TESOL
in Context

Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

About**TESOL** *in* Context

ACTA statement
TESOL in Context is a refereed journal with a wide target audience, both national and international. Readership includes TESOL / EAL professionals working in all sectors of education; universities, primary and secondary schooling, early childhood settings, adult migrant programs, vocational training, ELICOS and TESOL teacher education, both in Australia and internationally. Articles published in *TESOL in Context* typically examine the nexus between theory and practice.

The aims of *TESOL in Context* are to:
• provide professionals in the field with insights into TESOL issues in Australia and internationally
• contribute to the development of classroom expertise through dissemination of current research and thinking around TESOL.

For **guidelines** on length and presentation of items submitted to *TESOL in Context*, please consult the Notes for Contributors.

Copyright for all articles published in *TESOL in Context* is vested in the journal. Permission to publish articles elsewhere should be sought from the Editors.

Please note
Views expressed in contributions to *TESOL in Context* do not necessarily reflect those of ACTA.

Editorial: Teaching EAL/D learners across the curriculum

Leonardo Veliz
Gary Bonar
Jessica Premier
Editors

Australian society has become increasingly culturally and linguistically diverse. This is mainly because Australia is home to a significantly large number of refugees, refugee-humanitarian entrants, migrants, international students, and long-term visitors who all come with not only varying expectations of participation in the Australian community, but with an immensely rich repertoire of social, cultural, linguistic, and religious practices. While this makes a significant contribution to the diverse nature and richness of Australian society, it poses educational and pedagogical challenges to schools and teachers who seek to meet the diverse needs of students for whom English is a second or additional language, including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students.

Such increased cultural and linguistic diversity in Australian classrooms has prompted numerous studies that have investigated aspects of English as an additional language or dialect (EAL/D) teaching and learning in diverse contexts and from diverse viewpoints. For instance, studies have examined the language needs of EAL/D learners from an early childhood perspective (Dobinson & Buchori, 2016), the preparation of mainstream teachers for EAL/D practice (de Jong & Harper, 2005), the skills and knowledge base required of secondary teachers for effective EAL/D pedagogy (Liu et al., 2017), among several others.

While a significant body of research has suggested that a range of pedagogical strategies are needed to cater for the diverse needs of EAL/D learners (e.g. Gibbons, 2008; Hammond, 2014), it appears that we continue to face a lack of synergy across a number of domains that prevent the effective and successful integration of effective practices for EAL/D students in diverse

classrooms. Such incongruity manifests itself at various levels. Besides the misalignment between the political rhetoric of inclusion and diversity in Australia and the precarious ways in which these are fully embraced, in this Special Issue we draw particular attention to the multifaceted educational, pedagogical and ideological aspects that enable and/or constrain the possibilities of inclusive learning and teaching environments for EAL/D learners in mainstream classes.

Teaching EAL/D students across the curriculum in the Australian context presents distinct challenges. The diverse range of language backgrounds requires educators to navigate varying levels of language proficiency, necessitating personalised support and differentiated instruction (Herrera & Murry, 2019). Balancing the acquisition of language skills with content mastery requires careful pedagogical planning. Addressing potential cultural biases in educational resources and assessments is also crucial to ensure equitable learning experiences for EAL/D students (Cummins, 2000). By contrast, integrating EAL/D students across the curriculum offers meaningful opportunities for empowerment within the Australian education system. Collaborative cross-disciplinary efforts enhance teachers' professional learning, leading to a deeper understanding of language learning within specific subject contexts (Hawkins, 2015).

Establishing genuinely inclusive learning settings for EAL/D learners in mainstream classes requires structural and pedagogical modifications. Strategies for inclusive teaching for EAL/D students may encompass a wide range of approaches. For instance, content and language integration strategies (CLIL) are gaining traction, as teachers collaborate to design lessons that simultaneously address content and language learning objectives (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010). Differentiated instruction, scaffolded support, task orientation, adequate resources, materials and visual aids are all essential tools to cater to the diverse needs of EAL/D students (Gottlieb & Ernst-Slavit, 2014). Culturally responsive teaching practices that validate diverse backgrounds and languages contribute to a welcoming and supportive classroom environment. Efforts to integrate EAL/D students across the curriculum also present valuable opportunities for both educators and learners. Cross-disciplinary collaboration enriches professional development, fostering a deeper understanding of language learning within

subject-specific contexts (Hawkins, 2015). EAL/D students, when provided with equitable access to learning, contribute diverse perspectives that enrich classroom discussions and encourage intercultural competence among all students.

Our first article delves into challenges around teaching of writing in Standard Australian English (SAW). Teaching EAL/D students involves multifaceted pedagogies, that typically focus on supporting students with the macro skills of reading, writing, listening and speaking. However, the complexities of teaching EAL/D students in Australia are further compounded as teachers must focus on supporting students with Standard Australian English (SAE). This can be challenging for some EAL/D students, particularly when writing in SAE. Kitson and Li conduct a thorough exploration of the complexities surrounding writing in Standard Australian English for EAL/D students in their article "Exploring challenges and supports for writing in Standard Australian English for Australian secondary English as an Additional Language/Dialect (EAL/D) Students: A scoping study". The research not only highlights the multifaceted nature of writing proficiency among EAL/D students but also underscores the importance of addressing these complexities. By shedding light on the challenges faced by these students in developing their writing skills, the study emphasizes the critical role of appropriate resources and support mechanisms in enhancing their writing abilities. Important recommendations are brought to light as a result of this research, which may have implications for future policy and practice when teaching EAL/D students writing. The outcomes of this study are relevant not only to EAL/D teachers, but mainstream content area teachers too.

The following article by Partridge and Harper extends on this conversation, by further exploring effective teaching practices for EAL/D students, focusing on new arrivals to Australia. In "Enablers and barriers for plurilingual practices: How EAL/D teachers support new arrivals in a rural secondary setting," the authors delve into the concept of plurilingualism in a rural Australian secondary school setting. Plurilingualism was found to have positive outcomes for students, and this research offers valuable insights into the complexities of supporting plurilingual practices among students from a single cultural group. It explores the challenges faced by EAL/D teachers and the favourable

conditions that enable plurilingualism to thrive, highlighting the critical role of skilled bilingual aides in facilitating effective communication and learning. The findings have important outcomes for both EAL/D and mainstream classrooms, as supporting plurilingual practices was seen to benefit EAL/D students. Incorporating this practice into mainstream classrooms may be beneficial to students. The research indicates that stronger collaboration between mainstream teachers and EAL/D specialist teachers will assist with incorporating plurilingualism into mainstream classrooms. A key finding of this research is the need for collaborative practices between EAL/D and mainstream teachers to fully support plurilingualism.

Framed around the idea of attitudes towards diversity and, in particular, EAL/D learners in schools and mainstream classes, the third article by Veliz and Bonar examines the important but rather under-researched area of the attitudes of school principals towards EAL/D learners. Based on in-depth interviews with principals from secondary schools in Victoria and New South Wales, they explored attitudes towards diversity within educational settings, suitable pedagogical approaches, and the principals' stance on professional learning (PL) related to how teaching and leadership staff work with EAL/D learners. As recent studies have further shown (Rice et al., 2023) there is a lack of diversity within school leadership roles in Australia, and this has implications for how well the needs of students with diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds can be understood and catered for, especially where principals' beliefs about diversity may be influenced by systemic, structural schemas that sustain monoglossic and White-supremacy ideologies. This is closely aligned with findings that support the notion that negative perspectives or attitudes are frequently influenced by a monolingual bias or lack of awareness about multilingualism (Barnes et al., 2019).

Another key finding was the presence of a deficit perspective among some principals, primarily focusing on EAL/D students' English language proficiency as a key factor in perceiving them as less capable. Nevertheless, some principals also recognised the broader systemic issues contributing to the deficit view, including societal prejudices and stereotypes. Professional learning emerged as a key avenue for improving teacher and leader knowledge and practice, with potential benefits for both individual teachers and the broader school community. The authors contend that effective pedagogical approaches for EAL/D students require more than surface-level adjustments, emphasising high challenge and high support, and school principals are pivotal in creating safe spaces for teachers and students from diverse backgrounds to foster inclusivity and diversity within the school community.

Relating to that theme of professional learning, Smith and Downes' article shifts the focus to examine how pre-service teachers at a Queensland university are being prepared to support EAL/D learners in mainstream classes. Through a critical discourse analysis of transcripts of five expert EAL/D teachers who shared their insights and experiences with a cohort of pre-service teachers, Smith and Downes bring to the fore examples of the presence of three main discourses related to the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary for working with EAL/D learners. In addition, they highlight two social concerns that need to be acknowledged, namely the dominance of an Anglo-centric approach and the prevalence of deficit discourses in education. To begin to address these concerns, they propose a translanguaging approach that promotes the use of all languages in the classroom and values cultural diversity. This research is a timely reminder of the complexities of preparing preservice teachers to meet the needs of diverse student populations, with an emphasis on making explicit the specialised knowledge and skills required for effective engagement with EAL/D students. As part of their recommendations, the authors advocate for specialised EAL/D units within initial teacher education (ITE) programs to address these complexities. They also stress the importance of ongoing collaboration between ITE programs and expert EAL/D teachers to better prepare mainstream teachers. As three educators of pre-service teachers ourselves with regular engagement in this work in initial teacher education, we can see not only the importance of this study, but also how the findings and recommendations the authors provide will be of interest to those currently working in this space in schools.

Besides the need for specialised EAL/D units in ITE programs, as advocated by Smith and Downes, Steele, Dobinson and Winkler highlight the value of teacher-researcher collaborations as a catalyst for the development and implementation of more inclusive and responsive environments that value EAL/D learners'

diverse linguistic repertoires. The authors also highlight that, despite the increasing cultural and linguistic diversity, there is a significant gap in teacher preparation programs concerning the instruction of EAL/D in Australian classrooms. They argue that prevailing educational paradigms, influenced by neoliberal ideologies, often prioritise monolingual approaches to literacy development. The authors suggest that teacher-researcher collaborations can serve as a valuable avenue for teachers to enhance their knowledge and skills in addressing the diverse and complex needs of EAL/D learners. The authors present a case study of their collaboration in a super-diverse primary school setting, employing 'identity texts' and arts-based approaches. Steele, Dobinson and Winkler posit that case studies emphasise the contextual nature of teaching, making it challenging for research to universally address every educational situation. They suggest that teacher-researcher collaborations can effectively tackle this challenge by developing localised approaches grounded in theory and empirical evidence. Through such collaborations, research can contribute to a more comprehensive evidence-based approach to addressing and responding to EAL/D learners' needs.

The final article in this Special Issue is situated at the intersection of school autonomy, commercialisation, and the delivery of specialised services in EAL/D education. Creagh, Playsted, Lingard, Hogan and Choi highlight the shift from centralised management to school autonomy, where principals control budget decisions, and how this intersects with the commercialisation of educational services. The paper presents survey findings from EAL/D teachers in Australia, focusing on the extent of commercialisation and its impact on delivering equitable outcomes for English language learners. The authors suggest that the use of commercial products may not align with appropriate educational practices tailored to language learning needs. Further to that, they point to the need for further research to explore the uptake of commercial products in specialist language support, examining their appropriacy and potential effects on the professional standing of EAL/D teachers. Of great interest to EAL/D teachers, educators and other stakeholders, the study suggests that commercial practices, particularly the purchase of digital resources, are prevalent in schools due to the autonomy

in budget expenditure, leading to consequences for both EAL/D students and the professional standing of EAL/D specialists. The study reveals concerns about the misuse of commercial products not designed for EAL/D learners, indicating a lack of understanding or awareness among mainstream teachers. The de-professionalisation of EAL/D teachers is highlighted, as their knowledge and skills are being replaced by these products. The authors call for further research to explore the impact of commercialization on funding, the nature of products used for EAL/D support, and the role of EAL/D specialists in influencing appropriate resource selection. Additionally, they emphasise the need for transparency in funding processes and a re-evaluation of the use of commercial products that may work against equity in education.

We are also priviledged to include four book reviews in our Special Issue. The first book review is by Nurlaily. Her review of *Contemporary foudations for teaching English as an additional language* edited by Polina Vinogradova and Joan Kang Shin is a well-organised description and discussion of not only the structure of the volume but also the fundamental tenets about incorporating participatory pedagogies at the intersection of multilingualism and multimodality in the TESOL arena. In Shoecraft's review of *Pedagogical Translanguaging* (Cenoz & Gorter, 2022), we find a succinct, and yet comprehensive, overview of each chapter through which readers' attention is drawn to a clear definition of the framework of pedagogical translanguaging, the ways in which it differs from other translanguaging approaches, and the benefits as well as challenges assocciated with the framework in multilingual contexts. Shoecraft concurs with the authors on the increasing need for further empirical research at the intersection of translanguaging pedagogies and assessment practices. Similarly, with a focus on equitable approaches for bi/miltilingual learners, Diaz Mazquiaran reviews *Plurilingual pedagogies: Critical and creative endeavors for equitable language in education* by Lau and Van Viegen (2020). In a nutshell, besides a critical description of the volume, Diaz Mazquiaran capitalises on the importance of pluralistic approaches that acknowledge the multilingual resources of speakers of minoritised languages. Finally, on the topic of inclusion/exclusion and epistemic oppression of certain student populations, Rillera Kempster reviews a timely volume entitled

English and students with limited or interrupted formal education: Global perspectives on teacher preparation and classroom practices by Luis Javier Pentón Herrera. The review provides a thorough description of both the structural apparatus of the volume and of the different perspectives on students with limited or interrupted formal education (SLIFE) across multiple contexts.

To sum up, this Special Issue has two primary goals. Firstly, we aimed to bring together diverse perspectives and voices from across Australia that showcase the remarkable efforts that teachers and educators are already doing to cater for the needs of EAL/D learners in schools and mainstream environments. Secondly, and while acknowledging these commendable efforts by educators, we argue that more work is needed to address the persistent challenges in providing tailored support that addresses the diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds of EAL/D students. We acknowledge that catering for EAL/D learners' needs in schools and mainstream classes involves more than just structural adjustments. It necessitates a paradigm shift in educational perspectives. Beyond the accommodation of linguistic diversity, there is a crucial need to challenge and disrupt dominant deficit views that may prevail in educational settings. The insights gathered from these articles illuminate the multifaceted and dynamic landscape of EAL/D education in Australia. They collectively underscore the necessity for an integrated approach that encompasses not only specialized pedagogies but also a deep understanding of the cultural and linguistic diversity present in our classrooms.

References

Barnes, M., Shwayli, S., & Mathews, P. (2019). Supporting EAL students in regional education contexts: "It creates a huge workload and often times disappointment". *TESOL in Context, 28*(1), 45-64.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2022). Pedagogical Translanguaging (Elements in Language Teaching). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009029384

Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning.* Cambridge University Press.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire.* Multilingual Matters.

de Jong, E., & Harper, C. (2005). Preparing mainstream teachers for English-languagelearners: Is being a good teacher good enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly, 32*(2), 101-124.

Dobinson, T., & Buchori, S. (2016). Catering for EAL/D students' language needs in mainstream classes: Early childhood teachers' perspectives and practices in one Australian setting. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(2).

Gibbons, P. (2008). 'It was taught good and I learned a lot': Intellectual practices and ESL learners in the middle years. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 31*(2), 155-173.

Gottlieb, M., & Ernst-Slavit, G. (2014). Academic language in diverse classrooms: Definitions and contexts. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Vol. 3, pp. 249-267). Routledge.

Hammond, J. (2014). An Australian perspective on standards-based education, teacher knowledge, and students of English as an additional language. *TESOL Quarterly, 48*(3), 507-532.

Hawkins, M. R. (2015). Transforming teaching and learning: A model for professional development for teachers of English learners. *TESOL Quarterly, 49*(3), 552-577.

Herrera, S. G., & Murry, K. G. (2019). *Mastering ESL/EFL methods: Differentiated instruction for culturally and linguistically diverse (CaLD) Students.* Pearson.

Lau, S. M. C., & Van Viegen, S. (2020). Plurilingual Pedagogies (Vol. 42). Springer International Publishing

Liu, Y., Fisher, L., Forbes, K., & Evans, M. (2017). The knowledge base of teaching in linguistically diverse contexts: 10 grounded principles of multilingual classroom pedagogy for EAL. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 17*(4), 378-395.

Vinogradova P., & Shin, J. K. (2021). *Contemporary Foundations for Teaching English as an Additional Language.* Routledge.

Rice, S., Garner, A., & Graham, L. (2023). *Increasing the diversity of the teaching workforce.* Faculty of Education, The University of Melbourne.

Leonardo Veliz is an Associate Professor in Language and Literacy and Head of Department (Curriculum) in the School of Education at the University of New England, Australia. Leonardo is a

qualified secondary school teacher with extensive experience in highly diverse contexts (UK, South America, Australia). Leonardo's academic career spans over 20 years in Australia and overseas. Leonardo's research and research interests sit broadly within the realms of teaching and learning, multilingual and multicultural education, culturally responsive pedagogies for EAL/D learners, multiple literacies in diverse contexts and initial (language) teacher education.

lveliz@une.edu.au

Gary Bonar is a Lecturer in the Master of TESOL and Languages specialisation courses at the Faculty of Education, Monash University, Australia. He is involved in teacher education at both pre-service and post-graduate level and supervises research students in TESOL and Language-related fields. Prior to commencing his lecturing position he worked in the Victorian secondary education sector, most recently in the role of Curriculum Coordinator responsible for Literacy, Languages and Social Sciences and he also taught two languages (Japanese and Italian) and English as an additional language. He also has over ten years' experience teaching English in diverse sectors in Asia and Europe. Gary's current research explores the complex dynamics of language teacher identity and how future and current language teachers can be best prepared and supported to thrive as language teachers in schools.

Gary.Bonar@monash.edu

Jessica Premier is a Lecturer in the School of Curriculum, Teaching and Inclusive Education, within the Faculty of Education at Monash University. She is the Course Leader of the Diploma of Tertiary Studies (DoTS) and Diploma of Higher Education (DoHE). Jessica teaches in DoTS and DoHE, the Bachelor of Education, and Master of Teaching. Prior to working at Monash University, Jessica held classroom teaching and leadership positions in primary and secondary schools, and tertiary English language centres. She has experience teaching in Australia and Norway. Jessica's research interests include English as an Additional Language (EAL), literacy, and teacher education.

Jessica.Premier@monash.edu

Exploring challenges and supports for writing in Standard Australian English for Australian secondary English as an Additional Language/Dialect Students: A Scoping Study

Lisbeth Kitson
Cavendish Road State High School, Brisbane

Minglin Li
Griffith University

Abstract: *The overall purpose of this study was to explore the identified language challenges and supports for writing in Standard Australian English for secondary English as an Additional Language or Dialect (EAL/D) students. An initial review of the academic literature revealed that this research topic has not been extensively researched in the Australian context. For this reason, this research project involved a systematic scoping study of the academic literature, based on the framework of Arksey and O'Malley (2005) to determine findings to date. The 35 articles examined revealed a range of themes that either challenged or supported the writing process for Australian EAL/D secondary students. Key challenges that EALD learners in secondary contexts face when developing Standard Australian English (SAE) writing skills revolve around policy mandates from curriculum and assessment authorities, de-facto policy as realised through EAL and mainstream curriculum, teachers' attitudes, knowledge and beliefs, including notions of deficit, and pre-service teacher preparation. What was found to support EAL/D students were different pedagogical approaches which are cognizant of students' cultural knowledge, experiences and linguistic resources, as well as genre-based approaches incorporating Systemic Functional Linguistics and a teaching and learning cycle and technology. Given that some of the studies were relatively small which impacts*

generalizability, further research in relation to the topics under study would be encouraged, particularly as to what supports a wider range of EAL/D students.

Introduction

Australia is a culturally and linguistically diverse country with students drawing from over 2,000 different ethnic backgrounds. In primary and secondary classrooms this equates to approximately 21%-25% of students for whom English is an Additional Language or Dialect (EAL/D), with numbers of EAL/D students as high as 90% in some schools. EAL/D students can come from a range of backgrounds including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander, immigrants, refugees, migrant children and international students from non-English speaking countries (ACARA, n.d.). Not only are these students learning English as a language or dialect in a range of content areas, but they are expected to demonstrate their understanding in Standard Australian English (SAE) in written forms which can be challenging.

National and international data reveal that EAL/D students underperform in SAE literacy tests, and they require additional support with English language in order to access age-appropriate curriculum (ACARA, n.d.; ACTA, 2022). In response to supporting EAL/D students, federal and state governments have made and implemented various policies to guide and support teachers. For example, in Queensland where the authors are based, Queensland public schools are guided by the *State Schools Improvement Strategy 2022-2026* (Department of Education Queensland, 2021) which is underpinned by a range of policies that focused on inclusion of student diversity counting the *Human Rights Act 2019, the Multicultural Recognition Act 2016*, and *Inclusive Education Policy*. The goal is to have all students, including culturally and linguistically diverse students succeeding and, in particular, succeeding in writing in SAE. At the local level all secondary schools are charged with implementing the *State Schools Improvement Strategy 2022-2026* and lifting the outcomes and engagement of domestic EAL/D students, with schools often identifying improvement agendas for writing.

However, research findings indicate that mainstream classroom teachers may not have the specialised knowledge to support EAL/D students and need more support to do so (Gilmour et al., 2018; Premier, 2021). An initial review of the literature found only a dearth of studies in relation to writing for EAL/D learners in the secondary years. This indicates a gap in the literature generally but more research is needed for the diverse groups of EAL/D students, which has become the recent impetus for the present scoping research.

By conducting such a scoping review, this study aims to 1) explore the identified challenges and supports for writing in SAE for secondary EAL/D students in a range of learning areas, and 2) identify ways to support educators to teach SAE writing skills explicitly, actively and meaningfully. The remainder of this paper will provide a short review of the academic literature relating to the policy context for EAL/D education in Australia, and discuss the theoretical and conceptual framing for this research. The research methodology employed will then be rationalised and detailed, followed by the presentation and discussion of the findings. Some key considerations for future research and practice will conclude this paper.

The policy context in Australia

Teaching and learning do not take place in a vacuum and as such are influenced by policy which in turn impacts funding for various initiatives. As Scarino (2022) advises the current situation in Australia is that there is no national policy on language. Given the lack of national policy, Scarino (2022) states that a standardised Australian national curriculum serves as a "de facto policy in the schooling context," supported by a range of EAL/D resources (p. 154). Responsibilities for funding EAL/D moved from the Commonwealth Government to state and territory governments, and Gonski funding found its way into general school budgets (Creagh et al., 2022; Scarino, 2022). In Queensland Education, a restructuring of the educational bureaucracy has meant EAL/D has been incorporated into an overarching inclusion policy. In spite of extensive funding for EAL/D, this has been "devolved to schools, which now have greater autonomy over one-line budgets and with very limited accountability measures in respect of the provision and outcomes of the EAL/D policy in practice" (Creagh et al., 2022, p. 2).

In reality, changes in funding have resulted in "the disappearance of EAL/D qualified teachers and leaders in schools, diversion of earmarked funding away from EAL/D learner support, EAL/D programs subsumed within other school programs and dissipated EAL/D services in schools" (ACTA, 2022, p.5). As a result of these changes, ACTA (2022) highlight

this erosion of provision for EAL/D students coincides with their poor performance in literacy as measured by NAPLAN, and other literacy tests. Further concerned by the loss of EAL/D provision for students in Australian Schools, ACTA has again recently released a Roadmap for EAL/D Education post COVID-19 (ACTA. 2022). This roadmap suggests 12 key actions aligned to the Reform Directions and *National Policy Initiatives in National Schools Reform Agreement* (Department of Education and Training, 2018), which is a joint agreement amongst the Commonwealth, States and Territories, designed to boost student outcomes across Australian schools.

Of particular focus to this research study is the emphasis on ensuring teachers can support EAL/D students, given the lack of policy and structural support for EAL/D (Scarino, 2022). ACTA (2022) call for high-impact pedagogies that can support EAL/D learning losses, help achieve economic parity with their peers, and accelerate English learning. This research project, with a scoping study as its method, could "provide a coherent and sound evidence base for national policy, planning and practice in EAL/D education" which could inform teacher practice (ACTA, 2022, p.15).

Conceptual framework for this study

This research is guided by a range of theories, which are interpretive in nature. From an interpretivist paradigm, reality is viewed as subjective and relative (Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005; Neuman, 2006). One interpretivist approach that frames this study is a hermeneutically inspired understanding of language acquisition which acknowledges the subjectivities of both students and teachers in the learning process (Gadamer, 1976; 2004). It seeks to understand the beliefs, values and actions of individuals that are shaped by their language, culture, and personal experiences, which in turn shapes interactions with others, the meanings made through development of knowledge and understanding, and demonstration of their knowledge and understanding (Scarino, 2022).

For Gadamer (2004), language, as a tool for mediation and negotiation between people, serves a social purpose. This notion of negotiation of meaning making as not only individualistic but collaborative, frames our second theoretical frame, that of social constructionism. As Scarino (2022, p.158) emphasises, "It is this being 'at home' in the language of their primary socialisation that shapes students' (and teachers') learning and coming to know".

Part of this coming to know, is not only tied to notions of language as a legacy, deeply rooted in histories, tradition and culture (Gadamer, 1976), but also tied to issues of power. This is particularly important given that written texts are co-constructed, and presented as genres that are socially recognised, with languages like SAE often privileged over the languages that EAL/D students may bring into the classroom (Scarino, 2022).

These interpretive theoretical approaches have shaped the choices made in regard to methodology, analysis, interpretation, and discussion of the results.

Research Methodology

The key aims and purposes of this study informed the following research questions:

1. What is known from existing academic literature about challenges for writing in Standard Australian English for EAL/D secondary students?

2. What is known from existing academic literature about opportunities to support writing in Standard Australian English for EAL/D secondary students?

To seek answers to these questions, a scoping review following Arksey and O'Malley's (2005) methodological framework for scoping studies was conducted. Given the potential audience of this report (educators and/or researchers), "a scoping study is an appropriate tool for enabling the research community to access existing understandings in the literature" (Major et al., 2018, p. 1996), which may reveal knowledge gaps and inform future research (Peters et al., 2020). Scoping studies need to be conducted in a rigorous and transparent manner, documented in sufficient detail to allow for replicability to ensure greater reliability of the findings. Whilst the five stages of Arksey and O'Malley's (2005) framework are delineated in a linear fashion, it should be noted that, the process is not linear but iterative, requiring researchers to engage with each stage in a reflexive way and, where necessary, repeat steps to ensure that the literature is covered in a comprehensive way. For the purposes of discussing the process, it will be discussed in a linear fashion as per the five stages of the framework:

- Stage 1: Identifying the research question
- Stage 2: Identifying relevant studies

- Stage 3: Study selection
- Stage 4: Charting the data
- Stage 5: Collating, summarizing and reporting the results

When **identifying the research question**, key parameters such as the study population, interventions or outcomes were defined as recommended by Arskey and O'Malley (2005). For this study a focus on the target population of secondary Australian EAL/D students drew from our roles as a secondary classroom teacher and TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) educator trying to support culturally and linguistically diverse students. The concept of writing was both a school priority and national priority as explained earlier, with the context defined to focus on Australian secondary schools.

To **identify relevant studies**, a comprehensive search of both published and unpublished studies and reviews addressing the research questions was undertaken, using search terms drawn from the research question (challenges, supports, opportunities, writing, Standard Australian English, EAL/D). Five electronic databases were selected for their relevance to education and EAL/D. For the majority of searches, Boolean operators, such as AND, were used to join key words, or phrase searching (such as "secondary schools"), truncation symbols such as EAL* were also applied when searching. These searches were limited to full text, peer reviewed articles published between 2010-2022. The term EAL/D was first used in 2011 in Queensland in relation to the EAL/D bandscales. ACARA then started to use the term from 2012 and afterwards. Given that it was officially used in 2011, it was decided to search from 2010 as there may have been some slightly early references prior to its more official use in Queensland educational documents. There were variations in the number of results yielded from each search strategy conducted (see results in Table 1).

The **selection of relevant studies** was an iterative and reflective process (Levac et al., 2010). A Level 1 review based on the article title, abstract and summary, applying the exclusion criteria revealed a total of 77 potential articles. Some identified relevant studies appeared in more than one of the above databases. For most of the citations selected from applying the search strategy a large number of studies were not relevant to the topic, in spite of defining the terminology at the beginning (Arskey & O'Malley, 2005). This was the case for Google Scholar which yielded large number of sources (e.g., 18,000 or more). Analysis stopped after the first 100 potential sources were searched for relevance. Findings also included other terminology such as English as a second language (ESL), English Language learners (ELL), which in turn shaped the refining of searches. Overall, searches with no Boolean operators revealed more appropriate results.

To counter the possibilities of irrelevant studies, key decisions were made as to the inclusion and exclusion criteria at both Level 1 (title, abstract and summary) and Level 2 (full articles) review (Levac et al., 2010; Peters et al., 2015, 2020). The 77 articles identified from Level 1 Review were manually scanned and read for further detail for their ability to answer the research questions and for inclusion/exclusion criteria. This laborious process realised 35 relevant articles (see Appendix A for a list of these studies). Table 1 shows the number of studies remaining after application of inclusion and the exclusion criteria at Level 2 Review.

Table 1. Level 1 and level 2 identification of relevant studies

Level 1 Review	Level 2 Review
Review of full text, peer reviewed journals based on **article title, abstract and summary.**	Review of the **whole article** for those identified in **Level 1 Review.**
Criteria for Exclusion: • Non-peer reviewed articles/ journals or books • Prior to 2010 • Other countries apart from Australia • Participants – primary years, University undergraduate • Non-ESL, EAL or EAL/D students • Writing as multimodal	**Criteria for Inclusion:** • Published peer reviewed journals or other peer reviewed sources, books which included research results • 2010- 2022 • Australian • Participants – secondary or high school • ESL, EAL or EAL/D students • Writing or aspects of writing for print-based text • Challenges for writing for EAL/D students • Opportunities or supports for writing for EAL/D students

Database searched	Results Yielded from Searches	Number of Articles remaining after Level 1 Review	Number of Articles remaining after Level 2 Review
Griffith University	26	7	6
Eric Proquest	4	1	1
Proquest Education	77	1	2
Sage Database	22	2	2
Google Scholar - 3 searches	17, 000 18,500 980	21 8 37	24
		Total = 77 potential articles	**Total = 35 articles**

Charting of the data involved extraction of data from the included studies after inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied. Arksey and O'Malley's (2005) charting approach and Levac et al.'s (2010) descriptive analytical method were adopted as an iterative process and updated throughout, as well as a thematic analysis approach (Creswell, 2012) to make sense of extracted data. Data extracted from the previous stage was collated and summarized in Stage 5 – **collating, summarising and reporting the results**.

For those 35 suitable extracted studies, thematic synthesis process (Thomas & Harden, 2008) was undertaken, seeking to explore themes emerging in the data and refine meaning in relation to the guiding questions of the study. All empirical data were open coded for concepts related to writing challenges and supports either for teachers or EAL/D students. At all times, when coding data, comparisons were made between emerging categories. Documented information yielded from this comparative process allowed for the establishment of connections between categories. **Findings** from **collating and summarising** the extracted studies will be reported and discussed in the sections that follow.

Results

Eight primary themes and some sub-themes emerged from the analysis of the extracted studies from the scoping study though it should be noted that the content of some articles could fall into more than one category (Kitson, 2022) (see Table 2). For example, whilst Baak et al. (2021) explored the rhetoric of policy and what was enacted, the main topic discussed was assessment, so it was included under the theme of assessment. In addition, writing in a range of subject areas were discussed in some readings, but these were categorised under pre-service teacher preparation, teachers' attitudes knowledge, skills and experience or writing as part of a curriculum.

Table 2. Primary Themes and Sub-themes Emerging from the Extracted Studies

Primary Themes	Sub-themes
Factors impacting teachers' practice in relation to writing	Pre-service teacher preparation and writing instruction
	Teachers' attitudes, knowledge, skills and experience
	Deficit Discourses
Writing as part of a curriculum	Critical literacy
	Hidden curriculum
Writing in a range of subject areas	
Writing as a creative and individual identity building endeavour	
Pedagogical approaches to writing	
Creating an environment that supports writing	Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) Valuing students' cultural and linguistic resources
Assessment of writing for EAL/D students	NAPLAN writing tests
	Classroom assessment
Ways to support different groups of EAL/D students	IEAL/D
	International students

All of these themes are reported in Kitson (2022). However, to address the focus of this journal article and a reduced word limit, only six key themes, though not all sub-themes will be reported here: F*actors Impacting Teachers' Practice in Relation to*

Writing, Writing as Part of A Curriculum, Pedagogical Approaches to Writing, Creating An Environment That Support Writing, Assessment of Writing for EAL/D Students, and Ways to Support Different Groups of EAL/D Students. Since some challenges identified can also be framed as supports or opportunities and vice versa, challenges and supports are discussed together.

Factors impacting teachers' practice in relation to writing
What occurs in the classroom in regards to how EAL/D students learn is impacted by macro and micro level contextual factors such as policy mandates, funding, school programs, pre-service teacher preparation, teachers' attitudes, knowledge and skills, and notions of deficit. Some major findings are presented in this section.

Pre-service teacher education preparation for writing
Three studies reported findings based on programs provided for pre-service secondary teachers (PSTs) to prepare them for school-based practicum experiences with a diverse range of students, including EAL/D students (Davison & Ollerhead, 2018; Love, 2010; Ollerhead, 2018). PSTs undertaking either a Bachelor or Master of Secondary Education, were mentored as to how to teach academic literacies including aspects of genre such as structure, register, and linguistic features in a range of learning areas, delivered through a series of workshops. Workshop content included a focus on building PSTs pedagogical language knowledge for writing (Davison & Ollerhead, 2018; Ollerhead, 2018) or in Love's (2010) case, literacy pedagogical content knowledge (LPCK). In Ollerhead's (2018) study, PSTs worked with Indigenous and Pacific Islander students, identified as needing more support with language and literacy in an intensive tutoring program. All three studies focused on literacy, which was conflated as supporting EAL/D students but also students who were struggling with literacy. Love (2010) included a focus on oral language, but did not really touch on second language acquisition and what strategies or knowledge is specially needed for EAL/D students.

Nguyen and Brown's (2016) study which explored the factors influencing the writing instruction of three PSTs, was the only one with a dedicated EAL practicum. Their mentors were all trained in TESOL, and the PSTs had completed some specialist EAL courses as part of their undergraduate teaching program. This study revealed that the writing instruction PSTs delivered in

schools was influenced by contextual elements including the school EAL program, the EAL and mainstream curriculum, the teachers who mentored them, and the PSTs' prior knowledge about their EAL/D students' proficiency levels, backgrounds and ability to respond to tasks. Whilst PSTs' experiences varied from school to school and with different levels of success, what was found to be successful was differentiated instruction based on student backgrounds, needs and interests and genre-based writing instruction. Structural templates like TEEL (Topic, Evidence, Explain, Link) and graphic organisers were less effective for one PST due to lack of clarity of purpose of all parts of the template.

Teachers' attitudes, knowledge and skills
Three studies explored teachers' attitudes, knowledge and skills (Gleeson & Davison, 2016, 2019; Truckenbrodt & Slaughter, 2016). Truckenbrodt and Slaughter (2016) proposed that EAL/D teachers, language teachers and classroom teachers should be working collectively to identify shared goals and expertise, to explore commonalities in the curriculum, create a common metalanguage and pedagogical approaches, in order "to promote plurilingual notions of language and literacy and, where appropriate, to align language and literacy practices" (p. 27). Notions of collaboration as implied, however, did not appear to be supported by other studies exploring the attitudes, content knowledge and skills of teachers.

For example, in Gleeson and Davison's (2016) study 11 teachers from a range of teaching areas from two public NSW secondary schools, each with over 70% EAL/D students, as well as a feeder intensive language centre for new arrivals were interviewed and completed questionnaires. In spite of opportunities to co-teach with ESL specialists, and thus learn how to support EAL/D students, Gleeson and Davison (2016) found there was a conflict between this experience, professional learning, and their beliefs about teaching EAL/D students. Some teachers were cognisant that different disciplines used different genres to convey information, and used some strategies to support secondary EAL/D students. However, they maintained that teachers only had a superficial understanding of the language knowledge needed for teaching EAL/D students, also supported in their later study (Gleeson & Davison, 2019). Gleeson and Davison (2016, p. 48) found that one ESL teacher did not have "the pedagogical language knowledge to guide or challenge his colleagues". Other

teachers in Gleeson and Davison's (2016) study also noticed a disparate difference between oral language proficiency and proficiency in writing, but there was lack of awareness that this was a common occurrence during language acquisition.

Further, some teachers did not consider teaching EAL/D students as a specialist area, viewing English teachers as having the necessary skills to teach them. In relation to differentiation in subject areas, others conflated teaching EAL/D students with foreign language teaching or supporting those with literacy learning difficulties. Some did not value writing as important to their subject (e.g., mathematics), and would focus on meaning but overlook grammatical and spelling errors. However, some more experienced teachers did not perceive any friction between their subject teaching beliefs, their professional knowledge and practices, and those related to teaching English language learners, "they saw no need to seek out additional specific professional learning" (Gleeson & Davison, 2016, p.53). This is contrasted with Gleeson and Davidson's (2019) later study, which found newer teachers who had EAL/D understanding built into their pre-service training were more open to professional development. Gleeson and Davidson (2019) also found that teachers had low views of EAL/D students pursing an academic pathway.

