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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Rationale

This thesis reports on a case study on the notion of “new arrivals” to Australia. It documents how a group of adult\(^1\) newcomers, enrolled in a New Arrivals Program\(^2\) (NAP), was constructed as “new arrivals” in an array of discourses surrounding them in a South Australian educational-institutional context. The term “new arrivals” is framed with double quotation marks throughout the thesis to stress the socially constructed nature of its meaning.

Australia is a multicultural, multiethnic and multilingual nation consisting of past and present newcomers. A number of its residents have their ancestry roots outside Australia. In 2006, the number of overseas-born Australians represented nearly a quarter of its whole population (Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), 2008a), and almost a quarter of Australian-born residents had one or both parents who were born overseas (ibid.). The country continuously receives people from elsewhere in the world. Newcomers accounted for nearly half of its population growth in years 2005-6 (ABS, 2008b). Thus, on paper, living as a newcomer and living with newcomers are part of Australian history. Once inside, however, past newcomers start assuming old timer’s status and have various degrees of ease in accepting present and future newcomers.

“New arrivals” is a significant element for Australia, for it constitutes the current and future state of the country. It is a generic social category identified in comparison to old timers. The category signals how newcomers were addressed to and being incorporated into the existing social fabric of Australia. The term

---

\(^1\) “Adult” here includes those who were 17 years of age at the time of arrival but were to turn 18 within their enrolment in NAP.

\(^2\) The different spelling conventions for “program/me” appearing in this thesis reflect how they are applied by relevant government sectors and institutions. Elsewhere in the body of text, a British convention “programme” is applied.
thus can be interpreted as an indicator of the current state of Australian multiculturalism and the country’s attitude towards wider migrant populations.

“New arrivals” therefore denotes sociopolitical considerations influencing its definition. From a linguistic point of view, the generic nature of the term can be observed. The term “new arrivals” (individuals) is a nominalisation (Fairclough, 2003; J. R. Martin, 1992) of the phenomenon of “newly arrived”, which in turn derives from the process of “newly arriving”. It is suggested that the transformations from the process to the phenomenon, and from the phenomenon to the individuals, cement certain implicature as generic to the category (Fairclough, 2003). This nominalisation connotes socio-political and institutional considerations at a given point in time, which have developed historically and which have been accepted particularly in education. It can therefore be assumed that there is a superseding meaning that governs this category, so that the diverse population can be grouped together.

Nevertheless, it has been a loosely defined term. The composition of this social category remains neither fully articulated nor consistent. The term carries conflicting characteristics. It tends to be used as a generic cover term which encompasses diverse individuals with various backgrounds. Yet, when framed institutionally, it can function as a more specific term which distinguishes certain newcomers from others. Both characteristics may be operating in an institutional context such as NAP/on-arrival migrant educational programmes.

Focusing on (newcomer) migrants’ identity has been a popular line of research (Day, 2002; Giampapa, 2001; Hewson, 2006; Lotherington, 2003; Miller, 1999, 2003; Norton, 1997, 2000; Norton & Toohey, 2002), yet thus far very few studies have focused on the median category “new arrivals” and the experience of being one. The current investigation aims to address this gap.

The current study approaches the experiences of “new arrivals” from the viewpoint of institutional-educational settings. Just as the categorisation of “new arrivals” can denote societal attitude, on-arrival migrant education can be an expression of the host society’s response to its newcomers. What happens in
these programmes can be seen as an enactment of such stance. Currently, on-arrival migrant education is considered as one of the two major strands of Australian multicultural education (Lo Bianco, 1990). Being a relatively young country with less than three centuries of documented history, much of the nation's attention has been paid to the treatment of first generation migrants (Jayasuriya, 2009). It is held by some that Australia operationalises a generally richer and more committed migrant education system than other migrant-receiving countries (Burns, 2006). While attending to the first generation migrants alone has been seen as insufficient (Jayasuriya, 2009; Moore, 2005), this attention indicates that Australia takes on-arrival migrant education very seriously.

Even so, on-arrival migrant education programmes potentially function as boundary markers between “new arrivals” and the host society. Its institutional setup suggests that certain newcomers are grouped together and, albeit for a short period of time, are separately addressed before joining the mainstream. An issue that arise from such a construct concerns whether teachers and learners are in a dual role relationship in which a teacher typically represents the host society and a newcomer takes on the role of a learner. The composition of “new arrivals” is further complicated by the presence of administratively defined “new arrivals” and empirically and discursively constructed “new arrivals” simultaneously operating in the classroom. These two “new arrivals” categories are not always clear-cut, but the latter categorisation plays a significant role in framing what is talked about “new arrivals” and pedagogical choices and considerations that are made. To make the matter further complicated, as will be developed in Chapter 2, an adult “new arrival” is a distinctive construct specific to South Australia. Those eligible for on-arrival programmes account for only part of all adult newcomers. In addition to this, the adult NAP is one of two overlapping, yet discrete, on-arrival programmes currently available for adult newcomers in this state.

The conceptualisation of “new arrivals” is significant for learning experiences made available in NAP. For those officially classified as “new arrivals”, the discourse around them permeates their life. The construction of their respective role is a social process, the explanation of which requires a semiotic inquiry. For,
the process must be mediated by the use of language. The role language plays in the construal of “new arrivals” is paramount, as language reflects and constructs reality (Fairclough, 2003; Halliday, 1993b). Hodge and Kress (1988, p. 23) argue that a semiotic inquiry “should have some account of the relationship of semiosis and ‘reality’, that is, the material world that provides the objects of semiosis and semiotic activity”. As well as being semiotic, the process of constructing “new arrivals” will be a multi-modal, multi-dimensional one in which multiple practices at different time, place and scale are intertwined. Of particular interest is the significant role that pedagogy plays in shaping particular role relationships (Bernstein, 1990).

Bernstein (1990) stresses the vital importance of attending to the composition of the pedagogic discourse to delve into the social construction process of students’ experiences. He asserts that pedagogic discourse is not merely a vehicle of societal attitude but a significant constitutive element to the societal attitude (Bernstein, 1990). This theoretical position strongly suggests that attending to the discourse of NAP provides insights into how “new arrivals” are attended to as well as how they are constructed in the daily business of educational-institutional life. It is well understood that the use of language is “purposeful behaviour” (Eggins, 2004, p. 4). Just as the composition of adult-child interaction is critical to form a child’s orientation to the world (Hasan, 2004c), so are the learning experiences construed by teacher-student interaction in NAP. Being primarily a classroom-based study, the study explores the nature of teacher-learner role relationship as an enactment of the host society–newcomer relationship.

### 1.2 Purposes and Research Questions

Having emphasised the term “new arrivals” as an experiential, social semiotic construct, the present study sets its focus on the social processes of constructing the notion of ‘new-arrival-ness’. The starting point of the exploration is to grasp what makes somebody a “new arrival” beyond the administratively defined category.
1.2.1 Purposes

The specific focuses for the present investigation are what makes someone a “new arrival”, what is discursively constructed under the term “new arrivals” (i.e., ‘new-arrival-ness’) and how it is constructed by discourses surrounding them. The main context of inquiry is an institutional learning context (Cloran, 1999).

The overarching aims of the study are:

◆ to explore the concept of “new arrivals” as an experiential, social semiotic construct, and
◆ to investigate how the notion of ‘new-arrival-ness’ is construed in the socio-political and pedagogical context of NAP.

With particular reference to the constitutive power that language has on meaning, the objectives of the study are:

◆ to explore the attitudes of the host society towards “new arrivals” in NAP;
◆ to investigate the positioning of “new arrivals” in relation to the host society; and
◆ to explore the inferences of being a “new arrival” arising out of “new arrival”/host society relationship.

1.2.2 Research Questions

Put simply, the questions asked in this study are “Who is a “new arrival” to Australia?”, and “How is the social category of “new arrivals” construed in Australia?”. To pursue these questions, the practical research questions devised are:

◆ In what ways were a group of adult “new arrivals” constructed in the social practices of NAP?
◆ In what ways was the nature of students’ experiences in NAP shaped by such construal?
1.3 Research Design

The study adopts a transdisciplinary approach (Halliday, 1993a), informed by applied linguistics, anthropology, migrant studies and sociology of education. The study employs a qualitative case study approach (e.g., Merriam, 1998) to explore in depth the discursive representations and constructions of “new arrivals”. It combines ethnographic methods with discourse analysis, regarded as an emergent approach in research in educational settings in the past 25 years or so (Heath, 2000). A Systemic Functional Linguistic perspective of language (Halliday, 1978, 1985, 1994; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) underpins the discourse analysis.

The current research evolved in the course of my engagement in a year-long classroom observation. Identification of issues and methods for investigation developed together rather than the former preceding the latter (Nunan, 1989). This means that, in the current investigation, the researcher was not a shadow player of the theory, documenting and projecting what went on in data. Rather, the researcher was heavily involved in the generation and the interpretation of data.

This investigation attends to discourses surrounding a group of adult newcomers in multiple dimensions of NAP. The programmatic documents, ESL classroom teacher talk and written tasks from the case study classroom (the Red Ochre class) are analysed. The framework is informed by a Bernsteinian approach to pedagogic discourses, which is typically semiotic, multi-dimensional in nature. Specifically, the curriculum-related documents are analysed to explore what aspects of ‘new-arrival-ness’ are foregrounded as pedagogic concerns in a general framework of NAP. Classroom teacher talk is addressed to find out the ways one ESL teacher constructs her role in class and by implication the students’ roles. This is to investigate the positioning of “new arrivals” in their host society through an enacted relationship between the host society and newcomers in a specific pedagogic setting. The written tasks are explored in the light of what societal expectations and value assumptions were behind the tasks and how they might have shaped the ways the students produced their texts. This is designed to complement the question of the nature of students’ experiences in NAP.
1.4 **Significance of the Research**

The thesis is designed to contribute to the body of knowledge concerning migrant education from the angle of English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction. First, the study intends to achieve a deeper understanding of the research context, an adult NAP in South Australia, through delving into the processes behind the classification of “new arrivals”. It is intended that findings of this study offer insights into the potential systematicity and complexity underpinning the ways in which the term “new arrivals” is socially constructed.

Second, this study targets a median categorisation “new arrivals”, unlike the majority of the past scholarship in this field which focussed on social categories of varying specificities. The scope of research on migrants has tended to be either broader (e.g., those who arrived during certain timeframes with various visa categories) or more specific (e.g., refugees from a particular country) than “new arrivals”. The latter case often represents a ‘flavour of the month’, that is, those from one or more of main refugee source countries of the time. “New arrivals” is a particularly interesting term to explore since it encompasses both broad and specific aspects of migrants. Its meaning stands on the intersection of historical and geopolitical development at a particular point in time. As will be shown, NAP is not easily classifiable as a refugee education programme per se, nor is it skilled migrants’ accelerated English course as such. While some strongly advocate for focusing on the specifics of the refugee education (Sidhu & Taylor, 2007), focusing on this aspect may obscure the complexity and particularities of the programme. Besides, the reliability of a voluntary-involuntary migration dichotomy has been questioned (Gibson, 1997). Newcomers consist of individuals with various backgrounds and reasons for entering Australia, so much so that attempting to make sense of them as one group does not seem to do their diversity justice (cf. Cooke, 2006). In a way, being new to the country may well be the only common element amongst them. Considering this, setting up a particular educational programme to cater for a variety of “new arrivals” can be seen as generating similarities out of differences. Having stated this, certain primary visa applicants, notably skill-based migrants, are less likely to constitute the majority of the adult NAP population. Chiswick and Lee (2006) reports that there is a
relationship between primary visa applicants’ English proficiency levels and their visa categories. They find that English proficiency of skill-based and business migrants was amongst the best. It might be that a particular composition of the adult NAP clientele influences the representation of “new arrivals”. The present study intends to present a snapshot of what is happening in an actual adult NAP classroom beyond the level of the specific visa categories or demography.

The third point about the significance of the current research lies in its methodology. It is designed as an in-depth, qualitative case study that attends to multiple dimensions of an adult NAP, including classroom data. Traditionally, research into migrant’s settlement has tended to be conducted quantitatively with cross-sectional data (Cobb-Clark, 2001). Many studies have been conducted in a survey style, collecting data from migrants retrospectively. Moreover, even the longitudinal ones, designed as an alternative to the cross-sectional data (Cobb-Clark, 2001), tend to be oriented towards quantitative investigation. An existing major survey conducted on the NAP learners in South Australia (Wenner & Mckay, 1986) is no exception to these orientations. Other South Australian studies (Hinsliff, 2006; Lucas, 2006; Stevens, 1990) were specifically targeted at selected refugee demographics. Furthermore, survey-style research often focuses on primary visa applicants only, leaving out the family members who accompanied them (Cobb-Clark, 2001). Presumably, (on-arrival) migrant education programmes deal more with accompanying family members than with primary applicants. This study intends to complement these orientations by presenting a qualitative account of the actual classroom data.

Fourth, also methodologically, the study intends to make a contribution to the research on ESL pedagogy through developing a particular discourse analysis of classroom teacher talk. Specifically, the study develops one way in which classroom teacher talk can be analysed in the light of macro- and micro-pedagogic functions. This dissertation offers ways to explore what learning outcomes ESL lessons offer, what students may learn through exposure to English and curriculum rather than how they learn an English language. This approach generates pedagogic discussion on how a particular social positioning that a host society assumes for its “new arrivals” permeates its pedagogic
approach both in terms of contents and modes of delivery. The present study asserts that it is out of the dual role relationship between the teacher and students that the learning experiences of “new arrivals” emerge.

Finally, the report intends to contribute to the body of research presented from the perspective of the margin (Rampton, 1997). My firsthand experiences of being positioned as a “new arrival” founded the impetus for the current exploration. The whole investigation was conducted from my viewpoint as an overseas student who recognised her positioning in Australia has been nebulous and unstable. Researching social matters from a peripheral position is now recognised as a valid perspective (Rampton, 1997). As Rampton states,

it is now quite often suggested that being marginal is actually a crucial experience in late modernity. Being neither on the inside nor on the outside, being affiliated but not fully belonging, is said to be a normal condition, and in line with this, it is often said that the key imperative of our times is for people “to learn to live with difference,” for people to learn to live happily with their own exclusion from groups that they actually like and interact with daily (cf., Rampton, 1995b) (Rampton, 1997, p. 330)

As someone who has spent the past seven years in Australia, I have been sitting on the boundary between being a total newcomer and an old timer to Australia. Together with the episode detailed below, my positioning and perspective matches the perspective endorsed by Rampton.

My experience as a “new arrival” dates back to 2005, when I was involved in a research project on “new arrivals”. The research project was a confusing experience. Although my primary role was as a researcher, my position in the project shifted flexibly. I was a Japanese international student embarking on a research degree. I had spent nearly two years in Australia, during which time I completed a postgraduate coursework degree. Because I had had several previous visits to Australia, I had little doubt in my smooth adjustment to life in Australia. However, this proved to be a naïve conviction when the research project began. I had difficulty in assuming my legitimacy in the research group (Teramoto & Mickan, 2006). I could not participate in research meetings actively. It was as
though I was lacking some shared understanding critical for active participation. I could not follow what was talked about because I could not make sense of its significance or the logic behind it. I also had difficulty in asserting my researcher’s status at the participating school. I was often approached as a “new arrival” student either being lost or not observing rules. In short, I was a “new arrival” because of my appearance, overseas student status and prior training—I was not a practising teacher.

As well as a “new arrival”, I was also positioned as a non-“new arrival”. When in the classroom as an observer, my participatory role involved acting as a teaching assistant. I had to utilise quite a lot of local knowledge to fulfil this role. This constant swing from a “new arrival” to a non-“new arrival” resonated with my affiliation with the research group in an inverse proportion. It became progressively difficult to reconcile these two contradictory positions, since I was confused with what was expected of me. In addition to these, my impression of the “new arrival” students did not really match the presupposition I had developed prior to meeting them. Out of all the preparatory activities I was assuming that I was going to see a group of individuals not functioning as a classroom due to the students’ lack of schooling experiences and English. I constantly heard and read how extensive their difficulties were and how they faced difficulties one after another. I wondered why I was not seeing the situation in the same way as other research members. When I flagged my concern of being an odd element in the research group, I was advised to invoke my perspective as a “new arrival”, that is, as a foreigner, student and English learner. This suggestion shocked me, since it never occurred to me that I would count as a “new arrival” such as had been talked about in the research project. Also, as my presupposition of “new arrivals” shows, I was incorporating other teacher research members’ perspectives into mine. At the same time, the whole experience told me that my social positioning was not as far away from that of a “new arrival” as I believed. I realised I was treading on thin ice, and that for some mysterious reason I had come to be distinguished from a “new arrival” and had somehow found myself in the researching group. In short, I neither belonged to the researched group nor the researching group (cf. Scott, 1985), yet I was walking into the NAP classroom as a researcher (a non-“new arrival”) rather than as a researched (a “new arrival”).
I initially thought my dilemma and non-belonging to the research group was due to my lack of experience with NAP and with teaching in general. Now, almost five years later, it seems there was more to the story. In retrospect, the research group was orientated towards the perspective of an ESL/NAP teacher or educational provider. The default setup of the research was ‘mainstream’ Australian residents receiving “new arrivals” into their society. I possessed neither of those elements.

This experience highlighted the elusiveness and arbitrariness underlying the categorisation of “new arrivals”. The category of “new arrivals” was stretched and redefined as I went in and out of the category. This illustrates how the category “new arrivals” was constructed on site (Lemke, 1990), where “events, including spoken or written words, do not have intrinsic meanings, but only the meanings we make for them” (Lemke, 1995, p. 196). I witnessed that the classification of a “new arrival” could occur capriciously. “New arrivals” can encapsulate a wider population than NAP enrolees. There could be more than the chronological newness involved in the definition. Being comparatively new to Australia, yet for classificatory reasons not officially labelled as a “new arrival”, I was intrigued by the complexity of the situation I was caught in: my fluid social positioning resonated with the fluidity of “new arrivals”. These experiences motivated me to explore the socially constructed nature of Australian “new arrivals”, which formed a rationale for the present study.

Thus, my ill-fitting positioning in the research group has served as an empirical rationale for me to pursue my exploration. However, rather than letting my personal perspective drive the inquiry, I withheld my ‘gut reaction’ and conducted the investigation with conventional means.

1.5 Definition of the Terms

The term “new arrivals” will not be defined here, since the entire thesis concerns its definition. Likewise, many of the key terms will also have to be introduced and defined along the way (in particular, in the following chapter) for their relational
nature to “new arrivals”. Accordingly, only the terms which I chose to use with my self-defined meanings will be listed here.

**Newcomers**

In this thesis, “new arrivals” (with double quotation marks) is treated as a marked term which warrants explanation. It is used to refer to the social category as well as the individuals who are identified as “new arrivals”. “Newcomers” is used as a generic term to refer to individuals who have recently arrived in Australia with an intention to live, rather than work or study, as their primary reason of entry. The “new” part of the term connotes no qualification other than recentness of their arrival.

**Migrants**

Unless specified otherwise, “migrants” is used throughout the thesis to cover individuals who are officially granted permission to enter Australia to lead their life. Similar to the case of newcomers, education or work may constitute a part of their life, but are not the officially stated reason for their entry. Thus, those on work visa or overseas student visas are not included in this definition. It is to be noted that the same term appearing in quotes and data do not necessarily conform to this definition.

**Forced migrants and humanitarian entrants**

Forced migrants is used to refer to those identified as refugees and internally displaced people (International Association for the Study of Forced Migration (IASFM), 2009; Refugees Studies Centre (RSC), 2009). Of those, individuals who enter Australia under its Humanitarian Program (Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC), 2009c) are termed “humanitarian entrants”.

**On-Arrival Migrant Education Programmes**

This term is used as a generic term to refer to officially organised/authorised educational programmes for eligible migrants who recently arrived in Australia.
1.6 **Organisation of the Report**

This thesis consists of nine chapters. Following the current chapter, Chapter 2 presents an account of background and contextual information of the study, with a particular focus on the fluidity of the category adult “new arrivals”. Chapter 3 provides the theoretical framework adopted in the study, followed by a review of relevant literature in the field. Chapter 4 details the methodology and methods employed in this study. Chapters 5, 6, 7 and 8 analyse data, whose findings will be summarised and discussed in Chapter 9.
CHAPTER 2
CONTEXT OF THE STUDY:
Locating Adult “New Arrivals” in the Australian Education System

2.0 Introduction

Current Australian on-arrival migrant education programmes stand in a complex web of historical and geopolitical factors. Historically, the programmes were borne out of the country's changing attitudes towards its newcomers. How the programmes are currently being operationalised is embedded in the developments in wider educational philosophies as well as gradual shifts in theories and approaches to teaching languages (Burns & de Silva Joyce, 2007). Geopolitically, the organisation of on-arrival migrant education programmes varies across states. This makes some of the programmes unique to their state.

The New Arrivals Program directed to adult populations (henceforth the adult NAP) is one such programme unique to South Australia. It is one of the two on-arrival migrant education programmes for adults currently in place. Accordingly, adult NAP “new arrivals” has become a unique category unlike that in any other state. Further, the positioning of the adult NAP is made complex by politics surrounding on-arrival adult migrant education programmes. Of particular relevance is the positioning of NAP in relation to mainstream education, English as a Second Language (ESL) Programs and the Adult NAP's state adult counterpart, Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP). For the present investigation on “new-arrival-ness” to proceed, then, generating a clear picture of the generality and specificity of the positioning of the adult NAP is imperative.

Accordingly, this chapter provides an overview of the adult NAP as the research context of the study. The chapter addresses the definitional and classificatory issues surrounding the term “new arrivals” from several angles. The chapter begins by addressing the macro historical context that encompasses Australia’s
societal attitudes towards migrants, as well as the geopolitical context that characterises South Australian migrant education. It highlights how the definition and the positioning of “new arrivals” have been made tenuous and how adult “new arrivals” have been caught in a tangled web of adult on-arrival migrant education, ESL programmes and mainstream education.

2.1 Migrant Education in Australia: Historical Aspects

Australia is an “immigration society” (Reitz, 2003). Every year, a number of individuals of different national origins enter Australia to lead a life in the country, accounting for nearly half of its population growth in years 2005-6 (Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), 2008b). Reasons why they enter Australia vary, ranging from doing business in Australia to relocating from their countries of origin to avoid civil war. Main source regions from which Australia receives settlers keep shifting, partly in response to the circumstantial changes in the world, and partly reflective of changes in the country’s immigration policy (ABS, 1994). This diverse population, coupled with some others with certain temporary permits (e.g., international students), constitute Australian newcomers.

Australia has a history of changing attitudes towards newcomers. Working out appropriate ways to incorporate its newcomers into its social fabric has been an ongoing challenge. The move to formally recognise, accept and value cultural and linguistic diversity within its population is typically a post-war phenomenon, developed in the past four decades (Carder, 2008).

The current Australian migration policy is multiculturalism. The country adopted multiculturalism in the 1980s with officialised commitments to value and welcome diversity (Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs, 1980). Multiculturalism ostensibly promotes intercultural understanding and tolerance towards other cultures, encouraging the maintenance of one’s own cultural heritage and providing equal opportunities to migrants (Australian Ethnic Affairs Council Committee on Multicultural Education, 1981). However, its naming can be somewhat difficult to interpret, as it was already pointed out at the time of the policy’s inception that the concept of multiculturalism “has been advocated for
Australia without any clear picture of what is implied by it or even whether the term is intended as a description of Australian society or a prescription for it” (Taft & Cahill, 1981, p. 30, italics in original). Similar questions were raised elsewhere (e.g., Australian Ethnic Affairs Council Committee on Multicultural Education, 1979, 1981).

Now, nearly thirty years from its inception, it still remains a question whether multiculturalism and racial/ethnic tolerance permeate the public space. It has been observed that multiculturalism has had several versions with differing stances to handling diversity (Jayasuriya, 2008, 2009). According to Jayasuriya (2007, 2008), the early 21st century, around the time the current investigation was conducted, falls into the era of “managerial multiculturalism” with a strong call for national unity within diversity under Australian values. Reportedly, demands for migrants’ obligations were looming, in particular, learning English (Hart, 2007) as well as adopting Australian values. The idea of implementing a new citizenship test to assess English proficiency and Australian values followed, yielding heated debates and questions arising from applied linguists (e.g., McNamara, 2006). Some politicians were explicitly advocating for tougher migration rules to exclude migration from particular parts of the world (Caldwell, 2007; Refugee Council of Australia, 2007).

Such moves are viewed by Jayasuriya (2007, 2008) as a new assimilationism, that is, a partial recourse to a pre-multiculturalism era under the White Australia policy. The White Australia policy was in place from the beginning of the twentieth century to the early 1970s (Harris, 1979), and it initially adopted “assimilation”, a strong Anglo-conformist stance (Australian Ethnic Affairs Council Committee on Multicultural Education, 1981). During that time, Australia reportedly restricted the intake of so-called non-white immigrants and also created a hierarchy within so-called whites (Garner, 2007). Garner (2007) observes that it was an era where “[c]ultural and political factors can override the phenotypical ones” (p. 72). As the country’s cultural diversity came to be recognised in a more positive manner, “assimilation” turned into progressively less racially exclusive stances called “interactionism” (Harris, 1979) and “integration”, before being taken over by the principles of multiculturalism. Interestingly, Eckermann (1994) asserts that the
road to multiculturalism was underpinned by the pragmatic goals of the country. That is, abandoning the earlier assimilationist and integrationist approaches was prompted as a matter of necessity due to a realisation that the approach did not work as expected (Australian Ethnic Affairs Council Committee on Multicultural Education, 1979, 1981). Such an observation suggests that multiculturalism has been operating against the backdrop of earlier policies and that shifts in stances towards migrants reflect the host society’s gradual catch-up process with a perceived reality.

Interestingly, changes in societal attitude towards newcomers prompted terminology shifts. Under assimilationist policies, “New Australians” and “migrants” were used as cover terms to refer to incoming newcomers. According to Harris (1979), these labels were gradually abandoned and were replaced by “newcomers” during the early to mid 1960s, due primarily to the earlier terms’ perceived connotations of inferiority. Decades later, the cover term appears to have been settled as “new arrivals”.

Shifts and changes in societal attitude towards migrants have permeated the country’s educational spheres, while migrant education also had its own progression. Of primary concern here is the ESL sector which traditionally has most direct contact with migrants. Davison (2001) holds that ESL in 21st century Australia has been in a “mainstreaming” phase, which emerged from multiculturalism around the mid 1980s. This ESL mainstreaming approach typically involves working out ways to support the migrant population in the mainstream classes. This is underpinned by a triple stance on equity: firstly by questioning the separate educational provision for migrants (Clegg, 1996); secondly by asserting that language learning is a long-term, ongoing enterprise which must continue well beyond the initial stage of migration (Clegg, 1996; Cochran, 2002); and thirdly by strongly promoting situating migrant education as a central concern of the whole school (Barnett, 2002). This mainstreaming concern can be viewed as part of a wider “mainstreaming” movement towards access and equity that was occurring at that time (see, Jayasuriya, 2003). One product of this era was ESL in the Mainstream (Education Department of South
Australia, 1991), the in-service programmes to equip mainstream teachers with ESL teaching strategies led by the South Australian state government.

In addition, the road to mainstreaming seems to have also been underpinned by changes in educational philosophies over this period. To start with, it can be observed that the emergence of progressivist pedagogy assisted the transition from assimilation to integration and ultimately to multiculturalism (J. I. Martin, 1978; Taft & Cahill, 1981). Progressivism was regarded highly for its ostensible encouragement of learner's active inquiry and celebration of diversity, while its predecessor, the “transmission model” (Cummins, 1989, 1991) of pedagogy, was criticised as treating knowledge as a static commodity to be inserted into learners’ minds. There was a radical pendulum swing from a teacher-centred approach to a learner-centred approach (Nunan, 1988a). However, in the 1980s, progressivism was criticised as insufficient for promoting critical awareness of, and interrogation into, the power imbalance of the society (Cope & Kalantzis, 1990; Cummins, 2000; Kalantzis & Cope, 1993; J. R. Martin, Christie, & Rothery, 1987/1994) and lacking coherence within and across programmes (Burns & de Silva Joyce, 2007), and it was taken over by post-progressivist pedagogies. Australian genre approaches to literacy (Callaghan & Rothery, 1988; Cope & Kalantzis, 1993; Kalantzis & Cope, 1993; Knapp & Watkins, 2005; J. R. Martin, 1984, 1985) were typically post-progressivist, developed as a means to reach out to those who were marginalised and disadvantaged in the existing educational system (Callaghan & Rothery, 1988; Cope & Kalantzis, 1993). Unlike progressivist approaches, they were typically interventionist in orientation (J. R. Martin, et al., 1987/1994), with an explicit focus on providing the so-called ‘non-mainstream’ population with access to mainstream practices. Not surprisingly, their development well coincided with the wake of mainstreaming approaches. Thus, just as progressivism can be seen as underpinning a multiculturalist pedagogy, post-progressivist pedagogy can be viewed as a mainstreaming pedagogy.

Clearly reflecting such developments in broader educational philosophies, attitudinal transitions towards mainstreaming in migrant education were also marked by shifts and developments in English language teaching approaches. The assimilationist era coincided with the succession of Grammar Translation,
Situational and Audio-Lingual approaches to teaching English (cf. Mickan, 2004), where, reflecting the transmission model of pedagogy, language was broken up “into its component parts for easier transmission” (Cummins, 2000, p. 257). This 1970s era of progressivism, coinciding with the transitional era of integrationist to multicultural policies, overlaps with the period when Communicative Language Teaching started gaining currency (Syarief, 2005), followed by Task-Based Teaching (Nunan, 1993) and its offshoots. When progressivism came under criticism in the 1980s, the aforementioned ‘mainstream’ Genre-Based Teaching emerged, initially with a primary concern with native English speaking students (Derewianka, 2003). Subsequently this became widely adopted by the ESL field (e.g., Derewianka, 1990; Feez, 1998), which marked the stage of mainstreaming in ESL.

