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ABSTRACT

This thesis aims to investigate how the Certificate of General Education for Adults (CGEA) caters for non-language outcomes in ESL literacy classrooms. The research focuses specifically on ESL literacy learners with limited or no formal education who are characterised as having literacy needs.

Non-language outcomes (NLO) such as improved self-esteem, cultural awareness and the development of learning-to-learn skills are seen by many teachers to be important gains from language and literacy courses. However, since the introduction of competency-based credentials like the CGEA, many practitioners are concerned that these do not acknowledge NLO.

Using the theoretical framework of a previous study by Jackson (1994) into NLO categories, this thesis reported on the findings of a qualitative multi-case study of six teachers and their low-level ESL literacy learners. A range of data including teacher interviews, classroom observations and fieldnotes was used to examine the informants' conceptualisation of both ESL literacy learner characteristics and of NLO. The teachers were also asked to comment on whether NLO were documented in the CGEA.

The data revealed that the informants' characterisation of ESL literacy learners matches current definitions found in the literature. The teachers reported that these learners do make non-language gains, particularly in the affective and learning skills categories. This thesis also identified classroom metalanguage to be an additional NLO for the target learners which was not previously identified by Jackson (1994). Only the General Curriculum Options stream of the CGEA was seen to document any non-language gains. Further research needs to substantiate the findings of this thesis since it strongly supports the findings of Jackson (1994).

The implications for policy and funding bodies are that the course delivery hours need to be extended and curriculum frameworks reviewed. This would assist ESL literacy learners to develop relevant learning skills and strategies which facilitate literacy competence.
CHAPTER 1
SETTING THE CONTEXT

1.1 Introduction

This thesis investigates how the non-language needs of English as a second language (ESL) learners are catered for in the Certificates of General Education for Adults (CGEA). The research focuses specifically on ESL learners with limited formal education and low levels of literacy.

The implementation of competency-based accreditation within Australia has had major ramifications for the adult education sector. Traditional outcomes of adult literacy programs, such as improved confidence and self-esteem, have been downplayed since the introduction of competency-based assessment (CBA) credentials. These 'learner centred personal growth' gains have been replaced with a set of learning outcomes which are economically driven and shaped by the Australian government's national training and reform agenda. This agenda links the improvement of Australian workers' literacy skills to the country's economic advancement within the world economy. These skills are described within the learning outcomes of many competency-based credentials like the CGEA. However, non-language outcomes (NLO) such as confidence, cultural awareness and learning-to-learn skills are not documented within many of these credentials despite the widespread perception that these are valuable outcomes of adult literacy and ESL courses.

The impetus for this research was two-fold. The prime motivating factor was a strong personal belief that non-language gains were indeed significant outcomes of adult literacy
and ESL courses; even within the confines of curriculum frameworks like the CGEA. It was, therefore, important to examine the kinds of NLO which result in adult ESL literacy classrooms and to investigate whether the learning outcomes of the CGEA formally recognised these. Secondly, of particular interest was the target group of learners who are commonly referred to by the term ‘ESL literacy’. Although there are a multiplicity of views as to the characteristics of these ESL literacy learners (see Chapter 2), they are often described as having higher levels of spoken language and comparatively lower reading and writing skills. In addition, they have minimal or no experience of learning in a schooled environment. This group constitutes an interesting and complex category of learner type because they have both second language and literacy needs. Traditionally, the education of languages other than English background (LOTEB) learners has been managed within programs particular to the ESL field whilst literacy programs have been managed by the adult literacy and basic education (ALBE) field. However, the needs of ESL literacy learners are not exclusive to either ALBE or ESL, rather they fall within the interface between the two fields. As a consequence, the complex educational needs of ESL literacy learners, including NLO, are not specifically addressed within the competency-based credentials that pertain to either of the two separate fields.

A study undertaken by Jackson (1994) had previously identified the kinds of NLO that occurred within adult ESL classes. Jackson classified eight categories of NLO which teachers had identified as being important outcomes within ESL classrooms. She also clarified the relationship between NLO and language and literacy gains, and situated these within a sociolinguistic model of language. Jackson’s findings lead to the inclusion of NLO into the competencies of the Certificate in Spoken and Written English (CSWE)
which was in line with current adult education provision. However, this thesis centres on the use of the CGEA; a competency-based curriculum and assessment framework which is commonly used with ESL and English speaking background (ESB) literacy learners in adult education providers in Victoria, and increasingly elsewhere in Australia. By using Jackson’s theoretical model of NLO as a framework for analysis, it would be possible to investigate whether similar NLO were found in ESL literacy classrooms using the CGEA. It would also enable the identification of any additional NLO which arose in this context and to examine whether the CGEA articulated these non-language gains within its learning outcomes.

This thesis reports the findings of a qualitative multi-case study of six experienced and qualified ESL teachers and their low-level ESL literacy classes undertaking the CGEA. These classes were delivered in a range of different settings and contexts across the inner and outer suburbs of Melbourne, Victoria.

In this chapter the background and rationale of the study are presented. Firstly, an historical overview of the implementation of CBA within the adult education sector is presented. Next it elaborates on Jackson’s (1994) NLO project and describes the inclusion of NLO within the CSWE. Thirdly, it outlines the structure of the CGEA focussing primarily on NLO within the credential. Finally, the chapter concludes with an overview of the nature and focus of the research and a review of the thesis structure.

1.2 An historical perspective

This section of the chapter describes the historical effect of the Australian government’s “economic restructuring” policies (Moore, 1996) on the ALBE and ESL fields and the
subsequent development of competency-based training models of curriculum and assessment such as the CSWE and the CGEA which are relevant to the thesis.

In recent years the field of adult literacy within Australia has undergone radical reform. In its beginnings, tuition was delivered primarily by female volunteers (Lee and Wickert, 1994; Angwin, 1995), working on a one-to-one basis in private homes. In the seventies and early eighties, small scale classes were conducted in community centres and neighbourhood houses in which courses were needs-based and learner-centred. In these classes curriculum was often negotiated by the teacher with the learner and was constructed around learner needs and interests (Perry, 1998). These programs were reflective of the government’s social justice policies and the pedagogies of progressivism which espoused the rights and needs of individuals. Adult literacy, therefore, had a "charitable flavour" (Rado and D’Cruz, 1994: 2), one in which the commonly held view was that improved literacy skills would lead to an improved life for the disadvantaged (Cope and Kalantzis, 1994; Wickert, 1993).

In this last decade, in line with current industrial, political and economic reform and together with the 1990 International Year of Literacy, the adult literacy field has taken on new dimensions. With the demise of Australia’s primary and secondary industry, huge amounts of funding were made available for retraining the unemployed as suddenly Australia’s economic success became inextricably linked to ‘multi-skilling’ the workforce. The result of this new focus has been that improvements in “English language and literacy are recognised as integral to the success of industrial reforms, vocational education and training and adult community education” (Coates, 1994: 7).
1.2.1 The development of competency-based credentials

Central to the government’s economic policies in the 1990’s has been the endorsement of an approach to learning in vocational and educational training that is ‘product driven’ and relies upon the acquisition and assessment of skills or outcomes that are shaped by rigid performance criteria (Bottomley, Dalton and Corbel, 1994; Jackson, 1994). This approach to learning is known as competency-based training (CBT). It is accompanied by accreditation frameworks that report learner outcomes as competencies. This is known as competency-based assessment (CBA).

The implementation of CBA has meant a change in emphasis from the needs that benefit the individual to one that is concerned with benefits for the group (Lee and Wickert, 1994; Davison, 1996; STBV, 1998). Hence, the individual has now become redefined in society in such a way that the enhancement of individual skills is not viewed in terms of personal growth but rather is defined by the value that these skills will bring to the economic advancement of the society. In other words, learners’ needs are “viewed in economic terms” (Perry, 1998: 3).

In the adult education context, this has also meant a change from a focus on process, of how the learner goes about a task, to a focus on clearly defined and ‘measurable’ outcomes (Bottomley et al 1994; Davison, 1996) which are shaped by the workplace rather than negotiated by the learner (Davison, Taylor and Hatcher, 1994; STBV, 1998). These assessable outcomes are explicitly prescribed within the specific certificates and reporting frameworks that have been developed in line with training guidelines and that are relevant to particular industries and educational courses. To improve economic
viability workers need to become, “multi-skilled, flexible and adaptable” (Mayer, 1992: 2) and the assessment criteria of these frameworks must reflect this.

A more indepth description of one of these competency-based frameworks that is the focus of this thesis, namely the CGEA, will be given in a later section of this chapter.

One reason why CBA has been implemented is because of its claims of ‘accountability’ (Auerbach, 1992; Moore, 1996; Sanguinetti, 1995). By using a set of prescribed and documented outcomes or competencies, learners can be assessed as having ‘achieved or not achieved competence’ based on a set of assessable performance criteria that are applied to each skill. The concept of ‘competence’ that is constructed in relation to competency-based assessment is one that:

recognises that performance is underpinned not only by skill but also by knowledge and understanding and that competence involves both the ability to perform in a given context and the capacity to transfer knowledge and skills to new tasks and situations.

(Mayer, 1992: 4).

Thus each industry or field has a specific competency-based credential which the learner gains. These credentials are recognised and valued as ‘portable’ as learners move or develop ‘pathways’ (Coates, 1994; Sanguinetti 1995) within various educational and vocational training contexts. The documentation of these competencies is also a way of reporting learner outcomes to funding bodies.

1.2.2 The development of competency-based frameworks in adult language and literacy education

The establishment of closer links between education and work has resulted in the need to redefine the adult education field (Lee and Wickert, 1994). As funding has become
available and research has been conducted, the adult literacy field has established itself as an important and valuable profession within the larger educational sector.

One of the significant research projects that has been relevant to the adult literacy field is a report entitled *The Pedagogical Relations Between Adult ESL and Adult Literacy* (Hammond, Wickert, Joyce and Miller, 1992). The brief of this project was to examine the changing relationship between what had traditionally been the two separate fields of adult literacy and adult ESL within Australia. This included providing a historical overview of the changing provisions within the ALBE and ESL fields.

In view of the contemporary focus on literacy for vocational, educational and training Hammond et al (1992: 38) stated:

> Although overall policy change of emphasis from acquisition of language for settlement with its associated welfare orientation to a concern for training and employment outcomes, there continues to be acceptance of the fact that there are developments that occur within and outside the language classroom other than gains made in spoken and written language. Aspects of learning such as increased confidence and self-esteem have always been considered important aspects of adult learning. Non-language learning outcomes have been stated in vague and confusing terms that run the risk of being dismissed by funding bodies as too undefined to be legitimate outcomes of language and literacy provision.

This observation is salient because the National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research (NCELTR) funded several research projects arising from Hammond et al’s (1992) findings. One of these projects was Jackson’s *Non-Language Outcomes in the Adult Migrant English Program* (AMEP). The aim of this NLO project was to:

- identify outcomes other than language gains made by learners in the AMEP
- explore the relationship between these outcomes and language gains
- situate those outcomes in the context of current education and vocational reform. 
- explore some of the more commonly held preconceptions about NLO
- address issues to do with the assessment and recording of these types of outcomes

(Jackson, 1994: 3)
This investigation into NLO was significant for two reasons. Firstly, it proposed a format for expressing these as clearly defined competencies in line with the education and industry reforms. Secondly, it provided a theoretical analysis of NLO by demonstrating that these gains were interrelated with the language and literacy learning process.

A review of Jackson’s project follows.

1.3 Non-language outcomes: Jackson’s project

In 1992, the researcher Elaine Jackson conducted a survey of 72 teachers employed in the New South Wales AMES (See Appendix 1.1). The purpose of the survey was to identify a set of important outcomes of the classroom language learning process “which do not relate solely to language learning but are nonetheless common outcomes of instruction regardless of content or objectives” (Jackson, 1993: 2). Jackson posits that within schools these outcomes are valued by parents and teachers and tend to be recorded as comments alongside specific subject results. However, in an adult education contexts there was no formal recording of NLO so these were often ignored.

The results of Jackson’s survey (Appendix 1.2) identified the emergence of eight broad categories of NLO based on over 200 responses to the teacher surveys. These were:

- Confidence
- Social, psychological and emotional support in the new living and learning environment
- Knowledge of social institutions
- Cultural awareness
- Learning skills
- Goal clarification
- Motivation
- Access and entry into further study employment, and community life.
The identification of these eight NLO categories enabled Jackson to develop a framework for expressing these as legitimate learning outcomes of ESL courses. This was a crucial development as Jackson (1994: 60) suggests that NLO are often perceived as "free floating, marginal and largely unintended by-products of education and training programs despite their relevance to the underpinning of efficient, effective and productive work practices".

Working from this premise that NLO were important outcomes to the language and literacy learning process and that these were fundamental skills required for successful participation in the workplace, Jackson (1994) proposed a competency-based model for NLO which would enable the integration of these non-content gains with the traditional content areas of language and literacy. The content areas tended to focus explicitly on the development of the macro skills of reading, writing, speaking and listening and often included an understanding of mathematical concepts. Jackson's model was a contrast to the perception that NLO and content gains were two completely separate and divergent outcomes.

1.3.1 Integrating content and non-language outcomes

The divergence of NLO, Jackson contends, occurs as the individual moves along the education continuum. In the early years of primary education, the development of skills such as confidence, independence, and resourcefulness are acknowledged and reported to parents. The emergence of these skills is documented equally along with the child's development in the traditional content areas of reading and writing and mathematics. However, as the child progresses through secondary school, specifically to about the age of 15 or 16, content and NLO suddenly diverge with NLO becoming less valued. In fact
of 15 or 16, content and NLO suddenly diverge with NLO becoming less valued. In fact as Jackson (1994: 69) observes, "the older a learner becomes, the less frequently these outcomes are reported upon except in the negative: is ‘uncooperative and lazy in class’" (see Figure 1.1 following).

Jackson (1994) believes the difference between adult and child learning equates closely to societal beliefs about what children and adults can do by the virtue of being adults and children. In other words, adults are expected to have attained a set of skills with specific reference to the educational process which equip them for living and working within a range of different contexts. Those who do not attain these skills are often judged as being "unworthy (personally and morally in relation to the further expenditure of public monies) and often as unteachable" (1994: 69).

The relationship with age and the development of these skills has resulted in the tendency for NLO to be described as psychological attributes of individual personalities. Jackson believes that this view has contributed to the separation of language and NLO in adult literacy programs particularly when self-esteem and confidence are seen to be preconditions for successful language and literacy learning. Adopting an integrated approach within the social context of the classroom, however, means that teachers would explicitly teach adult learners the skills and strategies which are inextricably linked to successful language and literacy developments. Thus, Jackson’s eight broad categories of NLO would be addressed concurrently with content objectives in a contextualised approach to language.
Figure 1.1 Separation of content from non-content outcomes in relation to age and progress through the education system (Jackson, 1994: 69).

AGE IN YEARS

1-7 8-12 12-18 18+

pre-school infants

Content & non-content identical

increases divergence of content and non-content outcomes

TERTIARY AGE

complete divor of content an non-content outcomes

The results of Jackson’s work lead to the inclusion of NLO in the CSWE, a competency-based curriculum framework which was developed by the New South Wales Adult Migrant Education Services for ESL learners. NLO are expressed either directly or embedded within the other competencies of the framework. An example of the competencies appears in Figure 1.2.

Whilst the CSWE was designed for ESL learners it is generally not used with the kinds of ESL literacy learners who feature in this research. Bottomley et al (1994: 44) explain:

the CSWE is not suitable for high oracy low literacy students as statements of competence in the CSWE are only given when an individual has reached the same level of development in all four (macro) skills.

The CSWE is more often used with ESL learners whose levels of written language are roughly similar to their spoken language, including those with high levels of formal
education. These learners are primarily those who have arrived in Australia within the last three years and who are entitled to five hundred and ten hours of free English tuition through the Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (DIMA). This is in contrast to the ESL literacy learners of this study who have resided in Australia for five to forty years. ESL literacy learners also have little or no formal education and, therefore, need to be taught a range of learning skills and strategies that will help them to improve their literacy skills. They are usually enrolled in ALBE programs which focus more explicitly on improving the reading and writing skills of both ESL and ESB learners. As a consequence, credentials which have been designed primarily to cater for literacy needs of native speakers are also used with ESL literacy learners. The CGEA, which is the focus of this thesis, is an example of one accreditation framework which is widely used throughout Australia with both ESB and ESL literacy learners.

The next section presents an overview of the CGEA including its accreditation framework.

1.4 The development and composition of the Certificates of General Education for Adults (CGEA)

In 1990, the Australian Language and Literacy Policy (ALLP) directives deemed that adult education providers in both ALBE and ESL sectors needed to become more accountable in order to secure program funding. Coupled with the new policy provisions and competition for tenders, the adult literacy sector commenced working on the development of a draft curriculum document of clearly defined learner outcomes and pathways.
Figure 1.2. Stage 1 Learning competencies of the CSWE which incorporate Jackson’s (1994) non-language outcomes.

### Competency 1
**Can undertake the roles and responsibilities of a learner in a formal learning environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Performance Criteria</th>
<th>Range Statements</th>
<th>Evidence Guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. can demonstrate understanding of the role of assessment</td>
<td>• participates in assessment tasks</td>
<td>• L1 assistance (where available)</td>
<td>Sample Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. can demonstrate understanding of own role in language learning</td>
<td>• uses teacher feedback to modify own learning</td>
<td>• ongoing assessment throughout course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. can participate effectively in learning situations</td>
<td>• demonstrates learner autonomy as required by, for example:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- revising classwork at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- fulfilling Distance Learning learning contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• follows teacher instructions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• participates in a range of learning activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• fulfills formal participation requirements eg attendance and punctuality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Competency 2
**Can use a range of learning strategies and resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Performance Criteria</th>
<th>Range Statements</th>
<th>Evidence Guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. can use L1 resources</td>
<td>• uses L1 resources as available</td>
<td>• ongoing assessment throughout course</td>
<td>Sample Task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. can manipulate implements for text production</td>
<td>• manipulates implements for text production eg pen, pencil, rubber etc as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. can use equipment in the learning environment</td>
<td>• uses equipment in the learning environment eg cassette player, video player, telephone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. can organise materials to assist learning</td>
<td>• organises materials to assist learning:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- stores, retrieves and maintains materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- sends back appropriate work in Distance Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. can use strategies for learning outside a formal learning environment</td>
<td>• uses library, individual learning centre and resource centres as available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. can use basic techniques to aid memory</td>
<td>• uses techniques to aid memory eg:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- notes/marks unfamiliar items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- practices new language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1992, adult literacy practitioners McCormack and Bradshaw wrote the original competence documents for the framework that was eventually to become the CGEA. This draft document was called the *Adult Basic Accreditation Framework (ABEAF)* Project: *Competencies Statements for Adult Reading and Writing Volumes One and Two*
only included competencies for Reading and Writing. The final CGEA contains three other streams apart from the Reading and Writing competencies. These are the Numerical and Mathematical Concepts stream, the Oral Communication stream, which was written by Chris Corbel from AMES, and the General Curriculum Options (GCO) which replicate the Mayer Key Competencies. These Key Competencies were developed by the Mayer Committee (1992) and are considered to be the prerequisite skills required for young people's entry to the workforce.

The Numerical and Mathematical Concepts competencies are also based on Volume Three of the Victorian ABEAF Project and the draft work of the *National Framework of Adult English, Language, Literacy and Numeracy Competence* which "sets the context for the provision of mathematics within language and literacy projects" (ACFEB, 1993: 196). However, this stream is not relevant to this thesis and, therefore, no further discussion of Numerical and Mathematical Concepts is included.

The CGEA was accreditated for three years initially and in 1994 the reaccreditation process for the CGEA commenced. In 1997 the rewriting was completed, culminating the end of three years' investigation into issues surrounding the implementation of the CGEA. The reaccreditation of the CGEA involved an analysis of teachers' experiences and reflections of using the framework, incorporated responses from Sanguinetti's (1995) CGEA evaluation project outcomes and included directives from the reaccreditation team.
Before introducing the second version of the CGEA which is used in this thesis, it is important to briefly examine whether NLO were recognised in the first edition of the framework.

1.4.1 Non-language outcomes in the first version of the Certificates of General Education for Adults

In the Reading and Writing, Oral Communication and the Numerical and Mathematics stream there was clearly no recognition of NLO in the competencies in each of these streams. However, accompanying the Reading and Writing stream of this edition of the CGEA was a set of introductory papers called the Background Works which were also taken from the original ABEAF.

One of the features of the Background Works was the identification of nine educational principles which relate to the development of competence in the various literacies of the CGEA. The different purposes of these literacies are described in Table 1.1. Of interest is the claim that the development of literacy is "intimately entwined with, and influenced by" (ACFEB, 1993: 150) the inter-play of social, cognitive, emotional and psychological factors. In order to further illustrate how this inter relationship occurs, the diagram Figure 1.3 overleaf is used in the Background Works (p. 153).
An examination of Figure 1.3 reveals that the philosophical model underpinning the CGEA is well-balanced between psychological/cognitive and social theories of language. However, this introductory paper only pertained to the Reading and Writing streams. While the actual competency statements for the Reading and Writing stream have this philosophy underlying them, NLO were not explicitly included as observable outcomes in this stream of the CGEA.

The remaining stream of the CGEA, the General Curriculum Options, has more potential for recording NLO. An examination of this is stream is detailed in section 1.5.
The next section of the chapter introduces the structure of the second edition of the CGEA which is used in this thesis.

1.4.2 The structure of the Certificates of General Education for Adult

The CGEA is divided into the four streams: Reading and Writing, Oral Communication, Numerical and Mathematical Concepts and the General Curriculum Options (GCO). There are four different levels of each stream. One level of one stream, for example, Level 1 Reading and Writing is called a module. There are a total of sixteen different modules and on completion of a module the learners can receive a Statement of Attainment.

*Figure 1.4 below presents an overview of the Certificate 1 (Foundation) of the CGEA.*

Further examples of accreditation are contained in Appendix 1.3.

*Figure 1.4 The accreditation levels for Certificate 1 (Foundation) of the CGEA.*
As can be seen these modules are sequential but they have flexible entry and exit points.

Table 1.1 overleaf presents an overview of the structure of the three CGEA streams course which feature in this study. It also records the course delivery requirements.
Table 1.1 An overview of the structure of the CGEA streams and course delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purposes</th>
<th>Reading and Writing Stream</th>
<th>Oral Communication Stream</th>
<th>General Curriculum Options Stream</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literacy for self expression</td>
<td></td>
<td>Active Listening</td>
<td>Collecting, analysing and organising information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy for practical purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oracy for Practical Purposes</td>
<td>Communicating ideas and information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy for knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oracy for Exploring Issues and Problem Solving</td>
<td>Planning and organising activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy for public debate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Working with others and in teams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Assessment Requirements          | To complete a module learners need to be assessed on all eight learning outcomes | To complete a module learners need to be assessed on all three learning outcomes | To complete a module learners need to be assessed on three out of eight learning outcomes |

| Course Delivery                  | Can be taught and assessed as a discrete unit or integrated with other CGEA streams | Can be taught and assessed as a discrete unit or integrated with other CGEA streams | Can be taught and assessed as a discrete unit or integrated with other CGEA streams |

| Nominal delivery hours           | 80 hours                     | 80 hours                   | 80 hours |

| Course Context                   | Offered as a credential in literacy classes for ESL or ESB learners | Offered as a credential in literacy classes for ESL or ESB learners | Flexible course delivery offered over a range of contexts: "saddlery to stained glass windows, from Australian studies to Cookery, from horticulture to music, from literacy to workplace skills: interwoven with the basic literacy and numeracy needs relevant to each student" (Walker, 1996: 15) |

As indicated in Table 1.1, the CGEA offers flexible delivery options. Each of these CGEA streams can be offered or assessed as a discrete module or integrated with other streams.
The CGEA is underpinned by a sociocultural view of language. The introductory section, for example, states that the Reading and Writing stream is organised "to correspond to the four main social contexts in which we function within Australian society: family and social life: workplace and institutional settings; education and training contexts; and community and civic life" (p. 6). The learning outcomes of the Oral Communication streams in a similar way also reflect the different social purposes of spoken language. An example of learning outcomes for these two streams appear follow.

Figure 1.5. Learning Outcomes 2.1 from the Oral Communication stream of the CGEA.

---

### Learning outcome 2.1 Active Listening

**Demonstrate meaning has been gained from short oral texts which may include some unfamiliar aspects.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment criteria</th>
<th>Conditions of assessment</th>
<th>Assessment tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) identify key information from an oral text</td>
<td>- The subject matter will be everyday and may include some unfamiliar aspects</td>
<td>Where possible, tasks to assess specific assessment criteria from this learning outcome should be integrated with other learning outcomes from other streams. Some of the sample tasks listed below have been integrated with learning outcomes from the Reading and Writing stream. Tasks similar in complexity may be developed across streams:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) get the gist from a sustained oral text</td>
<td>- Advice/ modelling is available if required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Contexts will be familiar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Vocabulary used will be familiar or everyday which may include some unknown words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The structure will be characteristic of the oral text type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content/underpinning knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Listen to a TV news item, identify main points, then compare with a newspaper report on the same item (covers assessment criteria (a) &amp; (b) and links to Learning Outcome 2.2 and 2.4 Reading for Knowledge and/or Public Debate in the Reading and Writing Stream)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The content underpinning knowledge may include, but is not restricted to.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Listen for personally relevant information from a public announcement, eg. find date and time of public event from a radio announcement (covers assessment criteria (a))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- understanding of broad ranges of vocabulary from everyday contexts</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Listen to a presentation on unfamiliar topic and relate general information to a partner (covers assessment criteria (b))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- comprehension of longer texts with nuanced complexity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- use knowledge of structure of text to predict content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Just as NLO were not articulated in the competencies of the Reading and Writing and Oral communication streams in the first edition of the CGEA, these gains are not directly expressed in the learning outcomes of the revised version of these CGEA streams. Furthermore, the introductory papers to the Reading and Writing stream referred to as the *Background Works* are not contained in the revised CGEA. To recall, (see *Figure 1.3*) although NLO were not explicitly included in the learning outcomes of this stream, there was a clear philosophical underpinning within the CGEA which recognised the interrelationship between the social, psychological, cognitive and emotional aspects of literacy competence.

Johnson and Brearley (1994: 9) believe that the learning outcomes of the GCO “provides an opportunity for learners to demonstrate their life skills, to build upon existing competencies and experience successful background learning outcomes”. For this reason, it is possible that the very broad and flexible learning outcomes of the GCO when integrated with the delivery of the Reading and Writing and/or the Oral Communication streams may provide a format for assessing some but not all kinds NLO. For this reason a more in depth look at the GCO follows.

1.5 The General Curriculum Options and Non-language Outcomes (NLO)

The competencies of the GCO are summarised in Figure 1.7. (see Appendix 1.3). These competencies are borrowed from the Mayer (1992) Committee’s *Key Competencies Report: Putting General Education to Work*. The directive of this committee was to develop a set of key generic skills which described the perquisite skills young people required to commence employment. In the original version of the CGEA, there were only seven Key Competencies. However, in the revised CGEA, an eighth competency
on ‘cultural understanding’ was included. Originally the Mayer Report (1992) recommended that this competency be incorporated into the other seven Key Competencies. However, in order to “make the required knowledge and skills explicit” (p. 11), it was later included as a separate learning outcome. Currently, the CGEA is the only competency-based curriculum and assessment framework that replicates the Mayer Key Competencies (Walker 1996).

In referring to Table 1.1 it is evident that the GCO stream is extremely broad and can be applied to an enormous range of contexts. This distinguishes these GCO learning outcomes from Jackson’s (1994) NLO which she contends are inextricably linked to language and literacy gains, and which are clearly focused on ensuring the learner becomes familiar with formal learning environments and develops a range of learning strategies. However, even if the GCO are not underpinned by a theory of language and language learning, the very broadness of these learning outcomes, in fact, means that technically they can be used to document some NLO. This is especially so because in many instances the GCO are integrated with the Reading and Writing and Oral Communication streams.