Deficit discourses
Two studies addressed challenges EAL/D learners have relating to five competing deficit discourses (Alford, 2014; Choi & Slaughter, 2021). Findings from Alford's (2014) 16 interviews with four English teachers explored how teachers positioned their secondary EAL/D students, revealing five competing discourses in teachers' talk. These are that: EAL/D students lack levels of sophistication to achieve higher grades in writing *(deficit as lack)*, and may not possess what is required by the demands of the curriculum *(deficit as need)*. EAL/D students also have conceptual challenges *(conceptual capacity for critical literacy)*, challenges relating to cultures of learning, rhetorical sophistication in writing, or writing in exam conditions *(linguistic, cultural and conceptual difficulty with critical literacy)*. Whilst some of these discourses offer a challenging viewpoint, Alford (2014) suggests others offer hope. For example, Alford (2014) argues that regarding *learner difference as a resource* offers potential opportunities for more equitable literacy learning although some teachers in Alford's study did not always draw upon these

resources. Choi and Slaughter (2021) also proposed that to challenge notions of deficit, EAL/D students' linguistic repertoires, resources and experiences as well as their language practices, should be valued. They suggested creating "language trajectory grids" to make these visible, which can be then used to prompt rich discussions and as a stimulus for creative writing.

Writing as part of a curriculum
Of the extracted studies, four articles focused on writing as part of the English and EAL curriculum, three with a focus on critical literacy (Alford, 2014; Alford & Kettle, 2017; Allison, 2011), and one on the notion of hidden curriculum (Janfada & Thomas, 2020).

Critical literacy
Critical literacy skills are higher order thinking skills used when reading literary texts for hidden or underlying messages on political, social and cultural aspects, and writing critically is an expectation in secondary English and EAL studies. Both Alford (2014) and Allison (2011), however, found this to be problematic for EAL/D students. Allison (2011) indicated that although EAL/D learners had necessary linguistic resources to engage in critical literacy successfully or as suitable to their ages, when it came to "essayist literacy" (Scollon & Scollon, 1981, p. 50), they lacked knowledge and understanding of important content and concepts and repeated concepts, as well as the required skills and knowledge for topic development, and were unable to link the concepts in a cohesive and logical manner.

The main data from Alford (2014) centred on notions of deficit discourse as reported earlier in relation to a "conceptual capacity for critical literacy", and the other on the contrary, "linguistic, cultural and conceptual difficulty with critical literacy" (Alford, 2014, p. 71), also noted by Allison (2011). For example, in Alford's (2014) study, one teacher commented that in spite of language skills, students wrote about foregrounding, marginalisation, and how and why readers are positioned in particular ways, but they did not have the language proficiency to manipulate the language to argue their opinion, or they may have challenges with complex sentences, lack of rhetorical sophistication in their writing, or have problems in relation to writing in exam conditions. Both Allison (2011) and Alford (2014) point out the disenfranchising nature of the essay, which is a staple form of

assessment, suggesting the use of other ways for EAL/D students to demonstrate their knowledge (Alford, 2014) as well as intensive support across secondary schooling to develop the complex language demands, including the ability to build the field (Allison, 2011).

Hidden Curriculum

In examining the hidden ideological underpinnings of the EAL Curriculum enacted in Victoria, Janfada and Thomas (2020) found that whilst the EAL curriculum is specifically devised for EAL/D students, the study of the texts selected still demands the rigour required of first language speakers. Further, the texts deemed suitable for EAL/D students due to their awareness of the diverse needs of EAL/D learners, in reality means fewer texts, which still promote an anglophone perspective and view of the world.

Pedagogical approaches to writing

Whilst they will not be discussed in detail here, different types of pedagogical approaches were reported including drama pedagogy and trans-languaging poetry pedagogy (Dutton & Rushton, 2018; 2021; 2022), the use of "language trajectory grids (Choi & Slaughter, 2021) reported earlier, and the use of word poetry to create a third space for EALD students through culturally sustaining pedagogy (Jones & Curwood, 2020). These approaches (Dutton & Rushton, 2018; 2021; 2022, Choi & Slaughter, 2021) serve as a way of engaging students, building identity through shared stories and lives, supporting development in writing or as a way into writing. In particular, word or slam poetry (Jones & Curwood, 2020, p.281) allowed students "to manipulate the language without the restrictions of grammar or structure", as well develop critical literacy. However, this approach used a program outside the school curriculum of English.

Whilst a context-based approach helps fluid transitions between the context and concepts in written work in science of middle school students (King & Henderson, 2018), genre or text-based models, often used with Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) (Halliday, 1994) and in conjunction with a four-stage teaching and learning cycle, adapted from Callaghan and Rothery (1988), are the ones that have experienced success at whole school level (Clary et al., 2015; Humphrey, 2015; Humphrey & Feez, 2016). The use of SFL was found to support EAL/D students and provide a metalanguage for both teacher modelling and feedback on student drafts which allowed for growth in writing. Both studies of Humphrey (2015) and Humphrey and Feez (2016) also reported that teachers' work had positive impacts on both internal and external data such as NAPLAN (National Assessment Program – Literacy and Numeracy). In a similar vein, Clary et al. (2015) implemented a whole school literacy program in one regional NSW secondary school with a staff of about 50 teachers where 14% of the 700-student population identified as Indigenous and 8% as EAL/D. Anecdotal data revealed for Indigenous students there was improved pride in their written products, greater awareness of different genres, their structure and language, particularly in extended response questions using paragraphs. Janfada and Thomas (2020) also maintain that genre-based approaches can offer rich affordances for learning about the language of texts, although it has been criticised for teaching students to conform to predictable and normative ways of communicating which can dismiss multilingual voices.

Creating an environment that supports writing

Key studies exploring the notion of environments conducive to EAL/D students' writing were Gilmour (2017) who explored the school environment from teacher and student viewpoints, Downes (2015) in relation to ICTs, and Scarino (2022) the mediating role of culture and languages. Gilmour (2017) surveyed 2,484 students and 337 high school staff from five Queensland secondary schools in order to understand the learning experiences and environment for culturally and linguistically diverse students (CALD). Of the students surveyed 10.5% were classified as EAL/D, 10% were from bi/multilingual schools. Like authors reported earlier *in the Teachers' attitudes, knowledge and skills section*, Gilmour (2017) found that teachers did not have the necessary skills to support this 20% of the cohort, with only 4.7% of staff having received academic training, and only another 10.4% having received some professional development. 68 of the 2,484 students were further interviewed to unpack their experiences and their academic achievements, including performance in NAPLAN. In relation to writing, EAL/D students from years 7-9 were below the national minimum standard for writing, with -15.7%, -14.8%, and -36.9% respectively for writing. Grammar was another area of concern for this group. Those from bi/multilingual homes achieved slightly better. In exploring their school experiences, Gilmour (2017)

found that writing across a range of subjects was challenging for this group of students. Challenges included mixing up words when speaking two or more languages, sentence structure, starting to write, coming up with ideas, vocabulary, or writing up theory or in exams for Science and Health and Physical Education.

Downes (2015) and Scarino's (2022) studies found opportunities for environments to support writing. Downes (2015) in his review of the academic literature observed that ICTs offer more opportunities than face to face interactions for collaborative learning activities. They can lead to EAL/D students' literacy development, based on a more collective scaffolding, authentic language input and output, peer feedback and assistance. Scarino (2022) highlights the mediating role of culture and languages in relation to student learning particularly in relation to writing. She explored the written work on senior secondary EAL/D students, in particular one case study of a Malaysian's student's response to a written item in a Year 12 EAL/D exam. This case study highlighted that when writing for an Australian audience, as a Malaysian person, this student had to transpose himself to thinking in an Australian way, and to position himself in a particular role, as well as create a text in a genre that works differently in his culture. Scarino (2022, p. 166) proposed that EAL/D teachers tend to focus more on the written product or the genre, "when what is also needed is a variety of tasks that invite consideration of multiplicity, comparison, translation, different positionings and different vantage points".

Assessment of writing for EAL/D students
Several studies discuss the assessment challenges for EAL/D students regarding external data like NAPLAN, and internal data like ESL band-scales and other senior secondary writing tasks, which are guided by senior certificate policies (Angelo, 2013; Baak et al., 2021; Creagh, 2014; Dixon & Angelo, 2014). Angelo (2013), Dixon and Angelo (2014), and Creagh (2014) raised the highly problematic nature of NAPLAN. Creagh (2014) points out for ESL students, the manner in which NAPLAN data is disaggregated based on LBOTE (Language Background Other Than English) is the only indicator of language and it does not take into account proficiency in SAE or any second language factors which may impact upon student performance in writing. In doing so, Angelo (2013, p. 93) enforced that all EAL/D students should be assessed using EAL/D band-scales that relate to "their specific language

ecologies and particular learning situations". Creagh (2014) interrogated the LBOTE data to explore if there was a connection between English language level and NAPLAN test performance. Creagh (2014) found that teacher judgement is valid and aligns with NAPLAN performance, and where teacher judgement is based on qualitative observations measured quantitatively, it is beneficial and should not be discounted.

Other high stakes assessment is often dictated by policy. Baak et al. (2021) sought to explore the differences in the rhetoric of new South Australia senior certificate policies aimed at being more inclusive, and what was enacted in practice in two schools with a high population of refugee students. For EAL/D staff in these two schools, there were tensions in regard to the enactment of assessment in spite of allowances for flexibilities in assessment design. For example, even offering oral modes or powerpoint instead of written assessment, these modes still required oral or written competency in SAE which is still a challenge for students from refugee backgrounds. Teachers were also divided in relation to offering fewer assessment to students with some finding less would be better, whilst other teachers felt that more opportunities to write offered opportunities to draft, process and think, edit and revise their work. However, such flexibilities do come with their challenges for enactment, including teacher workload, previous assessment practice, experience, as well as fear in relation to aspects of uniformity and fairness, especially given the high stakes nature of this assessment, as well as a cultural shift at the school level.

Ways to support different groups of EAL/D students
The majority of the 35 studies reviewed discussed EAL/D students as a more homogenous group, even though there was great diversity within them, both as to how they were classified (rural, remote, urban, refugees, indigenous) or their ethnic background. These have been reported elsewhere under the main theme of the study. In this section, however, only Indigenous EAL/D students (IEAL/D) (Bevan & Shillinglaw, 2010) and international students (Crossley, 2021; Filipi & Keary, 2018; Lindner & Margetts, 2022) are reported, as these are the key studies that centred around the experiences of these specific groups.

Bevan and Shillinglaw (2010) found that Year 11-12 IEAL/D students from a secondary school in Western Australia, when completing an EAL/D course of study, needed further SAE

literacy development. They highlighted the importance of acknowledging the skills that these students bring from their Indigenous culture, a more oral culture and one based on the notion of story. The classroom teacher, along with a cultural consultant negotiated the classroom space, using the Two-Way Approach, codeswitching between cultures and dialects to develop students' literacy development. Such an approach develops both dialects, and creates a bridge to learning SAE. To overcome issues of developing linguistic and cultural awareness, along with a metalanguage for talking about SAE, students completed a code-switching journal.

Three studies reported on international students. Lindner and Margetts (2022) sought to investigate the experiences of 116 Chinese international students. As Lindner and Margetts (2022) point out, there is a dearth of research in relation to this at the undergraduate tertiary level but little for secondary. In relation to writing, Lindner and Margetts (2022) found that 35.2% of international students expected writing in English in Australia to be difficult or very difficult. Interviews with students revealed that writing for meaning was difficult, as it is inhibited by the inability of additional supports such as body language or gesture which can be used for oral communication. Other interview responses highlighted challenges of text length and vocabulary.

Filipi and Keary (2018) found that content area teachers lacked confidence in addressing international students' language needs, even though they felt a responsibility to do so. Crossley (2021) indicated a challenging gap between Intensive English Language Programs to Year 10 EAL/D courses in which some students enrol in some Victorian colleges. This was brought about by disconnected course content and insufficient teacher qualifications to support this transition, where higher order language skills, literacy and critical thinking are required.

Discussion and Conclusion

This scoping study sought to explore both the challenges for EAL/D secondary students for writing, as well as supports that may assist them. However, it should be noted that what can appear to be challenges can also be framed as supports and vice versa. The biggest challenges that EALD learners in secondary contexts face when developing their SAE writing skills revolve around policy mandates from curriculum and assessment authorities, de-facto policy as realised through EAL and mainstream

curriculum, teachers' attitudes, knowledge and beliefs, including notions of deficit, and pre-service teacher preparation. Each of these will be discussed.

Scarino (2022) points out, with a lack of national policy, the Australian national curriculum serves as a "de facto policy in the schooling context" (p. 154). The notion of curriculum and other educational imperatives from curriculum authorities and policies for senior secondary schooling where the stakes are higher, shape what EAL/D students experience in the classroom, in relation to sequences of learning, pedagogical practices that support the content, and the assessment tasks that might be used to assess the content. However, the theoretical underpinnings of each subject area will shape all of these aspects. In relation to the English and EAL curricula, critical literacy has underpinned these curricula, its intent to promote equity and access for non-native speakers though this is tokenistic (Allison, 2011). This tokenism is evident in EAL curriculum where the study of texts has the rigour of a first language speaker, and where text selection is fewer and still promotes anglophone perspectives (Janfada & Thomas, 2020).

Whilst authors were divided as to students' conceptual capabilities to be critically literate, other deficit discourses revealed challenges experienced by EAL/D students including the lack of rhetorical sophistication to achieve higher grades in writing, lack of necessary skills, challenges relating to the cultures of learning or lacking the linguistic, cultural and conceptual difficulties to perform under written exam conditions. This usually relies on what Allison (2011) refers to as "essayist literacy" (Scollon & Scollon, 1981, p. 50) which EAL/D students struggle with, in particular lack of knowledge of important content, how to develop a topic and how to sequence this logically and cohesively rather than repeating. These challenges mean that schools need to support EAL/D students to build these capabilities right from when they transition from primary school and throughout the junior and senior secondary years.

Numerous authors (Alford, 2014; Allison, 2011) call for opportunities to move away from the traditional staple assessment item of the essay. However, as the Baak et al.'s (2021) study highlights even with policies that allow for more flexibility in assessment to include EAL/D students, particular challenges exist that need to be considered. For example, even allowing presentation in other modes, EAL/D students still can suffer lack

of competency in SAE. Change like this is never easy and involves a cultural shift to embrace such opportunities.

Generally, whilst writing is part of all curricula in secondary schools, English is considered the subject area where literacy, and writing as part of literacy, is taught "in a manner that is more explicit and foregrounded than is the case in other learning areas" (ACARA, n.d.). However, it is the responsibility of all subject area specialists to teach students the language and literacy requirements. Numerous researchers (e.g., Gilmour, et al., 2018; Premier, 2021) have found that mainstream classroom teachers may not always have the specialised knowledge and support to teach EAL/D students, especially in regard to language. Of concern to Gleeson and Davison (2019) are more experienced teachers who view their years of practice with EAL/D students as enough. Gleeson and Davison (2016) have suggested it is only when there is a lack of dissonance between their existing beliefs in relation to their subject knowledge and practices that teachers will seek more professional learning or guidance from specialist EAL staff. It is about finding a way to challenge this status quo and for teachers to see the relevance of engaging in second language acquisition research, rather than just their literacy practices they gleaned from primary years teachers or from supporting struggling writers (Gleeson & Davison, 2016; 2019). Further, Initial Teacher Education preparation courses need to go further than teaching about disciplinary literacies, to develop PSTs' understandings of how EAL/D students acquire a second language.

Key supports for secondary EAL/D students' writing identified were different pedagogical strategies which are mindful of students' cultural knowledge, experiences and linguistic resources, genre-based approaches incorporating Systemic Functional Linguistics and a teaching and learning cycle, as well as technology. EAL/D students are individuals who draw from a wide range of culturally and linguistically diverse groups with a wealth of knowledge, experiences and linguistic resources. Such diversity can be brought to writing identity tasks (Choi & Slaughter, 2021; Dutton & Rushton, 2018; Jones & Curwood, 2020). Not only do they offer rich opportunities for student engagement and for students to use their linguistic resources, histories and experiences, but they act as a bridge to more academic discourses (Dutton & Rushton, 2018). Writing as an act is a cognitively demanding task where the writer not only needs to

think about content and how to sequence it, but also text structure, text purpose, how to use language to achieve this purpose, and punctuation and spelling as well.

Genre or text-based models are pedagogical approaches that have experienced success at whole school level. In secondary schools a genre-based model works nicely with Systemic Functional Linguistics (Halliday, 1994), a language approach that underpins the Australian Curriculum: English (ACARA) Language Strand. It also supports curriculum literacies or disciplinary literacy approaches with its focus on text structure and language. Whilst it has great promise it should be remembered that it has been criticised for teaching students to conform to predictable and normative ways of communicating which can go against dismissing multilingual voices (Janfada & Thomas, 2020).

EAL/D students live in a technologically advanced society, one which they are expected to engage in as part of ACARAs General capabilities. Downes' (2015) study highlights the potential of web-based ICTs to provide opportunities for more collective scaffolding, authentic language input and output and peer feedback. The use of web-based ICT such as blogs, wikis, Google Docs, and online chat services might reduce pressure and anxiety, thus motivating and encouraging EAL/D student participation and engagement, should they have familiarity with the technology.

In conclusion, challenges can be turned around to provide supports for students. The transition of EAL/D students throughout secondary schooling means ensuring that there is a whole school approach to support EAL/D students across the secondary years, one that is built on an understanding of second language acquisition rather than just literacy or good teaching. Studies have shown success with this type of approach, where implementation involves whole school sharing of practice to enable buy in from more teachers. In relation to the teaching profession, ITE courses and their approach to language and literacy is a great start, developing PSTs who have developed knowledge about these genre-based models in their disciplinary areas and who may be able to have a positive influence as beginning teachers. Finally, another support would be that more consideration needs to be given to Truckenbrodt and Slaughter's (2016) suggestion of a coming together of EAL/D teachers, language teachers and classroom teachers to promote plurilingual notions of language and literacy, recognising that all cultural

groups have their own language and literacy practices. With this in mind, we make the following tentative recommendations:

1. Build staff capacity to support EAL/D students in writing through whole school EAL/D programs and trained specialists;

2. Build student capabilities in writing through a whole school focus that spans from junior to senior secondary;

3. Provide professional development for all teaching staff around Second Language Acquisition;

4. Build teacher awareness of the EAL/D and English resources that can support them to enact a focus on language and how it functions;

5. Advocate and engage in EAL/D communities of practice.

Writing is an important endeavour as part of demonstrating mastery of the curriculum, and improving writing for EAL/D students will reap benefits to all aspects of language development. Like all students, EAL/D students deserve the opportunity to experience success in school, or pursue an academic pathway should they choose. Therefore, it is imperative, for schools and teachers to take action as per the above recommendations. At the core of the Australian Curriculum documents is advocacy for student diversity, including EAL/D students. Classroom teachers and schools must take action to ensure some of our most vulnerable populations receive the support they need. It is only through educated and upskilled mainstream classroom teachers and EAL/D specialist staff that we can lift EAL/D student achievement so that they may succeed. ACTA (2022) suggests we need to enact key measures to ensure this happens. To support teachers in the classroom, the EAL/D resources supporting the Australian Curriculum must be updated, particularly to acknowledge or make visible IEAL/D learners (Angelo & Hudson, 2020). Further, these resources, along with professional development, must be rolled out in a systematic way so that teachers know of their existence, so that teachers know how they can be used to support their practice.

References

ACARA [Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority] (n.d.). Meeting the needs of students for whom English is an additional language or dialect. Accessed on 1 May 2023 from: Meeting the needs of students for whom English is an additional language or dialect | The Australian Curriculum (Version 8.4).

ACTA [Australian Council of TESOL Associations] (2022). National roadmap for English as an Additional Language or Dialect education in schools: Directions for COVID-19 recovery and program reform. Accessed on 1 May 2023 from: Roadmap-for-English-as-an-additional-language-or-dialect-in-schools-ACTA-May-2022.pdf (tesol.org.au)

Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *International Journal Social Research Methodology, 8*(1), 19-32.

Callaghan, M., & Rothery, J. (1988). *Teaching factual writing: A genre based approach.* NSW Department of Education: Sydney, Australia.

Clary, D., & Daintith, S. (2017). Raising the bar: Setting an agenda for writing improvement in the middle years. *Literacy Learning: The Middle Years, 25*(2). 45-57.

Creagh, S., Hogan, A., Lingard, B., & Choi, T. (2022). The 'everywhere and nowhere' English language policy in Queensland government schools: a license for commercialisation. *Journal of Education Policy, 38*(5), 829-848. DOI: 10.1080/02680939.2022.2037721.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). Educational research: Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

Department of Education Queensland (2021). State Schools Improvement Strategy 2022 – 2026: Every student succeeding. Accessed on 22 September from: State Schools Improvement Strategy 2022–2026 – Every student succeeding (eq.edu.au).

Department of Education and Training (2018). National Schools Reform Agreement. Australia. Accessed on 22 September from: National School Reform Agreement - Department of Education, Australian Government.

Ellis, R., & Barkhuizen, G. (2005). *Analysing learner language.* UK: Oxford University Press.

Gadamer, H. G. (1976). *Philosophical Hermeneutics* (D. E. Linge, Trans.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gadamer, H.G. (2004). *Truth and Method* (J. Weinsheimer & D. G. Marshall, Trans.; 2nd Ed). New York: Continuum.

Halliday, M. (1994). *An introduction to Functional Grammar* (2nd ed). London: Edward Arnold.

Kitson, L. A. (2022). *Exploring challenges and supports for writing in Standard Australian English for Australian secondary English as an additional language/dialect (EAL/D) students: A scoping study*, Unpublished Masters Independent Research Study report. Griffith University: Australia.

Levac, D., Colquhoun, H., & O'Brien, K. K. (2010). Scoping studies: advancing the methodology. *Implementation Science: IS, 5*, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-5-69.

Major, L., Warwick, P., Rasmussen, I., Lidvigsen, S., & Cook, V. (2018). Classroom dialogue and digital technologies: A scoping study. *Education and Information Technologies, 23*(5), 1995-2028. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-018-9701-y

Peters, M. D. J., Godfrey, C. M., Kahlil, H., McInerney, P., Parker, D., & Baldini Soares, C. (2015), Guidance for conducting systematic scoping studies. *International Journal of Evidence-Based Healthcare, 13*(3), pp. 141-46. doi: 10.1097/XEB.0000000000000050.

Peters, M. D. J., Godfrey, C., McInerney, P., Munn. Z., Tricco, A. C., & Khalil, H. (2020). Scoping reviews. In E. Aromataris, & Z. Munn (Eds), *JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis.* JBI, 2020. https://synthesismanual.jbi.global. https://doi.org/10.46658/JBIMES-20-12.

Premier, J. (2021). Teachers' experiences of educating EAL students in the mainstream primary and secondary classrooms. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 46*(8), 1-16.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S.B.K (1981). *Narrative, literacy and face in interethnic communication*, Norwood, N.J: Ablex.

Thomas, J. & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitive research in systematic reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 8*(45), 1-10.

Appendix A – Studies included in the scoping study

Alford, J. H. (2014). 'Well, hang on, they're actually much better than that!': Disrupting dominant discourses of deficit about English language learners in senior high school English. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique, 13*(3), 71-88.

Alford, J.H., & Kettle, M. (2017). Teachers' reinterpretations of critical literacy policy: Prioritizing praxis. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 14*(2-3), 182-209. DOI: 10.1080/15427587.2017.1288067

Allison, D. (2011). Learning our literacy lessons: EAL/D students, critical literacy, and the national curriculum. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 34*(2), 181-201.

Angelo, D. (2013). Identification and assessment contexts of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander learners of Standard Australian English: Challenges for the language testing community. *Papers in Language Testing and Assessment, 2*(2), 67-102. DOI:10.58379/XANY2922

Angelo, D., & Hudson, C. (2020). From the periphery to the centre: Securing the place at the heart of the TESOL field for first nations learners of English as an additional language/dialect. *TESOL in Context, 29*(1), 5-35. http://tesolincontext.org.au.

Baak, M., Miller, E., Sullivan, A., & Heugh, K. (2021). Tensions between policy aspirations and enactment: assessment and inclusion for refugee background students. *Journal of Education Policy, 36*(6), 760-778. DOI: 10.1080/02680939.2020.1739339

Bevan, C., & Shillinglaw, D. (2010). Bigges Mob Mirlimirli: Teaching two way - codeswitching cultures and dialects. *Literacy Learning: The Middle Years, 18*(2), 11-17.

Choi, J., & Slaughter, Y. (2021). Challenging discourses of deficit: Understanding the vibrancy and complexity of multilingualism through language trajectory grids. *Language Teaching Research, 25*(1), 81-104. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820938825

Clary, D., Feez, S., Garvey, A., & Partridge, R. (2015). From little things big things grow: enhancing literacy learning for secondary students in rural and regional Australia. *Australian and International Journal of Rural Education, 25*(1), 24–36.

Creagh, S. (2014a). National standardised testing and the diluting of English as a second language (ESL) in Australia. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique, 13*(1), 24-38.

Creagh, S. (2014b). NAPLAN test data, ESL Bandscales and the validity of EAL/D teacher judgement of student performance. *TESOL in Context, 24*(2), 30-50.

Crossley, L. (2021). IELP and Year 10 EAL/D Curriculum in Australia: An investigation into the adequacy of prior knowledge to international students. [Master's Thesis, Deakin University]. https://doi.org/10.35542/osf.io/ky3e5

Davison, C., & Ollerhead, S. (2018). But I'm not an English teacher!: Disciplinary literacy in Australian Science classrooms. In K. S. Tang & K. Danielsson (Eds.), *Global developments in literacy research in for science education* (pp.29-43). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-69197-8

Dixon, S., & Angelo, D. (2014). Dodgy data, language invisibility and the implications for social inclusion: A critical analysis of Indigenous student language data in Queensland schools. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 37*(3), 213-233.

Downes, C. (2015). Using information and communication technologies to promote participation and peer co-operation during collaborative literacy tasks for English-language learners. *Journal of Student Engagement: Education Matters, 5*(1), 2-11. http://ro.uow.edu.au/jseem/vol5/iss1/2

Dutton, J., & Rushton, K. (2018). Confirming identity using drama pedagogy: English teachers' creative response to high-stakes literacy testing. *English in Australia, 53*(1), 5-14.

Dutton, J., & Rushton, K. (2021). Using the translanguaging space to facilitate poetic representation of language and identity. *Language Teaching Research, 25*(1), 105-133. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820951215

Dutton, J., & Rushton, K. (2022). Drama pedagogy: Subverting and remaking learning in the thirdspace. *The Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 45*(2), 159–181. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44020-022-00010-6

Filipi, A., & Keary, A. (2018). Hit the ground running? An exploratory study of the positionings teachers and international students take or ascribe to others on academic language. *Australian Educational Researcher, 45*(3), 363–382. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-017-0253-8

Gilmour, L.A. (2017). *Children from bi/multilingual homes in Queensland secondary schools: An exploratory study of their experiences and learning environments.* [Doctoral dissertation, Griffith University], Australia.

Gilmour, L., Klieve, H., & Li, M. (2018). Culturally and linguistically diverse school environments – Exploring the unknown. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 43*(2), 172-189.

Gleeson, M., & Davison, C. (2016). A Conflict between Experience and Professional Learning: Subject Teachers' Beliefs about Teaching English Language Learners. *RELC Journal, 47*(1), 43–57.

Gleeson, M., & Davison, C. (2019). Teaching in linguistically and culturally diverse secondary schools: how far have we come? *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 42*(3), 301–321. https://doi.org/10.1075/aral.17093.gle

Humphrey, S. L. (2015). How one school has developed a metalinguistic toolkit for supporting multilingual students as writers. *English in Australia, 50*(1), 55-65.

Humphrey, S., & Feez, S. (2016). Direct instruction fit for purpose: Applying a metalinguistic toolkit to enhance creative writing in the early secondary years. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 39*(3), 207-219.

Janfada, M., & Thomas, C. (2020). Homogenised narratives in and through English: Examining the hidden curriculum in an Australian secondary EAL context. *English in Australia, 55*(1), 34-43.

Jones, K., & Curwood, J. (2020). Tell the story, speak the truth: Creating a third space through spoken word poetry. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 64*(3), 281-289

King, D., & Henderson, S. (2018). Context-based learning in the middle years: Achieving resonance between the real-world field and environmental science concepts. *International Journal of Science Education, 40*(10), 1221-1238. DOI: 10.1080/09500693.2018.1470352

Lindner, K., & Margetts, K. (2022). English language expectations and experiences of Chinese students in Australian secondary schools: opportunities and challenges. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education.* DOI: 10.1080/02188791.2022.2044287

Love, K. (2010) Literacy pedagogical content knowledge in the secondary curriculum, Pedagogies: *An International Journal, 5*(4), 338-355. DOI: 10.1080/1554480X.2010.521630

Miller, J., Keary., A., & Windle, J. (2012). Assessing the reading and writing of EAL/D students: Issues and implications. *TESOL in Context, 20*(3), 1-15.

Nguyen, M., & Brown, J. (2016). Influences on preservice writing instruction during the secondary English as an Additional Language practicum in Australia. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(8), 84-101.

Ollerhead, S. (2018). Pedagogical language knowledge: preparing Australian pre-service teachers to support English language learners. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 46*(3), 256-266. DOI: 10.1080/1359866X.2016.1246651

Scarino, A. (2022). Language teacher education in diversity – a consideration of the mediating role of languages and cultures in student learning. *Language and Education, 36*(2), 152-16. DOI: 10.1080/09500782.2021.1991370

Truckenbrodt, A., & Slaughter, Y. (2016). Working from the same page: languages, literacy and EAL/D teacher collaboration. *Literacy Learning: The Middle Years, 24*(3), 27-30. https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A468771613/AONE?u=anon~623bbfb6&sid=googleScholar&xid=f2c763ac

Dr Lisbeth Kitson is an experienced educator, having taught in a range of contexts from primary to university, as well as secondary. Her main areas of expertise are in relation to English and literacy, in particular multiliteracies, including the literacy demands of curriculum areas. Lisbeth is an experienced researcher and author, with many publications in these areas. More recently, catering to the needs of EAL/D students has become an important focus, with Lisbeth furthering her studies by completing a Master of TESOL. She currently works as an EAL/D Coordinator, EAL/D teacher and English teacher at Cavendish Road State High School, Brisbane, Australia.

lakit0@eq.edu.au

Dr Minglin Li is a Senior Lecturer in TESOL / Educational Linguistics in the School of Humanities, Languages and Social Science at Griffith University, Australia. Since 1987, Minglin has been a TESOL teacher trainer and educator, and has taught English language and linguistics, second language acquisition, and is currently teaching second language teaching theories and approaches, second language curriculum design, and research methodologies in TESOL. Minglin is a researcher in the field of Educational Linguistics. Her main areas of expertise include language education policy and planning, TESOL pedagogy, TESOL teacher education, TESOL curriculum study, and studies on learners' dictionary.

minglin.li@griffith.edu.au

Enablers and barriers for plurilingual practices: How EAL/D teachers support new arrivals in a rural secondary setting

David Partridge
University of New England

Helen Harper
University of New England

Abstract: *This paper explores the reported practices of five specialist EAL/D teachers from a rural Australian town. They work with a cohort of refugee students from a single cultural group, who recently arrived in Australia with minimal English and with generally low levels of literacy in their first language. A questionnaire and semi-structured interview were used as data collection tools to explore how plurilingualism was being supported amongst these students.*

Our findings indicated that plurilingual practices occurred predominantly in the EAL/D setting, where participants benefited from favourable conditions. These conditions were characterised by a homogenous student group and allowed for a slowing down of the curriculum and the incorporation of students' first languages in the learning process. The presence of skilled bilingual aides was the lynchpin for the success of plurilingual practices in this study.

Our research highlighted the need for further investigation into the enablers and barriers of collaborative practice between EAL/D and mainstream teachers and the role bilingual aides play in supporting plurilingualism in schools. There is evidence from this study to support reframing the concept of bilingual education in Australia, to better capture the complexities of plurilingual interactions in school contexts.

Introduction

The recent arrival of a significant number of refugee families in rural Australian towns has created new challenges for teachers, as they respond to the complexities of catering for EAL/D learners

in what have previously been largely monolingual school contexts. The challenges can be situated more broadly within the Australian educational context, where there is ongoing debate about how best to support EAL/D learners in mainstream settings. Many mainstream teachers may lack the knowledge and pedagogical strategies needed to cater for EAL/D learners (ATESOL, 2022; Hammond, 2006; Ollerhead, 2019; Watkins et al., 2013), leaving English learners in a 'sink or swim' submersive environment without appropriate support. The knowledge gap is compounded by a lack of systematic pedagogical direction for EAL/D at the policy level, which may limit the availability of expert guidance (French, 2016; Hornberger & Johnson, 2007).

By contrast, in specialist EAL/D settings certain conditions may support English language learners (Faltis, 1993). In this paper, 'EAL/D settings' refers to secondary schooling settings that specifically cater for EAL/D students. In some areas, newly arrived EAL/D students are catered for in Intensive English Centres (IECs), where students spend thirty to forty weeks receiving specialised English instruction before joining mainstream classes (NSW DoE, 2023b). In areas where there is not enough demand to establish these centres, the EAL/D setting may consist of intensive English classes or parallel EAL/D classes that support students' language development before they fully transition to a mainstream environment where they are commonly taught by classroom teachers and supported by specialist EAL/D teachers.

Students in EAL/D settings benefit from teaching that is specifically designed to be comprehensible and commensurate with their current language proficiency, whilst fostering English language learning and development (Baker & Wright, 2017). Teachers in these settings also tend to use more culturally inclusive teaching and learning practices, and students have opportunities to develop a collective sense of belonging through interacting with students in a similar situation (Faltis, 1993).

Additionally, specialist EAL/D settings may give space to teaching practices that draw on students' 'plurilingual linguistic repertoires' (Lüdi & Py, 2009), exploiting their existing linguistic and cultural knowledge to support new learning (Cenoz & Gorter, 2013). The meaningful incorporation of students' first languages (L1) in learning acknowledges the existence of students' already-rich linguistic tapestry (Blom et al., 2021; Kerr, 2019; Seng & Hashim, 2006), and offers both students and teachers a valuable pedagogical resource (Slaughter & Cross, 2021). In particular,

students with a low level of proficiency in English may draw on their L1 in their learning (Seng & Hashim, 2006), which can be enhanced when L1 is meaningfully used by both the student *and* the teacher (Cook, 2001; Ma, 2019). The use of students' L1 also aids in developing linguistic awareness and metacognitive strategies and supports students to function more effectively as social actors (Coste et al., 2009). Such inclusive teaching practices have the potential to shift EAL/D learners from being "academic outsiders to intellectually-capable insiders" (Feez & Harper, 2021, p. 12).

This paper explores the reported practices of a group of five specialist EAL/D teachers from a rural Australian town. The teachers work with a cohort of refugee students from a single cultural group, who recently arrived in Australia with minimal English and whose home language use is largely oral in nature. To explore how plurilingualism is supported amongst these students at school, a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews were used to gauge how the teachers draw on students' linguistic resources for learning. The teachers' responses allow us to identify specific conditions that may act as enablers and barriers for supporting plurilingual practices in schools. We propose that a clearer understanding of the conditions that support plurilingual practices in specialist EAL/D classrooms can in turn inform teachers' choice of practices. Although the practices are most easily applied to specialist EAL/D settings, we reflect on how they can also be applied to mainstream settings.

In the following sections we explore the notion of plurilingualism within the field of EAL/D education. Then, drawing on our study's findings, we discuss the enabling and constraining factors that influence plurilingual practices in schools.

Plurilingualism in EAL/D education

In this paper, we follow the Council of Europe in defining plurilingualism as "the ability to use languages for the purposes of communication and to take part in intercultural interaction, where a person, viewed as a social actor has proficiency, of varying degrees, in several languages and experience in several cultures" (Coste et al., 2009, p. 11). Due to the unbalanced nature of their linguistic and cultural knowledge, plurilinguals operate in an emergent state (Vallejo & Dooly, 2020), with their plurilingualism developing throughout the course of their lives (Coste et al., 2009). EAL/D learners can be described as plurilingual as they are language learners whose L1 is a language or dialect other than

Standard Australian English (SAE), who may have varying levels of competence in their other languages (ACARA, 2014). As plurilingualism is not seen as a fixed competency, the lens of plurilingualism counters the widespread understanding that EAL/D learners have a language deficit (Baker & Wright, 2017; Cummins, 1981; García, 2009) and fosters a more holistic perspective of language learning (Cenoz & Gorter, 2013). When we understand EAL/D learners to be plurilingual, we can observe how they draw on their varied linguistic and cultural skills, as well as the pre-existing knowledge encoded in their L1, to support their learning (Cook, 1999; Cummins et al., 2005; Deda, 2021).