Taken together, then, the current climate in Australian migrant education can be seen as primarily multicultural in orientation with a mainstreaming focus, enacted by post-progressivist approaches to pedagogy and language teaching. This particular configuration is aimed to create a particular relationship between the host society and “new arrivals” in class: the migration process has been reconceptualised from essentially a one-way process, where only migrants have to change to be accustomed to Australia, to a two-way process where the host nation also has to change to accommodate their migrants.

However, in actuality, these transitions are not so neat and tidy. It has been pointed out that recent Australian migration policies are amalgams of assimilationist and multiculturalist attitudes (Eckermann, 1994). With pedagogy, some say that progressivism has not totally ceased and that its variations continue to operate, with constructivism as its theoretical base (Windschitl, 2002). This seems to hold with South Australian ESL, where they adopt constructivism (Department of Education Training and Employment (DETE), 2001b), while adopting a post-progressivist, genre-based approach. Language teaching approaches, too, are a complex mixture of past and present trends. Eclectic approaches to language teaching highlight the complex state of affairs, with some affirming or advocating for it (H. D. Brown, 2007; Cross, 2005; Larsen-Freeman, 2000), and others refuting it (Stern, 1983). Further, as far as the teacher-student...
relationship is concerned, there have been multiple pendulum swings, from exclusively teacher-centred (the transmission model) to radically learner-centred (progressivism) and back to a more teacher-centred stance (genre-based). Within these movements, there can be as many versions of migrant education and teacher-student relationships as the number of classrooms.

As of the first decade of the new millennium, then, what constitutes migrant education in this increasingly multicultural society, not to mention how to feed into its processes, is an ever-developing enterprise. While Davison (2001) sees the ‘mainstreaming’ stance as beneficial to the ESL profession in Australia, accommodating diversity and individuality has been a challenge. According to Duff (2002):

A topic of increasing concern in pluralistic societies, and especially in those undergoing rapid change, is how to create communities at school, work, and in the neighbourhood that demonstrate social and ideological cohesiveness, harmony, and ‘shared vision’ for what can be accomplished collectively, yet also accommodate individuality, diversity, fundamental differences, and change (p. 289).

The reality of migrant education is in constant flux, since Australian immigration policies have been affected by the state of the world, as well as by the country’s own policy for nation building. Thus, “[r]apid changes in the demographics of student populations can create management and pedagogical challenges for teachers and administrators and may profoundly shape the experience and performance of the students” (Ellen, O'Regan, & Conger, 2009, pp. 295-296). Meanwhile, it has been noted that “teachers’ expectations are likely to influence their pupils’ self-image and performance at school” (Australian Ethnic Affairs Council Committee on Multicultural Education, 1981, p. 4; also Teunissen, 1991). The mixture of these elements results in a particular representation of “new arrivals”. Thus, the present societal approach to migrants can be a looking-glass through which “new arrivals” can be seen.

So far, the generic, historical and circumstantial aspects surrounding “new arrivals” have been presented. The next two sections (2.2 and 2.3) will discuss the
specific, geographic factors that contribute to the current positioning of adult “new arrivals” in South Australia.

2.2 Current On-arrival Migrant Education Programmes: Geopolitical Aspects

The current landscape of Australian on-arrival migrant education programmes is made complex owing to the fact that different states have different systems in place. It has been pointed out that, while there are impressive numbers of migrant education and support systems in place, very few people who are inside the systems possess a comprehensive grasp of them, let alone eligible migrants themselves (Victorian Settlement Planning Committee (VSPC), 2008). South Australian adult newcomers are located in a peculiar context in which the state offers dual educational systems for them. Many newcomers are eligible for both programmes. This creates the situation where, depending on the programme chosen, a newcomer’s subsequent educational experiences can be framed somewhat accidentally. This is unlike any other state in Australia, and is a contributing factor to the elusiveness of the term “new arrivals”. Since such a situation applies to the research cohort for the present study, this section illustrates where and how such students are located within on-arrival migrant education programmes. It first focuses on available programmes at the federal level (2.2.1), before turning to the case with South Australia (2.2.2).

2.2.1 Two Federally Defined On-Arrival Migrant Education Programmes

Federally, two separate on-arrival migrant education programmes are currently in place, one for adult and one for school age populations. The former is the Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP) (Department of Immigration and Citizenship (DIAC), 2009a) and the latter is the English as a Second Language - New Arrivals (ESL-NA) Programme (Department of Education Science and Training (DEST), 2008). By looking at their naming alone, one can already see the potential ambiguities in the classification of “new arrivals”; the latter utilises the term as part of its name, while the former does not. One could either assume that “new arrivals” in federal-educational terms specifically corresponds to those enrolled in
ESL-NA, or one could assert that there are “New Arrivals” within “new arrivals”. Hereafter in this chapter, the former interpretation is applied, in order to illustrate the added complexity with adults in South Australia.

AMEP and ESL-NA have different developmental paths. AMEP was in place soon after the Second World War (Burns & de Silva Joyce, 2007; Davison, 2001; Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA), 2003), and it has been run continuously since its inception. By contrast, ESL-NA was established in 1982 (Stevens, 1990), essentially as a successor of the Child Migrant Education Program (CMEP), a children’s version of AMEP established in the 1970s (Australian Ethnic Affairs Council Committee on Multicultural Education, 1981; Davison, 2001).

Another significant contrast between AMEP and ESL-NA is their orientation to educational outcomes. AMEP is considered “a national settlement programme” (DIAC, 2009b), whose primary focus is ostensibly on the daily conduct of living in a new country. By contrast, ESL-NA is oriented more towards schooling, which in turn ostensibly focuses on academic matters rather more than life matters. In fact, this difference is reflected in the respective federal sectors that manages each programme; DIAC governs AMEP, while the Department of Education Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR), formerly DEST, governs ESL-NA. The educational providers for each programme also differ; AMEP is run by DIAC-appointed AMEP providers through tendering processes (DIAC, 2009c), while ESL-NA Programmes are run by government and non-government schools in each State (DEEWR, 2008).

However, these two programmes are not always clear-cut, not least because some “borderline” age applicants are eligible for both programmes. In some cases, those between 16 and 18 years of age may be accepted in AMEP rather than ESL-NA (DIAC, 2008). The flow chart of eligible individuals in federally defined on-arrival programmes is shown in Figure 2.1.
These two overlapping eligibilities highlight one complexity in the matter of classifying someone a “new arrival”. Assuming a dual eligibility for certain “borderline age” minors creates a situation in which they become “new arrivals” if processed through the ESL-NA scheme, while they do not if directed to AMEP. Despite the critical difference that a programme choice would make, the determinant factor(s) for such programme choice cannot be identified easily. Both programmes emphasise the level of English language proficiency and elapsed time of stay in Australia in determining eligibility (e.g., DIAC 2009a). Also, foregrounding English proficiency as a key unifying factor for eligibility alters the composition of “new arrivals” in that those proficient in English are slipped out of the category. Interestingly, these criteria precede the distinction between humanitarian entrants and other types of migrants, so long as a particular individual falls into the federally defined eligible visa categories. These factors complicate the composition of “new arrivals”, which may in turn obscure essential differences and diversity amongst those eligible for tuition. Grouping all eligible individuals together has been pointed out as a concern, as Clegg (1996) states:

…differences between ESL learners are considerable and complex, and a school cannot make blanket decisions about them…what distinguishes students within the ‘ESL’ category is often greater than what distinguishes them from ‘native-speakers’. …we should see ESL learners as full members of the school community, who have specific language needs, rather than as a separate group who must prove themselves linguistically before they can claim their full entitlement. (p. 5)
Meanwhile, in South Australia, the distinction between adults and minors has been further obscured due to its own system.

2.2.2 On-Arrival Migrant Education Programmes in South Australia

In South Australia, for various historical reasons, a different construal of “new arrival” learners can be found. As well as applying a slightly different adult-minor distinction from federal terms, a notable departure from the federal structure is that many adults are also accepted into the ESL-NA scheme (see Department of Education and Children's Services (DECS), 2006b).

2.2.2.1 New Arrivals Programs in South Australia

ESL-NA Programmes implemented in South Australian schools are termed the New Arrivals Program (NAP). Both public and private sectors run NAP. DECS directly coordinates the programme for the public sector, and Catholic Education South Australia coordinates their own NAP in the Catholic private sector. Since the present research is concerned with public systems, only the case with the public sector will be focused upon hereafter.

NAP covers both compulsory schooling stages and post-compulsory stages. It operates at three levels: Primary, Secondary and Senior Secondary/Adult (DECS, 2005). The institutions that run NAP are called NAP centres. It has been documented that NAP has developed into its current formation through multiple organisational changes (cf. Stevens, 1990). Currently there are fifteen NAP centres operating in the metropolitan area, and their number is on the rise (Barnett & Antenucci, 2009). Each NAP centre specialises in one educational level. Most NAP centres are located within the vicinities of the wider mainstream educational institutions of their respective educational level, while the Secondary NAP centre stands apart as one specialist language institution. Except for the remote areas, NAP is typically a separate provision, where NAP students are grouped together and receive instructions separate from mainstream classes. The present formation of NAP and its age-based eligibility has been illustrated in Figure 2.2.
As the figure shows, the classificatory system for South Australian NAP for their eligible student groupings at specific educational levels has been realised in a much more complex manner than the federal pattern would suggest. The incorporation of adults into NAP and the delineation of three NAP levels have created various patterns of dual eligibilities both within and outside of NAP. This complex classificatory system further complicates the picture of who count as “new arrivals”.

In line with the federal definitions, the SA NAP is ostensibly education oriented, with a primary educational goal of preparing the students to join mainstream schooling (DECS, 2005). Notwithstanding that, how much each enacted programme is directed towards schooling varies amongst the three levels. For NAP learners of compulsory school age (6 to 16) (DECS, 2009), the main, uniform goal is to join the mainstream schooling. Students’ continuous education at the local South Australian educational institutions is automatically assumed. In contrast, for learners above compulsory school age, this is not the case. That is, secondary and senior secondary NAP sectors do not automatically assume mainstream education as the students’ goal; pathways such as vocational education or employment are included as potential goals (DECS, 2005). Further, for adult clients, because they are supposedly ‘beyond’ the compulsory education age, their pathways beyond NAP are even wider than the senior secondary
population. This situation makes the boundary between AMEP and NAP blurred in some respects, even though these courses differ from each other.

Last but not least, one characteristic of NAP centres is their potential individuality. Stevens (1990) reports that during the 1980s it was up to the individual NAP centres to decide how to operate and that, in practice, the programme varied as much as the number of NAP centres.

### 2.2.2.2 Adult NAP and AMEP: Two English Programmes for Adult Newcomers in South Australia

A characteristic of the structure of South Australian on-arrival adult migrant education is its duality of operation and complex clientele identification system. Many adult newcomers are eligible for both the adult NAP and AMEP, and although there are funding schemes and other arrangements involved in the process, eligible adults themselves generally choose which programme to participate in.

While having multiple options presumably broadens the range of available experiences newcomers can access, it must be recognised that choosing one programme instead of the other would alter their institutional positioning and thus their subsequent pathways. In AMEP, by virtue of entering an adult education sphere, adults become the main, if not sole, clients. By contrast, in the general framework of NAP, they are positioned in the periphery, for the adult NAP is an extension of compulsory schooling. Such a difference can be identified in the types of institutions that run respective programmes for adults: AMEP is run by TAFE South Australia (TAFE SA) English Language Services (ELS) and LM Training Specialists (DIAC, 2009d), while the Adult NAP is run by a State-governed adult re-entry college which offers senior secondary/post-compulsory level education. Although all are specialised adult education institutions in their own right, they belong to different systems, as can be illustrated in Figure 2.3.
The difference in institutional positioning, depending on the system they choose, can impact significantly on the experiences of adult newcomers. As briefly touched on in 2.2.1, (adult) NAP and AMEP have different aims and outcomes. Because NAP is a schooling-focused programme, its ostensible premise is mainstreaming learners to the Australian schooling system. This premise is articulated in DEEWR’s website as “to improve the educational opportunities and outcomes of newly arrived students of non-English speaking backgrounds by developing their English language competence and facilitating their participation in mainstream educational activities” (DEEWR, 2008). In contrast, AMEP does not set mainstreaming to school curriculum as among its central foci. Instead, its aim is developing “functional English” deemed indispensable for immigrants “to settle successfully in Australia” and “to deal with everyday social and some work situations” (DIAC, 2009b). Indeed, the fact that the Immigration Department is the main governing body of AMEP signifies the programme’s orientation to life matters. Burns (2006) favourably observes the general orientation of AMEP, stating that locating adult migrant education within the vicinity of migration matters rather than educational matters makes the Australian system distinctive.
Based on such a background, then, one would assume that adult newcomers should access NAP if they wish to join the mainstream school-based education system, while they should access AMEP if their focus is to settle into their life in Australia. However, whether there can be such a clear distinction between the two programmes remains unclear. There has not been much research conducted on the adult NAP; compared to AMEP, the adult NAP is somewhat of a mystery. A context-specific account of the nature of adult NAP instructions may shed light on this point.

Significantly, it appears that the differences between the two programmes remain largely invisible to many adult newcomers. Choice of programme seems to depend heavily on the nature of information a student accesses prior to, or immediately upon, arrival. For example, the on-arrival information booklet, *Beginning a Life in Australia: Welcome to South Australia*, is issued by DIAC (2007, 2009d), and, perhaps reflecting the tie between AMEP and DIAC, the booklet provides significantly more information on AMEP than on NAP. The adult NAP appears under the heading of “Non-English Speaking Children”, with only a remark that says, “Adults with little or no knowledge of English can enrol” (DIAC, 2009d, p. 47). Furthermore, anecdotal evidence from an adult NAP teacher indicates that getting to know the existence of adult NAP is largely through word of mouth rather than through any systematic dissemination of its information. Thus, even here, the position of the adult NAP within adult migrant education remains somewhat obscure. This is at odds with the recommendation from DIMIA (DIAC’s former name) that available on-arrival support for adults “require[s] a clear delineation of the roles of various services and providers” (DIMIA, 2003. p. 257). Thus, contextualised study on the adult NAP will potentially contribute to the articulation of its specific practices hitherto invisible to many.

In this way, as South Australia has extended the scope of its NAP to cover adults, eligible adult newcomers are situated in-between two different on-arrival education programmes available for them. Choosing the Adult NAP has its own implications. However, a fuller picture of the adult NAP cannot be obtained without taking into account NAP’s very own institutional positioning, in relation
to ESL and mainstream education. Accordingly, this point will be pursued in the next two sections with a widened scope of discussion at the federal level.

2.3 NAP, ESL and Mainstream Education: Disciplinary Relationship Issues

A glance at the current landscape of education alerts us to the situation that NAP and ESL converge, but that the nature of the relationship between these two has rarely been delineated. ESL does not always refer to a school subject that is offered as an alternative to mainstream English subjects. It can also be a programme. By contrast, NAP is a programme but it is never a school subject. Would this make ESL a portion of NAP? The answer is negative, since the ESL population is much wider than the NAP population. Although migrant education is sometimes equated with language tuition, there is more to the story. Such an equation obscures the complexity that lies in educating migrants. NAP foregrounds the dilemma of what constitutes ESL.

2.3.1 ESL, ESL-NA and ESL-GSP

Because of its wide application, the term ESL in Australian educational systems needs some explaining. In the light of the positioning of “new arrivals”, ESL has at least three aspects: ESL as a general cover term, ESL as school-based general ongoing support, and ESL as on-arrival English tuition.

Although ESL functions as a cover term that encompasses various sorts of English language tuition in and out of school, its meaning in the Australian formal schooling system originates from the federally organised English as a Second Language (ESL) Program. The ESL Program commenced in 1982 in response to the 1978 commonwealth report (the Galbally Report, Commonwealth of Australia, 1978) which recommended increased funding and the restructuring of existing services and programmes for migrants.

The ESL-NA is one of the two strands of this ESL Program. Its counterpart is called the General Support Program (ESL-GSP) (DECS, 2008a; Stevens, 1990), aimed at ongoing English language support in mainstream schools. Because
initially both strands were targeted primarily at non-English speaking settlers, the ESL Program and school-based migrant education were once synonymous, particularly in the 1970s (Australian Ethnic Affairs Council Committee on Multicultural Education, 1981). However, with the expansion of the student population, such an ESL-migrant education equation does not seem to hold any more.

Further, in federal funding terms, what constitutes the ESL Program has changed dramatically. Since 1997, the ESL-GSP has been subsumed into general funding for mainstream education (Moore, 2005). ESL-NA has become a sole front-runner of the ESL Program, by virtue of being the only recipient of the funding allocated under the ESL scheme. Funding shifts do not mean the disappearance of ESL-GSP at schools, and the South Australian system has maintained the double-stranded structure of its ESL Program to date, with overlapping personnel arrangements (for example, see DECS 2008a). However, as it stands, the situation looks as though the degree of newness of arrival to Australia has overpowered the extent of the actual need for English support in the wider student population (Moore, 2005). As a result, the federal ESL Program is virtually equivalent to ESL-NA.

Such a ‘promotion’ has simultaneously consolidated and complicated the positioning of ESL-NA, and consequently, “new arrivals”. While the ESL-NA has, prima facie, gained the federally endorsed status of what counts as ESL, for some, ESL-NA signifies the lack of federal attention to a wider ESL population which needs to be better catered for than at present (e.g., Moore, 2005). In a sense, ESL-NA stands out from the rest of ESL.

Just as the NAP stands out from the rest of ESL, “new arrivals” stands out from the rest of ESL learners by virtue of being positioned as sole and target recipients of federal attention. The ramification of this is that, although “new arrivals” are privileged in one respect, they are singled out as more disadvantaged and possessing special needs for the very reason that has made them privileged. That is, their privilege is built upon their perceived disadvantage supposedly caused by their limited English proficiency. As of 2008, this disadvantage-driven
nature of federal attention was symbolically reflected in the ESL-NA’s location within the category of “disadvantages and/or special needs” in DEEWR’s webpage (see DEEWR 2008).

The current positioning of “new arrivals” in the wider ESL domain is painted with additional controversies as to what counts as ESL. The shift to target ESL-NA students coincided with the nation’s increased attention to literacy skills under the “Literacy for All” policy (Department of Employment, 1998). According to Burns (2007), this literacy movement was part of the “moral panic” that the then Government had over the seemingly deteriorating basic literacy skills amongst school populations in the mid 1990s. The removal of ESL-GSP from ESL funding was reportedly a part of this shift, since the ESL-GSP became embedded within the general literacy funding (Lo Bianco, 2002). This relocation was not well-received by many ESL researchers and practitioners, who regarded the literacy movement as reducing the scope of ESL by conflating it with literacy (de Courcy, 2007; Hammond, 1999; Hammond & Derewianka, 1999; Lo Bianco, 1998, 2002). Lo Bianco (1998) raised concern that narrowly focused literacy education would neglect wider learning experiences, while simultaneously maintaining that such a narrow pedagogic focus would seriously undermine the specificities of ESL students and the expertise of ESL teachers. As the ESL field was about to experience this identity crisis, Eckermann (1994) observed that not possessing adequate English literacy skills had come to be stated as a distinct problem. She asserted that this move was a legacy of the assimilationist era. It is perhaps not coincidental that there were observed shifts in the approaches to multiculturalism around this time, from “egalitarian” approaches to more “managerial” ones (Jayasuriya, 2003).

Although ESL-NA has been structurally marked out of the general literacy funding, the aforementioned literacy fever certainly had an influence over ESL-NA. After the turn of the new millennium, there was a visible change in the composition of humanitarian entrants who make up a significant portion of “new arrivals”. A number of people arriving from Africa were identified as lacking literacy not only in English but also in their first language(s). Under such a circumstance, it is not hard to imagine that an intensified pedagogic focus was
being placed on decontextualised literacy skills. Quite naturally, then, “new arrivals” became positioned as further handicapped in relation to literacy skills than general ESL learners.

Meanwhile, adult ESL sectors are also observed to be managing a nebulosity relationship with literacy (Murray, 2005). According to Murray (2005), they are trying to not be synonymous with adult literacy in general. Such an observation seems to be supported by a literature search on adult ESL: research articles in this field very often contain both “adult ESL” and “adult literacy” as their main focus and these terms are used almost interchangeably. This situation provides reasonable grounds to suspect that adult “new arrival” ESL learners tend to be automatically assumed to be literacy learners.

In sum, the current federal funding arrangement of ESL-NA makes “new arrivals” marked. “New arrivals” are in a paradoxical situation where they stand out from the rest of ESL while at the same time enjoying the centre of attention as “the” ESL population. Due to the wide public attention to literacy skills, “new arrivals” have been singled out as a particular subset of the ESL population with extensive disadvantages. Meanwhile, Lo Bianco (2002) proposes that articulating and foregrounding the particularities of the ESL population are key to securing the discipline’s identity. He asserts that such acts would maximise the potential of generating official recognition of the ESL students’ need for professional specialist support. Similarly, Ellen, O’Regan, Schwartz and Stiefel (2002), drawing on Schwartz and Gershberg (2001), observe that it is not the “migrants” per se that receive more resources at school but those identified with limited English proficiency. If this is the case, then “new arrivals”, and in fact the whole ESL population, will become identified in terms of their distance from the ‘mainstream’ and this will have implications in relation to the distance between “new arrivals” and the ‘mainstream’. This point will be elaborated in 2.3.2.

2.3.2 ESL-NA and Mainstream Education

The location of ESL-NA within existing Australian educational structures can be seen as a manifestation of the social positioning of the “new arrivals”. The NAP,
an enacted ESL-NA programme in South Australia, is typically a form of criteria-based separate education, the social effect of which is feared to be segregational. While some affirm segregation from an economic point of view (e.g., Parasnis, 2006), concerns have been expressed that educating newcomers separately may enhance the already existing social segregation in schools and society rather than diminishing it (e.g., Feinberg, 2000). Feinberg (2000) argues that “we have many good reasons to be wary of the consequences of segregation on the basis of language, no matter how good the plan or how benign the intentions” (p. 225). Harklau (2003) warns that this practice “renders students subject to socialization practices and social positionings that are predicated on assumptions and beliefs about their salient identities as ethnic minorities, as immigrants, and as non-native speakers of English” (p. 86). As such, even a case of “withdrawal” arrangements is seen as having an effect of making students “marked” (Harklau, 2003).

Additionally, the NAP is in effect an example of pre-mainstream education, by virtue of operating as a bridging programme to prepare learners for mainstream education. To say that “new arrivals” are being prepared for mainstream education is equivalent to saying that they are not yet ready to participate in mainstream schools. That is, learners become fully-fledged curriculum learners only after exiting the NAP. For this reason, the stated NAP levels (primary, secondary and senior secondary) are more like target levels; the programmes are working towards the respective levels rather than fully operating at those levels. Then it can be said that the NAP and mainstream education are in a dialectical relationship in which one is defined by the other. Insofar as students are enrolled in the NAP, their institutional positioning necessarily remains pre-mainstream, and the existence of a pre-mainstream course is a confirmation of the mainstream itself, which effectively exists outside the realm of the NAP.

Furthermore, what is meant by “mainstream” seems to become progressively more complex as the students’ age goes up. One of the functions of ESL-NA is to set up mainstream joining points. This creates an issue of where in the mainstream education to allow learners to join, as well as when and how. Although joining the age-appropriate mainstream education can be identified as
the uniform goal for the learners of compulsory school age (cf. DECS 2008b, 2008c), this cannot be the case for learners of post-compulsory school age. DECS includes home duties as part of the pathways for the latter cohort (cf. DECS 2008b, 2008c), indicating that joining mainstream education is not necessarily an ultimate goal. In this sense, there is less necessary connection between the NAP and mainstream education in higher sectors, hence less difference between NAP and AMEP than their structural differences suggest. Also, it can be assumed that the ‘mainstreaming’ goals set at this level are potentially more to do with life and society than education per se.

However, there is another dimension that needs to be taken into account. It seems that the above definitional issues have a significant impact on the positioning of the “new arrivals”.

2.4 The Definition and Positioning of “New Arrivals”: Societal Issues

For the NAP, “new arrivals” are the reasons for the programme to exist. The programme’s practices and stances depend on how “new arrivals” are defined. In this sense, attributes of “new arrivals” can be seen as the NAP culture’s “key symbols” (Ortner, 1973). Conversely, it can be seen that the way learners are positioned derives from a particular programme’s own definition and positioning within a wider educational framework.

2.4.1 Disciplinary Issues of Migrant Education and the ESL Profession, and Representation of “New Arrivals”

The social and institutional positioning of “new arrivals” seems to depend on how the pedagogy for migrants and the ESL profession are defined. As discussed earlier, migrant education programmes reflect a host society’s response to its newcomers. Harklau (1999a) holds that it is through education that “attributions of social positions are communicated to and negotiated with students, and nowhere is that more true than in the case of immigrants in ‘migrant societies’ (Gibson, 1997)” (p. 258). Critical to this process is the adoption of particular
pedagogy, as this entails a particular conceptualisation of learners and a teacher-learner relationship. Knapp and Watkins (2005) see that pedagogy “involves ...something that is often left unsaid, but which implicitly underpins all teaching practice; that is, a pedagogy is always grounded by a particular philosophy which frames a teacher’s conceptions of his or her role in the classroom and perspective on the ways in which the students learn” (pp. 82-83).

Research suggests that migrant education/ESL has been suffering from both definitional and positional issues. It has been suggested that what counts as ESL is always in flux, “defined by a particular conceptualisation of ideas and activities as articulated by its key stakeholders at any one time” (Mohan, Leung, & Davison, 2001, p. 5). It has also been observed that “because ESL is in very close contact and interacts with social, cultural, political and economic developments in multiethnic and multicultural societies it is exceptionally ‘unstable’ and that it undergoes fundamental changes frequently” (Mohan, et al., 2001, pp. 5-6). Further, its positioning within a wider educational framework seems to be far from comfortable. ESL has tended to be positioned as less prestigious and afforded less authority than conventional subject areas (Davison, 2001; Love & Arkoudis, 2006). One of the critical observations of the ESL profession can be found in Clegg (1996), who argues that “most ESL teachers conduct their curriculum-orientated work at a low-to-middle level of subject-specificity; the limits of their own subject expertise and the language-development priorities of the ESL class determine this” (p. 10).

Such positional and definitional issues seem to have yielded a double-helix effect on the way “new arrivals” are positioned. On the one hand, as Love and Arkoudis (2006) observe, a less privileged positioning of the ESL profession might render the ESL teachers powerless in challenging the ways “mainstream” subject area teachers construct their role and stance towards ESL learners. The aforementioned state of general ESL being subsumed under the broad category of literacy can be interpreted in this light. On the other hand, to assert their legitimacy within the education arena, ESL programmes have tended to foreground the “need” of their learners in effectively deficit terms (Harklau, 1999a).
Indeed, migrant education programmes do seem to be inherently susceptible in this area, in that their very existence can be seen as based upon the assumption that there is distance between the norm (mainstream) and migrant students, categories that are conceived as mutually exclusive (Firth & Wagner, 1997). Some researchers argue that the image of ESL learners tends to be generated through an assessment against “metatheoretical” (Firth & Wagner, 1997) and idealised native speaker norms (Firth & Wagner, 1997; Harklau, 2003; Leung, Harris, & Rampton, 1997). These researchers perceive that underpinning the pedagogical decisions are such sociopolitical assumptions as the notion of stability and standard-ness of target language varieties (Harklau, 2003; Rampton, 1997). They argue that such a dichotomised view of ESL learners and native counterparts renders both parties as symbols of ‘nativeness’ and ‘foreignness’ respectively (Firth & Wagner, 1997), which may even lead to the “idealisation of the nation state” (Rampton, 1997, p. 330) and collective/one-dimensional identification of educational levels for the immigrants (Harklau, 2003). Rampton (1997) observes that the assumption of standard language tends to come “with a bundle of ideas that are remarkably tenacious” (p. 329).

Presumably, such a tradition in ESL has two potential implications for the instruction of “new arrivals”. One is the likelihood of their being identified by their perceived deficits. Firth and Wagner (1997) contend that such a simplistic view creates “an analytic mindset that elevates an idealized ‘native’ speaker above a stereotypicalized ‘nonnative’, while viewing the latter as a defective communicator, limited by an underdeveloped communicative competence” (p. 285). Similarly, Harklau (2003) argues that learners tends to be “perceived only as struggling to overcome a deficit in English” (p. 91). De Courcy’s (2007) findings on Australian pre-service teachers’ attitudes towards ESL students seem to consolidate such an argument. She reports that the discourse of her research participants was filled with such expressions as “allowing, difficult, problem, deficit, difference, ESL/Australian and assistance”, which functioned to “portray ESL children as being a problem, perhaps not ‘Australian’, and needing teachers to do something about them” (p. 198). While de Courcy attributes such negative representations of ESL students to the absence of teaching experience in ESL...
classrooms, Harklau (1999a, 2003) suggests that representational practices are more pervasive and ingrained in a wider variety of social practices.

Another implication is that ESL’s disciplinary struggles may have negative impacts on enacting multiculturalism, in particular, in embracing diversity. Organisationally, Harklau (1999a) observes that “greater pressure is placed on college aspirants to conform to its practices and ethos than is placed on institutions to accommodate student diversity” (p. 259). The heavy attention to the mastery of English has been viewed as detrimental to embracing diversity (Crawford, 2000). Students’ expertise in their own languages is often left unrecognised (Harklau, 2003), despite the growing discourse on celebrating diversity and prior knowledge. Similarly, Miller (2003) criticises the way multiculturalism has been enacted in an Australian mainstream school setting as being “about singing and dancing, but not actually speaking out loud” (p. 184). Moreover, in Australian ESL contexts, quite contrary to the ever-growing diversity amongst migrant students, it is common practice to have a locally-bred monolingual English-speaking instructor assigned to such classes (de Courcy, 2007). This constructs teachers as representing the ‘mainstream’ host society, which makes embracing diversity an especially complicated task.