Figure 1.7 provides an example of one of the GCO learning outcomes.
Figure 1.7 Learning outcome 1.1 from the General Curriculum Options of the CGEA: 
An overview

Summary of Learning Outcomes
1.1 Can collect, analyse and organise information
1.2 Can plan and organise activities
1.3 Can communicate ideas and information
1.4 Can work with others and in teams
1.5 Can use mathematical ideas and techniques
1.6 Can solve problems
1.7 Can use technology
1.8 Can identify, analyse, and apply the practices of culture

Content/Underpinning knowledge
For each learning outcome these may include but are not restricted to:

1. Can collect, analyse and organise information
   • Identifying purpose of information, recognising the nature of the audience and sources of information
   • Identifying modes of information delivery
     - Oral, text based, visual, technological
   • Recognising social, cultural and ethical responsibility in the use and management of information
     - Privacy, copyright, plagiarism, defamation, libel, censorship
   • Locating and acquiring information:
     - Libraries, community sources, resource directories, experts, specialist
   • Accessing and retrieval techniques and principles:
     - Retrieval tools ranging from hard copy indexes to computer based systems
     - Research strategies - defining topic, creating a plan, following steps, asking questions
   • Analysis and organisation of information:
     - Creating and recognising categories, sorting for key information, filing systems
   • Observational and recording techniques:
     - Taking notes, filling in tables, drawing diagrams, interview techniques
   • Evaluating quality and validity of information:
     - Asking the right questions, identifying bias of sources.

| Learning outcome 1.1 General Curriculum Options |
| Can collect, analyse and organise information |

| Assessment criteria |
| All assessment criteria must be met in the one assessment task/activity |
| a) follow task guidelines for the collection, analysis, and organisation of information |
| b) access and record information from a given source |
| c) organise information into predetermined categories where relevant. |
| c) Check information for completeness and accuracy. |

| Assessment tasks |
| Where possible this learning outcome should be integrated with at least two other learning outcomes. An assessment task similar in complexity to one of the following may be appropriate(Please note that these interlink with other learning outcomes as part of a broader learning process): |
| • Draw up a list of participant's favourite television programs and decide if one program is more popular than another (see also 1.5, 1.3) |
| • Observe a simple science experiment, discuss what was seen with a partner, and then fill in a 'true/false' answer sheet (see 1.4 & 1.2) |
| • Record the weight of two lots of 10, crushed, aluminium cans, on a simple chart (see 1.3 & 1.5). |

| Conditions of Assessment |
| The student will have access to: |
| • A learning environment appropriate to the task |
| • Support from expert/mentor, advice modelling and recourse to first/other language |
| • Communication supports as required. |
| The subject matter will be familiar and/or personal |

| The guidelines for the completion of the task will be established and clear. |
| The nature of the task will be simple with information required from one source |
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There is also an acknowledgment within the introductory section of the GCO that “for many students it is the capacity to ‘learn to learn’ that has been absent from their past educational experience” (ACFEB, 1997: 257). This implies that there is an awareness within the CGEA that adults do need to learn a range of skills and strategies to facilitate their learning in a range of contexts. The GCO may possibly incorporate some of these skills although the learning outcomes within this stream are not as comprehensive as Jackson’s (1994) eight broad categories of NLO.

1.6 Focus and structure of the thesis

The introduction of CBA credentials like the CGEA has had ramifications for ESL literacy learners. This is partly because these learners have both second language and literacy needs which are not always catered for within the credentials of either the ESL or ALBE fields. It is also because the characteristics of these learners are extremely diverse as are their reasons for attending literacy classes. Not all ESL literacy learners are seeking employment. They enrol in classes to develop their literacy skills and improve their access to such things as their local community and their English-speaking grandchildren.

This investigation was motivated by a personal interest in low-level ESL literacy learners and by a concern that many non-language gains that these learners made were not always recognised in credentials like the CGEA. It seemed to be important to find out in actual ESL literacy contexts using the CGEA how teachers viewed NLO and whether they believed that the CGEA acknowledged these. An added complexity is the
fact that low-level ESL literacy learners are not necessarily the primary client for which the CGEA was intended, yet it is being used for these learners.

Hence the main research question guiding this thesis was:

- How does the CGEA cater for NLO in adult ESL literacy classrooms?

In order to examine this research question, it was also important to gain a better understanding of what teachers saw as ESL literacy learner characteristics.

1.7 Structure of the thesis

The structure of the rest of the thesis is as follows. Chapter 2 examines the literature related to the three crucial research elements of the thesis namely, ESL literacy learner characteristics, NLO and the CGEA. Chapter 3 introduces the pilot study and presents the final qualitative multi-case study research design. Chapter 4 describes the six case study teachers and their classroom contexts. Chapter 5 presents the findings in relation to the research questions. Chapter 6 reports on the research questions and addresses the implications of these findings.

An exploration of the literature related to ESL literacy learners, NLO and the CGEA now follows in Chapter 2.
CHAPTER 2
THE ESL LITERACY LEARNER, NON-LANGUAGE OUTCOMES AND THE CGEA: A REVIEW

2.1 Overview

This chapter reviews the relevant literature related to the main research question. To recap this was:

- How does the CGEA cater for NLO in adult ESL literacy classrooms?

Firstly, the chapter examines the contemporary definitions of 'literacy' and describes the characteristics of ESL literacy learners. Secondly, it critically examines Jackson's (1994) study on non-language outcomes, focussing specifically on those outcomes which are relevant to the target group of learners. This is important because since the introduction of CBA, as described in Chapter 1, assessment practices in adult education have undergone enormous changes. These changes have often lead to the omission of NLO within given accreditation frameworks. For this reason, the CGEA is examined in order to ascertain whether this competency-based credentials caters for NLO and therefore whether it is suitable to use with ESL literacy learners.

2.2 Definitions of literacy in an Australian context

This section of the chapter reviews the reconceptualisation of literacy over the last decade and looks at its implications for ESL literacy learners of this study.

In recent times, the term 'literacy' has been reconceptualised from one which focuses on the individual's basic reading and writing ability to one which reflects the spoken and
written sociocultural practices within given communities. Barton (1994: 32) states that “literacy is a set of social practices associated with particular systems and their related technologies. To be literate is to be confident within these practices”. Due to the recognition of the diversity of literacy in and across societies, to refer to literacy as a singular concept is ‘inappropriate’ and therefore, the term ‘literacies’ is now utilised (Gee, 1990; Black and Thorp, 1997; Wrigley, 1993). Indeed, credentials like the CGEA refer to literacy in its plural form.

Central to this understanding of literacy is a belief that within given cultures and societies the literacies which pertain to the dominant cultures are highly valued. In a westernised context, schools have been perceived to be sites of “potential social mobility” (Cope and Kalantzis, 1993: 8) as these educational institutions are responsible for teaching students about the different structures and functions of literacies that are valued in a given society. In particular, these highly valued schooled literacies tend to reflect Australian mono-lingual culture (Farrell, 1996). Gee (1999: 49) refers to these discourses as “essay-text literacies”.

Gee's (1990) theory of ‘Discourse’ distinguishes between what he terms ‘primary’ and ‘secondary’ Discourses. Primary Discourses are those first learnt literacies which are used within families. ‘Secondary Discourses’ develop as the individual engages with employment, social and education institutions including “schools, workplaces, stores, government offices, business and churches” (p. 151). Gee asserts that Discourses define group membership and reflect power structures. He also contends that a definition of literacy involves ‘mastery’ over these Secondary Discourses. Therefore, even amongst
those who speak English, there will be a range of different primary Discourses which are reflective of sociocultural stratification.

Whilst the concept of primary and secondary Discourses has always existed within cultures, the implications for those in Australian mainstream society who have not 'mastered' secondary Discourses is now more pronounced. In Chapter One, the ramifications of the economic and industrial changes that have occurred during the last decade, including the introduction of competency-based credentials, were described. Adult ESL and ALBE courses have now become economically driven as the focus on vocational, educational and training outcomes supersedes the learning needs of many clients. This linking of literacy with economic improvements has implications for those who come from languages other than English backgrounds. Rado (1995), Davison (1996) and Kalantzis (1992) all assert that for one of the major issues for ESL learners is that literacy in Australia is equated with English literacy. This is because the learning outcomes of competency-based credentials and the literacies promoted in adult education contexts only use English texts. As Rado (1995: 16) states "despite official recognition of the importance of knowing a language other than English (LOTE) in Australia, special provision is rarely made to develop and maintain non-English speaking immigrant first language". Davison (1996: 50) acknowledges that English is the "language of public communication in Australian, although with reference to multilingual adults she believes that "literacy should enhance the learners' existing language skills, not be a substitute for them". In other words, being multi-lingual should be viewed as an asset not a deficit.
Jones (1995) contends that in some ways all ESL learners are literacy students whilst they are learning the discourses of Australian society. In an American (and Australian) context this is also supported by Murray (1998). However, those ESL learners who are familiar with the ‘powerful’ discourses within their own cultural communities will be able to transfer their knowledge to the new cultural context. Jones (1995: 14) further posits that those from ‘marginalised’ communities will have difficulty accessing the valued “systems of power”. In an adult literacy context, Davison et al (1994) and Hood (1990) suggest that the primary Discourses used by many LOTE background (and ESB) learners do not equate with the dominant ‘essay-text’ Discourses of the Australian society. In other words, there is a ‘mismatch’ between the learners’ comprehension of these valued or mainstream literacies and what is familiar to them culturally and linguistically, in their everyday lives.

Wickert (1993) believes that just as ‘schooled literacies’ have been highly valued, in the adult education sector these are now being replaced with ‘workplace literacies’. Morris (1998) and Nichols and Sangster (1996) and Murray (1998) also comment on the predominance of ‘workplace literacies’ which currently shapes many adult education classes. Morris (1998: 10) argues that this focus “homogenises” the learners’ reasons for attending classes by forcing them to “meet the educational agenda set by others.” This is because many competency-based credentials focus on the acquisition and assessment of learning outcomes which relate purely to workplace literacies. This reductionist approach to adult education funding assumes that all learners enrolled in ESL literacy classes are seeking to improve their literacy skills for employment purposes. Hence, Lee and Wickert (1994: 57) believe that this workplace educational agenda which is set by governments serves “the needs of the funding agency rather than
the needs of the students”. This focus ignores the myriad of other reasons learners have for attending adult literacy classes.

The potential shift in content towards vocationally orientated literacy within ALBE and ESL classes ignores the myriad of other reasons learners have for attending adult literacy classes. Learners from both ESB and ESL backgrounds may come to class to improve their literacy skills simply so they can communicate more effectively with their children or grandchildren. However, whilst both ESB and ESL learners have specific literacy needs, both groups have different characteristics and different learning requirements. As this thesis focuses specifically on ESL literacy learners, a review of the characteristics of this target group follows.

2.3 Characteristics of ESL literacy learners

In order to answer the main research question of how the CGEA caters for non-language outcomes in ESL literacy learners, it is first necessary to establish an understanding of the characteristics of ESL literacy learners. One example of an ESL literacy learner's profile is given by Dixon and Lyons (1995: 1) who state that these learners:

have relatively high oral communication skills and comparatively low literacy skills in English; have had limited education in their native country or in Australia; usually are long-term residents of Australia or some other English speaking country.

Dixon and Lyons’ (1995) foregoing characteristics are now used to examine the features of ESL literacy learners.
2.3.1 High oracy low literacy skills

Within the adult ESL and adult literacy field, one pedagogically useful definition describes the target group of learners as having ‘high oracy low literacy’ needs (Moraro and McIntyre, 1988). It is assumed that many ESL literacy learners have acquired a good understanding of informal spoken modes of English such as casual conversation. In comparison, they do not have a well developed knowledge of print-based English. Whilst spoken and written modes of literacy are inextricably linked, the teaching and assessment of oracy appears to be more problematical. In adult literacy classes, for example, the learners often have difficulty mastering the spoken and written literacies of the classroom context. Apart from issues of accessing mainstream discourses, the assessment criteria of many competency-based credentials can present problems for ESL literacy learners. Literacy in Australia is equated with dominant Anglo-Australian English and assessment benchmarks in many frameworks reflect this. Faine (1995: 10) argues that assessment and reporting credentials like the CGEA, apart from highlighting “what the learner cannot do, rather than what they can do” focus implicitly on standards of target language use. This contention is also shared by Suda (1995) and Sanguinetti (1995) who both question the notion of “culturally exclusive” benchmarking particularly for the assessment of spoken discourse. A more in depth examination of competency-based assessment (CBA) appears in section 3.5.

The use of the label ‘high oracy low literacy’ has implications for ESL literacy learners. ‘Low literacy’ in an adult literacy context reflects the learners’ limited mastery of written text. In contrast, the term ‘high oracy’ suggests that the learner’s ability to use spoken modes of discourse is ‘comparatively’ more developed. However, many linguists such as Allwright and Bailey (1991) argue that the oral language of these ESL
literacy learners is ‘fossilised’. Allwright and Bailey (1991) perceive that ‘fossilisation’ is oral language which is characterised by a system of linguistic forms that do not match the target language model.

McIntyre (1995) disregards the term ‘fossilised speech’ because of its negative connotations. Instead, he prefers to use the term ‘stabilised learners’. He perceives that this term more clearly describes what has happened to the learner’s language development. In the initial stages the learners acquired language which was relevant for their needs and subsequently their speech stabilised. Faine (1995: 8) also rejects the use of the word fossilisation preferring the use of the second language acquisition concept of ‘interlanguage’ (Selinker, 1972). Faine's position is linked to her belief that interlanguage implies “difference” rather than the notion of “deficit” which is associated with fossilised speech. Faine perceives that the term ‘interlanguage’ describes the language of post war Australian immigrants to Australia who feature in many adult literacy classes. McIntyre (1995: 185) observes that these migrants often “have developed a level of English which is suitable for daily purposes”. However, this has been acquired informally over the years in social situations and explains why many of these learners have developed appropriate casual conversation skills.

Rado and D’Cruz (1994: 86) suggest that there are several contexts or domains in which ESL learners use mother tongue or English. Within the “intimate domain” of close friends, family and relatives, these learners communicate in their first language. However, in the language for the public and social domain their need to use English is greater. Rado and D’Cruz's concept of the public and social language domain complements Gee’s (1990) identification of ‘public sphere’ secondary Discourse. Gee
asserts that these all “involve interactions with people beyond the initial socialising group and the local community” (p.52). The CGEA itself also suggests the need for learners to access the literacies of “community and civic life” (p.8). The notion of having higher oracy is often limited to learners only being proficient in the social domains and contexts. Hence, ESL literacy learners still need to access both the written and spoken forms of the dominant discourses in order to fully function in mainstream Australian society.

If the target group of learners are described as having higher oracy skills, what function does this serve in an adult ESL literacy classroom? Hammond et al (1992: 38) report that the development of written language is as important as oracy. Traditionally, ESL courses have focussed heavily on spoken language although now there is a greater emphasis on teaching written forms of literacy. Despite this focus, the roles of spoken and written language are inextricably linked, particularly, in the context of the classroom.

Suda (1995) comments on the amount of talking that goes on around texts within adult literacy classrooms. McIntyre (1995) also posits that the concept of translating written language into spoken language is a feature of ALBE classrooms. This technique is used when the teacher talks and interprets and discusses a written text, prior to its first reading with the learners. This strategy is especially useful for ESL literacy learners who are capable of orally discussing texts well above their reading and writing levels. Colman and Schiffman (1993: 50) also believe that for the target group of learners “it is especially important to work to reading and writing via spoken English”. This “pre-teaching” enables the teacher to contextualise the task. In these examples, the learners rely heavily on spoken language to assist their understanding of written text. This
supports the notion that these learners do have “higher oracy skills” and their reliance on the spoken mode of discourse to complete literacy tasks. Black and Thorp (1997: 14) comment that some learners rely heavily on “switching to oral modes as a means of circumventing literacy events”. Therefore, in adult ESL (and ESB) literacy classrooms, having ‘high oracy’ assists the learners to discuss and unravel the linguistic and schematic features of mainstream written texts.

The characteristic of having higher oracy skills generally applies to ESL literacy learners who have resided in Australian for many years and who have acquired English informally. Yet it is important to keep in mind the specific contextual nature of the ESL literacy learners' high oracy ability. In recent times, many of the newer Australian immigrants such as the Hmong peoples and those from some communities in the Horn of Africa are dominated by oral cultures. These ESL literacy learners certainly display higher oracy in their first language as they have no familiarity with written forms of language (Dixon and Lyons, 1995). These learners are often described as non-literates (Hood 1990). In these examples, the learners’ level of oral proficiency may not be as influential in shaping their literacy proficiency as their lack of familiarity with written texts and their limited or no experience of formal education. Indeed, Hammond et al (1992) comment that many ESL learners find the experience of learning a second language difficult because they lack a basic education. Some researchers such as McKay (1993) posit that the formal learning skills and strategies which have accompanied the development of literacy in the first language can transferable into the second language learning context. The characteristic of ESL literacy learners displaying low levels of formal education is examined next.
2.3.2 Limited formal education

One of the most important and influential factors within the ESL literacy learner’s profile relates to formal education attainment. Dixon and Lyons’ (1995) characteristic of ‘limited formal education’ is not quantified. However, many of the learners in adult ESL literacy classes, such as the post war Italian and Greek immigrants, have not completed primary school education. In some instances, these adults have never undertaken any formal schooling.

In order to examine why many of these learners have only had primary school education, it is important to reflect on the political, economic, historical and cultural practices of societies which affect access to formal education. Jackson (1993), Davison et al (1994) and Frohman (1996) all acknowledge that many of these learners have interrupted schooling due to war and political unrest in their country of origin. Harris, Ison and Thompson (1998) and McKay (1993) contend that some learners come from cultures with a strong oral tradition where literacy does not have the same status as in westernized society. However, these learners are often highly literate in the literacy practices which structure their societies even if these do not complement the westernised notion of print-based literacies. McKay (1993: 8) underscores this:

What literacy is cannot be separated from how literacy is used by individuals within their community and how it is valued. Thus, the fact that some societies put a high economic value on literacy while others do not or that some cultures depend heavily on written language to transmit knowledge while others do not is central to defining literacy.

One additional factor which often reflects limited levels of education is the issue of gender. Faine (1990) and Nichols and Sangster (1996) report that in some cultures women are not given the same educational opportunities as males. Many of these women never attend school while others leave after a few years to work in the family
home or on the land. It is also important to recall that historically workers could obtain semi-skilled and unskilled employment which did not require them to have high levels of literacy.

The limited formal education and lack of familiarity with written English distinguishes ESL literacy learners from other LOTE background learners who have high levels of formal education in their first language. The lack of formal learning experience in the cultural context of an Australian classroom also distinguishes ESL literacy learners from English speaking background (ESB) learners with literacy needs. Therefore, limited formal education is a significant characteristic in the ESL literacy learners' profile.

### 2.3.3 Long term residence

'Long term residency' reflects the number of years the learner has lived in Australia. Although Dixon and Lyons (1995) have not quantified this number of years, there is a tendency amongst literacy providers to equate this figure with a minimum of five years residence. Furthermore, in some instances it includes learners who have lived in Australia for up to forty years.

Faine (1995) observes that many long term resident ESL literacy learners are post war immigrants. Davison et al (1994) and Wickert (1993) also note that within this category some are older, retrenched workers. This group is strongly represented by women formerly employed in the textile, clothing and footwear (TCF) factories and by men from the car manufacturing industries (McIntyre, 1995). Whilst some are seeking to improve their literacy skills for re-employment, older learners come to class to learn English for a variety of different reasons. Raleigh (1998: 23) elucidates this point:
Limitations imposed by poor English skills can influence the elderly migrant’s experience of life in Australia. Communication between generations, community participation and access to information can be severely hampered without adequate English language skills. This can result in isolation, dissatisfaction and embarrassment. For some access to even the basic necessities such as health services and shopping for daily requirements is limited because of poor English.

In the same way that older learners feature within adult ESL literacy classes, women also comprise a high portion of ‘long term residence’ enrolments. In the foregoing section, reasons why women may have lower levels of education in their first language were explored. However, women’s access to second language education is also affected by their gender. Mudaly (1992) and Griffith (1990) observe that for many women who have retired from paid employment or finished raising their families, this is the first opportunity they have had to attend formal English classes. Black and Thorp (1997) also note that at times some males are hostile to their partners wanting to learn English. In some instances women are caught in a domestic “web of dependence” (Black and Thorp, 1997: 15) whereby they are forced to depend on their children and male partners due to their limited knowledge of English. Mudaly (1992) further asserts that this lack of English creates isolation barriers. Foster and Rado (1992), Mudaly (1992) and Troy (1990) all perceive that women’s access to literacy classes may be impeded by practical issues such as a lack of childcare or adequate transport facilities.

Whilst Dixon and Lyons’ (1995) characterisation of ESL literacy learners is quite widespread, as is the label of ‘high oracy low literacy’, there is no one set of criteria that are used by all adult education providers to classify these learners. In Technical and Further Education (TAFE) and AMES organisations, the Australian Second Language Proficiency Rating (ASLPR) is used to assess the learner’s oracy for class placement. However, the ASLPR has not been formally adopted by all community providers
outside TAFE and AMES. In community settings, class placement is often determined by interview with the coordinator whereby the learner completes a range of spoken and written tasks to determine literacy competence. This procedure is generally conducted by the centre coordinator. In addition, the interview includes background information about the learner's level of schooling and length of residence in Australia. Whilst some locally produced placement guidelines are available such as Sara Lyons (1994) *An Assessment Guide for Adult Basic Education Programs in Victoria: incorporating the Certificates of General Education for Adults*, this has not been formally adopted by all providers delivering the CGEA. Instead, many centres have developed their own individual interview and class placement procedures.

In acknowledgment of the lack of consistent class placement procedures, Davison et al. (1994: 44) suggest that there are a number of factors that define the learner profile and these are: "language and literacy experience, competencies and practices, sociocultural background and familiarity with Anglo-Australian cultural practices and prior education, experience and attitudes". Davison et al (1994) believe that all these features should be factored into the class placement of literacy learners from both ESB and ESL backgrounds. Apart from assessing language competence, placements often reflect the learners' limited attainment of formal education.

This research project specifically targets low-level ESL literacy learners. In many educational providers delivering the CGEA these learners are placed in classes labelled as 'ESL literacy' or in a multi-ethnic class. As the characteristics of both classes and learners labelled 'ESL literacy' have been discussed, it is important to examine the other typical type of literacy class in which these learners feature. The purpose of this is also
to highlight the different needs of ESB and ESL learners even when they are taught together in a multi-ethnic class. A review of the features of the multi-ethnic class follows.

2.4 The multi-ethnic class

The multi-ethnic class, one that has learners from both ESB and ESL backgrounds, is now becoming predominant within many literacy programs (Davison et al 1994; Collins, 1996; Frohman, 1996; Taylor and Murray, 1998). It has been reported that in some TAFE colleges when ESL learners have a minimum level of ‘social proficiency’ (Taylor, 1993), or ASLPR 2, they are placed with ESB students. This occurs particularly in vocational and training contexts. It also happens when an institution is only funded for a certain number of hours or semesters for courses and class placements are subsequently affected. In these cases institutions may have to offer multi-ethnic classes as opposed to offering specific ESL literacy and native speaker literacy classes.

Hammond et al (1992: 130) conclude that it is appropriate to combine ESB and ESL students “if learners had similar goals, similar educational background and if NESB had developed considerable control of spoken language”. Faine (1995: 5) raises concern about using “ethnic origin as the most important criteria in class placement”. She perceives that this focus tends to “outweigh” other salient factors including “age or level of education”. Many of the ESL and ESB learners in multi ethnic classes, reveals that they have both had interrupted or negative schooling experiences. Furthermore, learners in multi-ethnic classes have not developed the appropriate learning-to-learn strategies and skills which pertain to the culture of a formal Australian learning environment. Similarly, both types of learners need to be explicitly taught how to access the
secondary Discourses of mainstream Australian-English. As Gee (1990) notes, many English speakers from marginalised social communities still need to learn those highly valued and dominant Discourses. Therefore, as Davison et al. (1994) suggest there are often similar gaps in the ESB and ESL learners’ socio-cultural knowledge but for very different reasons.

Several smaller, unpublished projects (Collins, 1995; Frohman, 1996) have also commented on the complexity of teaching a range of multi-ethnic learners highlighting specific concerns that the oral language needs of the LOTEB learners were not receiving sufficient attention. Apart from learning the appropriate use of spoken modes of discourse and their cultural contexts, it has been suggested that ESL learners need to “develop control of grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation of English” (Hammond and Wickert, 1993: 23). McIntyre (1995) also supports the explicit teaching of these linguistic features of the English language to ESL learners. However, Faine (1995: 10) argues that whilst there are some contexts where it is necessary to use target forms of discourse “the issue is, which contexts and under what that conditions?” Baynham (1991), for example, contends that “most students of Adult Basic Education would profit from experiences and strategies in handling public and formal modes of education”. This recommendation includes both ESL and ESB learners and is supported by the research of Davison et al. (1994) and Taylor and Murray (1998).

Frohman (1996) recommends that ESL learners need to have developed proficient spoken English language skills in order to be placed in multi-ethnic classes. However, even Frohman (1996: 22) concedes that “how coordinators determine the level of proficiency is debatable”. Davison et al. (1994) also believe that it is essential for ESL
literacy learners to have 'control' over spoken modes of English to be placed with ESB literacy learners. Davison et al (1994) and Hammond and Wickert (1993) also both report on the need for separate ESL classes for beginner levels. This is so the teacher can focus on the specific language and cultural needs of the learner.

Although oral language proficiency appears to be an important criterion in separating these two types of literacy learners, Coleman and Schiffman (1993) focus on the ESB and ESL learners' contrasting cultural experience of formal learning. Coleman and Schiffman (1993) argue that many ESL learners have difficulty adjusting to the "unstructured" or "non-formal approach" used in many ALBE classrooms. This occurs even when the learners have minimum levels of formal education and is even more pronounced if they have no schooling at all. Indeed Coleman and Schiffman (1993: 1) believe that: "the combination of low English proficiency and contrasting cultural educational frames of reference can make the adult literacy classroom a very unrewarding experience for the NESB learner". This is significant also as anecdotal evidence suggests that there is a tendency to place ESB learners with mild intellectual disabilities in literacy classes with LOTEB students. This was certainly a characteristic of the multi-ethnic class in Taylor and Murray's (1998) study.

Although these ESL literacy learners often have more highly developed spoken language skills accompanied by comparatively lower literacy skills their lack of basic education may be more influential on their progress. A lack of formal education or limited education specifically within an Australian cultural context distinguishes ESL literacy learners from ESB literacy learners. Sinclair Bell (1995: 687) underscores this by observing that learners who have developed their first language (L1) in a formal
educational context demonstrate "their comfort and familiarity with classroom routines and ways of learning rather than a direct transference of their literacy skills". Therefore, for this reason, lower level ESL literacy learners may benefit from having separate English classes.

This concludes the examination of ESL literacy learner characteristics and the different types of CGEA classes in which these learners commonly enrol. In particular, it highlights some of the reasons why lower level ESL literacy learners may benefit from being placed in separate classes. This was partly why the researcher decided to focus solely on low level learners in ESL literacy classes rather than include those attending multi ethnic classes.

The next section of the chapter focuses on the types of ESL literacy learners characterised in this previous section, and explores the relevance of Jackson's (1994) NLO project NLO for this learner category.

2.5 Jackson's non-language outcomes project: An examination

In Jackson's (1994) study into NLO and ESL learners was described in Chapter One. To reiterate, Jackson developed eight categories of NLO based upon teachers' responses to a survey. The teachers were asked to identify the types of gains ESL learners made in AMEP classes apart from language and literacy gains. This clarification of NLO meant that they could be incorporated into the competencies of the CSWE.

Jackson's (1994) project focussed on all types of ESL learners, even those with tertiary levels of formal education. Therefore, only the three broad NLO categories that she
identified as being significant to ESL literacy learners are explored within this thesis.

These categories are:

- Confidence
- Social, psychological and emotional support in the new living and learning environment
- Learning skills

The next section of chapter investigates the critical tenets of Jackson’s study including the interrelatedness of NLO and language gains and Jackson’s perception of the role of the teacher.

2.5.1 Non-language outcomes and their interrelatedness with language gains

One crucial aspect of Jackson’s (1994) analysis of NLO is that these gains need to be viewed in terms of their ‘language relatedness’ rather than as preconditions to learning. Historically, the aim of many adult literacy programs was to focus on individual ‘emancipation’ at the expense of literacy gains. Therefore, outcomes like improved self-confidence and self-esteem almost overrides the importance of improving literacy skills. These gains Jackson perceived were often described in terms of individual personality changes. Hammond et al (1992: 47) and Wickert (1993: 33) further elaborate this point by reporting on the metaphorical use of terminology such as “bloom,” “coming out and opening up” which was used to describe individual success within ALBE programs. Speaking from a historical perspective, Wickert (1992: 32) contends that this focus on personality changes as indicators of success has contributed to the view that adult literacy programs have “limited” aims and little to do with the development of “cognate and sociolinguistic competence”.
Jackson's (1994) argues that if NLO relate specifically to experience of learning in the context of the adult second language classroom, then the formal recognition of these skills is possible. Furthermore, NLO are not "by-products" of language and literary programs: "rather they are consciously fostered outcomes institutionalised in the curriculum" (p. 50). Jackson also believes that this highlights the interconnectedness of these gains with learning outcomes of the 'content' curriculum areas that are related to reading, writing, speaking and listening developments.

The work of McCormack and Pancini (1990) supports Jackson's (1994) analysis of NLO. McCormack and Pancini (1990) suggest that there is a relationship between confidence and motivation and the skills required to operate successfully within an educational context. They posit that the best way to increase the self-image of learners is to provide learners with skills and strategies that lead to the natural development of confidence in the learning context. Coleman and Schiffman (1993) also notes that independence in learning and affective outcomes such as development of confidence occur through successful learning experiences of literacy programs. Griffith (1998) further asserts that gains in affective behaviours cannot be sustained if separated from the process of learning. Griffith (1998: 14) states: "gains in self-esteem are a temporary phenomenon in Adult Basic Education in the absence of learning or subsequent employment or vocational skills acquisition".