Recognising the benefits of plurilingualism and teaching practices that support plurilingual contexts is particularly relevant to the Australian educational context which has traditionally embodied a monolingual orientation (Clyne, 2005; Ellis et al., 2010; Fielding, 2016). The adoption of a plurilingual lens inverts a tradition of language separation and advocates for more equitable education outcomes for marginalised EAL/D learners (Vallejo & Dooly, 2020). Plurilingualism as an inclusive approach to EAL/D education highlights students' complex and hybrid language behaviours (Vallejo & Dooly, 2020) and rebuts the concept that plurilingualism is a "marginal phenomenon" in favour of seeing plurilingualism as a common linguistic behaviour of many (Lüdi & Py, 2009). This is particularly relevant when students' formal education has been interrupted. Migration and refugee experiences, often intensified by experiences of trauma and limited access to formal schooling, can exacerbate the challenges of learning through L2 (Baker & Wright, 2017; Hammond & Miller, 2015).

Enablers and barriers of plurilingualism

Research suggests that students' plurilingual repertoires can be enabled through various teaching practices (Cenoz & Gorter, 2013; Heugh et al., 2019; Soares et al., 2021). Three practices stand out as relevant to the scope and context of this study. These are: the use of spontaneous translanguaging, the use of bilingual aides and the potential for EAL/D specialists to work in a collaborative mode. In this section, we discuss each of these practices in turn.

In translanguaging, students "draw on and mingle all elements of their linguistic repertoire" (Feez & Harper, 2021, p. 12) to decode and produce language in all modes. Translanguaging

can be both planned and spontaneous in nature (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021; García et al., 2016; Kleyn & Yau, 2016). Spontaneous translanguaging (also referred to as "translanguaging shifts") is used at a point of need to promote communication and understanding and is not necessarily part of the lesson design (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021). The efficacy of spontaneous translanguaging relies on an 'agent' to mediate learning through the meaningful use of the students' L1 as they interact and support learners in the classroom. In practice, this could mean, for example, that translations of key words or explanations of concepts are provided through L1 (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021; Kleyn & Yau, 2016).

In many studies, the teacher is often identified as the agent enabling translanguaging practices in the classroom (Kerr, 2019; Sayer, 2013; Tai & Wong, 2022). However, when the teacher does not share the students' L1, which is often the case in the Australian setting, students themselves can facilitate translanguaging practices when the linguistic homogeneity amongst the student cohort is high (Partridge, 2023). In these situations, there are opportunities for teachers to hand over agency to the students and invite stronger students to lead micro sessions in L1, to create meaning from the classroom content (Partridge, 2023).

Skilled bilingual aides are also ideal agents for mediating learning and for negotiating the language gap between the teacher and student. Also known as bilingual school learning support officers (SLSO), SLSOs are employed for their linguistic skills and cultural knowledge to provide transition, wellbeing and in-language support to EAL/D students and their families, including students from refugee backgrounds (NSW DoE, 2023a). In the EAL/D setting they perform a range of meaningful tasks such as translating and interpreting classroom content, providing efficient concept clarification and leading micro-teaching sessions in L1 (Partridge, 2023). These moments of 'meaning-making' can become rich learning experiences where the bilingual aide provides students with contextualised information and facilitates linking the learning to the curriculum (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021; Collins & Simco, 2006). When this occurs, it supports a shift in classroom practice towards pedagogical translanguaging more broadly (Cenoz & Gorter, 2021).

Bilingual aides are often also the conduit between home and school, mediating communication with parents, and playing an active role in enhancing students' access to the curriculum,

positively contributing to equality and inclusion in the school setting (Baak et al., 2021; Baker, 2014). Just as bilingual aides use students' plurilingual repertoires to enhance student learning, they also draw on students' prior knowledge and cultural capital through the exchange of knowledge systems ("transknowledging") to enhance learning (Heugh, 2021; Heugh et al., 2022). Thus, bilingual aides not only serve as brokers of language, but they also act as brokers of culture for students, communities, and school systems. In this way, they enrich our plurilingual lens of EAL/D learners and advocate for them by valuing their knowledge resources alongside their linguistic resources (Heugh et al., 2022).

EAL/D specialist teachers can also facilitate teaching practices that support their students' plurilingualism. EAL/D teachers often find themselves in a *de jure* role of working in a collaborative mode (Arkoudis, 2006), and as policy entrepreneurs and enthusiasts (Ball et al., 2011). This suggests that in principle they have the means to leverage change in school systems. However, performing this role is easier said than done. Competing priorities in schools compounded by curriculum and time pressures means that achieving a culture where EAL/D teachers can work collaboratively with other teachers is an ambitious task (Arkoudis, 1994, 2006). There may also be an institutionalised perspective that EAL/D teachers do not possess the same level of curriculum expertise as their mainstream counterparts (Arkoudis, 2006). Failure to develop collaborative structures between those who have the knowledge to support plurilingual practices (the specialist EAL/D teacher) and those who require support to do so (the mainstream teacher) can result in EAL/D learners not being adequately supported (Arkoudis, 2003).

Context for the study
The context for this study is the rural town of Armidale, NSW, with a population of 24,000. As a university town, Armidale has long had a diverse population, especially accommodating international students and their families, but was not formerly a destination of settlement for significant groups of refugees. However, in 2018, the town became a site of settlement for Ezidi (also known as Yazidi or Yezidi) refugees, mostly from the Shingal (Sinjar) region in northern Iraq (SSI, 2019). Between 2018-2022, over 650 Ezidi settled in Armidale under Australia's Humanitarian Settlement Program (Burge, 2023) and at the time of writing there are approximately 350 Ezidi students enrolled in the town's schools. Further students are arriving weekly as refugee resettlement has resumed in the post-COVID period.

The Ezidi are an ethno-religious minority who have traditionally lived in areas of northern Iraq, Syria, Turkey, and Iran (Kaplan, 2022) and who were targeted by the Islamic State in a series of systematic and genocidal attacks in August 2014 (Minwalla, et al., 2022; SSI, 2019). The Ezidi language (Kurmanji) is closely linked with Kurdish Kurmanji (UNHCR, 2008), but many Ezidi in Armidale prefer to refer to their language as the Ezidi language, maintaining a sense of unique cultural identity (Tillman, 2023). The primary mode of communication in the Ezidi language is oral. There are very few social contexts in which writing is used (Kaplan, 2022) and traditionally Ezidi people have had minimal engagement with written language systems.

The long, intergenerational history of segregation and persecution of Ezidi people has impacted their access to education and Ezidi are underrepresented in the Iraqi schooling system (Wendt et al., 2019). Access to education was further restricted by the refugee experience, where make-shift schools in camps were overcrowded, under resourced and often financially inaccessible. Further, most available schooling was in Arabic, rather than the students' L1 (UNHCR, 2019). Ezidi students in Armidale have experienced various levels of trauma, and most have spent upwards of four years in refugee camps.

Hence, although they represent a homogenous cultural group, Ezidi students in Armidale arrive with varied linguistic and literacy skills dependent on their refugee experience, with few students having had prior language or literacy experiences that have prepared them for the demands of western schooling. Therefore, most Ezidi students, arriving with limited experience of literacy, need very high levels of support in learning both English as an additional language and in learning the literate, often unfamiliar ways of using language (Schleppegrell, 2004). Developing appropriate strategies for inducting Ezidi students into the language and literacy of the mainstream curriculum has been a major challenge for teachers in Armidale.

The study
We conducted a small qualitative study to elicit how EAL/D teaching practices drew on Ezidi students' plurilingualism in order to support their learning. The research focused on how the students' L1 was used in teaching and learning and the conditions

under which L1 was used. Participants for the study were recruited through an EAL/D teachers' book club, with five book club members agreeing to participate. All held tertiary TESOL qualifications and were working, or had recently worked, as EAL/D teachers in local schools. As a group, they represented a broad range of teaching experiences in domestic and international settings, in primary and secondary schools, and in the government and private sectors. The pseudonyms of the five participants are Raylene, Sally, Cameron, Elaine, and Ginny.

The participants answered a questionnaire and took part in a semi-structured interview in which they were asked to describe how students used L1 in their classes and how they used L1 as a teaching and learning resource. By using these data collection tools, we sought to create a clear picture of enablers and barriers to the support of the students' plurilingualism.

Enablers of plurilingual practices

Through the participants' descriptions of their EAL/D setting, we have generalised a number of conditions favourable to supporting students' plurilingualism. These conditions were a) the presence of a largely homogenous student cohort, b) the pared back time and curriculum pressures of the EAL/D setting and c) the strategic use of students' L1 and bilingual aides.

Homogenous student group

As noted above, the study participants were working with a largely homogenous cultural group, who shared the same L1 and whose lived experience included disrupted, or even no formal schooling prior to their arrival in Australia. The students were also mostly in the beginning phases of English language learning.

All participants reported that they leveraged this relative homogeneity to draw on students' L1. They did so in various contexts and for different purposes, particularly with the students at the beginning phases of English learning. For example, Ginny and Sally reported that when their classes were composed of EAL/D learners from the same language group, L1 was frequently used. Sally further remarked that students used their L1 as their primary mode of communication. Elaine compared the Ezidi students to other international students and noted that students with more limited schooling relied on their L1 more heavily and required more explicit teaching of 'schooling'.

Favourable curriculum and time pressures

Participants reported that within the EAL/D setting there were more opportunities to slow their teaching down and to place emphasis on language learning and skill development, rather than powering through syllabus documents. These favourable conditions afforded EAL/D learners with disrupted schooling histories more time and support to adjust to the Australian schooling system. Cameron remarked that:

> [As an EAL/D teacher you] get to slow down and focus on a few things, the way that you can't when you are a [mainstream] teacher. That's what I think the main difference is. It's the intensity in the time between the two roles.

Drawing on plurilingual resources

Having knowledge of their students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds enabled participants to design learning that was accessible and inclusive of students' cultural capital. This knowledge was used by participants to facilitate meaningful curriculum connections and allowed them to identify entry points for supporting student learning. Ginny remarked that knowledge of students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds informed her teaching decisions and was key to helping students access curriculum. Raylene similarly remarked:

> I found myself actually drawing really heavily on their world views and their perspectives actually to support them in that English course. And I chose texts specifically that would allow them to tap into that. ... I found that tapping into their personal experiences as people who've been kind of, you know, in between cultures and who ... have been taken out of one place and plopped into another for whatever reason - that actually really supported their conceptual understanding and their interpretations of the text.

In lessons, L1 was primarily used by students and bilingual aides in the form of spontaneous translanguaging to increase student understanding and provide students with clarification. Participants reported using L1 in classroom tasks such as translating new vocabulary, discussing new ideas and concepts, and as a back-up for when English was not successful. Positive attitudes towards using L1 were reported, with Cameron referring to the use of L1 as being "one more step in that chain to ultimately

accessing knowledge".

Participants also reported that L1 use in the classroom increased students' confidence in their learning, supported an inclusive learning environment and allowed students to function as plurilinguals.

Bilingual aides

Bilingual aides played a pivotal role in supporting students' plurilingualism and were the lynchpin for supporting the use of L1. Participants described bilingual aides as linguistic and cultural brokers. In Raylene's terms, they functioned as advisors for EAL/D teachers, by providing a cultural lens and offering deeper cultural and linguistic insights into their preparation for teaching. Elaine remarked, "I include bilingual aides when I'm preparing a unit of work. Make sure, one, it's culturally appropriate and, two, where are the language difficulties here?". Participants noted that bilingual aides also acted as cultural brokers more broadly in school through broader cultural advice to teaching staff to ensure that their practice was more culturally responsive. Ginny commented:

> [Bilingual aides] can inform us a little bit more about cultural differences and maybe, you know, cultural festivals and explain things in a bit more detail for us that we understand the culture a little bit better as well.

All participants reported that bilingual aides were essential in the delivery of curricula and allowed ease of communication and engagement with their culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) community. Bilingual aides as essential staff members performed several tasks aptly summarised by Raylene:

> These tasks could involve translation/interpreting for students, clarifying concepts, helping students communicate with the subject teacher, engaging with parents/community, supporting small groups of students requiring further support.

Bilingual aides also offered interpreting and translation services to schools and facilitated teaching through L1 in the classroom. They assisted the teacher, ensuring that students understood the lesson by translating key vocabulary and clarifying new concepts in L1. Elaine commented:

> [Bilingual aides] also helped to clarify instructions. So,

there could be an instruction that you've given that you thought was quite clear ... and the kids just completely missed it or misunderstood and so clarification and that fine tuning of a lesson really works well through the bilingual aides.

Cameron further remarked, "I guess in many ways, they're, well, they're absolutely indispensable for helping communicate an idea and ... a new concept to an EAL/D student".

Bilingual aides were reported to play an essential role in engaging with a school's CALD community, which was particularly important for family members who had low literacy in L1, as well as low English language proficiency. Sally remarked, "our bilingual non-teaching staff play quite a massive role in administrative [tasks] as well as student support. We use our [bilingual aides] for translating notes and stuff that go home. Also, for any parent interviews that need to occur or enrolments". Bilingual aides were also reported to have played a major innovating role, turning to the creation of audio-visual materials and social media to engage with the community in L1 in lieu of traditional home-school communication that was not accessible for the CALD community. For example, audio-visual messages can be consistently created by familiar people, and QR coding allows messages to be viewed through a YouTube channel, allowing parents to feel more engaged with the school.

Barriers to plurilingual practices

Participants developed many insights through their access to the mainstream teaching setting, where they were able to take on the students' perspective to a considerable extent, and to contrast the observed teaching practices with those they were accustomed to in their EAL/D setting.

A key theme that emerged from the study was the participants' perceptions of how the needs of EAL/D learners were being addressed in mainstream classes, and where pedagogic shifts were required to support their learning. Generally, the participants perceived that mainstream setting did not support the students as plurilinguals. Our participants gave three key reasons for this: a) the time and curriculum pressures of mainstream secondary school; b) teachers' capability; and c) the absence of collaborative structures.

Time and curriculum pressures

From the perspective of the research participants, the curriculum and time demands in the mainstream setting drives the pace of teaching. Participants described the pressure felt by mainstream teachers to push through the curriculum, despite this pace not accommodating the learning needs of EAL/D learners. Raylene noted, "there might be a lot of dot points in the syllabus, especially with stage six courses, that [teachers] feel like they have to tick every single one of these things off, and so they just power, power, power through".

Participants also noted that some students were still processing the impacts of trauma and required greater time to learn a new language together with subject content: "I think mainstream teachers go too fast for their mainstream students. Sometimes they're so busy focusing on getting through a curriculum, rather than really ensuring that their students do understand the concepts and what's happening" (Elaine).

Lack of teacher capability

In mainstream classes, the focus on content delivery at the expense of language was compounded by a reported lack of experience and confidence of mainstream teachers to cater for EAL/D learners. This perception was expressed multiple times by the participants throughout the study. Sally reported that holistically "there's a lack of confidence in mainstream teachers in teaching EAL/D students". Teacher inexperience was reported to be a possible reason that EAL/D learners are not fully catered for in the mainstream setting. Raylene commented that with teacher experience comes the deep specialist curriculum knowledge that allows the teacher to know when they can go deeper and where the curriculum can be rationalised. Raylene suggested that this ability, developed over time, is a way to accommodate the needs of EAL/D learners.

Given these observations, it was not unexpected that students' L1 was not used by teachers as a learning resource in mainstream classrooms. Our participants unanimously reported that mainstream teachers do not use students' L1, and they suggested that this was due to a lack of experience and confidence in teaching EAL/D learners. Elaine observed that mainstream teachers experience a sense of alienation and lack of control when students use their L1, stating, "it's a very closed space for them be in. They are confused and they're not quite sure what's going on".

This was also commented on by Cameron: "They don't feel confident in being able to, I guess, in being creative enough to use it or they wouldn't quite know where to start".

Lack of collaboration

Our study revealed that a lack of collaboration between EAL/D specialist teachers and their mainstream counterparts was a key factor for the plurilingual needs of students not being supported in mainstream classrooms. Although collaborative practices were a part of their official role descriptions, participants reported that this was the aspect of their role that they engaged in the least. They also experienced a change of status and agency when they shifted from teaching their own classes to working in a support mode. That is, they shifted from feeling like active agents who were able to support students' plurilingualism, to feeling like passive agents in a support role. Sally made insightful comments in this regard:

> When I am teaching my class, it is direct structured teaching where I have the control of the lessons and the direction they're going, how I design them and what needs to be followed up with the students is all my decision. When I'm supporting in a class, I take from what the teacher is actually doing and may translate or simplify some of the language or simplify some of the work down as it's happening in the class. But it's work ... I haven't seen beforehand. ...I don't have any control over what's happening in those classes, I just support and follow what's happening by the main teacher.

When Sally was asked if she had any insight into why this might be the case, she noted the challenge collaborating with mainstream teachers who have limited time, and may also have limited interest:

> It's been hard to engage some of the mainstream teachers into doing some co-planning, and whether it's been because of time constraints or in some a lack of interest in co-planning. So, the support's being given to the student that needs it rather than supporting the teacher developing lessons suitable to EAL/D students.

Discussion

This study adds to our understanding of how plurilingualism may be supported in Australian rural school settings, and particularly,

the conditions under which students' L1 is most effectively used. Our study suggests that we have much to learn from specialist EAL/D settings about how best to support plurilingual practices for EAL/D learners, in ways that benefit their learning. We believe it would be useful to repeat this study in other settings in order to develop a wider data set that would enable us to make broader generalisations about the enabling and constraining factors that influence plurilingual practices in schools.

Our participants identified conditions that were favourable to plurilingualism for the refugee student group. One such condition was the relative homogeneity of the student group, which allowed students to draw on L1 in a collaborative way. Another condition was the reduced pressure of mandated curriculum, which allowed teachers the time to focus on the development of language and skills, whilst drawing on students' plurilingual resources as a rich teaching and learning tool

EAL/D settings are transitional in nature, as their purpose is to prepare students for mainstream schooling. However, it is important that students have enough time in the specialist setting. Our study suggests that movement from the EAL/D setting into mainstream classes based on time rather than need is unlikely to benefit students with significantly interrupted education histories who are in the initial phases of learning English. Further, moving students to the mainstream too early can mean that students who have not acquired sufficient language and schooling skills to independently engage with the curriculum are taught by teachers who in turn are reported to lack the knowledge and skill needed to cater for EAL/D learners (ATESOL, 2022; Watkins et al., 2013). This is especially relevant for students such as those described in this study: who are recently arrived refugees with little experience of literacy and who are new to learning English. For such students, it is suggested that more time in specialist EAL/D settings would be beneficial.

While it is not possible to replicate the conditions of an EAL/D setting in mainstream classrooms, this study suggests that mainstream conditions could be enhanced by creating opportunities for plurilingual practices in a number of ways. First, we should recognise the role of bilingual aides as brokers of language and culture outside of the EAL/D setting. Our participants noted that bilingual aides bring value to the planning process, notably in light of their ability to check that content is culturally appropriate, and to monitor potential language difficulties. Bilingual aides also serve as an important conduit between home and school and can facilitate relationships between teachers and parents.

Second, authentic collaboration between EAL/D specialist staff and their mainstream counterparts may mitigate the challenges faced by mainstream teachers in catering for EAL/D learners and to support the learner's plurilingualism. Such collaboration requires the establishment of mutual goals and recognition of parity among participants. Shared responsibility and decision making are also needed (Friend & Cook, 2010). Our study highlighted that misconceptions of the role of EAL/D teachers was one reason for a lack of collaboration. This revealed an imbalance, where EAL/D teachers who possess specialist knowledge and qualifications often have lower professional status than their mainstream counterparts and thus have little agency to influence curriculum planning and delivery (Arkoudis, 2006).

References

ACARA. (2014, February). *English as an additional language or dialect teacher resource: EAL/D overview and advice.* https://docs.acara.edu.au/resources/EALD_Overview_and_Advice_revised_February_2014.pdf

Arkoudis, S. (1994). Changing the role relationship between classroom teacher and ESL teacher. *Prospect, 9*(3), 47–53.

Arkoudis, S. (2003). Teaching English as a second language in science classes: Incommensurate epistemologies? *Language and Education, 17*(3), 161–173.

Arkoudis, S. (2006). Negotiating the rough ground between ESL and mainstream teachers. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 9*(4), 415–433.

ATESOL. (2022). *National roadmap for English as an additional language or dialect education in schools: Directions for Covid-19 recovery and program reform.* https://tesol.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2020/12/Roadmap-for-English-as-an-additional-language-or-dialect-in-schools-ACTA-May-2022.pdf

Baak, M., Tippett, N., Johnson, B., Brown, J., & Sullivan, A. (2021). *Refugee education in Australian secondary schools : An overview of current practices* [Full report]. University of South Australia.

Baker, C., & Wright, W. E. (2017). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (6th ed.). Multilingual Matters.

Baker, F. S. (2014). The role of the bilingual teaching assistant: Alternative visions for bilingual support in the primary years. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 17*(3), 255–271.

Ball, S. J., Maguire, M., Braun, A., & Hoskins, K. (2011). Policy actors: Doing policy work in schools. *Discourse, 32*(4), 625–639.

Blom, E., Soto-Corominas, A., Attar, Z., Daskalaki, E., & Paradis, J. (2021). Interdependence between L1 and L2: The case of Syrian children with refugee backgrounds in Canada and the Netherlands. *Applied Psycholinguistics, 42*(5), 1159–1194.

Burge, M. (2023). 'I'm Armidaleian': Ezidi refugees put down new roots in New England. *The Guardian.* https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2023/may/07/im-armidaleian-ezidi-refugees-put-down-new-roots-in-new-england

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2013). Towards a plurilingual approach in English language teaching: Softening the boundaries between languages. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*(3), 591–599.

Cenoz, J., & Gorter, D. (2021). *Pedagogical translanguaging.* Cambridge University Press.

Clyne, M. (2005). *Australia's language potential.* University of New South Wales Press Ltd.

Collins, J., & Simco, N. (2006). Teaching assistants reflect: The way forward? *Reflective Practice, 7*(2), 197–214.

Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(2), 185–209.

Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review/La Revue Canadienne Des Langues Vivantes, 57*(3), 402–423.

Coste, D., Moore, D., & & Zarate, G. (2009). *Plurilingual and pluricultural competence: Studies towards a common European framework for language learning and teaching.* https://rm.coe.int/168069d29b#:~:text=Plurilingual%20and%20pluricultural%20competence%20refers,and%20experience%20of%20several%20cultures.

Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In C. F. Leyba (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (pp. 3–49). Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Centre, CSULA.

Cummins, J., Bismilla, V., Chow, P., Cohen, S., Giampapa, F., Leoni, L., Sandhu, P., & Sastri, P. (2005). Affirming identity in multilingual classrooms. *Educational Leadership, 63*(1), 38–43.

Deda, S. H. (2021). Metacromprehension awareness of primary school plurilinguals. *Darnioji Daugiakalbyste | Sustainable Multilingualism, 19*, 141–172.

Ellis, E., Goglin, I., & Clyne, M. (2010). The Janus face of monolingualism: A comparison of German and Australian language education policies. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 11*(4), 439-460.

Faltis, C. J. (1993). Critical issues in the use of sheltered content teaching in high school bilingual programs. *Peabody Journal of Education, 69*(1), 136–151.

Feez, S., & Harper, H. (2021). Learning and teching English as an additional lanaguage or dialect in mainstream classrooms. In H. Harper & S. Feez (Eds.), *An EAL/D Handboook: Teaching and learning across the curriulum when English is an additional language or dialect* (pp. 1–15). PETAA.

Fielding, R. (2016). Students' use of their plurilingual resources in Australian schools. *Language and Education, 30*(4), 361-377.

French, M. (2016). Students' multilingual resources and policy-in-action: An Australian case study. *Language and Education, 30*(4), 298–316.

Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2010). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals* (6th ed.). Pearson.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective.* Wiley-Blackwell.

García, O., Johnson, S., & Seltzer, K. (2016). *The translanguaging classroom: Leveraging student bilingualism for learning.* Caslon.

Hammond, J. (2006). High challenge, high support: Integrating language and content instruction for diverse learner in an English literature classroom. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 5*, 269–283.

Hammond, J., & Miller, J. (2015). At-risk EAL students in mainstream classrooms. In J. Hammond & J. Miller (Eds.), *Classrooms of possibility: Supporting at-risk EAL students* (pp. 1–10). PETAA.

Heugh, K. (2021). Southern multilingualism, translanguaging and transknowledging in inclusive and sustainable education. In P. Harding-Esch &H. Coleman (Eds.), *Language and the sustainable development goals* (pp. 33-43). British Council

Heugh, K., French, M., Armitage, J., Taylor-Leech, K., Billinghurst, N., & Ollerhead, S. (2019). *Using multilingual approaches: Moving from theory to practice. A resource book of strategies, activities and projects for the classroom.* British Council.

Heugh, K., French, M., Arya, V., Pham, M., Tudini, V., Billinghurst, N., Tippett, N., Chang, L.-C., Nichols, J., & Viljoen, J.-M. (2022). Multilingualism, translanguaging and transknowledging: Translation technology in EMI higher education. *AILA Review, 35*(1), 89–127.

Hornberger, N. H., & Johnson, D. C. (2007). Slicing the onion ethnographically: Layers and spaces in multilingual language education policy and practice. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*(3), 509–532.

Kaplan, E.W. (2022). Refuge and resistance: Theater with Kurds and Yezidi survivors of ISIS. *Humanities, 11*(5), 111.

Kerr, P. (2019). *The use of L1 in English language teaching.* Cambridge University Press.

Kleyn, T. & Yau, H. (2016). The grupito flexes their listening and learning muscles. In O. García & T. Kleyn (Eds.), *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments* (pp. 100-117). Taylor & Francis Group.

Lüdi, G., & Py, B. (2009). To be or not to be...a plurilingual speaker. *International Journal of Multiculturalism, 6*(2), 154-167.

Ma, L. P. F. (2019). Examining the functions of L1 use through teacher and student interactions in an adult migrant English classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 22*(4), 386–401.

Minwalla, S., Foster, J.E., McGrail, S. (2022). Genocide, rape, and careless disregard: Media ethics and the problematic reporting on Yazidi survivors of ISIS captivity. *Feminist Media Studies, 22*(3), 747-763.

NSW DoE. (2023a). *Final statement of duties school learning support officer.* https://files.jobs.nsw.gov.au/fw8cbk#:~:text=A%20 School%20Learning%20Support%20Officer%20is%20 required%20to%3A&text=Assist%20students%20with%20 school%20routines%20and%20classroom%20 activities.&text=Assist%20the%20classroom%20teacher%20 in,programs%20and%20individual%20transition%20 programs.

NSW DoE. (2023b). *Intensive English centres.* https://education. nsw.gov.au/teaching-and-learning/curriculum/ multicultural-education/english-as-an-additional-language- or-dialect/new-arrivals-program/intensive-english-centres

Ollerhead, S. (2019). Teaching across semiotic modes with multilingual learners: Translanguaging in an Australian classroom. *Language and Education, 33*(2), 106–122.

Partridge, D. (2023). *EALD in theory and practice: How EALD practices support plurilingual contexts* [Unpublished Master's thesis]. The University of New England.

Sayer, P. (2013). Translanguaging, TexMex, and bilingual pedagogy: Emergent bilinguals learning through the vernacular. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*(1), 63-88.

Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004). *The language of schooling: A functional linguistics perspective.* Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Seng, G. H., & Hashim, F. (2006). Use of L1 in L2 reading comprehension among tertiary ESL learners. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 18*(1), 29–54.

Slaughter, Y., & Cross, R. (2021). Challenging the monolingual mindset: Understanding plurilingual pedagogies in English as an Additional Language (EAL) classrooms. *Language Teaching Research, 25*(1), 39–60.

Soares, C.T., Duarte, J., & Günther-van der Meij, M. (2021). 'Red is the colour of the heart': Making young children's multilingualism visible through language portraits. *Language and Education, 35*(1), 22-41.

SSI. (2019). *All in for Armidale: A whole-of-community approach to Ezidi settlement.* https://www.ssi.org.au/images/SSI_All_In_ For_Armidale_A_whole-of-community_approach_to_Ezidi_ settlement_in_Armidale.pdf

Tai, K.W.H, & Wong, C.Y. (Cathy). (2022). Empowering omg students through the construction of a translanguaging space in an English as a first language classroom. Applied Linguistics, December, 1-53

Tillman, M. (2023, July 4). Ezidi refugees in Armidale say gap in language translation service impacts health care. *ABC New England.* https://www.abc.net.au/news/2023-07-04/ezidi- refugee-healthcare-language-not-recognised/102499178

UNHCR. (2008). *The human rights situation of the Yezidi minority in the Transcaucausus (Armenia, Georgia, Azerbaijan).* https:// www.refworld.org/pdfid/485fa2342.pdf

UNHCR. (2019). *COI note on the situation of Yazidi IDPs in the Kurdistan region of Iraq* (Issue May). https://www.refworld. org/pdfid/5cd156657.pdf

Vallejo, C. & Dooly, M. (2020). Plurilingualism and translanguaging: emergent approaches and shared conferns. Introduction to the special issue. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 23*(1), 1-16.

Watkins, M., Dunn, K., & Noble, G. (2013). *Rethinking multiculturalism, reassessing multicultural education* [Project report number 1]. University of Western Sydney.

Wendt, H., Abas, B. E., Hamo, D. S., Kuti, F. K., Khadeeda, S. H., & Sinemillioglu, H. (2019). *Access and barriers to higher education for Yazidi minority students in Iraq.* Dortmunder helfen im Kooperation eV.

Mr David Partridge works in the field of EAL/D education and has a research interest in educational linguistics and refugee education in Australia. He recently completed a Master of Applied Linguistics at the University of New England with a dissertation that examined how teacher practices can act as enablers and barriers to plurilingual contexts.

dpartri2@myune.edu.au

Dr Helen Harper is a senior lecturer and member of the English, Literacies and Languages Education team within the School of Education at the University of New England. She specialises in English language and literacy education. Previously she has worked as a linguist in remote Indigenous communities, and as a teacher of English as an Additional Language.

hharper2@une.edu.au

School leadership attitudes towards EAL/D students and their commitment to professional learning for diverse contexts

Leonardo Veliz
University of New England

Gary Bonar
Monash University

Abstract: *Due to the increasingly diverse nature of classrooms in Australia, a great deal of attention has been understandably dedicated to the pedagogical approaches, resources and conditions needed to cater for the needs of English as an additional language or dialect (EAL/D) learners in mainstream settings (see Dobinson & Buchori, 2016; Taplin, 2017). However, research has demonstrated that while the practices that take place within the classroom are essential to supporting EAL/D students, the institutional practices of the school community driven and underpinned by school leaders' positionings, views on and attitudes towards diversity are fundamental to the creation and facilitation of opportunities for teachers across the curriculum to support a socially-just environment for all learners, including EAL/D students (Brooks et al., 2010; Theoharis & O'Toole, 2011). To better understand the views of school leaders, this article reports on a study into principals' perceptions about the diverse needs of EAL/D learners in mainstream settings. Grounded in the premises of qualitative research methodologies (Stake, 2010), data was collected through in-depth semi-structured interviews that explored (i) principals' views on diversity, (ii) the perceptions and positioning of EAL/D students in schools, and (iii) the role of suitable pedagogical approaches and their commitment to opportunities for professional learning to enhance responsiveness to EAL/D learners' needs in mainstream settings. Thematic analysis of the interview data revealed that principals' views on diversity acknowledged the pervasive presence of Anglophone teaching and leadership staff in school communities which contributes to colourblind perspectives on and deficit framings of*

EAL/D students and of their needs. To address these systemic and structural issues which heavily impact the classroom, principals indicated that suitable pedagogical approaches are needed along with effective avenues for professional learning (PL) to support EAL/D students in mainstream classes. Though small scale in design, this study also contributes empirical data to this under researched area of principals' attitudes towards EAL/D students.

Key words: *EAL/D students, principals' perceptions, deficit views, leadership attitudes, professional learning*

Introduction

Australia is an increasingly multicultural and multilingual nation. Fuelled by forces of globalisation, increased transnational mobility, and well-sustained refugee and resettlement programs, the country has become home to thousands of international students, temporary and permanent residents and a wide range of refugee communities (Elias et al., 2021). As Taplin (2017) points out, "as Australia's multicultural society continues to become more diverse, increased EAL/D student numbers are inevitable" (p. 48). The super-diversity (Vertovec, 2007) of Australian classrooms, especially characterised by a significant presence of English as an additional language or dialect (EAL/D) students, requires that teachers and principals know who these students are, what kinds of language support is needed for them to develop Standard Australian English (SAE), which pedagogies are most suited to cater for their needs, and what plans, actions and processes need to be in place to foster a culture of equity and social justice for EAL/D learners.

The need for equity and social justice pedagogies is vital in a context such as Australia where pervasively dominant language ideologies and practices continue to marginalise the rich cultural and linguistic voices of EAL/D students. Such suppression is evident in education, and society at large, and on multiple levels. Firstly, the Australian Professional Standards for Teachers (Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership [AITSL], 2011), which outline what teachers should know and be able to do, make only tangential reference to the needs of EAL/D learners, what they know, and how they should be taught (Nguyen & Rushton, 2023). Secondly, a prevalent "monolingual mindset"

(Clyne, 2005, p. xi) in which monolingualism is regarded as the norm, has been described as one of the greatest impediments to recognising and valuing the diverse cultural and linguistic repertoires of EAL/D learners. The impact of this ideology is a deficit discourse that positions these students as lacking "the requisite knowledge and skills to engage with intransigent school curricula" (Alford, 2014, p. 71) and continues to perpetuate monoglossic practices towards EAL/D learners. As Slaughter and Cross (2021) point out, this monolingual mindset is deeply engrained into the Australian education system as "policies that inform curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment are predicated on English-only assumptions" (p. 42), something which often renders invisible the broader range of cultural and linguistic resources that EAL/D learners bring to the learning experience.

School principals are uniquely positioned to build a professional culture in their schools that is conducive to equity and social justice practices, and one which addresses the multifaceted needs of EAL/D students. As Pollock and Briscoe (2019) state, school principals play an important role in their school communities to "either promote or undermine equity" (p. 519) for EAL/D students. In countries such as Canada, the role of principals in creating equitable spaces in their school environments has been acknowledged (Berger et al., 2009; Pollock & Briscoe, 2019), and studies in the United States also suggest that principal leadership is central to the development of inclusive and socially just learning and teaching environments (Kose, 2009, 2011). In light of this, Theoharis and O'Toole (2011) have called for principals to employ and advocate for 'social justice leadership', that is, a type of leadership that "advocates for the needs of marginalized students" (p. 648). Yet, while it is recognised that one of the most critical attributes of effective education for EAL/D students is strong advocacy leadership (Anderson, 2009; Theoharis, 2007), previous studies in contexts such as Canada and the US have shown that principals may hold ambiguous beliefs about diversity and about the needs of EAL/D learners (Pollock & Briscoe, 2019) and may possess limited knowledge on how to implement programs for EAL/D students (Padron & Waxman, 2016). Apart from related studies that examined principal's attitudes to racism in Australian schools (Aveling, 2007; Charles et al 2016), there is limited information available on Australian

principals' perceptions of EAL/D students. In response to this complex context, this study seeks to address the following research question:

What are principals' perceptions of EAL/ learners and what is their commitment to professional learning for diverse contexts?

Literature review

Australian schools have growing numbers of students for whom English is an additional language or dialect. These students, in the process of becoming plurilinguals (Ellis, 2013), bring a rich cultural and linguistic repertoire into the classroom which is not often accounted for by teachers in their practices or pedagogies. Despite the uniquely diverse range of experiences and funds of knowledge which EAL/D students possess while learning English, about English and through English, EAL/D students are often variously categorised as 'language minority' students (Byrnes et al., 1997), limited English proficient students (Lee, 1996), or even, at times, low-ability learners (Tangen & Spooner-Lane, 2008). While these labels are partly reflective of the emerging multilingual trajectories of EAL/D learners, they reinforce a discourse of deficit which not only capitalises a focus on 'student lack' (Dooley, 2012) or failure, but also risks silencing and impairing students from EAL/D backgrounds.

One of the repercussions of essentialising EAL/D students into deficit framing is marginalisation. Marginalisation of EAL/D students occurs at various levels. At national and international levels, research shows that students from language backgrounds other than English are often racialised (García et al., 2021; García & Torres-Guevara, 2021) and, in the context of racio-linguistic ideologies (Flores & Rosa, 2015, 2019), may be viewed as deficient learners. This view, largely framed by a monoglossic discourse of language learners and learning, silences and renders invisible the presence, voices, identities, and rich repertoires of culturally and linguistically diverse (CaLD) students. Similarly, various levels of marginalisation are evident in school contexts. For instance, previous studies (Artiles & Klingner, 2006; Brown, 2004) suggest that EAL/D students who are actively navigating complex social, cultural and linguistic environments may in fact be "misidentified by teachers as having learning difficulties" (Tangen & Spooner-Lane, 2008, p. 63). Marginalisation can also occur through lack of understanding of EAL/D students and their needs at school leadership and the macrolevels above this. In Creagh's (2016)

study on the problematic positioning of EAL/D students in Australian national testing systems, it is evident that a lack of a nuanced understandings of the diversity within this EAL/D category can have negative impacts on both these students and their teachers. So, while EAL/D and mainstream teachers carry a great deal of professional and pedagogical responsibility to address the needs of EAL/D students, this is largely facilitated or hindered by school leaders' views of, and attitudes towards, diversity.