Thus, it can be seen that in the face of mainstreaming, migrant education programmes and ESL professions at large carry conflicting agendas. Behind the rhetoric of mainstreaming is the division between those in the mainstream and those who are not. Davison (2001) remarks that “there is still tension between the philosophical base of the ESL field which emphasises diversity and complexity, and the demands of the ‘mainstream’ educational agenda for commonality, simplicity and homogeneity” (p. 29). There is a possibility that the distance from the ‘norm’ determines learners’ present proficiency, while pedagogical decisions may be mapped around the deficit model of a learner. So too may be the research interests on the problems and difficulties that the learners face, which is deemed problematic (Firth & Wagner, 1997). It is possible that attaching differences to the learners’ property contributes to construct the gap between learners and norm.
2.4.2 Elusiveness in the Definition of “New Arrivals”

Meanwhile, the term “new arrivals” has its own definitional issues. From the outset, the broad and temporal nature of the label can be easily recognised. “New arrivals” is a cover term referring to various kinds of people falling into this category. Diversity and differences amongst its constituents are necessarily subsumed under their commonality. Also, it is a context-dependent term whose specific application to people, but not to goods and products, is arbitrarily decided. Furthermore, its application is temporal (cf. Crawford, 2000). Its demographic composition shifts constantly by reflecting the changes in sociopolitical and socioeconomic situations in the world (ABS, 2008b). Thus, people from different parts of the world comprise “new arrivals” at different points in time. Additionally, “new arrivals” will eventually become non-“new arrivals” after a certain time. At a glance, anything between six months and two years after arrival can be a cut-off point, where certain eligibility and entitlement as “new arrivals” will lapse. Presumably, then, the same individual will not count as a “new arrival” in one system, while still identified as one in another.

While being broad and generalised, the term is also selective; it does not necessarily refer to every single newcomer. Statistics suggest that entrants from the United Kingdom and New Zealand have constantly occupied around a quarter of newcomers or more for the past twenty years (ABS, 2008b). Yet this recognisable portion of newcomers slips out of the category in the contexts of migrant support and education. That is, “new arrivals” are effectively made up of the rest of the newcomers. This suggests that additional parameters have been applied. Logically, the parameters can be deduced as language and sociocultural background deemed significantly different from the Australian mainstream population. Such semantic changes highlight the arbitrary nature of the constructed term “new arrivals”, the meaning of which becomes stretched or shrunk according to contexts. Since educational, institutional contexts resonate with wider social contexts, it is plausible that “new arrivals” tends to be used in a narrower sense, that is, not only with the sense of newness to Australia but also with other attributes.
Significantly, the definition of “new arrivals” becomes no less elusive in the educational domain. Outside the realm of on-arrival migrant education, “new arrivals” can refer to international students (see, for example, DECS, 2006a). Inside the context of on-arrival migrant education, the use of “new arrivals” overlaps with that of “migrants”, “refugees” and “humanitarian entrants”. Of those relational terms, the emergence of the category “humanitarian entrants” seems to have some role to play in complicating the situation.

Perhaps it would not be an overstatement to suggest that the main constituents of humanitarian entrants at a certain point of time dominate the discourse of “new arrivals”. The history of humanitarian entrants resonates with changes in Australia’s migration policies, if we are to take into account the suggestion that the country’s transition from assimilationist policies was underpinned by its pragmatism. The country’s “regular and planned” intake of humanitarian entrants commenced in the late 1970s (DIAC, 2009f), around the time multiculturalism gained currency. Then the main constituents of humanitarian entrants constantly shifted. In the 1970s and 1980s, Vietnamese (representative of Indo-Chinese) and Eastern Europeans dominated human entrants, until taken over in the mid-1980s by Latin and Central Americans and those from the Middle East (DIAC, 2009f). In the 1990s former Yugoslavia, the former Soviet Union, Timor and Lebanon became primary source countries for humanitarian entrants (ABS, 1998). Around 2005, humanitarian entrants from the African continent and Afghanistan were the main constituents of humanitarian entrants (DIMIA, 2002). Of those, Sudanese immigrants were the representative group for incoming humanitarian entrants between 2003 and 2005 (J. Brown, Miller, & Mitchell, 2006; Burgoyne & Hull, 2007).

The high proportionality of Sudanese in humanitarian entrants provoked concentrated social and educational attention to their settlement issues, thereby making Sudanese represent the African refugees, humanitarian entrants and ultimately “new arrivals”. They were deemed as distinctively different, and a flood of research and opinion papers followed, identifying their severe needs (e.g., Atwell, 2005; Australian Council of TESOL Associations (ACTA), 2006; J. Brown, et al., 2006; Burgoyne & Hull, 2007; Gunn, 2003, 2005; McGuire, n.d.; Miller,
Mitchell, & Brown, 2005; Muir, 2003). There was also notable media coverage and public reaction against the incidents and law and order issues in which the Sudanese were involved. Consequently, there arose a view that Sudanese refugees have difficulties in integrating into Australian society, which reportedly led to the then federal government's decision in 2007 to reduce the subsequent intake of African individuals under the Humanitarian Program (Caldwell, 2007; Refugee Council of Australia, 2007).

Yet, from a historic perspective, many of the observed difficulties of the Sudanese had been already noted in the past. During the time the Indo-Chinese were the main humanitarian entrants, research reported their difficulties arising out of illiteracy in their first language, little previous education, severe effects as a result of civil war and so forth (e.g., Marsh, 1989; Stevens, 1990). These are the same kinds of difficulties subsequently reported on the Sudanese. This is not to suggest that the perceived difficulties of the Sudanese were of the same nature as the Indo-Chinese; Gunn (2005), for instance, emphasised that the degree of difficulty that Sudanese and many other Africans were facing was unmatched by the Indo-Chinese. Rather, this is to point out that the prevailing tone of research and media reports on the Sudanese sounded as though the nation had never experienced dealing with people with similar kinds of difficulty. Such a tone in the public discussions would cement the distinctiveness, difference and deviation not only of “Sudanese”, but also “African refugees”, “humanitarian entrants” and ultimately “new arrivals”.

This situation obscures the reality that there are many more “new arrivals” enrolled in on-arrival programmes than refugees. Contrary to the degree of attention paid to Sudanese cases, humanitarian entrants have actually been a minor component of the sum of migrants to Australia (ABS, 1998, 2007); at most, they have occupied only a fraction more than 10% of the annual intake of migrants. In ESL-NA contexts, while their proportion against the sum of enrollees increased in 2005, it still accounted for only 35% of the whole clientele (Ministerial Council on Education, 2006).
Thus, on paper, there does not seem to be an intrinsic connection between a person’s newness to Australia and the increased degrees of disadvantage and the settlement difficulties associated with the humanitarian entrant newcomers. The increased attention to a representative segment of humanitarian entrants at any time, and the subsequent, virtual synonymisation of “humanitarian entrants” to “refugees”, “migrants” and “new arrivals”, raises a question as to whether there has been an adequate generic conceptual framework developed for making sense of “new arrivals”.

From a slightly different angle, locating the main thrust of the increased attention to the ‘most struggling’ segment of “new arrivals” is in fact more complex than it looks. On the one hand, there seems to be a movement to differentiate certain “new arrivals” from the rest, so that they will be better looked after. To maintain that certain individuals are different from the rest of “new arrivals” would presuppose a default way of conceptualising the majority of “new arrivals”. Then, it would look as though other non-humanitarian entrant “new arrivals” had been adequately conceptualised and it becomes just a matter of attaching additional meaning to refer to the distinctive segment now identified. In such a case, identifying the “default” meaning of “new arrivals” becomes imperative. On the other hand, there seems to be a movement to synonymise “humanitarian entrants” with “refugees”, “migrants” and “new arrivals”. Given the essentially generic nature of the term, attending to a specific segment of “new arrivals” can alter the whole meaning of “new arrivals” altogether. In such a case, a question arises as to how and where the other, non-humanitarian entrant “new arrivals” are positioned. Thus, either way, deciphering the meaning of “new arrivals” as a generic, median cover term in current educational practices seems imperative.

In sum, currently the term “new arrivals” appears to be used unproblematically, despite the indications that the meaning of the term has been elusive. Identifying characteristics attached to the notion of “new arrivals” and just how a particular meaning of “new arrivals” may be played out in educational arenas is crucial, for such attributes would play a critical role in shaping the experiences of adult “new arrivals”. As Harklau (1999a) observes, the “[s]chooling process is predicated upon some a priori, collective image of student background, abilities, and
identities” (p. 259, italics in original). Identifying and grouping together “new arrivals” and placing them in a specially tailored education programme sets a boundary between “new arrivals” and others (e.g., mainstream students). As it currently stands, being admitted to on-arrival programmes connotes that students are regarded as not ready to join mainstream education. Exploring the social, cultural and educational ramifications arising out of such practices is a matter of urgency.

2.5 Conclusion

Post-war Australian migrant education programmes have been through changes which have been prompted and assisted by a combination of factors such as societal attitudes, educational philosophy and approaches to language teaching. On-arrival migrant education is a site where tension exists between expectations of migrants adapting to the host society and the readiness of the host society to embrace their difference and diversity. It is out of this tension that the concept of “new arrivals” emerges.

“New arrivals” is an elusive term. Other than newness to Australia, which is itself loosely defined, the interpretation of the term, as well as its application, is rather unrigorous. Not only its demographic composition changes according to Australia’s immigration policies, its main context of use is also hard to locate. The term functions both as a generic cover term and a more specific term, yet its specific, contextualised use has not attracted much recognition. Overlooking how the term might refer to specific kinds of migrants could obscure the particular connotation attached to this term.

This situation becomes far more complicated with adult “new arrivals” in South Australia. The term suffers from naming issues as well as definitional issues. The state implements two structurally different yet intersecting on-arrival programmes for adults. Adult “new arrivals” tends to be used to refer to learners from both programmes, even though its wording is more closely associated with the adult NAP than with AMEP. Further, the circumstances surrounding the term are made complex due to the disciplinary issues amongst the general frameworks of
NAP, ESL and mainstream education. The NAP does not quite sit comfortably within a wider framework of ESL, while its nature as criteria-based separate education and its pre-mainstream position makes it stand in opposition to mainstream schooling. The issue is that these complex factors have tended to be overlooked in research on newly arrived migrants, and “new arrivals” has been used in a context-neutral manner. To make the matter worse, there is indication that certain cohorts of newcomers, notably humanitarian entrants of the time, are made to represent “new arrivals” by virtue of their receiving particular pedagogical and social attention.

Such a state creates room for investigating how the notion of “new arrivals” is being socially constructed, as well as how it is being applied in particular contexts. Observations on the historical and sociopolitical circumstances surrounding on-arrival migrant education signal the socially constructed nature of “new arrivals” (cf. Crawford, 2000; Harklau, 1999a). Documentation of how adult “new arrivals” is constructed is therefore required.
CHAPTER 3
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

3.0 Introduction

In Chapter 2, through an account of circumstances surrounding adult “new arrivals” in South Australia, I explained how the adult New Arrivals Program (NAP) currently stands at the intersection of a complex network of factors influencing the programme. Through the account, the contingent, socially constructed nature of “new arrivals” has emerged. I emphasised that the elusiveness of the definition of “new arrivals” reflects the changing nature of the historical, socio-political climate of newcomer education. I pointed out a possibility that the term “new arrivals” is an identity assigned to certain individuals rather than a generic category referring to anyone newly arrived. As such, it is a loaded term that affords an exploration of its own. Meanwhile, NAP contains everything critical about language education. It contains the host society’s response to its newcomers. For those enrolled in NAP, a significant portion of their initial institutional experiences in Australia comes through NAP practices. It can be asserted that NAP practices inform, and are informed by, the societal-institutional understanding of what it means to be a “new arrival”. It then follows that the NAP students’ learning experiences derive from their position as “new arrivals”. For this reason, their new ‘identity’ can be seen as a social construct. Then, what it is to become a “new arrival” in a localised NAP context is of particular interest to this thesis. Based on this, I argue for the critical importance of gaining insights into how the host society’s attitude towards newcomers is currently being played out. This opens up room for a contextualised, in-depth study exploring how adult “new arrivals” are conceptualised and represented in the day to day business of NAP.

The purpose of this chapter is two-fold. It first presents a theoretical framework which informs this study. This involves an account of language and
representation and the understanding of intertextuality. Both theoretical notions will be discussed to pinpoint the particular angle of inquiry that can be undertaken with regard to ‘new-arrival-ness’. The chapter will then theorise how to approach classroom-based studies. It will explore three interrelated areas of the current research context in relation to the developed framework, together with a review of literature related to each area. The areas chosen for investigation are programme documents, classroom teacher talk and written tasks. Analytical considerations will be discussed along the way, with a focus on how the concept of “new arrivals” is constructed in acts of teaching and learning.

3.1 Social Semiotics

Put simply, inquiring who “new arrivals” are means insisting that the understanding and the treatment of the term’s meaning has been problematic. Approaching the term “new arrivals” as a social construct (cf. Lacroix, 2004) is underpinned by a theoretical assumption that meaning arises out of social practices, in particular, through language. Social semiotics (Halliday, 1978; Hodge & Kress, 1988; Lemke, 1990, 1995), in particular, that of a language-oriented, functional tradition, provides a theoretical model of language capable of describing the processes and product of its function (Butt, Fahey, Feez, Spinks, & Yallop, 2000; Eggins, 2004; Halliday, 1985, 1994; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004; J. R. Martin, 1997, 2000). It is a transdisciplinary model (Halliday, 1993a) that sits at the intersection between linguistics, anthropology, sociology and education. Its approach is to illustrate “a system where the individual elements—‘signs’—take their overall meaning from how they are combined with other elements” (Carter, Bowring, Goddard, Reah, & Sanger, 1997, p. 2). A social semiotic inquiry, therefore, investigates the process of making meaning (‘how’) and the meaning itself (‘what’) as a fruit of our practices (Lemke, 1995).

One of the basic tenets of social semiotics is that language and our interpretation of reality, as well as language and context, are mutually constitutive (Bakhtin, 1986; Halliday, 1978, 1993b; Montgomery, 1995). This tenet stands on the premise that our perception of the world is metaphorical (Halliday, 1975/2003), mediated through semiotic resources (Hasan, 2004a). This means, in Lemke’s
(1990) terms, “we do not so much ‘discover truths’ as we construct meanings” (p. 185). As such, the social symbolic features of language are the main concern of social semiotic inquiries (Hodge & Kress, 1988; Lemke, 1995). The centrality of language in social semiotic inquiries derives from its status as one of “the culture’s most important tools” (Wells, 1999, p. 138).

This stance sets meaning as a product of particular social settings. Analysing how the construction of meaning occurs is underpinned by the concept of texts, which are defined as “instances of linguistic interaction in which people actually engage” (Halliday, 1978, p. 108). A text is defined as “a unified whole” and “a linguistic and sociocultural artefact” (Gerot, 1995). It is viewed as an “actualised meaning potential” (Halliday, 1978, p. 109) created amongst the myriad of potentially available choices. The creation of text is context-specific, hence assuming a reciprocal relationship between language and context (see also Eggins & Slade, 1997; Gibbons, 2006; Halliday, 1978). Halliday (1978) observes that “the context plays a part in determining what we say; and what we say has a part in determining the context” (p. 31). Social semiotics necessarily takes into account the social structure of the context (Halliday, 1978), including power and social hierarchy (Fairclough, 1989; Halliday, 1978; Hodge & Kress, 1988). In the light of the current investigation, this suggests that exploring the meaning of “new arrivals” is to gain understanding of a particular context in which the construction takes place. Conversely, it can be said that specific contexts produce specific meaning of “new arrivals”.

Specifically, the pertinence of social semiotics for the current study lies in its theoretical commitment to account for individuals in relation to social environment (Halliday, 1978). As Lemke (1990) suggests, just as meaning is seen as the product of a society, so are our social membership and thoughts. Their construction is suggested to be a semiotically mediated (Hasan, 2004a), socially situated practice (Cross, 2005; Giampapa, 2001). There is an emergent line of semiotic inquiry which investigates how human emotion, personality and individuality are socially constructed (e.g., Ivanić, 1998; Lemke, 2002, 2003; J. R. Martin & White, 2005). Researchers in this line of inquiry take particular interest in “how people become those kinds of persons”, that is, “an ongoing
commitment to seeing the person in the context/s in which they live” (Poynton & Lee, 2000, p. 3). In some research, the interpersonal element of language is accorded particular significance in creating, maintaining or adjusting a particular nature of human relations, from which the participants’ identities emerge (J. R. Martin, 1992, 1999a; J. R. Martin & Rose, 2003; J. R. Martin & White, 2005; White, 2005b).

Research suggests that the socially constructed collective identity has multiple ramifications for those who fall into that category. Specific to migration and the social construal of migrant identities, Lacroix’ (2004) study on refugee claimants in Canada signals the constitutive power of official recognition over one’s migration experiences. She points out that there is such a thing as an officialised, contextualised meaning of “refugee”, and that this official meaning and an individual claimant’s experiences do not necessarily match. She observes that it is essentially the authority’s official recognition that identifies somebody as a refugee, rather than the claimants’ lived experiences per se (Lacroix, 2004).

Such observations provoke an interest in looking at the case of “new arrivals” from a complementary angle: the implication of being identified as “new arrivals”. Whether or not a newcomer is identified as a “new arrival” affects some of their experiences immediately following their arrival. Being a sociocultural and historical product, the label “new arrivals” is essentially given and attached to certain individuals by the host society, and once they are identified as “new arrivals”, negotiation as to what kind of “new arrivals” will inevitably take place in relation to that label. Thus, questions arise as to what groups together certain individuals as “new arrivals”, while leaving out others, and how language contributes to make this happen. Such an inquiry requires taking into account the representational role of language, and its operations.

3.1.1 Language, Representation and Social Construction of Identity

In social semiotics, echoing Halliday’s (1978) view that “social reality is encoded in language” (p. 2), it is generally held that the representational role of language constitutes its central research foci (Montgomery, 1995). For this stance to be
maintained, it seems indispensable to acknowledge the constitutive power of
language over meaning (Fairclough, 1992); as Santoro (1999) maintains, language
“works to construct or create meaning rather than simply communicate it in some
pre-existent form” (p. 16). Lee and Poynton (2000) term this awareness the
“linguistic turn” in the human sciences, with an interest in “the significance of
language and discourse in the construction of knowledge and the formation of
persons or subjects” (p. 1). This is the stance taken in this thesis, and the meaning
of “new arrivals” is therefore seen to concurrently reflect the past and present, as
well as potentially projecting on future cases.

Past research suggests that the construction of ‘new-arrival-ness’ involves
complex processes. One factor for this is the potential multiplicity of constructed
meanings traversing multiple modes of representation. Fairclough (1992) also
demonstrates that discourse has both reproductive and transformative properties
in the existing social formation. These seemingly oppositional properties of
discourse are asserted to be operating in one setting. For example, Harklau (2003)
reports how, in her study, different types of discourse around migrant students
were simultaneously operating in an educational setting and how this could yield
conflicting representations of the same students. She observes that the same
students were constructed as glorious migrants embarking on achieving ‘American
dreams’, deficit learners, and invisible constituents of a wider student body, all in
one setting (Harklau, 2003). In the present investigation, this can be taken to
mean that different NAP domains might yield different representations of “new
arrivals”, and consequently, the investigation needs to proceed inductively.
Conversely, if a consistency is identified in the representations, this will make an
indicator of durability in the dominant meaning.

Another factor contributing to the complexity of the ‘new-arrival-ness’ is the
selectivity of available meanings. Another study of Harklau (1999a) signals that
representation of migrants is based on particular choices while leaving out other
choices. She observes that “some of their background characteristics are brought
to the fore, disregarded, or even imagined to exist based on their categorization
within educational institutions” (Harklau, 1999a, p. 260). Harklau (1999a) also
emphasises the essentialising and homogenising effect of representation. The
possibility of constructing meanings that are “imagined to exist” has also been highlighted by Achugar (2008) in her theoretical discussions on the act of remembering as social practice.

All this suggests that, in exploring the social process of meaning construction, the viewpoint from which discourse is produced is critical in creating a particular meaning (Fairclough, 2003). This point has already been raised by de Saussure (1965), who states that “[f]ar from it being the object that antedates the viewpoint, it would seem that it is the viewpoint that creates the object” (p. 230). Further, Hasan (2004a) adds interpersonal elements to this, asserting that “[a]cts of meaning call for someone who ‘means’ and someone to whom that meaning is meant: there is a ‘meaner’, some ‘meaning’ and a ‘meant to’” (p. 33). These understandings are helpful in clarifying the source of ‘new-arrival-ness’. In the present investigation, the main perspective that is to be pursued is the host society’s perspective, and accordingly, the primary “meaner”-“meant to” relation will be projected onto that of the host society and “new arrivals”. However, this relation may need to be extended further within a wider framework of migrant education in order to capture its complexity; “new arrivals” can be those who are ‘talked about’ as well as those who are ‘talked to’. Also, they can be those who talk about themselves, in which case they can be both “meaner” and “meant to”. Consequently, the construction of ‘new-arrival-ness’ that will be pursued in this study encompasses both ‘talked about’ and ‘talked to’.

The primary “meaner”-“meant to” relation seems appropriate considering the function of education. Harklau (2003) argues that educational institutions are there for “conveying messages to immigrant students about their identities” (p. 85). She explains that these messages are the host society's expectations placed upon them. These expectations include particular social positions and roles as well as norms, values, beliefs and attitudes that migrants are expected to take on. Also, it is suggested that the particular position of migrant education programmes within a wider educational framework influences the way the migrant students’ identities are conveyed at school (Harklau, 1999a). Harklau (1999a) observes that education programmes of an “assisting” nature, by virtue of being positioned as sub-stream programmes, have a moral dilemma in
representing their students. She maintains that “[i]n the process of justifying their place in the academy, they inevitably reinvoke homogenised representations of their students’ needs, and in doing so continually normalize and legitimate the very deficits and positions of disadvantage that they are charged with addressing” (Harklau, 1999a, p. 259). Such observations point to a potential that equity-driven educational practices have an internal dilemma: the more provocative their approach to equity, the more homogenised and deficient the target cohort might be constructed.

Indeed, on the point of the potential drive for homogeneity, an additional contributing factor has been suggested by van Leeuwen (1993), who holds that “[e]verywhere there is generic homogeneity and discursive heterogeneity” (p. 7). Van Leeuwen maintains that our focus in meaning making tends to be drawn from the process of human participation in the activities rather than what this represents. Further, he argues that the binding of individuals in a community is not actualised by the commonly held beliefs as such, but by the commonly carried out practices and procedures (van Leeuwen, 1993). As an exemplification for his argument, van Leeuwen observes that while an array of academic beliefs and contents exist in one university [discursive heterogeneity], there are content- and context-free procedures that are routinely imposed in carrying out academic practices [generic homogeneity]. As a result, van Leeuwen (1993) asserts that the more heterogeneity there is, the fewer sets of genres and practices there are available. This suggests that the drive for homogeneity reflects the inherent heterogeneity and vice versa. Another potential is that the heterogeneity and diversity become vulnerable in the face of homogeneity, and vice versa.

Such a relational view on homogeneity and heterogeneity is potentially useful in approaching NAP and “new arrivals”. On the one hand, “new arrivals” are presumably a heterogeneous configuration of individuals who happen to fall into this category. On the other hand, by virtue of their heterogeneity, they might be dealt with in an increasingly homogeneous way. That is, there is a potential that, once enrolled in NAP, they are defined by the procedures and practices that they engage in in NAP.
Further, in thinking about the drive for homogeneity, it seems indispensable to take into account the power of meaning constructed through the written mode over the degree of durability and negotiability of the meaning. The property of the written mode is viewed as “to store and consolidate information and interpretations” (J. R. Martin, et al., 1987/1994, p. 238), and in written texts, the world is treated as a thing rather than a process (J. R. Martin, et al., 1987/1994). Meaning constructed through written mode can be seen as becoming concretised (cf. Barton & Hamilton, 2005; Wenger, 1998). This understanding enables us to assume that written materials in and about NAP contribute to a concretisation of the meaning of “new arrivals”.

For this, Iedema’s (2000, 2001) notion of “resemiotisation” offers a complementary framing for “new arrivals”. Iedema (2000) suggests that, where bureaucratic processes are involved, “meanings made and settled on in interaction are transformed from one semiotic mode into another, and thereby rendered less and less negotiable” (p. 47). He describes a typical resemiotising process as a shift from spoken mode to written mode, which changes the nature of a fluid, on-going process to a concrete, nominalised thing (Iedema, 2000).

This theoretical understanding prompts us to see that a potential ramification of “resemiotisation” and “concretisation” of meaning is that what counts as “new arrivals” in NAP can be presented as a firmly established ‘given’. Iedema (2000) predicts that people are then recruited into “particular regimes of meaning” which “construe, and to a degree impose, a consensus as to what can be meant; that is, what can be done and said” (p. 47). If resemiotisation occurs and these notions of ‘new-arrival-ness’ become constantly affirmed, this forms the basis of ‘the’ meaning of “new arrivals”. In other words, in the context of NAP, resemiotisation can be seen as a process of constructing a frame of reference through which past, present and future “new arrivals” will be understood. Then, it is plausible that due to the orientation role of NAP, certain aspects of “new arrivals” will be focused on rather more than others. In a sense, they become “new arrivals”, not because they are ‘new arrivals’ but because their nature is interpreted against a pre-existing meaning of “new arrivals”.
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These crucial arguments can be extended and applied in two senses. Firstly, these “particular regimes of meaning” of “new arrivals” can function as a “consensual representation” (cf. van Leeuwen, 1993) of “new arrivals” in an educational sphere. Secondly, if there are regimes of meaning constructed for “new arrivals”, the same can be assumed for their “relationally invoked counterpart” (Talmy, 2009), the ‘mainstream’ population of the host society. From this, observation can be made as to whether “particular regimes of meaning” are operating in acts of teaching and learning in NAP. For example, a question can be raised as to whether learning involves adopting particular, and potentially regimented, mainstream ways of doing things. A related question that can be asked is whether there is a link between regimented ways of doing things and particular values, norms, beliefs and attitudes. This possibility increases when the officialised view on “new arrivals” is published in written material; adopting Iedema’s (2000) framing, NAP curriculum documents can be theorised as written material which has the potential power of disseminating a “particular regime of meaning” for NAP, that is, formalised understanding and procedure for NAP practices.

Accordingly, a proposition can be put forward that in the context of a NAP, there may be a resemiotisation process by which meanings become less negotiable, and accordingly, “new arrivals” arising out of the NAP context may well take on a resemiotised meaning. Being an officialised educational program, bureaucratic processes are involved in NAP practices, and eligibility criteria and the general purpose of the programme can be seen as products of bureaucratic processes. Also, it is certain that both spoken and written modes of meaning-making are involved, achieving various purposes while involving various primary participants. Classroom teacher talk is one salient instance of spoken mode, while curriculum documents, official programme statements and written tasks offer instances of written mode. In the present study context, then, a question arises as to whether the meaning of “new arrivals” constructed through classroom teacher talk gets taken up in curriculum documents, official programme statements or written tasks.

However, rather than assuming a shift from spoken discourse to written discourse (or other materialised form), approaching the potential resemiotisation process as
being cyclical and multiple seems much more appropriate in the present study context. In practice, the process does not seem to be a uni-directional affair, where meaning made in spoken mode becomes concretised in written mode. Instead, it is possible that the meaning of “new arrivals” constructed in curriculum documents (written documents) will be taken up in classroom practices (spoken discourse), which might in turn feed into further curriculum developments (written discourse).

This also indicates a need to explore what is going on with the concept of “new arrivals” in terms of ongoing social construction, and in relation to educational institutional practices as part of a bureaucratic process that might lead to the resemiotisation of meaning. As such, attempts will be made 1) to describe how “new arrivals” are defined and talked about, or talked to; 2) to interpret what aspects of “new arrivals” are foregrounded; and 3) to explain why the category has emerged and developed in the way that it has (Fairclough, 2003; Rogers, 2004). For this to proceed, a further understanding of how particular meaning develops through multiple semiotic resources across time and space is needed. In Harklau’s terms, “while no single individual or group is responsible for producing domination and inequalities, ‘individual and group interests and desires that are acted out within local spheres take on a coherence that systematically produces consistent patterns’ (Ryan, 1991)” (Harklau, 1999a, p. 259, emphasis added). For example, it is not hard to imagine that, after years of receiving newcomers to Australia, a certain configuration of meaning has been developed over time and assigned to the term “new arrivals”. Further, this pre-existing notion may become called on when the host society deals with a new set of “new arrivals” (cf. Hinnenkamp, 1987). Explicating this mechanism in theoretical, intertextual terms is necessary.

3.1.2 Intertextuality: Across Texts and Time

Intertextuality is an important concept in a social semiotics perspective (Lemke, 1990, 1992, 1995). It is understood as “everything makes sense only against the background of other things like it” (Lemke, 1990, p. 204). It is a meaning-making process in which people draw on their existing experience and use it as a basis to interpret social phenomena.
Intertextuality is a broad concept with many applications to research. It has two theoretical strands that are both relevant to this thesis. One strand is outward-working in nature and the other strand is inward-working. These two intertextualities are not discrete concepts but are intertwined. Both are significant in understanding how society works to construct a particular concept of “new arrivals”.