It seems that within both ALBE and ESL contexts adults learners need to be explicitly taught a range of learning skills and strategies which lead to successful learning outcomes in these contexts. Therefore across these two sectors, there is support for this aspect of
Jackson’s project. However, in the next section of the chapter, Jackson’s (1994) perception as to the role of the teacher in the adult ESL classroom is challenged.

2.5.2 The role of the teacher in the adult ESL literacy classroom

Jackson’s (1993, 1994) view of NLO positions these within a sociolinguistic model of language. By recognising that NLO are interrelated to language gains made within the sociocultural context of the classroom, this redefines the role of the teacher. Jackson (1994: 5) argues that:

On the whole, psycholinguistic approaches tend to locate non-language outcomes such as increased confidence and motivation within the mind and personality of the learner. One consequence of this is to make them relatively inaccessible to the teacher/trainer who in addition to his or her teacher/trainer role must also function as a psychologist. Another feature of psycholinguistic approaches is their limited ability to provide a theoretical framework which adequately comprehends the taking of cultural meanings as part of language acquisition.

Jackson’s (1993, 1994) view that psycholinguistic approaches to language define the teacher’s role as psychologist is supported by Wickert (1993). Wickert (1993: 33) is highly critical of the many literacy workers whose espoused ideology is:

that of personal empowerment, while the ideology expressed through their actions and indeed pedagogy is one of containment, even dependence. The casting of the tutors role as psychologist, as being there to ‘listen to problems’ suggests emotional dominance.

This characterisation of the teacher as a psychologist which is highlighted by both Wickert (1993) and Jackson (1993, 1994), complements a progressivist approach to literacy as opposed to more contemporary sociolinguistic pedagogies. Historically, the philosophical tenets of ALBE has been one of “social justice, access and equity” (Burns, Brown and Prince, 1994: 30) which was in line with humanist views of literacy. These philosophies centred on individual needs-based, process orientated curriculum whereby the learner was ‘emancipated’ from the ‘scourge’ of illiteracy. As Wickert (1993: 33)
states, what counted as success was "the movement from out-group to in-group status-
gaining abilities and confidence to be accepted as part of the societal norm".

A contemporary view of literacy no longer focuses on the individual. Rather, it
recognises that there are a plurality of literacies which are determined by the socio-
cultural practices within communities. Therefore, in adult literacy classes the teacher
focuses on explicitly teaching the linguistic and schematic features of a range of socially
appropriate texts via effective learning strategies. However, even in classes that utilise a
sociolinguistic approach to literacy, it is extremely difficult to divorce the learner's life
experiences, socio-cultural background, level of formal education, age, gender and
affective variables from the process of acquiring literacy. Hence in many instances the
teacher’s role goes beyond a focus on simply improving the learners’ literacy skills.
This is due to the difficulty in separating many of these aforementioned factors from the
learner’s experience of formally developing their literacy skills.

Raleigh (1998) perceives that many older learners require a great deal of non-threatening
support especially through having a good relationship with the teacher. Ramm (1992)
recommends that those with minimal formal education should remain with the same
teacher for some time to maintain consistency especially given that this teacher will have
a well developed knowledge of the learners’ specific needs. Even at the higher end of the
adult second language education continuum the teacher’s role is deemed to be crucial. In
describing the teacher's role in the learners’ acquisition of a second language at tertiary
level, Cohen and Norst (1989: 61) report that "the teacher’s unfailing caring, support,
positiveness, encouragement, kindness and patience can help to overcome anxiety in
time, and that these attributes are actually more important than technical knowledge or skill”.

This thesis does not attempt to argue that the teacher’s role should be that of a social worker or psychologist. To do this would be too extreme as it diminishes the prime role of the teacher as a ‘teacher’ or advocates a return to the pedagogies of progressivism which focused more on their welfare or emancipation role of individuals. Nor does it ignore the dominant power position of the teacher (see Sanguinetti, 1994 for an indepth discussion of this). However, as previously noted, the client’s background, life experiences, their ability to activate cognitive learning processes and their personality cannot be divorced from the literacy learning process. In TAFE colleges and at AMES centres, for example, some teachers undertake training so as to learn how to deal with learners who have experienced trauma and torture in war torn countries. This practice indicates that educational providers are aware that the learners’ ‘life experiences’ can affect learning and teachers need to be aware of some of these major influences. A more realistic pedagogy for ESL literacy learners is one Harrison and Thiel (1994: 58) refer to as a “holistic ESL approach” which entails “teaching language skills, developing a collaborative learning group, and supporting at some level the life projects (the personal, economic and social struggle) of the students”. This approach recognises the supportive role of the teacher without suggesting that teachers adopt an ‘emancipatory’ approach which was a central tenet of progressivism and a criticism made by Jackson (1994). Harrison and Thiel (1994: 58) underscore this point: “while it is not the job of the teacher to be counsellor or social worker to such students, it is necessary to approach them in a manner which acknowledges their problems and life situations outside the classroom”.
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The next three sections investigate the three main categories of NLO identified by the teachers in Jackson (1994) report as being most relevant for ESL literacy learners. The first of these categories is *Confidence*.

### 2.6 Confidence

Hammond et al (1992) and Wickert (1993) support Jackson's (1994) contention that confidence and self-esteem have historically been viewed as valuable outcomes of adult literacy programs. Burns, Brown and Prince (1994) observe that often these outcomes were expressed in terms of 'empowerment' and 'personal growth'. However, as noted in the foregoing section this focus on affective factors or on personality changes was at the expense of recognising and acknowledging the improvements in literacy, particularly when this was the central reason for attending class.

Within contemporary adult literacy classrooms which focus on sociocultural approaches to language learning, 'confidence' is still acknowledged as an important learning outcome. Harrison and Thiel (1994), Auerbach (1992), Wrigley and Guth (1992) and Mudaly (1992) all report on the development of confidence and self-esteem which occurs as the learner works through the process of developing literacy. This supports Jackson's (1994) view that NLO were highly contextualised and that they related to the process of formally learning spoken and written modes of English. The learner may develop confidence with regard to the learning skills of the language classroom but in terms of confidence as a personality attribute for example in social situations, they still display poor self-esteem. Jackson underscores this by noting that when teachers refer to the learners' "lack of confidence and motivation they are not usually making reference either
to aspects of their personality in general or to the events outside class". (p. 63). In other words, the development relates specifically to the literacy learning process within the classroom context.

Volkoff and Golding (1998) in their longitudinal study of ALBE classes around Australia reported that the learners themselves noted that the development of confidence was a significant outcome of literacy course attendance. Harrison and Thiel (1994), Foster and Rado (1992) and Goodman (1998) all comment on the development of learner confidence particularly for those clients in local community provider classes. This was often also linked to the ‘pace’ or ‘ethos’ of classes in this setting which Rado and D’Cruz (1994) reported was often more relaxed. It was also reflective of the additional support services many of these organisations provide. These are further discussed in Section 3.6.

Some researchers such as Goulborn and Manton (1995) and Burns et al, (1994) believe that learners need to develop ‘self-esteem’ and ‘confidence’ so they can overcome obstacles to learning within adult literacy classes. Goulborn and Manton (1995) contend: that ‘confidence building’ must be built into the curriculum. However, Burns et al (1994) believe that these NLO cannot be taught as part of the program ‘content’, rather they relate to teacher beliefs and to the classroom ‘ethos’ or methodologies. This is where Burns et al deviate from Jackson’s view of NLO. Jackson argues that NLO like confidence cannot be taught in isolation nor are these “by-products” of the program. Rather, these outcomes cannot be separated from the content within literacy classrooms. Teachers need to present learners with a range of successful strategies which develop literacy and in the process foster improved confidence and self-esteem in this context.
Whilst practitioners like Burns et al (1994) consider that the development of confidence is part of the classroom ethos, there is still a great deal of support for Jackson's claim that confidence and the development of self esteem are interrelated with language and literacy gains. This is particularly so when both learners and practitioners report this as being an important NLO which develops from attendance at literacy classes.

2.7 Social, psychological and emotional support in the new living and learning environment

Jackson's (1994) study reports that the development of psychological and social and emotional support within the classroom and in the living environment was an important NLO for ESL literacy learners. This support can refer to the teacher or to the additional services that this organisation can provide.

Huntington (1992) and Dixon and Lyons (1995: 109) believe that it is important to provide a "stress free learning environment" in order to facilitate learning. This was often seen to be one of the roles of the teachers independent from managing the group dynamics. McIntyre (1995) observed the supportive and cohesive learning environment that was created by the women in his class. Huntington (1992) reported that learners themselves reported that they worked much better in a supported classroom environment. Similarly, Volkoff and Golding’s (1998) interviews revealed this was an important outcome of literacy classes, particularly for older learners and non-job seekers. Some interviewees reported that "the key motivating force was the company of other learners: to feel part of a supportive group or community" (Volkoff and Golding, 1998: 18). Harrison and Thiel (1994) also believe that this is an important
outcome for many ESL literacy learners. They claim that for this reason the ‘coffee break’ within a literacy class serves an extremely important function in enabling learners to relax with one another.

As previously noted many practitioners such as Goodman (1998), Harrison and Thiel (1994) and Foster and Rado (1992) highlight the role of the community setting for low-level ESL literacy learners. Often this supportive role relates to issues of access. Goodman (1998), for example, believes that a close community location is essential to promote easy access and support for learners particularly women. Harrison and Thiel (1993: 54) report that the factors which foster a supportive, accessible environment conducive learning are: “location, disability access, learner friendliness, cultural inclusively, having positive role models that the students can relates to, class timing, child care and of course, cost”.

Whilst the teacher’s role in creating a supportive learning environment is crucial, the function of the class for learner will be different depending on their reasons for attending class. Mudaly (1992) for example, reports that some learners in her study did not believe that there were significant social benefits gained from attending English classes. They considered that learning English was the main objective for attending class.

The final NLO category is Learning Skills.

2.8 Learning skills

Jackson’s (1994) Learning Skills category included responses from the following areas: Study management techniques; Problem solving strategies; Learning skills and strategies;
Knowledge of formal learning environment and processes; Autonomous learning skills; Exposure to technological learning aids and Self-monitoring and self-evaluation skills.

Although not all of these skills are relevant to lower level ESL literacy learners, the types of learning strategies and skills that they need to develop in an adult learning context are essential. This is extremely important because unlike ESB learners, ESL literacy clients do not have the cultural experience of being schooled in an Australian classroom environment. Even if the learners have minimal levels of formal education in their first language, Deschepper (1995) reports many ESL learners have culturally different approaches to learning and differing perceptions of the role of the teacher. In addition, Troy (1990) reports those who come from strong oral traditions are not accustomed to thinking of language ‘formally’.

Dixon and Lyons (1995) and Hammond and Wickert (1993) suggest that it is important to develop ‘learning-to-learn’ strategies within the formal classroom context. These learning-to-learn strategies underpin the formal acquisition of literacy and must be explicitly taught to ESL learners in order to facilitate their language learning. As Jackson (1994: 64) comments about ESL learners and basic learning how to learn skills they “may not know about classroom features and expectations, institutional routines, attendance, filing and class management”. This contention is supported by Nichols and Sangster (1996) who report on the difficulty that some learners with limited or no formal education experience when confronted with numerous worksheets and ‘handouts’ and ‘whiteboard’ teaching methodologies. This is despite that fact that these types of teaching techniques and learning strategies are commonly used in adult literacy classrooms.
2.8.1 The development of metalanguage as a learning skill

Although Jackson’s (1994) study identified many learning skills within this NLO category, it did not report on the learner’s development of highly contextualised classroom metalanguage. Richards, Platt and Platt (1992: 227) define metalanguage as “the language used to analyse or describe a language”. More simply, Hammond (1990: 47) perceives that metalanguage is “a language for talking about language”. In one sense ‘metalanguage’ is obviously connected to the development of language gains within the classroom. Labelling ‘metalanguage’ as a NLO might seem to be a contradiction in terms. However, it is argued here that the development of metalanguage is a vital part of learning skills and strategies they use to formally acquire literacy in an Australian classroom context. Commenting from an American context, Wrigley and Guth (1992) observe the development of metalinguistic knowledge in this learner type. In other words, ESL literacy learners need to be explicitly taught skills such as how to use computers, how to organise their folders, note-taking, and comprehension of classroom metalanguage.

The role of spoken language and its interconnectedness with written texts was previously highlighted in an earlier section of this chapter. In particular, Suda (1995), McIntyre (1995) and Hammond (1990) all comment on the degree of talking which features in adult literacy classrooms. One aspect of this ‘talk’ relates to the learners’ use of metalanguage to describe the various forms of literacy. Christie (1998), and Hammond (1990) perceive that learners need to be explicitly taught about the features of written text. Learmonth also (1991: 64) highlights an example of ESL learners using “joint metalanguage” with the teacher to discuss features of a report text. Learmonth (1991) believes that learning about the language features used in formal writing motivates
learners and develops their confidence. Faine (1995) also recommends that ESL literacy learners should learn to use metalanguage to generate ‘target production’ of literacies in certain contexts. Faine (1995: 10) suggests that:

Grammatical terms provide a metalanguage that students can use to analyse texts including their own. The very fact that their teacher thinks them smart enough to understand some of the rules of English increases their identification with standard forms.

In contrast, McIntyre (1995: 188) comments with reference to long term ESL literacy clients that literacy courses utilising a formalised approach with an emphasis on “explicit grammatical forms and metalanguage” could make these learners “daunted” and “depressed”. Nicholas and Saunders (1996) and Hood and Kightley (1991) also perceive that instructional metalanguage is not useful for some ESL learners. However, the ESL learners referred to by Nicholas and Saunders (1996) and Hood and Kightley (1991) display low levels of oracy as well as written English. This distinguishes them from the ‘high oracy low literacy’ ESL learners in this study. Learners with higher oral language skills can comprehend and use some forms of basic instructional metalanguage. This is illustrated in a previous study by Murray (1995) which found that long-term resident ESL literacy learners were able to learn and apply the metalanguage used in pronunciation programs such as the ‘schwa’.

Winser (1991) in his study on adult second language reading, identified a ‘metalinguistic awareness taxonomy’. Winser suggests that readers use linguistic classifications to describe both the language, cognitive processes and learning strategies which they use to complete reading tasks. These include using metalinguistic terms such as ‘letter’, ‘syllable’ and ‘meaning’. Winser’s metalinguistic awareness taxonomy is structured in an hierarchical format to reflect the order of acquisition of language components.
according to the proficiency of the learner. This taxonomy ranges from micro word components to the larger scale processes involving a knowledge of discourse features and semantics within a text. Winser argues that the more proficient the learner the greater the understanding of the ‘larger-scale components’.

The lower-level ESL literacy learners of this study need to be taught a range of learning strategies which facilitate their learning of literacy. Even those who have minimal levels of formal education need to learn a repertoire of strategies to develop their literacy skills. In many instances, these learning skills are culturally determined and, therefore, as unfamiliar to the learner as the context. Winser (1991: 43) elucidates that it is “essential to provide contexts for adult L2 learners that raise their awareness of learning strategies and to be explicit in supporting their learning about language itself, as an object which can be attended to in its own right”.

This concludes the examination of Jackson’s (1994) study into NLO. It is relevant to note that the kinds of NLO Jackson identified as being important for ESL literacy learners is supported within the literature. However, metalanguage is an additional learning skill that ESL literacy learners should develop and which Jackson omitted in her study.

The next chapter section focuses on the CGEA which is the third integral component of this thesis. To recall, in Victoria and many other states of Australia, the CGEA is widely used with ESL literacy learners who are central to this research. Firstly, this section looks at the suitability of the CGEA for ESL literacy learners. Next, it examines the formal assessment of NLO and the current use of competency-based accreditation.
Finally, it reviews competency-based assessment and concludes with an exploration of the General Curriculum Options (GCO) stream of the CGEA as a format for reporting NLO.

2.9 The Suitability of the CGEA and ESL literacy Learners

The complex educational needs of ESL literacy learners present both placement and classification difficulties. In Chapter One the merging of the two separate fields of ALBE and ESL and the ensuing effects of funding allocation was examined. The lack of a consistent formal classification of these learners was also addressed in an earlier section of this chapter (see Section 2.3.). At the time this research was conducted, there were no formal accreditation frameworks designed specifically to cater for the educational needs of ESL literacy learners.

Earlier in this chapter it was argued that the CSWE was not suited to ESL literacy learners. Even though it is a credential for those from second language backgrounds, the assessment requirements at each ‘stage’ mean that the learners must demonstrate a similar level of ‘competence’ in both spoken and written English to receive accreditation. This means that it is not appropriate for ‘high oracy low literacy’ learners who tend to display more highly developed spoken language. With this in mind, it is relevant to look at the appropriacy of the CGEA for the low-level ESL literacy learners of this thesis.

The Introductory notes to the CGEA clearly state the following:

The certificates are designed for adults who have left school early and who need to improve their literacy, basic maths and general skills. Those who come from a language background other than English would be expected to speak some English. (ACFEB, 1997: 4)
This very broad description does suggest that the CGEA is suitable for ESL learners with literacy needs. However, what is meant by “some English” is not explained and is therefore left to the discretion of program coordinators. This also applies to the statement “left school early”; it does not explain whether this means leaving primary or secondary school early or both. Other factors such as length of Australian residence are not included.

Goulburn and Manton (1995) and Harris et al (1997) suggest that the CGEA is not suitable for highly educated ESL learners. This is most probably because the Level 4, the highest level of the CGEA, is equivalent to about Year 10/11 of secondary school. It is, therefore, unsuitable for those learners with tertiary education. Harris et al (1996) also observe that the CGEA is not suitable for those with limited oracy who initially require a more intensive focus on spoken language. Rado and D’Cruz (1994: 73) perceive that the CGEA is suitable for some ESL learners “who may not be well educated in their first language and who might have been in Australia for a long time”. Dixon and Lyons (1995), whose characterisation of ESL literacy clients informs this study, also believe that the CGEA is appropriate for these learners. However, Sanguinetti (1995) and McCormack (1994) observe that the CGEA was never designed to be an ESL curriculum and therefore question its suitability for LOTEB learners. These practitioners observe that the framework is not underpinned by a theory of second language acquisition. McCormack (1994: 12) notes that the teaching of English to learners “as a second language is a differently focused pedagogy from an ALBE framing of literacy”. This is because traditional ESL classes focus heavily on the teaching of vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation. This concern over the different pedagogies of the ESL and ALBE fields was also highlighted by Hammond et al (1992).
Furthermore, Karayannis (1994) recommends that practitioners who teach the CGEA to ESL learners need an excellent understanding of second language acquisition principles and even have appropriate TESOL qualifications. Karayannis’s assertion is supported by Frohman’s (1996) study of a multi-ethnic class. Frohman (1996: 14) found that the ALBE teachers of the multi-ethnic classes in the study expressed a need for professional development in relation to ESL methodologies because of their “inadequate and profound lack of knowledge when confronted with the specific language needs of their LOTEB students”.

Despite the limitations of the CGEA, the literature indicates that the CGEA is still widely used with ESL literacy learners. Apart from the different pedagogical approaches used to teach ESB and ESL learners, one other concern relates to competency-based assessment difficulties including NLO. These issues are now investigated.

2.10 The problem of assessment and non-language outcomes

The impetus for conducting this research was related to issues of assessment of NLO and ESL literacy learners. In particular, the focus was on the competency-based assessment (CBA) of the CGEA. This is important because educational organisations now have to compete for program funding. Therefore, as McKenna (1998: 10) observes, “post course assessment reports are being used, not only to determine individual progress, but also to evaluate the effectiveness of providers in a market driven training system”. This competition for funding means that courses often become very focused on assessment instead of pedagogy (Sanguinetti, 1995) and neglect some important learner gains such as NLO.
In order to examine the issue of assessment, this section of the paper looks firstly at the assessment of NLO and then at the time constraints placed on courses by funding and policy bodies.

2.10.1 Assessment of non-language outcomes

The introduction of competency-based frameworks like the CGEA and the professionalisation of the field (see Chapter One) has led to a greater focus on assessment and accountability. Prior to in the implementation of the CSWE, the post-course progress of ESL learners within AMES was recorded using the ASLPR. Whilst this proficiency rating scale recognised improvements in spoken language, it too was limited in its recognition of NLO. Huntington (1992: 30) in her report on pre-literate adult migrants comments that the “ASLPR scores would not give a complete picture of the progress they have made”. She uses the examples of increased self-esteem as an outcome which the ASLPR does not recognise.

Most accredited courses within the ALBE/ESL fields now use competency-based assessment. Sanguinetti (1995) and Coates (1994) report that this has increased the accountability of the profession and to funding bodies. Coates (1994) also notes that it gives teachers a ‘set of markers’ so they can talk about learner outcomes using a ‘shared language’. It has also enabled the establishment of educational pathways across courses and institutions due to the ‘portable’ nature of the many credentials like the CGEA. However, whilst these factors are the positive aspects of using competency based reporting, its introduction for the learners of this thesis does raise many concerns.
Lee and Wickert (1994) and Evans (1998) suggest that CBA serves the needs of funding bodies more than the students by focussing on narrowly-defined learning outcomes. Beever (1993: 90) believes that competency-based assessment ignores the “human, psychological and cultural practices which necessarily underpin learning and working”. Auerbach (1992) and Wrigley and Guth (1992) also comment on the lack of recognition of affective factors within CBA. This claim in relation to the CGEA is further supported by Sanguinetti (1995). She argues that CBA does “neglect the personal development aspect which is acknowledged in the Background Works (to the CGEA) as ‘traditionally’ an ALBE aim” (p. 20). Furthermore, other practitioners in Sanguinetti’s study clearly question the absence of NLO, in particular confidence and self-esteem. Even with regard to other CBA documents such as the National Reporting System and NLO, Taylor (1996: 1) perceives that the learning outcomes of this framework “leave little room for these NLO and if included they are placed in a lower order. This could be a mistake as it does not acknowledge a connection between NLO and language outcomes”.

Kalantzis (1992) and McKay (1993) observe that CBA particularly disadvantages ESL learners by ignoring the value of their bilingualism. Sanguinetti (1995: 25) also posits that the nature of competence is such that it “doesn’t allow for other factors that might influence that such as gender, socio-cultural background”. All these factors are important to the literacy education of ESL learners.

One other difficulty with CBA in both ALBE and ESL contexts is that these reflect vocational outcomes or, as previously highlighted, focus on ‘workplace literacies’. Given the range of learners and their various reasons for attending classes this is
problematic. Forward (1998) elucidates these issues with reference to the typical ESL literacy learner who features in this thesis. Forward (1998: 25) comments that for "older retrenched migrant workers, whose employment prospects were minimal because society had no work for them" this focus on vocational outcomes in some courses was "insulting".

2.10.2 Funding constraints: course delivery and teacher employment

One major difficulty reflects the limitations imposed by funding bodies and policy makers. The CGEA, for examples, recommends that a module be completed in eighty hours. Rado and Foster (1995: 59) contend:

> the inadequate length of literacy courses was often mentioned by organisers, teachers and adult learners alike. This is not surprising given most courses are organised in terms of months whereas it takes years to become proficient in a second language.

Forward (1998: 26) supports this position stating that "students were allocated funding for a particular period to 'fix' their problem. If their problem was not fixed in that time, continued funding was not available." This is significant for ESL literacy learners who need to learn about the formal culture of Australian adult education context and be taught learning strategies and skills in order to improve their literacy skills.

The other issue of time constraints and funding relates to practitioners. Evans (1998) and Forward (1998) contend that within the adult education sector courses are now staffed with contract or sessionally paid. Both Evans (1998) and Angwin (1995) also note that these employees overwhelmingly tend to be women. This uncertainty of employment coupled with a lack of supportive working conditions has repercussions for CBA. Evans (1998: 27) elucidates: "teachers are exhausted by day to day delivery,
heavily influenced by the paperwork of report requirements". Hence if NLO are not clearly articulated within the learning outcomes of the credential, teachers are too hard pressed to report these developments even if they perceive that they are legitimate outcomes of ESL and ALBE courses.

While CBA is generally seen to be problematic for ESL literacy learners, it is important to examine the potential of the CGEA for reporting NLO. Whilst the Reading and Writing and Oral Communication streams clearly do not articulate NLO, the learning outcomes of the GCO may enable practitioners to document some NLO.

The learning outcomes of the GCO and their specific relevance to NLO and ESL literacy learners will now be examined.

2.11 Non-language outcomes in the CGEA: The GCO and the Mayer Competencies

The learning outcomes of the GCO are presented below:

- Can collect, analyse and organise information
- Can plan and organise activities
- Can communicate ideas and information
- Can work with others and in teams
- Can use mathematical ideas and techniques
- Can solve problems
- Can use technology
- Can identify, analyse and apply the practices of culture
Johnson and Brearley (1994: 9) note that the GCO provide an opportunity for both ESB and LOTEB learners to “build upon competencies and experience successful background learning outcomes”. Many adult literacy learners experience difficulty accessing educational and workplace training programs. Therefore, as Johnson and Brearley (1994: 10) observe that “success through the GCO stream can provide a springboard to more positive experiences” especially to the other CGEA streams.

Walker (1996) reported that although the GCO were often taught as a discrete unit it was common to integrate these with other streams of the CGEA. Wignall (1996), Brearley (1994) and Johnson and Brearley (1994) all provide curriculum models which demonstrate this integration. By integrating the teaching of several CGEA streams, assessment may be conducted using only one task. Walker reports that the flexible delivery of the GCO is one of its strengths.

Whilst the broadness and flexibility of the GCO are considered to be a ‘strength’ by some, other practitioners view this aspect of the GCO as a limitation. Sanguinetti (1995) raises concerns with regard to the difficulty of assessing competence in one context and whether this can be generalised to other contexts. McKenna (1998) has also raised concern about this as general problem with all forms of CBA. Sanguinetti further illustrates her concerns of this by using the example of the fifth GCO learning outcome on problem solving. She questions the very contextualised and specific nature of problem solving. This is a valid point considering that the GCO may be used across a range of adult education courses including saddlery and aerobics.
Jackson’s (1993, 1994) theory on NLO is positioned within a sociolinguistic approach to language. NLO have been incorporated into the Knowledge and Learning competencies of the CSWE which exemplifies their relationship with language and literacy gains. In contrast, the GCO can be integrated with the Reading and Writing and Oral Communications streams or they may be taught as a discrete unit. As noted in Chapter One, a salient difference between Jackson’s (1994) theory of NLO and the GCO is that the latter is not inextricably linked to language and literacy gains made within an adult ESL literacy classroom. Rather, the GCO learning outcomes duplicate the Mayer (1992) Key Competencies. The background to the development of Mayer Key Competencies was described in Chapter One. Essentially, these were a set of generic skills which Australian secondary school leavers need to demonstrate before entering the workforce or other training contexts.

In Jackson’s project she acknowledges that the Mayer Key Competencies do recognise some ‘non-content’ outcomes within language programs. However, she also postulates that the acquisition of these generic skills for some socially disadvantaged ESL (and ESB) learners will require ‘additional challenges’. Jackson (1994: 35) states that these additional challenges are reflective of: “the level of English language and literacy required to achieve competence; the levels of cultural awareness underpinning the competencies; levels of exposure to formal learning in the country of origin”. Inherent within Jackson’s (1994) argument is her belief that the Mayer Key Competencies are underpinned by a level of literacy which matches the literacy levels of school leavers. In Australia, the minimum age for leaving school is fifteen years which in turn equates with at least ten years of schooling. Furthermore, Jackson (1994) also perceives that the Mayer Key Competencies assume that adults have a well developed knowledge of formal learning.
skills and strategies. This is certainly not true of the adult ESL literacy learners of this research. Hence, as the GCO are identical to the Mayer Key Competencies, it is reasonable to assume that Jackson (1994) would argue that they did not provide a format for documenting NLO.

Whilst Jackson (1994) claims that the Mayer Key Competencies (or the GCO) assume a higher level of skill development, some teachers within Sanguinetti’s (1995) study hold a contrary viewpoint. These teachers perceive that the GCO Levels 1 and 2, which are often used with low-level ESL literacy learners, are too simplistic and reductive for adult learners. Sanguinetti (1995: 35) states that the GCO Levels 1 and 2 are “trivial in comparison with what the adults are clearly already doing in their work and social life”. This assertion that some learning outcomes are inappropriate for adult learners by virtue of their adulthood and ensuing life experiences is supported by Rees-Miller (1993). Although not commenting specifically on the learning outcomes of the GCO, she believes that the use of terms like “learning-to-learn” with adults may have patronising overtones. Rees-Miller (1993: 684) contends that within adult education programs “it seems obvious that adults must be treated as adults” in view of the successes that most adults have achieved in other areas of their lives. This idea that adult learners are successful in other areas of their lives is also supported by Barton (1994). Barton (1994: 107) asserts that “those with literacy problems are usually ordinary people who hold down jobs, have families, participate in society and pursue hobbies”. This is a valid point because once again it reinforces the idea of the very contextualised nature of NLO within a formal learning environment.
2.12 Summary and conclusions

This chapter has examined the literature which relates to the three main focus areas of the research namely, ESL literacy learners, non-language outcomes, and the CGEA. It reveals that Dixon and Lyons' (1995) characterisation of ESL literacy learners using the CGEA is supported in the literature. However, as well as having specific spoken and written English language needs, there are a number of factors which impact on the ESL literacy learner's acquisition of English in an CGEA class particularly the level of formal education. Other factors include age, socio-cultural background, life experiences, length of Australian residency, affective factors, gender, and reasons for attending class.