Varying levels of marginalisation of EAL/D learners in schools can be prompted, or further entrenched, by 'colour-blind ideologies'; that is, the ideology that "allows whites to maintain white supremacy without pomp and without the circumstances of naming those it undermines and those it rewards" (Flores & Gunzenhauser, 2019, p. 964). While it is argued that [school] "leaders should become proficient at managing the dynamics of difference" (Lindsey et al., 2018, p. 189), difference can be obscured by leaders' colour-blindness, a phenomenon found to be widespread in schools in the US (Schofield, 2010). A 'colour-blind' approach purports to ignore group membership in favour of treating people solely as individuals in the belief that any consideration of group membership in decision making processes may lead to discrimination either against their interests or even reverse discrimination that would unfairly advantage them. This can be contrasted with what Mabokela and Madsen (2005) refer to as a 'colour-conscious attitude' that characterises the approaches of African-American school leaders in their roles as leading heterogeneous groups in order to meet the needs of all students. According to Mabokela and Madsen, these 'colour-conscious' leaders "appeared to be cultural integrators and consensus builders who had acquired a great deal of understanding about diversity of groups and were able to establish leader-member trust" (p. 204). In the Australian context, Aveling (2007) interviewed 35 principals in one Australian state over a four year period on their views of racism in schools. Not only did an overwhelming majority of principals state that incidents of racism were not a problem in their schools, but they tended to regard any incidents of racism as attributable to individual failings that should be managed through behaviour or bullying policies. This attitude, suggests Aveling, indicates that these school leaders "did not understand the nature and extent of racism and were ill-equipped to deal with the more covert expressions of racism" (2007, p. 69).

This can partly be attributed to an aversion to recognising the manifestations of racism is Australia (Nelson, 2013) , a denial that, as with the colour-blind approach, can actually reinforce and perpetuate the systemic discrimination and marginalisation of some EAL/D students.

Due to the central and strategic role of principals in schools, their views of and attitudes towards 'difference' and diversity can either facilitate social justice or perpetuate marginalisation. Pollock and Briscoe (2019) point out that "how principals frame notions of difference within student populations is important, because although educational institutions can produce societal change and transformation, they can also generate and maintain social inequalities and inequities" (p. 519). Informed by Ladson-Billings' influential writings on culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995, 2014), Pollock and Briscoe (2019) examined how principals in over fifty Canadian primary and secondary schools made sense of student diversity and how this meaning-making influenced their practices and behaviours. The authors argue that these understandings of diversity can shape decisions made in a wide range of areas including how resources (funds, staffing and professional learning support) are allocated, how they engage (or not) with culturally inclusive leadership practices, and how principals seek to foster diverse community involvement in and with the school. The key finding from their study was that the principals' understandings of student difference are influenced by their own personal experiences, beliefs, and values. with those who have a more nuanced understanding of student difference are more likely to create a more inclusive and supportive environment for all students. In addition, principals who were open to challenge their own biases and assumptions about student difference were more likely to advocate for resources and support for students from marginalised groups.

Study context

This study grew out of a conversation between the first author and a school principal at a Victorian secondary school. While the original intent of the conversation was to discuss matters relating to professional learning (PL) opportunities for teachers in their school, it promptly shifted to a reflective dialogue about principals' commitment to PL as a possible avenue enhance teachers' and school leaders' awareness of diversity, and of the strategies, mechanisms and practices that are needed to support both EAL/D learners in mainstream classes. This reflective conversation turned into a research idea as it was further discussed informally with academic colleagues and teachers in schools. As the idea was refined, the researchers became interested in examining principals' opinions, attitudes, and beliefs about the diverse needs of EAL/D students in mainstream settings, the support systems required to nurture them, and the role of opportunities for PL to support teaching staff working with EAL/D learners.

Methodology

The methodological underpinnings of this study are grounded on premises of phenomenological inquiry. Phenomenology seeks to understand "a phenomenon from the perspective of participants who have experienced it" (Bonyadi, 2023, p. 1). Phenomenological inquiry stresses on the uniqueness of individuals and that "each human is radically singular in their being" (Zigon et al., 2021, p. 9). This study examined school principals' beliefs about and attitudes towards EAL/D students in mainstream settings, their views about diversity, and their commitment to PL as an avenue to equip teaching and leadership staff for diverse contexts.

Participants

A total of nine school principals at Government secondary schools in Victoria (N= 4) and New South Wales (N= 5) participated in this study. Principals were recruited through an email invitation which was sent to a total of 17 schools across Victoria and NSW. These 17 schools were purposefully selected as the population of students from language backgrounds other than English was 40% or greater as per school profile data accessed via the My School website, a publicly accessible national database of Australian schools (ACARA, 2015). The email invitation contained an information sheet that outlined details of the study, ethical considerations such as matters of confidentiality, data storage and withdrawal from the study. Interested participants were asked to submit an expression of interest (EoI) via email to the first author. Of the 17 participants that were contacted, 10 sent an EoI to be considered for interviews. Due to personal and professional circumstances, one principal withdrew their EoI, thereby leaving us with nine participants in the study. Due to the rich depth and breadth of data gathered from participants, data from six participants is reported, three from Victoria and three from NSW. To maintain participants' confidentiality, pseudonyms are used to

refer to principals. An overview of participants' profiles is provided in Table 1 below:

Table 1. Overview of principals' profiles

Name	Years of (school leadership) experience	Country of birth	Languages spoken
Jeff	13	Australia	English (only)
Andrew	10	Australia	English (only)
Paul	9	Australia	English (only)
Shawn	17	Australia	English & basic Bahasa Indonesia
Ella	21	Australia	English (only)
Ben	19	Australia	English (only)

Participants were also asked about their ancestry. Three (Jeff, Paul and Shawn) reported British ancestry, two (Andrew and Ella) Scottish, and one (Ben) Irish. Information about country of birth and languages spoken was considered potentially relevant in relation to their views about and attitudes towards diversity. This was also premised on findings from a study done in the US into leadership for inclusion and diversity which found that white male leaders tend to be less engaged with diversity than their culturally and linguistically diverse colleagues (Shelton & Thomas, 2013). As shown in Table 1, all principals were born in Australia, are of European descendance, five of whom are males, and only one speaks a language other than English at a basic level.

Data collection and analysis

Data for this study was collected through in-depth semi-structured interviews with school principals. Interviews were conducted via Microsoft Teams at a time that was most convenient to participants. When interview dates and times were organised, principals were sent Teams meeting invitations along with interview questions in preparation for the interview meeting (Appendix A). Prior to the interview meeting, participants were also sent an information sheet that contained details of the study, and of their voluntary right to participate in the interview protocol and to withdraw at any time with no consequences.

The analysis of interview data was methodologically driven by the premises and processes of thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), which allowed for the systematic identification and analysis of recurring patterns and themes within the data. The themes that have been identified in the analysed data are as follows:

1. Principals' perceptions of diversity within teaching and leadership
2. Implications and consequences of a deficit view of EAL/D learners
3. Principals' views on suitable pedagogical approaches for EAL/D learners
4. Principals' commitment to professional learning for diverse contexts

To achieve greater consistency and accuracy in the analysis of interview data, participants were, first and foremost, sent a copy of their transcribed interview to ensure a verbatim account of the recorded interview was maintained. Participants were also given access to a password-protected folder that contained the recorded interview. Participants were asked to confirm their approval of their transcriptions within a week or raise any questions or concerns about them as soon as practicable. The coding process was undertaken by one of the researchers who identified possible themes and selected some representative quotes. These were then discussed with the second researcher. Upon discussing the possible themes and representative quotes, some modifications were made such as changes to theme labels and a further search for additional quotes. Once both researchers were satisfied with the themes and selected quotes, they proceeded with the analysis.

Analysis and discussion

The exploration and examination of principals' commentaries under each of the identified themes illuminate the complex multifaceted dimensions that interweave into the research question of the study. Before uncovering principals' views of EAL/D learners and their needs in schools, our focus was first on understanding their attitudes towards diversity within the spheres of teaching and leadership which unveiled aspects of colour-blind

ideologies. As Pollock and Briscoe (2019) assert, a possible avenue to mitigate educational disparities is by first gaining an understanding of principals' perspectives of diversity in education.

Perceptions of diversity within teaching and leadership
When asked to describe the overall profile of teaching staff, the perniciousness of colourblind ideologies was evident in some principals' responses. These exposed not only limited diverse representation in schools but also a tendency to diminish the presence of racial differences where these exist. Ben, for instance, notes that:

> not a lot [of] diversity exists at our teaching staff level, which is somewhat problematic because some teachers are colour blind.

The concern about the lack of diversity among teaching staff, while mentioning that some teachers are "colour-blind" also raises questions about the effectiveness of 'colour blindness' as a strategy for promoting inclusivity and equity.

> There're only two staff from backgrounds other than English, but they have always adjusted brilliantly into the school community (Paul)

With a focus on seemingly successful integration into the school community, Paul's perspective downplays the significance of cultural and racial differences by emphasising the seamless assimilation of these individuals into the existing environment. Alluding to aspects of social justice leadership (Dantley & Tillman, 2006), Paul also observes that the role of principals is pivotal in creating 'safe spaces' for teachers and students of diverse backgrounds to be a part of the school community.

> While I believe that diversity in teaching and leadership has a significant impact on students' learning and positive outcomes, but we have external authorities, like VIT and NESA, and internal systems in schools which don't see the uniqueness of international teachers and their potential contribution to the system (Shawn)

While acknowledging the value of having a diverse teaching and leadership workforce, Shawn's observation also points to a potentially colour-blind perspective by focusing on external authorities (such as VIT and NESA) and internal school systems as barriers to recognising and appreciating the uniqueness of international teachers. Even though Shawn seems to appreciate diversity, he appears cognisant of the systemic issues in and out of school which not only minimise the role of race and ethnicity but also perpetuate structural inequalities.

The lack of diversity and, more specifically, the prevailing presence of individuals from Anglophone backgrounds in positions of leadership is a notable observation in the following reflection by Ben who reminisces about a professional event he attended:

> I was recently at a conference in Canberra – a school leadership conference. The majority were males, and probably over 90% of them, us, White, Caucasian of some European background. What does that say about our schools and society at large? (Ben)

That anecdotal observation by Ben on the lack of diversity within school leadership at that gathering is supported by data from AITSL on the demographics of the Australian teaching workforce and school leadership (AITSL, 2019). Though the data available on diversity with school leadership is not comprehensive, the limited statistics available on those who identify as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander shows only 2% of teachers identify themselves within this group, with an even smaller percentage at the level of school leadership (AITSL, 2019). This contrasts with the 6.3% of students who identify as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Inlander (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2023). As Pollock and Briscoe (2019) have suggested, principals' understandings of student difference is heavily influenced by their own personal experiences and beliefs. If only a very small fraction of school leadership in Australian schools have some lived experiences of what it means to not be a part of the dominant White, Anglo majority, then it seems inevitable that there has been slow progress towards those in the majority actually becoming aware of the implications of this lack of diversity among leaders in schools.

Implications and consequences of a deficit view
A reoccurring theme through the discussions was how EAL/D students were seen predominantly through a deficit lens. This is most commonly linked to how these students are positioned as

less capable due to insufficient English language proficiency, as evident in the following two remarks:

> ...well, because they don't usually have the solid language foundations to say what they want to say (Shawn)

As noted earlier, a 'deficit perspective' primarily stresses student lack (Dooley, 2012). This deficit framework appears to shape Shawn's views of EAL/D students who capitalises on 'the lack' of "solid language foundations". Shawn's observation reflects the common stereotype that EAL/D students lack "solid language foundations," implying a deficiency in their linguistic skills. This deficit perspective assumes that these students are inherently disadvantaged and struggle to express themselves effectively (Tangen & Spooner-Lane, 2008). Such a viewpoint may inadvertently undermine their intellectual capabilities, perpetuating the notion that their linguistic challenges hinder their overall cognitive abilities.

> All our systems, protocols, avenues for success are all the same for everyone. The only thing is that sometimes we may think that EALD students cannot do certain things because they don't have full proficiency (Jeff)

In addition to this, EAL/D students may be viewed as lacking the initiative and willingness to make the most of what is on offer. While Jeff's observation below highlights the availability of opportunity for all students, it is a viewpoint that places the responsibility and agency solely on EAL/D students for not "taking up" opportunities.

> I think the opportunities are always there but either they don't take them up or get quickly taken up by the Aussie kids (Jeff)

The fact that opportunities "get quickly taken up by the Aussie kids" implies a sense of competition where EAL/D students are portrayed as being outperformed or overshadowed by their Australian peers. This perpetuates a deficit narrative by positioning EAL/D students as inferior or disadvantaged compared to their "Aussie" counterparts. It overlooks systemic barriers, linguistic challenges, and cultural differences that might impact EAL/D students' ability to access and capitalise on opportunities in the same way as all other students.

In contrast to Shawn and Jeff's focus on the student as the sole cause of the issue, some principals were more aware of various systemic factors that contributed to this situation. Andrew commented that:

> There's a repeated pattern in every single school. Students and teachers from other backgrounds tend to be seen as inferior by their peers, and that's a challenge for us as we have to battle those mental structures (Andrew)

This perception that EAL/D students and teachers from diverse backgrounds are somehow lacking or deficient in comparison to their peers who come from dominant linguistic and cultural backgrounds can lead to lowered expectations, reduced opportunities, and limited support for EAL/D students and teachers, ultimately hindering their educational experiences and outcomes.

Paul's observation acknowledges the potential contributions of EAL/D students in terms of their "wealth of knowledge and experiences", but states that "their knowledge is often not accounted for in what teachers actually do in class" implies that EALD students' expertise is not being effectively integrated into the learning process:

> EAL/D students bring a wealth of knowledge and experiences to the mainstream classroom, but their knowledge is often not accounted for in what teachers actually do in class. Also, there continues to be stereotypical views about these students, which we have to fix (Paul)

While Paul's perspective seems to tacitly call for the need of educators and institutions to adapt their approaches, curriculum, and pedagogy for a full integration of EAL/D students' knowledge and experience, it does not explicitly address the broader systemic issues that perpetuate their limited integration in the classroom (Windle & Miller, 2013). However, a critical self-reflection was extended further by other principals who regarded this as a much broader societal issue, and that what was occurring in schools was a merely a reflection of wider systemic problems. As Ella commented:

> Our society, and school alike, have underlying systems that invisibilise students from diverse backgrounds.

This also happens in leadership positions, government offices, etc. In our school, EALD students and Aboriginal students are often seen by some people through deficiency lenses.

A similar remark was made by Ben, who noted that:

I think there's a lot of dumbing down of EAL/D students in our society. They don't have enough English, not enough local knowledge, not enough literacy skills, therefore they can't think. This is in our society and in our schools.

A more complex manifestation of this deficit view, and a reoccurring theme evident in how some principals positioned EAL/D learners in their schools, was the contrast between what was regarded as an egalitarian desire to see them as just like every other student and to therefore to treat them no differently, and a more deficit-orientated approach in which EAL/D are viewed first as students whose English language proficiency levels defined their learning needs. This contrast is encapsulated in this remark from Shawn, who believed that:

EAL/D students have to be treated like all other students with full abilities. They tend to be seen as children with disability because they have a different worldview, different behaviours, manners, and low language skills (Shawn)

While Shawn's observation, for some, may stand as a rather democratically inclusive attitude towards EAL/D students, for others, it may come across as a colour-blind infused statement (Flores & Gunzenhauser, 2019) which, despite its intention to treat everyone equally, may fail to identify and cater for the unique, diverse needs of EAL/D students. Though not explicitly stated in Shawn's commentary, the inference is that there is a shared and dominant worldview and set of behaviours within the school and school community, and this is the standard against which EAL/D students are referenced. The pervasiveness and strength of this view is evident in how some participants stressed the need to 'convince' themselves that not belonging to the dominant group within the community was not necessarily a

barrier to accessing similar opportunities. A one participant mentioned:

I see my students as being all the same. I want to see them this way to convince myself that they can achieve the same outcomes, access the same opportunities... yeah, they have different needs, but with a bit of support...(Jeff)

The potential issue with this approach, which closely aligns closely with the overall premise of colourblind ideologies (e.g. Mabokela & Madsen, 2005) is that the lack of knowledge and misguided aim to treat everyone equally ignores the disparities in social capital EAL/D learners may experience such that thinking this can be overcome with un-systematic efforts to offer a 'bit of support' are likely to be insufficient to address the significant needs. Moreover, where an educator or school leader grounds their approach in the rationale that they are treating everyone equally, then that may see that as the endpoint of their responsibility.

Views on suitable pedagogical approaches

When discussing pedagogical approaches, some principals were clearly aware that supporting EAL/D students in mainstream classes requires a systematic and well-informed approach that does not transfer all the responsibility to the student to 'catch up' and 'keep up' in terms of English language proficiency. This awareness is made clear in the following comment:

There's a lot of work we need to do at school to include EALD students in mainstream classes. There's a view that just by speaking more slowly to them, they will pick up the things that are students taking in (Ben)

Acknowledging the work yet to be done in schools to fully integrate EAL/D students in mainstream classes is an attribute of what Mabokela and Madsen (2005) call a 'colour-conscious' leader. However, Ben's observation alludes more specifically to the need for more effective and inclusive pedagogical approaches that go beyond surface-level adjustments, a concern also shared by Ella who notes that:

High challenge and high support are important strategies to help EALD students in mainstream

classes. Classes are already challenging but teachers have to give them a lot of support to get them over the line.

Andrew's observation suggests that the existing educational system may not prioritize the personalised attention necessary for effective teaching and support of EALD students.

> We have to be upfront in saying that failing to really know the needs of EAL/D students comes down to a matter of time. Teachers should develop individual profiles of students, have one-on-one consultations, etc. but they are time poor (Andrew)

The fact that the issue "comes down to a matter of time" highlights the systemic constraint of limited resources, particularly time, faced by teachers. The reference to developing "individual profiles of students" and conducting "one-on-one consultations" stresses the ideal approach to supporting EALD students, which involves tailored instruction and close guidance. Harper and Feez (2021) point out that one avenue for getting to know every student in class is by "preparing a profile for all students, of all cultural and linguistic backgrounds" (p. 29). While the time barrier is one rooted in the current educational system, Andrew's comment highlights the critical need for targeted professional development to address the systemic challenges hindering suitable pedagogical approaches for EAL/D students.

Principals' commitment to professional learning for diverse contexts

Bearing in mind the associated problems inherent in the 'egalitarian' and 'deficit' approaches to viewing EAL/D learners, the transformational power of quality PL, whether formal or informal, or internally or externally led, was viewed positively by these principals. As one participant remarked, "There's a lot of power in professional learning in enhancing teacher knowledge about best practice for diverse students.   It can not only improve their skillset but also their practice" (Ella). The benefits of this type if PL, according to one principal, cannot be assumed to occur just through attendance and participation alone. Before encouraging their staff to engage in PL, one principal tries to "make them aware of the 'what', 'how' and 'why' of PL. What do they need? Why do they need it? Why do they want to do it?"

(Ben). This type of critical reflection and purposeful undertaking of PL has potential benefits not only for those individual teachers in their own classroom practice, but potentially to empower them to share this knowledge within the school. As (another) principal commented in relation to the flow on benefits that external PL can have within the school, "those teachers that have a lot of professional learning under their belt are now facilitating professional learning in school, especially for early career teachers, and specific subject specialists to better equip them with strategies for EAL/D students in their classes" (Andrew).

This type of collaboration is particularly important for teachers of subjects in which the language and literacy needs of students have traditionally received minimal attention (Davison & Ollerhead, 2018; Ollerhead, 2020). The benefits of this were noted by one principal who reported that: "We've had some team teaching going on this year that has allowed our EALD specialist to visit maths and science classes, for example, and then create joint lesson plans for their classes. Science teachers have said that it's been useful as they can now modify their language in science classes" (Shawn).

Besides principals' perceived benefits of PL for their staff and the broader school community, they expressed a strong commitment to intentional PL opportunities for themselves and leadership teams in their schools. It was acknowledged that PL is central to not only the professional growth of teachers but also of the development of leadership capabilities to promote equity and inclusion. While Andrew's observation appears to foster a democratic stance on EAL/D students, he believes that PLs can "equip everyone" with knowledge and skills for more effective functioning of diverse schools:

> I think PLs are for everyone in the school community. I mean there are some for teachers only, or leaders, etc. but what I'm trying to say is that we should all embrace them to develop new skills to better function in contexts with students and staff from different backgrounds (Andrew)

Some principals' commitment to utilising PLs as avenues to enhance their own knowledge, skills and dispositions to better support students and staff was evident in Paul's remark:

> I support EAL/D students because of their needs, the experiences and great knowledge they bring to our

communities. EAL/D teachers or teachers from diverse backgrounds should deliver PDs to us, Anglo leaders across Australia (Paul)

Not only does Paul highlight the highlight the rich diversity of knowledge and experiences of EAL/D student but also suggests that professional development sessions should be conducted by EAL/D teachers or teachers from diverse backgrounds. This is a crucial point because teachers with expertise in EAL/D education have a better understanding of the specific challenges and needs of these students. They can provide insights and strategies that can be particularly effective for EAL/D students, which may shape or re-frame principals' views and attitudes towards diversity and enhance their awareness of and commitment to the support systems needed for EAL/D students in schools.

The need for effective PL is reinforced from studies that have examined the learning outcomes for EAL/D students, particularly in areas where they are in schools that have higher proportions of students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds. As Windle and Miller (2013) have discussed, in these environments there is often an understandable emphasis on attending to the wellbeing since it often presents the most immediate attention. This, however, can lead to less emphasis on the literacy and language learning needs of the students. The unfortunate consequence of this can be students who are not as well prepared as they might be for progressing in their further education. (Windle & Miller, 2013)

Conclusion

In a multicultural and multilingual nation like Australia, the increasing diversity fuelled by globalization, transnational mobility, and resettlement programs has led to a significant presence of EAL/D students in classrooms and across the curriculum. Although EAL/D learners should not be categorised as lesser or superior students in comparison to their mainstream counterparts, prevailing societal narratives perpetuate negative views of EAL/D learners. Amidst this context, school principals emerge as pivotal figures with the capacity to create equitable and socially just spaces for EAL/D students. Furthermore, they are also responsible and accountable for cultivating professional culture that prioritises fairness, inclusion, and social justice for EAL/D learners across the curriculum. As Pollock and Briscoe (2019) assert, principals

have the power to either bolster or undermine equity for EAL/D learners. However, as attested in this study, principals may possess uncertain, and rather ambivalent, beliefs about diversity, which are, to a large extent, framed by systemic, structural schemas that sustain monoglossic, White-supremacy ideologies.

Though the findings from this study align with aspects of previous research into the perceptions of principals towards EAL/D students in other contexts (e.g. Pollock & Briscoe, 2019), the findings also serve to highlight attitudes towards English language learners that beliefs that are prevalent is Australian society. Upon critically exploring principals' perceptions of diversity, and of the diverse needs of EAL/D students across the curriculum, a recurring and disconcerting theme emerged about a prevailing tendency to perceive EAL/D students through a deficit lens. This limited perspective is often entrenched in the perception of these students as less capable, primarily due to their perceived inadequacy in English language proficiency. Furthermore, EAL/D students find themselves subject to misperceptions, and even viewed as lacking the initiative and readiness to embrace available opportunities. Yet, a more nuanced perspective also emerged, championed by certain principals who recognised systemic factors whereby societal patterns and structures as inferior by their peers, highlighting the need to address deeply ingrained mental structures.

In light of the intricate challenges posed by both a seemingly 'democratic' and 'deficit' approaches to understanding EAL/D learners, the principals' collective perspective capitalises on the transformative potential of quality professional learning (PL). This transformative power, whether arising from formal or informal, internally or externally led avenues, emerges as a beacon of hope within the educational landscape. The resounding sentiment that resonates is encapsulated by one participant's assertion that professional learning possesses the inherent capacity to enrich teacher knowledge, amplifying best practices for diverse students.

Even though the focus of this study was not primarily on the role of participants' ancestry, country of birth, or language spoken in their attitudes towards diversity, it is of particular interest to note that the demographic data collected in this study on categories of gender, ancestry and language background lay the foundation for further exploring how these categories may influence principals' perspectives on diversity and inclusion of

EAL/D students. Given the limited amount of data on these categories, and the small sample of participants, rather than drawing any unfounded conclusions on possible relationships, we stress the need for further research that aligns with, for instance, the findings of research in the United States which highlighted differences in engagement with diversity between white male leaders and their culturally and linguistically diverse counterparts (Shelton & Thomas, 2013).

References

ACARA [Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority]. (2015). *Myschool.edu.au.* www.myschool.edu.au

AITSL [Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership]. (2019). *Diversity in School Leadership* (p. 22). https://www.aitsl.edu.au/docs/default-source/research-evidence/spotlight/diversity-in-school-leadership.pdf

Alford, J. (2014). 'Well, hang on, they're actually much better than that!': Disrupting dominant discourses of deficit about English language learners in senior high school English. *English Teaching, 13*(3), 71–88.

Anderson, G. L. (2009). *Advocacy leadership: Toward a post-reform agenda in education.* Routledge.

Artiles, A. J., & Klingner, J. K. (2006). Forging a Knowledge Base on English Language Learners with Special Needs: Theoretical, Population, and Technical Issues. *Teachers College Record: The Voice of Scholarship in Education, 108*(11), 2187–2194. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2006.00778.x

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2023). *Schools, 2022.* https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/education/schools/latest-release

Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership [AITSL]. (2011). *Australian Professional Standards for Teachers* (p. 32). AITSL.

Aveling, N. (2007). Anti-racism in Schools: A question of leadership? *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 28*(1), 69–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596300601073630

Berger, M., Die, G., & Forgette-Giroux, R. (2009). Literacy, diversity and education: Meeting the contemporary challenge. *Comparative and International Education, 38*(1).

Bonyadi, A. (2023). Phenomenology as a research methodology in teaching English as a foreign language. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education, 8*(1), 11. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-022-00184-z

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10/fswdcx

Brooks, K., Adams, S. R., & Morita-Mullaney, T. (2010). Creating Inclusive Learning Communities for ELL Students: Transforming School Principals' Perspectives. *Theory Into Practice, 49*(2), 145–151. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841003641501

Brown, C. L. (2004). Reducing the Over-Referral of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students (CLD) for Language Disabilities. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice, 2.*

Byrnes, D. A., Kiger, G., & Lee Manning, M. (1997). Teachers' attitudes about language diversity. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 13*(6), 637–644. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(97)80006-6

Charles, C., Mahoney, C., Fox, B., & Halse, C. (2016). School principals and racism: Responding to Aveling. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 37*(2), 230–244. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2014.985634

Choi, J., & Slaughter, Y. (2021). Challenging discourses of deficit: Understanding the vibrancy and complexity of multilingualism through language trajectory grids. *Language Teaching Research, 25*(1), 81–104. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820938825

Clyne, M. G. (2005). *Australia's Language Potential.* University of New South Wales Press. https://research.monash.edu/en/publications/australias-language-potential

Creagh, S. (2016). A critical analysis of the Language Background Other Than English (LBOTE) category in the Australian national testing system: A Foucauldian perspective. *Journal of Education Policy, 31*(3), 275–289. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2015.1066870

Dantley, M., & Tillman, L. (2006). *Social justice and moral transformative leadership', in Marshall C., and Oliva M.(Eds.), Leadership for Social Justice: Making Revolutions in Education, Pearson Publishing*, Boston. London: Pearson.

Davison, C., & Ollerhead, S. (2018). But I'm Not an English Teacher!: Disciplinary Literacy in Australian Science Classrooms. In K.-S. Tang & K. Danielsson (Eds.), *Global Developments in Literacy Research for Science Education* (pp. 29–43). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-69197-8_3

Dobinson, T., & Buchori, S. (2016). Catering for EAL/D Students' Language Needs in Mainstream Classes: Early Childhood Teachers' Perspectives and Practices in One Australian Setting. *The Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(2), 32–52. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n2.3

Dooley, K. (2012). Positioning refugee students as intellectual class members. In F. McCarthy & M. Vickers (Eds.), *Refugee and immigrant students: Achieving equity in education* (pp. 3-20). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Elias, A., Mansouri, F., & Sweid, R. (2021). Public Attitudes Towards Multiculturalism and Interculturalism in Australia. *Journal of International Migration and Integration, 22*(3), 1063–1084. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-020-00784-z

Ellis, E. (2013). The ESL teacher as plurilingual: An Australian perspective. *Tesol Quarterly, 47*(3), 446–471.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review, 85*(2), 149–171.

Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2019). Bringing Race Into Second Language Acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal, 103*(S1), 145–151. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12523

Flores, O., & Gunzenhauser, M. G. (2019). The problems with colorblind leadership revealed: A call for race-conscious leaders. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 32*(8), 963–981. https://doi.org/10.1080/09518398.2019.1635278

García, O., Flores, N., Seltzer, K., Wei, L., Otheguy, R., & Rosa, J. (2021). Rejecting abyssal thinking in the language and education of racialized bilinguals: A manifesto. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 18*(3), 203–228. https://doi.org/10.1080/15427587.2021.1935957

García, O., & Torres-Guevara, R. (2021). Monoglossic Language Education Policies and Latinx Students' Language. In *Handbook of Latinos and Education* (pp. 93–102). Routledge.

Harper, H., & Feez, S. (2021). *Learning and teaching English as an additional language or dialect in mainstream classrooms.* Primary English Teaching Association Australia (PETAA). https://rune.une.edu.au/web/handle/1959.11/30036

Kose, B. W. (2009). The Principal's Role in Professional Development for Social Justice: An Empirically-Based Transformative Framework. *Urban Education, 44*(6), 628–663. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085908322707

Kose, B. W. (2011). Developing a Transformative School Vision: Lessons From Peer-Nominated Principals. *Education and Urban Society, 43*(2), 119–136. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124510380231

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a Theory of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465–491. https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312032003465

Ladson-Billings, G. (2014). Culturally Relevant Pedagogy 2.0: A.k.a. the Remix. *Harvard Educational Review, 84*(1), 74–84. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.84.1.p2rj131485484751

Lee, P. (1996). Cognitive development in bilingual children: A case for bilingual instruction in early childhood education. *Bilingual Research Journal, 20*(3–4), 499–522.

Lindsey, R. B., Nuri-Robins, K., Terrell, R. D., & Lindsey, D. B. (2018). *Cultural proficiency: A manual for school leaders.* Corwin Press.

Mabokela, R. O., & Madsen, J. A. (2005). 'Color-blind' and 'color-conscious' leadership: A case study of desegregated suburban schools in the USA. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 8*(3), 187–206. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603120500107313

Nelson, J. K. (2013). Denial of racism and its implications for local action. *Discourse & Society, 24*(1), 89–109. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926512463635

Nguyen, H. T. M., & Rushton, K. (2023). Teachers' perceptions about their work with EAL/D students in a standards-based educational context. *TESOL in Context, 31*(1), 49–72. https://doi.org/10.21153/tesol2022vol31no1art1698

Ollerhead, S. (2020). 'The pre-service teacher tango': Pairing literacy and science in multilingual Australian classrooms. *International Journal of Science Education, 42*(14), 2493–2512. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2019.1634852

Padron, Y., & Waxman, H. (2016). Investigating Principals' Knowledge and Perceptions of Second Language Programs for English Language Learners. *International Journal of Educational Leadership and Management, 4*(2), 127. https://doi.org/10.17583/ijelm.2016.1706

Pollock, K., & Briscoe, P. (2019). School principals' understandings of student difference and diversity and how these understandings influence their work. *International Journal of Educational Management, 34*(3), 518–534. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-07-2019-0243

Schofield, J. W. (2010). The Colorblind Perspective in School: Causes and Consequences. In J. Banks & C. McGee-Banks (Eds.), *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives* (7th ed., pp. 259–284). John Wiley.

Shelton, C., & Thomas, D. A. (2013). The Study on White Men Leading through Diversity & Inclusion. *Greatheart Leader Labs, February.*

Slaughter, Y., & Cross, R. (2021). Challenging the monolingual mindset: Understanding plurilingual pedagogies in English as an Additional Language (EAL) classrooms. *Language Teaching Research, 25*(1), 39–60. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820938819

Stake, R. E. (2010). *Qualitative Research: Studying how Things Work.* Guilford Press.

Tangen, D., & Spooner-Lane, R. (2008). Avoiding the deficit model of teaching: Students who have EAL/EAL and learning difficulties. *Australian Journal of Learning Difficulties, 13*(2), 63–71. https://doi.org/10.1080/19404150802380522

Taplin, A. (2017). Accounting for the needs of EAL/D students in the mainstream classroom. *Metaphor, 1*, 48–50. https://doi.org/10.3316/aeipt.215150

Theoharis, G. (2007). Social Justice Educational Leaders and Resistance: Toward a Theory of Social Justice Leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 43*(2), 221–258. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X06293717

Theoharis, G., & O'Toole, J. (2011). Leading Inclusive ELL: Social Justice Leadership for English Language Learners. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 47*(4), 646–688. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X11401616

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. E*thnic and Racial Studies, 30*(6), 1024–1054. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870701599465

Windle, J., & Miller, J. (2013). Marginal Integration: The Reception of Refugee-Background Students in Australian Schools. In L. Bartlett & A. Ghaffar-Kucher (Eds.), *Refugees, Immigrants, and Education in the Global South: Lives in Motion* (pp. 196–210). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/ 9780203067734

Zigon, J., Throop, J., Diemberger, H., Stasch, R., & Sanchez, A. (2021). Phenomenology. *Cambridge Encyclopedia of Anthropology.* https://doi.org/10.29164/ 21phenomenology

Appendix A: Interview questions

Demographic questions:

Could you please tell us your name?

What's your nationality? Country of birth? Language background?

Do you speak any languages other than English? Which one(s)? How many?

How many years of school leadership experience do you have?

Diversity:

How cultural and linguistically diverse is your staff body in the school?

What nationalities or languages are represented among staff?

Could you please tell us about diversity (cultural and linguistic) in the leadership team in school?

How important do you think it is for schools to have cultural and linguistically diverse teaching staff?

How important do you think it is for schools to have cultural and linguistically diverse school leadership teams?

Do you think school leadership in Australian schools has an adequate representation of diverse cultures and languages?

What are the implications of this (presence or absence of diverse cultures and languages) for EAL/D students in schools?

Are there any benefits or challenges in having teachers from diverse backgrounds in mainstream classes?

EAL/D students in schools:

Do you have EAL/D students in your school? How small or large is the EAL/D student population?

What are the benefits of having EAL/D students in schools and mainstream classes?

What are challenges of having students from diverse backgrounds in schools and mainstream classes?

Do EALD students have the same opportunities (e.g. academic, recreational, etc.) as other students in mainstream classes?

What areas of school life, structure, organization, or leadership do you think reinforce deficit mindsets about EALD students?

Do you think EALD students feel supported by teachers, school protocols and activities, and leadership?

Pedagogical approaches and professional learning:

How prepared do you think your teachers are to respond to the needs of EAL/D students

in schools and mainstream classes?

What kind of pedagogies do you know think are needed in schools to support EAL/D students?

Do you think professional learning is an avenue to support teachers with EAL/D students in mainstream classes?

What are some reported outcomes of professional learning ac-vi-es in support of EAL/D students in mainstream classes?

What else do you think needs to be done to support teachers, and support EAL/D students?

Leonardo Veliz is an Associate Professor in Language and Literacy and Head of Department (Curriculum) in the School of Education at the University of New England, Australia. Leonardo is a qualified secondary school teacher with extensive experience in highly diverse contexts (UK, South America, Australia). Leonardo's academic career spans over 20 years in Australia and overseas. Leonardo's research and research interests sit broadly within the realms of teaching and learning, multilingual and multicultural education, culturally responsive pedagogies for EAL/D learners, multiple literacies in diverse contexts and initial (language) teacher education.

Email: lveliz@une.edu.au

Gary Bonar is a Lecturer in the Master of TESOL and Languages specialisation courses at the Faculty of Education, Monash University, Australia. He is involved in teacher education at both pre-service and post-graduate level and supervises research students in TESOL and Language-related fields. Prior to commencing his lecturing position he worked in the Victorian secondary education sector, most recently in the role of Curriculum Coordinator responsible for Literacy, Languages and Social Sciences and he also taught two languages (Japanese and Italian) and English as an additional language. He also has over ten years' experience teaching English in diverse sectors in Asia and Europe. Gary's current research explores the complex dynamics of language teacher identity and how future and current language teachers can be best prepared and supported to thrive as language teachers in schools.

Email: Gary.Bonar@monash.edu

Implications for Initial Teacher Education (ITE) programs in preparing mainstream teachers for culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms

Jennifer Smith
(corresponding author)
Queensland University of Technology

Lynn Downes
Queensland University of Technology

Abstract: *With a rising percentage of English as an Additional Language or Dialect (EAL/D) learners in Australian schools and recent policy changes, increasingly these students find themselves learning curriculum content in mainstream classes without appropriate language learning support. Professional standards for teachers in Australia require graduates to demonstrate knowledge of teaching strategies that are responsive to the learning strengths and needs of students from diverse linguistic, cultural, religious, and socioeconomic backgrounds, including Indigenous learners. However, teachers report being ill-prepared for teaching in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms. It seems that Initial Teacher Education (ITE) courses may not be consistently equipping preservice teachers with the necessary knowledge, dispositions, skills, and expertise to be responsive to EAL/D learners' needs. This study analysed audio-transcripts of five practising EAL/D teachers responding to questions posed by ITE students from an Australian university. Using Fairclough's (2003) Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), research results offer insights into specialist knowledge and skills necessary for successful EAL/D student engagement in mainstream classrooms. This timely research presents five recommendations that will inform higher education institutions when developing ITE courses for preparing preservice teachers for culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms. Insights are shared for already practising mainstream classroom teachers.*

Introduction

Queensland Department of Education (DoE) policy changes related to inclusion have devolved decisions about the type of support provided to English as an Additional Language or Dialect (EAL/D) learners to the individual school level (DoE, 2022), prompting the closure of many EAL/D units in schools and the redeployment of many specialist EAL/D teachers (Creagh et al., 2022). Current state education policy requires EAL/D students to be taught in a mainstream classroom, "alongside their similar-aged peers, supported by reasonable adjustments and teaching strategies tailored to meet their individual needs" (DoE, 2021, p. 1). Consequently, generalist classroom teachers who may not have sufficient specialist training and assistance have become responsible for supporting the language learning of EAL/D learners in their classrooms. These changes have been mirrored in other jurisdictions around Australia and the world, resulting in concern that ITE programs are not equipping teachers with the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions to take on this challenge.