The outward-working intertextuality is concerned with understanding the socially constructed links across different modes and domains of social practices (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993) as well as linking wider social arenas and specific contexts. According to Fairclough (1992), intertextuality is “the property texts have of being full of snatches of other texts, which may be explicitly demarcated or merged in, and which the text may assimilate, contradict, ironically echo, and so forth” (p.84). Intertextuality goes beyond the written texts physically available at hand. Meaning is made based on “the in-situ articulation of a dense web of local, accountable practice, built through the actual spatio-temporal arrangement of talk, gestures and relevant tools” (Goodwin, 1999, p. 490).

The notion of an inward-working intertextuality operating in a particular community has been articulated by Lemke (1995), who maintains that a community retains “its own set of important or valued texts, its own preferred discourses, and particularly its own habits of deciding which texts should be read in the context of which others, and why, and how” (p. 10). A community’s intertextuality decides what is normal and what is not. Thus, a particular view that is common place in a given community has to be seen as a version of worldview constructed within that community (Hall, 1995). Intertextuality of this type is “a historically shaped, locally constituted architecture for perception” (Goodwin, 1999, pp. 489-490). As such, it will “come to any present interactive moment already imbued with these sedimented, historical meanings and attitudes” (Hall, 1995, p. 208). For example, Gubrium and Holstein (1995) refer to the circumstantially conditioned nature of interpretation as “local culture”, and see that local culture “provides recognizable categories and vocabularies for assigning meaning” (p. 210).
Gubrium and Holstein (1995) observe that the contemporary world is a “deprivatized” one, in which “questions of who we are as persons ... are addressed and answered in decidedly public forums” (p. 209, also Holstein & Gubrium, 1998). They assert that the contemporary life is “conditioned under the auspices of formal and informal groups, organizations, bureaucracies, and institutions” and that “personal (often private) experiential objects, ... and the life course are subjected to extensive public discussion, debate and definition” (Gubrium & Holstein, 1995, p. 204). Holstein and Gubrium (1998) argue that identifying the connection between interpretive practice and interpretive structures sheds light in understanding deprivatized experience. The notion of deprivatization fits in with the earlier discussion of representation and identity, and is thus significant to note in the present study. “New arrivals” can be seen as an instance of deprivatized identity. Those classified as “new arrivals” do not own their categories of identification, since the categories are constructed by the local, host society. Harklau (1999a) warns that “what are taken to be normal and common-sense images of student identity are in fact socially constructed artifacts” (p. 260).

Intertextuality can be seen as the mechanism through which similarity is constructed in a particular community. Similarity is context-specific, recognised as such because there is a particular way of looking at the instances shared between community members (Lemke, 1994). This particular viewpoint which affords particular sense-making is ideology (Hasan, 2004b). Its mechanism is dynamic and powerful. According to Lemke (1994):

…there are no inherent similarities except the ones that a culture, a community constructs as meaningful … after each instance is encountered. What our semiotic practices, such as the use of semantic distinctions coded in language, do is to enable us to fit instances to prior categories, or to create categories to encompass known sets of instances. We must invent a way to fit each new type of instance into an existing category, and insofar as the category is defined by the practices that assign its members, we actually change the category (i.e. add new categorization practices) for each new type of member. (pp. 93-94, italics in original)
Where similarity is constructed, difference is also constructed. Lemke (2003) suggests that the construal of the role that a person plays is predicated upon the existence of other human beings that have different identities/roles/characteristics. Similarly, Hodge and Kress (1988) observe that “[a]ny group of any size needs markers of group membership to give it identity and cohesion, and to differentiate it from other groups” (p. 79). It follows that one’s own socially assigned role is relational in nature, and is based on a system of differentiation. In the context of the current study, this means that ‘new arrival-ness’ is constructed based on the premise that there exist certain non-“new arrival” individuals. This suggests that “new arrivals” is not a free standing category but a relational one, arising out of contrast with other relational corollaries such as “Australians”. This is despite the situation that it is the very notion of who the Australians are that has been called into question in the face of the disparate, rapidly changing modern world (Lotherington, 2003; Ramanathan & Pennycook, 2008). Such an approach seems pertinent in making sense of how individuals are recognised in contemporary society.

Thus the powerful nature of the inward-working intertextuality necessitates a consideration of who possesses the power to construct intertextuality. Intertextual practices derive from what Bloome and Egan-Robertson (1993) call “entitlement rights”, which specify “who gets to make what intertextual relationships and how” (p. 312). They suggest that entitlement rights are unequally distributed in social spheres including classrooms. Martin-Jones (1996) emphasises that for an understanding of the pedagogic practices “it is necessary to link them to the institutional arrangements and social, economic, and political interests that act as constraints on what can be said or written at school, by whom, in what ways” (pp. 13-14). Hall (1995) expresses a similar view and argues that “[i]t is these larger influences which constrain, in varying degrees, one’s knowledge of and ability to use the resources particular to any practice and the locally-situated conditions of the moment, and thus which must be given both theoretical and empirical consideration” (p. 207).

This issue of entitlement rights distribution is profound in the migration process. Only those who are institutionally recognised become certified migrants of some
kind (cf. Lacroix, 2004). In her study of Canadian refugee identification processes, Lacroix (2004) shows how, to be able to gain official recognition as “refugees”, refugees need to satisfy certain requirements specified by this third party. Yet, she maintains, there is a potential contradiction that some refugees who know they are refugees based on their actual experiences cannot become certified “refugees” if they fail to satisfy the requirements, and vice versa. Ironically, refugees do not own their experience because what counts as certified refugee experiences is essentially determined by people who are not “refugees”. This is evidence to how entitlement rights operate in constructing an intertextual notion of these people and their life experiences.

Moreover, the issue goes beyond similarity, differences and identification matters. Intertextual practices possess a force for homogenisation, whereby a new instance will be buried in a large mass. Where this is applied to individuals, Lemke (1990) suggests that recognition of individual uniqueness tends to give way to socially assigned roles and groups. He explains that “the larger social patterns of the community tend to depend more on what social role or type an individual represents than on their uniqueness, because those patterns are patterns of relationships among groups and categories” (Lemke, 1990, p. 192). The patterns persist because “[t]hey are the result of history, of many individual actions that have tended to recreate and change these patterns over long periods of time (Lemke, 1990, p. 192).

This links with an earlier point raised by van Leeuwen, that the more diverse the instances become, the stronger the call for uniformity becomes (cf. van Leeuwen, 1993). This call for uniformity operates as an inner force that attempts to make sure that the outcome will not be too dissimilar to the pre-existing category, maintaining the positioning of the pre-existing category in the community. Educational goals and standards are clearly artefacts of a society, whose system of intertextuality has yielded particular discourses in language, education, and the language of education, which are conducive to realising very specific, socially sanctioned goals and standards (Martin-Jones & Heller, 1996).
Last but not least, intertextuality is multimodal in nature. According to Bloome and Egan-Robertson (1993), the construction of intertextuality is “a material and ‘visible’ part of the social interaction” (p. 331). Most importantly, “the intertextual processes, substance, and distribution of entitlement rights involved are also material and visible, and the related invoking of broader contexts is therefore also necessarily materially realized and visible, at least in part” (Bloome & Egan-Robertson, 1993, p. 331).

In sum, intertextuality is indispensable in social semiotic inquiries. A sense of legitimacy and normality comes from particular ideological stances popular in a given community. Moreover, the ideological stances are social constructs in the first place. This again confirms that meaning needs to be viewed as both processes and outcomes of particular social practices. This offers a theoretical rationale for investigating the notion of “new arrivals” as socially constructed intertextual phenomenon at different time scales as well as in different social domains. Analysis of surrounding discourse and social practices of NAP at multiple levels is therefore involved.

3.2 Exploring Adult “New Arrivals” in Educational Settings

This section discusses how discourse and social practices of NAP can be approached from a Bernsteinian, tri-phasic framework of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment. It presents the pertinence of attending to these components in exploring the construction of ‘new-arrival-ness’. Theoretical as well as analytical issues in each component are also reviewed.

3.2.1 Code, Discourse and Curriculum-related Documents

Bernstein’s seminal studies show how all educational programmes are socially constructed (Bernstein, 1973a, 1975, 1990). He has argued compellingly that “there is nothing intrinsic about how educational time is used, or the status of the various contents or the relation between the contents” (Bernstein, 1975, p. 80). It is out of these relations that social constructions become embedded in educational structures.
Educational institutions can be seen as a site in which a host society’s prevailing system of intertextuality is at work. As Sarangi and Baynham (1996) state, “any form of situated pedagogic discourse…occurs within the broader context of societal understanding”. They also argue that “instructional discourse, with its moral overtones, finds its way out of the educational context into other domains of social life” (p. 77). This means that what occurs in an educational domain resonates with macro-social domains that encompass it. Such a view enables us to assume that society’s preferred texts and their interpretation are made explicit through education.

These theoretical understandings make educational settings pertinent for an investigation of ‘new arrival-ness’. Educational settings are ample contexts to explore “code” (Bernstein, 1971) operating in migrant education through actual language in use (discourse). According to Halliday (1978), this Bernsteinian category of “code” is a supra-linguistic element, which is “the principle of semiotic organization governing the choice of meanings by a speaker and their interpretation by a hearer” and it “controls the semantic styles of the culture” (p. 111). Halliday continues to explain that what Bernstein terms “codes” are types of social semiotic, or symbolic orders of meaning generated by the social system (cf. Hasan 1973). The code is actualized in language through the register, since it determines the semantic orientation of speakers in particular social contexts… When the semantic systems of the language are activated by the situational determinants of text – the field, tenor and mode – this process is regulated by the codes. (Halliday, 1978, p. 111)

It can be said, then, that code manifests in discourse. It follows that discourse represents a particular worldview (Gee, 2005) that is intertextually governed by code. As Gee (2005) sees it, this worldview includes “what is ‘normal’ or not; what is ‘acceptable’ or not; what is ‘right’ or not; what is ‘real’ or not; what is ‘the way things are’ or not; what is the ‘ways things ought to be’ or not; what is ‘possible’ or not; what ‘people like us’ or ‘people like them’ do or don’t do” (p. 2). Foley (2004) therefore states that “[i]n some ways, we are trapped inside the discourses we inhabit in our everyday lives” (p. 2). It is a logical and natural
progression from this that a normative view of learners (“new arrivals”) can be
tapped into from discourse operating in an educational programme (NAP).

Drawing on Bernstein (1972), the present research is mapped around three,
interrelated core constituents of education: curriculum, pedagogy and assessment.
Bernstein (1972) defines a curriculum as an organisation of knowledge, pedagogy
as the distribution of knowledge, and assessment as the evaluation of knowledge.
Based on these definitions, Australian society’s preferred meaning of “new
arrivals” is investigated through corroborating the meanings arising from each
constituent.

NAP curriculum-related documents, the primary focus of chapter 5, can be seen
as imparting society’s officialised view on “new arrivals” to inform the
curriculum-building process. Here, a basic understanding of genres reminds us
that the functions of curriculum-related documents vary with different social
purposes and intended audiences (e.g., Swales, 1990). For example, it can be
assumed that general programme descriptions and curriculum statements are for
all parties involved in a given programme, whereas teacher induction and
professional development documents are intended primarily for pre-service and
in-service teachers. It follows that learners’ positioning within these documents
varies accordingly. While learners may be counted as primary readers for the
former, they are unlikely readers of the latter in which they are the topic of the
documents, appearing as officialised, constructed clients.

Significantly, the documents of the latter kind serve the particularly unique social
purpose of creating intertextuality. The documents potentially yield both
semiotising and resemiotising effects. Being a written and printed material artefact,
they reflect past experiences to inform future pedagogic practice, as well as
current NAP classrooms. In so doing, educational domains and bureaucratic
domains are being converged in these documents; past experience from NAP
classrooms informs the bureaucratic process, which in turn informs the future
NAP classroom practices. Such purposes seem to indicate a potential drive for
homogenised, consensual representation of “new arrivals”. Thus, exploring how
learners are constructed in documents of this type is a fruitful way to identify a
macro NAP context. As indicated, the primary treatment of this issue is provided in Chapter 5.

Meanwhile, how much of what is imparted in curriculum-related documents is actualised in a specific teaching context is another matter (cf. Carter, 1996). It is suggested that every classroom is different due to “the enormously complex, interactive nature of instruction and the multilayered makeup of the influences that affect it” (Fullan, Hill, & Crevola, 2006, p. 29). Similarly, Wright (2005) sees the classroom as “the essential locus of formal education, where many social and cultural influences intersect” (p. 15). It is therefore important to investigate classroom pedagogy.

3.2.2 Pedagogy, Role Relationship and Classroom Teacher Talk

As introduced earlier, Bernstein (1972) defines pedagogy as the distribution of knowledge. Following this definition, educational institutions can be seen as where this knowledge distribution occurs. On this point, however, Lemke (1985) cautions us that the educational institutions are not to be seen as mere ‘knowledge delivery systems’ but as a site where “people affect each other’s lives” (p. 1) through social interaction in class. In other words, knowledge distribution should be seen as arising out of a series of “interactive events of meaning exchange” (Hasan, 2004a, p. 33) in class. Scholars who follow this line of thinking have demonstrated that learners’ experiences are embedded in the history of meaning being constructed in the classroom (Christie, 1995; Lemke, 1985). Gibbons (2006) observes that, “[i]n the classroom, texts carry residues of other texts and meaning is constructed out of this intertextual classroom history” (p. 142). Further, it is suggested that this intertextual history goes beyond the classroom boundary, for discourse in educational settings also derives from the outside world (Rose, 1999).

One of the developments of direct relevance to this study is how the learners’ experiences, and ultimately learning, are underpinned by the nature of relationship between learners and teachers (Christie, 2002; Toohey & Day, 2007).
In Christie’s (2002) terms, a teacher and a learner can thus be conceptualised as pedagogic subjects. As she observes:

The pedagogic subject position available to the learners is necessarily constrained by the nature of the relationships assumed with respect to various teachers and school institutions over the years of schooling; a particular kind of consciousness is constructed, involving the building of a willingness and capacity, ideal at least, to accept methods of defining what counts as knowledge, what counts as acceptable performance in demonstrating a capacity to use such knowledge. Quite critical to the building of these matters is the nature of the relationship of teacher and learners (Christie, 2002, p. 29)

Following these theoretical understandings, then, teacher-learner roles played out in classrooms can be seen as “the work of aligning as relationally identifiable kinds of persons” (Silverstein, 2004, p. 621). NAP pedagogy can thus be viewed as enacting a particular, relational and mutually constitutive role relationship between “new arrival” students and teachers.

There is ample body of research which supports the view that this process is mediated by discourse. To begin with, Christie (1995) defines a teacher and learners as those “who both participate in the construction of the discourse and who are shaped by it” (p. 221). How language contributes to positioning those participating in discourse comes from Toohey (2007), who argues that “[t]hrough our choices of languages, dialects, genres, styles, modes, intonations, and timing, we create certain positions for ourselves and simultaneously position others in particular ways” (p. 627). How language shapes social roles is elaborated by Foley (2004), who contends that “by taking up social roles, we are inducted into particular ways of using language and viewing the world” (p. 2). Christie (2002) states, “[l]anguage is never neutral, for it is necessarily involved in the realization of values and ideologies; just as it serves to realize such values and ideologies; it also serves to silence others” (p. 7). In English as a Second Language (ESL) contexts, this positioning carries implications for learners’ worldviews, by virtue of the fact that “different languages construct reality and classify phenomena in slightly different ways” (Perrett, 2000, p. 92). From a practical point of view, Santoro (1999) draws our attention to the power of language in positioning learners in particular ways, maintaining that ESL practitioners “need to be more
alert to the discourses operating in the texts and exercises set for learners and conscious of their constitutive powers” (p. 17). She observes that “it is easy for teachers to overlook the role language plays in constructing expectations and subjectivity, and the ways in which learners who may be non-members of the discourses represented, are positioned by the language and texts they are required to use in the ESL classroom” (Santoro, 1999, p. 18).

Classroom discourse has frequently been a central focus for exploring pedagogy. Being a situated activity in a context of schooling (Love, 2001), classroom discourse is regarded as an essential, constitutive element to meaning negotiation and exchange in class (Love, 2001). Christie (2004) maintains that “a close study of classroom discourse can provide a useful basis on which to test both the processes of knowledge construction and the nature of the teacher-student relationship in those processes” (p. 174). Her remark suggests that classroom discourse can be viewed as enacting a curriculum. Lemke (1985) proposes the vital importance of attending to classroom discourse, asserting that “the actual ‘content’ of curriculum” can be identified through “analysing what systems of thematic meanings are being developed in the classroom” (p. 1). Specific to additional language learning contexts, Perrett (2000) articulates that “for an approach to pedagogy to be effective, its practice and development need to be tied both to an understanding of what actually happens while learners are learning and to an understanding of how the target language functions, is structured and is used” (p. 88). As such, exploring what occurs in a NAP classroom is central to understanding NAP pedagogy and, ultimately, the “social function of education” (Lemke, 1985) operating in NAP. It was on the basis of this theoretical framework that the investigation outlined in Chapters 6 and 7 was conducted.

Of the two roles, the teacher’s role has been regarded as critical, for, as Halliday (1978) asserts, “it is the teachers who exert the most influence on the environment” (p. 9). Similarly, Christie (2002) observes that “it is the teacher who exercises particular power in offering information, in eliciting information and in directing the nature of activity” (p. 16). Because schooling “privileges certain meaning orientations rather more than others” (Christie, 2002, p.31), Christie
(2002) contends that teachers “assume the principal, officially sanctioned educating roles” and thus become “the authoritative figure” who “orchestrates what happens in the classroom, managing both what will be learned, and what constitutes acceptable behaviour in its learning” (p. 29). In NAP contexts, then, the teacher’s role can be conceptualised as imparting particular expectations placed on “new arrivals” as well as realising them. This role is embedded in the wider institutional processes in which “[s]chools work with and construct ideological positionings for their pedagogic subjects” (Christie, 2002, p. 7).

All this points to the potential significance of the NAP teacher’s social positioning and the role of classroom discourse which shape it. Building on the discussion so far, NAP teacher talk can be seen as an enactment of the teacher’s assumed role in class (Christie, 2002). Within classroom discourse, often the focus is placed upon teacher talk for its constitutive role in shaping learners’ experiences (e.g., Christie, 2004). It can be theorised that teacher talk provides a looking glass to explore the learners’ role being constructed through the teacher constructing her role. Underpinning the focus on teacher talk is the asymmetric nature of the teacher-learner relationship. In fact, Christie (2004) argues that more research focus should be on what a teacher does in terms of its impact on the range of meaning made available to the learners. Due to the mounting significance of the teacher’s role in NAP classrooms, it was a logical choice that this thesis also focused on teacher talk. This discussion is presented in Chapters 6 and 7.

3.2.2.1 Teacher Talk: Teacher as Educator and Representative of the Host Society

Past research has demonstrated that classroom teacher talk is an amalgam of complex factors that surrounds the classroom. Some illustrated how it reflects macro social frameworks and curriculum requirements that shape it (Cazden, 1988; Lemke, 1985). It has been argued how teacher talk can be seen as an “institutional language with significant and established social functions”, which possesses “socially determined language patterns for the realisation of social purposes or functions” (Mickan, 2006, p. 344). Others illustrated how in teacher talk curriculum demands and classroom particularities are intermingled. For
example, Harders and Macken-Horarik (2008) illustrate how teacher instruction can be seen as goal-oriented practice, which consists of “macro”, planned and “micro”, contingent dimensions. Further, Richards (1996) foregrounds a personalised aspect of teacher talk, suggesting that the individual teacher’s personal and professional history and beliefs will also shape teacher talk. These insights position us to view the teacher as a medium between the local classroom context and the wider social context that surrounds the classroom.

Speaking of teacher-learner relationships, some sociolinguists and second language acquisition scholars suggest that the nature of NAP teacher talk may be profoundly affected by the set up that characterises the teacher’s social positioning. Despite coming from different research paradigms, their research findings on societal implications may complement the above discussion, and thus warrant some acknowledgement here. It has been suggested that, because of the teacher’s role of representing English language speakers and the host society, the resultant teacher talk shows the properties of so-called Foreigner Talk (Ferguson, 1975), that is, quantitative and qualitative deviations from presumed native-to-native speech. While some approach Foreigner Talk as attempts to carry out a successful communication (Chaudron, 1983, 1988; Ellis, 1994; Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991; Long & Sato, 1983), others detect a hint of prejudice and social ramifications underpinning its use (Bialystok, Fröhlich, & Howard, 1978; Hinnenkamp, 1987; Ruscher, 2001; Schinke-Llano, 1983). For example, Hinnenkamp (1987) argues that the use of Foreigner Talk marks a boundary between native and nonnative speakers, thereby “carrying moral and social attributes and profiles” attached to nonnative speakers (p. 158). Others note the dramatic changes in the nature of lessons, with an increased focus on managerial instructions (Bialystok, et al., 1978; Schinke-Llano, 1983) and a decreased focus on content instructions in return (Schinke-Llano, 1983). Such findings do seem to endorse the stance taken in the current research on teacher talk, in that role-relationships played out in teacher talk are likely to permeate the nature of lessons, and hence students’ experiences and learning.

Such an understanding of teacher talk is relevant in research on NAP. In this era of ESL as mainstreaming, NAP has been set up as a gateway for the mainstream
3.2.2.2 Analysing Classroom Teacher Talk

Categorising discourse is a complex enterprise since it is an act of “imposing a grid on reality” (Iedema, Feez, & White, 1994, p. 13). Christie (2002) states that “discourse analysis is also not neutral, for it necessarily involves the imposition of some interpretation upon events” (p. 22). She also points out that “the very transcript of the classroom talk (and the video record from which that is drawn), is already removed from reality, and itself and interpretation of it” (Christie, 2002, p. 22).

The ways in which teacher talk is analysed vary significantly in scope and orientation. In terms of the organisation of talk, some scholars have analysed teacher talk from a viewpoint of exchange structures and patterns (Love & Suherdi, 1996; Sinclair, 1982; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975), while others have focused on switching between two domains of talk, one concerned with producing target language forms and the other with carrying out the classroom activities (Willis, 1987). Still more others have focused on ethnographically-oriented events (Bloome, Power Carter, Christian, Otto, & Shuart-Faris, 2005), as well as those focusing on what makes teacher talk dialogic (Lyle, 2008; Nystrand, Gamoran, Kachur, & Prendergast, 1997). Some researchers, typically those from a SLA tradition, have compared differential linguistic properties of teacher talk between native and nonnative audiences (Chaudron,
1983; Long & Sato, 1983; Schinke-Llano, 1983) as well as between different age groups (Oliver, 1997).

Analytical focus on the ‘functions’ of classroom teacher talk also varies. Some are action-related, either in a discourse move sense, such as “eliciting” or “informing” (Sinclair, 1982; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975), or in a Systemic Functional Linguistic mood-function analysis (Eggins, 2004; Halliday, 1994; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) sense, such as “statement”, “command”, “offer” or “question” (Iedema, 1996). Others are more notionally oriented functions. They may be incorporating action (e.g., discussion), main actor(s) involved (teacher/peer) and nature of action (authoritative/dialogic) in analytical scope (Viiri & Saari, 2006), categories based on teacher’s exercising power from a poststructuralist orientation (J. Wright, 2000) or macro social purposes under an overarching function of socialisation (Mickan, 2006). In addition to these attempts, Schinke-Llano’s (1983) study investigates macro pedagogic functions.

Schinke-Llano’s (1983) study is of particular note here, since both her findings and her analytical methods have influenced the ways teacher talk is approached in the current study. As briefly touched on earlier in this chapter, Schinke-Llano (1983), coming from a different paradigm of Second Language Acquisition with a specific focus on Foreigner Talk, demonstrates that learners with limited English proficiency tended to receive managerial instructions at the expense of content instructions. Her analytical framework incorporates the classification of teacher talk into three macro pedagogic functions, instructional talk, managerial talk and disciplinary talk, and a miscellaneous category. Through this, she is able to illustrate just what types of teacher talk are directed at students with perceived limited English proficiency with what proportionality.

Whilst offering a potentially very useful framework to analyse teacher talk, two points have to be considered when incorporating her approach. One is that assigning pedagogic functions may need to be more complex. Schinke-Llano’s (1983) approach assumes a one-to-one correspondence between an exchange and a pedagogic function. The unit of analysis was based on Sinclair and Coulthard’s (1975) notion of exchange structures to identify the junctures between pedagogic
functions. This approach appears to run the risk of oversimplifying the pedagogic functions teacher talk is serving at one time, which will likely result in overlooking the potential multifunctionality in teacher talk. Another point to consider is the nature of the classrooms Schinke-Llano (1983) investigated. Schinke-Llano’s (1983) research derives from content classrooms, in which both native and nonnative speakers of English are learning together. This is the case due to her primary focus on Foreigner Talk. Her main concern is to illustrate the quantitative and qualitative difference in classroom teacher talk directed at students with limited proficiency in English from talk that is directed at more proficient peers (including native speakers) in the same class.

All these approaches have emerged out of making sense of what it is that teacher talk does in class, particularly in making learning occur through teaching. In addition to those approaches, at a conceptual level, Christie’s (1995, 1997, 1999a, 2000a, 2000b, 2002) conceptualisation of teacher talk provides a useful starting point.

Christie’s approach takes into account two aspects of teacher talk; one to do with “educational goals” and “the general management of students’ behaviour”, and the other to do with “the knowledge or information being learned” (Christie, 1995, pp. 240-241). Using a Bernsteinian framework, Christie terms the former aspect of teacher talk as regulative discourse and the latter as instructional discourse. In her terms, the latter can be approximated to the “content” (Christie, 2000b, 2002), a particular “field of knowledge” (Christie, 1995; Iedema, 1996). She combines this framework with a Systemic Functional Linguistic (SFL) model of language to describe in detail how the two types of discourses operate in a moment to moment unfolding of teaching and learning in class.

Christie conceives a series of classroom practices as curriculum genres which constitute a larger entity called a curriculum macrogenre (Christie, 1999a, 2002). This is formulated through a notion of genre as staged, purposeful and goal-oriented (J. R. Martin, 1984, 1985, 1992, 1997). Christie (1999a) predicts that, in a successful model of pedagogy, a gradual shift in the operation of regulative and instructional discourses will occur. Her prediction is that regulative discourse
will start operating tacitly, and in turn, instructional discourse will gradually surface more. She also notes that children who start schooling very quickly learn acceptable behaviour and institutional regulations within a matter of months, and such a learning can be visible in the changing nature of teacher talk (Christie, 2002). Thus, ideally, what can be observed in teacher talk is that: 1) from a long-term perspective (e.g., a school year), the proportion of explicit operation of regulative discourse will be in general decline, and, within that trend, 2) from a short-term perspective (e.g., a unit of work), the proportion of regulative discourse is high at the beginning and decreases towards the end.

However, Christie’s framework needs to be modified for the purpose of researching adult NAP ESL classroom discourse for two related reasons. The first is the difficulty in identifying the content in the subject ESL. As reviewed in the previous chapter, institutional positioning and definition of the ESL profession have been elusive. Accordingly, what counts as content of ESL is in constant flux. Further, in the Australian mainstream school curriculum, ESL serves as an alternative to the subject English which, according to Christie (1999b), has an inclination to be a “weakly classified” (Bernstein, 1973b, 1975) subject, in which boundaries between subjects are blurred and the subject is not isolated from daily life matters (Christie, 2002). These observations suggest that ESL is also a weakly classified subject. This may be reflective of the view that mastering the discourse of schooling needs to precede mastery of specialised discourse (Rose, 1999). This makes it difficult to identify instructional discourse in this context.

Christie’s framework is predicated upon clear delineation of regulative and instructional discourses. Specialised, technical language is associated with the latter discourse. In this framework, life matters are not viewed as technical language, hence not qualified as strictly instructional fields. This creates a dilemma in analysing ESL classroom discourses. Unless content is defined as a set of decontextualised linguistic items and rules, the English language classroom does not have a clearly defined content distinct from other subject areas. Yet the development of ESL in its current form has been based on socially oriented paradigms of language which have been aimed at handling more contextualised language use in class.
The second reason why Christie’s framework needs to be modified here is a possible fusion of regulative discourse with instructional discourse. This is due to the nature of NAP; NAP is oriented towards inducting its learners into Australian society and its institutional systems. It has mainstreaming students as its goal. Because learners are being inducted into the Australian schooling system presumably for the first time in their life, NAP’s mainstreaming goal is closely tied up with the general role of education. According to Mickan (2007), “[e]ducation has a crucial role in making society’s practices and behavioural patterns and values explicit” (p. 1). This role is likely to manifest strongly in NAP pedagogy, since shared understanding of society’s practices and behavioural patterns are not assumed. Further, an argument can be made that the interpersonal meaning of teacher talk can be explored more deeply in this context to investigate the teacher-student role relationships enacted in teacher talk.

These reasons lead to a question to be answered before a distinction between regulative and instructional discourses is applied to the teacher talk, that is, whether teachers mainly talk about their specific subject matters (however they are defined), and if they don’t, what the potential reasons are. Very few questions have been raised as to whether teachers really talk about the content of their given subject area. Accordingly, little attention has been paid to identify just how much of content talk a teacher actually carries out in his or her class in the first place. Delving into this area has a potential to offer insights into the nature of NAP ESL. As Schinke-Llano’s (1983) research has revealed, the nature of teacher talk in content areas can vary depending on the students’ presumed English language proficiency. This can be translated to suggest that when the students are judged to be limited in English, the amount and quality of instructional discourse may decrease, and instead regulative discourse may dominate. This is the constitutive effect of who the students are thought to be. However, two issues need to be sorted before reaching conclusions. The first is to find out the nature of ESL discourse operating in class where, presumably, 1) the classification is weak and 2) there is no native speaking counterpart. The second is to explore whether there is a leap from target language proficiency to the need for more regulation at the cost of content. For, it can be argued that the students with language proficiency issues do need more content instruction than, say, regulation.
Borrowing van Leeuwen’s (1993) analogy, it can be argued that concentrating on the behaviour of following instructions or carrying out specific actions can result in a “sidestepping of content”.