The chapter also investigated Jackson's study (1994) and focused specifically on the three main categories of NLO which she claimed were relevant to the ESL literacy learners. There is some evidence within the literature to support Jackson's claim that these NLO are highly contextualised and that they are interrelated to the language and literacy outcomes within adult ESL classrooms. In particular, the target group of learners need to learn how to operate within the context of an Australian learning environment. It appears that the CGEA can document some NLO but with great difficulty. For example, the broad and flexible nature of the GCO mean that these competencies can document NLO but only in a restricted way. This documentation can only occur when the GCO are integrated with the Reading and Writing and Oral Communication streams of the CGEA. Therefore, even if teachers perceive NLO to be important, it requires a great deal of initiative and additional application to assess NLO within the assessment criteria of the GCO. However, in the current economic climate which has limited the funding and duration of course hours, this is extremely difficult. Furthermore, the sessional or contract employment of adult literacy and ESL teaching
staff, means that teachers already have enormous difficulty completing the reporting requirements associated with CBA. This may account for the lack of formal assessment of NLO in adult ESL literacy classes by teachers if these important learning outcomes are not explicitly contained within curriculum frameworks like the CGEA.

Chapter 3 describes the qualitative case study methodology used in this thesis and introduces the pilot study. It also describes the modifications to final research design in light of the pilot study findings.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

3.1 Overview

In order to examine the main research question in this thesis, a qualitative multi-case study approach was used. Initially, a single case study was trialed in the pilot study primarily to test the research design procedures and data collection instruments. To reiterate, the main aim of this project was to investigate how the Certificates of General English for Adults (CGEA) cater for non-language outcomes (NLO) in the context of adult English as a second language (ESL) literacy classes. In order to examine this question, it was necessary to obtain the views of adult ESL literacy teachers currently working with the CGEA. This included investigating the case study teachers' perceptions of ESL literacy learner characteristics.

This chapter describes the case study approach used in the thesis and seeks to justify why this methodology has been selected. Firstly, the chapter examines the main principles underpinning this form of qualitative research. Next, it introduces the research design and outlines the pilot study procedures. Finally, it describes the modifications made to the final research design in light of the pilot study findings.

3.2 The case study approach

This section of the chapter defines the case study approach and presents a rationale for using this form of analysis to answer the research questions. It also introduces the concept of the multi-case study which is a strategy used in the research.
Bogdan and Biklen (1998: 54) postulate that “a case study is a detailed examination of a single subject, a single depository of documents or a single event”. Thus, the ‘case’ or as Merriam (1998: 43) notes the “unit of analysis” is an instance of one particular context such as an individual, an organisation or even a population. Thus, unlike traditional scientific investigations, it is not a requirement that the case be a representative sample of the phenomenon under study. Stake (1988: 255) also describes the unit of analysis as a “bounded system”. This notion of a bounded system encapsulates the idea that any given case under study is a singular, holistic examination of one specific context. Indeed for Merriam (1998: 28), these boundaries should have a “common sense of obviousness”. In this thesis, for example, the bounded system is the teacher and her particular adult ESL literacy class.

The qualitative case study is also referred to as being ‘naturalistic’ (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998; Merriam, 1998), a term borrowed from anthropological studies. This is because the research is conducted in the actual setting or ‘field’ where the events under study ‘naturally’ take place. In naturalistic or qualitative studies, no intended manipulation or interference of the context under study should occur. The researcher is the main source for the collection and analysis of data that is descriptive, subjective and highly interpretative. Yin (1994: 13) further reports that a feature of this form of inquiry is the use of “multiple sources of evidence” such as documents, observation and interviews. These multiple sources of data are then used by the researcher to identify underlying patterns in the analysis. Arising from the analysis, is the development of theory which is ‘grounded’ in the data.
When theory emerges after a detailed examination of the case study data sources, it is referred to as ‘grounded theory’ (Glesne and Peskin, 1992). This is in contrast to experimental research which commences with a testable hypothesis that is either accepted or rejected. In experimental studies, the research is generally conducted in a controlled environment using a highly representative ‘sample’ of a given population. The results are presented in a statistical or measurable format and are examined in the light of a pre-stated hypothesis. It is also an expectation that the findings of this kind of research have ‘scientific generalisation’ or ‘external validity’. This refers to the degree in which the case is representative of other populations so that the findings can be predicted to ‘generalise’ to other contexts.

Yin (1994) and Merriam (1998) note that the case study approach has been criticised because of issues related to validity and reliability. The issue of reliability is addressed in a later section of this chapter. A critique of external validity or generalisation, in relation to qualitative case study research, follows.

3.3 Generalisation and the case study

‘Scientific generalisability’ refers to the degree in which generalisations can be made from one case to another. As Stake (1988: 261) reports, case study research draws criticism because “there is too little indication of the degree to which the case is representative of other cases”. In addition, Merriam (1998) claims that proponents of scientific generalisation raise concern over the inability to generalise from one singular unit of analysis. Experimental research is conducted in a controlled environment and uses “careful sampling strategies” (Glesne and Peskin, 1992). This type of research
expresses the findings in a measurable statistical format and aims for replication of results across a large number of populations.

Stake (1994) contends that whilst researchers look for commonalities within case studies, often what results is the ‘uniqueness’ of the particular study case. Therefore, it is the lack of ‘typification’ in the end product of the case study and the degree to which the results can be generalised which have drawn criticism. Stake (1994: 238) perceives that whilst the case study findings may result in “a small step towards grand generalisation”, in all instances generalisation should not always be the focus. Stake (1988: 256) elucidates this point:

In the case study, there may or may not be an ultimate interest in the generalisable. For the time being, the search is an understanding of a particular case, in its idiosyncrasy, in its complexity.

For Merriam (1998: 29) citing the words of Cronbach (1975: 123), the knowledge acquired from the singular case is “interpretation in context”. This recognises the particularistic nature of the case under study and the inductive knowledge which derives from the given context. Yin (1994) also acknowledges the value of the single case study and its contribution to the development of theory. He supports Stake’s contention of the uniqueness of the particular study. In fact, Yin (1994: 47) underscores this point by observing that the singular case study can “even help to refocus future investigations in an entire field”.

In addressing the value of the case study approach, Yin (1994) also critiques the notion of generalisation. Yin (1994) draws a distinction between scientific or statistical generalisation and analytical generalisation. As previously noted in scientific or statistical generalisation, careful sampling strategies are devised so that experimental
replications can be made across populations. In contrast, analytical generalisation occurs when case study results are generalised not to other populations but rather to a theory. In other words, as Yin (1994: 31) notes “the previously developed theory is used as a template with which to compare the empirical results of the case study”. In qualitative research, analytical generalisation can be applied across one or more case studies. Yin (1994) asserts that if a number of case studies all support a previously developed theory then ‘replication’ can be claimed.

Bogdan and Biklen (1998) note that when two or more informants or settings are examined, the research strategy is known as a ‘multi-case study’. Multi-case studies are used to enable cross-case analysis and to address replication issues.

A discussion of the multi-case study and replication follows.

3.4 The multi-case study and replication

Merriam (1998) and Yin (1993) contend that when a multi-case study is used replication, rather than sampling logic, should be employed. To recapitulate, ‘sampling logic’ uses a probability criterion to ensure that the ‘sample’ selected is highly representative of a given phenomenon under study. However, in case study research the investigator may look for a replication of findings across two or more cases. Yin (1993: 34) contends that “the more replications, the more robust the findings”.

Whilst replication of results may strengthen the findings, Marshall and Rossman (1995) suggest that this can be difficult to achieve. Due to the naturalistic setting in which the case study is conducted, replication is impossible. This is because the ‘real world’ is in
a constant state of change. Stake (1994: 241) posits that “no observations or
interpretations are perfectly repeatable”. Both Stake (1994) and Merriam (1998) also
make the point that each case study is highly subjective and that it is the reader or user
who approaches the research with pre-existing knowledge. Merriam (1998: 211) refers
to this as “reader or user generalisability”. She recommends leaving the extent to which
the findings can be generalised to known reference populations and to the readers and
users of the research.

Yin (1994) and Merriam (1998) both recommend the use of the multi-case design to
enhance the generalisability of the research, specifically for the reader or user. In
addition, Merriam (1998: 211) also contends that two other measures be incorporated
into the research design to address generalisation issues. Firstly, she suggests that the
research should provide a “thick rich description” and secondly a “typicality category”
should be devised as a way of enabling comparisons with others in the same context.
Hence, in order to address generalisation issues, several of Merriam’s (1998)
recommendations were incorporated into the final research design. This design is fully
described in a later section of this chapter.

The problem of external validity in relation to generalisation and the qualitative case
study approach has been discussed. As previously noted, the other area of criticism
leveled at the case study approach relates to reliability. An examination of these issues
follows.
3.5 Reliability and internal validity

'Reliability' refers to extent to which these research findings can consistently be replicated. Yin (1989) observes that a lack of strict documentation procedures has historically lead to problems with the reliability of case study research. Therefore, Yin (1994: 37) contends that to enhance reliability, it is necessary to "conduct the research so that an auditor could repeat the procedures and arrive at the same results". However, Bogdan and Biklen (1998) observe that the nature of case study approach is such that two researchers studying the same context could come up with different results. It is Bogdan and Biklen’s (1998: 36) belief that reliability in naturalistic inquiry should be viewed "as a fit between what they (the researchers) record as data and what actually occurs in the setting under study, rather than literal consistency across different observations".

Some researchers such as Merriam (1998) suggests an emphasis on 'internal validity' instead of reliability. Yin (1994: 35) notes that internal validity relates to whether certain conditions leading to other conditions may be inferred as having a causal relationship. In order to strengthen the internal validity of a qualitative case study inquiry, several measures have been suggested. Yin (1993: 40) advises using a clearly specified context as well as testing and analysing the data using a rival theory. Stake (1994: 241) advocates the use of 'triangulation' which "is a process of using multiple perceptions to clarify meaning, verifying the repeatability of an observation or an interpretation" to enhance internal and external validity.

The use of triangulation is only one of the six strategies Merriam (1998: 204-205) suggests to increase the internal validity of the case study. She also advocates the use of
member checks by those informants involved; long term or repeated observation of the unit of analysis; peer examination of the findings; involving the participants in the whole research process and identifying the researcher position or bias at the commencement of the study.

This concludes the introduction to the case study approach used in this thesis. The issues of internal and external validity and reliability have been reviewed. A rationale for choosing this approach as a research strategy for the thesis follows.

3.6 Selection of the multi-case study approach: a justification

A multi-case study design was selected for several reasons. Firstly, the researcher was most interested in conducting an indepth investigation of a small number of teachers and their ESL literacy classes. This necessitated studying the teacher and the class in a setting where the events under study ‘naturally’ occurred or as Nunan (1992: 102) states in “the genuine language classroom”. In order to do this, it was necessary to provide a detailed examination of each context through the gathering of multiple sources of evidence. These data sources included techniques such as observation, interviews and documents.

This thesis uses a multi-case study approach focusing on six different contexts. This given number of cases was selected for two reasons. Firstly, whilst acknowledging that naturalistic inquiry is indeed highly subjective and contextual, the researcher’s intention was to draw comparisons across cases. In this study, it was predicted that there would be a “literal replication” (Yin, 1994: 48) across the findings of each case. As the name suggests, “literal replication” is when particular units of analysis are selected because
similar results are predicted across these cases. As Yin (1994) and Merriam (1998) note, this is one method of strengthening the findings of case study research as well as addressing the issue of generalisation. The second reason for choosing six units of analysis was to do with time management. The researcher believed that within the time allocation this was a manageable number of cases to investigate.

Finally, Marshall and Rossman (1995) postulate that for research questions which seek an explanation, such as in this thesis, a suitable research strategy is to use a multi case study design. Yin (1994: 9) also advocates using of qualitative cases study when "a 'how' or 'why' question is being asked about a contemporary set of events, over which the investigator has little or no control".

This concludes the justification for using the multi-case study as a research strategy. An overview of the pilot study now follows.

3.7 The pilot study.

A pilot study was conducted to test the data collection techniques and the overall research design. In this section of the chapter these pilot study procedures are firstly described. Next, the choice of data collection techniques used to answer the main research questions are justified. Finally, the methodology used in the analysis is introduced.

In preparation for the final research strategy, a pilot study of one adult ESL literacy teacher and her ESL literacy class were conducted. Glesne and Peskin (1992: 20) state with regard to the pilot study "the idea is not to get the data per se but to learn about
your research, interview schedule, observation, teaching and yourself'. Hence, although
it was anticipated that the pilot study findings be included in the final investigation, the
researcher was more intent on trialing the data collection instruments and testing the
research design. A brief overview of the pilot study design is given below. A
justification for using these data collection techniques follows in a later section.

3.7.1 The pilot study design

The pilot study focused on one teacher and her adult ESL literacy class in a community
setting. The pilot study was conducted for a four week period during August and
September, 1997. The learners in the class were all working towards gaining two of the
four streams the CGEA. These were Level 1 or 2 of the Reading and Writing and Oral
Communication streams.

At this time, the teacher and the learners were observed twice a week during each of the
three hour classes. This time frame was chosen so that the researcher could observe the
teaching of one complete unit of work. These eight classes were all audio-taped and the
researcher observed the class whilst taking indepth field notes (Appendix 3.1). The
focus of the observations was primarily to look for examples of NLO which the teacher
had noted during interview.

Each week, the teacher was interviewed for ten to fifteen minutes. The interview topics
centred specifically on the teacher's identification of NLO within her ESL literacy
classroom. It also included a focus on the CGEA and whether or not NLO were
included within this framework. Prior to the weekly interview, the teacher was also
asked to complete a set of written pre interview tasks (see Appendix 3.2). This
technique had been used by Davison et al (1994) and enabled the informant to become familiar with the topics to be covered at interview. All the interviews were audio-taped and then transcribed in preparation for analysis (Appendix 3.3.). Documentation such as the teachers' anecdotal records, journal records, lesson plans and workshops were also collected and used as data.

The next section of the chapter examines the data collection techniques used in the pilot study. A description of the teacher, the context and the class is contained in Chapter 4.

3.7.2 Selection of the pilot study informant

Before choosing a suitable teacher to participate in the research, several criteria were incorporated into the selection process. Firstly, only teachers who had attained ESL qualifications were considered. This was because within the Adult Literacy and Basic Education (ALBE) field it is not a pre-requisite for teachers to have TESOL qualifications. However, it was predicted that those teachers who held ESL qualifications would have an understanding of second language acquisition principles. This was critical because of the second language needs of the target group of learners in this thesis. Secondly, as the study focused on the use of the Certificates of General Education for Adults (CGEA), only classes where Levels 1 and 2 of the framework were taught were included. This is because ESL literacy learners tend to have zero to seven years formal education and therefore Levels 1 or 2 of the CGEA appear to be most appropriate.

With the selection criteria set in place, the pilot study teacher was then chosen. The researcher used a range of educational contacts to approach interested participants at
several TAFE, community and private providers. However, there were many difficulties gaining access to teachers due to the concerns raised by the ‘gatekeepers’ (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998; Glesne and Peshkin, 1992; Merriam, 1998) or coordinators at these organisations. Many of the ‘gatekeepers’ felt that the majority of teachers were employed on a sessional payment basis and, therefore, their time and availability was extremely limited. The eventual informant was chosen for what Yin (1993: 34) refers to as ‘feasibility and access’ reasons. In other words, apart from filling the selection criteria, the researcher was able to gain access the informant and her class with the support of the ‘gatekeepers’.

3.7.3 Sources of data: interviews

Interviewing was selected as the main data collection method for the pilot study. This was because the information required to explain how the CGEA caters for non-language outcomes, was based upon teacher beliefs. Glesne and Peshkin (1992) and Bogdan and Biklen (1998), all perceive that interviewing is extremely useful for attaining the informants’ perceptions, attitudes and opinions. Saunders (1995: 99) also supports this contention, observing that interviewing “allows the researcher some insight into teacher thinking.” Marshall and Rossman (1995: 81) further comment that an additional value of an interview is that it is “a useful way of getting larger amounts of data quickly”.

Whilst interviewing is a commonly used technique for gaining insight into opinions and beliefs, it has been criticised for several reasons. Saunders (1995) notes that when responding to questions, it is possible that informants are ‘influenced’ by what they perceive to be ‘acceptable views’. Hence, they answer by giving the researcher what they believe is sought as opposed to revealing their own true opinions. Marshall and
Rossman (1995) also note that a further limitation of interviewing is that it requires complete cooperation from the informant. Thus, it is necessary to establish a rapport with the respondent in order to elicit the best response. In terms of interview selection procedures, Saunders cautions that using the ‘one off’ interview can be inadequate. This is because “it is often after reflection and analysis of the early transcripts that the need for explanation, elaboration and further probing becomes apparent”. The issue of a ‘one-off’ interview in relation to this thesis, is addressed in a later section of this chapter.

The specific type of interview selected in the pilot study is described by Patton (1990) as the ‘general interview guide approach’. Patton (1990: 283) elucidates:

An interview guide is prepared in order to make sure that basically the same information is obtained from a number of people by covering the same amount of material. The interview guide provides topics or subject areas within which the interviewer is free to explore, probe and ask questions that will elucidate and illuminate that particular subject. Thus the interviewer remains free to build a conversation within a particular subject area, to word questions spontaneously, and to establish a conversational style- but with a focus on a particular subject that has been predetermined.

This form of interviewing which is often used in naturalistic research is also known as a ‘semi-structured interview’ (Merriam, 1998; Yin 1989; Saunders 1995; Glesne and Peskin, 1992; Bogdan and Biklen, 1998; Nunan, 1992). Patton claims that the advantage of using this interview method is that it enables the researcher to make the best use of the available interview time. When a number of informants are to be interviewed it also makes the conversation more ‘systematic’ and ‘comprehensive’ by allowing for the advanced planning of issues to be explored. In education research, in particular, Nunan (1992) reports that the semi-structured interview format is valuable because of its ‘flexibility’. As Saunders (1995) observes this is because it enables the researcher to
probe and to further clarify the responses of individual informants. It also enables the identification of patterns upon which the case study analysis is based on.

In the pilot study the 'interview guide approach' was selected for several reasons. Firstly, as previously noted, it was perceived to be an ideal way to obtain the opinions and beliefs of the informant. This was because the teacher was asked to explain how the CGEA caters for NLO in the ESL literacy class in which they taught. This type of research question is highly subjective and the researcher was interested in gaining a detailed insight into the informant's view. The pre-written tasks were developed so that the teacher would have time to focus on the topics to be discussed at interview. A 'general interview guide' was employed so that the researcher was able to diverge and seek clarification on the issues discussed. It also enabled careful planning of the interview topics in the time allocation.

Nunan (1992: 150) has raised concern about the "asymmetrical relationship between the participants" in interviews particularly in terms of the language used by the interviewer. In the pilot study context, both the interviewer and interviewee came from the same profession, therefore, the register of the interview was familiar to both participants. The teacher also freely agreed to participate in the pilot study after the research design procedures had been explained. She was also willing to have the interview audio taped. Thus in this instance, the problem of cooperation between the research participants was not an issue.

Finally, although interviewing in qualitative research can be a 'stand alone' data collection instrument, several sources of evidence are recommended for triangulation.
Yin (1994: 96) asserts that case study research designs which utilise many sources of evidence measures are claimed to have better “construct validity” and are viewed more “favourably”. This was one reason why multiple data sources were incorporated into the research design in this thesis.

The second data collection technique used was participant observation and this is examined next.

3.7.4 **Source of data: participant observation**

In qualitative research, one of the main data collection techniques is to observe the participants in their ‘real life’ settings. Glesne and Peshkin (1992) report that there is a ‘participant observer continuum’ which ranges from ‘mostly observer’ through to ‘mostly participant’. Throughout this pilot study the researcher adopted what Glesne and Peshkin (1992: 39-40) define as “observer as participant”. This is where the “researcher remains primarily as observer but has some interaction with the study participants”. Thus, in this study, the researcher sat and observed the informant teaching her class although, at times, her assistance was requested by learners who were having difficulty completing tasks. During the study, the teacher also sought clarification of teaching points such as grammar conventions.

Saunders (1995) notes the use of observation in the classroom can be problematic because it requires the complete willingness of both the teacher and the learners. In this study, the case study teacher was approached and she explained the presence of the researcher to the learners prior to the classroom observations. The research was only able to proceed after both the teacher and all the learners signed the consent forms.
Saunders (1995) states the following with regard to observation:

Observation may have advantages over both survey and interview methods in which teachers may be actively presenting a stance that is not really their own but one they think they should be presenting.

It is also important because it enables the researcher to see the informant in the natural setting where the phenomenon under study occurs. However, Bogdan and Biklen (1998) and Saunders (1995) do comment that observation can be too time consuming. The problem of time management and observation is addressed in a later section of this chapter.

The final data sources was the use of fieldnotes and documents. A description of these follows.

3.7.5 Fieldnotes

Bogdan and Biklen (1998: 107) define ‘fieldnotes’ as “the written account of what the researcher sees hears, experiences and thinks in the course of collecting and reflecting on the data in a qualitative study”. Hence, fieldnotes may include interview transcripts, pictures and official documents. In the pilot study, for example, they include documentation such as the interview transcripts, the researcher’s observation notes, the teacher’s pre-interview tasks, lesson plans, anecdotal records, lesson work sheets and copies of the learners’ work. As Bogdan and Biklen (1998: 60) note, case studies which use interviewing or observation as the main data sources often include documents as a supplementary information. In addition, fieldnotes can be used as a source of evidence for triangulation and validity purposes. Marshall and Rossman (1995) suggest that the value of documentation is that is an unobtrusive way of obtaining a data source. Bogdan
and Biklen also note that in some instances “official documents” which include policy
documents and student records may present a bias.

This concludes the examination of the data collection techniques and overview of the
analysis follows.

3.7.6 The pilot study analysis.

In conducting the analysis, the researcher adopted Miles and Huberman (1994: 10) three
step “concurrent flow activities” recommended for use in qualitative case study
research. This procedure recognises that the analysis is an iterative on-going procedure
that evolves throughout the study. When all the data was collected, the interviews were
firstly transcribed and all the fieldnotes were then examined. However, the audio-tapes
of the lessons were not fully transcribed, rather they were summarised in sections using
a tape counter. (see Appendix 3.4).

The first of the three step analysis is classified by Miles and Huberman (1994) as “data
reduction”. This refers to the process of simplifying, selecting and focusing on all
sources of evidence. The second step of the analysis involves the construction of “data
displays”. Data displays ensure that the data is organised into an accessible format such
as matrices or graphs, so that the researcher “can see what is happening and then draw
justified conclusions” (Miles and Huberman, 1994: 11). The final step is refer to as
“conclusion drawing/verification”. This is when the data displays are used by the
researcher to make conclusions drawn from the data which ultimately leads to the
development or refinement of theory.
In this thesis, a matrix format was used with "partially-ordered categories" (Miles and Huberman, 1994: 240). This involved constructing a series of categories within a matrix. The categories were based on pre-defined and emerging themes obtained from all the qualitative data sources. In this thesis, the work of Elaine Jackson (1994) and her study, into NLO in AMEP, including the stage of data analysis, was used to inform the research. Hence, eight of the matrix classifications were based on Jackson's (1994) eight categories of NLO. The remaining 'pre-defined' matrices corresponded to the three CGEA streams central to the study and to the Dixon and Lyons' (1995) definition of the ESL literacy learner. Dixon and Lyons' (1995) characteristics of an ESL literacy learner is described in Chapter 2 of this thesis. The final categories in the analysis were reflective of recurring themes which emerged from the data. These were constructed by "clustering" (Merriam, 1988: 150) or "grouping" together, similar patterns within the data. These particular matrices had not been pre-defined prior to collection of the data. All the common themes emerging from the matrix categorises were then used in corresponding sequential order to present the results of the research. (See Appendix 3.5).

The final step of analysis suggested by Miles and Huberman's (1994) entails "drawing conclusions/verification". The conclusions drawn from the pilot study served two purposes. Firstly, the findings of the pilot study were highly informative and the participant, as predicted, was used as one of the final case study teachers in the research. Secondly, the pilot study was also conducted to trial the data collection techniques and the research design. In view of this, the 'emerging themes' arising from the data are included in the cross-case analysis which is detailed in Chapter 5. Changes made to the final research design in light of the pilot study results are now outlined.
3.8 The final research design

The modifications made to the final research design stemmed primarily from observations made by both the researcher and the informant. The use of interviews, observation and documents such as anecdotal records remained as the main data collection techniques. The criteria used to select the pilot study teacher and her class were still applicable and were used to select the five other informants. The final analysis procedures remained the same as described in the foregoing section of the chapter section 3.7.6. On the whole, changes to the research design relate to issues of time management. The changes made are now outlined.

3.8.1 Interview and pre-interview tasks modifications

An examination of the interview transcripts indicates that as a source of data these contain the most detailed and revealing evidence. This can be seen (refer Chapter 5) by the amount of interview data which is quoted as exemplar in the final analysis. The initial pilot study research design included four ten to fifteen minute interviews. Before each of the interviews, the informant was asked to complete a written set of pre-interview tasks. As previously noted, these tasks all focused on the interview topics. Whilst these pre-interview tasks provided an additional data source, the pilot study informant had commented that these tasks were ‘arduous’ and ‘time-consuming’. Whilst she was happy to participate in any aspect of the research which was conducted at her workplace, the completion of the pre-interview tasks at home became ‘a nuisance’. This was also a reflection on the informant’s sessional employment status and the fact that she was only paid for ‘face-to-face’ teaching hours. Any additional
work such as lesson preparation, or indeed the pre-interview tasks, were to be completed in the teacher’s own time.

In light of the pilot study informant’s comments, it was decided to omit the pre-interview tasks in the final research design. As their purpose was primarily to give the teachers an opportunity to reflect on the forthcoming interview topics, a different strategy was used. In the final research design, the informants were only interviewed once for thirty to forty five minutes. This single interview incorporated the topics used in the four short pilot study interviews. Each informant was sent a copy of the interview schedule prior to the interview (Appendix 3.6). This replaced the pre-interview tasks yet still gave the teachers an opportunity to reflect on the topics they were to be asked. In all instances, it was emphasised that this was only a ‘guide’ and that at any time the interviewer may diverge and seek clarification based on their responses.

In order to address Saunder’s (1995) previously noted criticisms of the ‘one off’ interview, where possible, the informants were shown the interview transcripts (Appendix 3.7). The teachers were then asked to comment on whether or not they believed that the researcher was truly representing their viewpoint. If further clarification on an issue was required, a second interview was conducted although this only occurred in one instance. Two of the teachers made written amendments to the transcripts. Where possible, the informants were then asked to complete a ‘verification statement’ (Appendix 3.8) which recorded their acknowledgment that the researcher had correctly represented their opinions. This was also a form of ‘member checking’, a measure noted by Merriam (1998) to increase the internal validity of the research.
The change to the format of the interviews and the corresponding deletion of the pre-
interview tasks was a salient change to the final research design. The other significant
change to the pilot study design was the reduction in classroom observation time. An
explanation of this follows.

3.8.2 Classroom observation modifications

The decision to observe the pilot study class for the duration of a topic or a unit of
work was made for arbitrary reasons. Both the learners and the pilot study teacher gave
formal permission for the researcher to be present observing and audio-taping the
classes. It was found that the problem with observation, as the literature reports, is that
it is too ‘time-consuming’. An initial examination of the classroom observations and
recordings revealed that only a comparatively small amount of data was useful in the
research analysis. This is in contrast to the volume of informative, relevant, data
obtained from the interview transcripts. The pilot study teacher had been very willing
for the researcher to be present in the classroom. However, despite the unobtrusive
nature of the researcher’s observations, the informant did comment that she was always
aware of the researcher’s presence.

The reduction of classroom observation hours was made for two reasons. Firstly, the
data obtained from the interviews was far more revealing than the data obtained during
classroom observations. Secondly, the time constraints of managing six case studies
meant that the classroom observation hours were reduced. It was decided to observe
and audio record the case study teachers and their classes on only one occasion. Indepth
fieldnotes were still taken at each observation (Appendix 3.9).
A comparison of the pilot and final research design now follows.

3.9 **An overview of the pilot study and final research design**

In order to contrast the changes made to the pilot study and final research design, *Table 3.1* illustrates the two research procedures utilised in the thesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The pilot study research design</th>
<th>The final research design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 4 x 10/15 minute audio-taped interviews</td>
<td>• 1 x 30-45 minute audio taped interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pre-interview tasks</td>
<td>• General interview guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 sets of written tasks relating toforthcoming interview topics</td>
<td>Schedule of topics sent to informants prior to interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participant observation</td>
<td>• Participant observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation and audio-taping of a eight lessons</td>
<td>Observation and audio-taping of one lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fieldnotes</td>
<td>• Fieldnotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include interview transcripts, pre-interview tasks, lesson observation fieldnotes, anecdotal records, evaluation sheets</td>
<td>Include interview transcripts, lesson observation fieldnotes, lesson plans, anecdotal records, evaluation sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Analysis using partially-defined matrix categories to identify pre-defined and emerging themes</td>
<td>• Analysis using partially defined matrix categories to identify pre-set and emerging themes used for cross-case comparison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen the final research design utilises the same data collection instruments as in the pilot study; only the pre-interview tasks have been omitted. The analysis used the same 'partially defined' matrix categories for presenting themes. The final research design was more time efficient for both the researcher and the informants especially when conducting multi-site case studies.