Australia is a culturally and linguistically diverse country with the proportion of residents born overseas or having a parent born overseas now at over half the population at 51.5% (Australian Bureau of Statistics [ABS], 2021). Accordingly, over 25% of young people grow up speaking a language other than English at home. Notably, this figure does not include the 9.5% of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders that speak a traditional Aboriginal language or Kriol or an Aboriginal dialect of English at home (ABS, 2021). In addition to the challenges of participating in the classroom in a new language, many EAL/D learners are underperforming in comparison to their English proficient peers academically (Creagh et al., 2019). Alongside the policy changes regarding the provision of EAL/D support, this growing cultural and linguistic diversity has implications for schooling and Initial Teacher Education (ITE) programs because it means that all teachers need to be adequately prepared for teaching students whose first language is not English.

A review of ITE courses by the Australian Council of TESOL Association (2022) uncovered that only two ITE programs in Australia included mandatory basic EAL/D content. It seems that there is little consistency across ITE programs as to how these units are taught and the content that is delivered. Therefore, in the following section this paper will review the literature in relation to what is already known about EAL/D learners in Australia, the specialised knowledge needed by teachers working with EAL/D learners, and then highlight some of the gaps and issues arising in ITE EAL/D education at present. This paper then looks at addressing these gaps by sharing research focused in the area with commentary from five expert teachers in the field. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is used to analyse the responses of five expert EAL/D teachers talking about how to successfully support EAL/D learners in schools. Fairclough's CDA will be explained in more detail and finally, the findings are discussed before presenting five recommendations for ITE courses.

Literature review

Who are EAL/D learners?

In Australia, EAL/D learners constitute 25% of students in classrooms (ACARA, 2023; Gibbons, 2015). EAL/D students speak a language or dialect other than Standard Australian English (SAE) and need support with the English language to access the school curriculum. These students can include newly arrived immigrants and refugee background students, international students, or Australians who have lived for extended periods of time in countries where their schooling was not in English. EAL/D students can also be born in Australia but grow up speaking a language or dialect other than English in the home such as some Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander or migrant families (ACARA, 2023). Stemming from this diversity of linguistic, ethnic and cultural backgrounds are varying levels of English proficiency which further contributes to the complexity of teaching EAL/D learners in mainstream contexts (Flockton & Cunningham, 2021).

Needs of EAL/D learners

The Australian Curriculum states that "EAL/D students require specific support to learn and build on the English language skills needed to access the curriculum, in addition to learning area-specific language structures and vocabulary" (ACARA, 2023). This requires a teacher knowing how to analyse and teach texts relevant to schooling, including a nuanced understanding of how different text structures are used in particular learning areas; therefore, knowledge about paragraph organisation, cohesion, sentence grammar, and relevant metalanguage (Coleman, 2015; Hammond, 2014; Schleppegrell, 2020). It has been argued that 'good teaching' is insufficient for EAL/D learners and that teachers require specialised knowledge and skills about language and culture (de

Jong & Harper, 2005; Gibbons, 2015). Recent studies call for more explicit coursework in ITE programs to address this need by including topics such as, how to teach reading to EAL/D learners, specialised linguistic knowledge of each discipline and ways to teach language, and knowledge about student cultural backgrounds and how this affects learning (Wissink & Starks, 2019).

While EAL/D learners need consistent and ongoing support with language learning to develop skills in listening, speaking, reading and viewing, and writing across the curriculum and across all levels of schooling (Gibbons, 2015), teachers should also be attuned to the different cultural background knowledge of learners, assisting them to understand taken-for-granted cultural practices (Willenberg, 2015). Lucas and Villegas (2013) assert that it is necessary for teachers to value and understand the connections between language, culture, and identity while also acknowledging the power and privilege associated with the speakers of certain languages. However, most EAL/D learners are being taught by non-specialist mainstream teachers who are overwhelmingly monolingual and have no personal experiences with language learning as a reference (Ellis, 2013; de Jong, 2019). If this monolingual and monocultural orientation is left untroubled, students' linguistic and cultural diversity can be overlooked.

When faced with newly arrived culturally and linguistically diverse students, Dobinson and Buchori (2016) found that teachers had few strategies available to them, leading to the recommendation that ITE programs should include practical language teaching strategies and develop language awareness, in particular, the skills and knowledge necessary to implement a translanguaging approach. A translanguaging approach recognises that language practices are complex and interrelated through viewing other languages as resources for learning a new language (de Jong, 2019; García, 2008). Translanguaging strategies focus on using the learner's home language and culture as a resource for learning an additional language, in this case SAE, and challenges the traditional approach in classrooms where languages are kept separate (Willenberg, 2015).

ITE programs not preparing teachers to work with EAL/D learners
Worldwide teacher training programs are not adequately preparing teachers to teach culturally and linguistically diverse learners (Dobinson & Buchori, 2016; Flockton & Cunningham, 2021; O'Neal et al., 2018; Sugimoto et al., 2017; Wissink & Starks 2019). As previously mentioned, recent policy changes have resulted in responsibility for EAL/D learners being devolved to schools and mainstream classroom teachers. However, it is unclear how university ITE programs have responded to these policy changes. According to O'Neal et al. (2018) teacher training programs have not prepared teachers for working with EAL/D learners. Despite this, teachers reported managing but emphasised their lack of training, resulting in schools responding by trying to 'fix' teachers with professional development. This gap in ITE training has created a void which has further intensified the commercialisation of EAL/D services to schools (Creagh et al. 2022).

A lack of professional experience working with EAL/D learners during ITE programs has also been noted as an area of concern (Wissink & Starks 2019; Flockton & Cunningham, 2021). More placement experience working with EAL/D learners is needed. However, the success of these programs is often dependent on the ITE institution's school partnerships and the quality of the supervising teachers (Flockton & Cunningham, 2021). Examining how field-based experiences shaped 49 preservice teachers' dispositions towards EAL/D learners, Sugimoto et al. (2017) found that not all classrooms modelled positive dispositions or pedagogical practices towards EAL/D learners. They found some preservice teachers developed deficit discourses about EAL/D learners by viewing them as problems to be solved rather than as learners with vast cultural and linguistic resources. These findings suggest that ITE programs should look for ways to develop positive teacher orientations towards EAL/D learners (Ellis, 2013).

In summary, the literature shows that teacher education programs are grappling with ways to prepare preservice teachers to work in increasingly culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms (de Jong, 2019; Foley et al., 2022; Ollerhead, 2018). While government and school policies are undergoing rapid change, it appears that ITE programs have been slow to respond. Therefore, this research looks to address this gap by analysing the responses of five expert EAL/D teachers to understand the knowledge and skills needed to work effectively with EAL/D learners and make timely recommendations for inclusion to ITE programs.

Research Design and Methodology

Keeping the above-mentioned literature and focus in mind, we outline the design of the research study. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) was used with a sociocultural lens to analyse and investigate:

1. What practising EAL/D specialist teachers view as necessary for EAL/D student classroom engagement and success and,
2. What the practical implications for ITE programs are in preparing all subject teachers for diverse classrooms.

Research Context

In 2021, as part of the planning and development of specific EAL/D units structured for the bachelor's and master's degrees of education at a large university in Queensland, five expert EAL/D teachers were approached to assist with creating a series of videos to be used as a teaching and learning resource. Students currently enrolled in ITE courses were asked what they would like to know from practising EAL/D teachers. These questions were collated and themed, resulting in 13 final questions, such as how to differentiate for EAL/D learners. These questions were provided to the expert teachers prior to each of them being videoed individually answering the questions in a recording studio without an audience present. Six short videos of approximately 8 minutes duration each were produced. These videos have since been used as part of the teaching and learning resources at the University. After gaining additional ethical clearance (Ethical Clearance Number 6806) and permission from the expert teachers to use the audio transcripts of the videos for research purposes, the audio transcripts were prepared by the researchers for analysis.

Participants

Table 1 presents the relevant information about the five expert EAL/D specialists including their pseudonyms, highest qualification, years of teaching experience, and languages spoken. In summary, all the participants have considerable years of teaching experience and most of them are multilingual and have Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) qualifications.

Table 1. Participant Information

Pseudonym	Highest qualification	Years teaching experience	Languages Spoken
Mia	MEd (TESOL)	14	Cantonese (L1), Mandarin, English, Spanish
Tina	MEd (TESOL) EdD candidate	20	English (L1)
Sara	GradDip (Second Language Teaching)	40	Italian (L1), English, French, German, Turkish, Vietnamese
Dan	BEd PhD candidate	12	English (L1)
Rose	GradCert Education (TESOL)	15	English (L1), Norwegian, Dutch

Methodology

As a detailed linguistic analysis of texts, Fairclough's (2003) CDA was used when analysing the transcripts from our five expert EAL/D teachers. CDA was chosen to analyse the data because it allows the critical examination of the teacher responses in the transcripts with a view to power inequities including the sociocultural and political context in which these responses occurred. CDA investigates the linguistic features of a text as well as the connections with social impacts, ideology, and changes in language, culture and social change which is especially pertinent when focusing on culturally and linguistically diverse students learning and using language (Fairclough, 1992).

Analysis

Fairclough (2003) differentiates between three dimensions of meaning in text – Action or Genres, Identification or Style, and Representation or Discourses – and guides analysts to use a range of textual analysis markers that highlight these three dimensions. Ways of interacting or acting within a social event – Action or Genres – demonstrate how a text contributes to and situates within social interaction and social action. Instances of Action/

Genre in this context include the specialist knowledge required by our teacher experts and the disruptions and inadequacies of the curriculum requirements, the context and understandings behind assumed SAE knowledges, student ability and the assumption of understanding from stakeholders, including preservice teachers.

The Identification or Style dimension connects identities and how people use language and speak – the ways of being. Here the analyst looks at the use of modality, mood, predictions, evaluation, exchange types, and phonological features such as pronunciation, stress, rhythm, intonation, and vocabulary choice.

The Representation or Discourses dimension are ways of representing the world and its different perspectives using language. Here the analyst focuses on features of vocabulary such as hyponymy (meaning inclusion), antonymy (meaning exclusion), and synonymy, (meaning identity) because vocabulary choices "lexicalize" the world in particular ways (Fairclough, 2003). Discourses are also determined with the use of patterns of co-occurrence of words, collocations, words that precede or follow, metaphor use, assumptions or presuppositions that are present in the text, and the representation of social actors, time, and place. For the sake of brevity in this paper, the main findings below focus on the discourses found in the data.

Findings

Three main discourses are evident in the data, namely knowledge, skills and dispositions deemed necessary for working with EAL/D learners. Following below, each of these discourses are detailed with excerpts from the data.

1. Knowledge deemed necessary for working with EAL/D learners
ITE programs aim to build foundational knowledge. That is, facts and information about EAL/D learners and how to work with them effectively, including an understanding of who EAL/D learners are, how to create supportive learning environments, how additional languages are learnt, and how language is used within different curriculum areas. It is well-established that the domains of knowledge needed by mainstream teachers working with EAL/D learners include a knowledge of language, literacy, and language development; knowledge of the curriculum; and knowledge of how to plan high-challenge and high-support programs (Hammond, 2014).

The participants demonstrated this discourse of knowledge in several areas: (a) establishing the right conditions for EAL/D learners in the classroom, (b) how and why to connect with students, (c) defining differentiation and the objective of using differentiation in the classroom, (d) using and sourcing appropriate resources, (e) scaffolding language learning for EAL/D students, (f) assessing, providing feedback to, and reporting on student outcomes for EAL/D students, and (g) the affordances and challenges of teaching EAL/D students. Two specific examples of knowledge from participants' transcripts are discussed below.

First, regarding establishing the right conditions in the classroom, the expert teachers emphasised the importance of safety and a relaxed environment in the classroom. For example, Rose highlights: "For all EAL/D learners to succeed in the classroom, you need to create a positive, safe environment … ask lots and lots of questions. There are no silly questions in the classroom". Sara agrees stating: "Is your classroom a safe space? Do your students feel that they can talk without fear of being laughed at or made to feel different?" Similarly, connecting with the safe environment, we hear from Dan who says, "First of all, it's incredibly important to have a welcoming classroom".

The expert teachers explain that safe, welcoming classrooms provide the necessary conditions for EAL/D learners to take risks with their language learning. Risk-taking is an inevitable part of learning a new language as learners trial the new language and learn from making mistakes by applying feedback. With surveys confirming that around one-third of students feel moderately to mildly anxious about language learning (Horwitz, 2013), our expert teachers know to normalise making mistakes as part of the learning process. Rose explains: "We love making mistakes. That's the most important thing, is that a messy workbook or a messy worksheet shows how you've been thinking". In talking about the importance of making mistakes and accepting that making mistakes is all about the language learning process, Rose demonstrates her knowledge of affective support. Affective support includes the promotion of self-confidence, feelings of competence and positive affective attitudes which helps to establish a supportive community feel in the classroom through quality tasks and interactions (Mariani, 1997).

Second, relating to pedagogical knowledge of how to scaffold language and content learning for EAL/D learners, the expert teachers shared their knowledge of the teaching and learning cycle. Dan explains: "So, we use what's called the teaching and learning cycle, which is a way of making the expected

outcome, that genre or the texts that you're trying to create, really explicit and obvious to the students". Mia reiterates this with "break it down and build it up". The teaching and learning cycle mentioned by Dan and Mia, acknowledges that the language of schooling is different to the language of home (Cummins, 2008; Derewianka, 2015). It outlines how a teacher can scaffold academic writing using real tasks with relevant, authentic texts, based on the sociocultural view of learning where interaction with more knowledgeable others helps to support learning (Derewianka, 2015; Gibbons, 2015; Hertzberg, 2012). This requires teachers having knowledge of the genres or text types used in their teaching areas and knowing how to break-down and explicitly teach the language used in those genres. This sociocultural perspective of scaffolding spoken about by the teachers demonstrates their expert content and pedagogical knowledge of how to teach EAL/D learners.

2. Essential skills and strategies for working with EAL/D learners
The expert teachers mention many skills and strategies used in classrooms with EAL/D students. Skills are an assemblage of effective practices and strategies an educator must draw from, such as contextualising new language using visuals, hands-on activities and experiences, activating prior knowledge of content and associated language, and building relevant background knowledge as necessary (de Jong & Harper, 2005; Hertzberg, 2012). What connects many of these skills for our participants are: (a) ways to know your students and show interest in their culture/background/language, (b) advice on choosing appropriate resources, (c) ways to teach EAL/D students, (d) ways to be culturally and linguistically aware, and (e) advice on how to show humanity. Examples from the data are provided in Table 2.

Table 2. Skills Deemed Necessary by Expert EAL/D Teachers

Skill	Example
Know your students	Use the school database, enrolment papers, speak to previous teachers, check Visa details (refugees), your own general knowledge about the world and where they've come from and the challenges they've faced, talk to parents.
Be interested in their culture, background, language	Ask questions and learn about their culture and country, family background, favourite things, invest time, little steps, use translator, cultural liaison officer, personal likes and dislikes, what makes them laugh, interests.
Use the correct resources	Create or use resources that reflect cultures/interests of your students e.g., world map. Good resources = language is explicit, visuals to support meaning-making, provide comprehensible input, not too wordy, simple, clear.
Understand how to teach EAL/D	Use different modes, a survey, help them navigate the school grounds, teach rehearsed phrases, make things explicit, break up the task and the language, bridge the gaps, modelling, think alouds, exemplars, drafting, informal practice, group work, modify texts
Be culturally aware	Be aware of cultural norms about sharing personal/family information, be patient, supportive, natural, culturally inclusive, learn about the world.
Show humanity	Patience, empathy, tolerance, things take time, caring, being flexible, integrating different ideas, making adjustments, acknowledging different ways of doing and knowing, and being sensitive.

Translanguaging is the use of all a person's linguistic repertoires to communicate and make-meaning (García & Wei, 2014). It is one of the more important skills discussed by our expert teachers and how the welcoming of other languages in the classroom empowers EAL/D learners to reach their full potential. Dan and Rose elaborate,

> There's emerging research on translanguaging, ... which is a way of getting the student's language, their first or second language into the classroom ... that can make the students feel welcome ... make those students feel valued as learners and as contributors to the classroom. (Dan)

> They may choose something about their culture or their country or language ... and that's a wonderful place to start to have a conversation ... they have new ideas about the world ... they might have concepts and vocabulary in their language that we don't have in English. That brings a richness to the understanding of the students in the classroom and to yourself as a teacher. (Rose)

Through including the pedagogic aspects of translanguaging, the participants become accepting of other languages in their classroom space. They know that using the home language to learn new content and/or concepts reduces the cognitive load on the learner and have developed effective practices and strategies to incorporate translanguaging into the classroom. Furthermore, these expert teachers recognise the strong connection between a person's language and culture. By including the EAL/D student language into the classroom, translanguaging allows for the student to include parts of their culture and draw on their other languages to make meaning. This in turn apportions the opportunity for other students (and teachers) in the classroom to expand their knowledge about different cultures and languages in the world, thus developing a culturally responsive pedagogy (Morrison et al., 2019; Willenberg, 2015).

3. Fundamental attitudes and dispositions for working with EAL/D learners
We define dispositions in education, and in particular, in EAL/D educational contexts as closely aligned with John Dewey's early work, referring to 'underline motivators' and 'organisers' for behaviour (Dewey, 1922) that grow from our experiences (Dewey, 1938). Specifically, we favour Katz and Raths' definition, "an attributed characteristic of a teacher, one that summarizes the trend of a teacher's actions in particular contexts" (Katz & Raths, 1985, p. 306).

Dispositions are noted by the expert teacher's underlying responses to the dominant monolingual culture and Anglo-centric worldview in western cultures. Intertwined throughout their discussions about theories and pedagogies, their attitudes and views of themselves as teachers of language and cultural facilitators shines through. Participants expressed the view that educators should refrain from the Anglo-centric discourse in classrooms, that is, thinking the Anglo-centric way is the only (and correct) way of doing and being. Sara and Rose comment on this.

> Integrate language and culture when appropriate, not just as a tokenistic gesture... do not create an atmosphere or an attitude that an Anglo-centric approach or perspective is the only way of understanding ... there are other ways of thinking and understanding which are just as valid. (Sara)

"There's no one right way to do anything or to say anything or to think anything" (Rose) and "different cultures have different ways" (Sara).

Another aspect of the disposition or attitude of teaching EAL/D students is the knowledge of the learner and steering away from dominant discourses about difference and deficit. Dan begins by focusing on alternative experiences and points of view by sharing:

> EAL/D learners are not illiterate. It's likely that they are literate in their first language so that's not to say that literacy teaching is not helpful ... any sort of language teaching is beneficial to EAL/D students ... we don't make assumptions because everybody is different.

Tina adds to the conversation with, "... acknowledging that my classroom will have students who learn in different ways and that I develop lessons that cater for those diverse needs".

Aligning with the direction of alternative perspectives and difference, the participants highlight one of the more dominant discourses of deficit, for example.

> It isn't just about dumbing it down or making it easier. All of those language demands of a subject area need to be taught ... do not think of EAL/D students from a deficit point of view, students from other cultures bring so much to the classroom. (Dan)

Dan shares that the EAL/D student brings with them a different set of experiences, cultures, and languages and teachers need to find ways to bring that into the classrooms and make those children feel valued as learners and contributors to the classroom. Sara too acknowledges the deficit discussion with "An unsuitable resource is one in which both the language and content are dumbed down ... treat them [EAL/D learners] like everyone else, not as different or other, it can be tokenistic". Sara furthers this with her personal reflection of being a second language learner:

> I saw first-hand the power that language plays in social participation and social acceptance. I learned early on about assumptions and stereotyping and racism and about feeling other ... EAL/D learners have made me aware of the transformative nature of language, of the power that language use holds in society.

Our expert teachers know the value of integrating cultures, histories, language, and understanding to make for a richer teaching and learning experience, both for the students and the teachers. The expert teachers recognise the theories, pedagogies, and attitudes required to teach in EAL/D contexts, including (a) the importance of making mistakes and receiving feedback in a safe and welcoming environment, (b) the teaching and learning cycle as a way of teaching subject-specific genres through principled scaffolded support, and (c) demonstrating the value of other languages and cultures through implementing a translanguaging approach.

Teacher professional dispositions, as discussed above, can be difficult to quantify and test. Dispositions are not static states but are malleable and can be shaped (Diez, 2007). Importantly, when viewed from a sociocultural perspective, dispositions are learnt and developed through social experiences, therefore teacher education programs become crucial to cultivating professional dispositions in tandem with knowledge and skills. This can be done through the careful choice of learning experiences throughout ITE programs to help build and refine these dispositional skills (Cummins & Asempapa, 2013).

Discussion
In relation to the above analysis, we note two areas of social concern, namely the tacit belief that English, and the ability to speak and work in English, is the default 'privilege' and the only correct way; and second, that anyone speaking a language other than English suffers a deficit in their life and learning space. We detail these two social areas of concern below and follow with a solution-driven approach supplied by our teacher participants. The paper then concludes with recommendations for ITE programs that substantiated from this data.

The Anglo-centric approach
When sharing the discourses of skills and dispositions deemed necessary for working with EAL/D learners, participants highlight the ever-present Anglo-centric approach within our Australian classrooms. The essence of this approach is "a tacit belief in the natural and neutral status of English words and meanings ... where English words have become the default linguistic-conceptual (and dominant) [authors addition] currency" (Levisen, 2019, p. 2). This Anglo-centric approach manifests itself in relation to language

and culture. The dominant western worldview is assumed in educational settings through the curriculum, choice of classroom resources, and in the decisions teachers make regarding how teaching and learning will occur. Due partly to a lack of cultural diversity within the teaching profession in Australia (only 17% of the teacher workforce was born outside of Australia; AITSL, 2021, p. 8), classrooms are by default largely monolingual and monocultural. The expert teachers challenge this dominant discourse through integrating different languages and cultures into their classrooms in authentic ways, seeking out alternative perspectives and valuing all contributions and experiences in the classroom.

The deficit approach
The ubiquitous deficit discourse mentioned by the participants is normalised and often directed by those in power, positioning the EAL/D learner as "lacking" in some way (Dooley, 2012). Many teachers, even well-meaning teachers (Lam, 2006), find themselves inducted into this way of thinking. The deficit discourse establishes itself within the narrative of "difference", referring to social and biological variations among people, be that gender, sexual orientation, sex, ethnicity, race, socio-economic status, geographical location, (dis)ability, and other large-scale demographic categories (Kalantzis & Cope, 2005). The deficit discourse highlights how EAL/D students are "different from", or separate from, the dominant norm (Alford, 2014). Participants reveal within the discourse of knowledge deemed necessary when working with EAL/D learners that the deficit view is not acceptable when teaching EAL/D students and that the EAL/D student can contribute to the classroom environment with alternative points of view and ways of knowing, being, and doing and should not be positioned as "empty buckets" (Gannaway, 2022, p. 233).

Translanguaging approach
By accepting and incorporating translanguaging opportunities into classroom contexts the authors posit that the Anglo-centric approach and deficit discourses will be challenged. While acceptance of translanguaging in the classroom as the normal practice of bilingual people is important (Scarino, 2022), of greater consequence is the promotion of translanguaging strategies by teachers as a legitimate and attested way to learn a new language. The linguistic and cultural diversity within Australian

classrooms is viewed as a valuable resource by our expert teachers which is often left untapped (Alford & Kettle, 2020). Therefore, the teacher's role is preeminent in setting up and guiding EAL/D learners to use their other languages and cultural knowledge as a scaffold for their learning of SAE alongside content learning. The expert teachers acknowledge language is powerful and that having access to the dominant form of language in society and knowing how to use it effectively can be transformative.

With the abovementioned insights from our participants in mind we forward five recommendations for future ITE programs in Australia below.

Recommendations

The knowledge that linguistic and cultural diversity exists within our classrooms is understood by most preservice teachers. However, the discourses of the expert EAL/D teachers in this study highlights the specialist knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary for working with EAL/D learners. These are the teachers who work with EAL/D learners on a daily basis and have had to adjust to recent policy changes relating to inclusion in schools. From listening to their expertise about their everyday practices, key components that need to be better addressed by ITE programs can be identified. Therefore, we make the following recommendations for ITE programs.

1. We advocate for specialist EAL/D units within ITE degrees so that specialist knowledge that is currently demonstrated by the five expert teachers is not watered down or lost.

2. Within these specialist EAL/D units develop pedagogical practices and teach culturally responsive pedagogies that challenge the Anglo-centric world view and deficit discourses that were highlighted by the participants. A practical way to achieve this could include a provocation such as a language immersion experience and reflection. Further to this, normalise multilingualism by providing opportunities for multilingual preservice teachers to share their personal experiences as second language learners, and create teaching resources such as videos of expert teachers working with EAL/D learners for classroom observation and discussion.

3. To improve the responsiveness of ITE programs to policy changes within schools, ongoing relationships between ITE program academics and expert EAL/D teachers should be developed to identify the practical skills, knowledge, and dispositions needed to work successfully with EAL/D learners based on current, real-life teaching situations, and then incorporate this into ITE teaching units.

4. To address the current lack of professional experience, build-in professional experience opportunities working with EAL/D learners in mainstream contexts as part of EAL/D units and possibly as part of assessment. To ensure that the current Anglo-centric approach and deficit discourse is challenged this needs to be structured to include time for reflection and to capitalise on teachable moments.

5. By practising the skills, knowledge, and dispositions of EAL/D teaching and learning over time, expertise is built. Providing opportunities for further study and professional development will increase the numbers of expert EAL/D teachers which in turn will improve the quality of teaching and learning in our schools.

Conclusion

Of interest to the authors during this study were the interconnections between knowledge, skills, and dispositions of the expert teachers. During analysis, the linkages between the three discourses (as can be seen in the example of translanguaging) were revealed. It became clear that to better prepare preservice teachers, a crucial response by ITE programs would be to cultivate the professional dispositions of trainee teachers by developing their responsiveness towards linguistic and cultural diversity in the classroom. This can be achieved through carefully curated learning experiences that establish the knowledge and skills necessary to enact a culturally responsive pedagogy, thereby leveraging the linguistic and cultural capital of diverse classrooms for the benefit of all.

References

Alford, J. & Kettle, M. (2020). Defining bilingualism, multilingualism and plurilingualism in education: Innovations in teaching for diversity in mainstream classrooms. In R. Arber, M.

Weinmann, & J. Blackmore (Eds.), *Rethinking languages education: Directions, challenges and innovations* (1st ed., pp. 167–177). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315107974-10

Alford, J. H. (2014). "Well, hang on, they're actually much better than that!": Disrupting dominant discourses of a deficit about English language learners in senior high school English. *English Teaching: Practice & Critique, 13*(3), 71-88. https://eprints.qut.edu.au/236400/

Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS). (2021). *Snapshot of Australia: A picture of the economic, social and cultural make-up of Australia on census night, 10 August 2021.* https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/people-and-communities/snapshot-australia/2021#culturally-and-linguistically-diverse-communities

Australian Council of TESOL Associations (ACTA). (2022). *National roadmap for English as an additional language or dialect (EAL/D) education in schools.* https://tesol.org.au/acta-calls-for-national-reform-and-revitalisation-of-eal-d-in-schools/

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA). (2023). *The Australian Curriculum Ver 9.0: EAL/D students.* https://v9.australiancurriculum.edu.au/student-diversity/eal-d-students#accordion-47609c6685-item-f14878fc30

Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL). (2021). *Australian teacher workforce data: National teacher workforce characteristics report December 2021 (ATWD Teacher Workforce Report).* Education Services Australia. https://www.aitsl.edu.au/docs/default-source/atwd/atwd-teacher-workforce-report-2021.pdf?sfvrsn=126ba53c_2

Coleman, J. (2015). Accessing the linguistic 'funds of knowledge' of students in teacher education programmes. *English in Australia, 50*(1), 29–37. https://web.s.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=0&sid=230b4e15-74f2-46dd-b868-e486002aaa7f%40redis

Creagh, S., Hogan, A., Lingard, B., & Choi, T. (2022). The 'everywhere and nowhere' English language policy in Queensland government schools: A license for commercialisation. *Journal of Education Policy*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2022.2037721

Creagh, S., Kettle, M., Alford, J., Comber, B., & Shield, P. (2019). How long does it take to achieve academically in a second language? Comparing the trajectories of EAL students and first language peers in Queensland schools. *The Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 42*(3), 145–155. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03652034

Cummins, J. (2008). BICS and CALP: Empirical and theoretical status of the distinction. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed., pp. 487–499). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-30424-3_36

Cummins, L. L., & Asempapa, B. (2013). Fostering teacher candidate dispositions in teacher education programs. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 13*(3), 99-119. https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/fostering-teacher-candidate-dispositions/docview/2387858805/se-2

de Jong, E. J. (2019). Expanding EAL expertise: Taking a multilingual stance. *TESOL in Context, 28*(1), 5–20. https://doi.org/10.21153/tesol2019vol28no1art907

de Jong, E. J., & Harper, C. A. (2005). Preparing mainstream teachers for English-language learners: is being a good teacher good enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly, 32*(2), 101. https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A133566590/AONE?u=qut&sid=bookmark-AONE&xid=02548a5e

Department of Education (DoE). (2021, August 10). *Inclusive education policy, Ver 1.3.* Queensland Government. https://ppr.qed.qld.gov.au/pp/inclusive-education-policy

Department of Education (DoE). (2022, October 13). *English language support in Queensland state schools.* Queensland Government. https://education.qld.gov.au/students/inclusive-education/english-language-support

Derewianka, B. M. (2015). The contribution of genre theory to literacy education in Australia. In J. Turbill, G. Barton, & C. Brock (Eds.), *Teaching writing in today's classrooms: Looking back to look forward* (pp. 69–86). Australian Literary Educators' Association. https://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2620&context=sspapers

Dewey, J. (1922). *Human nature and conduct: An introduction to social psychology.* New York, NY: Henry Holt. https://doi.org/10.1037/14663-000

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education.* New York, NY: Collier.

Diez, M. E. (2007). Looking back and moving forward: Three tensions in the teacher dispositions discourse. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(5), 388–396. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487107308418

Dobinson, T., & Buchori, S. (2016). Catering for EAL/D students' language needs in mainstream classes: Early childhood

teachers' perspectives and practices in one Australian setting. *The Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(2), 32–52. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n2.3

Dooley, K. (2012). Positioning refugee students as intellectual class members. In F. E. McCarthy & M. H. Vickers (Eds.), *Refugee and immigrant students: Achieving equity in education* (pp. 3-20). Information Age Publishing. https://eprints.qut.edu.au/38621/

Ellis, E. (2013). The ESL teacher as plurilingual: An Australian perspective. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*(3), 446–471. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.120

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change.* Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://www.academia.edu/download/32494531/Fairclough_Analysing_Discourse_Textual_Analysis_for_Social_Research__2003.pdf

Flockton, G. & Cunningham, C. (2021). Teacher educators' perspectives on preparing student teachers to work with pupils who speak languages beyond English, *Journal of Education for Teaching, 47*(2), 220-233. DOI: 10.1080/02607476.2020.1855942

Foley, Y., Anderson, C., Hancock, J., & Conteh, J. (2022). Exploring the professional identity and agency of student teachers in multilingual classrooms. *Language and Education, 36*(2), 106–121. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2021.1991369

Gannaway, J. M. (2022). Honouring student repertoires: Connecting oracy to "ways of being". *Literacy, 56*(3), 225–233. https://doi.org/10.1111/lit.12301

García, O. (2008). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective.* John Wiley & Sons.

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). Language, languaging and bilingualism. In *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education* (pp. 5–18). Palgrave Pivot. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765_2

Gibbons, P. (2015). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: Teaching English language learners in the mainstream classroom* (2nd ed.). Heinemann. https://www.academia.edu/download/60105773/Scaffolding_Language__Scaffolding_Learning_201420190724-88771-f0v3pr.pdf

Hammond, J. (2014). An Australian perspective on standards-based education, teacher knowledge, and students of English as an additional language. *TESOL Quarterly, 48*(3), 507–532. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.173

Hertzberg, M. L. (2012). Chapter 3: Pedagogical conditions for learning a language. In *Teaching English language learners in mainstream classes* (pp. 29–47). Primary English Teaching Association Australia (PETAA). http://handle.uws.edu.au:8081/1959.7/520800

Horwitz, E. K. (2013). What should I know about language learners and language teaching settings? In *Becoming a language teacher: A practical guide to second language learning and teaching* (2nd ed., pp. 3–24). Pearson Education.

Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (2005). *Learning by design*. Victorian Schools Innovation Commission & Common Ground Publishing.

Katz, L.G., & Raths, J. D. (1985). Dispositions as goals for teacher education. *Teacher and Teacher Education, 1*(4), 301-307. https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(85)90018-6Kemmis

Lam, W. S. E. (2006). Chapter 6: Culture and learning in the context of globalization: Research directions. *Review of Research in Education, 30*(1), 213–237. https://doi.org/10.3102/0091732X030001213

Levisen, C. (2019). Biases we live by: Anglocentrism in linguistics and cognitive sciences. *Language Sciences, 76*, 101173-101186. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2018.05.010

Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2013). Preparing linguistically responsive teachers: Laying the foundation in preservice teacher education. *Theory Into Practice, 52*(2), 98–109. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2013.770327

Mariani, L. (1997). Teacher support and teacher challenge in promoting learner autonomy. *Perspectives: A Journal of TESOL Italy, XXIII*(2). http://www.learningpaths.org/papers/papersupport.htm

Morrison, A., Rigney, L.-I., Hattam, R., & Diplock, A. (2019). *Toward an Australian culturally responsive pedagogy: A narrative review of the literature.* University of South Australia. https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/apo.262951

Ollerhead, S. (2018). Pedagogical language knowledge: Preparing Australian pre-service teachers to support English language learners. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 46*(3), 256–266.https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2016.1246651

O'Neal, D. D., Ringler, M., & Rodriguez, D. (2008). Teachers' perceptions of their preparation for teaching linguistically and culturally diverse learners in rural Eastern North Carolina. *The Rural Educator*, 5-13. https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A219632599/AONE?u=qut&sid=bookmark-AONE&xid=ae839953

Scarino, A. (2022). Language teacher education in diversity – a consideration of the mediating role of languages and cultures in student learning. *Language and Education, 36*(2), 152-169. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2021.1991370

Schleppegrell, M. J. (2020). The knowledge base for language teaching: What is the English to be taught as content? *Language Teaching Research, 24*(1), 17–27. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818777519

Sugimoto, A. T., Carter, K., & Stoehr, K. J. (2017). Teaching "in their best interest": Preservice teachers' narratives regarding English Learners. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 67*, 179–188. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.06.010

Willenberg, I. (2015). Working with bilingual learners: An introduction. *English in Australia, 50*(1), 86-96. https://search.informit.org/doi/abs/10.3316/informit.249145589109123

Wissink, B., & Starks, S. (2019). Elementary teachers' perceptions of preparedness to teach English language learners. *Educational Research and Reviews, 14*(10), 349–357. https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2019-3734

Jennifer Smith is a lecturer in the School of Teacher Education and Leadership at the Queensland University of Technology. She is an applied linguist and qualitative researcher in the area of second language teaching and learning. Her teaching experience includes teaching undergraduate students how to teach EAL/D learners in the mainstream classroom and developing TESOL specialists in the Master of Education course. ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9547-2005

j268.smith@qut.edu.au

Lynn Downes is a lecturer in the School of Teacher Education and Leadership at the Queensland University of Technology. Her research interests focus on language, specifically language variation and change and sociolinguistics. Lynn's interests also include Critical Discourse Analysis and English language and literacy in the primary school context. At present Lynn is researching oral language practices and skills of young people from birth to 8 years. ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4393-620X

Using teacher-researcher collaborations to respond to the demands of 'real-world' EAL/D learning contexts across the curriculum

Carly Steele
Curtin University

Toni Dobinson
Curtin University

Gerard Winkler
Early Childhood Education

Abstract: *Despite the increasing levels of cultural and linguistic diversity represented in Australian classrooms, many universities do not adequately prepare teachers to teach English as an additional language or dialect (EAL/D). Moreover, in neoliberal educational regimes, teaching tends to remain steadfastly focused on monolingual conceptions of literacy development, and 'evidence-based' practices tend to reflect this stance. In this paper, we argue that due to the diversity and complexity of EAL/D learner cohorts, and current systemic constraints, teacher-researcher collaborations can be one avenue available to teachers to develop their knowledge and skills whilst simultaneously guiding future research. Drawing on 'identity texts' and arts-based approaches, through this case study, we describe our teacher-researcher collaboration in a super-diverse primary school classroom setting to illustrate the 'messiness' of classroom research, the challenges, and the considerable opportunities to effectively respond to EAL/D learner needs whilst valuing and embracing their diverse linguistic repertoires.*

Introduction

According to the most recent census, there are over 350 languages spoken in Australia and 5.5 million people in Australia use a language other than English (ABS, 2021). Since opening Australia's

border again after COVID closures, record levels of migration have been recorded with a net migration of 387,000 people in 2023 (ABS, 2023). This increase in cultural and linguistic diversity represents a 'superdiversity' situation that has not yet been experienced in Australia and is likely to continue (Vertovec, 2007, p. 1024). The implications for the classroom are significant. Teachers need to respond to the highly diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds of their students in their teaching and must teach students whose first language is not Standard Australian English (SAE) (Ollerhead, 2018; Scarino, 2022). These students are referred to as English as an Additional Language or Dialect (EAL/D) learners.