For all these reasons, developing a more delicate analytical framework that attends to regulative discourse is required in this study. To begin with, it is useful to explore the general orientation of teacher talk, with particular focus on what aspects of life and human practices are regulated or managed. Schinke-Llano’s (1983) method of analysing teacher talk is useful for the exploration of regulative and instructional discourses based on pedagogic functions. For example, the idea of setting up such categories as managerial talk and disciplinary talk can be viewed as constituents of regulative discourse, whereas content talk can be viewed as part of instructional discourse. As well as having potential subcategorisation of regulative and instructional discourses, such a framework would combine Christie’s perspective with Schinke-Llano’s method incorporating the macro-pedagogic functions of teacher talk, and approach classroom teacher talk holistically for an extended period of time. That way, it becomes possible to find out the general orientation of teacher talk as well as depicting shifts and changes in patterns of teacher talk.

One remaining constituent of education is assessment, Bernstein’s “evaluation of knowledge”. Of the assessment, written tasks are particularly significant in the NAP programme for their property of materialising what “new arrival” learners are required to demonstrate as learning.

3.2.3 Genre-based Teaching, Assessment and Written Tasks

It seems quite customary that assessment is examined in relation to a particular teaching approach adopted in a programme. Assessment has been regarded as a key component of the curriculum (e.g., Nunan, 1988b). It is defined by Bernstein (1975) as one of the message systems which represent “realizations of the educational knowledge code” (p. 88). Specific to the literacy-based education of which NAP ESL is a part, Macken-Horarik (1998) notes that “[d]ifferent literacy teaching regimes foreground different skills and these have both interpretive and
productive dimensions” (p. 74). Written tasks are clearly a locus of assessment in NAP ESL, and for this reason, it can be expected that analysing written tasks may well shed light on the nature of the particular “literacy teaching regime” and its expectations.

Currently South Australian schools have adopted a genre-based approach for both ESL teaching practices and assessment purposes (Department of Education Training and Employment (DETE), 2001c). Their formal assessment framework is called ESL Scope and Scales (DETE, 2002). The particular genre-based approach has been developed by Sydney-based researchers of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), which originates in the work of Halliday (1985, 1994; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) and colleagues. NAP has adopted both the Sydney-school genre approach and ESL Scope and Scales (Department of Education and Children's Services (DECS), 2007b).

The Sydney school genre approach has developed since the 1980s. The approach was motivated by a social justice movement which aims to provide students from certain segments of the population with access to ways of speaking and writing valued in the Australian schooling system (Callaghan & Rothery, 1988; Cope & Kalantzis, 1993; J. R. Martin, 1985, 1999b). The approach has been characterised as an explicit, interventionist pedagogy (Callaghan, Knapp, & Noble, 1993; J. R. Martin, 1999b), which aims to equip learners with resources and strategies to produce appropriate text-types through explicit means. Researchers developed their framework by first identifying and describing text-types/genres typically valued in Australian contexts (e.g., Iedema, et al., 1994; J. R. Martin, 1985). They then adapted the identified genres and their taxonomies for pedagogical use, and generated teaching processes (Callaghan & Rothery, 1988; Cope & Kalantzis, 1993; Feez, 1998; J. R. Martin, 1985, 1999b). Some also developed specific writing frames for each genre (e.g., Wray & Lewis, 1997). While there are other genre approaches in the field, Hyon (1996) remarks that this Sydney approach stands out in its explicit teaching stance and focus on school contexts.

Admittedly, the use of the terms “genres” and “text-types” is itself a contested area among genre researchers (see Derewianka, 2003). However, attending to this matter is beyond the scope of the present investigation. Accordingly, the two terms are used interchangeably in this thesis.
While it has become a prominent approach to teaching literacy during the past few decades, there appears to be tension between the approach’s theory-based proposal and its enactment. One contested area concerns the degree of rigidity of the text-types that is to be imposed in pedagogic contexts. Researchers propose that typical genres be presented as a guide, so that the approach “explicitly encourages creative exploitation of the genre and its possibilities” (J. R. Martin, 1999b, p. 127). Some advocate a flexible treatment of genre boundaries in teaching (e.g., Knapp & Watkins, 2005), while others promote an in-class exploration of texts that are made up of multiple genres (e.g., Derewianka, 2003). Over the years, the classificatory boundaries between genres have been gradually softened as well (J. R. Martin, 1997). However, these flexible, open-ended approaches to genre may not always have come through to be operationalised in teaching. Concern has been raised that genres may “become prescribed and authorized as ‘the’ texts children need to master” (Richardson, 1994, p. 135). For example, Wray and Lewis (1997) seem to hold a rather strong conformist stance, as they assert that learning involves “assimilating the generic structures” (p. 139, italics added). Consequently, concerns about instruction and learning outcomes seem to be looming even within genre advocates (e.g., Derewianka, 2003; Knapp & Watkins, 2005).

The plausibility of such a concern for the conformist application of genre rises in a pedagogic context like NAP, where individual text-types are lined up for assessment. It is at least possible that the immediate objective becomes getting the target text-type right and a strong instructional focus will be on ensuring the students’ appropriation of target text-types. Such a situation may render it less likely to promote the creative mixture of the multiple genres, since students’ deviation from the ‘textbook’ text-type can cause instant ramification on the evaluation outcomes. While Hyon (1996) observes that genre experts vary in their stance towards the rigidity of genres, some argue that learners need to master the rules first to be able to break them (Kay & Dudley-Evans, 1998). While this might be the case with patterns of language use, it raises a question as to whether such a view will extend to negotiating the “ideologically driven” (Derewianka, 2003, p. 142) nature of the genres. This point will be of relevance in the analysis.
presented in Chapter 8, which looks at the contextual constraints of the “new arrival” students’ engagement with written tasks.

This issue of a rigid imposition of text-types is often regarded as merely the exterior of a more profound issue surrounding the implementation of a genre approach. It is documented that the Sydney-school genre theories have been accommodated in order to “meet the pragmatic concern of teachers” (Hyon, 1996, p. 708). Reportedly, the approach has then become essentialised and institutionalised (Derewianka, 2003), and the enacted approach tends to be “overly pedagogocentric, valorising teachers’ perspectives on the demands and possibilities of school learning” (Macken-Horarik, 1998, p. 77). A similar concern is registered by Luke (1996). Moreover, Derewianka (2003) notes the tendency that the text-types are presented as culturally neutral materials and warns against it. These observations signal a complexity in dealing with the culture-specific nature of genres when teaching diverse populations such as NAP learners. As discussed previously, NAP teachers may reserve a visibly powerful role, with an added legitimacy and authority underpinning the commitment to offer access to mainstream literacy. It is possible that the tightness of target text-types converge with the rightness of mainstream in NAP classrooms.

All these points indicate the potential significance of pinpointing a particular enactment of genre-teaching with particular respect to circumstantial factors. Of specific concern here is the contextualisation of genres, that is, the treatment and effect of the social purposes associated with text-types and the intended audience in relation to the topics set for the task (Derewianka, 1990). Due largely to the interventionist orientation of the genre-based approach, Australian genre approaches have been regarded as more ideologically charged than other approaches (Hyon, 1996). Thus, teachers’ and educational institutions’ beliefs and values are likely to play a recognisable role in the selection and organisation of tasks, as well as in the evaluation of the learners’ work.

Multiple factors seem to underpin the issues of the contextualisation of genre in the arena of implementation (as opposed to theorisation). Genre approaches have been renowned for their strong pedagogical focus on the contextualisation of
genres. Hyland (2008) postulates that the approaches’ key instructional purpose is “illuminating the constraints of social contexts on language use” (p. 543). Likewise, Sydney-school genre researchers hold the contextualisation of genres as their strength and key to their pedagogy (Derewianka, 1990, 2003; J. R. Martin, 1997). Still, a close reading of the phrase suggests a quite specific nature of the scope of contextualisation: what is meant by the contextual elements has tended to be removed from the immediate institutional environment in which student writing typically occurs. ‘Social purposes’ of the texts and ‘the intended audience’ seem to be more closely tied with the theoretical context than to the classroom context. These elements typically refer to 1) what has been found in sample texts examined by the researchers for theory-generation purposes, while subsequently projecting 2) what would (or should) typically be found in texts produced in similar contexts. At this ‘theoretical’ level of contextualisation, there is little place for the specific educational, institutional and societal environment in which students engage with the texts. In other words, the classroom tends to be situated as a portal in which information about the generalised contextual factors for the texts will be imparted, and likewise, teachers tend to be located as a medium through which what can be found outside the classroom will be disseminated to the students. As a result, a duality can be found in the conceptualisation of ‘context’: a generalised, putative context and an immediate one.

Significantly, this immediate institutional context may not be the same as the generic, rather unanimously-treated context. Once genres are recontextualised into pedagogic, assessment spheres, it is plausible that there are additional contextual effects and constraints on what can be said in texts, and how. These added elements might even involve value concerns and expectations (cf. Kay & Dudley-Evans, 1998). It has been pointed out that the institutionally sanctioned value positions play a critical role in determining students’ success in assessment (Cranny-Francis, 1996; Macken-Horarik, 1996). Specifically, previous research has demonstrated that to be successful in written assessment, a learner must tap into the intertextuality that is in sync with that of an assessor’s reading of his or her texts and activate it (Hamp-Lyons & Zhang, 2001; Macken-Horarik, 1998). Macken-Horarik (1998) suggests that, even though different students may “activate different intertexts according to their interpretation of a context” (p. 76),
assessors’ intertextual expectations can even override the overall well-formedness or well-execution of texts. These findings offer significant implications in the NAP context, because, clearly, the teacher takes on the role of an instructor of knowledge as well as an assessor of that knowledge. It follows that the intertextuality that becomes critical for students’ success will be most likely that of the teacher. Considering the mainstreaming function of NAP, teacher’s intertexts may converge with the wider Australian community’s intertextuality to a significant degree.

This situation seems to create an immediate paradox facing NAP. If the learners are expected to operate within the wider Australian community’s intertextuality, achieving this might constitute assessment criteria and presenting deviating views may eventuate in negative evaluations. However, Freebody and Luke (1990) argue that a successful pedagogy needs to go beyond satisfying criteria (see also Freebody, 1992). They suggest that, ultimately, a learner needs to become a “text-critic” who is able to decipher the ideological underpinnings of texts and challenge them. If one is to follow their perspective, an indicator of successful learning becomes how well learners challenge the assumptions behind the texts. Scholars such as Macken-Horarik (1998) present a critical literacy to illustrate how such an activity can be conducted in class. Yet, in the instances presented, the texts are typically brought from outside the classroom, and, perhaps understandably, the ideological makeup of the immediate instructional context is not called into question in class. In other words, a critical interrogation of contexts in pedagogic terms is again about putative contexts lying outside the realm of the classroom, and very likely, a critique of immediate pedagogic context is not in evidence.

Such a situation provokes an interest in critically examining the immediate NAP and its genre-learning, contextual elements in relation to putative contextual understandings. In such a construct, a critical question will be how the written tasks position the learners in the first place. In particular, a question can be asked as to how a dual context might be constructed and how that context positions the learners with specific reference to text-types. Outside the realm of genre theory, Harklau (1999a, 1999b, 2003) has investigated how ESL written tasks
communicate with the host society’s cultural norms and values. Of particular relevance for the present study is her illustration of how the task topics signify the particular social positioning assigned to the learners, how learners are expected to enact relevant identities available in the topics, and how such positioning interacts with the ways in which ESL programme’s assert their institutional identity (Harklau, 1999a). Harklau’s work demonstrates that various immediate institutional factors enact different contexts for writing. It also reminds us that these differently enacted writing contexts require a different organisation of information, which has implications on how the ‘reality’ is construed in texts (cf. Blackledge, 2003). Thus, the relationship between institutional values and learners played out in text-types is important to explore. Investigating the construal of the context of written tasks may provide insights into the nature of institutional expectations. It can be assumed that these contextual expectations contribute to the formation of ‘new-arrival-ness’, that is, the particular kind of role and relationship assumed in “new arrivals”. Pedagogic decisions have been made to select specific combinations of text-types and topics for NAP written tasks. Individual topics and the assortment of topics across tasks can signal just what aspects of life are brought to the fore. It can be expected that the combination of the topic(s) and the text-type(s) may interact with each other to create specific kinds of meanings that will come out of the task.

In particular, investigating the expository genres (J. R. Martin, 1985) that specifically prompt the learners to advance their own opinions and arguments is of relevance here. J. R. Martin (1985) advocates introducing these expository genres from an early stage of schooling, on the grounds that ultimately educational success is predicated upon mastering these genres. While incorporating expository genres into ESL pedagogy has been a groundbreaking enterprise, explicit teaching of how to argue can simultaneously be a source of dilemma. With these genres’ specific purpose of representing a writer’s own arguments, the possibility arises that a tension between students’ intertexts and the officially sanctioned ones will be visible in these genres. It can also be expected that such an investigation will potentially highlight how the combination of topics, text-types and intended writers (e.g., “new arrivals”) and audiences (e.g., teachers) may specify available, or even expected, value positions and arguments
for “new arrival” students. While Callaghan, Knapp and Noble (1993) insist that “[i]t is not linguists or teachers...but the social context which ‘imposes’ certain requirements” (p. 181), arguably linguists and teachers can actively contribute to construe the social, pedagogic values and the immediate institutional writing context.

In sum, genre-based teaching constitutes a microcosm of the mainstreaming approach to ESL and thus signifies potential dilemmas that providing “access to the mainstream” may produce.

### 3.3 Conclusion

Investigating the social construction of “new arrivals” in an adult NAP setting is valuably informed by social semiotic understanding of language and practices. The investigation here grew out of an emergent line of semiotic inquiry on how human emotion, personality and individuality are socially constructed (e.g., Ivanič, 1998; Lemke, 2002, 2003; J. R. Martin & White, 2005). As established previously, this study adopted a semiotic approach which explores what meanings are made and how meanings are created and understood.

A framework of semiotic representation, construction, resemiotisation and intertextuality underpin this exploration of “new arrivals” as a particular construal of being (Lemke, 2003). This necessitates the current research focus to be two-fold: exploring what particular concept of “new-arrival-ness” is being moulded (product), while simultaneously documenting how it is effectively constructed (process). As Halliday (1978) states, “[t]here is no clear line between the ‘what’ and ‘how’” (p. 33). From this analysis it is clear that learners’ experiences can usefully be approached from three aspects of NAP: programme provision statements to explore the general approach to “new arrivals” constructed in the wider framework of NAP; classroom teacher talk to explore role relationships between teacher and learners; and written tasks to explore what knowledge is selected for learning and evaluation, and how the students’ experiences are shaped.
CHAPTER 4
METHODOLOGY AND INVESTIGATIVE PROCEDURE

4.0 Introduction

Now that the background and the theoretical framework of the study have been presented, the next step is to outline the research methodology and methods employed in exploring the ways “new arrivals” were constructed in an adult New Arrivals Program (NAP) class. This chapter first discusses the methodological approach adopted for the investigation, which has been designed as a qualitative case study. It also explains why this approach has been adopted, then presents research context, data collection process, types of data collected and analytical framework and procedure. The information on the research context is followed by an account of the subject position I took as a researcher. This is a necessary part of making my interpretive stance as there are multiple interpretations possible of the data analysed in this study. The information on analytical procedure includes how different procedures have been applied to different aspects of NAP. The reliability of the study as well as its limitations are then discussed.

4.1 Research Methodology

4.1.1 A Qualitative Research Approach

The study adopted a qualitative case study research perspective (Merriam, 1998) which incorporated ethnographically-motivated fieldwork data collection techniques. It approached the data with an interpretivist epistemological stance, which has been defined as “an inductive, hypothesis- or theory-generating (rather than a deductive or testing) mode of inquiry” (Merriam, 1998, p. 4). In a qualitative research tradition, choosing a particular approach has been regarded as a matter of “paradigm commitments” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 367), or worldview choice (Merriam, 1998). Merriam (1998) states that “[r]esearch is, after
all, producing knowledge about the world” (p. 3). Similarly, Bloome, Power Carter, Christian, Otto and Shuart-Faris (2005) uses the term “research imagination” to highlight the significance of “the ways of imagining the world and the people in it” (p. 234) operating in a qualitative inquiry.

There are several reasons why an interpretive qualitative approach has been adopted for the present research. The first reason is the approach’s capacity to provide insights into processes and mechanisms that operate in society (Mehan, Hertweck, & Meihls, 1986). This capacity will enable the inquiry into an unquantifiable theme like the notion of ‘new-arrival-ness’. Although the present study utilised some numerical data, this was done within an essentially qualitative framework, that is, for the purpose of contextualising a qualitative interpretation of data.

The second reason derives from a theoretical acknowledgement that there are multiple realities constructed from multiple viewpoints. A stance is taken that the ultimate goal of this inquiry is to pursue one possible account of contextual reality. As Holstein and Gubrium (1998) note, research into human practices has entered the stage of “making new attempts to begin to consider interpretive practice for the ways that the objectivity of the world is locally accomplished and managed with reference to broad organizational, social and cultural resources” (p. 138). Moreover, Elliot, Fischer and Rennie (1994, quoted in Lincoln, 2002, p. 331) rightly point out that qualitative research “is conducted not to confirm or disconfirm earlier findings, but rather to contribute to a process of continuous revision and enrichment of understanding of the experiences or form of action under study”. Such theoretical premises help to distinguish the current study from scientifically driven, positivist research paradigms, whose epistemological stance is typically to pursue a single, objective reality.

The third reason is the methodological compatibility with a social semiotic perspective of language. Qualitative researchers state that theory and method are in a dialectical relationship (Bloome, et al., 2005; Ivanič & Weldon, 1999). As reviewed in the previous chapter, language simultaneously represents and constitutes realities, and realities we explore are essentially mediated through
language and other semiotic resources. It therefore follows that, essentially, there
are no ‘raw’ data to deal with. It is recognised that “we cannot study lived
experience directly, because language, speech, and systems of discourse mediate
and define the very experience we attempt to describe” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000,
p. 636; see, also Reason, 1998). As Silverman (2000) asserts, much of the data
collected for qualitative inquiries into human practices will be language-based.
This allows for heavy reliance on language data in a classroom-based research like
this one.

Last but not least, an interpretive approach is suitable for a research account
based on meaning-making ‘dialogues’ that occur between the researcher and the
researched, and the researcher and the research context. The present study is an
attempt to provide a contextual account of what is happening in a NAP context
in a naturalistic, real-life setting (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007). Reason (1998) argues
that “it is through dialogue that the subject-object relationship of traditional
science gives way to a subject-subject one, in which the academic knowledge of
formally educated people works in a dialectical tension with the popular
knowledge of the people to produce a more profound understanding of the
situation” (p. 270). In such a construct, researchers cannot be detached observers
sitting outside the context. They become actively involved in the context and in
data generation through direct contact with research participants in the actual
research context. Identification of research focus and selection of data thus
become inseparable from the dialogues that researchers engage in during the
course of investigation.

4.1.2 A Qualitative Case Study

The current investigation has been designed as a case study of a particular group
of individuals in a particular Australian institutional setting. According to Gall
and colleagues (2007), a general definition of the case study is “(a) the in-depth
study of (b) one or more instances of a phenomenon (c) in its real-life context
that (d) reflects the perspective of the participants involved in the phenomenon”
(p. 447). Further, a case study focuses “on one particular instance of educational
experience and attempt[s] to gain theoretical and professional insights” (Freebody,
2003, p. 81), which would not otherwise be gained. The employment of case study is therefore towards realising “the context-sensitive, value-relevant, interpretive methodologies that fit more comfortably with late modern assumptions” (Rampton, 1997, p. 330).

Case studies have been employed in various disciplines, although they vary in the theory, methodology and practice that is adopted (Bassey, 1999; Freebody, 2003; Gall, et al., 2007; Merriam, 1998). Duff (2007) maintains that case studies are “driven by the researchers’ and the discipline’s current interests in theoretical and analytic phenomena in a range of possible domains” (p. 17). In educational settings, the choice of case study is based upon the theoretical conviction that teachers “are always teaching some subject matter, with some particular learners, in particular places and under conditions that significantly shape and temper teaching and learning practices” (Freebody, 2003, p. 81). Because this study focuses on one actual adult NAP classroom with authentic data, it satisfies all these theoretical underpinnings of a case study.

Researchers suggest that defining a “case” depends upon how it is approached and scrutinised in a given investigation. Generally, a case is regarded as an instance of a phenomenon that is set as the research foci (Gall, et al., 2007). It occurs in a bounded entity (Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994), which can be notional or physical. Yet, a case “always occurs in a specified social and physical setting” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 27, italics in original), and is “a real-life entity that operates in a specific time and place” (van Lier, 2005, p. 205). Further, according to Miles and Huberman (1994), a case does not have to be monolithic but can consist of multiple subcases. Meanwhile, in this thesis, the phenomenon under study is the notion of “new arrivals”, being constructed in a specific NAP setting. The investigation involves a specific classroom. Accordingly, the case for this study is a particularly organised “unit” of people chosen for data collection and analysis (Duff, 2007; Merriam, 1998). The singularity of the account also marks this investigation as a case study (Bassey, 1999).

Being a qualitative, interpretive investigation, the present case study employed some methodological stances and techniques of an ethnographically-motivated
inquiry (Atkinson & Hammersley, 1998; Duff, 1995, 2002; Saville-Troike, 2003). Thus, in Atkinson and Hammersley’s terms (1998), the study is an investigation of a particular social phenomenon through naturally-occurring data with the focus on a specific case. A considerable amount of participant observation was involved in data collection. Although my involvement with the classroom practices was partial, this partiality of the involvement lasting for an extended period of time created an optimal condition for me to develop a research perspective from the periphery (cf. Rampton, 1997). One such instance is the mobilisation of intertextuality in the methodology.

4.1.3 Intertextuality: Linking Human Practices and Interpretation

Just as intertextuality constitutes the theoretical framework for the present study, it contributes to framing the methodology of the study. An interpretive, qualitative case study can be seen as a matter of constructing intertexts out of a particular point of view. It has been argued that individuals bring into a context different intertexts depending on their subject positions (Macken-Horarik, 1998). As an outsider with some overlapping experiences with the “new arrival” students, I was bringing in my intertexts which may resonate with that of the students or even with teachers in some respects, while differing from these insiders in other respects.

Also, an interpretive, qualitative case study can be seen as building intertexts out of multiple data sets. Intertextuality necessitates us to regard why and how people do things as two sides of a coin. As reviewed in the previous chapter, humans act upon their interpretation of the world, and humans construct their interpretation of the world as they carry out activities. Methodologically, Silverman (2000) cautions against over-emphasising the ‘why’ side of human practices, maintaining that “the fashionable identification of qualitative method with an analysis of how people ‘see things’ ignores the importance of how people ‘do things’” (p. 832). If over-qualifying human viewpoints is methodologically unsound, then it can be suggested that the reverse will be equally problematic. Thus, focusing on how people do things must be connected with how they see things, which constitutes why people do things.
This points to the need for constructing a plausible account of the case from multiple data sets. Love and Arkoudis (2006) call for research methods which not only tap into teachers’ thoughts and beliefs on their role but also identify how their assumed roles are played out in their teaching practices. Collating multiple findings with one another, in other words the triangulation of data, would connect human interpretation (‘why’) and human practices (‘how’) adequately.

Thus, intertextuality is an indispensable understanding for integrating multiple analyses based on multiple data sets in a case study like this one. If continuities (i.e., intertexts) are identified across findings, this will constitute a strong basis for a specific meaning orientation running through a NAP context. Conversely, if discrepancies are identified, such a finding will be equally valuable in documenting the complexities of the current research context. Intertextuality not only unites different levels of analysis but also justifies the methodological decision to carry out these analyses.

### 4.2 Research Context and Participants

#### 4.2.1 The College: A South Australian NAP Centre

The study focused on a teacher and a group of students (the Red Ochre class) from an adult NAP centre located within the vicinity of a South Australian adult re-entry institution (The College). With its original foundation dating back to the beginning of the twentieth century, The College’s development into an adult learning institution in the early 1990s was a fairly recent phenomenon.

The College offers a number of mainstream education programmes ranging from pre-secondary levels to post-secondary ones. One of its main courses is senior secondary level education for those intending to complete secondary education to obtain the South Australian Certificate of Education (SACE). SACE consists of two stages, Stage 1 and 2, which are roughly equivalent to Year 11 and 12 levels respectively. The College also offers vocational education and training, university foundation studies, as well as community programmes for those who do not necessarily aspire to join, or move through, the South Australian educational
system. It was in addition to these programmes that The College took on the function of an adult NAP centre.

The College is situated in a suburb quite close to the CBD. It has a large campus with a range of facilities and buildings. Generally, different programmes operate in different buildings. During the course of data collection in 2005, NAP classes operated in specific parts of the campus with little overlap with other programmes, except for shared facilities such as computer suites, gymnasiums and library. However, NAP came to be operated in two locations from the middle of the year, as a sub-campus was set up in the CBD to accommodate an ever growing number of incoming NAP students. This additional campus is called the City Campus. Since its foundation, the City Campus has been used solely for NAP purposes.

4.2.2 The Red Ochre Class

The Red Ochre Class was amongst a dozen or so NAP classes operating in The College in 2005. Because of the continuous intake of new students, the class went through multiple changes. It started with 13 students at the beginning of the year. It then continuously received new students, mostly in the first term. At one stage the number of students expanded to 24. This impacted on the ways lessons were organised (cf. Yates, 2008) as well as the classroom formation. Reportedly there were discussions to split the class into two, but the idea did not materialise. While many of those enrolled from the beginning stayed throughout the year, the number of Red Ochre Class students started decreasing, as some students left the programme. The number settled at 17 in the final term.

A total of 21 Red Ochre students participated in the study. All but two were male. Only about half of them were enrolled right at the beginning of the school year, others joining at various timings. The participants included four students who left the programme before completion and one who was absent from practically all the lessons observed.
The students were diverse in various respects. Their range of English proficiency and prior formal educational experiences were just about the only two broad similarities amongst them. Their state of origin covered four regions; twelve of them were from Africa, five from Asia, three from the Middle-East and one from Europe. Of the Africans, nine were from the Southern part of the Sudan, one from its Northern part and the rest from Burundi and Somalia. Of those from Asia, three were from Vietnam, one each from Thailand and China. Those from the Middle-East were from Afghanistan, Iran and Iraq (Kurdistan). Their language and demographic backgrounds were more diverse than their countries of origin. Their age at the time of enrolment ranged from 17 to 41. Two were 17, six more were under the age of 20, nine in their twenties, three in their thirties and one at 41. Their entry status in Australia also varied greatly, consisting of humanitarian entrant, spouse, sponsored migrant, family of a Business migrant as well as overseas student visas.

The students’ primary purpose of enrolling in NAP also varied somewhat. In an initial enrolment survey, some stated that they enrolled in NAP to learn English rather than receive formal education per se. Others stated finishing secondary education as their purpose of enrolment. Their stated future aspirations also varied, although undertaking tertiary education appeared to be most popular.

While all of them were identified as possessing a certain level of English, their entry proficiency varied across several scales. So did their assessed numeracy skills, ranging from “some” to “good”. These assessments derived from an initial placement test they each undertook as they enrolled. Further, while all were recognised as having formal schooling experiences, the extent of their prior education varied greatly. At least one-third had continuous education prior to their arrival, and some also had post-secondary educational experiences, such as undergraduate law or technical college. Others, mainly humanitarian entrants, reportedly experienced, to varying extents, interruption in their education. Interestingly, the composition of The Red Ochre Class indicated that the students’ English language proficiency was the main criterion for their grouping, whereas its labelling, “language class” foregrounded the students’ prior formal educational experiences. The label “language” class meant that the class consisted
of those who were identified with certain formal schooling experiences (the “language” students). However, two of the students were registered as “literacy” students, that is, those who were officially identified as possessing formal schooling experiences below threshold.

The students undertook five main subject components, namely, “English as a Second Language (ESL)”, “Mathematics”, “Science”, “Computing” and “Administration Program”. It was observed that some of the lesson times allocated for ESL were substituted with “Introduction to Technology” and “Physical Education” programmes. This mainly occurred in the first half of the year. The Administration Program did not have its specified time. It was a series of workshops on life matters, and as such, it was also termed “Life Skills Program”. There was no elective subject, thus all students studied all the subjects. Each lesson was 100 minutes long, and a typical day consisted of two morning lessons and one afternoon lesson. While the proportion of subject components changed each term, ESL always remained as the dominant subject. Weekly timetables had consecutive ESL lessons on certain days.

The inception of the City Campus in the second semester altered the way NAP operated. In the first semester, classes were held entirely at the main campus except for out-of-school excursions and events. From the middle of the year, however, every NAP class rotated to use the City Campus at least one day a week. The Red Ochre class spent Wednesdays and Fridays at the City Campus.