Before concluding the discussion on the final research design a review of the validity and reliability procedures incorporated into the research design are detailed.
3.10 Validity and reliability issues

In order to address the issues of validity and reliability, this thesis has adopted several measures suggested in the foregoing discussion in order to strengthen the research findings. This thesis draws heavily on Merriam's (1998) recommendations for increasing both the internal and external validity of the research. In terms of external validity or generalisation, the study provided a thick rich description of the data and conducted a cross-case analysis. Several of Merriam's (1998) strategies for increasing the internal validity of the study have incorporated using multiple sources of evidence for triangulation. In this thesis, these data sources included interviews, observations and documentation. Merriam (1998) also advocates the use of member checking. Member checking was conducted by providing the informants with a copy of their interview transcripts to review. The informants were then asked to sign a 'verification statement' acknowledging that their opinions had been accurately represented by the researcher. The data was also shown to a colleague to enable 'peer examination' of the results. The final measure was to introduce an audit trail. This involved recording the counter number on a transcribing audio machine to accurately quote and locate the informants' audio-taped comments and to code the fieldnotes. When this was completed another colleague examined several sections of the documentation evidence and listened to several interview quotations to verify their authenticity (Appendix 3.10).

3.11 Conclusion

This chapter has presented an overview of the qualitative case study approach used within the thesis and a rationale for selecting this methodology. It has also introduced
the pilot study and described the multi-case study used in the final research design. As the research question has an 'explanatory' focus the design and strategy used is one suggested by Marshall and Rossman (1995: 41). This incorporates the use of multi-case studies and data collection techniques such as interviewing, participant observation and the use of documentation such as anecdotal records. These measures have also been incorporated into the methodology to address criticisms of case study research. These criticisms relate to issues such as internal and external validity and reliability. Finally, modifications to the final research design, in light of the pilot study, are described and justified. These modifications were made primarily, to obtain the most revealing data in a realistic time frame.

In the following chapter, the six case study teachers are introduced. The factors governing the selection of teacher and their classes are outlined. A description of the classroom setting and the learners is given.
CHAPTER 4

NATURE AND NUMBER OF SETTINGS AND PARTICIPANTS

4.1 Introduction

The decision to use a multi-case study as a strategy to investigate the research questions of this thesis entailed choosing six informants. In Chapter 3, the criteria for selecting these case study teachers was listed. Apart from teaching a low level ESL literacy class and using the specific streams of the CGEA, the only other requirement for inclusion within the study was that the teachers had an appropriate ESL qualification. The choice of the six case study teachers was done on a “purposive” (Miles and Huberman 1994: 27) selection basis. This refers to the fact that the aforementioned selection criteria were used as a basis for choosing the informants. It was also envisaged that a range of settings, contexts and CGEA streams, would be represented through the selection of the informants. As with the pilot study, centres were contacted and requests for teacher participation were made through the ‘gatekeepers’ or coordinators, at each setting. Once again the difficulty in gaining teacher involvement was not due to the teachers’ lack of interest in the research topic. Rather, the gatekeepers expressed concerns about teachers participating in any additional unpaid work such as the research tasks.

The six case study informants all taught in the inner and outer suburbs of Melbourne, Victoria. All but one of the six classes observed were part time and, on average, each module of the CGEA was delivered over four hours per week. The one full time class was taught by four different teachers. Apart from the Numerical and Mathematical Concepts stream (which is not the focus of this study) the teaching of the other streams was shared by each of the teachers.
It should be noted that the group focused on in this study is learners with minimal levels of formal educational experience. However, as will be seen in the description of the learner profiles, many of the classes included learners with a range of educational backgrounds that far exceed the target literacy levels of the class. As this is common place, the teachers were asked in interview to focus mainly on the learners highlighted by the research topic. The two teachers who taught several classes of ESL literacy learners and multiple streams of the CGEA, were asked to reflect on all their classes when interviewed although only one of these classes was observed.

It is also relevant to note that the information about the learner profiles was obtained during the case study interviews and class observations. Therefore, some of the information about the learners is based on the teachers’ perceptions of characteristics such as learner age and length of Australian residency. It seemed that often teachers themselves were only given a brief background profile of their ESL literacy learners by the organisation in which they worked. Whilst the students were not questioned during the research, the thesis still attempts to provide a true and accurate representation of what was observed in classrooms and what was presented by the case study teachers.

An overview of the class setting and the learner and teacher profiles follows. These are presented in a random order. It should be noted that the names of the teachers, the learners and the contexts have all been changed to ensure confidentiality.
4.2 The pilot study class

4.2.1 The context

This part time class was held in a community centre in Melbourne. It was situated in a local shopping complex. The class was held for a period of eight hours per week and the teacher, ‘Hannah’, taught the class for six hours per week.

This class was located at the back of an enormous open plan room. Halfway around the back perimeter of the room were computers and towards the front of the room were sets of shelving which contained pamphlets of information about the centres courses and local services. This section of the room also provided a large area with comfortable seating. Adjacent to where the class was taught were two glass-fronted offices where the coordinators worked.

The class tables were set in a horse shoe shape and the teacher worked predominantly at the front with a whiteboard. Due to the openness of the setting, the noise level was at times disturbing to both the teacher and the researcher although the students did not appear to be affected. In addition, the centre also provided free childcare for the learners and attendance was excellent.

4.2.2 Teacher profile

The teacher, Hannah, had a Diploma of Primary Teaching and a postgraduate qualification in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). She had also undertaken some ALBE units of study.
Hannah commenced working part time, teaching evening classes in adult ESL and ESL literacy in a TAFE setting six years ago. She also worked in a community provider setting. In both contexts, she was paid on a sessional basis.

4.2.3 Class profile

There were about twelve students in this class whose ages range from 22-75 years. Four of these are men who were members of a local Vietnamese club. The rest of the class was made up of mainly Turkish or Vietnamese women. Three of these women made use of the free childcare facility provided by the centre.

Most of the learners had been in Australia for over four years and their educational background varied enormously. Some of the students had very limited formal education—as little as three years. These students came from a farming background or else they left school at an early age to work at home with their families.

The remainder of the class had a diversity of educational backgrounds ranging from early secondary school level to that of a nurse and teacher who had tertiary qualifications. Only one younger woman was presently interested in seeking further studies in dress design. Many of the learners had experienced interrupted schooling and for most this was their first experience in a formal Australian learning environment.

Although Hannah focused on using the Reading and Writing and Oral Communication streams Level 1 and 2 of the CGEA as a curriculum framework, there was no pressure on her, from an organisational level, to ensure that the students were accredited. In other words, it was not a requirement that the learners be assessed according to CGEA
accreditation at the end of the course. When asked if this accounted for why there was such a disparate group of students in the class, Hannah responded that it was more to do with simply providing the students with an English language class. It seemed that the coordinator was not regimented in the criteria that was used to place the students in this class. It appeared that if the learners were not native speakers of English and they were looking for language classes, they were then placed in this course.

All the students appeared to get on extremely well. As the class consisted primarily of Vietnamese and Turkish learners, they tended to sit with those who came from the same language background. The more highly educated class members often helped the other learners who had little formal educational experience to draw upon. When this happened, it often involved the learners ‘codeswitching’ in and out of their first language to ensure that everyone understood the task at hand.

The majority of the learners were not seeking employment as they were either retired or else they were presently at home looking after young children. One of the Vietnamese women who had been a teacher in her country was employed to teach music at a Vietnamese Saturday morning school.

This concludes the overview of the pilot study setting and the participants. The next section of the chapter introduces the other five contexts used in the research and profiles the five teachers and their ESL literacy classes. Once again the identity of these participants and the settings have been changed. At times, the name given to each context reflects the institution type and whether or not the class is full time or part time.
A description each of the five other class contexts and the teacher and learner profile now follows.

4.3 The full time day class

4.3.1 The context

The full time class was organised and managed by an inner city community program in Melbourne. The actual class was held on different premises which the centre rented from another local organisation.

This was a full time class which offered the learners the opportunity to gain the CGEA Foundation Certificate One. The class ran for sixteen hours a week and all four streams of the CGEA were taught. The class was taken by four teachers who shared the teaching of the framework based on the number of hours that they were employed. Only one of the teachers appeared to be responsible exclusively for one stream, namely the Numerical and Mathematical stream; the others tended to integrate the teaching of the other three streams. At certain times in a semester, individual teachers were solely responsible for the delivery of one of the modules. Together all the teachers managed the course curriculum although the case study teacher, Laura, and one of the others, were primarily responsible for the delivery of the Reading and Writing and Oral Communication modules. These two teachers worked closely together. As Laura explained about her colleague: “we are both part time or casual workers so we plan on the phone with each other”.

The organisation had one large principal room in which the class was taught. This classroom was entirely surrounded by windows and was very light. A whiteboard was situated at the front of the class and the students sat at tables placed in rows. As the area was small and the other workers needed to walk through the classroom to access the kitchen, this was the only way that the tables in the room could be organised to accommodate the class.

This class was funded on a term by term basis and at the time Laura’s class was observed, a newly funded course had just commenced.

4.3.2 Teacher profile

Laura had taught for a total of twenty years. She initially worked in primary schools as a class and ESL teacher and during this time she completed her TESOL qualification. In 1991, she commenced working in an ESL literacy context teaching in DEET funded programs for the long term unemployed. Laura had worked in this community organisation for six years. She was employed on a sessional pay basis.

Laura also worked as a backfill teacher in primary schools and took art classes in a secondary school. As she said herself with regard to her employment “she is (was) sick of being a gypsy”.

4.3.3 Class profile

Laura’s class was a fluid group which had a core group of ten regular attendees. Some of the learners had been coming to the program for several years. These tended to be the older long term migrants who originally enrolled in DEET funded courses when they
were retrenched from the clothing and textiles industry in the local area. At the time, these learners were paid to attend class. When government policy changed and this financial incentive was removed, many of the learners stopped coming. However, a few of the original class members still attended the program of their own volition. Most of this group were aged between 40 and 65 years, were long term unemployed and were no longer officially seeking re-employment. This older group consists of four Italian woman and one Italian man; one Chinese man and two Turkish men. Some of these have been attending this class for several years.

At the time of this study, several younger learners who were new arrivals from the Horn of Africa, enrolled in the class. They were two males and two females who were all in their early twenties. The men were from Eritrea and the women from Somalia.

The educational background in this class was as diverse as in Hannah’s class. Half of the class had zero to four years education in their first language whilst the remainder, especially the younger members, had attended secondary school. One learner had a university degree.

4.4 The library class

4.4.1 The context

This part time class was managed by a suburban community provider in Melbourne and was held once a week for three and a half hours in a local library. Another higher level literacy class ran concurrently at the library. The two class teachers travelled to the library together, collecting one of the students on the way.
The case study class was held in an open section of the library which housed the computers. On arrival, the learners arranged the smaller library tables into one large rectangular table in preparation for their class. They also placed the chairs and tables back into their original positions when they had completed their lesson. The learners all sat around the long rectangle table and the teacher sat at the head of this table. The noise level was unobtrusive but the facilities for the teacher were minimal.

4.4.2 Teacher profile

Ruth had taught exclusively in the adult education sector since graduating from university. She had a secondary teaching qualification with a specialisation in English and ESL. Ruth had taught a range of ESL and ESL literacy classes at a TAFE college and in the community sector. She had worked in organisation for four years. She was employed on a sessional basis and worked three days a week.

Apart from teaching, Ruth also had additional coordination responsibilities in the organisation. At the time of the study, she was the regional moderation representative for the Reading and Writing streams of the CGEA.

4.4.3 Class profile

There were ten learners in this class whose ages range from the late 40’s to late 70’s. They were mainly from European backgrounds apart from one Chinese male. The other male and four of the women were Italian, one was Greek, two were Macedonian and one was Spanish. During the class, learners from the same language background sat together
and ‘codeswitched’ in and out of their first language when they experienced difficulty completing tasks.

This class consisted of a regular group of learners who had attended the course for two years. They had all gained the Oral Communication Module 1 of the CGEA and were currently enrolled in the Level 1 Reading and Writing module.

The learners were all long term residents who had a high level of oracy. In fact, as Ruth noted “they have to have a high deal of oracy to cope with the class”. Most of the woman had two to four years of formal education except a Spanish woman Mercedes, who had attended school for nine years. Huan, had only three years of formal education until he began night classes as an adult. He had also accessed an AMES course. The other male, Pietro, had no formal education until he was an adult when he then attended night school for three years. Due primarily to their ages, none of these learners are seeking employment.

4.5 The TAFE evening class

4.5.1 The context

This class was run through the ALBE department of a suburban TAFE in Melbourne. This area of the TAFE was located in a shop front which was situated on a busy main road.

The TAFE college had very regimented enrolment and assessment procedures. All ESL students who had achieved an ASLPR 2 in all skill areas were enrolled in ALBE classes
as opposed to remaining in the ESL department of the TAFE. The institute’s ALBE centre managed ESL literacy and multi-ethnic classes where the learners were enrolled in CGEA courses.

The students in this class were enrolled in Level 1 or 2 Reading and Writing and Oral Communication streams of the CGEA and these modules were taught in an integrated delivery method. It was an expectation of the TAFE that the learners gain an accreditation and that they should achieve this in the nominal eighty hours as suggested in the CGEA. If unsuccessful, the learners had one opportunity to repeat. If still unsuccessful, Mary said “We’d probably suggest a pathway to a community provider where they can move at a slower pace”.

The class itself was held in a large classroom that contained chairs and tables that were organised into three rectangular groups. A large whiteboard was at the front of the room and the teacher also used an over head projector. Despite having an air conditioner the room was very hot. The centre on the whole appeared to be very well resourced.

This class was unusual because the teacher was assisted by two volunteer tutors who were qualified ESL teachers. The tutors circulated and worked with the students often without teacher direction and the students appeared to be very accepting of their assistance. The teacher was very grateful for the tutors’ support. During the class, Mary would often confer with the tutors for clarification, for example, on spelling points.
4.5.2 Teacher profile

Mary had worked with adult learners for the past five years. Originally she had trained and worked as a secondary school teacher. After doing a variety of jobs and teaching in different contexts, Mary completed a Master of Education specialising in TESOL.

Mary had taught a range of adult ESL and ESL literacy classes. She originally taught ESL learners in Special Intervention Programs (SIP) and she was familiar with several other competency-based curriculum frameworks including the CSWE. Mary was employed in a 0.8 contractual position at the TAFE and was confident of maintaining her current employment in the following year.

During the daytime at the TAFE, Mary also taught a full time Level 1 Foundation Certificate CGEA class for sixteen hours per week. In this class, she taught the four streams of the CGEA in an integrated delivery method. At the time of setting up the case study, it was hoped that the researcher could observe this class for the study. However, due to TAFE assessment requirements at the near the end of the course, this was not possible. It was for this reason that the evening class was then selected for observation. During the interview, Mary’s comments reflected her experience of using all the streams of the CGEA that were relevant to this research.

4.5.3 Learner profiles

There are approximately fifteen learners attending the class whom Mary described as coming “from fairly disparate backgrounds and a disparate number of countries”. All of these had some kind of employment. Some of the learners were trying to improve their
literacy skills as part of their overall job seeking strategy which was to improve their employment opportunities.

The age range of the learners was from mid twenties to late fifties and they had all resided in Australia for five to twenty five years. On the night of observation, there were four Greek women, three Hong Kong Chinese and one Egyptian man in attendance.

Within the class there appeared to be several groups of different learners who were classified according to their age and levels of formal education. This also determined which level of the CGEA they will be enrolled in.

The class could probably be divided into two main groups of learners. The first group were characterised as being in their late forties to early fifties, residing in Australia for ten to thirty years and having two to five years formal educational. These people had well developed oracy skills and a good understanding of Australian culture. This group appeared to be enrolled in the Level 1 modules of the CGEA.

The other group of learners also ranged in age up to their fifties, but include a group of learners in their twenties and thirties. All of these students have had a minimum of seven or eight years education and some have even completed secondary school. Many of them have only been in Australia for four or five years. However, they have had more extensive and more recent formal language learning experiences to draw on, and as Mary observed “they are usually slightly quicker learners”. This group of learners tended to comprise those enrolled in the Level 2 modules of the CGEA. One student in this group was observed using an electronic dictionary and thesaurus.
4.6 The evening Adult Migrant Education Services (AMES) class

4.6.1 The context

This class was held twice a week at a suburban AMES centre in Melbourne. Due to the learners' low level literacy skills, this was one of the few classes, at this AMES using the CGEA.

The classroom was one of a group in a cluster of portable buildings. Apart from the classrooms and staffroom, the centre also contained a room with a large collection of resources. At the time of observation, the premises were undergoing refurbishment.

The class was held in a large room that was well-lit and comfortably heated. The tables and chairs were organised in small clusters with seating for six at each cluster. At the front of the room was an enormous whiteboard that ran the length of one wall and around the rest of the classroom were displays of students' work. The informant taught at the front of the room when using the whiteboard or an overhead projector. Most of the time she rotated around the class and spent a great deal of time sitting with individual groups of students.

This teacher, Clare, was extremely relaxed and joked continuously with the learners. They were very responsive to her and Clare appeared to have established a good rapport with them.
4.6.2 Teacher profile

In 1993, Clare graduated from university having attained a teaching qualification with a specialisation in ESL. Since that time, she has taught exclusively in the adult education sector.

Clare commenced teaching adults in a range of community centres where in terms of gaining professional experience she observed that this “got a foot in the door”. She then began teaching at AMES five years ago. Clare shared the teaching of several of her classes and also worked at another AMES campus. She was employed on a sessional payment basis.

4.6.3 Learner profiles

In this class there were ten learners but as Clare commented “on the books there are another five” who came from Turkey, Lebanon, Poland and Italy. On the evening of observation there were five Italians, one Greek, three Turkish and a Polish woman who had recently joined the class that evening. These learners were predominantly aged from forty five to sixty-five. Half of them were seeking employment and some were attending the course “for self-improvement”.

The class was enrolled in Level 1 and 2 of the CGEA, Reading and Writing modules. The educational background of the learners varied from one to ten years. One of the new class members was a qualified nurse who was having difficulty obtaining employment that was commensurate with her experience. Clare felt that this learner had been placed inappropriately in the class.
4.7 The daytime TAFE class

4.7.1 The context

This class was managed by a department of a local TAFE college in Melbourne which catered solely for ESL learners. The department offered a range of courses and several levels and modules of the CGEA.

The room in which the class was held was rather small. The tables were arranged in a horseshoe. There was a large whiteboard at the front and an overhead projector was also used by the teacher. The walls of the classroom were totally covered in word and spelling charts, students' work, class stories and photographs. This centre also appeared to be extremely well resourced.

4.7.2 Teacher profile

Gabrielle had worked exclusively in adult education for the last ten years. Apart from a teaching qualification, she had a Graduate Diploma in TESOL, and a Master of Education specialising in ALBE and had just commenced doctoral studies.

At the centre, Gabrielle taught several other CGEA classes apart from the one the researcher observed. She also held the main coordinator’s position. Unlike any of the other informants, Gabrielle had a full time permanent position within this institution.
4.7.3 Learner profiles

The learners in this course were all enrolled in Level 1 Reading and Writing and Oral Communication modules of the CGEA. The class was held three times a week for a total of eight hours.

There were twelve learners who came from Hong Kong, China, Timor, Iraq and, as Gabrielle commented, “a strong contingent from the Horn of Africa” in this single sexed women’s class. These women had resided in Australia for two to twenty years and were aged in their mid-thirties to mid-seventies. Half the learners in the class had no formal education in their first language and the other half had three to six years education. For all the class members, this was their first major experience of schooling in an Australian context.

4.8 Summary and conclusions

In order to enable comparisons across the six contexts, Table 4.1 (overleaf) presents a summary of the nature and number of settings and participants.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study Teacher</th>
<th>Teaching Qualifications</th>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Course Provider</th>
<th>CGEA Level</th>
<th>CGEA Streams</th>
<th>Class Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hannah            | • Diploma of Teaching (Primary)  
• Bachelor of Education. (TESOL) | sessional part-time | Community Provider | Level 1/2 | • Reading and Writing | 12 learners from Turkey and Vietnam. Aged 22-75 years Zero to tertiary level education |
| Laura             | • Diploma of Teaching (Primary)  
• Bachelor of Education. (TESOL) | sessional part-time | Community Provider | Level 1/2 | • Reading and Writing  
• Oral Communication  
• GCO | 12 learners from Italy, China, Turkey, Eritrea and Somalia. Aged 25-65 years Zero to tertiary level education |
| Ruth              | • Bachelor of Education (Secondary)  
English/ESL | sessional part-time | Community Provider | Level 1 | • Reading and Writing  
• Oral Communication  
• GCO | 10 learners from Italy, Spain, China, Macedonia and Greece. Aged late 40's-70's. 0-9 years schooling |
| Mary              | • Bachelor of Education (Secondary)  
• Master of Education (TESOL) | 0.8 contract part-time | TAFE | Level 1/2 | • Reading and Writing  
• Oral Communication  
• GCO | 15 learners from Greece, Hong Kong, China and Vietnam. Aged 25-55 years 2-10 yrs schooling |
| Clare             | • Bachelor of Education (Secondary)  
English/ESL | sessional part-time | AMES | Level 1/2 | • Reading and Writing  
• Oral Communication | 15 learners from Turkey, Lebanon, Poland and Italy. Aged 45-65 years 1-10 yrs schooling |
| Gabrielle         | • Graduate Diploma (TESOL)  
• Master of Education (ALBE)  
• Undertaking Ph.D studies | on-going full-time | TAFE | Level 1 | • Reading and Writing  
• Oral Communication | 12 female learners from HongKong, China, Timor, Iraq and Horn of Africa Aged 30-70 0-6 yrs schooling |

As can be seen the case study teachers come from a wide range of backgrounds and have taught in a diverse range of contexts. Apart from their shared experience of being experienced and qualified ESL literacy teachers, the informants were all familiar with the lower level modules of the CGEA.
The learners also come from a range of ethnic backgrounds and bring differing social, cultural, education, political and even economic experiences into the classroom environment. The reasons they give for attending class are also very diverse.

With this in mind, Chapter 5 presents the case study findings.
CHAPTER 5
THE CASE STUDY FINDINGS

5.1 Overview

This chapter reports the findings of the six case studies. These findings are presented in a format which corresponds to the pre-set and emerging themes arising from the data analysis as noted in Chapter 3. The implications of these findings are discussed in Chapter 6 of this thesis.

5.2 Introduction

In order to present the results of this research, several frames of reference have been incorporated. As previously noted, Jackson’s (1994) study into NLO in the AMEP was the informing theoretical framework used in the thesis. Jackson’s (1994) project identified eight broad categories of NLO in the AMEP. These comprised teachers’ identification of the gains learners made apart from language and literacy developments within adult migrant classrooms. In the same way, the six case study teachers were asked to identify the NLO that ESL literacy learners made in literacy courses and also to comment upon the salience of NLO in relation to the learners’ language and literacy gains.

It is important to recapitulate, before reporting any of the results, that Jackson’s project focused on all types of ESL learners, not specifically ESL literacy learners. Some of the teachers’ views in Jackson’s report (1994) related to learners with tertiary levels of formal education in their first language. For this reason, it is essential to include the case study teachers’ definition of the characteristics which they perceive to constitute the
ESL literacy learner’s profile. This is important so that the differences between the two categories of ESL learner maybe highlighted and the target group of learners for this thesis be kept in mind. In addition, this definition underpins the main research question of how the CGEA caters for the non-language needs of ESL literacy learners.

The findings of the six case studies follow. This commences with the case study teachers’ description of what they perceived to be the important characteristics of ESL literacy learners.

5.3 ESL literacy learner characteristics

One of the complexities of conducting this research project was trying to establish whether teachers of ESL literacy classes using the CGEA had a shared notion of the characteristics of an ESL literacy learner. As noted in Chapter 2, Dixon and Lyons’ (1995: 1) characteristics of this learner type were used to inform the study. The case study teachers’ responses to this question are presented according to Dixon and Lyons’ (1995) three sub-categories of ESL literacy learner characteristics. These now follow.

5.3.1 High oral communication skills and low literacy skills in English

In terms of giving a brief or succinct definition, Clare, Mary, Laura and Ruth identified the notion of having ‘relatively high’ levels of oracy and ‘comparatively low’ levels of literacy as being the most salient feature of an ESL literacy learner profile. As Clare observes in terms of the learners in her class “their writing is definitely lower than their oracy- that’s the basic thing”.
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Both Hannah and Mary gave similar responses although their comments also included giving an ASLPR score of Level Two in speaking and listening as being necessary in terms of placement in literacy classes. This may be reflective of the initial learner placement procedures used in TAFE settings where the two teachers worked, as not all educational institutions use the ASLPR to assess and place their clients. As Mary notes:

We wouldn't have anyone in an ESL literacy class unless they were Level 2 (ASLPR) speaking and listening so they would manage. Otherwise, they'd be more suitable for perhaps straight ESL because we are looking at people who are slightly stronger in oracy to begin with.

Gabrielle gives a slightly different interpretation of the types of characteristics displayed by these learners. She clearly believes that they have limited or no literacy in their first language. She also asserts that "when talking about literacy, I mean print based because they are literate in many other ways". Gabrielle also conceded that the definition may include those learners "that have a lack of familiarity with roman script".

Whilst Gabrielle clearly supports the idea that ESL literacy students have limited reading and writing skills, she states, with regard to her own experience, that having relatively lower literacy skills "doesn't always accompany higher oracy. In fact I think it is certainly not the case".

This is an interesting observation because most of the case study teachers identified the main characteristic of an ESL literacy profile as having higher levels of oracy in comparison to reading and writing skills. However, on examination often 'higher oracy' is limited to proficiency in a small range of contexts such as in casual conversation
discourse. Indeed, Mary says when describing the learners in her class that, in terms of reading and writing, “their difficulties are often problems that are ingrained in their oracy”. Laura also comments that her students “can understand but this is limited by their limited vocab”.

Gabrielle’s belief that higher oracy skills as compared to ‘print based’ literacy skills is not always a feature of an ESL literacy learners profile is based on her perception that this is not the major defining characteristic of these learners. This is supported by her discussion of class placement procedures for the learners at her centre. She states that placement is reflective of:

the combination of their educational history and also their assessment in English. Usually when they get placed in that kind of class they tend to be sort of ASLPR 0 across the board. They might have 0+ in one skill area.

This statement indicates that the ESL literacy learners in Gabrielle’s class do not have high levels of oracy.

It would seem, therefore, that there are some alternative viewpoints with regard to ESL literacy learners having higher levels of oracy than in reading and writing. However, the case study teachers unanimously identified the need for these learners to develop their reading and writing skills as being an important characteristic of this type of learner.

5.3.2 Limited education

Limited education was identified by all the informants as being a salient feature of an ESL literacy profile. Definitions varied and were generally not quantified. Hannah suggested that these learners had “low levels of formal education” whilst Clare, Ruth
Gabrielle and Laura included ESL literacy learners who had no formal schooling at all. Clare and Gabrielle also noted that this characteristic incorporated those with 'disrupted' schooling.

None of the teachers specified the number of years of schooling when articulating this characteristic. However, when reviewing class profiles often the teachers such as Mary described many of their students as those “who didn’t finish primary school education” thus implying a definition of under seven years education when using the term ‘limited education’.

The learners’ experience in a schooled setting was seen to be important primarily because those with higher levels of formal education could draw upon their experiences of acquiring literacy in their first language and apply these to learning English. This was quite apart from the cultural differences of being in an Australian classroom context. So as Gabrielle remarks when contrasting ESL learners with higher levels of formal education and ESL literacy learners:

I think in my mind there are many things you transfer when you develop in a first language, particularly when you develop literacy in a first language, that actually transfer into a new setting. They (ESL literacy learners) don’t have those skills to draw upon. So I mean that it’s two things. They’re developing literacy for the very first time in a second language context which is not familiar to them, in a language that is not their own.

The final characteristic Dixon and Lyons’ (1995) use to characterise ESL literacy learners relates to years of residency in Australia.
5.3.3 Long term residents of Australia

The expression 'long term resident' was used by Laura and Ruth to describe the students in their courses. Both Hannah and Clare identified ESL literacy learners as those who had been in Australia for more than five years.

The label of 'long term resident' seems to be applied more frequently to the older Europeans who migrated to Australia in the 1950's and 1960's. In this instance, the notion of 'long term' means twenty to forty years. This is certainly true for some of the learners in the classes taught by Ruth, Laura, Clare and Mary. However, it was not always the case in every context. In Gabrielle and even in Laura's class, several of the learners from countries in the Horn of Africa had only resided in Australia for three years and yet they were still classified as ESL literacy students in terms of class placement. There were also a group of younger learners in Mary's and again Laura's class who had lived in Australia for up to seven years. Many of these had completed several years of secondary education. Whilst their level of literacy was higher than that of target group, they are still representative of the types of ESL literacy learners that are generally enrolled in CGEA courses.