Despite the growing number of EAL/D learners in Australia, and the curriculum requirement to teach SAE to EAL/D learners, most teachers do not possess specialist language teaching education or sufficient levels of professional development in this area (Gilmore et al., 2018; Neilsen et al., 2016). At the same time, support from EAL/D specialist teachers has diminished. Once a leader in the provision of specialist language learning education through trained specialist teachers, the responsibility of teaching SAE has gradually shifted to mainstream classroom teachers over the last few decades (Oliver et al., 2017). Moreover, EAL/D specialist teachers have been amongst the hardest hit educational sectors from the COVID pandemic, resulting in a critical skills shortage (Neilsen et al., 2020; Neilsen & Weinmann, 2022). Consequently, teachers and education systems are currently ill-prepared to meet the challenges and demands of teaching superdiverse student populations. This, combined with the increased demands placed on teachers' time and an 'over-crowded' curriculum, can result in professional learning in this area being sidelined with preference given to more 'pressing' matters or those perceived to be more important.

It is notable that the level of linguistic diversity amongst student populations in Australian classrooms is not adequately expressed in learner's EAL/D status. Within EAL/D populations, there is a diversity of learners, learner language backgrounds/ecologies, and across Australia, the SAE language learning environment can differ dramatically. Therefore, different approaches to learning and teaching SAE might be required, according to the learner and their context. For example, some students' SAE might represent an additional language whereas for others, it might be an additional dialect. Even though some students speak additional languages, it might be a localised dialect of that language, not the standard language. Thus, it is crucial to understand the intricacies of students' linguistic repertoires beyond language boundaries (Wei & García, 2022). Some students may speak a range of languages at varying levels of proficiency. Some may not have developed literacy skills in their first language. Some may have experienced disrupted schooling. Some students may be gifted and talented whilst others may have a language impairment or disability that may be difficult to identify due to language barriers. The wide range of attributes that characterise EAL/D learners may impact their language acquisition. Furthermore, in parts of Australia, for example remote Aboriginal communities, very little SAE may be spoken and it may be limited to school settings (Poetsch, 2020; Angelo & Hudson, 2021; Wigglesworth et al., 2018). These environments are akin to learning 'English as a Foreign Language' (EFL) where generally, in EFL language learning environments language input and opportunities for language use/practice are reduced and language acquisition is slower (Steele & Wigglesworth, 2023). In other contexts, EAL/D learners might be required to use SAE in almost all their daily interactions resulting in rapid SAE acquisition (Dobinson & Steele, under review). Given the diversity and complexity inherent within EAL/D learner cohorts and learning contexts, one-size fits all approaches are not recommended. Yet, these approaches are increasingly being implemented as teachers grapple with teaching SAE to EAL/D learners across the curriculum (Creagh et al., 2022; Fogarty et al., 2017). Instead, we offer teacher-researcher collaboration as an avenue to learn about and respond to diverse EAL/D learner needs in the classroom.

Neoliberalism, literacy & evidence-based practices

The rise of neoliberal approaches to education has resulted in increased school autonomy, higher accountability measures for schools and teachers, and the privatisation and commodification of education (Gobby et al., 2017; MacDonald et al., 2021). The National Assessment Program – Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) is a key feature of the recent suite of neoliberal reforms in Australia. Whilst, NAPLAN has emerged from the national focus on 'English literacy' (Lo Bianco, 2008; Lo Bianco, 2016), the role of the media and its coverage of NAPLAN results has intensified the already pervasive monolingual centric discourses about

'literacy' (see Cross et al., 2022) both in the public arena and educational settings (Blackmore & Thorpe, 2003; Doolan & Blackmore, 2018; Thomas, 2005; Waller, 2012). Examples of these discourses include the focus on 'back-to-basics' approaches and the 'literacy wars' between phonics based versus whole language approaches to teaching literacy which receive extensive media coverage alongside the 'literacy crisis' and falling standards of English (Steele & Oliver, under review).

With this steadfast focus on monolingual literacy development, the English language learning needs of EAL/D learners are often conflated with 'literacy' learning. In the absence of specialist knowledge and education in additional language acquisition, first language monolingual literacy programs (and frequently literacy programs designed for monolingual English-speaking children with learning difficulties) are often adopted with EAL/D learners in response (Creagh et al., 2022; Fogarty et al., 2017). Creagh et al. (2022) describe how, in Queensland, the decentralisation of EAL/D support and greater school autonomy (without commensurate accountability measures for EAL/D funding) associated with neoliberal approaches to education have resulted in the replacement of specialist EAL/D programs and educators with commercial products. One example is the use of the American literacy program designed for children with learning difficulties that has been funded by the Federal government for use with predominantly EAL/D First Nations children across the country (Fogarty et al., 2017). Fogarty et al. (2017) argue that this product is another in a long list of packaged programs that hold little validity in these contexts and for which there is not an established evidence base for this learner cohort and learning context. In these ways, as argued by Piller and Cho (2013), neoliberalism, as an economic ideology 'serves as a convert language policy' (p. 23) that shapes educational practices.

Ironically, at the same time, education systems are calling for a greater focus on evidence-based teaching practices in the classroom (e.g., Productivity Commission, 2022) with the Australian Education Research Organisation (AERO) established in 2021 to develop a relevant research evidence base for Australian schools (Productivity Commission, 2022, p. 18). These calls are based on reports that suggest the use of evidence-based practices in classrooms remains a significant challenge (Productivity Commission, 2022, p. x) and that 71% of teachers use ineffective strategies in most or every lesson (AERO, 2021). However, for the reasons discussed above, existing evidence may not fully cater for EAL/D learners, or account for the diversity of EAL/D learners and language learning contexts represented across Australia. Within EAL/D specific research, one of the main reasons posed for teachers not engaging with research is a lack of relevance (McKinley, 2019; Rose, 2019). Therefore, there is a need to expand the current evidence base to include this diversity. Teacher-researcher collaborations can address the need for highly relevant, and contextual, teaching practices specifically for EAL/D learners. In doing so, teacher-researcher collaborations hold the potential to expand the current, and somewhat limited, evidence-base about teaching practices for diverse EAL/D learners.

Teacher-researcher collaborations

Against this backdrop, teacher-researcher collaborations can be one avenue available for teachers to develop their knowledge and skills for teaching EAL/D learners. Current demands on teachers' time make it crucially important to ensure that research is both relevant and accessible to support teachers who seek to enhance their knowledge base and professional capabilities in this area. To achieve this, Rose (2019) argues that in applied professions such as teaching, the focus should not be on research-informed teaching – but rather, teaching-informed research. That is, research conducted with teachers in the classroom in response to their needs, as determined by them. It is crucial that such research is conducted collaboratively. In a similar vein, McKinley (2019, p. 876) calls for 'research to be more grounded in classroom contexts, and for methods to be more transparent about the messiness of doing real-world classroom research'.

Applied linguistics, as an applied field, has a long history of teacher-researcher collaborations. However, more recently, increased impediments to conducting classroom-based research are making collaborations more difficult. Despite this, teacher-research collaborations offer great potential to meet the skills shortage in specialist EAL/D teachers, to counter the use of commercial and often inappropriate literacy programs, and to address the specific and highly contextual needs of diverse EAL/D learners, as widely acknowledged within the literature (Edwards, 2017; Fowler-Amato & Warrington, 2017; Hamza et al., 2018; Slaughter et al., 2020; Tian & Shepard-Carey, 2020).

Research centres teachers' knowledges, co-constructed approaches to learning and teaching and relationality as being

integral to enacting teacher-researcher collaborations that generate new ideas and bring about change. Tian and Shepard-Carey (2020) build upon García et al.'s (2017) framework for enacting translanguaging pedagogies (e.g., a stance, a design, a shift) to conceptualise this process with teacher-researcher collaborations in mind. They argue that these collaborations are inherently dynamic, negotiated, and complex. From this perspective, teachers and researchers are not viewed as separate entities but rather are seen as constantly engaged in a process of co-construction (Tian & Shepard-Carey, 2020). Together, they develop a *co-stance*, engage in *co-design*, and responsively deploy *co-shifts* in their teaching (Tian & Shepard-Carey, 2020). With a focus on the centrality of co-design to creating transformative practices, Fowler-Amato and Warrington (2017, p. 359-360), in their teacher-led classroom-based interventions, position teachers as "transformative intellectuals" (citing Giroux, 1985, p. 378) who must rightfully play a driving role as "designers of their own futures" (citing Gutiérrez & Jurow, 2016, p. 2). Edwards (2017) brings relationality to the fore in her discussion of teacher-researcher collaborations. Likewise, Hamza et al. (2018) describe their long-term commitment to developing a community of practice approach in order to overcome initial minor differences between teachers and researchers to ultimately develop reciprocal learning, teaching and research practices.

Identity texts & arts-based research methodologies

To meet the learning needs of diverse EAL/D learners, first and crucially, teachers must learn about their students' language backgrounds and language use. Indeed, culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogies are based on the premise that teachers not only account for students' cultural and linguistic repertoires in their teaching but adopt strengths-based approaches that capitalise on students' rich cultural and linguistic knowledge (Cummins & Early, 2011; García & Wei, 2014; Lucas & Villegas, 2013; Paris & Alim, 2017). Identity texts and arts-based approaches are increasingly being used as a starting point for culturally and linguistically responsive practices in the classroom, and to effectively plan for EAL/D learners across the curriculum.

From Cummins and Early (2011, p. 3), 'identity texts' are representations of students' identities that are created in

multimodal forms, and may be written, spoken, visual, musical, dramatic, and so on. They act to affirm students' identities in educational spaces that may have previously silenced students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds (Cummins et al., 2015). Some examples include language portraits (Browne, 2019; Busch, 2018; Chik, 2019), language maps (Browne, 2019; Dutton et al., 2018; D'warte, 2013) and language trajectory grids (Choi & Slaughter, 2021; Slaughter et al., 2020). In our study, we used both language portraits and language maps in a Year Two multilingual classroom to gain insight into EAL/D learners cultural and linguistic identities as well as their daily language use. In this article, we focus on the language maps as an arts-based practice, and give example of how identity texts can be integrated across the curriculum in learning areas other than English to inform teacher planning and practices.

Case Study: Year Two multilingual classroom

Our case study is from a Year Two classroom in an independent public school in Western Australia (W.A.). The school population represents 32 cultural and linguistic groups with 10 of those represented in the classroom of students aged between 7 and 8 years old and many identifying as EAL/D learners. Traditionally a lower socioeconomic location, with population growth, the area is becoming increasingly gentrified, and students come from a range of family backgrounds including from immigrant, refugee, and international student statuses as well as First Nations and settler Australians.

Our case study forms part of an ongoing critical participatory action research project that has been running since 2018 between the school and our institution led by the second author. Permission to conduct research has been granted by the Department of Education, W.A., and the Human Research Ethics Committee, Curtin University. The school principal, the teacher, the children, and their parents all provided informed consent for the study. Age-appropriate consent forms were used with the Year Two students with verbal explanations to ensure that the children were able to consent.

Two university academics (Authors 1 and 2) and the teacher of the Year Two classroom (Author 3) formed the teacher-researcher collaboration. Both university academics situate

themselves as teacher-researchers having both previously had teaching careers outside of a university context. The Year Two teacher has been involved in the research project since 2018. In November 2022, the team met to discuss the future directions for the collaboration for the next year. Given that further collaboration was planned for Term 1, when the Year Two teacher would have a new class, it was suggested that identity texts might provide the teacher with a good opportunity to learn about the cultural and linguistic identities of the children in the class to further inform planning and teaching practices. This would enable the classroom teacher to effectively respond to EAL/D learners needs whilst valuing and embracing their diverse linguistic repertoires.

Using examples from Browne's (2019) study, the university academics shared student samples of the language portraits and language network maps with the classroom teacher who was enthusiastic about the potential of using these tools in the classroom. However, there were significant constraints to negotiate. An extensive assessment regime in Term 1 left little time for teaching. Furthermore, the school, like most schools, had a dedicated two-hour literacy block in the morning with school-wide expectations and a mandated schedule. Activities like this would take up a significant proportion of the literacy block, and impact overall planning and progress. Lastly, there was the perceived value of such activities not always being viewed as central to the curriculum (despite forming a crucial, but often ignored, element of the general capability 'intercultural understanding' in the Australian Curriculum). However, the power of teacher-researcher collaborations was immediately felt when the classroom teacher innovatively suggested ways that we could work around these constraints to bring research-based approaches into the classroom. The classroom teacher suggested that we re-create the language network into an art activity to be used as the class's Harmony Day display.

Harmony Week is a yearly event intended to be a 'celebration that recognises our diversity and brings together Australians from all different backgrounds.' (Australian Government, n.d.). The Australian Government (n.d.) states, 'It's about inclusiveness, respect, and a sense of belonging for everyone.' In 2023, Harmony Week was held from Monday 20th to Sunday 26th of March. Across education sectors, a day is usually designated for Harmony Day celebrations. Internationally, Harmony Day is known as the 'International Day for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination'

(Anderson, 2022). However, in Australia it has been re-imagined with the 'race-neutral language' of Harmony Day reflecting the broader silencing of talk about racism in Australia (Anderson, 2022; see also Hollinsworth, 2016). It is therefore not surprising that Harmony Day celebrations have been accused of being tokenistic, superficial or at worst, encouraging of cultural stereotypes and appropriation. In this regard, developing identity texts with students to share with their parents and the wider school community through their Harmony Day display represented a chance to engage more meaningfully with the real intent behind the day. Developing these texts also fits within the intent of identity texts: 'When students share identity texts with multiple audiences (peers, teachers, parents, grandparents, sister classes, the media, etc.) they are likely to receive positive feedback and affirmation of self in interaction with these audiences' (Cummins & Early, 2011, p. 3). As a final point, the classroom teacher was thrilled at the thought of preparing for Harmony Day in a meaningful way weeks beforehand, thus, avoiding a last-minute panic and/or high demands on his time and class time just before the event.

Tying the identity texts to Harmony Day addressed the concerns about the perceived value of the activities by meaningfully locating them within school/community events with a broader social value as well as the curriculum. To overcome the time constraints related to initial assessments in Term 1, and the requirements placed on the morning literacy block, the identity texts were re-imagined as art activities to take place in the allocated art time. Without a specialist art teacher in the school, teaching the art curriculum was the responsibility of the classroom teacher, providing scope to connect the activities to learning areas other than English. The language network map was re-imagined as a 'dreamcatcher' with coloured paddle pop sticks as the frame, labelled with the different places their languages were spoken, and coloured cotton wool representing the different languages spoken. Using a hot glue gun, feathers were added as a decorative element. Some example dreamcatchers are shown in Figure 1 and were displayed alongside language portraits for the Harmony Day display. The dreamcatchers illustrate the classroom teacher's creative and innovative thinking to re-create identity texts in ways that are both engaging and meaningful for students whilst also integrating learning about EAL/D learners cultural and linguistic identities and practices in other learning areas, for example, art.

Figure 1. Language network map 'dreamcatchers'

When creating the dreamcatchers with students, we were fortunate to also have a pre-service teacher in the room alongside the two academics and the classroom teacher because we encountered many difficulties in the process and students required a high level of support to complete the activity. The most obvious difficulty was that many students did not have the dexterity to complete the task of weaving the cottonwool around the popsticks and required assistance. Another notable observation was the confusion between the language portraits they had completed and the language maps that required students to identify domains – or the places – they spoke the language rather than the language itself, which was indicated by the coloured cottonwool and coloured key they had developed. Despite these challenges, the children reported enjoying the process immensely. We attribute this to the cognitive and physical demands of the task. It was a highly tactile arts-based activity that was intrinsically related to their expressions of self.

Student responses to the task were audio recorded during the classroom activities and in a reflective lesson. They reveal that their enjoyment largely derived from the process of connecting the strings, which surprised us given that this was what they appeared to find most difficult. Student responses included:

S1: I liked the Language Network because it was very fun to connect the strings.

S2: And I got to finish the string.

S3: Cause because the strings.

S4: I like the string part where we put the strings where we go to and talk with other languages… Because, because, I really like strings like with writing and we talk about.

S5: I liked the pop sticks because I got to paint it then.

S6: The language network because of pop stick has places and I got to write my favourite places.

S7: Because I got to put the language network up under the undercover area.

S8: Pop sticks… I feel like wood.

S9: Because it was nice, and we can take it home.

S10: Because it's telling us where we use our languages… The language network makes me feel calm and happy.

Many of the student responses point toward the value of the task being related to its tactile nature with the use of strings, painting, and the feel of the wood (S1, S2, S3, S4, S5, S8). This point could even be extended to student 10's response that the activity produced a 'calm and happy' feeling. Others suggested it was the personal connections through their languages, and the places they visited that made the task valuable to them (S4, S6, S10). While other student responses (S7, S9) reflected the position of Cummins & Early (2011, p. 3) that the value of identity texts is also derived from the experience of sharing one's identity with others. As one child poignantly described with reference to his language portrait, "Because honestly, I think when we did the language portrait, I liked it because we could colour in, and we could express our feelings and the cultures."

Whilst identity texts hold great value as a vehicle through which students can describe their identities and feel a sense of belonging in the schooling community, they also hold the potential to inform future planning and teaching practices across the curriculum. The classroom teacher shares his reflection on the process:

> I have been very fortunate to work with university practitioners to plan, implement and reflect on a series of lessons designed to recognise and value students' multilingual abilities for meaningful language learning experiences. This approach required me to develop a deep understanding of translanguaging practices and to create inclusive classroom environment that

embraces linguistic diversity. As a result, I became a facilitator of student-centered learning, promoting active engagement, collaboration, and critical thinking. This method not only enhanced language acquisition with the majority of students speaking an additional language but also promoted higher-order thinking skills and creativity. The students appreciated learning about additional languages and how this fostered and nurtured their own identity and sense of self. This is an important aspect of the Early Childhood Curriculum.

In this excerpt, the classroom teacher speaks to the value of teacher-researcher collaborations for the students and the teacher. The reflections from the university academics highlighted the importance of connecting theory to practice and experiencing the 'messiness' or the 'realities' of the classroom. They felt this was especially important for those university-based researchers who are currently training future generations of teachers (McKinley, 2019; Rose, 2019).

Discussion and conclusion

One benefit of teacher-researcher collaborations is the ability to create something new that, whilst being based on well-established theoretical grounds and pedagogical approaches, is responsive to the needs of children in the classroom. In our study, the classroom teacher was able to borrow a somewhat 'dry' research-based approach and re-imagine it in creative ways that students thoroughly enjoyed. The benefits extend beyond the students' learning to the learning of teachers and researchers who are actively involved in the process. Working collaboratively, they bring different insights to produce new learnings that are mutually beneficial. Together, they are required to navigate the complexities and constraints of the educational system to locate opportunities and produce innovations.

Our case study demonstrates the value of identity texts in the classroom but also, how through teacher-researcher collaborations, neoliberal educational regimes can be successfully navigated to resist dominant monolingual approaches to schooling. In doing so, students' diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds were embraced and valued in the classroom, and EAL/D learner needs were explicitly addressed in teaching. This extended beyond the identity texts. For example, the classroom teacher included

greetings in students' languages as part of the morning routine. He invited parents into the classroom to read bilingual stories in their languages to the children. He created a reading corner with bilingual books from a diverse range of languages for children to explore. Furthermore, the classroom teacher was able to use his knowledge of students' language backgrounds to inform his planning and to effectively respond to EAL/D learners' needs in the classroom. He included specific teaching techniques for EAL/D learners such as explicitly teaching word stress in English and pointed out how writing directionality in English differs from Arabic. These examples, and others were included in his teaching to not only foster inclusion, but also to specifically aid language learning.

Case studies highlight the highly contextual nature of teaching. Thus, research cannot necessarily speak to every situation. Teacher-researcher collaborations can work to address this through the development of theoretically grounded and empirically based localised approaches. In doing so, research conducted through teacher-research collaborations can act to broaden the evidence base. To achieve this, teacher-researchers need to make clear the processes undertaken and the realities of classroom-based research; the challenges and the opportunities presented (McKinley, 2019). In this way, the focus shifts from research-informed teaching to teaching-informed research (Rose, 2019). Encountering the 'realities' of the classroom in teaching-informed research also provides university-based researchers with vital knowledge, involvements and understandings for their role as educators of future teachers.

In our experiences, we have noted considerable impediments to conducting research-based teacher-researcher collaborations. There have been significant delays due to the ethics approval process which must be completed at both the university institution as well as the Department of Education, each with a different process and focus for their evaluation of the application. These delays are often compounded by the busyness of teachers, and academics, and their respective education systems. In many cases, where we are situated, it can take between 1 to 2 years to enact teacher-researcher collaborations. Given the current focus on embedding evidence-based teaching practices into the classroom, as well as ensuring the university-based researchers are cognisant of the realities of classroom teaching (AERO, 2021; Productivity Commission, 2022), there is a strong need to develop more

streamlined and supportive approaches to university/school collaboration.

There is also the divergence in philosophical stance that is often present in teacher-researcher collaborations on which to reflect. Currently, neoliberal philosophies dominate educational policies and are evident in everyday classroom practices. Not only are opportunities for teacher-researcher collaborations limited due to the schooling time constraints and over-crowded curriculum that is associated with increased teacher accountability, but there are also the underlying normative assumptions of monolingual first language learners inherent within neoliberal policies (Cross et al., 2022). Teacher-researcher collaborations must overcome the impasse these approaches present for education generally, and specifically for EAL/D learners. As academics in this space, we strongly advocate for approaches that better align with social justice perspectives and sociocultural theories of learning. More recent theories of translanguaging, and culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogies, reflect this positioning in the way they value and embrace students' rich cultural and linguistic knowledge (Cummins & Early, 2011; García & Wei, 2014; Lucas & Villegas, 2013; Paris & Alim, 2017). The tensions between these approaches and dominant monolingual teaching approaches that tend to silence students' cultural and linguistic backgrounds are often acutely felt in educational settings. Whilst we seek to resist and counter these monolingual approaches, these approaches alongside the tensions that exist, are the realities of teachers' and students' classroom and schooling experiences. Thus, it is crucial to learn to navigate diverse ideologies, philosophies, theories of learning, and systemic pressures, constraints, and opportunities. This is where the strength of school teacher-university researcher collaborations lies (Edwards, 2017; Fowler-Amato & Warrington, 2017; Hamza et al., 2018; Slaughter et al., 2020; Tian & Shepard-Carey, 2020).

Acknowledgements

Disclosure statement
The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

References

Angelo, D., & Hudson, C. (2020). From the Periphery to the Centre: Securing the Place at the Heart of the TESOL Field for First Nations Learners of English as an Additional Language/Dialect. *TESOL in Context, 29*(1), 5–35. https://doi.org/10.21153/tesol2020vol29no1art1421

Anderson, P. (5th April, 2022). Racism at work: A call to anti-racist action for Australian organisations. *The Conversation*. https://theconversation.com/racism-at-work-a-call-to-anti-racist-action-for-australian-organisations-179758

Australian Bureau of Statistics [ABS]. (2021). *Language Statistics for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples*. ABS. https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/aboriginal-and-torres-strait-islander-peoples/language-statistics-aboriginal-and-torres-strait-islander-peoples/latest-release.

Australian Bureau of Statistics [ABS]. (15th June, 2023). *1.9% populatioin growth driven by overseas migration*. ABS. https://www.abs.gov.au/media-centre/media-releases/19-population-growth-driven-overseas-migration#:~:text=Australian%20Bureau%20of%20Statistics%20(15,Website%2C%20accessed%2015%20July%202023

Australian Educational Research Organisation (AERO). (16th November, 2021). *Evidence-based teaching strategies – how often are Australian teachers using them?* AERO. https://www.edresearch.edu.au/articles/evidence-basedteaching-strategies-how-often-are-australian-teachers-usingthem

Australian Government, Department of Home Affairs. (n.d.) *Harmony Week*. Australian Government. https://www.harmony.gov.au/

Blackmore, J., & Thorpe, S. (2003). Media/ting change: The print media's role in mediating education policy in a period of radical reform in Victoria, Australia. *Journal of Education Policy, 18*(6), 577–595. https://doi.org/10.1080/0268093032000145854

Browne, E. (2019). Multimodal tools for exploring communicative practices among multilingual students in remote central Australia. *Babel, 54*(1&2), 28–33. https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/informit.717095603222752

Busch, B. (2018). The language portrait in multilingualism research: Theoretical and methodological considerations. *Working Papers in Urban Languages and Literacies, 236*, 1–13. https://www.heteroglossia.net/fileadmin/user_upload/publication/busch18._The_language_portrait_copy.pdf

Chik, A. (2019). Becoming and being multilingual in Australia. In Kalaja, P., & S. Melo-Pfeifer (Eds.), *Visualising multilingual lives: More than words* (pp. 15–32). Multilingual Matters.

Choi, J., & Slaughter, Y. (2020). Challenging discourses of deficit: Understanding the vibrancy and complexity of multilingualism through language trajectory grids. *Language Teaching Research, 25*(1), 81–104. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168820938825

Cummins, J., & Early, M. (2011). *Identity texts: The collaborative creation of power in multilingual schools.* Trentham Books.

Cummins, J., Hu, S., Markus, P., & Kristiina Montero, M. (2015). Identity texts and academic achievement: Connecting the dots in multilingual school contexts. *TESOL Quarterly, 49*(3), 555–581. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.241

Creagh, S., Hogan, A., Lingard, B., & Choi, T. (2022). The "everywhere and nowhere" English language policy in Queensland government schools: A license for commercialisation. *Journal of Education Policy*, online, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2022.2037721

Cross, R., D'warte, J., & Slaughter, Y. (2022). Plurilingualism and language and literacy education. *The Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 45*(3), 341–357. https://doi.org/10.1007/s44020-022-00023-1

Dobinson, T., Steele, C., & Winkler, G. (under review). *From English-only to only English: Shifting perspectives in primary school classrooms.* Submitted to Language, Identity and Education.

Doolan, J., & Blackmore, J. (2017). Principals' talking back to mediatised education policies regarding school performance. *Journal of Education Policy, 33*(3), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2017.1386803

Dutton, J., D'warte, J., Rossbridge, J., & Rushton, K. (2018). *Tell me your story: Confirming identity and engaging writers in the middle years.* Primary English Teaching Association Australia (PETAA).

D'warte, J. (2013). *Pilot project: Reconceptualising English language learners' language and literacy skills, practices and experiences.* Sydney, NSW: Department of Education and Training, NSW and The University of Western Sydney. Available at: https://www.uws.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/714391/Pilot_Project_Jacqueline_Dwarte.pdf

Edwards, A. (2017). Revealing relational work. In A. Edwards (Ed.), *Working relationally in and across practices: A cultural-historical approach to collaboration* (pp. 1–22). Cambridge University Press.

Fogarty, W., Riddle, S., Lovell, M., & Wilson, B. (2017). Indigenous education and literacy policy in Australia: Bringing learning back to the debate. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education, 47*(2), 185–197. https://doi.org/10.1017/jie.2017.18

Fowler-Amato, M., & Warrington, A. (2017). Teachers as designers: Social design experiments as vehicles for developing antideficit English education. *Literacy Research: Theory, Method, and Practice, 66*(1), 358–372. https://doi.org/10.1177/2381336917719054

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education.* Palgrave Macmillan.

Gilmour, L., Klieve, H., & Li, M. (2018). Culturally and linguistically diverse school environments – Exploring the unknown. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 43*(2), 172–189. https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2018v43n2.10

Gobby, B., Keddie, A., & Blackmore, J. (2017). Professionalism and competing responsibilities: Moderating competitive performativity in school autonomy reform. *Journal of Educational Administration and History 50*(3): 159–73. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2017.1399864.

Hamza, K., Palm, O., Palmqvist, J., Piqueras, J., & Wickman, P. O. (2018). Hybridization of practices in teacher–researcher collaboration. *European Educational Research Journal, 17*(1), 170–186. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474904117693850

Hollinsworth, D. (2016). Unsettling Australian settler supremacy: combating resistance in university Aboriginal studies. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 19*(2), 412–432. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2014.911166

Lo Bianco, J. (2008). 'Language policy and education in Australia', in S. May & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed.), (pp. 343–353). Springer Science+Business Media LLC.

Lo Bianco, J. (2016). Multicultural Education in the Australian Context: An Historical Overview. In J. Lo Bianco & A. Bal (Eds.), *Learning from difference: comparative accounts of*

multicultural education, (pp. 15–33). Multilingual Education 16, Springer International Publishing. DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-26880-4_2

Lucas, T., & Villegas, M. (2013). Preparing linguistically responsive teachers: Laying the foundation in preservice teacher education. *Theory into Practice, 52*(2), 98–109. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2013.770327

MacDonald, K., Keddie, A., Blackmore, J., Mahoney, C., Wilkinson, J., Gobby, B., Niesche, R., & Eacott, S. (2021). School Autonomy Reform and Social Justice: A Policy Overview of Australian Public Education (1970s to Present). *The Australian Educational Researcher*, online. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-021-00482-4

McIntosh, S., O'Hanlon, R. & Angelo, D. (2012). The (in)visibility of "language" within Australian educational documentation: Differentiating language from literacy and exploring particular ramifications for a group of "hidden" ESL/D learners. In C. Gitaski & R. B. Baldauf Jr (Eds.), *Future directions in applied linguistics: Local and global perspectives* (pp. 447–468). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

McKinley, J. (2019). Evolving the TESOL teaching-research nexus. *TESOL Quarterly, 53*(3), 875–884. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.509

Neilsen, R., Huang Lan Xih, N., Soetjaminah, S., & Veliz, L. (2016). *Demystifying Grammar: Rethinking language awareness for teacher education.* Office for Learning and Teaching, Department of Education and Training. https://ltr.edu.au/resources/SD13_3330_Neilsen_report_2016.pdf

Neilsen, R., Weinmann, M., & Arber, R. (2020). Editorial: Teaching and learning English in the age of COVID-19: Reflecting on the state of TESOL in a changed world. *TESOL in Context, 29*(2), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.21153/tesol2020vol29no2art1427

Neilsen, R., & Weinmann, M. (1st July, 2022). When we talk about the teacher shortage, don't forget those who teach English as an additional language. *The Conversation.* https://theconversation.com/when-we-talk-about-the-teacher-shortage-dont-forget-those-who-teach-english-as-an-additional-language-185134

Oliver, R., Rochecouste, J., & Nguyen, B. (2017). ESL in Australia – a Chequered History. *TESOL in Context, 26*(1), 7–26. https://doi.org/10.3316/ielapa.002955400465516

Ollerhead, S. (2018). Pedagogical language knowledge: preparing Australian pre-service teachers to support English language learners. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 46*(3), 256–266. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866x.2016.1246651

Paris, D., & Alim, H. S. (Eds.). (2017). *Culturally sustaining pedagogies: Teaching and learning for justice in a changing world.* Teachers College Press.

Piller, I., & Cho, J. (2013). Neoliberalism as language policy. *Language in Society, 42*(1), 23–44. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047404512000887

Poetsch, S. (2020). Unrecognised language teaching: Teaching Australian curriculum content in remote Aboriginal community schools. *TESOL in Context, 29*(1), 37–58. https://doi.org/10.21153/tesol2020vol29no1art1423

Productivity Commission. (2022). *5-year Productivity Inquiry: From learning to growth, Interim Report*. Commonwealth of Australia. https://www.pc.gov.au/inquiries/completed/productivity/interim5-learning/productivity-interim5-learning.pdf

Rose, H. (2019). Dismantling the ivory tower in TESOL: A renewed call for teaching informed research. *TESOL Quarterly, 53*(3), 895–905. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/tesq.517

Scarino, A. (2022). Language teacher education in diversity – a consideration of the mediating role of languages and cultures in student learning. *Language and Education, 36*(2), 152–169. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2021.1991370

Slaughter, Y., Choi, J., Nunan, D., Black, H., Grimaud, R., & Trinh, H. (2020). The affordances and limitations of collaborative research in the TESOL classroom. *TESOL in Context, 29*(2), 35–61. https://doi.org/10.3316/INFORMIT.103649551545684

Steele, C., & Oliver, R. (under review). Distraction in Australian language education policy: A call to re-centre language rights. Submitted to Current Issues in Language Planning.

Steele, C., & Wigglesworth, G. (2023). Recognising the SAE language learning needs of Indigenous primary school students who speak contact languages. *Language and Education, 37*(3), 346–363. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2021.2020811

Tian, Z., & Shepard-Carey, L. (2020). (Re)imagining the future of translanguaging pedagogies in TESOL through teacher-researcher collaboration. *TESOL Quarterly, 54*(4), 1131–1143. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.614

Thomas, S. (2005). *Education policy in the media: Public discourses on education.* Post Pressed.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30*(6), 1024–54. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870701599465

Waller, L. J. (2012). Bilingual education and the language of news. *Australian Journal of Linguistics, 32*(4), 459–472. https://doi.org/10.1080/07268602.2012.744267

Wei, L., & García, O. (2022). Not a first language but one repertoire: Translanguaging as a decolonizing project. *RELC Journal, 53*(2), 313–324. https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882221092841

Wigglesworth, G., Simpson, J., & Vaughan, J. (Eds.). (2018). *Language Practices of Indigenous Children and Youth, The Transition from Home to School.* Palgrave MacMillan.

Dr Carly Steele is a Lecturer and early career researcher in the School of Education at Curtin University. Her research focuses on how Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander languages, particularly new varieties, are positioned in schools, as well as culturally and linguistically responsive teaching and assessment practices.

Carly.Steele@curtin.edu.au

Dr Toni Dobinson is an Associate Professor and Discipline Lead in Applied Linguistics, TESOL and Languages in the School of Education at Curtin University, Australia. She coordinates and teaches the Post Graduate Programmes in this area at the Bentley Campus and at a provider institution in Vietnam (SEAMEO RETRAC). She is the winner of multiple teaching awards at faculty, university and national level (Australian Awards for University Teaching [AAUT]) for her culturally inclusive approach to teaching. She researches in the areas of language teacher education, language and identity, language and social justice, translingual practices and language in migrant communities.

T.Dobinson@curtin.edu.au

Gerard Winkler is a Primary School Teacher currently focussing on Early Childhood Education. His research interests include explicit teaching, high impact teaching models and students with languages other than English. He has contributed to School Curriculum and Standards Authority (SCSA) in curriculum development and has developed local school networks for early childhood teachers. This is his second research project.

Gerard.Winkler@education.wa.edu.au

Commercialisation in Australian public education and its implications for the delivery of English as an Additional Language/Dialect: An EAL/D teacher perspective

Sue Creagh
Queensland University of Technology
University of Queensland

Skye Playsted
University of New England
University of Queensland

Anna Hogan
Queensland University of Technology

Tae-hee Choi
University of Southampton

Bob Lingard
Australian Catholic University

Abstract: *Privatisation and commercialisation in education encompass a range of interrelated practices, including the outsourcing of educational services as well as increased reliance on commercially produced resources for the delivery of learning and assessment. An increase in these practices has accompanied the shift from centralised systemic management of schools and specific programs like English as an Additional Language/Dialect (EAL/D), to school autonomy whereby principals control budget expenditure decisions, ostensibly in response to the needs of their school population. The intersection between school autonomy, commercialisation and delivery of the specialised service of EAL/D is the focus of this paper.*

This paper presents the findings of a survey with EAL/D teachers in Australia, in relation to the extent to which they are experiencing commercialisation and the impact this is having on the delivery of a longstanding service designed to ensure equity of outcomes for English language learners. The data suggests that the use of commercial products in schools may not be aligned with appropriate educational practices which target language learning needs. There is a strong need for further research in the uptake and use of commercial products for specialist language support. This will elucidate the extent to which EAL/D as a specialisation is being impacted by the use of commercial products both in the appropriacy of the products and in the deprofessionalisation of specialist EAL/D teachers.