As with other NAP centres, The College used the South Australian Curriculum Standards and Accountability (SACSA) Framework (Department of Education Training and Employment (DETE), 2001a). It employed the ESL Scope and Scales as an assessment framework for an initial placement test as well as major assessments. Students were scaled multiple times at different stages of NAP. The assigned Scales informed pedagogic and administrative decisions. In particular, Scales upon exiting NAP functioned as a determinant factor in each student’s recommended pathways. Many of the Red Ochre students’ exit Scales remained largely unchanged from the initial ones, and some exited with lower Scales.
Exiting (as opposed to leaving) NAP and choosing post-NAP pathways both involved The College’s recommendations and negotiations with individual students. All the Red Ochre students who remained enrolled throughout the year exited NAP together at the end of 2005. Their enrolment in NAP lasted two semesters, while, on paper, the eligibility for NAP could range from 6 to 18 months, that is, one to three semesters. Their post-NAP pathways were characteristically similar. The majority of the final 17 students remained in The College, and many moved onto Year 11 studies in 2006. They included those who had completed secondary education outside Australia. The vast majority of those who undertook Year 11 studies were placed in intermediate level ESL classes. While a few chose to undertake vocational-based studies/training, no one proceeded to undertake a sole Year 12 studies or above. Thus, as it turned out, the pathway choices for the students were narrower in the range of educational levels (vertically) and wider in the specified range (horizontally). Also, insofar as their post-NAP pathways were similar, the assumed gap between “literacy” and “language” students in the Red Ochre class had become practically non-existent.

It seemed that commencing Year 11 studies virtually functioned as skipping grades for some students, while repeating or going down grades for others, depending on their prior educational backgrounds. For those with interruptions in their education, entering Year 11 effectively allowed them to skip some years of education they had presumably missed. However, for those who had completed secondary education at least up to the Year 11 level outside Australia, studying in Year 11 could have come across as a restart. One student from the latter group resisted The College’s initial recommendation to remain in the institution and undertake Year 11 studies. After being recommended to do a hybrid of a majority of Year 11 subjects and one Year 12 subject, he turned down this recommendation and shifted to another institution to commence Year 12 studies. Anecdotal teacher accounts indicated that it was rare for a NAP student at The College to go straight into Year 12 or post-secondary education programmes upon completing NAP. The accounts also indicated that, due to this, seeing students undertaking studies beyond Year 11 levels on exiting NAP was generally perceived as an exceptional case.
4.2.3 The Teacher of the Red Ochre Class

The participating teacher, Ms Jen Smith (pseudonym), was a long-serving NAP ESL teacher with over two decades experience in working with “new arrivals” and migrants. She was a native speaker of English. Her prior experience included working as a student counsellor in language institutions, which were precursors of current NAP centres. She was amongst the senior figures in NAP, and was playing a key role in NAP practices not only at The College but also at state-wide level. She was actively engaged in the state-led project of devising pre- and in-service NAP teachers’ professional development materials. At the time classroom observations were conducted, she was simultaneously a homeroom and the main ESL teacher of the Red Ochre class. She was also teaching other NAP classes.

Ms Smith prioritised her students’ wellbeing more than any other aspects of their life in Australia. She was deeply compassionate about the hardships that some of the students had experienced before and after arriving in Australia. Illustrations of the students’ difficulties and problems often dominated her talk. She was also extremely sensitive to the emotional state of her students, and was therefore careful about removing potential shocks from students’ experiences at The College. She was of an opinion that NAP students would be better off taking things slowly. Her careful approach to students’ wellbeing was reflected in many aspects of her professional practices. One instance was her approach to making arrangements for classroom observations. She stressed that students with little or no English and/or with little or no prior formal education were not suitable for having researchers in class because of their emotional and communicative difficulties. Accordingly, she ensured to assign students with a certain degree of English as participants of the study.

4.2.4 The Researcher

As well as research participants, some remarks about myself may be necessary since my subject position in relation to the research context influenced the ways I interpreted data (see also 4.4.4 for my reading position).
As outlined in Chapter 1, the present study has emerged somewhat contingently out of my involvement in a wider research project on NAP. I was a Japanese international student who, at the time of data collection, had spent a couple of years in South Australia. Being a second language learner of English myself, I was particularly interested in the learning experiences of “new arrivals” in English. However, my interest was not so much about their language development as about identity issues. Being relatively new to Australia myself, I was keen to find out what it was like to be a “new arrival”, although it never occurred to me that I would count as one of them. I initially approached the Red Ochre class as a detached outsider, since I regarded migrant education as essentially someone else’s business. As an adult international student with no accompanying family, the existence of NAP or AMEP had been completely invisible to me up until the moment I encountered the Red Ochre class. Thus, I made a clear distinction between international students (me) and migrants in general. I was also developing a sense of being an insider to Australian society. Living with a British-descendant Australian host family, completing an MA coursework degree with local students and acting as casual teaching member in an academic discipline all contributed to such a feeling. However, as touched on in Chapter 1, this self-proclaimed insider status came to be seriously questioned as I engaged with NAP practices.

Thus, it is out of my efforts to present how I understood what I observed that this study developed.

4.3 Data Collection

4.3.1 School Visits and Classroom Observations

The data were collected primarily through ethnographically-driven approaches to educational settings (Duff, 2002; Toohey & Waterstone, 2004), primarily by way of school visits and classroom observations.

Classroom observations were conducted over a period of nine months. Observations were carried out fortnightly in each school term. Typically Friday
mornings were chosen because the Red Ochre class had a block of ESL lessons with Ms Smith. The entire morning sessions (two lessons) were observed. Initially, classroom observation was conducted solely at the main campus. Subsequently observation was at the City Campus, as the Red Ochre class started having their Friday lessons there. A total of thirty lessons were observed over fifteen occasions. Additional visits were made to The College for supplementary data collection. Some of the excursions and social events were also observed, as was an initial placement test, although this was in the following year. The teacher in charge confirmed that its content and procedure were the same as the test the Red Ochre class students had undertaken.

While the observation was taking place, there was another researcher observing the class. The presence of the other observer was due to the initial investigation into the Red Ochre class being part of a larger research project on “new arrivals” that was being undertaken in 2005. Two researchers, one of whom was myself, were assigned to The College, and hence with the Red Ochre class. Both researchers were university research students and approached the same classroom with different research interests and objectives. The other observer is referred to in this chapter as “my then colleague”. We collaborated in our data collection, particularly when it came to making audio- or video-recordings. I set up the main recording devices for the majority of main classroom proceedings, while the first few recordings were made by my then colleague with her recording device. We also utilised our individual recording devices so as to supplement main recordings and to capture small group/individual activities.

The classroom data collection process was gradual and cumulative in nature. Ms Smith had requested a cautious, time-taking approach in order for me to develop a sense of familiarity and trust with the students. I spent nearly an entire term visiting the class as a de facto volunteer teaching assistant. After this, permission was finally granted from Ms Smith to begin a dialogue with the students on my actual purpose. The students’ consent to participate in the study was then sought (see Appendix A for the participant consent form). It was well into the second term that substantial recording of classroom activities commenced. Earlier classroom visits were documented in the form of field notes.
The fortnightly observation and a late commencement of classroom recording impacted the nature of the lesson data collected. Ideally, the whole sequence of a unit of work would be documented to adequately grasp the sequential nature of classroom activities and their progressivity (Christie, 2000b). However, this was not possible because fortnightly observations were the institution’s request. As a result, lesson data were fragmented. This impacted on the resultant selection of methodology and methods as they were employed in this study. Thus, the current study literally emerged out of the ongoing negotiation between my growing research interest and what analysis the data made possible to pursue.

My close involvement with the classroom activities added to the fragmentation of data. When in the classroom, I operated as a passive yet willing participant observer (cf. Saville-Troike, 2003), participating in many classroom activities and playing multiple roles. My roles ranged from being a totally non-participant observer to a teaching assistant, contingent upon the teacher’s agenda and requests on the day. My teaching assistant role included being an interviewee, taking students for short “field work” around the campus and assisting with group and individual tasks. This participatory style yielded both positive and negative outcomes. On the one hand, engaging with classroom activities provided me with ample opportunities to build rapport with the students. Also, by virtue of assisting students’ learning, there was a sense of legitimacy accorded to my presence in class. On the other hand, participating in classroom activities hampered the quality and quantity of the data collected, because this made documenting classroom proceedings not always possible. Field notes were filled in on site, supplemented by post-observation reflections. However, the most affected data were teacher-student talk during group or individual work. Students were often spread across several rooms, and the teacher was often unavailable during that time, since she had to attend to administrative matters. Besides, I was often assisting students.

My participant observer role also created an increased risk of observers’ paradox (Saville-Troike, 2003), where an observer contributes to the generation of the very phenomena under investigation. Indeed, my presence in class yielded multiple activities that might not otherwise have occurred. One notable example
of this was what might be termed the “researchers’ newsletter”. During observations, the teacher would allocate several minutes for the classroom observers to interact with the students, typically at the beginning of the first lesson of the morning. This phase of the lesson typically involved the teacher officially announcing to the class the observers’ presence, and then would leave the floor to the observers to have an interaction with the students. It was arranged that observers would prepare a newsletter to distribute to the students every time they visited the class. This phase developed into a quasi-“show-and-tell” activity, in which the students would read the newsletter, and then ask the observers questions related to the topic covered in the newsletter of the day. Further, it is possible that my presence encouraged the participants to demonstrate selected activities and practices they would not otherwise have portrayed. Lesson agendas may have been arranged to accommodate the situation of having outsiders. Nevertheless, these were treated as a calculated risk, by following Bloome et al’s (2005) view that “research does not exist separate from what people—researchers—do” (p. 241).

4.3.2 Types of Data

There were three sets of data collected for this study. A different data set is used in each analysis chapter to address specific aspects of NAP. The first data set consists of two types of NAP documents. The first type includes excerpts from Federal and State government websites, NAP brochures, The College website and its 2005 and 2006 curriculum handbooks. The second type are drafts of the NAP curriculum-related documents being developed by the South Australian State government. Both types were utilised since different documents addressed different audiences. The first type included the general public as its audience, while the second type set pre- and in-service NAP teachers as primary audience. Chapter 5 attends to this data set.

The drafts of the state NAP curriculum-related documents are the precursors of the published versions (Department of Education and Children’s Services (DECS), 2007a, 2007b). These documents were not designed as a fixed curriculum prescription. Rather, they were “to support NAP teachers to use the
framework to meet the needs of the learners in their classes in order to achieve quality provision in the New Arrivals Program” (The 2006 draft, p. 3). The drafts have been developed through collaboration between the South Australian State Government and experienced NAP teachers.

These curriculum-related documents were included for several reasons. Firstly, they were regarded as valuable resources to access the shared knowledge of the “inner circle” of NAP practitioners. They were aimed at predisposing new NAP teachers to the conceptual framework of NAP, as well as (re)orientating in-service teachers to the framework. It was expected that such a norm-setting function would optimise an exploration of the general orientation of NAP (i.e., Bernstein’s “code”). Secondly, the documents were designed to be an intermediary between State government and NAP centres. As touched on in Chapter 2, Stevens (1990) observed that South Australian NAP practices developed on a school-by-school basis. The documents signify a state initiative to synthesise existing NAP practices. Indeed, a DECS officer, in a private conversation, cautioned that the drafts might not provide any clue as to how NAP was run at The College. The officer also asserted that The College must have developed their own curricula and guiding principles. Interestingly, this view was somewhat at odds with the DECS attempt to synthesise the ethos and dispositions of NAP teachers through collaborating with NAP practitioners. Thus, corroborating the findings from the curriculum-related drafts with the NAP classroom data would offer insights into the current state of South Australian NAP. Thirdly, the positioning of the “new arrivals”, the recipients of NAP, in the documents, was unique. As theorised in Chapter 3, “new arrivals” appeared in the documents by way of a third party representation because the drafts were intended for educators. Their descriptions were who they are to a certain group of people rather than who they are. Such representational practices were deemed pertinent to the aim of the present study. Finally, the way curriculum provision documents were set up necessitates descriptions of “new arrivals” to become general, yet selective and essentialised. This made it possible to explore the construction of adult “new arrivals” in relation to a larger NAP population.
Choosing the draft versions of the NAP curriculum-related documents involved multiple considerations. The drafts were chosen to match the time frames of the classroom data and the draft production, in order to optimise the exploration of a potential intertextuality between them. There was a possibility that the contents of the drafts were simultaneously representative and constitutive of the classroom practices. The 2006 draft was included because it was assumed that the draft could reflect the teachers’ experiences in 2005. Besides, utilising draft versions was a strategy to create a ‘buffer zone’ by several years, in order to ensure the anonymity and confidentiality of the participants of the study.

The second data set consists primarily of audio- and video- recordings of classroom practices, field notes and classroom handouts. The third data set comprises students’ written work, task specifications, classroom handouts and relevant segments of classroom data. Additional artefacts were also utilised as supplementary data. These included materials on the noticeboard, and formal and informal interview data with students and teachers. Chapters 6 and 7 deal with the second data set, while Chapter 8 focuses on the third data set. It is to be noted that, due to the initial arrangements made for classroom observation as outlined in the previous section 4.3.1, there are two observers appearing in the classroom transcripts. One is myself and the other is my then colleague. We appear as HT and GI, respectively.

Three data sets were chosen to cover the broader NAP context that encircled the Red Ochre class. Each data set represented a different domain of the NAP context. Their respective domains with the NAP context are visualised in the figure below. The first data set cuts across the layers of macro social contexts that surround the Red Ochre class. Public NAP information (indicated as Data Set 1-1) covers federal, state and school level discussion of NAP, while SA NAP curriculum-related documents (indicated as Data Set 1-2) provide in-depth, state-level information on NAP. The second data set (ESL teacher talk data, indicated as Data Set 2) primarily refers to the specific domain of the Red Ochre class ESL lessons. The third data set (written tasks, indicated as Data Set 3) covers both the College domain and the Red Ochre class domain, since it carries
information as to how students are assessed beyond the Red Ochre class, that is, at the College level.

![Figure 4.1 Types of Data and NAP Domains](image)

Italicised items in bold fonts represent the main constituents of each data set utilised in the present study. The first data set is indicated by the large, shaded arrows, while the second and third data sets are indicated in the ellipses. The position of the shaded arrows also represents the domains that the respective documents encompass. The ellipses are overlapping with each other to represent the view that some of the classroom ESL teacher talk is referential to, as well as constitutive of, the written tasks. Black arrows indicate the potential connectivity between data sets. The dotted arrow indicates the potential interconnectivity between the two kinds of documents, although the nature of their interconnectivity can be tenuous compared to the other relationships.

### 4.4 Data Analysis

The study consists of a series of data analyses, orchestrating multiple data sets. In broad terms, approaches taken in the data analysis were informed by general
understandings of Hallidayan Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), which were operationalised to varying degrees of technicality. The ideas gained from SFL are framed by the overall analytical procedure of multi-dimensional, intertextual discourse analysis enhanced by ethnographically-motivated perspectives. From a theoretical point of view, incorporating discourse and ethnographic perspectives is deemed crucial in interpretive analysis. Analyses with specific SFL tools were supplementary to the overall discourse analysis. From a practical point of view, the scope of the study made it inevitable to limit the depth of SFL techniques applied to data analysis. Thus, although the thesis is informed by SFL, the analysis has focussed on selected linguistic components considered relevant for examination. To attend to all the linguistic components would require studies of much larger scale, and is thus beyond the scope of the current investigation. For these reasons, the understandings of SFL will be presented first, followed by an explanation of the analytical procedure employed in this study.

4.4.1 Systemic Functional Linguistics


In SFL, meaning is seen as arising out of a specific social context, which “comprises patterns of language patterns” (J. R. Martin, 1997, p. 4). Context is perceived as functioning in such a way that it “limits the range of meanings that can be selected” (Christie & Unsworth, 2000, p. 3). It is understood as double layered, with the outer layer being termed “context of culture” and the inner layer termed “context of situation” (Halliday, 1985, 1994; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004).

Within a context of situation, there are three variables, Field, Tenor and Mode, operating to realise meaning (Halliday, 1978). Field concerns “social activity, its content or topic”, Tenor concerns “the nature of the relationships among the
people involved”, and Mode concerns “the medium and role of language in the situation” (Christie & Unsworth, 2000, p. 3). Halliday (1978) terms these variables as “the general concepts needed for describing what is linguistically significant in the context of situation” (p. 33). They are operating at the level of discourse semantics which characterise a context of situation (Christie & Unsworth, 2000).

It is held that the discourse semantics are realised by lexicogrammar, which in turn has three metafunctions: ideational metafunction for “representing our experience of reality”, interpersonal metafunction for “enacting our social relations” and textual metafunction for “presenting messages as text in context” (Christie & Unsworth, 2000, p. 6). Ideational, interpersonal and textual metafunctions are closely tied with contextual variables Field, Tenor and Mode respectively (see Figure 4.2 for an illustration). According to J. R. Martin (1997), lexicogrammar and discourse semantics are the two stratified layers which realise “content” of meaning.

NOTE:
This figure is included on page 98 of the print copy of the thesis held in the University of Adelaide Library.

Figure 4.2  Stratification of Meaning (from J. R. Martin, 1997, p. 8)

In the present investigation, Field and Tenor have been primarily focused upon for their relevance in the documentation of constructed ‘new-arrival-ness’. Focusing on Field made it possible to identify just what areas of human practices were foregrounded in the adult NAP. As will be explained later, the dimension of Field was explored by primarily focusing on the topics covered in all data sets.
Where appropriate, some techniques of transitivity analysis were used to highlight particular ways “new arrivals” were positioned. Tenor and interpersonal meaning were particularly relevant in pursuing the nature of teacher-student relations being assumed in classroom teacher talk. As will also be explained later, the dimension of Tenor was explored primarily by looking at the discourse semantic system of Appraisal. Where appropriate, other aspects such as modality were attended to. The combination of Field and Tenor was also useful in exploring the general orientation of NAP.

While contextual variables and metafunctions are held as operating within the context of situation, genres are held as the product of the context of culture. According to J. R. Martin (1997, p. 6), genres are “set up above and beyond metafunctions (as a higher level of abstraction) to account for relations among social processes in more holistic terms, with a special focus on the stages through which most texts unfold”. This theoretical stance underpins the analysis of NAP written tasks; it suggests that the nature of the context of culture being enacted in the tasks plays a crucial role in the ways the students engaged with the tasks, and ultimately, in the ways the students were constructed.

As outlined above, SFL has been used for the analysis of individual data at a conceptual level for the focus on Field and Tenor of the adult NAP social context in which the Red Ochre class was located. These SFL-informed conceptualisations are operationalised in an overarching framework that is designed to orchestrate the three data sets.

4.4.2 Overall Analytical Procedure

The framework is based on the theoretical premise that each NAP domain was interconnected. Overall, a multi-dimensional, intertextual discourse analysis was conducted (c.f. Figure 4.1), following Gee and Green's (1998) suggestion to combine a discourse analysis with ethnographically-motivated perspectives. They assert that ethnographic investigation feeds into a researcher’s understanding of discourse in a given setting. They state that “the task of the discourse analyst is to construct representations of cultural models by studying people’s actions across
time and events” (Gee & Green, 1998, p. 125). They use “cultural models” to refer to semiotic resources “distributed across the different sorts of “expertise” and viewpoints found in a group” (Gee & Green, 1998, p. 123), functioning in part as “a plot” that guides members to the predictable patterns and ways (i.e., Bernstein’s “code”).

The general analytical procedure was to work progressively from macro to micro domains of NAP. It was a triple-layered analysis which modelled the Bernsteinian framework of knowledge discussed in Chapter 3: Curriculum, Pedagogy and Evaluation. The first layer of analysis utilised the first data set (NAP documents), and was concerned with exploring the wider NAP curriculum context in which the Red Ochre class students were situated. The second layer attended to pedagogic role-relationship through ESL classroom teacher talk in the Red Ochre class. The third layer of analysis focused on written tasks to explore expectations and assumptions underpinning NAP assessment practices.

Specifically, this procedure adopted and adapted Santoro’s proposal (1999) which incorporates three processes to the analysis of discourse.

(a) an analysis of the language of the text, examining such things as vocabulary, grammar, cohesion and text structure;
(b) an analysis of the context of the production, distribution and consumption of the text;
(c) an analysis of the socio-cultural practices and the ideologies reflected in the discourses of which the learning text is a part
(Santoro, 1999, p. 17)

Situating language as a starting point, her analytical approach follows a progression from more concrete, observable phenomena (a) to reach out for more abstract ones ((b) and then (c)). Adopting these steps as a general course of action, this study applied these steps multiple times in multiple domains of the NAP context. Thus, while progressively narrowing the scope of analysis in progressively narrower cuts of the context, the analysis worked through from language-based data (a) to the understanding of the context (b). Findings from this process fed into the process (c), to gain a deeper understanding of the
emergence of the concept of “new arrivals”. This process is visualised in the figure below.

![Analytical Procedure Diagram]

Each layer of analysis adopted different methods, which are outlined in 4.4.3 onwards. It is to be noted, however, that this chapter is concerned with a general account of the methods only. Analytical procedures for the second layer, on classroom teacher talk, require detailed description of the steps taken, together with the illustrations and exemplifications of analytical categories. Due to the specificity and extensiveness involved, they will be presented in their respective chapters (Chapters 6 and 7).

### 4.4.3 Layer 1: Document Analysis

The first layer of analysis involved document analysis. It was two-fold, as illustrated in Figure 4.1. The first stage was based on the general NAP documents such as programme statements and course descriptions from available sources. The second stage was concerned with the drafts of the NAP curriculum-related documents.

The first stage was aimed at deducing how “new arrivals” were identified across the levels and exploring how the purpose of NAPs was conceptualised. The analysis proceeded inductively by narrowing its scope from the Federal level documents to the State level, and then to the school level ones.
A total of six aspects of the documents were focused upon: programme levels, programme naming, programme purposes, main programme clients, eligibility criteria and client characteristics. Programme levels were explored in the light of stages of schooling that were included in the programme statements. Programme naming was literally about how the programmes were named. Program purposes concerned the stated aims and intended outcomes of the programmes. The constituents of the programme clients were identified by attending to the use of generic immigration labels such as “migrants” or “refugees”. For eligibility criteria, descriptions of the age ranges and visa categories were focused on. Client characteristics were explored by making inferences from the available descriptions about the clients.

The second stage of analysis focused on the ways in which certain aspects of “new arrivals” were foregrounded, generalised and/or essentialised. It also focused on which aspects were assumed, taken for granted or modalised. The analysis incorporated an examination of the overall orientation of the programme, the degree of the agency accorded to the “new arrivals” and the nature of skills and competency assumed or otherwise in the “new arrivals”. To do this, references made to “new arrivals” and remarks on the role of NAP were specifically targeted for analysis. All the instances that contained such references were extracted from both 2005 and 2006 drafts.

Through multiple readings of the extracted data, three key macro terms emerged due primarily to the constant repetition of expressions related to: a) their eligibility for NAP, b) the function of NAP and c) positive and negative references to NAP learners which were later grouped under a broad category of the attributes of NAP learners. The first two terms, a) the eligibility for NAP and b) the function of NAP, were both complementary to the first stage of analysis. Given that the curriculum-related documents were NAP insiders’ materials, it was deemed appropriate to identify how the two areas were described in the documents, and to collate the findings with the results of the previous stage of analysis of official statements. It turned out that this exploration yielded additional and at times contrasting information to the official programme
statements. Such information was selected to make inferences about the assumed “new arrivals” in the curriculum-related documents.

The third macro term, c) the attributes of NAP learners, was investigated through further readings and groupings of extracted references made to NAP learners. Positive and negative references were grouped separately, and references made to similar areas of human practices (e.g., previous schooling experiences, English proficiency) were grouped together. The process was repeated to see whether common themes or noticeable patterns would emerge. While doing this, remarks on English proficiency and adult “new arrivals” were separated from the rest for individual examination. This was done to cover the general research area of the current study, namely, adult “new arrivals” in an adult NAP ESL class. While compiling positive references made to “new arrivals”, the degree of agency accorded to the “new arrivals” emerged as a noteworthy feature. Here, lexicogrammatical features of transitivity were focussed upon to supplement this observation. Transitivity highlighted where in a clause “new arrivals” might be frequently positioned. While examining negative references made to “new arrivals”, expressions involving “need” stood out due to their repeated use. Since “need” was often used as a modality of obligation in the form of “need to”, this modality was focussed upon to identify which participants of the clause it was frequently associated with.

A corpus analysis software, ConCapp (http://www.edict.com.hk/PUB/concapp/), was used as a supplementary tool to conduct the second stage of analysis. Because the amount of information contained in the curriculum documents was vast, it was deemed necessary to employ a corpus analysis software to systematically handle the data. ConCapp has a function of displaying frequency of the use of words and of extracting all the instances of expressions involving a word or phrase of the researcher’s choice. The software was used to identify similar lexicogrammatical patterns, frequent usage of certain expressions and contextually logical corollaries. Such expressions were then keyed in to the software to sort out all the instances which include them. For example, using the example of the modality “need” mentioned previously, it was decided that exploring just who tends to be assigned with
obligations would be potentially noteworthy. However, “need” also appeared in the documents as a noun, as in “individual needs”. In both cases, “need” also appeared in the form of “needs”, either to indicate a third person singular or to indicate plural form. Thus, “need” and “needs” were keyed in to ConCapp to draw out all the instances associated with the word “need”. Individual cases of “need” were then examined separately.

4.4.4 Layer 2: Classroom Teacher Talk Analysis and the Appraisal Framework

The second layer of analysis was concerned with classroom teacher talk, with respect to the nature of the relationship between the teacher and the students being constructed in it. In particular, the analysis focused on the role(s) the teacher was assuming in her own teaching context, and by implication, the role(s) being assigned by her to the students.

The analysis proceeded in an inductive manner. Initially, the macro pedagogic functions of teacher talk were focused upon (Phase I). As Phase I yielded intriguing findings, an additional analysis was conducted to identify more finely the overall orientations of the teacher talk (Phase II). Both phases proceeded in a similar manner: teacher talk was classified into analytical categories, and then the proportionality of the analytical categories was calculated. Based on the proportionality, particularly noteworthy features were further investigated. Some additional remarks on each phase of analysis are made below.

Phase I: Macro-level Analysis

Phase I was a macro-level analysis of teacher talk. It was aimed at profiling classroom teacher talk into major pedagogic functions. In preparation, recorded lessons were transcribed (see Appendix B for transcription convention and Appendix C for transcripts). The transcribed lessons were then cross-examined with field notes for further selection. In the interest of exploring the macro organisation of teacher talk, only the lessons with substantial teacher talk in teacher-fronted situations were selected for analysis. Teacher-fronted situations
were focused on, firstly for the assumed relevance of teacher talk for all the students in class and secondly for the multiplicity of functions that teacher talk served in such settings. Ten lesson transcripts with a majority of teacher-fronted situations were selected for analysis.

Teacher talk was then classified into pedagogic functions. As reviewed in Chapter 3, this method was motivated by the theoretical foundation of the pedagogic discourse (Bernstein, 1990; Christie, 2002) and empirical research findings (Schinke-Llano, 1983) on the pedagogic functions of teacher talk. Categories used for classification were high-inference ones (Chaudron, 1988; Duff, 2007) which require a considerable degree of researcher interpretation in classification. Although high-inference categories tend to be criticised for their potential inapplicability to other research contexts (Chaudron, 1988; Ellis, 1994), it was assessed that delving into teacher talk would require categories that were customised to the particular research context. While the categories were generally based on a Bernsteinean orientation towards regulative and instructional discourses, a set of categories emerged through my intensive engagement with transcripts. Interpretation of teacher talk was supplemented by field notes, classroom materials and my firsthand involvement with classroom activities.

In principle, multiple data coding was allowed. This was to acknowledge the multi-functionality of language (Mehan, 1979) as its significant semiotic feature. There was also a pedagogic consideration that skillfully mixing talk on classroom management and talk on the subject matter is seen as a quality of experienced teachers (Thwaite & Rivalland, 2009).

Phase II: Micro-level Analysis on Evaluative Language Use

This phase was built onto the findings from Phase I. Its focus was on the evaluative use of language underpinning the teacher talk. The analysis employed a SFL-oriented framework of exploring evaluative language use called the Appraisal Framework (J. R. Martin, 1999a; J. R. Martin & Rose, 2003; J. R. Martin & White, 2005; White, 2005b). This framework specialises in exploring the strand of Tenor,
with the premise that evaluative stances constructed through Tenor are critical for
the enactment of human relationships (J. R. Martin & White, 2005).

The Appraisal framework offers a means to illustrate linguistic realisation of
evaluative stance (J. R. Martin, 1997; J. R. Martin & Rose, 2003; J. R. Martin &
White, 2005; White, 2005b). It explores how individuals manipulate available
semiotic resources to construct a particular interpersonal relationship in a given
social context. Its analytical focus includes “how writers/speakers approve and
disapprove, enthuse and abhor, applaud and criticise, and with how they position
their readers/listeners to do likewise”, as well as “the construction by texts of
communities of shared feelings and values, and with the linguistic mechanisms
for the sharing of emotions, tastes and normative assessments” (J. R. Martin &
White, 2005, p. 1). This perspective is pertinent to the exploration of
teacher-student role relationship, since teachers’ expectations carry normative
elements as they overlap with institutional expectations (i.e., norms).

The Appraisal framework takes into account various types of lexicogrammatical
features. It has three simultaneously-operating “interactive domains” (J. R. Martin
& White, 2005) called Attitude, Engagement and Graduation. Each domain
specialises in different aspects of evaluative language use. Attitude identifies
writer’s/speaker’s attitudinal stance, i.e., the positive or negative assessments they
advance. Engagement attends to adjustments of the evaluative positioning with
or without the presence of the listener/reader. Graduation specialises in
adjustments of the degree of evaluation and evaluative stances a writer/speaker
has adopted. Each domain is further summarised below.

**ATTITUDE**

Within the interactive domain of Attitude, evaluations are registered through
means of Affect, Judgement or Appreciation. Affect looks at one’s mental states
foregrounded in relation to a particular phenomenon or situation in which he or
she is located. Judgement foregrounds one’s social or moral considerations on
specific human behaviour or character. Appreciation depicts how a
writer/speaker is responding to a particular phenomenon or situation. Generally,
each means, or “region of feeling” (J. R. Martin & White, 2005), contains both positive and negative evaluative items with differential degrees of positivity or negativity. Each region of feeling is further divided into its respective subregions.