Mary has several learners belonging to this category in her class and she reports that "they are slightly quicker learners". Apart from having more years of recent education in a schooled context where they can access many classroom learning strategies, many of these, by virtue of their age, are seeking employment where highly developed literacy skills are essential.
It appears that of the ESL literacy learner characteristics documented by Dixon and Lyons (1995), having limited or no formal education as well as low level reading and writing skills, have been identified by all six case study teachers as being a feature of this kind of learner profile. The characteristic of being a ‘long term resident’ was not always mentioned and, even if it was, the number of years equated with ‘long term’ ranged from four to thirty years.

In the next section, each of Jackson’s (1994) eight major categories of NLO are used to present the findings. These findings complement Jackson’s (1994) project in that the case study teachers identified similar types of NLO for ESL literacy learners. The most relevant NLO categories for the learners in this thesis were: Confidence, Learning Skills and Social, Psychological and Emotional Support in the New Environment. This study also found that, for these learners, the development of classroom metalanguage featured as a learning-to-learn skill. Further exploration of these themes follows.

5.4 Jackson’s non-language outcomes: the eight major categories.

Jackson’s eight major categories were created out of twenty two responses given by the 72 teachers surveyed in the AMEP. These responses were then analysed and the eight categories developed. To recapitulate, Jackson’s (1994) eight categories of NLO were:

- Confidence
- Social, psychological and emotional support in the new life and learning environment
- Knowledge of social institutions
- Cultural awareness
- Learning skills
- Goal Clarification
- Motivation
- Access and entry into further study, employment, community life
The categories in this thesis are ordered in a format which mirrors Jackson’s (1994) project. Added to these categories are patterns which emerged from this analysis such as the development of metalanguage as a NLO. Jackson’s research utilised both qualitative and quantitative forms of data analysis. It described the frequency of responses to a survey although the information was originally obtained in one to one or group interviews where the participants were asked to record and expand on written responses. Feedback from professional development and consulting sessions was also included.

This research included several sources of data collection including interview transcripts, classroom observations, informants’ anecdotal records and journal recordings. All of these have been analysed and incorporated into the same eight broad categories but are not ordered to match with the frequency of responses as Jackson did. In this thesis, a qualitative multi-case study was used because the researcher thought this approach would yield more in-depth analysis.

It is important to note that although the data has been classified according to Jackson’s (1994) NLO categories, all of these are interrelated. At times, grouping the data was difficult because the categories were not rigid nor was that Jackson’s original intention. As Jackson (1994: 10) cautions with regard to this methodological framework, “the categories are here presented as discrete for the purposes of conceptual and practical convenience only”.

Within each of the eight major NLO categories are several sub-categories which reflect patterns emerging from the six case studies. In Jackson’s (1994) original project some of
NLO recorded, such as *Study management* in the *Learning skills* category, were not applicable to the lower level ESL literacy learners of this study. As previously noted, Jackson's (1994) study included learners with tertiary levels of education. In this thesis, study management techniques, for example, are irrelevant. This is because the case study learners still required a great amount of teacher direction and support.

The findings pertaining to Jackson's first major category of NLO follow.

5.5 **Confidence**

The first major category of NLO included the development of the learners' confidence, self-esteem, and self-image. In the same way as the teachers in Jackson’s (1994) report identified this as the most frequently occurring gain, all the informants in this project acknowledged the learners' development of confidence.

In terms of identifying this first major category of NLO, the informants clearly linked the emergence of these gains with the acquisition of literacy skills and the process of learning in the classroom context. Ruth simply noted that her students developed confidence through "learning about the topics we study". This idea of reaffirmation of skill development was clearly important to Clare. She states "Yes, it’s confidence and recognising that they can do things they didn’t think they could". This was also supported when the researcher observed her teaching. While the class was working Clare made an aside to the researcher with reference to a learner called 'Anna'. Clare said that Anna had good literacy skills but being in the class was really a "confidence
building thing”. In other words, attending class increased Anna’s confidence through reaffirming her literacy knowledge.

Hannah also strongly identified gaining confidence as a NLO which she links not only to the learning process, but to the learners’ development of classroom metalanguage. The concept of metalanguage has been reviewed in Chapter 2 of this thesis. Briefly, to reiterate, metalanguage is defined as “the language used to analyse or describe a language” (Richards, Platt and Platt, 1992: 227). Hannah contends that the learners become more confident when they use the “classroom terminology” so that “they can immediately tap into what is happening within the classroom”. As Hannah linked the development of learner confidence to the acquisition of metalanguage, additional findings related to this, are reported in the Learning-to-learn sub-category (see 5.8.1).

Mary also identified the “growth in self-esteem” as an important NLO which she related to the learners’ improvement in literacy. Growth in self esteem occurred when students began “to realise that ‘Yes I can do this’”. Laura, in a very similar way, observed that her students were identifying improvements in self-esteem since acquiring learning-to-learning skills related to literacy. As Laura states:

They (the learners) say We can do this. I helped my son; I know how to use a cassette recorder; I know how to photocopy......I can start to take a message, you know that sort of thing. Just feeling part of not feeling so isolated from what their children are doing.

Gabrielle identified “enhanced confidence” and “self-esteem” whilst aware that these gains can “sound cliched”. She also highlighted the difficulty in quantifying these types of NLO. She concedes that “I’m really clear that I’m talking about self esteem in as much as you can describe how. I don’t know if it’s quantifiable but there are ways of
measuring it if you think laterally”. This in turn becomes an issue in relation to competency-based curriculum models and the reporting of outcomes to funding bodies. These issues are addressed in Chapter 6.

This concludes the reporting of the first category findings. The findings related to the second NLO category now follow.

5.6 Social, psychological and emotional support in the new life and learning environment

This second category, as the heading suggests, incorporates the development of support networks, contact and friendship groups support and was seen by the informants to be highly salient in that it was identified by all. As noted in the introduction section of this chapter, within some of the eight major NLO categories, several sub-categories have been devised to reflect the results of the six case studies. The first of these is now presented.

5.6.1 Social interaction

The notion of “companionship”, of “social interaction” and of “making friends” was mentioned by Mary, Ruth and Clare, respectively, as being one of the gains which occurred within their classes. For Laura this was also true as she comments about her full time course that “it has become a very tight social group, not that they exclude people, but the class is the centre of their day”.
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This idea of gaining some kind of support network within the classroom was also highlighted by Gabrielle and Hannah as being a central reason for learners attending class. As Gabrielle suggests:

For many of these women this is partly why they come. I think it is just a sense of community with other adult learners which I think is really important. Some are terribly marginalised and isolated in the flats where they live or have no family members. I think it (the class) fulfils an important function in that way as well.

This is interesting because when observing Gabrielle’s class it was evident that the learners really did support one another in their attempts to improve their literacy skills. At one point in the class when a Somalian woman was asked to stand at the front of the class to fill in an answer on a cloze activity, one of the other students continually calls out to her “Yes, good girl”. There are also instances in the field notes (Classroom Observation 28/10/98), with regard to this activity in which the researcher noted “The students clap H.”.

Hannah also contends that the students came to class for a whole range of reasons. She observes that for many of the learners including those with high oracy skills, “coming to class is often the only time that they are actually speaking English so the social aspect is really important”.

The importance of making learners feel relaxed was perceived as a duty of the teacher. This is elucidated next.

5.6.2 Negative and traumatic experiences: the teacher’s role

Many of the case study teachers commented on the support role that they played within the classroom, particularly in being approachable and making the learners feel
comfortable. Hannah believed that this was important because many of the learners had negative formal learning experiences. Clare contends that if “the students are feeling comfortable and relaxed they perform better than if they don’t”. She also believed in encouraging students to continue attending classes. Clare commented that it was important to let students know that the classroom “is not a scary place to be and it’s not going to be all hell and awful because if you don’t catch some people like that on the first night you lose them”.

This role of the teacher providing support for the learners appeared to be a significant NLO for Clare. In another part of her interview transcript she adds that the teachers at her centre have had “training in trauma and torture”. Clare believed that this training was helpful in identifying the outward signs of trauma displayed by some learners in the class. In this instance she was referring to refugees. In Clare’s opinion, showing compassion and providing support for these learners ultimately led to the enhancement of their literacy skills.

While observing many of the classes, the researcher was struck by how relaxed the teachers were with the learners and how they did indeed try to create a comfortable and supportive learning environment. The field notes taken during the class observations which relate to the informants included comments like “nice rapport with students” (Fieldnotes 13/10/98) with regard to Clare; “lots of laughter and lots of encouragement” (Fieldnotes 28/10/98) describing Gabrielle and “gives lots of praise” (Fieldnotes 26/10/98) in relation to Laura.
This concludes the findings for the second NLO category. The third category findings are now reported.

5.7 **Knowledge of social institutions**

This category included an awareness of community resources and a knowledge of the ‘system’ and how to access it. It appeared that this was achieved through the selection of topics covered in the courses. Thus, whilst the overall aim was to improve learners’ literacy skills NLO gains were made simultaneously. Both Clare and Mary observed that the learners themselves had commented that the literacy classes helped them to “access community things much better”. Clare’s example specifically related to a learner finally understanding patient procedures at the dental hospital since attending class.

Both Ruth and Gabrielle also identified the general knowledge increases that their students made through participation in the CGEA modules and the development of those through the selection of suitable topic choice. For Hannah, this was an important focus of her class. This is demonstrated when examining some of the data related to a unit of work on *The Local Community* which included class observations. Hannah planned and noted in her journal and lesson plans the value of focusing on these topics (Appendix 5.1). These particularly relate to her belief that the students should learn to have access to community resources and facilities. It was hoped that this access would continue beyond the classroom context.

Laura’s selection of topics to generate non-language gains in this area is also reflective of the older students in her class. She refers to educating students about health issues and
taking them on excursions to places where they can have their blood pressure checked.

As she observes, the information imparted to the learners has made them aware that
"it’s good to have your diabetes and blood pressure checked otherwise some wouldn’t
do it at all". It is interesting to note that the older learners in Ruth’s class were also
focusing on writing reports with regard to health issues reflective of common ailments
associated with their age at the time the class was observed (Appendix 5.2).

This concludes the findings for this NLO category. The fourth NLO category findings

*Cultural Awareness* are now outlined.

### 5.8 Cultural awareness

This category included responses related to the awareness of multicultural issues and of
Australian and cross-cultural issues.

In identifying one of the important non-linguistic gains that ESL literacy learners made,
Hannah wrote in her journal “learning about cultural procedures”. Laura believed that
the students “learnt tolerance of other cultures”. The fostering of “cross-cultural
awareness in the classroom” was identified by Gabrielle as being one of the important
outcomes of being in a literacy course.

Mary and Ruth both conceded that learners in their classes gained cultural understanding
but both these informants qualified their responses with regard to their long term
resident students. Ruth stated that these learners:

> have a pretty good awareness of those things any way because they are
> long term residents and their children have grown up here so they are not
> in the dark about Australian culture.
Laura also linked her comments to developing culturally appropriate social skills within the classroom setting which she hoped might be drawn upon in a whole range of other contexts. She believed that these learners make cultural awareness gains so they can:

function within a learning environment and in this case it is a classroom. They are also learning to function in Australian society too. The culture of shouting very loudly doesn’t go down very well in a lot of social situations.

The idea of learning socially and culturally appropriate behaviour in the classroom appeared to be integral part of Laura’s teaching philosophy. This type of NLO was strongly linked to the development of learning skills and is now presented in the findings of the Learning Skills category.

5.9 Learning skills

The Learning skills category generated a great number of responses and, therefore, reaffirms the relationship between this type of NLO and the formalised teaching of literacy skills. Jackson’s (1994) Learning Skills category included responses from the following areas: Study management techniques; Problem solving strategies; Learning skills and strategies; Knowledge of formal learning environment and processes; Autonomous learning skills; Exposure to technological learning aids and Self-monitoring and self-evaluation skills.

For the purposes of this research, the findings of the Learning skills were collated into three sub-categories. These three sub-categories are reflective of the NLO made by lower-level ESL literacy learners using the CGEA as described by the case study teachers.

The first sub-category follows.
5.9.1 Learning-to-learn skills

The kinds of learning-to-learn strategies that the case study teachers identified were varied. However, providing the learners with techniques to improve their literacy skills involved teaching them about learning skills and processes which they needed to complete literacy tasks. Therefore, at times during the interviews, the case study teachers made a link between the development of NLO and the acquisition of literacy.

Data collected from Hannah’s class observations and interviews clearly illustrates this point. She gave the following response:

Learning how to learn is particularly relevant to ESL literacy students. Group work or pair activities where you need to work together in order to gain the required work where there are designated roles such as genuine ‘information gap’ information. Organisational skills, trying to have a set time to complete work, time management, encouraging students to correct their own drafts, managing their folders. These things all develop independence and self-reliance.

This was also part of Hannah’s personal teaching philosophy. She also believed that learning-to-learn skills require students to learn and be able to apply the basic metalanguage used within the literacy class. Hannah’s identification of classroom metalanguage was also linked to the learners developing confidence. This was reported in the findings contained in Jackson’s first category of NLO.

In terms of classroom metalanguage Hannah posits:

I think it is important with ESL literacy students to know how a class functions and to understand the language of classroom. So therefore, words such as brainstorm, cloze, the use of the terminology like writing reports, procedures so that they know what you mean and then you don’t have to keep explaining it all the time.

In order to further illustrate Hannah’s viewpoint, during a class observation the following exchange occurred between Hannah and a new Vietnamese student, ‘Tran’. 
Tran had just recently enrolled in the class. Hannah (H) was directing the students to work on a group activity as part of an introduction to the topic on *The Local Community* when the following oral exchange occurred with Tran (T). It should be noted that the initials denote who is speaking.

**H:** I want you to ‘brainstorm’ all the words you know about your community. Remember, I only want you to write down any words that come into your head. Don’t worry about spelling and don’t write in sentences.

**T:** Excuse me Teacher- ‘brainstorm’? But I still don’t understand. ‘Brain’- I know (points to head). ‘Storm’- Psssh! (gestures motions with hands). Together- a storm in my head?

Hannah’s Lesson Observation 22/8/97

As can be seen Tran has never heard the word ‘brainstorm’ yet all the other learners in the class engaged in this activity without seeking further explanation from Hannah. Apart from Tran, the other learners were familiar with this classroom terminology or metalanguage and understood what they were required to do. Hannah’s identification of metalanguage is significant because it was not identified by Jackson’s (1994) as a ‘non-language outcome’. Yet metalanguage is clearly interrelated to the more traditional content-based outcomes within the language classroom. Although Hannah did not use the term ‘metalanguage’ her examples of ‘classroom terminology’ (and those of other informants) match with the concept of metalanguage.

Ruth also identified learning-to-learn as a salient NLO as well as linking this to learning about being in a formal classroom environment. As she says in relation to NLO within the literacy classroom “so it’s about learning, learning about school, learning about education, learning about books and knowledge”. This is interesting because despite the learners in this class having reasonably low levels of literacy skills, when observed, Ruth still used the same kinds of metalanguage as Hannah. One particular example relates to
her trying to teach the learners where to locate information required to complete a health report. The learners are well aware of terms such as ‘heading’ and ‘section’ despite them having difficulty in successfully being able to accurately complete this report for CGEA accreditation.

Other observations of case study teachers provided examples where the informants used classroom metalanguage to direct the learning process. In Gabrielle’s class when a student was completing an activity, Gabrielle said to her “Quan, underline your answer. Do you remember underlining?” and in Mary’s class she tells a student to “proof read” his work.

Mary also believed that learning-to-learn strategies were an important NLO. She perceived that due to the limited number of hours in which the learners were in the class, it was important for them to acquire these learning strategies. By doing this, they could further access information independently.

As can be seen, learning-to-learn constitutes a major part of this NLO category. Teaching learners how to develop their literacy skills requires, at this level, a great deal of assistance from the teacher especially through imparting the strategies and techniques which are used in the classroom. Developing these learning skills is also linked to the students acquiring the knowledge of how to operate in an Australian formal learning environment. This includes using the metalanguage which is used to describe many of these learning strategies used in a adult ESL literacy class. Findings which pertain to the next Learning skills sub-category follow.
5.9.2 Knowledge of a formal Australian educational environment

Laura’s identification of this learning skill complements her viewpoint that the learners develop socially and culturally appropriate kinds of behaviours in the context of participating in an Australian adult literacy classroom. This viewpoint has also been noted in the findings for the second major NLO category (refer section 5.5 of this chapter). As Laura explained when describing the NLO that the learners in her class acquired:

> They have obviously got some sort of knowledge of (the) formal learning environment. So they know you don’t come in and just throw your books all around you. If someone is sitting in a seat, you don’t ask them to move and those sorts of appropriate kinds of things.

Laura also was keen for her students to learn how to “modify how they interrupt” and to learn how to appropriately interact in a classroom. This focus was noticeable when observing Laura teach. When one student was speaking and another kept interrupting, the researcher noted in the fieldnotes that Laura “continually gestures to student to stop interrupting” (Fieldnotes 26/10/98).

Gabrielle also remarked on the gains learners make from being in a schooled environment. With regard to her class, she stated that “I think the importance of being in a formal learning environment takes on an importance that sometimes surprises me”. Gabrielle linked this also to the culturally-specific learning activities used in this context which for some learners may judge as “frivolous” such as going on excursions.

The final sub-category of the Learning Skills category follows.
5.9.3 Awareness of technological learning aids

The use of information technology such as the use of computers as learning aid was identified by some of the informants as a NLO. In Clare’s, Hannah’s and Mary’s classes there were set timetables for learning computer skills. In Laura’s class, part of the course focused on the learners acquiring basic keyboarding skills. Mary explained that for her students, learning how to access computer technology such as the Internet resulted in “the gradual increase in skills and expertise and has been a big boost in those affective outcomes certainly”.

The idea of being able to access technological learning aids was not limited to the learners being able to use the more sophisticated forms of technology such as the Internet. Laura, for example, noted that the learners in her class could now operate a photocopier, fax machine and an answering service.

Hannah wrote in her journal that learning-to-learn that it involved “the ability to recognise the skills needed to further contribute to the learning process, that is, how to use the photocopier, the computer, use the Independent Learning Centre (ILC) or the library”.

As can be seen, the case study teachers believed that ESL literacy learners need to be taught strategies which facilitate language development and to understand how the Australian classroom functions.

The findings for Jackson’s (1994) next major NLO categories follows.
5.10 Goal Clarification

This category included the learners acquiring a knowledge of options and opportunities as well as goal clarification.

Most of the informants were able to comment on the reasons why learners in their programs attended classes. Although Mary, Clare and Laura noted that many of their learners clearly wanted to improve their literacy skills in order to obtain employment, the students also attended class for many other reasons which have previously been noted. To recapitulate, for Laura and Hannah many of their learners were there for the social aspect of the class. For others, acquiring English literacy skills was the most important objective; they were not really interested in obtaining a CGEA certificate. As Laura observes about her learners’ goals “essentially it was (is) about learning English but not academic English.”

Clare commented that the learners in the evening class came for reasons such as “self improvement and to feel more confident about their ability to relate to other people in the community”. Ruth’s class of older learners wanted to improve their literacy skills so they could become more self reliant. Gabrielle, on the other hand, felt she could not be certain as to why the women in her class attended. She commented that “it’s always a sort of a guess as to why they are here”. However, this was linked more to the fact that many of the women had “no shared language to communicate with”. In other words, the learners’ oracy levels were very low so they were unable to articulate their reasons for coming. Gabrielle did suggest that some of the learners were, in fact, long term unemployed.
Whilst the learners had a variety of reasons for attending class, the teachers also noted that from an organisational level, there were always attempts to create pathways from one course to another or from one centre or another. Laura saw the creation of pathways as providing “accountability”. Clare said of her organisation “if they (the learners) come here and we can’t help them with a class here then we can at least suggest somewhere for them to go”.

It appeared that generally the learners not only had clear ideas about why they were attending class but also the organisations where they were enrolled in classes informed them of the choices that were available to them. For TAFE classes such as Mary’s, the learners were issued with a very stringent number of hours to fulfil the course requirements. In community centres, such as Hannah’s and Laura’s, some of the learners had attended similar levels of classes for several years. The issue of nominal delivery hours available for CGEA courses was raised by many of the teachers. Its implications are discussed in Chapter 6.

This concludes the findings for this category of NLO. The results of the Motivation category are now presented.

### 5.11 Motivation

In the responses obtained from all the data sources, the word ‘motivation’ was rarely used. However, it was strongly implied particularly with regard to the learners improving their literacy skills and to their own acknowledgments with regard to their overall achievements. This is borne out by comments such as when Laura describes the progress that her students have made “they have learnt English on the way and we look
at what they can do originally and what they can do now and they have learnt a lot. It’s motivated them to come to class”.

Hannah was the only other teacher who clearly nominated ‘motivation’ as being a NLO that her students made. In a pre-interview task she identifies “being motivated” as a NLO. In her comments she writes that being motivated relates to students “seeing content (i.e. lesson content) as relevant”. This is another instance of a teacher observing the interdependence of the NLO or non-content gains with the content or language and literacy gains in the classroom.

The other category of NLO, which is directly related to ‘Motivation’, is the first NLO category of Confidence. Examples discussed by the teachers relate to the learners themselves making positive acknowledgments of the things they can now do since commencing class. These are indicators of the development of confidence as well as providing motivation to continue coming to class. Indeed Jackson (1994) consistently refers to these two NLO concurrently whilst stressing the interdependence of these gains with language and literacy developments.

Gabrielle, in discussing her class, emphasises the idea that learning literacy is a motivational stimulus in itself. As she asserts:

I do not believe that these women come to class as faithfully as they do, over such a long term as the have, purely because it makes them feel good. I actually think they do place importance, just as one might assume of another learner at a higher level, in gaining and building their language acquisition and their literacy development.

This once again highlights the case study teachers’ belief in interrelatedness of NLO to the language learning process.
The findings for Jackson’s (1994) final major NLO category now follow.

5.12 Access and entry into further study, employment, community life

This category of NLO generated less data than many of the other categories. This was partly due to the fact that many of the learners, for reasons such as their age, were not interested in seeking employment or achieving high levels of further education. It was also difficult to differentiate the responses to this category from those relating to community life which has been previously reported in the Knowledge of Social Institutions category.

In the same way that access to the community (see 5.6) was a feature of gains made by the older learners, the acquisition of work skills appeared to be more relevant to the younger learners. In commenting on those younger students, Mary said that they “need help to go any further in work, accessing reading and writing”. This acknowledgment of age as being relevant is important especially in terms of fulfilling learner goals. As Laura states with regard to the older non-job-seeking learners “they don’t want to write a resume-they have got no interest in it”. Gabrielle also acknowledged “you know a woman of 65 isn’t looking for work”.

Mary also noted that the younger students in her class were aware that they must improve their literacy skills in order to access further study. Mary had a clear idea of the need to create opportunities within the class to ensure the students made gains in this area and that this was achieved partially through the choice of topics covered in the class. This, she believed was a positive outcome of using the CGEA. As she states:
I find with the CGEA, because it has no prescription of content, that the content can grow out of current interests and can proceed at their own pace. You can build up a context and predict from where you are going which I find is a great way for these people to learn.

Laura also acknowledged the value of using the CGEA in terms of providing the learners with “pathways to further study”. It is interesting to note once again that this category of NLO, from the comments made by the teachers, is another instance of the difficulty in separating the NLO and language and literacy gains.

This concludes the section on the informants’ identification of NLO according to Jackson’s eight major categories of NLO. Before examining NLO in the CGEA, the case study teachers’ views on the importance of NLO in relation to language and literacy gains for ESL literacy learners, follows.

5.13 The importance of non-language outcomes within ESL literacy classrooms

In terms of acknowledging the importance of NLO in relation to language and literacy gains that ESL literacy learners made, all six case study teachers indicated that both types of outcomes were crucial and were in fact interrelated.

Both Ruth and Clare perceived that NLO were indeed important to the whole literacy process. Mary saw the development of NLO and literacy gains as being “part of a whole growth, a gradual growth”. She also noted that the learners themselves often identified these gains as being outcomes of the learning process.

Some of the other informants presented quite strong viewpoints with regard to partnership of NLO and language and literacy gains. Gabrielle, for example, asserts:
I can’t imagine a functional, healthy, pedagogical environment where one component (that is, NLO and ‘content’ gains) wouldn’t be there. I think that they are part and parcel of the same project in a way and they are critical, I think particularly for these learners although with other learners too.

In the same way Laura also expressed a clear position on this relationship between these two kinds of outcomes. In response to the importance of the two gains she stated:

They do work alongside each other but I do say we have days when NLO are probably more important and take a higher priority and we have days when the others do. But somewhere in the middle, I hope they are in partnership. Sometimes one is more dominant than the other but essentially if you don’t have a program with NLO- you might as well pack up your books.

Hannah’s position somewhat mirrors Laura’s view. She believes that fundamentally it is important to recognise NLO because otherwise one whole aspect of the learning process within the language classroom is not acknowledged.

Thus it is evident from the case study teachers’ perspective, that NLO and language and literacy gains are both considered to be important components of the learning process. It appears that within ESL literacy classrooms using the CGEA teachers believe that NLO and literacy gains develop in ‘partnership’.

As one of the integral components of this research is to focus on using the CGEA as the guiding curriculum framework in ESL literacy classrooms, the next section of this chapter reports on the teachers’ comments on how the CGEA caters for the non-language needs of these learners.

5.14 Non-language outcomes and the CGEA

Throughout the interviews and during the class observations of the case study teachers, it was clear that the informants believed that NLO were related to the literacy learning
process. All the teachers were able to identify examples of NLO which ESL literacy learners in their classes developed and which corresponded with Jackson (1994) eight major categories. The issue of whether or not the CGEA catered for NLO and ESL literacy learners depended more on which CGEA streams and modules the informants were currently using or had taught in another context. To reiterate, the target streams of this research were the Reading and Writing stream, the Oral Communication stream and the General Curriculum Options (GCO). One level of one stream is a module, for example, Level 1 Oral Communication stream would be a classified as a module. The modules included in this thesis correspond mainly with Level 1 and the entry points for Level 2 of the CGEA.

In this section, the teachers’ views on how the CGEA caters for NLO are presented according to the target streams of the credential.

5.15 NLO in the Reading and Writing and Oral Communication streams of the CGEA

Whilst these are two separate streams of the CGEA, the findings are presented here in an integrated format. This is because it is common pedagogic practice to integrate the teaching and assessment of these two CGEA streams. In fact, all the informants integrated the teaching of both the Reading and Writing and Oral Communication streams. This also eliminates any concerns which have been raised about the separation of spoken and written discourse.

During the interviews, teachers were asked whether the CGEA catered for the non-language gains made by ESL literacy learners. Although NLO were incorporated into
their teaching of the CGEA, none of the informants believed that the Reading and Writing and Oral Communication streams provided a format for acknowledging NLO. However, it should be noted that these teachers were overwhelmingly positive about the value of teaching the learners about the main social purposes of the four ‘literacies’. To recapitulate, the CGEA (STB, 1997: 25) identifies the four main social contexts as “family and social life; workplace and institutional settings; education and training contexts; and community and civic life”. These social contexts correspond with the four CGEA domains, namely, literacy for self-expression; literacy for practical purposes; literacy for knowledge and literacy for public debate. These social contexts are also reflected in the learning outcomes of Oral Communication streams. Hence, as Gabrielle states in regard to these CGEA streams, she likes “the notion of literacy for different purposes”. Ruth also believed this was an important aspect of the CGEA.

Both Ruth and Clare noted that the learners’ main reason for coming to class was to improve their literacy skills. Ruth, Laura, Hannah and Mary also felt it was an important to teach the learners about the different purposes and linguistic features of these ‘literacies’. As Mary commented it was “empowering” for these learners.

The final module of the CGEA focused on in this research was the GCO and the findings related to this stream now follow.

### 5.16 The General Curriculum Options

Whilst Laura and Mary were the only two case study teachers using the GCO in the courses they taught, both Ruth and Gabrielle gave unsolicited comments about NLO and the GCO during the interviews.
Ruth, when asked whether the GCEA recognises the non-language gains of these learners, stated that “I think that the GCO can go some way to addressing those learning-to-learn things and group work skills and that sort of thing”. Gabrielle also gave a similar response when she said:

To be fair to the CGEA I think that there is some acknowledgment of those. I suppose the most obvious example would be the GCO which we do use from time to time depending on funding and things where you look at how people interact with a learning environment, more the kind of communication, team building, working for a particular cause or whatever.

Mary, who was one of the two informants who was currently teaching the GCO module of the CGEA in her full time classes, reflected that “perhaps some of the GCO cover to a certain extent the working in teams, those sorts of GCO”. Mary, as previously mentioned, commented on the learners accessing technology and being able to work through the process for example, of arranging excursions. Ultimately, she saw that the GCO “were connected with learning to learn strategies but they were all very connected anyway so you’ve got this increase in independence, in confidence developing out of the way those GCO can be incorporated”.