Introduction

In the Australian education system, the delivery of English as an Additional Language/Dialect (EAL/D hereafter) has moved from being a specialist targeted and stand-alone aspect of migrant settlement services[1] to being encompassed by the broader umbrella concept of Inclusive Education (IE). Concurrently, Australian education has not been immune to the forces of neoliberalism and associated practices of accountability, standardised large-scale assessment, school-based management and the implementation of privatisation practices (Keddie, et al., 2020; Le Feuvre, Hogan, Thomspon & Mockler, 2023; Lingard, Sellar and Savage, 2014). The impact of these policy forces on the delivery of EAL/D in Australia is complex. IE is intended to recognise and embrace the diversity of all learners in the classroom; however, the enactment of this concept for specific groups of English language learners has been problematised as needing clearer and more specific guidance on how inclusion is actioned, along with specific professional guidance for teachers on best practices (Baak et al., 2021; Taylor & Sidhu, 2012). Teachers are required to make mainstream curriculum content accessible for EAL/D learners, and special consideration for compulsory standardised assessments is limited. For example, only in their first year in Australia are EAL/D learners allowed

exemption from the National Assessment Program: Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) if their English language level is considered not sufficient to cope with the demands of this literacy and numeracy test (ACARA, 2023b). Programs of support in schools can include intensive English programs, and access to the support of a specialist EAL/D teacher, though this service is now hampered somewhat by the removal of EAL/D as a specialist teaching area in all pre-service teacher programs across Australia (Dobinson & Buchori, 2016). However, there is a requirement that all preservice teachers are prepared for teaching in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms (Ollerhead, 2018). Consequently, the majority of EAL/D students in Australia are participating in mainstream classrooms, with diminishing access to specialist EAL/D support. This situation has enhanced the likelihood that teachers are searching for support to deliver specialist content and/or differentiate curriculum for EAL/D learners (Hammond, 2012; Nguyen & Rushton, 2022). This support often comes from commercial providers.

There is virtually no research examining the impact of privatisation and commercialisation on the delivery of programs like EAL/D in Australia. In this space, this paper is examining the contemporary uptake of commercial products, when EAL/D sits within inclusion and in which the delivery of EAL/D, beyond initial beginner stage, is largely provided by classroom teachers. Since the 1990s, the government has decentralised its support for EAL/D funding, which has resulted in individual schools being responsible for managing their budgets for EAL/D provision autonomously. However, the specific details of how EAL/D education is provided are left to the discretion of individual school management, with "limited accountability in terms of how this funding is spent" (Creagh et al., 2022, p. 10). This lack of accountability regarding how EAL/D funding is spent raises concerns about equitable access to EAL/D education across Australian schools. The purpose of this study was to better understand how the delivery of EAL/D is operating under these new policy conditions.

The paper will proceed in the following way. First, we will define and present a summary overview of the literature relevant to privatisation, commercialisation and the delivery of English services. We will then present the research project and key findings. Finally, we will draw out the key messages from the project, suggesting direction for further research.

---

[1] The authors recognise that English language learning is not limited only to migrant populations but includes Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students who are speakers of traditional and/or creole languages. However, no similar program of English language support has historically existed for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children.

Background

The privatisation of education has been described as enabling greater choice for parents, improved quality and greater efficiency, whilst, at the same time, threatening educational equity (Burch, 2009; Verger et al., 2016). Both of these conditions are resultant from privatisation practices which see increased marketisation of schools expressed through performance reporting and comparison (Hogan & Thompson et al., 2018), and devolution of budget control to school principals, accompanied by reduced bureaucratic control (Ball & Youdell, 2008). Into this space, there is an associated uptake of commercialisation, where education goods become a source of commercial gain for external providers, who engage in contractual relationships directly with schools (Hogan & Thompson et al., 2018). Hogan and Thompson (2017) note that privatisation happens to schools, through changes to institutional or policy structures that develop competitive, 'quasimarkets' promoting parental choice or school autonomy, while commercialisation occurs *in* schools, through the "creation, marketing, and sale of education goods and services to schools by external providers'' (p. 3). Practices of privatisation and commercialisation are framed as increasing access to quality education within schools, providing opportunities for greater innovation and enabling choice in schooling (Burch, 2009). Educational policy documents can leverage the language of 'educational reform' in promoting the need for private providers in schools. Policies can be framed with the language of educational "improvement, accountability and management" (Burch, 2009, p. 57), offering to meet reform goals and equitable access to education (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation [UNESCO], 1990). However, there is potential for marketised models to negatively impact equity in education (Burch, 2009). For example, the privately funded and managed charter school movement in the US that has grown out of the school reform movement offers select students in low socio-economic areas access to resources and educational opportunities they may otherwise not afford. Lack of regulation within the charter school movement, however, has raised concerns of deregulation and competitive, profit-oriented structures operating in these schools (Stahl, 2018).

Ball and Youdell (2008) provide a useful distinction between endogenous and exogenous forms of privatisation. Endogenous privatisation sees ideas and practices from the private sector imported into the public sector to make schooling "more business-like" (p. 21) whereas exogenous privatisation opens services in public education to external private sector providers "to design, manage or deliver aspects of public education" (p. 10). In the UK, private sector involvement has occurred across a range of management structures, partnerships between schools and private organisations and tendering systems for resourcing and assessment management (Ball & Youdell, 2008). In the context of school programs which deliver English to speakers of other languages (ESOL), educational equity is at stake when endogenous and exogenous privatisation measures are in place. For example, in the UK, policy decisions made during the roll out of the national curriculum (National Curriculum Council [NCC], 1991) saw changes from a "withdrawal" model of tuition for EAL/D students, in which these students were withdrawn from mainstream classes and taught in smaller groups by an EAL/D specialist teacher. These changes were made in the name of "educationally principled" models of equitable inclusion of EAL/D students, regardless of their educational backgrounds. However, as Costley and Leung (2013) have noted, the endogenous practice of streamlining provision of educational support in schools has resulted in a default to mainstreaming education for students whose EAL/D needs are no longer adequately met. Such failure is observed in other contexts as well. For instance, in Hong Kong, exogenous privatisation practices are seen in the outsourcing of English language tuition in government schools. Choi (2019) investigated both high and low SES schools to compare the impact of outsourcing tuition to third-party educational providers of English language education. Government school funding was used to outsource English language tuition so that students from low SES schools had more equitable access to English with a view to levelling the field in relation to university entrance opportunities for these students. However, while "low SES districts prioritised building basic English skills", the schools serving high SES districts "focused on elite and showcase programs (e.g., to demonstrate students' achievements), providing their students with a competitive edge for admission to prestigious universities" (p. 14). In this situation, despite the intention to attend to equity, outsourcing of programs was not successful in this regard and inequity was in fact sustained (Choi, 2019).

In the Australian context, the links between privatisation practices and equitable education for students from EAL/D

backgrounds have been highlighted in the pressures around student performance on Australian national literacy and numeracy tests (NAPLAN). The creation of standardised national systems of schooling to improve outcomes in student and school performance has been linked to an increased pressure on school management to meet performance targets and demonstrate a school's "improvements in efficiency and effectiveness" (Hogan et al., 2018, p. 143). A school's lower NAPLAN scores can potentially point to literacy risk areas of English language proficiency, prompting school leadership to seek "privatised solutions to [such] educational problems" (Dooley, 2020, p. 242). Solutions can include the use of commercial products (for example, commercially produced assessment and reporting tools purchased by individual schools to gather and report on student data in areas targeted for improvement such as literacy or numeracy) (Hogan & Thompson, 2017) framed as helping to improve student outcomes. Private providers offer schools what seem to be "ready-made 'solutions' to various education 'problems'" (p. 143), such as declining results reported in national assessment benchmarks (Daliri-Ngametua & Hardy, 2022), through the purchase of externally produced resources (Hogan et al., 2018). At an individual level, the pressure to perform well in national tests can heighten parental concerns that a student from an EAL/D background may be at a disadvantage because of language proficiency. This also has links to privatisation measures, as revealed in Dooley's (2020) recent research with families from migrant backgrounds. Dooley's (2020) study highlighted that parents from migrant backgrounds were more likely to engage private, external tutoring to improve their children's English language and literacy achievement in NAPLAN tests. Whilst it is true that additional time is required for EAL/D students to achieve academic parity with their English-speaking peers on national literacy tests (Creagh et al., 2019), this should raise concerns for policy makers as it highlights the need for more adequate funding, targeting academic support for EAL/D students in Australian schools (Creagh et al., 2022).

We posit that these examples of solutions from external providers being sought by school leaders and families to supplement resources are indicative of increased privatisation practices as funding arrangements enable schools the autonomy to seek solutions for students requiring additional support (Burch,

2009; Hogan et al., 2018). The growing input of commercial organisations to fill this gap suggests that there is a lack of acknowledgement for federal support for equity groups, such as students from EAL/D backgrounds (Creagh et al., 2022; Oliver et al., 2017). Reports showing productivity and academic results as national areas in need of reform in Australian schooling note that a "transparent, systematic approach" is needed to "evaluate the case for new priority equity cohorts" (Australian Government Productivity Commission [AGPC], 2023, p. 36), including EAL/D and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students. Yet, there is little clarity in these reports (AGPC, 2023) around how the specific needs of these groups will be supported through federal initiatives or funding. The call for adequate support for EAL/D students and teachers has been an ongoing area of advocacy (Creagh et al., 2022; Oliver et al., 2017). In 2014, a survey conducted by the Australian Council of TESOL Associations (ACTA hereafter), the peak body for TESOL in Australia, reported on teachers' experiences of reduced systemic support for EAL/D students in Australian schools (ACTA, 2014). In this paper, we seek to contribute to ACTA's (2014) EAL/D advocacy by drawing attention to a specific area of concern that is the increase and impact of privatisation and commercialisation practices in EAL/D education. Presenting preliminary findings of a recent survey conducted with the support of ACTA, we introduce concerns of teachers about practices that are potentially jeopardising the provision of equitable, government-funded support for EAL/D students in Australian schools.

Research design and methods
Context of study
The study reported in this paper is part of a larger, international comparative study which is investigating privatisation of the teaching of ESOL in the government school systems of four countries including Australia, Hong Kong, Japan, and Greece. In each country, the research examines how the privatisation and commercialisation of the education sector have impacted the provision of English language services. The impetus for the Australian study reflects a growing concern in relation to the impacts of Australian government policy and funding decisions on equitable provision and access to EAL/D education (ACTA, 2014; Creagh et al., 2022).

Each country in the project was required to complete a survey with teachers with the intention of better understanding how privatisation and commercialisation practices were occurring specifically in relation to the delivery of English language services within government schools. The Australian survey results being reported here include description of the respondents, their work situation and their engagement with EAL/D students, and their reports, primarily of commercialisation in EAL/D, in contrast to sites like Hong Kong, for example, where English support is outsourced to private companies who operate within government schools (Choi, 2019). The process of designing the survey was done in consultation with ACTA, to ensure that the questions were relevant to ACTA's advocacy and research foci. The survey was designed as an online tool, using Qualtrics software. Ethical approval to conduct the research was granted through the University of Queensland Human Ethics Committee (Ethics application: 2022/HE001040).

The decision was made to approach EAL/D teachers and mainstream teachers of EAL/D students, nationally and across all schooling systems, through convenience sampling, via ACTA's network of state and territory based professional associations in Australia and through social media platforms. Two factors influenced this decision. First, in order to carry out research in Australian schools, gatekeeper permission is required from each relevant state and/or territory system, in the case of government and catholic schools, and from each school, in the case of independent schools, and the process can take considerable time. The larger project, of which this study is a part, had already endured lengthy COVID-related delays. Secondly, the impact of COVID on the schooling system continues to have ramifications for access to schools and teachers for research purposes.

Survey distribution and completion rates
The online survey opened on August 24, 2022, coinciding with the final weeks of the Australian school term, and remained open for seven weeks, closing on October 6, 2022, after completion of the ACTA International Conference and Australian school holiday period. In total, 139 respondents of the potential 926 members in state and territory ACTA affiliated organisations (ACTA Treasurer, personal communication, June 23, 2023) gave consent for the use of their survey data. This disappointing response reflects the situation that Australian teachers are reporting of extremely stressful work situations (see Stacey et al., 2022, for example) and they may simply not have had time to take on the additional task of an on-line survey. This fact, coupled with the decline of clear EAL/D policy and management in some states and territories may have added to this situation. It is noteworthy that most respondents were from NSW which has a very clearly delineated policy response to and support for EAL/D in schools (New South Wales Education Standards Authority [NESA], 2023).

Findings and Discussion
Due to the limited number of participants, the following results are presented as descriptive statistics. However, we argue that because most of the respondents are highly experienced EAL/D teachers, their insight into the situation 'at the coalface' of schools, in the delivery of English for EAL/D students, has merit and value. All output was generated using Stata V15.1. Open (qualitative) responses were thematically analysed and recurring and common themes in these data are highlighted below.

Description of the respondent group and their teaching situations
By far, the majority of respondents were EAL/D specialist teachers, with TESOL qualifications and a number of years of experience in the field of TESOL. In addition, there was some representation of mainstream teachers of EAL/D students, as well as school leaders. Table 1 below shows the details of respondents' work roles.

Table 1. Work roles of respondents

Work role	Frequency (%)
EAL/D specialist teacher	85 (67)
Mainstream teacher with EAL/D students	20 (16)
School leader	10 (8)
EAL/D advisor/co-ordinator/consultant	9 (7)
Other (university/adult context)	2 (2)
TOTAL	126 (100)

Two thirds of respondents (83 or 66%) had more than eight years of experience teaching English, while a further 23 (18%) had between four and eight years of experience. Of the remainder, 14 teachers had one to three years of experience and 5 teachers had less than one year of experience. 82% of this group had some kind of TESOL qualification, including a Masters in TESOL or Applied Linguistics (34 teachers, or 27% of the group), or a post graduate diploma or specialist degree (31 teachers, or 25%) A small proportion of the teachers (17, or 14%) had no qualification in the field of TESOL.

We did not limit the survey to any particular system of education across states and territories and have representation of all systems including government (67%), Catholic (14%), Independent (15%) and Vocational Education and Training (5%). The majority of schools represented by the respondents are in urban locations (77 schools, or 71%), followed by regional locations (28 schools, or 26%) with a very small number of remote schools (3 or 3%). Of these schools, 47 (44%) were primary schools, 31 (29%) were secondary, and 16 (15%) were P to 12 schools (consisting of both primary and secondary combined). Six schools were senior secondary schools, and the remaining six sites were vocational/TAFE/adult contexts. Just under half of the schools (47%) were reported to have a student population of low socio-economic status (SES), 41% were classified as middle, and 12% were reported as having a high SES population.

Respondents were not necessarily confined to a particular year level of schooling and reported a range of teaching levels within primary and secondary schools. Half of the group worked across lower and upper primary school, while 33% worked in junior or senior secondary, or both. For the remainder, 17% reported that they worked across a range of levels in both primary and secondary schools. This reflects the nature of EAL/D teaching roles, which can be distributed across schools, or within a school, providing specialist support at different levels of schooling.

Using the broad categories of EAL/D learner provided by the Australian Curriculum and Assessment Authority (Australian Curriculum and Assessment Authority [ACARA], 2023a) on the Australian Curriculum website[2], we asked teachers to indicate all the groups they worked with in their teaching roles. The majority of teachers reported a broad mixture of these student groups.

Table 2 shows the frequency of each category across the selections made by respondents. Teachers who participated in the survey are primarily working with students who have immigrated to Australia, including refugees, or who are of migrant heritage. Less represented are international students and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students. This has relevance to the validity of some findings which may not translate to the experiences of these two groups of learners. (see Creagh et al., 2022, for problems with identification and counting of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students in schools.) For those students who are represented in this survey, there is enormous diversity of language and dialects, with teachers uniformly reporting multitudes (sometimes "over 35", "over 50", "40+") of languages spoken in the open responses to this question.

Table 2. Student groups represented by survey respondents

EAL/D group	Frequency of selection (%)
Immigrants to Australia and temporary visa holders from non-English speaking countries	93 (24)
Children born in Australia of migrant heritage where English is not spoken at home	86 (22)
Students with a refugee background	70 (18)
International students from non-English speaking countries	48 (12)
English-speaking students returning to Australia after extended periods in non-English speaking settings	45 (11)
Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander students	41 (10)
Children of deaf adults who use AUSLAN as their first language	9 (2)
TOTAL	392

[2] ACARA use the following classifications to describe EAL/D students: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students, immigrants to Australia and temporary visa holders from non-English speaking countries, students with a refugee background, children born in Australia of migrant heritage where English is not spoken at home, English speaking students returning to Australia after extended periods in non-English speaking settings, children of deaf adults who use AUSLAN as their first language, and international students from non-English speaking countries.

We asked teachers to describe all types of support provided for EAL/D students in their schools. We provided ten categories of options (for example, EAL/D teacher, mainstream teacher support, literacy program) and asked teachers to select all that applied. In addition, we provided an open response option for teachers to report other forms of EAL/D support. There were 39 combinations of the ten responses, and most of these combinations included an EAL/D teacher, which is unsurprising given that most respondents were EAL/D teachers. Table 3 shows the frequency of each option given by respondent.

Table 3. Types of support for EAL/D learners

Support	Frequency	%
an EAL/D teacher	89	35.18
Mainstream classroom teacher support	55	21.74
Bilingual teacher aides / teacher assistants	35	13.83
The literacy program	20	7.91
Resources in languages other than English	15	5.93
Teacher/community made bilingual resources	12	4.74
The Inclusive education program	11	4.35
Other (Please give detail)	10	3.95
A bilingual program	5	1.98
Don't know	1	0.40
TOTAL	253	100

For the open response, there were 10 further comments and four of these listed Intensive English programs. The remainder included comments such as "An hour here and there", "Collaborative planning", "English speaking teacher assistants in the classroom", "reading program", "EAL/D education leader in network" and "AMEP".

Finally, in better understanding the situation of EAL/D in the schools of the respondents, we asked teachers to evaluate, using a Likert scale, the extent to which equity groups (rather than ACARA groupings) of EAL/D learners are supported in their

schools. The scale range was "not well", "ok", "very well" and "not applicable". Table 4 reports their responses to this question.

Table 4. Level to which equity groups are supported

EAL/D group	not well (%)	OK (%)	very well (%)
Low academic performance	17	47	38
Special needs	25	37	37
Beginners	20	34	46
Limited prior schooling	25	37	37
Low-income family	10	47	43
Gifted	21	53	27
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders	29	46	23
Refugee-background	13	50	37
Experiencing trauma	17	50	33

On face value, it could be observed that support is perceived to be OK or better for most groups, though perhaps better for those who are from low-income families, or of refugee background and both these categories fall into broad groups who are targeted through funding. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander EAL/D students could also be noted as a group not well supported, in comparison to other EAL/D groups. This aligns with research in this area (Angelo & Hudson, 2020; Creagh 2022). Indigenous students have historically been marginalised in the TESOL field, with limited or no recognition of languages, insecure funding, and insufficient access to EAL/D pedagogy (Angelo & Hudson, 2020). In addition to this question, teachers were asked whether they believed the support provided by their school was sufficient for the current EAL/D learner need. The majority of respondents (77%) indicated that the support was not sufficient.

Practices of commercialisation
i) in the classroom
As noted previously, the uptake of commercial products and practices is facilitated when schools have autonomous control over budgets and accountability is not targeted to particular

groups such as the EAL/D learner group. Teachers were asked about funding sources to support EAL/D programs and one quarter of the respondents did not know how EAL/D programs are funded in their schools. Commonwealth and/or state/ territory government funding was identified as a primary source of funds by just over half (52%) of respondents. In the open responses, broad categories were named (e.g. "system funding", "new arrivals program", "school allocated funding"). Generally, given that most of the survey participants were EAL/D teachers (67%), this data suggests that there is limited understanding amongst teachers about how EAL/D programs are funded, suggesting limited capacity to advocate for use of those funds for the delivery or improvement of EAL/D programs. Further, with limited knowledge of how funding is allocated, there is uncertainty regarding whether EAL/D expertise plays a role in the processes of selecting, applying and reviewing classroom resources for EAL/D students.

In order to understand whether and how commercialisation was occurring in relation to the support of EAL/D learners, the survey asked a series of questions about particular forms of commercialisation, occurring through the purchasing of products and their use in the support of EAL/D students. The questions were asked twice, first in relation to EAL/D student support, and then in relation to resources being used for EAL/D students, but not specifically designed to target language skills. In other words, these would be products possibly used more broadly throughout the school, but not necessarily designed to target the development of English as an additional language. The responses are presented for both sets of questions in table 5.

Table 5. Types of products being used to support EAL/D learners

Types of products	Resources designed specifically for EAL/D learners			Resources used for EAL/D but not specifically targeting EAL/D pedagogies		
	Never	Sometimes	Often	Never	Sometimes	Often
Materials sourced from within the dept as a paid subscription	46	40	14	31	47	22
Learning materials from outside providers	25	53	22	14	52	34
Standardised instruments for measuring macroskills (R/L/S/W) [3]	37	37	26	21	47	31
Online learning programs (e.g. Education Perfect) from commercial providers	56	29	15	36	46	18
Online learning programs from non-commercial providers. (e.g. charity, other schools)	76	18	5	54	36	9
Resources are created within the school	5	20	75	3	32	65

There are two points that could be drawn out from these data. First, the findings suggest that it may be more common for schools to purchase and use commercial products created for "mainstream" classes as a way of supporting EAL/D students. Secondly, the data suggest that teachers and schools are still creating their own resources for the support of EAL/D students. This again is unsurprising given that most respondents are highly experienced EAL/D teachers who would be skilled in the design and creation of such resources.

Teachers were also asked to name products purchased by their school, which are either designed for EAL/D learners specifically or are being used for the support of EAL/D but are not specifically designed for EAL/D. The open responses for this question are presented in table 6, in Appendix 1. The first column shows the resources which are purchased to support EAL/D

---

[3] Results are reported as percentages and are rounded. R/L/S/W = Reading, Listening, Speaking, Writing

learners but are not identified by a specific brand name and include materials such as bilingual texts, books and dictionaries, language games, grammar reference books, visual aids etc. The second column lists those products or their brand names, being specifically used for EAL/D learners and some of these are designed to support EAL/D pedagogy (e.g. Pearson EAL/D science) or are being adapted for that purpose. The third column lists products purchased in the school which are not specifically designed for EAL/D but are used to support EAL/D learners. These commercial resources are categorized in relation to the skill/s they are targeting. The third column lists a range of literacy related products which may not necessarily be designed for EAL/D students and may be designed with the assumption that students using the product are English speakers. Such products may require considerable adaption by teachers to be appropriate for English language learners.

The numerous resources listed in third column suggest that schools are making considerable use of commercial products, accessible through digital technology. This raises questions about how the materials are used for engagement with the Australian curriculum, the appropriacy and adaptability of the products for students who are learning English, and the extent to which student performance with these materials is interpreted through an EAL/D lens. It suggests that commercialisation occurring in schools may not support equitable educational practices, in this instance, for EAL/D learners. What is unclear is the extent to which these products are replacing well-delivered programs of EAL/D support.

We asked a series of questions designed to better understand how resources for EAL/D learners are selected, and who is involved in this process. The procedure for selection of resources is presented in table 7 and shows that the most common process for selecting resources occurs informally, or through staff meetings.

Table 7. Procedure for selection of resources for EAL/D students

Support	Frequency	%
Informal chat with colleagues	48	23.08
Staff meeting	36	17.31
School management (or School board) make decision	31	14.90

Seek advice from departmental EAL/D officers	31	14.90
Seek advice from experts (e.g. academic in EAL/D)	26	12.50
Talk with service providers	22	10.58
Other	10	4.81
Parent survey or meeting	2	0.96
Student survey	2	0.96
TOTAL	208	100

There were ten open responses about this process. A common theme across these comments was that there are no purchases made for EAL/D learners across the school, or that purchasing resources for EAL/D learners does not happen beyond the intensive EAL/D program. Another comment related to the nature of the purchases being whole of school, "many programs are whole of school programs or whole site literacy. We rarely purchase programs for EAL/D alone".

We asked which school personnel were involved in the selection of resources for EAL/D students, and the two main groups are the EAL/D teacher or the principal (both 28% or responses), followed by faculty heads or heads of department (18%). We were also interested in whether resources purchased for EAL/D learners were evaluated within the school. Table 8 shows that the process is mostly based on teacher feedback, the results of student learning, and in-class observation. However, it is noteworthy that 11% of responses indicated that there is no process of evaluation. This may indicate an inherent faith in the quality of commercial products, or a lack of capacity for schools to review the myriad commercial options available to them (see Creagh et al., 2022).

Table 8. Evaluation of resources purchased for EAL/D learners

Process of evaluation	Frequency	%
Teachers' feedback	53	24.77
Student learning outcome	53	24.77
In-class observation	41	19.16

Students' feedback	29	13.55
There is no evaluation of products normally	24	11.21
Other	9	4.21
Parents' feedback	4	1.87
Report from service provider	1	0.47
TOTAL	214	100

Finally, teachers reported the value and impact of commercial resources in their school. Table 9 reports a compilation of a series of Likert style questions, with a range of four responses. The findings suggest that in the experience of the respondents of this survey, commercial resources may not align well with EAL/D learner need, have not necessarily enhanced EAL/D support, generally requiring some kind of modification for suitability for EAL/D learners. The lack in specialised EAL/D resources and the subsequent need to allocate time to adapt commercial resources exacerbates the intensification of teachers' workloads and the "time poverty" experienced by teachers (Creagh et al., 2023).

Table 9. Value and impact of commercial resources (%)

Commercial resources...	Not at all	Slightly	Somewhat	A lot	Highly
Align well with EAL/D learner need	12	31	43	11	3
Have enhanced EAL/D support	30	28	29	12	1
Need modification to cater for EAL/D	5	10	27	29	29

ii) Teacher professionalisation

The other area of interest in relation to the impact of commercialisation on EAL/D services, has been the impact on the professionalisation of teachers. Respondents reported that they are infrequently targeted by commercial education providers and

rarely used software products for reporting, or for data analysis purposes. When asked whether they felt that their professional knowledge was enhanced by commercial products, responses were predominantly at the negative end of the scale, with respondents reporting 'not at all' (35%), 'slightly' (27%), 'somewhat' (30%), 'a lot' (6%) and highly (1%). There was more evidence of concern about the deprofessionalisation of EAL/D teachers caused by the uptake of commercial products, with responses of 'not at all' (29%), 'slightly' (18%), 'somewhat' (22%), 'a lot' (13%) and 'highly' (18%).

Discussion and Conclusion

The study presented in this paper interrogates the issue of commercialisation in the delivery of EAL/D services in schools in Australia. The findings indicate consequences not only for EAL/D students, but also for the professional standing of EAL/D specialists. We would argue that the commercial practices reflected in the purchase of educational resources, and in particular, digital resources are now well established in schools and that this practice is enabled by school autonomy and limited accountability in budget expenditure, both features of endogenous privatisation (Ball & Youdell 2008). Whilst, ostensibly, this freedom to use expenditure enables provision of services and resources to target local need (Hogan & Thompson, 2017), our survey findings suggest that in the case of EAL/D, schools are purchasing and using commercial products, a number of which are not designed for nor are inclusive of EAL/D learners.

As one respondent stated:

> "Products like Read Write Inc have good intentions but are overused and not adapted for EAL/D learners' language and cultural needs. Products like Reading Eggs are used unsupervised to keep students quiet during group rotations."

It is not clear the extent to which this responsibility to modify, adapt or reject commercial products not suited to EAL/D students is understood by mainstream teachers, who would be using some of the resources listed in Table 6 (Appendix 1). The expectation of inclusion would require that mainstream teachers have these skills, however they may not have the time, nor the professional guidance to do so (Nguyen & Rushton, 2022). At the same time, it is concerning that EAL/D teachers are feeling

deprofessionalised by this situation, that their knowledge and skills are being replaced by such products. As such, some of the current survey's findings raise serious questions which deserve to be explored in further research related to funding, the nature of commercial products being used for EAL/D support, and the impact commercialisation is having on specialist teacher roles, such as that of the EAL/D teacher.

There are additional implications, suggested by the research data. Firstly, it is important that all teachers understand how support programs are funded in schools, and this process should be transparent, both for teachers and for parents. As noted earlier, reports continue to highlight the need for transparent funding processes (AGPC, 2023), without going the next step and making such processes visible at the school level. Even though EAL/D students are targeted through various funding programs, the survey data suggest that this is not well understood by teachers and the consequences are such that there is little capacity then for specialist (or mainstream) teachers to engage in conversations with school management about how best to allocate funds to support students. This devalues EAL/D specialists' professional judgements in relation to appropriate resource selection for their students. Instead, there appears to be a general uptake of numerous commercial products, the majority of which are part of a whole of school response to literacy and numeracy pressures imposed now on schools through accountability measures and standardised testing (Daliri-Ngametua & Hardy, 2022). This is somewhat unsurprising when there is little accountability attached to individual student funding, and highlights how commercialisation can work against equity (Burch, 2009). The respondents have reported concerns about deprofessionalisation caused by the uptake of commercial products, while at the same time reported that the products themselves may not align well with EAL/D learner need, have not necessarily enhanced EAL/D support, and generally require some kind of modification for suitability for EAL/D learners. There is a sense also, from open responses, ("doesn't happen", "outside the small Intensive English Unit at schools, this never happens. Money is not spent on supporting EAL/D students so there are no procedures") that EAL/D teachers may have little influence on the purchase of products for mainstream use, despite the understanding that EAL/D support is required for a number of years beyond any kind of intensive

EAL/D program (Creagh et al., 2019). There is scope for EAL/D specialists in schools to play a key role in providing advice on the kinds of commercial products which would be appropriate for continued EAL/D support if schools see the uptake of such products as valuable to the delivery of education programs.

The key limitation of this study is lack of sufficient participants, particularly, of teachers who work as mainstream teachers supporting EAL/D learners in their classrooms, nevertheless, the respondents who have participated are representative of specialist EAL/D teachers. As such, they offer informed insight into some of the practices occurring in schools. Methodologically, the survey has raised further questions, but potentially generates an incomplete understanding of what is happening, particularly within mainstream classrooms without specialist EAL/D teacher support. It would be useful now to take the questions raised by these data and pursue these qualitatively. Specifically, research needs to explore in depth the phenomenon of commercialisation as an aspect of inclusive education, and to examine to what extent it is either amplifying or ameliorating inequity.

Funding

References

Angelo, D. & Hudson, C. (2020). From the periphery to the centre: Securing the place at the heart of the TESOL field for First Nations learners of English as an Additional Language/Dialect. *TESOL in Context, 29*(1), 5-35. https://doi.org/10.21153/tesol2020vol29no1art1421

Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority [ACARA]. (2023a). *Meeting the needs of students for whom English is an additional language or dialect.* https://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/resources/student-diversity/meeting-the-needs-of-students-for-whom-english-is-an-additional-language-or-dialect/

Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority [ACARA]. (2023b). *Student participation, NAP National Assessment Program.* https://www.nap.edu.au/naplan/for-schools/student-participation

Australian Council of TESOL Associations. (2014). *State of EAL/D survey final report*. https://tesol.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/562_ACTA_2014_Survey_Report_Final.pdf

Australian Government Productivity Commission. (2023). *National school reform agreement.* https://www.pc.gov.au/inquiries/completed/school-agreement/report

Baak, M., Tippett, N., Johnson, B., Brown, J., & Sullivan, A. (2021). *Refugee education in Australian secondary schools: An overview of current practices. Full Report.* University of South Australia. https://apo.org.au/node/315727

Ball, S. J., & Youdell, D. (2008). *Hidden privatisation in public education.* Education International.

Burch, P. (2009). *Hidden markets: The new education privatization.* Routledge.

Choi, T.-H. (2019). Education in partnership with third parties: Lessons from Hong Kong. *In Education reform for the future of work: The shift to a knowledge society* (pp. 11-17). Asian Productivity Organization.

Costley, T., & Leung, C. (2013). English as an additional language: Symbolic policy and local practices. In D. Little, C. Leung & P. Van Avermaet (Eds.), *Managing diversity in education: Languages, policies, pedagogies* (pp. 27-42). Multilingual Matters.

Creagh, S., Kettle, M., Alford, J., Comber, B., & Shield, P. (2019). How long does it take to achieve academically in a second language? Comparing the trajectories of EAL/D students and first language peers in Queensland schools. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 42*(3), 145-155. https://doi.org/10.1007/bf03652034

Creagh, S., Hogan, A., Lingard, B., & Choi, T. (2022). The 'everywhere and nowhere' English language policy in Queensland government schools: A license for commercialisation, *Journal of Education Policy,* (ahead-of-print), 1-20. https://doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2022.2037721

Creagh, S., Thompson, G., Mockler, N., Stacey, M., & Hogan, A. (2023). Workload, work intensification and time poverty for teachers and school leaders: A systematic research synthesis. *Educational Review,* (ahead-of-print), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2023.2196607

Daliri-Ngametua, R., & Hardy, I. (2022). The devalued, demoralized and disappearing Teacher: The nature and effects of datafication and performativity in schools. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 20*(102), 1-24. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.30.6174

Dobinson, T.J. & Buchori, S. (2016). Catering for EAL/D Students' Language Needs in mainstream classes: Early Childhood teachers' perspectives and practices in one Australian setting. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(2), 32-52. http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n2.3

Dooley, K. (2020). Intent and probability: Parents' use of NAPLAN-related private literacy tutoring. *The Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 43*(3), 235–244. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03652059

Hammond, J. (2012). Hope and challenge in the Australian Curriculum: Implications for EAL students and their teachers. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 35*(2), 223–240. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03651884

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism.* Oxford University Press.

Hogan, A., & Thompson, G. (2017). Commercialization in education, In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education* (pp. 1-20). Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.180

Hogan, A., Thompson, G., Sellar, S., & Lingard, B. (2018). Teachers' and school leaders' perceptions of commercialisation in Australian public schools. *The Australian Educational Researcher, 45*(2), 141-160. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-017-0246-7

Keddie, A., MacDonald, K.C., Blackmore, J., Eacott, S., Gobby, B., Mahoney, C., Niesche, R. & Wilkinson, J. (2020). School autonomy, marketisation and social justice: The plight of principals and schools. *Journal of Educational Administration and History, 52*(4), 432-447. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220620.2020.1818699

Le Feuvre, L., Hogan, A., Thompson, G., & Mockler, N. (2023). Marketing Australian public schools: The double bind of the public school principal. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 43*(2), 599-612. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2021.1953440

Lingard, B, Sellar, S. & Savage, G.C. (2014). Re-articulating social justice as equity in schooling policy: The effects of testing and data infrastructures. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 35*(5), 710-730. https://doi.org/10.1080/014256 92.2014.919846

National Curriculum Council (1991) *Circular number 11: Linguistic diversity and the national curriculum*. National Curriculum Council.

New South Wales Education Standards Authority. (2023). *EAL/D education leadership strategy*. https://education.nsw.gov.au/teaching-and-learning/curriculum/multicultural-education/english-as-an-additional-language-or-dialect/eald-education-leadership-strategy

Nguyen, H. T. M., & Rushton, K. (2022). Teachers' perceptions about their work with EAL/D students in a standards-based educational context. *TESOL in Context, 31*(1), 49–72. https://doi.org/10.21153/tesol2022vol31no1art1698

Oliver, R., Rochecouste, J., & Nguyen, B. (2017). ESL in Australia: A chequered history. *TESOL in Context, 26*(1), 7-26. https://doi.org/10.21153/tesol2017vol26no1art700700

Ollerhead, S. (2018). Pedagogical language knowledge: Preparing Australian pre-service teachers to support language learners. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 46*(3), 256-266. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2016.1246651

Stacey, M., Wilson, R. & McGrath-Champ, S. (2022). Triage in teaching: The nature and impact of workload in schools. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 42*(4),772-785. https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2020.1777938

Stahl, G. (2018). *Ethnography of a neoliberal school: Building cultures of success*. Routledge.

Taylor, S. and Sidhu, R. K. (2012). Supporting refugee students in schools: What constitutes inclusive education? *International Journal of Inclusive Education, 16*(1), 39-56. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603110903560085

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation. (1990). *World declaration on education for all: Jomtien declaration, Jomtien, Thailand*. http://www.unesco.org/education/efa/ed_for_all/background/jomtien_declaration.shtml

Verger, A., Lubienksi, C.& Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2016). The emergence and structuring of the global education industry:

Towards an analytical framework. In A. Verger, C. Lubienski, & G. Steiner-Khamsi (Eds.), *World yearbook of education 2016: The global education industry* (pp. 1–27). Routledge.