Affect has subregions of “dis/inclination”, “un/happiness”, “in/security” and “dis/satisfaction”. “Dis/inclination” differs from the rest, for it involves intention towards irrealis external agency rather than emotional reaction per se. Affect can be expressed directly with lexis such as “like” in the case of “happiness”, or indirectly with descriptions of behaviour such as “cry” in the case of “unhappiness”.

Judgement has five subregions, namely, “normality”, “capacity”, “tenacity”, “veracity” and “propriety”. The first three (“normality”, “capacity” and “tenacity”) are criteria for social esteem, which is to do with behaviour which is likely to be positively or negatively viewed but which would not be regarded as illegal or immoral. The last two (“veracity” and “propriety”) are criteria for social sanction, which is to do with one’s morality and ethics. Receiving a negative judgement against different criteria will therefore have different ramifications (J. R. Martin & White, 2005). A negative judgement made against social esteem means that an individual is deemed socially incompetent and as such requires assistance. By contrast, negative judgement against social sanction indicates that the individual is deemed trouble-making, or even immoral. Martin (1997) suggests that Judgement can be conceptualised as “the institutionalization of feeling, in the context of proposals (norms about how people should and shouldn’t behave)” (pp. 23-24).

Appreciation consists of three major subregions, namely, “reaction”, “composition” and “valuation”. “Reaction” deals with emotional reaction to things. “Composition” focuses on the ways a given thing is organised, while “valuation” declares the worth or otherwise of a given thing. As with Judgement, J. R. Martin (1997) suggests that Appreciation can be conceptualised as “the institutionalization of feeling, in the context of propositions (norms about how products and performances are valued)” (p. 24). Further, J. R. Martin (1997) observes that “valuation” has a close association with Field due to the fact that
“the criteria for valuing a text/process are for the most part institutionally specific (pp. 24-25).

All three regions of feeling can be expressed either directly (inscribed) or indirectly (invoked). Also, one region can invoke an attitudinal meaning of another region. Interpretation of invoked Attitudes occupies a significant component of the analysis of evaluative language.

**GRADUATION**

Graduation is a set of resources utilised to adjust the degrees of the evaluative positions of a writer/speaker. Broadly, this adjustment is accomplished in two ways; either by customising the intensity of evaluation (Force) or by modifying the precision of boundaries between categories (Focus). These resources are employed as a writer/speaker attempts to control how they come across to a reader/listener in regards to the degree of commitment to a particular evaluation that is advanced. In the case of English, it is held that more resources to intensify the evaluations are available than resources to lessen the evaluations (J. R. Martin, 2003; J. R. Martin & Rose, 2003). Graduation can invoke Attitudinal meanings in some instances (Hood, 2004).

**ENGAGEMENT**

Engagement refers to a variety of means through which a writer/speaker creates a particular interpersonal alignment with the reader/listener. Engagement ranges from investing in a close writer-reader relationship (dialogic/heteroglossic positioning) to a state of disengagement, whereby an attempt to construct a writer-reader relationship is absent (monoglossic positioning). In dialogic/heteroglossic positioning, an alternative point of view other than that of the writer/speaker is acknowledged in some way. There are two rhetorical effects associated with dialogic positioning; either to be open to more than one position (dialogically expansive), or to close the door against alternative positions (dialogically contractive). In monoglossic positioning, the possibility of acknowledging an alternative point of view is non-existent. A writer/speaker can
shift between monoglossic and heteroglossic positions within a stretch of discourse.

This study has primarily attended to Attitude, since this is the area where the teacher’s role relationship with the students becomes salient. However, where appropriate, Engagement and Graduation resources were looked at for their supplementary roles to Attitude. Both influence the way attitudinal meaning is expressed, and it is suggested that Graduation can even be an implicit representation of Attitude. Both implicit and explicit representations of Attitude were identified and coded.

An overview of the Appraisal resources outlined above is presented in Figure 4.4.

NOTE:
This figure is included on page 109 of the print copy of the thesis held in the University of Adelaide Library.

Figure 4.4 Appraisal Resources (from J. R. Martin and White, 2005, p.38)

One significant understanding of discourse underpinning the Appraisal framework is that any interpretation of interpersonal meaning is prosodic (J. R. Martin & White, 2005). Appraisal is seen as “an ongoing cumulative motif” (J. R. Martin & White, 2005), and as such, requires a researcher to deal with any given instance of Appraisal within a stretch of discourse rather than treating each instance separately.

Another significant premise of the Appraisal framework is that multiple interpretations are allowed in analysis. Rothery and Stenglin (2000) point out that
the outcome of the coding in Appraisal, both in its multiplicity and classification, may depend on the analyst’s reading positions. How invoked Attitudes are interpreted depends heavily on the particular value orientation held by an analyst, that is, analysts’ varying sociocultural positioning (Rothery & Stenglin, 2000). J. R. Martin and White (2005) stress that interpretation of invoked evaluation is where difference in reading positions makes a large difference. For this reason, the Appraisal framework is a flexible tool, the precise application of which will be adapted by analysts. Further, this flexibility ensures a given text’s multiple meaning potential at a theoretical level. Appraisal is thus suitable for an interpretivist approach.

At the same time, such theoretical stances make it imperative for an analyst to state upfront the particular reading position that guided their interpretation (J. R. Martin, 1997; J. R. Martin & White, 2005). In this thesis, I primarily adopted the position of a “tactical” reader, that is, “a typically partial and interested reading, which aims to deploy a text for social purposes other than those it has naturalised” (J. R. Martin & White, 2005, p. 62). As explained earlier, I approached data as an international student and applied linguist who was interested in describing, interpreting and explaining the process and the product of the on-going construction of ‘new-arrival-ness’ (Fairclough, 2003). This tactical reading, however, had also taken on a certain degree of “resistant” reading, which is to “oppose the reading position naturalised by the co-selection of meaning in a text” (J. R. Martin & White, 2005, p. 62). As explained in Chapter 1, being an international student with very unstable social, academic and institutional positioning in the research process provoked the exploration of ‘new-arrival-ness’. This research interest was already a commitment to not take the meaning arising out of the text as background to research but to critically examine the meaning-making process. Based on this reading position, Judgement and Appreciation within Attitude were given significance for their evaluative qualities. My hybrid reading position also provoked an interest to read many instances of Affect and Appreciation as invoking Judgement.
4.4.5 Layer 3: Written Task Analysis

Analysis of written tasks was based on a discourse analysis approach supplemented by SFL understandings of genre and lexicogrammar. The analysis had the overall purpose of identifying expectations behind the tasks and their potential influence on students’ texts. As a preparation, all the documented written tasks were examined from a year-long perspective. This was to find out what principles were behind their arrangement. Topics and associated text-types were cross-referenced. After the preparation, the analysis focused on the final assessment task, an expository genre. This task was selected firstly for the presumed potential of equipping the students with the resources and skills to craft their own arguments and secondly for the topic selection. Topics were analysed from the viewpoint of contestability. While an ethnographically-driven, contextually plausible interpretation of the topics was taken into account, the topics were also analysed from the perspective of lexicogrammar. Lexicogrammatical features attended to were participants of the main clauses, process types from Field, and Mood choices, modality, voice and polarity from Tenor. These features were examined to highlight the patterns governing the assortment of the topics. The nature of the relationship between the assigned topics and the target text-type was examined in the light of how the “new arrival” students might be positioned in relation to the topics. Where appropriate, a comparison with its lead-up task was made.

4.5 Ethical Considerations

All the participants of the study were informed of the purpose of the recordings. The students all consented to participate in the study and voluntarily signed the consent form. Interviews with the students outside the lesson time were conducted on a voluntary basis.

Due to the particularities and sensitivities associated with the current qualitative case study, due care has been taken to protect anonymities of the research participants. All the names appearing in this thesis are pseudonyms. The students’ names and other individuals’ names other than teachers’ were replaced with their
initials. Also, as noted in 4.3.1, a ‘buffer zone’ was created between the time data was being collected and the time this thesis is issued. This was to ensure the protection of the participants’ identity.

4.6 Reliability of the Study

It has been observed by Lincoln (2002) that establishing criteria for trustworthiness of the research findings is an ongoing process in a qualitative, interpretive research tradition. With this in mind, the present study aims to establish grounds for “interpretive validity” (Duff, 2007), which is “the judgments about the credibility of an interpretive researcher’s knowledge claims” (Gall, Gall and Borg (2002), cited in Duff, 2007, p. 176).

This study does not claim the generalisability of its findings. Instead, following Duff’s (2007) view, this study proposes its validity and trustworthiness in terms of the representativeness of the case within a wider research context. The Red Ochre class was nominated as the research site for an exploration of the world of adult NAP by the very institution in which it was situated. For this reason alone, certain grounds can be established for the representativeness of the group. Because no two classes are the same, this class’s potential peculiarities are simultaneously representing the nature of a NAP class when seen from an historical perspective. Any particular distribution of demographics, gender, language proficiencies or prior formal educational experiences represents how dynamic an on-arrival migrant education classroom is. Focusing on one classroom makes it possible to present a snapshot of what was the case at a particular point in time. Having a long-term practising teacher in the field of migrant education is another reason to claim the representativeness of the case. It can be assumed that many aspects of her teaching reflect her years of experience with a variety of immigrants. In this sense, the case of the Red Ochre class would not be a one-off case which would have little trace of the past development of NAP. Rather, it represents a case at a particular point in time, with continuity with other contemporary adult NAP cases. In addition to all these, the analysis of general NAP documents has been incorporated so as to situate the Red Ochre class within the wider framework of NAP.
Also, the present study sought to establish internal consistency in the data analysis as grounds for trustworthiness (Duff, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998). Rather than aiming at an exact way to conduct research again in other contexts, the research intended to devise methods which would best describe what was happening in the particular data set. One strategy to achieve internal consistency was the utilisation of multiple data sets. Data were collected from multiple levels of NAP and findings were collated. Findings deriving from high-inference categories employed for teacher talk analysis were further explored with an established, rigorously linguistic analytical framework (i.e., Appraisal). Such an analysis not only corroborated the findings with the preliminary ones but also highlighted the linguistic underpinning of the claims. Another strategy taken to achieve internal consistency was to come clean with the particular perspective I took as a researcher, while acknowledging that there are multiple reading positions available. Although my readings derive from the particular subject position I had at the time, they also emerged from my “prolonged engagement” (Lincoln, 2002, p. 330) with participants and data during the course of research. The contribution of this investigation is therefore to offer an internally consistent, plausible reading of the data, which may not be congruent with NAP practitioners and curriculum designers alike.

Still, there is a possibility that what has been observed and interpreted in this particular case does not necessarily correspond to what occurs in other adult NAP classes. It is therefore acknowledged that what is observed in this thesis may remain unique until further studies are conducted.

4.7 Conclusion

This study adopted a qualitative case study approach. A case study approach was suitable for the scope and scale of the current research, with a specific, single group of participants in a specific NAP setting. The study was set up as an interpretive inquiry to present one of the possible interpretations of the data from a semi-outsider’s point of view. This setup suited the current research focus for its inductive stance and commitment to gain insights into the social process surrounding the particular group of “new arrivals” under investigation. It also
provided a congenial theoretical basis upon which I present my interpretation of the data with the particular subject position I brought into the research. The research involved a group of students in an adult NAP classroom and their homeroom/ESL teacher as participants. Data were collected primarily through ethnographically-driven methods such as classroom observations and additional school visits. NAP documents, classroom teacher talk and written tasks were analysed individually from the viewpoint of how the “new arrivals” were constructed. A general orientation to data analysis was an ethnographically-motivated discourse analysis informed by an SFL understanding of language and context including Appraisal. Each layer of analysis had its own framework and procedure customised to address its respective dimension of the NAP context. The findings from each layer of analysis will be presented in the following four chapters.
CHAPTER 5
“NEW ARRIVALS” CONSTRUCTED IN THE OFFICIAL PROGRAMME DOCUMENTS

5.0 Introduction

In Chapter 2, I illustrated the fluidity of the category “new arrivals” in historical and geopolitical terms. I suggested that understanding how this term has come to be used to describe particular people requires documentation of a specific context in which this occurs. Based upon the discussion of the theoretical framework in Chapter 3, written materials on “new arrivals” have been accorded the potential to cement a particular configuration of meanings attached to the term “new arrivals” and, by extension, the people it refers to. As a first step of analysis, it is important to explore the macro context in which the particular case study class is situated. This chapter is aimed at achieving this through attending to the representation of “new arrivals” in public New Arrivals Program (NAP) documents at national, state and school levels.

The analysis in this chapter is two-fold. Section 5.1 looks at general information on NAP available through websites and widely distributed brochures. The overall aim for doing this is to illustrate their contribution to the fluidity of the concept “new arrivals”. Specifically, the analysis explores how far an outsider can narrow down the concept of “new arrivals” by accessing this information. Section 5.2 is concerned with the NAP curriculum documents and aims to explore what characteristics are attributed to the “new arrivals”, the clients of the program. Findings are discussed in Section 5.3.

5.1 Identifying “New Arrivals” in the Official Programme Statements

Analysis of the general programme statements at the federal, state and school levels suggests that each level provided a slightly different definition of eligible
students. The positioning of adult “new arrivals” within the programme changed as levels became more specific. The nature of the programme for adults also shifted as their positioning shifted.

5.1.1 At the Federal Level

In 2006, at the federal level, a “new arrival” was defined by Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST) (2006a) by target educational stage, language background and visa status. Being primarily administrative categories, these elements are general in nature. Below are excerpts from the DEST website. Emphases appearing on this and other excerpts in this chapter are my additions unless otherwise noted.

…intensive English language tuition to eligible newly arrived migrant primary and secondary school students. The Programme aims to improve the educational opportunities and outcomes of newly arrived students of non-English speaking backgrounds… (DEST, 2006a)

Eligible students include Australian citizens, permanent residents, minors under any part of the Australian Government's Humanitarian Program, holders of certain provisional visas granted under the Business Skills Category of the Australian Government's Non-Humanitarian Migration Program or holders of a Removal Pending Bridging visa. (DEST, 2006a)

The federal definition of “new arrivals” in the English as a Second Language – New Arrivals (ESL-NA) left many of the details open to interpretation. What constituted “primary” and “secondary” students was undefined, while the position of adults (18 years or older) within the scope of the programme was unclear. The word “minors” attached to one of the visa groups indicates that the age factor was involved. Yet information about whether this is only applicable to

---

4 Due to the restructuring of the Federal Government since December 2007, the Department of Education, Science and Training’s (DEST) has been replaced by the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR). Although DEEWR launched its website, in early 2009, DEEWR was also utilising much of DEST’s contents without yet changing their URL (i.e., starting with www.dest.gov.au/). In this thesis, any information initially obtained through the former DEST website before December 2007 is acknowledged as DEST’s material. Any information obtained through the DEEWR website after December 2007 is acknowledged as DEEWR’s material.
“any part of the Australian Government’s Humanitarian Program” was not available on the website. Thus, the target educational levels could be defined either exclusively in terms of age, the record of formal education or the competency level possessed by an individual. Also, the term “migrant” had a context-specific definition which may not have been compatible with other contexts. The elaboration of visa eligibility in the second excerpt suggests that some provisional visas counted as migration, but overseas student visas did not count (see DEST 2006b).

However, there is an indication that empirically-generated meanings were operating in conceptualising “new arrivals” both tacitly and explicitly. For example, simply coming from a “non-English speaking background” did not constitute a sufficient condition for eligibility. What counted as “non-English speaking background” is the level “requiring intensive assistance to enable the student to participate fully in mainstream classroom activities” (DEST, 2008). In addition, the programme's stated aim “to improve the educational opportunities and outcomes”, incorporated the implication that the English proficiency of “new arrivals” would impinge on their access to education. This generated a picture of “new arrivals” struggling in education due to their inadequate English proficiency.

Therefore, despite defining “new arrivals” primarily for administrative purposes, the basis of defining “new arrivals” in Federal terms is to be found in the empirical domain.

5.1.2 At the State Level

At the state level (Department of Education and Children's Services (DECS), 2005, 2006b), some federal definitions related to the programme were overruled, and additional features were added. Some additions were in accordance with the illustration (Figure 2.2) in Chapter 2. They include the incorporation of adults into the NAP sphere, or the division of NAP into three levels (Primary, Secondary and Adult Re-entry/Senior Secondary) instead of two. In addition, newness to Australia was articulated to be “less than 12 months (18 months
for students in Reception and year one) of stay in Australia (DECS, 2006b). Despite departing slightly from federal definitions, these definitions were essentially administrative in nature, and were not specific enough to paint a clear picture of “new arrivals”.

In fact, there was a rather arbitrary combination of “age”, “English proficiency”, “prior schooling experience” and/or “ability” operating across the three levels of NAP for students’ classroom placement. This suggests that depending on levels, different aspects of “new arrivals” were foregrounded. At the primary level, age was the main factor in class placement (see DECS, 2006b). Reference to English language proficiency was absent. Instead, “ability” was brought in as an additional parameter for the students’ post-NAP class placement, but without specifying its relationship with English proficiency.

**Primary New Arrivals Programs**

Newly arrived students of primary school age are catered for in small classes within designated mainstream schools. Classes are organised by age, and enrolment may take place from a learner’s fifth birthday at any time during the school year. Classes are staffed by specially trained English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers, and students are taught all areas of study in English, in order to prepare them for exit to mainstream classes appropriate to their age and ability (DECS, 2006b).

At the secondary level, age lost its primary status in class placement, and a combination of English proficiency and the students’ prior schooling experience was given priority (see DECS, 2006b).

**Secondary New Arrivals Programs**

…caters for newly arrived ESL students between the ages of 12 and 18 years. Students are assessed on their enrolment and placed in classes according to their English language proficiency and their level of previous schooling. They are also placed in one of three learning pathways (DECS, 2006b).

Prior schooling experience was a newly incorporated criterion which was not used in the primary NAP. Notably, at the adult re-entry/senior secondary level, no information was available concerning the class placement.
Adult Re-entry New Arrivals Programs

A one year intensive English language instruction course is available to newly-arrived students over 18 years of age at the adult (NAP) re-entry college. Students will be able to access a range of options on completion of the NAP course including further study, vocational education programs and employment (DECS, 2006b).

The case of adult/senior secondary level is particularly noticeable on two grounds. First, both English proficiency and prior schooling experiences were left unmentioned. Their roles in enrolment as well as class placement were either implicit or not assumed. Second, instead of administrative elements, the attitudinal element of “wishing to participate in full-time study” (DECS, 2005) was added as a condition for enrolment. By virtue of the above compulsory education age, “adultness” plays out in a way that one’s willingness to study weighed more than administrative elements.

Further complicating the picture of NAP students at the state level was the broadened eligible visa categories. A DECS brochure (DECS, 2005) hinted that temporary visa holders were conceptualised as NAP students, by stating that “[s]ome categories of temporary visa holders are not eligible for the New Arrivals Program, or may be required to pay a fee”. This suggests that a migrant = “new arrival” equation did not hold in this South Australian context. In fact, a recognisable number of non-migrant students, that is, students holding a student visa were enrolled in NAP programs across South Australia in 2006 (e.g., DECS, 2007c). School-age children of international students were also granted eligibility for NAP (see, The University of Adelaide, 2009).

In addition, the relationship between age and educational level was tenuous. Two sources of government information (DECS, 2005; 2006b) provided discrepant information regarding program names and eligible age ranges for two out of three NAP levels. In the first source (DECS, 2006b, hereafter “Website”), the second level NAP was defined as between the ages of 12 and 18 years, and the third level as over 18 years of age. By contrast, in the second source (DECS, 2005,
hereafter “Brochure”), the second level was defined as “from 13 to 17 years of age” and the third level as “over 17 years of age” (see Table 5.1).5

The discrepancy in cut-off age for the third level NAP resulted in the discrepancy in its naming. The website termed the third level “Adult Re-entry”, while the brochure termed it “Senior Secondary” NAP (see Table 5.1). The reason for not using “adult” in the brochure is obvious; their third level NAP included students of 17 years of age who were not adult.

Table 5.1 Programme Names and Eligible Age Range on the Website and Brochure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Brochure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary New Arrivals Programs of primary school age from a learner’s fifth birthday</td>
<td>Primary New Arrivals Program from 5 to 12 years of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary New Arrivals Program between the ages of 12 and 18 years</td>
<td>Secondary New Arrivals Program from 13 to 17 years of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adult Re-entry</strong> New Arrivals Program over 18 years of age</td>
<td><strong>Senior Secondary</strong> New Arrivals Program over 17 years of age</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such a naming change alters the semantics of the third level NAP. “Adult Re-entry” foregrounds the notion of “adult” individuals returning to study rather than levels of education achieved. By contrast, “Senior Secondary” foregrounds the educational level rather than students’ age. The latter naming was ambiguous, since it could be read as providing “senior secondary level education” (i.e., Years 11 and 12). These semantics have implications for what is on offer in the programme, impacting on the eligible individuals whose biological age happens to be in-between the levels. Depending on which information they access, those aged between 12-13 and 17-18 would find different information on which courses they were eligible for.

5 A revised version published in 2007 altered the second level age range to “12 to 18 years of age”, but still retained “over 17 years of age” as the third level age criterion.
Thus, the information on NAP at the state level yielded more complication than clarification. As the programme was expanded to three levels, the eligible individuals for NAP (i.e., “new arrivals”) also expanded. Clearly, the term “new arrivals” was still used as an umbrella cover term, with added diversity in terms of age. Although some clarifications were found, these clarifications were simultaneously a source of confusion. Adults were part of the NAP clients at this level, yet their positioning within the wide educational sphere was ambiguous, not least because there were discrepant sets of information.

5.1.3 At The College Level

The College-specific information on NAP redefined in its own terms some of the elements attributed to “new arrivals”. First, the concept of “adults” was clearly articulated as their main clientele in The College 2005 and 2006 curriculum handbook. Adults were defined administratively in terms of age, together with other administrative elements that were essentially a reproduction of the DECS’ Website description.

**PREREQUISITES**

To enrol students must

- be permanent residents or on long-stay visas with permissions to study in Australia
- have been in Australia less than 12 months
- be 18 years or older.


However, as with the naming discrepancies identified at the state level, potential discrepancies in adulthood were found in other sources of information. The College’s website stated that the programme was for “adults and mature young people”, rendering adults as different from mature young people. With the definition of “mature young people” being absent, all that can be observed is that “adults” was used with a loose definition.
Second, a redefinition had occurred in the term “migrants”. Instead of grouping “adults” altogether, The College’s general NAP brochure spelt out that their “new arrivals” consisted of “refugees” and “migrants”:

The New Arrivals Program (NAP) offers an intensive English language and literacy course for newly arrived refugees and migrants. It aims to prepare students for living and working in the community and for further study. (The College Brochure)

For the first time, the category “refugees” was used separately from “migrants”. Accordingly, “migrants” was used in a narrower sense than observed thus far, and consisted of non-refugees:

Newly Arrived

\[
\text{Migrants} = \text{migrants} + \text{refugees} + \text{others}
\]

(Federal) (The College)

Figure 5.1 Stratum of “New Arrivals”

The categories “migrants” and “refugees” were used as mutually exclusive. Setting “refugees” as separate from “migrants” reflects that The College empirically recognised these two categories as discrete. Moreover, placing “refugees” before “migrants” in their programme statement suggests that “refugees” were viewed as The College’s primary clientele rather more than “migrants”. However, the phrase “with permission to study in Australia” implies the possibility of having economic migrants or overseas students who entered Australia with student visas. This element was at odds with the categorically stated “refugees and migrants”.

Another major redefinition of the key concept concerns the students’ future pathways. The wordings in the state-level information and in The College handbook were in contrast with each other.
Adult Re-entry New Arrivals Program
... Students will be able to access a range of options on completion of the NAP course including further study, vocational education programs and employment.
(DECS, 2006b)

COURSE DESCRIPTION
The New Arrivals Program (NAP) ... aims to prepare students for living and working in the community and for further study.

Although referring to the same course, the order of purposes was slightly different from each other. “Further study” came first in the DECS document (DECS, 2006b) while “living (in the community)” came first in The College handbooks and “further study” came last. This may reflect that DECS’ goals were more education-oriented than The College’s.

Such a difference in stance can make a significant difference in the primary purposes the programme was organised to achieve, and by implication, what the institution viewed as learners’ area of need. However, much of the information on the course or nature of students was left implicit. One such instance was the double strands of “English language” and “(English) literacy” set for the course (see an earlier quote in p. 111). These expressions merely implied that the students were seen as needing intensive care for English language and literacy, yet the relationship between the two strands was not retrievable from the statement. Neither was it possible to grasp the degree of proficiency in English nor the literacy levels aimed at.

Thus, at The College level, further complication in the use of key terms was noted. A distinction between “refugees” and “migrants” was made, possibly indicating the institution’s primary concern was “refugees”. This is in addition to the loose definition of adulthood. Also noted was the possibility of The College prioritising living in the community over further study. Despite the changes, these new elements still left room for grasping what the target learner population would be like.
Analysis of the public NAP statement at three different levels has shown that not everyone used the term “new arrivals” in the same manner, and many of the key terms and concepts appearing in the documents suffered from definitional inconsistencies. Different stances and approaches have been noted between different levels. This indicates that institutional differences in the ways they make sense of the nature of NAP and NAP students might have significantly influenced the way “new arrivals” were represented. Yet much of the empirical diagnosis of the students was unavailable in such administratively orientated documents. This point will now be pursued by zooming into another document that was expected to contain much more empirically-generated information on “new arrivals”: drafts of State official curriculum provision.

5.2 “New Arrivals” Constructed in the Official Curriculum Provision

The first part of this section (5.2.1) continues with the definitional issues of “new arrivals” and some key concepts for NAP. Each curriculum provision draft will be referred to as “the 2005 draft” and “the 2006 draft”, based on their respective year of production. The second and third parts (5.2.2 and 5.2.3) describe how the “new arrivals” were represented in the same documents.

5.2.1 Through Eligibility to NAP

Analysis of the references made to enrolment in NAP in the 2005 draft yielded a picture of “new arrivals” more complicated than the publicised information analysed in 5.1. The “new arrivals” were described here in terms of three key elements, “eligibility”, “target group” and “cultural background”, and depending on the element chosen, the emerging picture of the “new arrivals” was altered. Note that “extended eligibility” indicates a longer duration of enrolment granted to the relevant students, not the scope of eligibility.
4. Newly arrived students

Newly arrived ESL learners are defined as those who meet the Commonwealth **eligibility** criteria. The **target group** of students are

- newly arrived permanent residents with minimal or no English and no previous schooling in Australia, enrolled in a school or New Arrivals Program within 12 months of arrival in Australia.
- temporary residents with visas under the Humanitarian Program, ... within 12 months of release from a detention centre
- permanent residents entering schooling in Reception or year 1 within 18 months of arrival.
- some categories of temporary residents.

The ESL Program may be consulted to approve individual students to enter into a New Arrivals Program. For instance, **eligibility** may be granted for some students born in Australia, such as Aboriginal learners with minimal English. **Extended eligibility** may be granted for students who have had limited or no schooling in their country of origin or for those who have been severely traumatised. (2005, p. 3)

“Eligibility” and “target group” were presented as slightly different entities, the latter included in the former. The “eligibility” was initially defined by “Commonwealth criteria”, mostly corresponding to those defined at the Federal level (see 5.1.1). However, “eligibility” was soon made flexible in two ways. It was extended to include temporary protection visa holders who would otherwise be ineligible for on-arrival English programmes (Hinsliff, 2006), as well as certain Australian-born students. In the South Australian educational context, then, the element “newly arrived”, originally understood as the first and foremost prerequisite, turned out not to be a necessary condition to be eligible for NAP.

Seen this way, one would note that the “target group” functioned as original “eligibility”. Although primarily defined by administrative elements (e.g., visa status), the shift in semantics was such that the students falling into the “target group” were not just eligible but were, in fact, the focus of the program. Interestingly, two kinds of specific information, “with minimal or no English” and “no previous schooling in Australia”, were connected together and

---

6 The 2005 draft had multiple page number systems applied and altered as the editing process continued. Because of this, specific page numbers supplied here are based on the then latest page numbers.
specifically attached to the first group of targeted students (i.e., “newly arrived permanent residents”). This was the first time reference was made to lack of schooling experiences, and in this draft these experiences were specified as those gained in Australia. Yet whether these traits also applied to the rest of the targeted group was unclear. If one strictly follows the wording and assumes that only the first “targeted” group carried such traits, the other three kinds of students would automatically be eligible irrespective of their English proficiency or schooling experiences in Australia. The absence of English proficiency and schooling experience might not have been necessary preconditions for defining a “new arrival”.

The third element, “cultural background”, appeared in a later section of the 2005 draft. It was used to emphasise the importance of enrolling in NAP.

Any student from non Anglo Celtic background, regardless of ESL Scale, should access NAP until NAP can determine their needs and to allow the student to have their transition needs met … (2005, p. 24)

“Non Anglo Celtic background” was used as a factor that could broaden the “eligibility” of NAP, while simultaneously characterising the Australian schooling system as Anglo-Celtic. This statement was at odds with the administratively defined “eligibility” of limited English language proficiency. After identifying “non-English speaking background”, “limited English language proficiency”, “requiring intensive assistance for participating in mainstream schooling” and “no previous schooling experiences (in Australia)”, this statement overturned all of them. The distinction based on incoming students’ cultural background (i.e., Anglo-Celtic or otherwise) was based on a hierarchical cultural division which set Anglo-Celtic culture as superseding others. Clearly, NAP was not concerned with the newly arriving individuals with Anglo-Celtic background. However, NAP was so concerned with the students with non Anglo-Celtic background that it even disregarded their English language proficiency or duration of stay in Australia. These students were urged to invariably enrol in NAP, with a sense of moral obligation as evidenced by the use of “should”. “Non Anglo Celtic background”
now functioned as a superseding criterion to determine the “obligation” rather than “eligibility” of enrolling in NAP.