Laura was the only other teacher currently using the GCO with a full time class. When asked to comment on whether any aspect of the GCEA acknowledged NLO she stated that “I think the GCO are a little bit better (than the other CGEA streams) but it’s really not expansive enough in terms of NLO”. Like Mary, she noted that her students were certainly accessing technological learning aids like the computer, organising excursions and learning skills such as working in groups within the context of the classroom. However, she very much felt that for the learners in her class “there were lots of skills you use with them which aren’t mentioned in the GCO”. In Laura’s case
this supports her contention that the CGEA ignores a very important social aspect of the learning process.

Laura was also very candid when she said that in terms of the CGEA “we have to look at matching it for assessment”. So, whilst she was very positive about some aspects of the CGEA such as accountability and providing learner pathways, she was concerned about its appropriacy for lower level learners. Laura’s concluding remarks were:

So I don’t have a problem with using an accredited document (CGEA), an accredited course, having formal evaluation and all that. But I still maintain that the course has been designed by people who chose to work in a very blinkered way and the reality is when you talk to people in community settings, the course doesn’t fit the students- we have to make the students fit the course and it’s wrong.

In terms of NLO, the informants who had taught the GCO believed that there was some kind of acknowledgment of the kinds of learning skills that occur within the literacy classroom. However, these were by no means expansive enough to include all the kinds of NLO which the teachers identified and which had been previously reported in Jackson’s (1994) study. The implications of this are discussed in Chapter 6.

In the next section of the chapter, the informants’ responses as to whether or not they recorded or documented NLO outside the CGEA is given.

5.17 Recording non-language outcomes

All the case study teachers suggested that NLO were important in adult ESL literacy classrooms even if they did not formally assess and report these gains. The teachers were still asked to comment on whether or not they recorded NLO.
Mary and Clare both acknowledged that they did not formally record NLO although they believing that such gains were important. Clare qualified her response by saying that she didn’t record these outcomes purely because “it is not required, you know, for quality assurance and there is no place for it in the assessment”. In other words, Clare believed that the learning outcomes of the Reading and Writing stream which she was teaching, did not recognise NLO.

Ruth highlighted a similar point raised by Clare in relation to NLO. Although she viewed them as being very important, the assessment procedures required by the CGEA itself proved to be very time consuming. So although Ruth noted the skills development briefly for each student as part of an organisational requirement, only sometimes would these observations be related to NLO (Appendix 5.3). In fact, Ruth commented that “I do keep notes on each student and it’s mainly CGEA stuff. I mean, I kind of keep the other stuff in my head I guess because there is so much of that (CGEA) to do”.

Laura also kept brief ‘dot point’ notes on each student. She was concerned about assessment and moderation procedures related to the CGEA and she believed that the “very low level people will never get the Foundation certificate- some won’t actually ever take out Level 1”. Hannah kept informal anecdotal records which documented the learners’ gains in NLO as well as noting their progress in literacy and language skills (see Appendix 5.4). These were used for her own purposes but also provided information about creating classes for students with similar needs or to assist her when discussing the students’ progress with the coordinator.
Gabrielle, due to her role as coordinator, stated about the recording of NLO that “I do document them; I go out of my way when I have the opportunity which is through formalised course reports”. Whilst these reports were not readily available, Gabrielle commented that her reason for informing funding bodies about NLO was “to indicate these sorts of things and try to fight to hang on to some of these classes”.

This concludes the findings of section of this chapter. The theme of the following category relates to funding issues.

5.18 Further findings: funding issues

As noted in Chapter 3, several categories were pre-set prior to conducting to the analysis. These categories corresponded to Dixon and Lyons’ (1995) ESL literacy learner characteristics and Jackson’s (1994) eight NLO categories. During an analysis of the data sources, several other themes emerged which related to funding issues. These are now presented as sub-categories.

5.18.1 Class placement procedures

In some contexts, the learners’ literacy levels matched the CGEA modules used in class. This was the case for Mary, Ruth and Gabrielle’s classes. However, when Hannah, Laura and Clare’s classes were examined (refer Chapter 4), the educational experiences of learners in these courses are extremely diverse. For many of the teachers, this was an issue in terms of using the CGEA. When asked to explain why there was such a diverse range of educational backgrounds within their classes, both Laura and Clare said that it was a funding issue based on “bums on seats”. In other words, in order to maintain
CGEA courses, organisations were forced to placed all levels of students in a class so as not to lose funding.

The difficulty for teachers working with this diverse range of ESL literacy learners was highlighted by Laura. She states:

the bottom line is that you have people who have had an advantage of having an education in their background and people who haven’t. I guess its one of the defining factors on who fits the course and who doesn’t and the CGEA should acknowledge this.

Working with all these diverse educational backgrounds and CGEA levels in the one class meant for Hannah that “NLO often go by the board” She said this was because teachers had to be only “focused on outcomes according to the CGEA” and due to the issue of “time constraints”.

The notion of CGEA and time constraints links to the issue of course delivery hours.

This is now reported.

5.18.2 The CGEA course delivery hours

The issue of CGEA course delivery hours was raised explicitly or implicitly by all the informants. In most courses, the nominal delivery hours recommended for teaching a module of the CGEA was eighty hours. As Gabrielle contends, for these ESL literacy learners the nominal hours is “one of the greatest difficulties” as it “homogenises the learners”. She further underscores this point:

I think there is possibly an incongruity between, for example, what policy or the funders demand of all learners because lets face it- they all think that the learners are all the same and that they should all complete this (CGEA module) in X number of hours.
Thus it appeared that in some contexts, such as TAFE colleges, the informants were required to adhere to strict course delivery policies. In Gabrielle and Mary’s organisations this was certainly the case. Mary also observed that if the learners did not satisfactorily complete a CGEA module within eighty hours, they were only given one “second chance” to repeat. This is interesting because Ruth, Laura and Hannah also observed that learners in the class often took longer than the nominal hours. In classes like Laura’s and Hannah’s the informants believed that some of the learners would never gain a CGEA credential.

The next funding issue relates to the informants’ employment conditions.

5.18.3 Teacher employment status

Whilst the teachers did not officially identify this as an issue, it was a theme which emerged in the data analysis. Of the six case study informants, four of these were employed on a sessional payment basis and one teacher, Mary, was employed on a 0.8 twelve month contract. Only one of the informant Gabrielle, had an on-going fulltime position. The issue of teacher payment arose very early in the study and was initially reflected by the difficult in getting teachers to participate in the research. As noted in Chapter 3, the ‘gatekeepers’ or coordinators, were concerned about their sessional teachers participating in any additional unpaid activities like this research project.

In relation to NLO in the CGEA, all the teachers acknowledged the importance of these to the development of the ESL learner’s literacy. However, as noted in the foregoing comments, the requirements of the CGEA assessment tasks were extremely time-consuming. Therefore, teachers did not have time to document any NLO which were
not expressed as learning outcomes within the given CGEA streams. Only the teachers who had used the GCO believed that the CGEA in any way documented NLO. However, this stream was not comprehensive enough to recognise all of Jackson’s (1994) eight major categories of NLO. As previously noted, Ruth, Laura and Hannah all commented on the time constraints of the CGEA with regard to teaching and assessment of the learning outcomes. It is interesting that Gabrielle who was employed fulltime with workplace conditions, did try to acknowledge the NLO that ESL literacy learners made whilst using the CGEA. However, this was done more through ‘course reports’ she completed in her role as coordinator for funding and policy bodies rather than through any of the CGEA streams.

It seems that teacher employment status adversely affected the case study teachers’ recording of NLO. Sessional teachers were too limited by issues such as financial constraints to look for creative, resourceful ways to incorporate NLO assessment. This was despite the teachers’ acknowledgment that NLO were important for these learners. If NLO had been clearly documented in the CGEA, the teachers may have been able to access these. Gabrielle, in her role as coordinator, had the opportunity to go beyond the confines of the CGEA and inform funding bodies of the significance of NLO for these learners.

5.19 Conclusions

The results of the findings of the six case studies indicate several things. All the teachers portrayed ESL literacy learners as having limited formal education experiences and needing to develop their reading and writing skills. Most informants, except Gabrielle,
also described these learners as having 'higher oracy' skills. The case study teachers all identified salient NLO. An analysis of the data presents similar findings to Jackson's (1994) project, particularly with regard to ESL literacy learners and the interrelatedness of NLO and language and literacy gains. Although this was not surprising given that these categories were pre-set, the research did reveal the emergence of metalanguage as an additional NLO in this context.

The informants had varying opinions as to whether or not the CGEA catered for NLO. Only those using or who had used the GCO modules of the CGEA believed that the framework could provide a format for the recording NLO. The informants also raised other issues related to using the CGEA with ESL literacy learners. These issues included class placement procedures and the nominal hours for CGEA course delivery, factors which all had bearing on the development of language and NLO for these learners. A summary of these findings and their implications for policy makers and future follows research follows in Chapter 6.
CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Overview

This chapter presents a summary of the case study findings reported in Chapter 5 and of the relevant studies presented throughout the thesis. The summary incorporates the four main themes arising from the research question and its implications for ESL literacy learners. These themes are ESL literacy learner characteristics; NLO for the group of target learners; NLO and the CGEA, and funding issues.

The chapter then presents the implications of the findings in relation to ESL literacy learners, non-language outcomes and the CGEA. These implications are discussed in two sections. Firstly, the thesis deals with the implications for educational policy and makes recommendations for future changes. Secondly, it looks at the implications and recommendations for further research.

The summary of the research findings for the four major themes follows.

6.2 ESL literacy learner characteristics

The case study teachers unanimously reported that the distinguishing characteristics of ESL literacy learners were that they had low levels of literacy and limited or no formal education experiences. This was apparent even when some learners in the case study classes did not display these characteristics. Although 'higher oracy' was identified by
Dixon and Lyon’s (1995) as an important feature, one participant, Gabrielle, did not agree that this was true.

Gabrielle’s perception that ESL literacy learners do not always have ‘higher oracy’ is an important point. It raises the issue that in an Australian context there are probably at least two categories of ESL literacy learners. The first of these are the ‘high oracy low literacy’ clients described by Dixon and Lyons (1995). This type of ESL literacy learner is usually a long term resident like the post war Italian and Greek migrants. The second type of ESL literacy learner described by Ramm (1992) and Hood (1990) generally has low oracy and low literacy needs and has often arrived in Australia more recently. Some of the women from the Horn of Africa who featured in Gabrielle’s class fit the description of this second type of ESL literacy learner although both these groups were called ESL literacy learners by the informants. This finding supports Murray’s (1998) contention that there are many different types of ESL literacy learners.

The informants seemed to give more credence to the learner’s lack of experience in a schooled environment than to their level of oracy. Because most of these learners did not have a formal education experience of learning a language, they could not draw on previously acquired learning skills and strategies and apply these to the new context (McKay, 1993). Even if they had undertaken some formal education, ESL literacy learners still needed to learn about the culture of an Australian schooled environment (Nichols and Saunders, 1997). This cultural context may be in complete conflict with their past education experience; if they had any at all. However, despite their limited education, other factors such as age, affective behaviours, sociocultural background and
gender also influence the ESL literacy learners development of literacy (Harrison and Thiel, 1994; Faine, 1995).

6.3 Non-language outcomes and ESL literacy learners

An examination of data from the six case studies indicated that the informants identified many of the same kinds of NLO as contained in Jackson’s (1994) project. This is salient because the teachers in Jackson’s project were given a list of typical examples of NLO within their survey questionnaires. In contrast, the informants in this study were asked to independently identify the types of non-language gains made by ESL literacy learners. Only after they had described these gains were they presented with Jackson’s conceptualisation of NLO.

The informants identified gains such as improved confidence and the development of learning skills and strategies as examples of NLO. These gains were highly contextual and reflected the experience of learning in a schooled environment. In addition, this thesis revealed that the development of classroom metalanguage was another outcome for ESL literacy learners. This finding of the increased metalinguistic knowledge of the target learners is supported by Wrigley and Gunn (1992), although metalanguage was not been classified as a NLO by these researchers. To recap, classroom metalanguage was not originally identified in Jackson’s (1994) NLO study but it features as an addition to the Learning skills category in this thesis.

It is relevant that all the informants linked the development of these NLO to the process of formally learning literacy. All the case study teachers believe that NLO occur in
CGEA classrooms, that these gains were salient and they were in ‘partnership’ with literacy gains.

6.4 Non-language outcomes and the CGEA

Whilst being positive about the CGEA’s presentation of literacy as a social practice, NLO were not viewed by the case study teachers as being formally recognised in either the Reading and Writing or the Oral Communication streams. However, those informants who had taught the GCO stream believed that this acknowledged some of the more broad NLO learning strategies such as using technology. Rado and D’Cruz (1995) comment on the use of technology as an important learning strategy for ESL learners to develop. Interestingly, only Mary and Laura were currently teaching GCO courses. Yet when asked to comment about NLO, both Gabrielle and Ruth independently suggested that the GCO recognised some of these gains. The GCO does not explicitly articulate all of Jackson’s (1994) NLO; nor was there any reference to the development of metalanguage. This finding supports some of the teacher views recorded in Sanguinetti’s (1995) study that the CGEA generally overlooks many of the outcomes which in this thesis are referred to as NLO.

6.5 Funding issues

The issue of funding was pervasive throughout the research. Many of the informants believed that the CGEA was flexible in terms of selecting appropriate curriculum content for the learners. The teachers endeavoured to choose themes that were relevant to the interests of learners and included topics such as accessing local community
resources. However, despite the CGEA's flexibility of curriculum content, teachers were concerned that the competencies of the CGEA did not acknowledge many gains made by learners including NLO. For this reason, some ESL literacy learners are considered by funding bodies to have not made 'satisfactory' progress within the course hours (Forward, 1998). Indeed, many of the teachers were concerned that the imposition of nominal course delivery hours by funding and policy bodies was detrimental to these learners. This supports the findings of Rado and Foster (1995) and Evans (1998).

A review of the case study classes also revealed that the teachers were forced to cater for an enormous range of educational backgrounds far beyond the target level for each class. Once again organisations were often forced to place all levels of learners in a given class to maintain enrolment numbers. If not the organisation could lose funding for that course.

Finally, all the teachers were dedicated practitioners who were generally employed as short-term sessional workers (Evans, 1998; Forward, 1998). This meant that the informants had to manage the teaching and assessment requirements of the CGEA as well as plan classes for a diverse range of learners without any additional payment. Therefore, even though NLO were seen to be interrelated with language and literacy gains, on the whole these were not expressed in the CGEA learning outcomes. Teachers had little time to go 'beyond' the assessment requirements of the CGEA.

This research has implications for both policy and funding bodies and for future research. These implications are briefly discussed.
6.6 Implications for policy makers and funding bodies

The findings of this thesis have several implications for policy makers and funding bodies. These overwhelmingly reflect the nature of ESL literacy learners themselves and the fact that their specific educational needs are not always catered for within accreditation frameworks like the CGEA. Policy and curriculum writers need to be better informed of the different types of ESL literacy learners, particularly those who enrol in CGEA courses.

It is clear that the CGEA is widely used with ESL literacy learners even though it is not underpinned by a theory of second language acquisition. Therefore, all teachers working with ESL literacy learners should have formal TESOL qualifications so that they can address the learners’ second language learning needs, including a focus on pronunciation and grammatical structures. This recommendation has previously been made by practitioners such as Karyannis (1994) and Frohman (1996). Hence, in many TAFE and AMES providers it is already a condition of employment that teachers of ESL learners have appropriate TESOL qualifications.

In addition, given that ESL literacy learners do face additional challenges acquiring English literacy, the CGEA nominal eighty hours for course delivery should be reviewed and extended (Sanguinetti, 1995). This is important as it reflects the learners’ need to develop culturally-specific learning-to-learn skills as well as becoming literate in a second language.
The clear and consistent identification of NLO by all informants means that these gains need to be viewed as valuable outcomes of literacy programs. In many instances due to funding and course availability, these factors will often determine what credential is used at a program level. This in turn means that NLO will only be recorded if the framework formally recognises these as legitimate gains of language and literacy programs. Even though the GCO of the CGEA acknowledges some aspects of NLO these are not nearly as comprehensive as Jackson’s (1994) categories. Funding and policy bodies must become more aware of the types of NLO that occur in adult classrooms and respond more positively to learner needs.

Foster and Rado (1992) and Harrison and Thiel (1994) also acknowledged the role that community provider classes play in meeting the needs of beginner ESL literacy learners. This research supports their findings with regard to funding bodies recognising that these types of organisations often provide a more relaxed and supportive learning environment for many lower-level ESL literacy learners. Classes in these centres often comprise women, older learners or those who are not seeking employment yet who want to become more knowledgeable about literacies used to function in “community, public and civic life” (CGEA, 1997: 8). They also provide additional services such as childcare and transport in a local environment.

6.7 **Implications for further research**

The findings of this thesis imply that NLO are important gains for ESL literacy learners even within classrooms using CBA like the CGEA. More research is needed to further substantiate the findings of this thesis, since it strongly supports Jackson (1994).
addition, further investigation needs to be conducted into whether or not the
development of basic classroom metalanguage is an important NLO for these learners.
This is essential given the small-scale of this research project.

Furthermore, the teachers in this thesis reported that the learning outcomes of the GCO
do recognise some but not all types of NLO. Further research needs to examine whether
this is a commonly held viewpoint across a wider section of adult literacy practitioners.

Finally, it is necessary to restate that the findings of this research are based on six
qualitative case study teachers and their ESL literacy learners enrolled in Level 1 and
Level 2 CGEA classes. The conclusions drawn from this thesis are particularistic, and
relate solely to the cross-case analysis made across each of the six contexts. It was the
researcher’s intention to conduct an indepth investigation of ESL literacy teachers using
the CGEA across a broad range of settings in Melbourne, Australia. Hence, in line with
the principles of naturalistic case study research, these six units of analysis were not
intended to be representative of all ESL literacy classes using the CGEA. Rather, it is
hoped that these findings may contribute to any future discussion on NLO, ESL literacy
learners and the CGEA.
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1. Do you believe that your students make gains other than purely language gains while attending AMES classes?

2. What kinds of non-linguistics gains seem most noticeable?

3. Can you describe in more detail what features of student behaviour you are registering when you say a student is:
   - more confident
   - more motivated
   - more independent
   - more successful
   - has greater self-esteem

4. Is there an AMES proficiency level at which you find this type of gain most noticeable or important?

5. Why do you think this is so?

6. Do you think this type of gain happens independently of language gain or always in conjunction with it?

7. Do you attribute this type of gain to the learning environment or other unrelated factors?

8. Are there any features of classroom dynamics which you feel maximise non-linguistic gains?

9. Do you favour one particular methodology which you feel best fosters this type of gain?
   Are there any particular types of activity which you feel best foster this type of gain?

10. Do you consciously incorporate specific activities into your teaching program which aim to foster this type of gain?

11. Would you rank this type of gain as equally important, less important or more important than purely linguistic gain?

12. Do you think students are aware of/value this type of gain?

13. Do you feel this type of achievement deserves to be recorded alongside language gains as part of an adequate student profile?
Table 1: Non-language outcomes: Eight major categories from 72 responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Mentioned by % of teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>• Confidence</td>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>• Support networks, contact and friendship groups support in new life and learning environment</td>
<td>Social, psychological and emotional support in new life and learning environment</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>• Awareness of community resources</td>
<td>Knowledge of social institutions</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of 'the system' and how to access it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>• Awareness of multicultural issues</td>
<td>Cultural awareness</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Australian and cross-cultural issues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cultural awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>• Study management techniques</td>
<td>Learning skills</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Problem-solving strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Learning skills and strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of formal learning environment and processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Autonomous learning skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Exposure to technological learning aids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-monitoring and self-evaluation skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>• Goal clarification</td>
<td>Goal clarification</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge of options and opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>• Motivation</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>• Access and entry into employment</td>
<td>Access and entry into further study, employment, community life</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access and entry into further study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access and entry into community life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONTENT SUMMARY

The set of Key Competencies does not constitute a curriculum or a set of subjects, nor do individual key competencies relate only to particular subject areas. Rather, the key competencies can be developed and applied across a range of learning environments and fields of study.

The learning outcomes may include but are not restricted to the following definitions:

- **LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS**
  - education/training
  - workplace
  - community

- **FIELDS OF STUDY**
  - reading, writing and numeracy classes
  - Australian studies
  - media studies
  - information technology
  - trade related subjects
  - study skills
  - Koorie studies
  - creative arts

A foundation of knowledge, skills, and understanding

The Key Competencies assume a basis of knowledge, skills and understanding which need to be integrated and applied to achieve a purpose or complete a task. The notion of competence however hinges on the capacity to 'do' something rather than to just 'know' something. The Key Competencies describe the processes by which knowledge and skills are integrated and applied. Knowledge is an essential foundation for competence but bodies of knowledge do not themselves constitute competencies.

The following section, Content/Underpinning knowledge, outlines key concepts pertaining to each learning outcome that should be considered by tutors in order that students can achieve competence in that learning outcome. For many students it is the capacity to learn to learn that has been absent from their past educational experience. Tutors must be clear that their classroom practice has introduced students to the range of skills and understandings that are then assessed in each learning outcome.

Content/Underpinning knowledge

For each learning outcome these may include but are not restricted to:

1. **Can collect, analyse and organise information**
   - identifying purpose of information, recognising the nature of the audience and sources of information
   - identifying modes of information delivery:
     - oral, text based, visual, technological
   - recognising social, cultural and ethical responsibility in the use and management of information
     - privacy, copyright, plagiarism, defamation, libel, censorship
   - locating and acquiring information:
     - libraries, community sources, resource directories, experts, specialists
• accessing and retrieval techniques and principles:
  - retrieval tools ranging from hard copy indexes to computer based systems
  - research strategies - defining topic, creating a plan, following steps, asking questions

• analysis and organisation of information:
  - creating and recognising categories, sorting for key information, filing systems

• observational and recording techniques:
  - taking notes, filling in tables, drawing diagrams, interview techniques

• evaluating quality and validity of information:
  - asking the right questions, identifying bias of sources.

2. Can plan and organise activities
• clarifying purpose of the activity

• management of priorities and process:
  - prioritising
  - plans, agreed procedures, taking initiative to create new procedures
  - self management, management of others, independence, autonomy, responsibility, accountability.

• evaluation of performance and process:
  - evaluation methods, recognising limits

• responsiveness to factors affecting priorities
  - accommodating differing values, differing perspectives,
  - allowing for competing interests
  - establishing and working within a time frame.

3. Can communicate ideas and information
• identifying the function of a communication:
  - appropriateness to context and audience.

• distilling main points, discarding unnecessary detail

• choosing the best mode of communication:
  - written, verbal/aural, visual, demonstration

• selection of appropriate form and style:
  - style of communication - manner of writing, speaking or doing as contrasted with what is to be expressed or to be done
  - form of communication - customary method, arrangement and style

• maximising carriage of intended meaning:
  - effective writing techniques, plain English, appropriate tones
  - visual literacy, semiotics, graphic communication.
  - display methodology - combinations of text, illustrations, diagrams

• revision of communication:
  - evaluation techniques, responding to questions, checking for accuracy, revising for a different audience.

4. Can work with others and in teams
• clarifying the purpose of working with others

• taking account of different roles and perspectives
  - differing life experience and skills
  - differing personal, gender, social and cultural differences
  - group structures and dynamics- committees, collectives, hierarchies, leaders, autocrats
- personal and organisational rights and responsibilities

- achievement of objectives
  - interpersonal skills - assertiveness and mediation and conflict resolution techniques
  - negotiation and collaboration skills
  - strategies for achieving outcomes - establishing time frames for completion of task and working within them.

5. **Can use mathematical ideas and techniques**
- establishing purposes and objectives of the activity
- choosing the best method or application to solve a problem
- separating embedded maths from written information
- adaptation and transfer of existing measurements or plans to new situations
- judgements about precision and accuracy in relation to the situation and the audience
  - rounding off or using decimal placing
  - calculation and estimation
- interpretation and evaluation of solutions
  - making sense of answers in light of own experience
  - making sense of answers in light of mathematical knowledge.

6. **Can solve problems**
- clarification and framing of a problem
  - definition of problem - practical, social, concrete, abstract
  - choosing a solution - following established and agreed procedures, adapting existing procedures or devising new methods
- understanding a problem
  - result specific, developmental, exploratory
  - anticipation and response strategies - lateral thinking, logic, brainstorming for solutions, troubleshooting
- achievement of appropriate completion
  - absolute completion, partial completion, referral of problem elsewhere
  - judgements about precision and accuracy in relation to the situation and the audience
- anticipation of problems, sources and contexts
  - technical faults and routine maintenance problems
  - personal and social rights, responsibilities and sensibilities
  - including different roles and perspectives
- evaluation of outcomes and processes
  - checking accuracy of outcome against intention
  - trialling and evaluating methods - learning from experience, formally reviewing implications.

7. **Can use technology**
- interpretation and use of the goals of using technology
  - definitions of technology - equipment and materials, patterns of operation forming a process, systems of principles and ideas
  - choosing the right technology for the job - hardware and machinery, versus/ or combined with, software and methodologies
- use of scientific and technological principles and practices
  - manipulative and sensory skills to operate machinery and tools
  - lateral thinking - exploration of alternative uses of/ for technology
  - adaptation of existing systems for other purposes
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- social and ethical responsibility in the use of technology
  - impact of technology on existing systems and environment
- accommodation of environs and personal physical capacity
  - occupational health and safety issues
  - ergonomics.

8. Can identify, analyse, and apply the practices of culture

- definitions of culture
  - personal, family, community, workplace, organisational, national, global
  - recognition of embedded culture in the stream of political, economic, social and historical activity
- recognition of different forms of effective communication
  - methods, modes and forms of communication
  - languages - LOTE, forms of English, AUSLAN, computer aided speech etc.
- respect of individual and organisational rights and responsibilities
  - personal values, religious values, sexuality, gender, social values, workplace values, organisational, systems, bureaucracy
  - differing expectations about the behaviour of the individual
- inclusion of differing perspectives in group processes
  - differing communication skills, values, priorities
  - problem solving, conflict resolution
  - interpersonal skills and group dynamics.
Pilot Study Observations

Teaching a Procedural Text

9/9/97

V.S. absent.

T asks Ss what are some things you would like to know how to do?

To access

T invited Ss to Vietnamese Club celebration.

Today I want you to use two things today in the class that are listed on the board.

Ss bit confused, one asked about a catalogue.

T realises he means instruction manual.

T gives out model of procedural text.

How to use a tape recorder.

Asks Ss what steps are noting each step begins with a action word a verb.

Ss talk amongst selves, codeswitching to Turkish, Chinese.

T explains activity. Ss to work in pairs and write the procedure of instruction for the things listed.

T matches more like Ss with lower ones.

Ss don't mind who they are working with.

SS move round in pairs looking at the items.

One pair walk over to another group to clarify the instructions, lots of codeswitching.
Appendix 3.2  Sample of pre-interview tasks

PRE-INTERVIEW TASK

Activity One

*Definitions of ESL learners for pedagogic purposes.*

1. When defining ESL/LOTE/NESB learners educators use many factors when describing or classifying students.

Factors to consider may include some of the following categories:

- language
- literacy
- sociocultural
- educational
- affective

1.1. Jot down some of the things that you would classify under each of the headings.

1.2. Using some of the above categories write down your own definition of an *ESL learner.*

1.3. Repeat the exercise but this time provide a definition of an *ESL literacy learner.*

Can you draw a diagram/concept map/mind map which would include the following adult learner classifications.

- ESL
- ESL literacy
- ESB literacy

You will probably find that your drawing will have overlapping categories.
Appendix 3.3  Pilot study interview transcript

Name: Hannah  
Class: Level 1/2 CGEA  
Stream: Reading and Writing and Oral Communication

Interview One 21/9/97

ESL literacy student definitions
003 One who is high in oracy in their listening and speaking skills and lower levels of reading and writing, low levels of formal education and a certain length of time 007 in Australia, perhaps 5 years or so at least

ESL student definitions
010 An ESL student would have lower oracy as compared to an ESL literacy student. An ESL student I would see as having high levels of formal education and therefore are 013 aware of the conventions of learning as opposed to an ESL literacy student. Also I suppose an ESL student, looking at the length of time in Australia, could be from new arrivals to recent arrivals in Australia.

ESL/ESL literacy students taught in separate classes
018 I think that they are coming from very different backgrounds and this needs to be taken into account when placing them in classes. ESL literacy students couldn’t be put into an ESL literacy class because of those different levels of oracy. Their education background too would mean the classes would have to be approached in a different way. So that whole aspect of learning how to learn and knowledge of earning would need to be taken into account.

Placement of students in multi ethnic classes
It would depend on oracy levels. The ESL literacy student would have a higher level of oracy anyway so that they would not be disadvantaged from ESB background students who have a higher level of oracy anyway so that would have to be taken into account.

ASLPR 2 would need to be in such a class.
Interview Two 7/9/97

Teaching approaches to Non language skills- conscious

033 Because of my philosophy of teaching, I think that there are skills which I would expect the students to come to terms with and to become familiar with through the 036 classes.