Dr Sue Creagh is a research fellow at Queensland University of Technology and an honorary Senior Lecturer in the School of Education at the University of Queensland. Sue has researched and written about the statistical processes used in national education testing in the Australian context which serve to misrepresent the performance of students for whom English is an Additional language. Her research areas include educational policy, particularly in relation to EAL/D and refugee education, EAL/D pedagogy and assessment, and, more recently, the intensification of teacher work. She has more than twenty years' experience as an English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom teacher and educational administrator. Sue's research has been published in a range of national and international journals, including the Journal of Education Policy and the Australian Educational Researcher.

screagh@uq.edu.au

Skye Playsted is an educator with over 20 years of teaching experience who has taught in primary and high schools, academic English programs and adult migrant English programs. She is a part time lecturer in English, literacies and language education at the University of New England and a doctoral candidate at The University of Queensland. Skye researches and teaches in the areas of literacy education, TESOL and research methods.

s.playsted@uq.ed.au

Associate Professor Anna Hogan is an Associate Professor of education policy within the School of Teacher Education and Leadership at the Queensland University of Technology. Her research interests focus on issues of marketisation, and how related concepts of privatisation, school choice, commercialisation and philanthropy affect public schools and those in them. She currently has ARC DECRA investigating private income in

Australian public schooling, and an ARC Linkage in partnership with the Queensland Teachers Union that focuses on the intensification of teachers' work and the role commercial edtech devices might play in 'saving' teachers' time. Anna is a lead editor of the *Journal of Education Policy* and the *Australian Educational Researcher*.

ar.hogan@qut.edu.au

Associate Professor Tae-hee Choi is an Associate Professor and the Director of Internationalisation at the Southampton Education School, University of Southampton. Prior to joining the University, she worked at The Education University of Hong Kong (EdUHK) (2013-2022) and part-time at King's College London (2010-2013). She has provided consultancy on policy processes and teacher development for international organisations (e.g., Asian Productivity Organisation; British Council) and national and local governments of various countries. She is an Honorary Professor at the National University of Battambang, Cambodia, and a Fellow of the East-West Center, UK, and of the Higher Education Academy, UK. As a scholar who researches education policy processes and teacher change therein, she has been invited to serve as an editorial board member of multiple journals, e.g., the Journal of Education Policy, and executive committee members of academic societies, e.g., President, Comparative Education Society of Hong Kong. She is currently a co-convenor of the network *Policy Studies and Politics of Education* of the European Educational Research Association.

t.h.choi@soton.ac.uk

Professor Bob Lingard is a Professorial Fellow with the Institute for Learning Sciences and Teacher Education. at Australian Catholic University. He is also Emeritus Professor at The University of Queensland, a Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences in Australia and a Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences in the UK. He has previously worked at the University of Edinburgh, where he held the Andrew Bell Chair of Education, and the University of Sheffield. He is an Adjunct Professor at the University of Glasgow and at the Education University of Hong

Kong. Professor Lingard has an international research reputation and has published widely in the sociology of education and education policy. His most recent books include *Exploring education policy through newspapers and social media* (Routledge, 2023) and *Global-national networks in education policy* (Bloomsbury, 2023).

Robert.Lingard@acu.edu.au

Appendix 1

Table 6. Products purchased by schools for support of EAL/D

General resources (non-specific) for EAL/D support	Commercial resources used for EAL/D support, target-ing language	Commercial resources used for mainstream students including EAL/D
atlases, globes, maps	ACER PAT tests and AGAT (general ability test)	**Maths:**
bilingual texts/books		Mathletics
concrete materials	Adele's ESL Corner	Mathsonline
craft supplies including paper, cards	AMES Readers	Mathspace
	Beach Street 1 (NSW AMES)	Stepping Stones
dictionaries/bilingual and picture dictionaries	BrainPOP (children's educational websites)	**Phonics:**
language games (including for grammar, positional and vocabulary), board games	Cengage	Crack the Code
	CSWE 1 and 11	Get Reading Right
	EAL/DD Ed Studio (Education Qld)	Heggerty Curriculum
language flash cards	Education Perfect	InitiaLit
maths resources especially con-crete materials	Fitzroy Readers	Jolly Phonics
	Focus on Grammar series by Pearson	Phonics Hero
		Phonics Play
posters	Get Reading Right	Sound Waves
puppets	GoGrammar (series of English workbooks)	Sounds Write
teacher reference books on grammar, language acquisition	Hidden4Fun (Shopping with Grandma game)	Speech Sound Pics (SSP)
		THRASS
	Insight education Books	The Sound Way
technology such as iPads	iSLCollective	
textbooks, books, literature, picture books, readers	Jacaranda	**Reading:**
	Kids Lips (Instructional guide for reading)	Alpha Kids
trial HSC exam papers/EAL/DD English past papers	Lexia Core5 Reading	Corrective Reading
		Decodable Readers
	Little Learners Love Literacy	Fitzroy Readers
visual aids	Longman Academic Writing series by Pearson	Fountas and Pinnell
wall charts		Inquisitive Readers
	Maths online	Literacy Box
	Milpera publishing texts	Morpheme Madness Multilit programs (multiple programs)
		Read Write Inc.
		Reading Eggs
		Springboard readers

	MultiLit/InitiaLit/MacqLit	Sunshine Online
	myON (digital library)	Targetted
	Nessy (online learning program for reading and spelling)	PM Readers
		Wushka
	Pearson EAL/D Science	York Assessment of Reading for Comprehension (YARC)
	Pearson English Readers	
	PM eReader	**Spelling:**
	Reading Eggs	Spelling Mastery
	Renaissance Products	
	Sentence Science	**Writing/Grammar:**
	Sounds-Write Spelling	GoGrammar
	Spelling Mastery (McGraw-Hill)	Jolly Grammar
	Studyladder, K5Learning	Oxford English Skills Builder/Grammar Skills
	Study.com	Seven Steps for Writing Success
	Ted-Ed (free lesson plans)	The Writing Revolution
	The Sound Way	Twinkl
	Twinkl	
	Words Their Way (Pearson)	**Cross curriculum & assessment:**
		Education Perfect
		Essential Assessment
		History Mysteries
		K5 Learning
		Interactive learning platform:
		SeeSaw
		Studyladder

Book reviews

CONTEMPORARY FOUNDATIONS FOR TEACHING ENGLISH AS AN ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE: PEDAGOGICAL APPROACHES AND CLASSROOM APPLICATIONS. ROUTLEDGE.
Vinogradova, P., & Shin, J. K. (Eds.)
(2021)

Nurlaily
Monash University, Australia

The book *Contemporary Foundations for Teaching English as an Additional Language: Pedagogical Approaches and Classroom Applications* provides an overview of recent research on the principles and methods for teaching English to speakers of other languages. It is an informative and illustrative resource for English teachers, course designers, and researchers. The book is organised into ten units, each containing conceptual chapters that emphasise embedding language teaching pedagogy within broader sociocultural contexts of teaching and learning.

The authors who contributed to this book come from a variety of countries with diverse backgrounds and educational systems, including Argentina, Brazil, China, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Rwanda, Serbia, South Korea, Thailand, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates, the United States, and Uzbekistan. As a result, the case studies presented in each unit illustrate the diversity of English teaching and learning experienced by teachers, students, and researchers in different contexts and settings.

Each chapter begins with an introductory section that frames the issue, discusses the relevant concepts and theoretical considerations, and highlights the implications for English language education, along with future directions for research and practice. These sections are beneficial, seeking to deepen readers' understanding of the topics presented.

In Unit 1: Introduction, Shin provides key insight into English language teachers' challenges in the 21st century. The "Framework for 21st Century Learning" illustrates the knowledge

and skills that should be integrated into curriculum, instruction, and standards. As bi/multilingual students in the 21st century come from diverse backgrounds and use language for various purposes, teachers should provide students with more than just linguistic knowledge while allowing each student to bring their world into the classroom.

Unit 2 examines and expands on a participatory social justice approach to critical pedagogy in TESOL. Through liberating and humanising critical pedagogy, TESOL can be a generative space that allows teachers and students to examine, disrupt, and re-imagine themselves, one another, and their communities. The case studies presented in Unit 2 include the "Life in Kochi Project" in Japan, the Freirean critical pedagogies, and a case study involving a cohort of MA students in English as a Second Language in Mexico.

Unit 3 of the book focuses on the implementation of post-method pedagogy. It encourages teachers to be independent practitioners and critical thinkers. For example, Case Study 3.1 illustrates how the author approached this apparent difficulty while developing a post-method course at a university in Thailand. The author argues that teachers can adapt the project-based course to help students improve their language skills and confidence by negotiating their teaching values with students' needs and interests, reflecting critically on lessons, and staying flexible and in tune with students' expectations.

Unit 4 examines Culturally Responsive Pedagogy (CRP) in ELT, especially when teaching youth and adults who are ethnically, linguistically, politically, and economically marginalised. Teachers and students can benefit from CRP by addressing marginalisation issues, affirming identities, and confronting hegemony in EL education. In Case Study 4.1, the results show that students better understood diversity and history of their new environment, found their place in their new country and encourage equity and respect while developing students' social and political awareness.

In Unit 5, the authors explore translingualism in English language instruction. It is argued that teachers speaking a different language should learn about students' sociocultural, linguistic, and semiotic practices and actively draw on their expertise. Translingualism allows students to experience language less compartmentalised and experience it more fluidly. It is, therefore, important to create an environment where students can use their languages as a resource to develop their knowledge.

Unit 6 introduces multiliteracies, which integrate various forms of communication (e.g., digital, linguistic, visual, audio, gestural, and tactile) into language learning. The four principles of multiliteracies pedagogy were situated practice, overt instruction, critical framing, and transformed practice. Case Study 6.3 demonstrates how multimodal educational rap videos can be an engaging way to implement multiliteracies in an EFL classroom.

Unit 7 discusses collaborative learning and its benefits and challenges through the use of technology. The authors also examine the implications of technology for EL education, emphasizing best practices, teacher professional development, and student support. Using Google Docs, the author in Case Study 7.1 integrated rubrics, peer assessments, and self-editing. Furthermore, in Case Study 7.2, the author shows the implementation of telecollaborative writing between university-level English classes in Indonesia and Japan through Moodle.

Nowadays, digital literacy is a fundamental skill that must be addressed in the language classroom. Unit 8 covers some common concepts, theoretical foundations and implementations of digital literacy. The case studies reveal that digital literacy training should promote a deeper understanding of how the internet operates culturally. For instance, in Case Study 8.1, the authors found that mobile technology can motivate students and increase their engagement.

In Unit 9, Chapter 9 explores concepts and frameworks for English language advocacy. Advocacy is gaining more attention in English language instruction. Case Study 9.2 investigates the development of teacher advocacy programmes in a public secondary school in north-eastern USA. The results highlight the importance of caring for newcomers who need formal education, literacy, and academic skills. Most of the data in Unit 9 comes from EAL research, suggesting a need for further research in EFL-centred advocacy.

As the book has previously discussed and defined terms essential to contemporary EL teacher education, in Unit 10, the authors discuss EL teachers' expertise, identity, and empowerment within critical participatory pedagogy as essential to training contemporary teachers. EL teachers must understand how these concepts are relevant for all teacher education programs. Case Study 10.1 discusses how international teaching practice can support graduate students and prepare them to engage in critical reflective practices in their language classrooms.

The ten units in this book provide focused, coherent, clear and impressive demonstrations of data. However, not all case studies provided sufficient detail on how their case studies were implemented and evaluated. Some more information on the process of measurement would help readers assess the effectiveness of the approaches.

In summary, the book provides a comprehensive understanding of the complexities of language teaching and learning. It explains how to address these issues based on the expertise of a diverse group of authors worldwide. This book supports English teaching and learning worldwide by providing rich information and insight for teachers, teacher educators, scholars, and policymakers.

Book reviews

PEDAGOGICAL TRANSLANGUAGING
Jasone Cenoz and Durk Gorter
Cambridge University Press, 2021.

Kelly Shoecraft
Griffith University

This book introduces a framework for language and content learning entitled 'Pedagogical Translanguaging'. Readers familiar with the concept of translanguaging will be aware of the origins of the term 'translanguaging' in Wales (Williams, 1996) and the broadening of this term through Garcia's (2009) work in the USA. The authors of Pedagogical Translanguaging position their framework as somewhat in between Williams' and Garcia's approaches. The framework is generally aligned with William's (1996) use of translanguaging as a starting point but moves beyond this application to include aspects of the entire linguistic repertoire (e.g., activities to develop metalinguistic awareness). As opposed to Garcia's (2009) inclusion of spontaneous translanguaging and social justice goals, Pedagogical Translanguaging remains focused on intentional, organized and planned multilingual strategies. In addition, while acknowledging the softening of boundaries between named languages, the authors rationalize the continued use of named languages to support students' abilities to manage socially constructed rules for language use. The book is organized into six chapters which systematically introduce the concept of translanguaging and the framework of Pedagogical Translanguaging, with a dedicated chapter to specific activities and assessment practices (Chapter 4). Chapter 5 – a discussion on minority languages, Immersion and CLIL – is a noteworthy inclusion in the volume as an area where concerns have been raised, and criticism received, in previously suggested applications of translanguaging approaches.

Chapter 1 is an introductory chapter which explains the rationale for the Pedagogical Translanguaging framework. The authors situate the framework in comparison to other multilingual

approaches in educational contexts and highlight the intended application in language and content classrooms. Chapter 2 provides an in-depth overview of translanguaging, with a focus on a comprehensive overview of both Williams (1996) and Garcia's (2009) versions of translanguaging. Part of the comparison between these two approaches is the geographical location of Williams in the Welsh context and Garcia in the United States (predominantly Spanish speaking immigrant) context. This comparison serves to situate the Pedagogical Translanguaging framework within these two applications of translanguaging and the broader geographical application. Another point of difference with Williams' and Garcia's application of translanguaging is the inclusion of monolingual individuals in the Pedagogical Translanguaging framework. Monolinguals' translanguaging practices are only briefly mentioned, but their inclusion in this framework is a valuable reflection of the realities within our societies. This chapter also discusses the challenges of not using named languages (as suggested by Garcia, 2009).

The Pedagogical Translanguaging framework itself is outlined in detail in Chapter 3. To begin, the framework is situated in a multilingual perspective with three dimensions of multilingualism: the multilingual speaker, the multilingual repertoire, and the social context. Further details of the framework include the learner-centred approach and theoretical concepts of prior knowledge, scaffolding and connected growers which provide multilingual strategies and activities that incorporate the individual's entire linguistic repertoire. This chapter stresses that Pedagogical Translanguaging requires purposeful and planned integration of multilingual resources within the same lesson.

Chapter 4, entitled "Metalinguistic awareness, pedagogical practices and assessment" further expands on the objectives of the Pedagogical Translanguaging framework. Practical activities for implementing this framework are suggested and the different forms of these practices are categorized into stronger to weaker forms. Some examples of using multiple languages in assessment tasks from other research are presented, which provides practical ideas for designing assessment tasks and rubrics when implementing Pedagogical Translanguaging. In addition, the authors state that assessment should assess students' development of metalinguistic awareness and incorporate student reflections and self-evaluation.

While there are some practical assessment ideas presented in this section, the authors acknowledge the ongoing challenges for designing and implementing appropriate assessments for multilingual learners – assessment that includes multiple languages and examines how students use their linguistic repertoires for effective communication.

Chapter 5 begins with an overview of the varied and diverse educational contexts in which students are exposed to multiple languages. The authors also discuss differences in minority language education. Some differences are evidenced in situations where the minority language receives extensive support (e.g., learning Basque in Spain) with the aim of multilingualism which may stand in stark contrast to contexts where the minority language (e.g., Spanish of Latinx students in the USA) has historically been suppressed. The authors draw on various literature to delve into an interesting discussion on how spontaneous translanguaging may be viewed in these contexts with regards to supporting minority language development (and indeed empowering students) or being viewed as a hindrance that may impede minority language development. Particular attention is given to immersion and Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) contexts due to the requirement to develop academic skills and comprehension in all content areas, as opposed to a specific language learning classroom. The authors suggest that Pedagogical Translanguaging enhances students' metalinguistic awareness and therefore develops their academic and comprehension skills. In addition to metalinguistic awareness, other recommendations are provided for the implementation of this framework, including: the importance of context, particularly social and historical factors; increasing language awareness (i.e. talking about the status of their home languages); the inclusion of translanguaging across all content areas (during time devoted to minority and majority languages) thus ensuring the minority language has adequate time for development, and; providing dedicated space for the minority language to be used. The conclusion chapter neatly summarises the Pedagogical Translanguaging approach and the need for further research is reiterated.

Overall, the authors provide an in-depth theorisation of the Pedagogical Translanguaging framework which positions it clearly

in relation to other translanguaging approaches. The authors acknowledge the need for more empirical research on the implementation of translanguaging pedagogies, particularly in relation to assessment practices, that allow for a full understanding of best practices in multilingual educational contexts. This volume is beneficial for practitioners in multilingual educational contexts as it provides practical suggestions for implementing Pedagogical Translanguaging. Moreover, the rationale for this approach is thought-provoking for researchers and practitioners to reflect on educational practices in various multilingual contexts.

References

Cenoz, J. & Gorter, D. (2021). *Pedagogical translanguaging.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009029384

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective.* Wiley/Blackwell.

Williams, C. (1996). Secondary education: Teaching in the bilingual situation. In C.Williams, G. Lewis & C. Baker (Eds.), *The language policy: Taking stock* (pp. 39–78). CAI Language Studies Centre.

Book reviews

PLURILINGUAL PEDAGOGIES. CRITICAL AND CREATIVE ENDEAVORS FOR EQUITABLE LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION

Sunny Man Chu Lau & Saskia Van Viegen (Eds.)
Springer (2020)

Jaione Diaz Mazquiaran
Monash University

Acknowledging the need for studies that break barriers, Lau and Van Viegen's edited volume offers a deep discussion related to the application of plurilingual approaches and translanguaging across a variety of educational contexts. The book comprises a unique balance between theoretical/conceptual and empirical contributions which focus on the complexities of the everyday language practices of bi/multilingual communities. It offers implications for promoting inclusion and well-being of these learners. It critically delineates both methodological and pedagogical approaches with which the existing monolingual bias and inequitable power relations embedded in language hierarchies can be resisted. The collection is divided into five different sections. Moreover, as an innovative feature which showcases the work's ongoing reflexive and dialogic nature, the editors include scholars' commentaries on the main sections of the book.

The first section focuses on the heteroglossic understanding of language practice, noticing the pressing need towards critical and creative approaches concerned with the equitable inclusion of the linguistic repertoires of students. These chapters point out the importance of situating these discussions amidst sociocultural, political and historical origins and directions. Lau and Van Viegen provide an overview of key terms and highlight some discussions in the field, reinforcing the idea that preferred multilingualism tends to include dominant European languages, ignoring the multilingual resources of speakers of minoritized languages, "a luxury afforded to a privileged few" (p.11). The editors' conversation with Moore in the second chapter gives an overview of the epistemological background and theorization of

plurilingualism and plurilingual competence in relation to understandings of translanguaging. They emphasize the need for adopting a reflexive plurilingual posture (p. 41). The third chapter by Lin, Wu and Lemke explains the move from a substance-based to a process-based ontology which would capture sense-and meaning-making practices in the real world. This means moving away from the conceptualization of named language systems as static and bounded and embracing the *translanguaging and flows* analytical framework, depicted as a nexus of dynamic material, social and historical processes across multiple timescales (p.54).

The second section includes chapters focusing on case studies where plurilingual pedagogies are applied to different teaching and learning contexts. These works reinforce the connection between language learning and critical literacy in bilingual and Indigenous school contexts, highlighting the need to consider every student as having agency, capable of challenging dominant ideas and social assumptions regardless of their language proficiency level. Aitken and Robinson's study focuses on the way language, culture, power and identity intersect in the First Nation communities and their school setting. Within an intergenerational project in the Naskapi Indigenous community involving grandparents, Grade 3 students produced identity texts in multiple languages, taking ownership of their learning of English and increasing their metalinguistic awareness. López et al's chapter presents an ethnographic study concerning three student teachers' efforts to implement plurilingual and translanguaging approaches in Oaxaca, Mexico. The project not only helped contesting the use of Standardized English as the only appropriate linguistic practice, it also accentuated students' understanding of health issues linked to the social reality where they live. Lau's research in Quebec, Canada, focuses on the strategic collaboration between English and French language teachers in building bridges across content and language to facilitate students' social inquiry of race issues and strengthen their biliteracy development. Guided by a materialist perspective, Toohey's commentary at the end of the section strengthens the idea of collaboration between researchers and teachers to engage in critical literacy, respecting the communities from which students come. Here, the notion of agency also includes the production of material objects.

The third section compiles works related to pluralistic approaches in classroom settings. Coelho and Ortega's study,

which was carried out in Portugal, Colombia, Canada and the United States, advocates for pluralistic approaches such as Awakening to Languages (AtL) (p.145) which promote children's curiosity about linguistic and cultural diversity in early childhood education. Van Viegen's chapter describes teachers' use of plurilingual pedagogies with multilingual children at the elementary level, showing a range of multilingual tasks and activities developed by teachers that encourage students' translanguaging practices. Findings support the value of engaging students' linguistic repertoire for scaffolding purposes and as a learning resource. Seltzer's ethnographic study, which took place in secondary education in the United States, illustrates the way minoritized students working with translingual texts can demonstrate their linguistic expertise, creativity and criticality, which can be further enhanced when working with translingual mentors. In his commentary, Cummins remarks on the value of the knowledge generated by teachers through their instructional practice as a way to embrace and use their students' linguistic repertoires positively against the coercive power relations operating at schools and the wider society. This would mean positioning teachers as knowledge generators (p.206) who would then inform theoretical insights.

Section four outlines plurilingual engagement in post-secondary institutions and portrays the need for a situated understanding of these pedagogies. Tian's qualitative study examined how one teacher educator adopted a critically reflexive stance, challenging the dominance of English and creating translanguaging spaces in her TESOL teacher preparation course. Her modelling intentionally cultivated her students' language awareness, interculturalism and tolerance towards linguistic and cultural diversity. In Galante's work, Freire's concept of conscientização (critical consciousness) is used when introducing plurilingualism along with a critical perspective in two case studies in the Canadian setting involving immigrant and international students. The author addresses the importance of providing learners with opportunities to exert agency in their own plurilingual choices, challenging monolingual standards. Next, Marshall's ethnographic work on plurilingualism as an asset for learning across disciplines at a Canadian University suggests the importance of avoiding idealization of plurilingual practices, respecting contextual differences, finding nuanced representations of plurilingualism through interdisciplinary collaborations, and

always helping students succeed academically. Li's autobiographical commentary on this section exemplifies the way plurilingual pedagogies can be promoted by embracing critical engagement, understanding our own situated, background linguistic histories, going beyond restrictions created by existing structures and systems and transforming them.

The last section of the book discusses future directions for policy and practice. Piccardo and North present the development, validation and calibration of new Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) for languages descriptors for plurilingual and pluricultural competence, going beyond utilitarian language use and giving value to language and cultural diversity (p.292). Kubota's work emphasizes the adoption of a critical lens in our engagements with the multilingual turn in the field of second language education, contributing to social change and exploring inequalities related to colonialism, imperialism and capitalism. In the concluding chapter, Van Viegen and Lau offer suggestions for implementing plurilingual pedagogies within a philosophy, principle, and practice (3 Ps) framework.

The editors of this comprehensive and thought-provoking volume successfully accomplish the three aims of their work: firstly, they critically engage with theoretical shifts marked by the multilingual turn, recognizing that theories are continuously evolving and changing. Secondly, they frame fieldwork as ways of being and doing by offering a wide range of contexts where the collaboration between university researchers and teachers is key to address teaching and learning needs. Thirdly, the book provides pedagogical approaches and assessment strategies for teaching and learning languages and subject matter across educational settings. This book is a noteworthy resource which will appeal to graduate students, pre-service and in-service teachers, teacher educators and researchers on an international level. It will certainly serve as a valuable tool to make plurilingual theories and approaches come alive amidst the multilingual classrooms of today's world.

Book reviews

ENGLISH AND STUDENTS WITH LIMITED OR INTERRUPTED FORMAL EDUCATION: GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES ON TEACHER PREPARATION AND CLASSROOM PRACTICES

Luis Javier Pentón Herrera (1st ed., Vol. 54).
Springer Cham (2022)

Jemima Rillera Kempster
University of Queensland

Upon resettlement in anglophone countries, students with limited or interrupted formal education (SLIFE) often face heightened exclusion and epistemic oppression instead of having access to inclusive, equitable, high-quality education with lifelong learning opportunities (Jensen, 2017). The edited volume *English and Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal Education: Global Perspectives on Teacher Preparation and Classroom Practices* by Luis Javier Pentón Herrera contributes to the growing body of literature that seeks to understand the complexities of supporting students who are learning the dominant language of their new settlement countries with little or no foundational literacy skills in their home languages. The term SLIFE, as popularised by Dr Andrea DeCapua and colleagues (2009) and Helen Marshall (2011), refers to migrant and refugee-background students whose educational experiences have been significantly impacted by various factors such as political conflict or instability, socioeconomic and cultural factors, natural disasters and forced displacement. Some of the challenges in supporting SLIFE in formal learning environments include adjusting to new cultural and educational environments, providing support for their emotional well-being due to traumatic experiences or difficult circumstances, lack of age-appropriate educational resources, and meeting educational level expectations in academic and literacy skills. This book focuses on the experiences of SLIFE in English-speaking learning environments and strongly advocates for holistic, culturally responsive, and strengths-based approaches to support their academic growth and advance epistemic access and justice.

The book is a collection of nineteen chapters and is divided into five parts. In the introductory chapter, Pentón Herrera establishes his positionality based on his cultural upbringing and professional experience, outlines the vision for this collaboration with fellow SLIFE advocates, and invites readers to be part of the dialogue regarding the unique challenges and needs of this cohort of students. A brief outline of the book is also provided.

The first part consists of a single chapter, but its significance in establishing the foundation for discussion about SLIFE cannot be overlooked. In Chapter 2, Pentón Herrera and contributors Christopher Browder and José Franco examine the multifaceted nature of the acronym SLIFE. The term can be a double-edged sword. While labelling types of students is integral to identifying their "needs" and determining appropriate support, it can also inadvertently result in stigmatisation, the perpetuation of deficient perspectives, and restrictions on opportunities for language learning and academic growth (p. 10). The construct of SLIFE has been previously raised by Browder (2019), arguing that "some people can become very educated without much formal schooling while others who are well-schooled can remain undereducated" (p.45). Given our expanding understanding of language learning, literacies, and education, discussing the inconsistencies in identification guidelines of SLIFE among educators, researchers, and institutions raise questions about our educational systems that tend to narrow the scope of literacy and English language learning to technical and quantifiable skills.

The second part of the book consists of chapters 3 to 6 and provides a comprehensive overview of SLIFE in educational systems across four anglophone countries: Australia, Canada, the USA and the UK. Chapter 3 specifically focuses on K-12 students. It identifies particular challenges such as issues of misplacement, compounded literacy demands based on the age of arrival or entry into the educational system, the development of literacy in home languages to support additional language and literacy learning, and varying degrees of parental support and involvement. Chapter 4 shifts our attention to adult learning contexts in the same four anglophone countries which receive a significant number of refugees. English language tuition for adult SLIFE includes various options such as government-initiated language and literacy programs in Australia to employment-focused adult

education, community-based organisations, community colleges, religious organisations and public schools in the USA, UK and Canada. Specific challenges identified for adult SLIFEs include cultural and instructional differences, the variable focus of classroom curriculum, issues with language transfer and perceived lack of social capital. Chapter 5 draws attention to the crucial role of teachers across the lifespan as advocates for SLIFE, whether in ensuring inclusion and high-quality education for SLIFE in the classroom or advancing policy especially regarding the acknowledgement of heritage languages. Another important addition to this volume is a discussion on trauma by Montero and Al Zouhouri in chapter 6, recognising that SLIFE's identity extends beyond singular identity markers such as trauma or limited education. While trauma plays a crucial role in the documentation, application and selection process for resettlement, these stories and experiences can also be empowering when SLIFE become authors and arbiters of their stories. The double-sided coin of trauma is stress and growth (p. 89), and the authors offer valuable recommendations on effectively incorporating trauma-informed teaching practices to support the well-being and education of SLIFE.

After an in-depth introduction to SLIFE as a distinct cohort of students, our attention is drawn to pre and in-service teacher education in Part 3. Chapters 7 to 10 address common concerns of teachers who feel overwhelmed and unprepared for teaching and supporting SLIFE. The functions of education encompassing acquisition of knowledge and skills, acculturation, and identity formation (Biesta, 2015) are evident in this book's elaboration on the role of teachers in supporting SLIFE in English-speaking learning environments. Chapter 7 presents two studies that examine state-level pre-service teacher education requirements and offer recommendations for pre-service teachers working with English language learners. While primarily addressing teacher preparation programs in the United States, the guiding principles can be adapted and applied to similar culturally and linguistically diverse contexts. In Chapter 8, the emphasis is on acknowledging SLIFE holistically: their identity, languages, cultures, knowledge, families, and social networks. DeCapua and Marshall remain steadfast in their message, reiterating the same themes concerning SLIFE in English learning environments: over-reliance on print

and literacy-centred approaches, the tendency to emphasise individual achievement and accountability, and the disconnection between school knowledge and real-world experiences (p. 129). The authors highlight the importance of learning materials that resonate with students' lived experiences and the need for a supportive and integrated learning community. Chapter 9 delves into resolving the tension between curriculum compliance and "meeting students' needs" (p. 147), while Chapter 10 highlights the benefit of early reading instruction for SLIFE, particularly for SLIFE adolescents.

In the last two parts of the book, the crucial role of teachers' judgments in the education process (Biesta, 2015) is brought to the fore. These sections acknowledge teachers as individuals and educational professionals and demonstrate how teacher judgment and decision-making are influenced by a teacher's expertise, experiences, assumptions, and insights. Part 4 consists of chapters 11 to 19 and explores the range of affordances and constraints teachers face when exercising their judgments in shaping the educational experiences they provide for their students. Chapter 11 focuses on effective classroom instruction that acknowledges and integrates community cultural wealth (CCW) of SLIFE from Latin America in the US, particularly focusing on unaccompanied minors. Through community projects or youth participatory research projects in Chapter 12, Trinh demonstrates how language learning environments can either silence or allow expression for marginalised queer SLIFE. Chapter 13 focuses on wordless books, which shifts the focus on print literacy in the investigative stage to students' full linguistic repertoire, including the target language (p. 232). Chapter 14 provides one of the many tangible examples in the book how SLIFE students were supported and enabled to do much more than in a "traditional" classroom. Through problem-based service learning (PSBL), adolescent SLIFE were positioned as "consultants" proposing solutions and strategies for real-world problems faced by their "client", the community (p. 250).

Chapters 15 to 19 in the final part are devoted to issues concerning adult SLIFE, also referred to in literature as LESLLA learners (Literacy Education and Second Language Learning for Adults). Chapter 15 promotes the co-creation of learning and encourages responsiveness to oral cultures among adult SLIFE.

The chapter provides a thorough explanation of the Mutually Adaptive Learning Program (MALP), integrating a "collectivist education paradigm and of Western-style education" (p. 267) . Based on case studies in an adult refugee education centre in Israel, Chapter 16 argues for explicit instruction with adult SLIFE, emphasising the need for a curriculum "which both breaks down and logically sequences content and skills" and specialist teachers knowledgeable in content and capable in delivery to students (p. 298). Chapter 17 explores various multimodal projects using participatory digital visual methods (PDVMs), which include Photo-elicitation, PhotoVoice, VideoVoice, and Community Filmmaking, encouraging co-construction of knowledge with adult SLIFE. Chapter 18 argues for grammar as the foundation for reading comprehension with adult SLIFE and finally, Chapter 19 focuses explicitly on the challenges and experiences of refugee women, touching on the global issue of adult illiteracy which disproportionately affects women.

Overall, the book has covered an impressive and wide-ranging exploration of issues and topics which showcase SLIFE and the breadth and depth of their knowledge, experiences and attributes. The book effectively captures the concepts, complexities, and considerations for supporting SLIFE from early primary to adult education in English-speaking countries. While many of the contributors to this book are based in North America, their collective experience in teaching and supporting SLIFE extends across the globe. The issues they address are not limited to a specific language or geographic region; thus, their insights are relevant worldwide to SLIFE teaching contexts. The contributors also encompass diverse backgrounds, from seasoned researchers, doctoral students and practising teachers, all of whom bring valuable knowledge and experiences that contribute to our understanding of SLIFE and effective strategies for supporting their learning in formal educational settings.

For teachers and educational institutions working with SLIFE, the book provides a well-rounded blend of theoretical insights and practical strategies that can be implemented in the classroom. Throughout the book, readers will find compelling research from innovative and wide range of methodological approaches that will inspire pedagogical approaches and practices for extending students' literacy skills, from grammar-focused

lessons to creative avenues that foster holistic learning experiences beyond reading and writing. The strategies can be as complex as project-based learning or as simple and accessible as using mini-whiteboards to check for understanding in explicit instruction. It is encouraging to read many examples of how transformative learning can happen across the lifespan, even with the constraints of standardised assessments and rigid curriculums.

As a practioner-resarcher working in the field of LESLLA, I appreciate how the book underscores the immense role of educators in engaging with SLIFE and facilitating their integration into educational and sociocultural contexts. The book consistently emphasised the need for teachers to recognise and tap into their students' full linguistic competencies, minimising over-reliance on printed materials, and utilising the rich resources of their students' oral and collectivistic cultures. The reflection questions at the end of each chapter serve as helpful prompts for further exploration and rich discussion about SLIFE. This book extends an invitation for all teachers to create inclusive and welcoming spaces for learning, remain open to new knowledge, and actively encourage the development and growth of their (SLIFE) students' identities.

References

Biesta, G. (2015). What is education for? On good education, teacher judgement, and educational professionalism. *European Journal of Education, 50*(1), 75–87. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26609254

Browder, C. (2019). The trouble with operationalizing people: My research with Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal Education (SLIFE). In D. Warriner & M. Bigelow (Eds.), *Critical Reflections on Research Methods: Power and Equity in Complex Multilingual Contexts* (pp. 43–52). Multilingual Matters.

DeCapua, A., & Marshall, H. (2011). Breaking new ground: Teaching students with limited or interrupted formal education in U.S. secondary schools. University of Michigan Press.

DeCapua, A., Smathers, W., & Tang, F. (2009). Meeting the needs of students with limited or interrupted schooling. University of Michigan Press.

Jensen, L. (Ed.). (2017). *Sustainable Development Goals Report.* United Nations. https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/files/ report/ 2017/TheSustainableDevelopmentGoalsReport2017.pdf

Notes for contributors

- It is understood that articles submitted to TESOL in Context have not been previously published and are not under consideration for publication elsewhere.
- Articles around 6,000 words including references are preferred, and an abstract of up to 200 words should be included with each article submitted.
- Electronic submission as attached files is required (Microsoft Word or rich text format).
- One file should contain a separate cover page with the article's title, the names of the author/s, their preferred titles, and the contact details for the author to whom correspondence should be sent (address, telephone numbers, and email address). About 70 words of biographical data should also be included.
- A second file should contain the title followed by the abstract, the body of the paper and the list of references. Number the pages but do not use identifying headers or footers.
- Headings and sub-headings should be left aligned, with the first letter capitalised.
- Indicate new paragraphs by using one extra line space.
- Text should be Times New Roman, 12 points, with 1.5 spacing.
- Short quotations should be incorporated into the text and enclosed with double quotation marks.
- Quotations of more than about 40 words should be set off from the main text by indentation, without any quotation marks.
- Referencing should follow the APA referencing style; for examples, see a recent issue of the journal at http://www.tesolincontext.org.au/.
- References in the text should be ordered alphabetically and contain the name of the author and the year of publication, e.g. (Adams, 2001; Jones, 1998). For direct quotations include the relevant page number(s), e.g. (Jones, 1998, p. 34).

- Tables, figures or diagrams should be numbered consecutively and included in the relevant part of the text. Each should have an explanatory title.
- Numbers up to and including ten should be spelt out and numbers over ten should be expressed as figures.
- The spellings used should be those given in The Macquarie Dictionary.
- All articles submitted are subject to blind, impartial refereeing; referees are asked to report against the following criteria:
  * The topic of the article is of relevance to readers of the journal (see ACTA Statement at https://tesol.org.au/publications/#publications-1).
  * The article is grounded appropriately in relevant published literature.
  * The article's claims/conclusions are based on rigorous analysis of primary data and/or well-supported argument and/or analysis of teaching practice.
  * The article is well structured and clearly linked.
  * Language use and style are appropriate to the audience and purpose.
  * Notes for contributors have been followed in all respects, including consistent use of APA style.
  * The article has potential to make a worthwhile contribution to the TESOL field.

Mission statement

ACTA is the national coordinating body representing all teachers of English to speakers of other languages. It aims to promote and strengthen English whilst supporting people's linguistic and cultural heritage. English is the language of public communication and the lingua franca for the many different sociocultural groups in Australia, as well as a major language of international communication. For full and effective participation in education, society, and in the international arena, competence in English is necessary.

TESOL is the teaching of English by specialist teachers to students of language backgrounds other than English in order to develop their skills in spoken and written English communication. At the same time, TESOL teachers strive to be sensitive to the diverse linguistic, cultural, and learning needs of individuals.

TESOL draws on a knowledge of the nature of the English language, first and second language acquisition, crosscultural communication, and appropriate curriculum, materials, and methodology for multicultural contexts. It is an integral part of the broader social, educational, and political context. It can inform and be informed by this context.

As a program, profession, and field of study and research, TESOL shares certain understandings and practices with the subject English as a mother tongue, child and adult literacy, languages other than English (LOTE), and bilingual and multilingual education, but also has distinct characteristics.

ACTA's objectives are

To represent and support the interests of teachers of English to speakers of other languages ACTA is committed to quality teacher training and professional development in TESOL and working conditions and career paths which enable teachers to have the stability and continuity of employment to develop, maintain, and deliver quality programs.

To ensure access to English language instruction for speakers of other languages ACTA is committed to ensuring that all students with ESL needs have access to programs that acknowledge and meet their diverse specific needs.

To encourage the implementation and delivery of quality professional development programs ACTA is committed to the development and maintenance of the highest quality programs for students at pre-primary, primary, secondary, and tertiary levels that are appropriately funded, resourced and staffed, and articulated in clear pathways.

To promote the study, research, and development of TESOL at state, national, and international levels ACTA is committed to ensuring that TESOL and TESOL related issues are debated and accorded due recognition in state and national policy initiatives as well as in the international community.