Learning how to learn is really important so that there are certain things I would be doing in classes which reflect that. I always use some group work activities where there is a genuine information gap, where students have a designated role so they need to find out information from a partner. They also use group work again where 041 they have designated roles so they are reporting back. One person is given the role as writer and they are all involved in that.

044 The terminology that I use in the classroom is something that comes up all the time. So they are aware of terms like cloze activity, brainstorm, the use of reports, procedures etc, use of genre terms, so that this recycled all the time. Then the 049 students are becoming aware of what is going on so I don’t have to be constantly referred back to all the time. So the students in my class, for a while, are conscious of these terms are used often.

Also I use drafting and redrafting. I’ve introduced correction codes so that students 054 become self reliant and gain confidence through being familiar with those sorts of terms and the ways of working. I find that the choice of topic is really important. The topic needs to reflect what the students’ needs and one of the things that I do is 060 to find out what the students know and what they want to know so the topic reflects their needs and then we move from there.

NLO- why are they important?
064 I want the students to become more self reliant and more confident and the sorts of approaches used reflect that. I think it is important with ESL literacy students to 068 know how a class functions and to understand the language of the classroom so, therefore, words such as brainstorm, cloze, as I mentioned before, the use of terminology like writing reports, procedures so that they know what you mean and 071 you don’t have to keep explaining it all the time.

Formal assessment of NLO
073 NLO are not assessed formally. Often its just anecdotal records that are kept. They can be discussed with the coordinator and this can be in a formal/informal 076 way. It could be just a chat about how the students are going or whether there is
Appendix 3.3 (continued)

077 a need for any movement in classes. Then this can be formalised in the staff meetings too when they are actually looking at movement in classes for the following semester or year.

Why record any achievements of NLO

073 I think there has to be an acknowledgment in teaching ESL literacy students, an acknowledgment of why they attend classes in the first place. It might not be 087 recordable language outcomes (CGEA) outcomes that they are important but it might not be but for some of these people the main focus for coming to. Often it’s getting out, coming to classes and having the opportunity to speak English 090 therefore the relationship with the teacher and that is really important in the class as well.
Appendix 3.3 (continued)

Interview Three  14/9/97

CGEA appropriacy for ESL literacy students
091 It (CGEA) is the most appropriate but there are limitations. I think what’s good about the CGEA is that it gives students access through the use of genre. It gives students access to particular texts and they become familiar with that and that’s constantly being recycled in the classroom and as ESL literacy students that’s important. So with a particular text that is modelled in class, they become aware of the different aspects of different texts.

But I think that in looking at outcomes it then becomes too focused on that.
107 Students can achieve certain aspects of the competencies yet they might do okay in parts of that yet perhaps they have not seen to achieve that competency overall.
111 So in being too focused on outcomes. I think that’s too limiting.

Focusing on outcomes
116 Looking at the use of drafting and use of correction codes might be an example so there is a process where students are making gains in one particular area and there is 119 no formal acknowledgment of that.

Gains made outside the CGEA
123 I think there needs to be an acknowledgment that students who are coming to class are doing it for a loads of reasons not necessarily for formal acknowledgment of 128 formal assessment. Often for a lot of these people perhaps coming to classes is often the only time that they are actually speaking English so that the social aspect becomes really important. Often they come along in friendship groups and this is 132 where I think the ‘break’ that you have in class is really important.

138 The use of the terminology which I think links up to the students becoming more confident being used to that terminology, when that terminology is used in the classroom and they can immediately tap into what is happening within the 144 classroom. And so they become confident in working in the classroom, pair work, group things and things like that which are reflection of my philosophy of teaching.

Older students
152 For a lot of these students it’s a time when they can get together and speak and make some contact even for a lot of them it doesn’t matter to them whether they 155 are achieving competencies. The CGEA in that sense can become really confined and limiting. As a teacher you have to work within the limitations. I have talked about this before that the important thing is looking at students needs, interests, 160 experience and choice of topic. The challenge is really to do that within the confines of the CGEA.
Time constraints

168 With the time constraints because it is outcomes-based, I find with a part time classes
you are looking at outcomes and achievements of competencies. I think that if
you’ve got to look at a procedure you’ve got to go over and over it because as a
teacher you’ve got to be focused on outcomes according to the CGEA and I think a
lot of other things go by the board. So in order to achieve it you have to present it a
179 number of times and make sure the students are achieving the competencies. All
those NLO can go by the board because of that, which is a shame. And as I said
184 before its their main reason for attending classes but with teaching the CGEA, I
think that’s a major one which is a shame.

190 I think as a teacher it’s a problem, that it is a challenge as a teacher, the relationship
with the teacher, providing a relaxed classroom. I have lengthy breaks I let the
students dictate when to finish the break. Then if you observe you can see there are
lots of valuable interactions going on in that time and knowing your class and seeing
194 that it is very important to these people.

I know you are working within the confines of the CGEA but you need to create a
198 balance. I suppose I try to incorporate that within the choice of topics and to work
within the CGEA so we can incorporate what they are interested in and involve lots
200 of time for group work, pair work, where there is a genuine information activities or
things they are interested in and need to know.

202 I’ll give you and example. A lot of the students I have use the photocopier, for
example. In lessons you observed, we looked at the broader topic of ‘Community.’
We looked at the equipment in the community setting we were in and I used that as
a procedure. So that sort of thing is what they needed to know because it was a new
photocopier. They needed to know the use and the procedure. It was also reflected
211 in the students wanting to know and having it written out.

216 I try to work within the structure of the CGEA and try to acknowledge that those
NLO are really important.

Other competency based frameworks

219 The CSWE competencies 1 and 2, acknowledge those NLO. Again, I suppose
though in achieving the competency in some of these, then you have a problem.
There might be one student who makes or gains in certain aspects they have to
228 achieve in order to gain the competency that may not be recognised, so you can’t say
that it is perfect. I think that really what is behind that is not presenting the teacher
230 with Competency 1 and 2 and whatever statements that you have but what is most
233 important is the philosophy of the teacher. Like for me personally, I think that giving
students access to the language of the classroom is really important for me and I
would be doing it no matter what I teach because it’s something I really strongly
236 believe in.
NLO CSWE doesn’t recognise

243 Gains in confidence but I suppose it is read into what is included in those competencies and the social aspect. As I said before I think competencies are a problem. I think it’s a philosophy of the classroom because the teacher needs to recognise that those things are really important and an outcome of that is feeling confident in the classroom, being aware of the language of the classroom etc., helps them in learning the other aspects which are the competencies in the CGEA or the CSWE.

265 I would stress again that is the philosophy of the teacher that’s more important and not being too confined by competency-based statements.

267 These things must happen in the classroom; those things need to happen in the classroom to have the outcomes in the first place.
Appendix 3.3 (continued)

Interview Four 16/9/97

NLO linked with content gains
I think it depends; they can be or they may not be linked. Perhaps what happens is
280 NLO are worked in through the content and I suppose that would be the ideal way for
it to happen. If you are looking at something like a procedure and then you are
looking at the NLO things that would happen in that, the NL, for example, the use of
the language in that sense and the student knowledge of that would be worked within
the content that they are doing like a procedure (text). And that would be a way of
296 students also gaining confidence and being aware of the issues of the classroom.
301 Now I was talking about the example of the photocopier, that student might be able
orally to demonstrate the use of that photocopier to another person which I suppose
would come into the oracy competencies so that would be linking the content with
307 the CGEA in some way, but they may not be able to write it.

NLO occurring prior to the content development
317 Yes if you are looking at the context of the classroom perhaps that at the moment or
students going on to other classes, they may be familiar with the language of the
classroom. You know working within the different ways the classroom would work.
320 For example, they may be familiar with the use of the language, recycling the
language from one classroom context to another at different times and settings. So
they may go to another class and they maybe familiar with the language and the same
317 things will be happening again.

323 I suppose that’s where I would say that NLO, about being aware of the language and
what happens within a classroom in a supportive environment, all these are
important. Because you would expect that when students go into another classroom
that the teacher will also be using that language and the students will immediately be
able to tap into what is happening in that classroom environment without having to
going over and over the same things again and again.

When I use terms like brainstorm, procedure, recount, or whatever, they are familiar
331 with that, even the use of correction codes and group work, pair work so they are
used to being able to work independently.
ESL literacy student classroom context

339 I think you need to take into account their limited experience in the learning classroom. I think you need to acknowledge that some of these students may not only have limited experience in formal education but it may also have been negative experience. So things about people feeling confident in the classroom, comfortable in the classroom, the relationship with the teacher and a teacher who acknowledges this and recognises this and recognises that it is really important too.

NLO -value compared to content areas

352 I think that it is really important that NL gains be recognised because otherwise I think you could miss out on a whole lot. So if you are constantly focusing on outcomes and miss enormous gains that students may make but perhaps they cannot be measured in some way, I think you miss a lot. I think that you’ve got to take into account, it’s almost essential that it be taken into account in order for these gains to 362 be met in the first place. Those NLO are almost a precondition to earning occurring.

NLO as competencies in the CGEA

377 I think at least it would be a move towards acknowledging that those sorts of things are really important and that’s a way for them to be recognised. I would still sort of 382 say that the philosophy of the teacher to create that sort of environment is important. And you would hope even thought it is not a measurable thing in the CGEA that it 384 would be happening and perhaps it does anyway.

387 I suppose there is a real trap with competency-based assessment there is a trap that just focusing on what can be formally assessed. At least if it was listed as part of a competency it would be away of making sure that these important NLO are recognised.

NLO recognition by funding bodies.

395 Funding is important. I suppose that if it has to be legitimised to those groups then that would be a positive thing.
Appendix 3.4

Sample of classroom observations

Teacher: Ruth
Date: 9/11/98
Class: Level 1 Reading and Writing CGEA

TRANSCRIPT Tape 1 Side B

T= Ruth
S= Students
Number= Tape counter

978 T: Now the second (question) was. I think that some of you found it hard
Some of you had trouble with it and that. It (question) was to choose one
section. Now first of all what do you think I meant when I said 'one section'?

983 S: Number 2 or 3 of this (exercise).

T: Yes that’s right. But what’s a section?

986 S: A paragraph (muffled).

T: See how all of you have got a piece of writing (holds text above head pointing)
This followed by another piece of writing, then another heading. All you should see I
is a heading followed by another piece of writing. So each piece of writing is one
section.

992 S: One section (nodding)

001 T: So for Question 2 all you have to do is to choose one section. Not everything- just
one bit. And the question was: What is it about? So I didn’t want you to copy it.
You didn’t have to do that.

S.: No?

T: So what is it (the text ) about when you’ve got that question?

005 S: Copy more easily.

T: But that’s not what the question says it is about. You just want a few words.
Just a few words. And the easiest way to do it is to look at the heading of each
section. So the heading for each section tells you what it is about. Okay? That’s
the easiest way. If you haven’t got a heading, it’s a bit hard.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Name</th>
<th>Dixon &amp; Lyons (1995) ESL literacy definition.</th>
<th>Other Factors</th>
<th>Jackson's (1994) 8 categories of NLO</th>
<th>Emerging Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Oracy</td>
<td>Limited no formal educn</td>
<td>Long term Resident</td>
<td>Soci/Psy/Emo. support in the new enviro</td>
<td>Learning skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NON-LANGUAGE OUTCOMES INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

1. Could you tell me a little about yourself—your teaching background, qualifications and your experience with adult learners.
2. How would you define an ESL literacy learner?
3. How is this different from an ESL or LOTE learner?
4. Can you describe the learners in your class?
5. Do you believe that ESL literacy learners should be taught in separate classes from ALBE learners? Why?
6. What reasons do learners give for attending classes?
7. What streams of the CGEA are you using with this class?
8. How do you teach these streams, i.e., are they taught and assessed as discrete or integrated units?
9. Are the learners all assessed or is the CGEA used only as a curriculum framework?
10. Who decides which stream is used and how/why are these decisions made?
11. Do you think the CGEA is a suitable curriculum framework for your learners? Why?
12. Do you believe that students in your class make valuable gains apart from language and literacy gains? If so, could you describe these?
13. Are these gains acknowledged within the streams of the CGEA?
14. The term 'Non-language outcome' has been used to describe those outcomes such as learning to learn skills, cultural awareness and affective behaviours. It has been suggested that NLO occur alongside the language and literacy developments in adult literacy classrooms. Could you comment?
15. Do you assess or document these outcomes?
16. In the context of a formal literacy classroom which kinds of outcomes are important for lower level ESL literacy learners? Why?
17. Have you used both the original and reaccredited CGEA?
18. Do you think that the reaccredited version provides greater flexibility for recording these outcomes? Why?
19. Would you like to add any other comments?
CASE STUDY INTERVIEW (26/10/98)

Name: Gabrielle
Program:
Class: Level 1 CGEA Foundation Certificate
Streams: Reading and Writing, Oral Communication

TRANSCRIPT

007 Exclusive exp. last ten years teaching ESL literacy and some ALBE due to uni qualifications. All adult work. Works also at uni teaching. Currently doing a PhD with the Dept. of Voc. Ed and Training and Language and Lit. Has Masters of Ed. in Adult and Community Education which is really ALBE. Grad Dip in TESOL. Undergraduate work in sociology and psychology

ESL literacy learner definition

020 I’m fairly clear in terms of how I use the term. I know there are different ways of conceptualising it. An ESL literacy learner is probably someone who in my mind usually has limited or little or possible no experience in a schooled setting. Possibly literacy I mean print based because they certainly are literate in many other ways. I suppose often people include those that have a lack of familiarity with roman script.

029 Yes and no. I think they tend to be included in terms of the class cohort usually because it’s probably the most appropriate placement for them but they are usually much faster. They tend to be fast tracked other than some of the other learners. And of course you’ve got a lack of English as well so they are true ESL learners in that sense in that they need to develop English literacy but they are ESL literacy because of the context they come from.

Oracy

040 It depends. If I think of the class I am teaching now and I’ve taught them for two years here now plus another year in another part of the institution their oracy is 0-0 although if I think back to when I taught with the TCF program, the women in that class clearly had higher levels of oracy. They had been in Australia for 23-27 years in Australia so their oral language had developed but it hadn’t expanded over in any terms of any mastery of English literacy. But I think my experience is that it doesn’t always accompany with a higher oracy. In fact I think that’s certainly not the case.

ESL and ESL literacy learners

052 Clearly they are coming from a particular context where because they have had disruptive schooling or never been in a classroom or never developed literacy they
bring that to that, that kind of limited or lack of experience in that particular way into this classroom. So I think in my mind there are many things that you transfer when develop in a first language particularly when you develop literacy in a first language that actually transfer into a new language in a new setting. They don’t have those skills to draw upon. So I mean I think that it’s two things. They’re developing literacy for the very first in a second language context which is not familiar to them in a language that is not their own.

Class description
The class at the moment is sort of late 30’s to 70. I have a strong contingent from the Horn of Africa, several from China, Hong Kong, Timor and Iraq. About half of the class have no education in their country of origin and no literacy in their first language. Some of the other students in that class actually have three to six years and then that’s sort of varying degrees of mastery of literacy in their first language from a little bit to actually quite a lot. They have it as a resource but the majority of students on that class don’t. (It’s their first major experience of schooling in an Australian context)

Separate classes for ESL literacy and ALBE learners
I guess for me it’s less an issue of sort of space in terms of whether they should be apart from.... Having taught with both students for a long time I think the starting place has to be with the kind of oral development. I mean it would just seem ridiculous for me to have my students mixing in with Fran’s class over there in ALBE because their command over spoken English is like night and day. But I think there is a point where you can kind of have a successful kind of melding of two types of learners because they share a lot in common. So once the oral language develops enough that they could actually engage in a classroom where English is the medium then I think it can work quite successfully. I mean there is differences but I mean any class is heterogeneous. I mean I think it depends really on the skill of the teacher and the kinds of dynamics.

Class placement
It’s a combination of a kind of detailed analysis of their background as much as possible particularly if there is an interpreter or a family member who can help provide that information and also some sort of language assessment but generally we have two ESL literacy classes and the women come to those classes because it’s the combination of their educational history and also their assessment in English. Usually that’s why they get placed in that kind of class and they tend to be sort of 0 (ASLPR) across the board. They might have 0+ in one skill area.

When you’ve got to make choices, when you’ve limited program offerings, then you’re trying to find the best placement for them, it’s probably the pacing of the class that is more suitable for them.
Learners’ reasons for attending classes

117 I think that’s a kind of a really hard thing for me to speak to because often when the women come they’re often not able to articulate because there is no shared language in which to communicate. It’s always a sort of a guess as to why they are here.

120 I mean gradually as you get to know your learners, you understand about their family and their community a bit more and you can kind of suss it out but generally I don’t feel terribly confident in. They are unlike other students who may be more explicit about their need to find a job or they want to do a course but they need English first.

125 and we do have those women here at the centre, but with these learners most of them are long term unemployed, will be long term unemployed so there is not that kind of ??

128 This is partly what my own research is about. So I think in terms of learners intentions, I think we have a great deal to learn.

The CGEA streams and delivery method

131 They are enrolled in Reading and Writing Module 1 and Oral Communication Module 1. It’s a part time class and that is why they are in those two as opposed to from the other two streams.

139 It (the CGEA) is used as both (an assessment tool and a curriculum framework). Certainly the framework guides me in my practice to a certain degree. I do assess using it. I do assess given their criteria

148 Ultimately, I make the decisions in consultation with other staff and Head of Dept. Generally there are a couple of things that dictate. Number 1 would be the number of hours that the course runs over. The class that you will be coming to on Wednesday, I see them 8 hours a week. So that kind of decision drives in part the whether its part time or full time. Full time classes clearly will involve an integration of all four streams. But the part time tend to either be Reading and Writing only or Reading and Writing and Oracy

Suitability of the CGEA for ESL literacy learners

159 It’s a difficult (one ) question. Yes and no. I don’t know if you have been speaking to other people, we don’t use it here but the CSWE or CESEL, a NSW AMES certificate that was designed for ESL.

164 Why I think it is a good document is that in terms of the sort of philosophy that guides the document are some of the kind of discussions that have gone into make it what it is, I think very much have the important bit of our learners in mind. When you look at CESOL or CSWE, I think they have it’s kind of mythical, I think they have this kind of vision of this kind of mythological ESL learner you know that is well educated, has full mastery over literacy etc.

173 So I have always had great difficulty because I have taught this type of learners with other documents as well. So I think philosophically I think there is a good match. I also think that I like in many respects the notion of literacy for different purposes. I think that is quite important for students to understand and develop. But I think one
178 of the greatest difficulties is just the whole *nominal hours*. I mean you’ve got 80 hours or whatever it is for Reading and Writing and again I think there is this kind 180 of, and I understand why it has to be that way I mean but its not necessarily the 181 authors intention. It is what happens at policy level etc. etc. But I think that again even within ALBE or within this particular document there is this kind of 183 homogenisation of learners- that all learners will achieve it which you know it really is at odds in the sense of competency based training. But I mean it doesn’t allow for other characteristics of the learner which really do have an impact on how long it 186 takes. So I think its unrealistic in that sense. Probably if you are thinking of benchmarks, if that’s the right word, its too high- it’s too pitched.

190 I think if you’re a skilled practitioner and you know this group of learners you can bridge or kind of work backwards and build up, but I think for newer teachers or 193 teachers who are less familiar with the learners they’d think its here when really its really down here.

196 There is the new second language document produced by AMES Victoria. It’s supposed to articulate into CGEA 1 or the new CSWE by AMES but..... 202 A document like that, because it is accredited by the state, does buy the learners some additional time.

NLO
211 Definitely but often these are the things that are the hardest to kind of articulate. I mean I think, like knowledge and information that are imparted through generating 213 language which I think is it’s like basic education or general education. So I think sometimes it’s less to do with putting pen to paper but more the kind of information 216 that they are being exposed to or engaging with, things like geography-you know those sorts of things-their place in the world, those kinds of things I think that’s important.

219 I guess language is more than a tool. It opens up different areas of knowledge and experience for them which I think is really important. I particularly find it with the 223 group that I am with now, I think the importance of being in a formal learning environment actually takes on an importance that sometimes surprises me. So there’s a notion of again without having the language to negotiate what it means for them

229 *(Learning metalanguage?)* Yes and No 231 *(Culturally?)* No certainly we hopefully foster cross cultural awareness in the classroom. But I think it’s more that there is a sense that they put a great deal of importance in being part of a class in coming to class and in attending regularly.

234 They take it very seriously. So I think for them there is something about being in a schooled environment which is part of why they come. It’s part of why they 235 come. They can see it and they don’t always understand for example, if we go on an excursion, some may think that it is frivolous that it is somehow not part of language
learning but I think there is something about the particular context of coming to a TAFE or being in a classroom that I think is quite important to them.

I think there is things like, and they can sound cliched, but enhance confidence, self esteem all those sorts of things and I think for many of these women this is also partly why they come I think is just a sense of community with other adult learners I think is really important. Some of them are terribly marginalised and isolated in the flats where they live or have no family members. I think it fulfils an important function in that way as well.

Acknowledgment of NLO in the CGEA
259 To be fair to CGEA I think to a certain extent there is some acknowledgment of those. I suppose the most obvious example would be the GCO which we do use from time to time depending on funding and things where you are looking at how people interact with each other in a learning environment, more the kind of communication, team building, working for particular cause or whatever.

266 We have had sewing, we have had numerous things that we fit into this GCO which I think reflects some of these kind of less language, although language is always part of it, but isn’t quite the focus that is maybe in some of the other streams it’s more so because of the nature of the streams. I also think that I suppose there is kind of a broadening of CGEA in that it does allow for other kinds of texts so you can use visual text, you know, technology, those sorts of things which we do integrate with our programs. So I think there is a kind of broadening of the kind of notion of what literacy and how people might make meaning in their own way but it can only go so far.

Partnership of NLO and literacy
286 I can’t imagine a functional, healthy, pedagogical environment where one component wouldn’t be there. I think they are part and parcel of the same sort of project in a way and they are critical I think maybe particularly for these learners although I think with other learners too.

292 Look given all the policy drives and outcomes sort of ‘speak’ that comes down through OTFE you can see why these sorts of outcomes there not quantifiable, you can tick a box but it doesn’t mean anything, but I think they are absolutely critical.

Assessment or Documentation of NLO
298 (Quantifiable) Oh absolutely not. I do document them-I go out of my way when I have the opportunity which is through formalised course reports or any kind of feedback back up through the food chain, I’m at the bottom not quite at the bottom but pretty down there. I mean we do constantly sort of talk. I’m very conscious, of unlike other colleagues, I understand why people tend to use the language of the market now. We try and use it for our course but I try less and less to actually use that kind of language. I’m really clear that I am talking about self esteem and as much as you
309 can kind of describe how. I don’t know if its quantifiable but there are ways of
311 measuring it if you think sort of think laterally. So I do try to indicate these sorts of
314 things and try and fight to hang on to some of these classes.

**Importance of NLO and Language outcomes**

325 I actually think that both are. I really do. I do not believe that these women come to
class as faithfully as they do, over such a long term as they have, purely because it
330 makes them feel good. I actually think they do place importance just as one might
assume of another learner at a higher level in gaining and building their language
333 acquisition and their literacy development, how be it. The pace might be very slow
335 or the steps might be very small but I actually think, and I think about this a lot
337 because I think this is why people often say that these kinds of classes don’t fit in a
TAFE system because really they could got to the library or they could go to a nice
little neighbourhood house and do whatever.

340 But I actually think that that misjudges the learner and I think it does them a great
disservice. I actually think they are serious about what they do it’s just that there is a
lot of misunderstanding about why it takes them so long to do what they need to do.
344 I think it does demand a shift in many ESL teachers minds in terms of working with
this group of learners so I think both (gains) are important.

348 However, having said that I think there is possibly an incongruity between, for
example, what policy or the funders demand of all learners because let’s face it they
all think that they are the same and that they should all do this in X number of hours
355 with the learners.

356 So if you are looking at sort of curriculum outcomes or policy outcomes
which do demand that you put an ‘S’ by the name- ‘Satisfactory Completion’ or
questions begin to be asked about why they are to be in the class. I think that they
360 are often at odds with why the learners are here and what they are actually getting out
of the class. You know a woman who is 65 isn’t looking for work. So I think in
362 VET that is felt particularly acutely with these learners.

**Flexibility of recording outcomes in new CGEA**

368 It’s maybe how you get to the outcome that has changed or maybe they stress slightly
different things like conditions of assessment that may offer or legitimise more
373 support for certain types of learners. I have already mentioned a kind of broadening
of literacy and the kind of notion that there are other kinds of literacy that sit side by
375 side. But at the end of the day, if you are looking at a student record from an
academic registry, they are wanting an ‘S’ or an ‘NS’ or ‘NC’, whatever it is, so I
378 think that point, both documents are the same. There is perhaps a little bit more
flesh within the second one that I think is quite helpful.
Sample of research verification statement

THE UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE
DEPT. OF LANGUAGE, LITERACY AND ARTS EDUCATION

Project: Non-language outcomes in adult ESL literacy classrooms

RESEARCH VERIFICATION FORM

I, .................................................................................................................., have read the summary of my interview transcripts for this research project and have clarified certain points where necessary.

I believe the project contains a true and accurate representation of my viewpoint with regard to the questions asked at the time of interview.

Signed.................................................................................................

Date..............................................................................
Class Observations. AMES evening class 13/10/98

C - W - large portable classroom. Enormous white board front of room. Plate of biscuits etc provided. Warmly heated. Tables / chairs in small groups of six.

T commences discussion about the past week's gas crisis. Intros. me. SS say "C is a great teacher!"

T recaps on story last week about Health.

T explains - Read story to partner.

T circulates with SS. Then write it down.

T says - Read the full stops, commas etc.

SS all working in pairs - spelling or reading the instructions. Two Italian SS working and correcting in Italian.

T assists the SS during paired activity by advising that "it's better to spell the word then show it".

While SS are working - T takes photos for class info bk.

T says to one SS "N., it (the camera) doesn't work, doesn't it like you?"

SS - All laugh.

* Nice rapport with SS.*

- laughs, jokes, very friendly

N, working with new SS who has commenced class this evening. Trained nurse from Poland who has been advised to enrol in literacy class to improve employment prospects. Her literacy levels are obviously much higher than many of the other learners.
I, .........................................................................................................................., have
examined several sections of the documented data for this research project
and listened to ten interview quotations to verify their authenticity.

The data has been accurately cited in this research paper.

Signed......................................................
### Monday 8th September

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / theme</th>
<th>Our Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recounts</td>
<td>Students identify features of a recount.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Students write a recount about a shared experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions / structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brainstorm 'Open Day'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show recount text, identify features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close activity, discuss text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction: account about open day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write on board who, what, when, where, why student have part of it. They work in small groups to write an introduction about the account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time line: Students are given an event that occurred during the open day. They blu-tac this to a time line on board. Write events out as full sentences, students use structured outline to write about the open day.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Next item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wednesday 10th September

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / theme</th>
<th>Our Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions / structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read text from 'City of Hume' about Meadow Heights Learning Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present procedural text 'How to use a tape recorder', identify features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence activity: Group accesses Word for Windows. Write up text together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students choose equipment at the NHTS computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students write up procedure about how they use the equipment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students tell other groups how to use the equipment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Itchy Toes

*Tinea*, or itchy toes, is very uncomfortable, but it is not really harmful.

**What causes tinea?**

Tinea is caused by a fungus that grows in dark, warm, sweaty parts of your skin – like between your toes.

All feet have fungus in the skin, but they don’t usually cause any problems. Sometimes, too much fungus grows and this causes tinea.

**How does this happen?**

There are many ways this can happen.

- Sweaty feet and shoes caused by hot weather or synthetic socks and shoes helps the fungus grow quickly
- Wet feet from swimming softens the skin and lets the fungus get in
- Walking barefoot on floors where tinea is growing

**Signs of tinea**

- Itching
- Soggy looking, whitish skin
- A bad smell
End-of-Semester Assessments
CGE(A) Students

Student Name: V P

Working Towards -
- R&W: 1 2 3 4
- GCO: 1 2 3 4
- Numeracy: 1 2 3 4
- Oracy: 1 2 3 4

Assessment Tasks -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attempted</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Passed(Y/N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>2/7.98</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Indicators of Progress Made -
- Spelling is improving
- Copying is accurate
- Developing confidence
- Word recognition improved

Future Goals/Recommendations for Sem.2
CGE(A) to complete R-W for SE

Other to improve vocabulary and simple sentence structure
Appendix 5.4       Sample of Hannah’s anecdotal records

- K. used the photocopier independently. Follow up from procedural text where the photocopier was used as a demonstration.

- H. volunteered some information today for model of text. First time he’s done this.

- V.B. protested about the gender specific language used by another group. Everybody shared the joke.

- S. wrote a few sentences independently. She seems more relaxed, able to laugh at herself.

- N.S. and F. all talked about their writing. How I felt about it - was I amused by it. Talked about how I gained info from their writing to help me plan.

- I. and M. worked well in a group. They assigned roles ie recorder and reporter. They listened to each others contributions and completed the task successfully.

- D. brought in a photo album to show me and the class. She spoke confidently about photos in her album, her village, her wedding etc.

- C. recognises mistakes and is gaining confidence in rectifying these. She is also able to write more lengthy pieces and not be too worried about producing correct texts.
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