Also altered was the causal link between “entry eligibility” and the function of NAP. Previously, the process was that certain individuals who meet the criteria would be identified as needing certain assistance, and then come into NAP to receive the instruction that NAP offers. It was now the other way round; NAP would determine whether or not a particular individual needed assistance, and that a wider range of people were urged to come into NAP to be assessed.

Interestingly, there was also a factor of “spatial availability” nominated as potentially overriding the NAP’s authority to require certain students to stay in NAP.

Students may need to be exited sooner than desirable if places are needed for new students entering the centre (2005, p. 24)

This could be read as a side effect of opening the NAP entry gate wider than originally designed; it necessitated the ‘fudge factors’ to function, so that the length of stay in NAP would become flexible. It is interesting that spatial limitation beat non-Anglo Celtic cultural background, which in turn beat English proficiency or prior schooling experiences.

Based on the above observations, “new arrivals” were considered cultural outsiders. Meanwhile, the specific references to “new arrivals” were removed in the 2006 draft. This draft only stated eligibility as “[m]ost new arrivals from non-English speaking backgrounds with minimal English”. This signals the possibility that the whole conceptualisation of eligible/target/focused students in NAP became implicit.

5.2.2 Through the Functions of NAP

The picture of “new arrivals” arising out of NAP’s stated core content was full of description of needs. NAP set out to focus on the students’ “self”, on the
premise that “[t]he degree to which schooling validates the wholeness of the learner is a key to successful learning, particularly for new arrivals” (2006, p. 6). Thus, the core content of the NAP set “self” as the starting point, and the “self” was situated at the inner most circle as seen in Figure 5.2 below.

This concept of “self”, however, was understood in relation to a set of learner needs rather than “self” itself. The drafts conceptualise learning as shifting from “self” to “the world”, and “cultural knowledge and understanding” and “language” were seen as consequential to this shift (for a fuller excerpt, see Appendix E-1). Under this scenario, the priority of learner needs was conceptualised in terms of the distance between individual needs and the new arrivals’ “self”. Accordingly, “initial critical needs” were identified as “personal information/needs”, “clothing” and “body parts”, which constitute the key topics to be addressed. The recommended sequence of curriculum was based on such perceived learner needs:

… the curriculum scope and sequence is guided by
- a hierarchy of needs which may begin with physical and emotional needs and move gradually to broader world issues
- beginning with the concrete and moving to the abstract (2006, p. 7)

Clearly, the focus on “self” in NAP was built upon a particular version of self. This “self” was connected with the need to deal with “physical and emotional
needs” before developing capability to learn more abstract and objective matters. Therefore, a logic can be built that so long as learners continued to deal with their “physical and emotional needs”, their development would not count as advanced. A parallel can be established that “physical and emotional needs” were linked to the “self” entity, which was conceptualised as a beginning, undeveloped and “the concrete” end of a curriculum continuum. Likewise, “broader world issues” was linked to “the world” entity, which was the most advanced stage and perceived as “abstract”. Being placed at the opposite ends of the continuum, the “self” and “the world” were segregated.

Thus, understanding of the self, claimed as the starting point of NAP, can be seen as a particular construct by NAP. Both the excerpt cited above and Figure 5.2 show that what was concrete and what was abstract were both predetermined, with the assumption that, initially, learners can only deal with concrete matters associated with them. Thus, despite its claims, it does not seem that NAP spheres were set up to validate “the wholeness” of the learner with an open hand.

Further, both drafts indicate that the “new arrivals” were constructed through the challenges they face. The basic pattern of discourse in the drafts was to first identify the challenges and then to profess the NAP purposes as responding to these challenges. In return, NAP was thus constructed as responsive in nature, and the fundamental role of NAP was envisaged as helping “new arrivals” tackle the problematic issues they were likely to meet.

NAP students’ primary challenges were conceptualised as “becoming familiar with new socio-cultural contexts and expectations, a new schooling system and a new language while managing loss, navigating belonging-ness and developing new friendships” (2006, p. 6). By implication, “new arrivals” were thought to be struggling to carry out these processes. The same mechanism applies to identify the learners’ relationship with “social skills”. The 2005 draft stated that NAP “work[s] explicitly on social skills both as communication skills and protective behaviour” (p. 23), implying that the program did not assume that the “new arrivals” would already possess adequate social skills. Learners were viewed as lacking communication skills and protective behaviour.
The issue of “social skills” was further elaborated in relation to language. The dominance of “Standard” Australian English was accorded the status of an indispensable asset for doing almost anything in Australia, at personal and school levels both for a student and a society member (see Appendix E-2). Ramifications for not possessing this asset were predicted as both disadvantage and inequality, as the example below:

> Without proficient language skills it is very difficult to demonstrate understanding, express one’s view and be heard on a par with language proficient peers (2005, p. 3)

NAP learners were viewed as lacking (Australian) English language skills and thus not recognised as “on a par” with “language proficient peers”, implying native speaker peers. This is where the primary purpose of NAP emerged as “to prepare all learners for equitable, effective and active participation in Australian society” (2005, p. 6). This cements an image of the learners as lacking readiness for equitable/effective/active participation in Australia.

### 5.2.3 Through Learner Attributes

Numerous references were made in these drafts to “new arrivals”, most of which were charged with the either positive or negative attributes that the “new arrivals” were perceived to carry with them. These will be discussed here through four focal elements: learners’ assets, liabilities, English proficiency and adultness.

#### 5.2.3.1 Assets

The representation of learners’ assets took several forms, each highlighting a particular attribute of “new arrivals”. The references to the learners’ assets included “capabilities and skills” and predictions of “success”, as well as some of the diversities among them.

However, “new arrivals” were often positioned as passive contributors to their own development. In a Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) terms, their position in the clause was often “Beneficiary” as opposed to “Actor”, as in the
first instance below, or was contracted as deictic qualifier, as in the second instance.

Each New Arrivals Program Centre will:
- prepare new arrivals for success in the school curriculum
- develop their [new arrivals’] confidence to live in the Australian community
(2005, pp. 4-5)

The participant placed in the “Actor” position was “each New Arrivals Program”, indicating that NAP was the primary “doer” to make success and development occur. Within such a construct, the recognition of the learners’ assets became the teachers’ obligation, as can be seen in the following instance.

Teachers need to perceive their learners in this positive light and engage their learners in the strengths that they have even where the structures in society do not have this same value. (2005, p. 14)

Here, the marginal role of “new arrivals” identified at a lexicogrammatical level resonated with the marginality of their assets as assessed at a societal level. Although it was presupposed that learners possess certain strengths, it was also presupposed that such “strengths” might attract little valuation. Indeed, as the following instances show, some assets were presented only to be discredited by the negative attributes that followed.

Some students have developed a great deal of world knowledge yet have gaps in the content knowledge valued in Australian [sic] schooling system.

Some students who have received formal education through their first language may adapt more readily to formal academic use of English yet may have difficulty communicating appropriately for social purposes (2005, p. 9)

Ultimately, learners’ assets were simultaneously suggested as liabilities in that privileged backgrounds were viewed as not enough to allow adaptation to the new environment, and even as negatively impinging on their ability to do so.
Some of our new arrivals also come from privileged backgrounds. This may impact on their ability to adapt to new structures (2005, p. 10)

There was a focus on the potential disservice that certain backgrounds cause to “new arrivals”. In this sense, “privileged background” was represented as no less handicapping than its logical antipode, “unprivileged background”. Then, it is perhaps a ‘logical’ consequence that learners’ achievements were portrayed as partial:

As a result of a range of factors including prior educational experience and learning style preference, some students will be strong orally and others strong in reading and writing (2005, p. 9)

The above instance contained a prediction of how certain “factors” would result in differential, yet equally partial, development in students’ language competency. Predicting different areas of strength that students would develop in language use simultaneously implied their areas of weakness. This observation can be further backed up by the fact that the drafts made no reference to the possibility of students developing all areas of macro skills successfully.

In the end, learners’ ultimate achievement to be able to exit NAP was constructed as merely constituting “ineligibility” for NAP:

Students are no longer eligible to attend a new arrivals program when they have achieved sufficient language skills to successfully exit from a NAP centre / school or...
(2005, p. 4)

Achieving proficiency in NAP was placed in a dependant clause, which indicates that it was not the main focus in this statement. Learners’ achievement merely functioned as a marker of “ineligibility” to enrol in NAP.

Based on the above observations, a trend has been identified that references to the learners’ assets were used here effectively to position the learners in a particular way rather than function as an appraisal of the assets.
5.2.3.2 Liabilities

Turning to the reference to learners’ liabilities made in the drafts, “new arrivals” and their contextual equivalents were frequently identified by three key words: “difference”, “diversity” and “needs”. In what follows, how these key words functioned to generate the liabilities of the “new arrivals” will be illustrated.

Differences
The first key attribute, “difference”, had its contextual equivalent “variety”. This attribute had the following seven types of meaning (see Appendix F for a table with full instances excerpted from the drafts):

1. Difference among learners
2. Difference of learners from the norm
3. Difference of second language (L2) learning from first language (L1) learning
4. Difference in the range of practices learners learn/experience/access A – learning challenges
5. Difference in the range of practices learners learn/experience/access B – instructions
6. The combination of 1 and 2
7. Difference as a theoretical construct – not related to the students

In general, whichever “difference” was mentioned, “new arrivals” were painted negatively. “Difference” was used to foreground certain aspects of “new arrivals” as reference points to make comparisons with the perceived ‘norm’ presumably held by English-speaking Australians from “Anglo-Celtic backgrounds” in the mainstream education and society. This was most saliently witnessed in Type 2 and Type 3 “differences”, as summarised in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2 Subcategories of Type 2 and 3 “Differences”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linguistic forms</td>
<td>“language script”, “word-order and word-formation”, “written form”, “language – interlanguage and errors”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural practices and norms</td>
<td>“cultural/school expectations of the use of language”, “expectations in the role of parents/caregivers”, “expectations in the nature of communication between home and school”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational systems</td>
<td>“teaching styles”, “educational systems and its practices”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ progress</td>
<td>“potential (slow) rate of progress”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The identified “differences” were invariably presented as students’ learning needs simultaneously, thereby painting the “new arrivals” as deficit. An illustrative instance of this is a reference to a “potential (slow) rate of progress”:

They desire, as do all other learners, to become increasingly independent individuals. However the rate of progress can be different than with L1 learners. NAP learners need to have their progress acknowledged even if the rate of progress is slow (2005, p. 11)

After acknowledging the NAP learners’ morale, the 2005 draft quickly added a comparison between “new arrivals” and L1 learners in terms of the speed of progress. This paints NAP learners as potentially lagging behind at school, thus requiring understanding and encouragement to keep making efforts. In the end, even their morale was painted as shaky since its maintenance was not viewed as at the learners’ own discretion. There was a hint of condescension in the suggestion that learners would maintain their morale if the teachers do them a favour.

In contrast, “differences” in linguistic forms conveyed a more implicit representation of “new arrivals”.

Nap [pɪ] learners will develop an interlanguage. … which needs to be recognised as a legitimate and valued stage of learning. It should not be seen as incorrect English or a poor attempt at English. (2005, p.11)

In learning English errors will occur. There needs to be a balance between correcting errors [æ] to ensure learners maintain enthusiasm to use the language. (2005, p.15)

Although such remarks may first appear to instruct the NAP teachers to accept the difference and deviations of their students in a favourable light, there is more to the story. The above instances shared the common pattern of presenting shared assumptions before specifying attitudinal stances. By presenting “interlanguage” and “errors”, they first confirmed that learners were far away from ‘standard’ or ‘norms’. This was followed up by anticipatory remarks that these deviations would be commonly perceived negatively. These remarks were themselves assumptions, yet here they operated as premises. Instruction to the
teachers to accept the existence of deviation was based upon these premises. Thus, attempts to promote learners’ motivation by structuring the teachers’ perception and attitudes were simultaneously the representation of learners’ shortcomings. Similar patterns were also found in Types 4, 5 and 6 “differences”. Significantly, putting forward the assumption that learners’ efforts would be received negatively had another effect: it constructed (mainstream/new NAP) teachers as potentially lacking sensitivity towards, and experiences in, accepting learners’ developing language use.

**Diversity**

The second key attribute “diversity” was mostly mentioned in the light of the learners’ diverse needs rather than their diverse abilities. The use of “Diversity” and its equivalents, such as “range”, “number” and Type 1 “difference”, fell into three themes of “recognition”, “factors” and “support and services”. “Recognition” corresponds to acknowledging diversity as the state of affairs. Then, while “recognition” tends to be neutral or positive in orientation, “factors” encompass the negative portrayal of learner diversity which was perceived to impinge on students’ learning. “Support and services” concern instances of society’s response to recognised diversity among “new arrivals” in the form of providing services (See Appendix G for a table with examples).

Under “recognition”, many references were made to accentuate the learners’ peculiarities. Whilst some instances showed positive variety (see first instance below), diversity was often translated into diverse “needs” (second instance below). Instances under “recognition” were linked with teaching strategies.

- to bring awareness that the learner has **many** skills (2005, p. 13)
- Support and value students’ language and cultural background and their **unique and individual** needs, interests and life experiences (2005, p. 26)

These instances show that the recognition and valuation of learners’ diversity were subject to a teacher’s attitude towards variation from the norm. They also show that even the learners’ positive recognition of their own heterogeneity was conditional on the teacher’s contribution. This pattern was consistently identified
even where “new arrivals” were recognised as possessing assets to enrich the society’s diversity:

...many new arrivals, ... contribute to the cultural and linguistic diversity of the schools and society. Where this is embraced positively, our new arrivals are benefit of [sic?] the school, community and society (2005, p. 10)

While initially commended as possessing contributing factors to social diversity, as it turned out, “new arrivals’” contribution, or their value, was viewed as dependent upon positive support from others. Similarly to the case observed in the learners’ “differences”, conditionalising the positive embracement of learners’ “diversity” construed schools and society negatively. Implicit in the wording was an assumption that people in the mainstream were generally not adept at recognising the potentially valuable diversity that NAP learners might bring in.

References to diversity as “factors” were largely made based on the rhetoric of cause-effect relationships between learners’ diversity and its potential impact. Diversity was viewed as affecting educational providers as well as “new arrivals” themselves in multiple ways, and thus often portrayed in a negative light. Affected aspects of educational providers’ experiences included DECS State strategic plan, the nature of the curriculum, and NAP teachers’ skills. Affected areas for “new arrivals” included their length of stay in NAP, as well as degrees of access to the curriculum and/or learning.

Among those factors attributed to affecting students’ experiences, one notable pattern was the illustration of how being in “contact with others of diverse backgrounds and the new culture”, might impact on the nature of the learners’ attitudes and outcome.

Their world views are changing and broadening through contact with others of diverse backgrounds and the new culture affecting the way that learners approach learning in their environment, how they apply their creativity, wisdom and enterprise and how they work to develop these skills, limited by their expertise in English (2005, p. 13)
The use of the definitive article “the” with “new culture” connotes that the culture referred to that of mainstream Australia. Because “the new culture” was listed with “others of diverse backgrounds” in a parallel manner, “others” seems to indicate fellow NAP learners rather more than unspecified individuals. The use of “affecting” indicates that, once again, diversity was located within a cause-effect relationship, that of learners’ diversity and its potential impact. Interestingly, this was framed in the very first statement “Their world views are changing and broadening”, which implied that learners’ initial worldviews would be narrow in the first place. Also, the use of “limited by” clearly indicates that the potentially positive impact of diversity would be tainted by the students’ lack of English proficiency. Similarly to the observation made on “assets”, the position of “new arrivals” at a clause level was passively constructed.

A further negative portrayal of diversity-as-“factors” was found in the drafts where it was explicitly stated that “[s]ome of these elements of diversity are risk factors to their accessing the curriculum”. The instance below exemplifies how a reference to diverse experiences was represented negatively:

Adult new arrivals have also had a range of employment experiences. Some adult new arrivals have for example been in positions of great responsibility. Coming to a new country and having to learn a new language can be a disconcerting and disempowering experience (2005, p. 10)

Having a range of employment experiences was seen as potentially doing disservice to certain adult learners, rather than, say, helping them to navigate and cope with new environments. There was a contrast established between being “in positions of great responsibility” and “coming to a new country and having to learn a new language”. The former implies being in a position to direct others, which was presumably the position that some learners were enjoying prior to their arrival. By contrast, the latter connotes being directed by others, which was supposedly the position that these learners would face. Also, whilst acknowledging the latter as the potentially disconcerting and disempowering experiences for “new arrivals”, the draft addressed these experiences objectively, treating them as observable phenomena that would simply happen sometimes.
**Needs**

Learner needs were the most salient area in which “new arrivals’” assumed liabilities were spelt out in detail. To begin with, learning objectives were described as “transition needs”, that is, a list of achievements that “new arrivals” have to demonstrate before joining the mainstream:

- acculturation to Australia society including transition to money, road and safety rules and procedures, child welfare
- familiarity with Adelaide
- Australian idioms: the on arrival assessment may not necessarily capture the students' understanding of Australian idiomatic language. Access to Australian cultural practices is advantaged by such familiarity
- study skills especially where students are coming from an education system which emphasises rote learning instead of research and problem solving
- IT skills: students with high language level may not necessarily have the level of skills and confidence in IT that the Australian schooling system requires
- Australian history / geography / civics and law: Australian schooling system assumes considerable knowledge about Australia
- level of trauma: students with a strong educational experience and skill in English but who have experienced trauma – we have had instances of students who do not speak and experience significant anxiety when enrolled directly into mainstream schools but who are able to flourish in NAP centres
- degree of variation in oral and written ability. Most assessments are based on written work, but students with strong control of written English may require significant development of oral language. (2005, p. 24)

As in the case of learner’s assets observed in 5.2.2.1, learners’ skills were continually understated to emphasise the required skills and knowledge. There were assumptions underpinning some of the elements on the list, and they were unproblematically held as generally well-accepted cases. For example, there was a dichotomy established within “study skills”, where some “systems”, presumably synonymous to “countries” or “societies”, would be solely based on “rote learning” and others on “research and problem solving”. In this construct, a rote learning oriented country was assumed to be paying no attention to research and
problem solving, and vice versa. Clearly the former type was portrayed negatively in the light of the latter. Thus, learners with rote learning skills were deemed limited in the light of a “problem-solving” tradition, which Australia would presumably fall into.

A similar pattern can be observed in the case of students’ “high language level” and “the level of skills and confidence in IT that the Australian schooling system requires”. The way the reference to IT skills was made indicates clearly an assumption that Australia has a markedly high standard of IT skills. Not only that, it was unproblematically held that the students in this nation’s mainstream education system uniformly possess the high skills and confidence in IT, which itself might need qualification. Even so, NAP learners with “high language level” were questioned as to whether they possessed IT skills that would match general students in Australia. Their “confidence”, which is an unquantifiable notion, was also questioned.

In addition to the above elements, learners with strength in written English were understated as needing to develop their oral competence. Even the effect of initial assessment of the learners’ English skills was discounted to emphasise the indispensability of teaching Australian idioms.

All the arguments above were negatively charged. There was an assumption that learners were likely to be less competent than they first appeared. Also, a comprehensive listing of requirements formed a check list of what counts as a mainstream learner, and individual elements as hurdles for the learners to surmount. It is as though there was the message that unless learners satisfy all of the items listed above, they would not be recognised as fully-fledged members of mainstream education, let alone functioning competently.

Another way that the “needs” were identified was the use of the modal verb of necessity (i.e., “need to”). This had at least four variations in positioning learners, as summarised below.
1. “Learners need (to do) something”. Learners were positioned as either “Actor”, “Behaver” or “Senser”.
2. “Learners need to be taught something”. Learners were “Goal”.
3. “Something needs to be taught (to learners)”. Learners were again “Beneficiary”, and their positioning was often implicitly conveyed.
4. “Teacher needs to do something (to learners)”. Learners were again “Goal” of the teacher action and their positioning was conveyed implicitly.

Learners were positioned as powerless and unknowledgeable in all these variations. For example, in the first pattern, despite being positioned as Actor, they were painted as powerless (see below).

Set clear expectations for classroom and school behaviour to support the safety of all learners. Most new arrivals will need ongoing support to adapt to the expectations (2006, p. 7)

Here, learners were doubly disadvantaged because they not only had to “adapt” themselves to institutional expectations but also needed “ongoing support” to achieve it. Ultimately, “new arrivals” were constructed as not even adept at ensuring their own safety.

The second pattern also portrayed learners as passive and lacking in knowledge. As can be seen in the examples below, an understanding of bias and stereotypes, and appropriate ways of managing conflict must come to learners:

New arrivals also need to be taught how bias and stereotype woks [sic] in the Australian context so that they are able to challenge the images and messages around them (2005, p. 13)

The notion of conflict and managing conflict differs [sic] with different cultures. NAP learners need to be taught what it means to handle conflict appropriately, in linguistic and paralinguistic terms, in the school and Australian context (2005, p. 14)

A similar pattern was observed with the third and fourth variations, although quite often learners were invisible in the wording. These variations sometimes
contained a more extensive portrayal of learners’ limitations. For example, the example below advances a suggestion for “explicit” intervention into the learners’ future pathway choices.

The choices that new arrivals see for their future can be determined by family and personal needs and the level of knowledge of the range of choices and trends. These may need to be explicitly taught. Knowing how privilege and status works in Australian society is crucial to decision making. This is as much about the importance of valuing all future options as it is about exploring who accesses the “privileged” jobs. Exploring new options can be threatening to new arrivals and… (2005, p. 15)

Subsequent references to the knowledge of privilege and status imply that these elements were not at the new arrivals’ disposal. With the remark of the potential threat that the widening of future options might cause to the learners, the above excerpt was virtually saying that “new arrivals” were not up to achieving privilege and status.

Similarly, combining two patterns of “need to” in one passage functioned to accentuate the probable incompetence and lack of knowledge of the “new arrivals”. This is particularly seen in the case of the concept of “sharing”:

The concept of interdependence as sharing may be difficult for [some] and moving learners to sharing in the classroom context may need to be deliberately taught. On the other hand, learners also need to be taught that sharing and helping can be abused and/or misunderstood eg in some learning contexts collaboration is not always valued (2005, p. 14)

Through focusing on knowing when and how to share and when not to, a particular way of sharing (or not) was set as an unchangeable default. It was in relation to this default notion of sharing that learners’ knowledge on this point was naturally assumed to be lacking.

As observed thus far in these texts, learner need was translated into what the host society saw as necessary for the learners to know. Thus, “needs” functioned as gate-keeping elements in the case of “transition needs”, and as illustrations of
specific learning areas in the case of the modal verb of necessity. Most importantly, both cases detailed what “new arrivals” do not know.

Yet there was a third way to describe learner needs, and this was by making explicit reference through foregrounding what “new arrivals” were perceived not to know. This was done directly, as seen in the first instance below, as well as indirectly, as in the second instance.

NAP students may not know what is considered appropriate nor have the linguistic tools to communicate in the appropriate way (2005, p. 26)

The importance of volunteer work may be new to new arrivals (2005, p. 14)

Stressing the significance of certain activities was also an indirect means of stating what was lacking in the “new arrivals”, as well as making specific reference to what was to be developed:

Excursions are crucial to the work of new arrivals. Excursions provide essential orientation to the community and are the basis for the real purposes of developing English language. (2005, p. 23)

begin to build critical awareness of the power relations that exist in everyday existence and the wider society and develop the strategies or communicative competence to challenge social practices of marginalisation eg how to respond to teasing (2005, p. 13)

build the range of strategies that learners have for identifying their own successes, to get support, to handle threatening situations and/or lack of success…Protective Behaviours practices, assertiveness/I statements, grievance procedure, conflict resolution (2005, p. 13)

Learners were construed here as in need of various strategies or competencies. In the second instance, such strategies and competencies were associated with countering marginalisation and teasing. Yet this is equivalent to saying that learners were not yet able to take effective action. Besides, by implication, they were viewed as likely to be subject to marginalisation and teasing. Similarly, items listed in this third instance can be viewed as a list of learner liabilities. The fact
that they were listed in this way is evidence that learners were understood as not being able to carry out any of these competently.

To sum up, in line with the overall purpose of NAP to be “responsive” to the “needs” of the “new arrivals”, learners’ attributes were more often described as liabilities than assets to learning and mainstreaming. The liabilities appeared in a number of forms including differences, diversity and needs. Many of the “needs” of the “new arrivals” are presented in the light of challenges and difficulties, of which the lack of control over English was perceived to be a part.

5.2.3.3 English Proficiencies

Learners' English proficiencies were also described as their liabilities. The 2005 draft emphasised how low their entry and exit ESL Scales were from the “Curriculum level”, that is, the “standard” level required for participation in the mainstream curriculum. This applies to both “Language” students (those who had considerable schooling experiences) and “Literacy” students (those with limited schooling experiences), although the latter group’s Scales were further below the ‘standard’.

Table 5.3 Entry ESL Scales of “Language” Students Listed in the 2005 Draft (p. 24)

NOTE:
This table is included on page 143 of the print copy of the thesis held in the University of Adelaide Library.

7 The 2006 draft did not contain information on Scale. However, this appears to be due primarily to the fact that the 2006 draft was undergoing an intensive redrafting process. The Scaling information has reappeared in all the published versions since 2007.
One notable aspect of the portrayal of “new arrivals” through their exit Scales is the seemingly low expectations placed on their English. As shown in Table 5.4, despite much lower than “Curriculum” levels (see Table 5.3), specific Scales were presented as “reasonably happy” Scales for the NAP personnel. For example, for “language” students exiting to join Year 10 to 12 levels, Scales 6 to 9 were presented as “reasonably happy” Scales, while the curriculum level was 14 (see Table 5.4). It is immediately noticeable that these Scales were to be positively appraised by the teacher's emotional reaction. Their entry Scales were recognised as anything between 0 and 10. Setting the default range of the NAP students’ English proficiency in this fashion suggests that the NAP personnel do not usually expect to see higher Scales in relation to these students.

Another notable aspect of references to the Scales is that English proficiencies were not necessarily presented as the indicator of the distinction between “Language” students and “Literacy” students. Both cohorts were thought to demonstrate lowest Scales (i.e., Scale 0), yet the difference was that the former cohort was thought to demonstrate a wider range. Again in the case of those exiting into Years 10-12, the 2005 draft showed the NAP entry Scale ranges of the former group as all the Scales from zero to 10, that is, from practically no English to the highest eligible Scale for NAP. By contrast, the latter cohort was represented as demonstrating a much smaller range of Scales, that is, from zero to 2 (see Table 5.5).

Presenting NAP students’ exit Scales as significantly lower than “standard” continued to be practised, and, in 2007, their deficit exiting NAP Scales were
subsequently presented upfront, providing grounds for their increased needs (see DECS, 2007a).

Table 5.5  Entry and Exit ESL Scales of “Literacy” Students Listed in the 2005 Draft (p. 25)

Moreover, in these drafts, possessing “high” Scales did not automatically lead to the recognition of learners’ capabilities. As the excerpts below show, “High” Scales were not valued unconditionally, and could even be discounted to give grounds for NAP support.

It must be understood that the Scales indicated here are not exclusionary but that even students at high Scales require NAP support (2005, p. 24)

The students with high Scales levels are still best served in NAP centres rather than mainstream schools, on entry to Australia (2005, p. 24)

Thus, references to English proficiencies in the 2005 draft presented two conflicting views on the “new arrivals”. They were by default limited in English, and perceived to require NAP. Yet because they would need more support anyway, they needed to enter NAP even when they scored higher than the default. In a way, this is consistent with the case of eligibility investigated in sub-section 5.2.1,
where almost all the administrative criteria were overturned by the cultural background.

5.2.3.4 ‘Adult-ness’

Perhaps reflecting their unique status in the programme, adult learners were marginally positioned in the macro context of NAP. Only a small portion of the drafts had specific reference to adults. Visual representations of the NAP students in the 2005 draft did not feature adult NAP students. Their visual appearance in curriculum-related documents would have to wait until the 2007 officially published version.

In addition, almost any reference to adult “new arrivals” was concerned with their liabilities. Adults were represented as having specific, undesirable attitudes, as underlined below, as well as needing various support, as italicised.

Notions of best interest shifts as they understand more about the new country and culture. For some adolescents and adults in the initial freedom they experience and money they have access to propels [sic] them to pursue entertainment as an initial priority and they will need to learn some sense of responsibility. Other new arrivals will begin with unrealistic expectations of the opportunities that will be available to them and understanding the process of learning a language and the education system is important to their understanding of realistic choices. On the other hand new arrivals who have experience [sic] trauma begin less optimistically and may need specialist support to regain their optimism.

(2005, p. 14)

The three instances quoted above all represented adult “new arrivals” negatively. The first foregrounded a lack of financial literacy skills in certain adults, rendering them as irresponsible. They were clearly portrayed as negatively affected by their newly gained “freedom” and access to money. The second instance represented certain adults as possessing “unrealistic expectations”, implying that they were probably incapable of achieving their desired outcomes, and that they were likely to be unaware of it. The third instance represented certain adult “new arrivals” as being potentially so pessimistic that they would require psychological support. Thus, if too liberated and excited, their sense of responsibility comes into
question. If too optimistic, they will have an unrealistic assessment of their own ability. If too pessimistic, they will be subject to mental pathology. Either way, adults’ problems were the focus of pedagogic attention.

In the drafts, adult learners received less attention in relation to their pathways. References to the pathways for adult students were absent in the 2005 draft. These were ingrained in the case of “secondary school aged” students.

Exit pathways are age dependent but may include:
- mainstream school
- re-entry school
- senior secondary education
- work
- tertiary education
- home duties
(2005, p. 25)

The first three pathways were not mutually exclusive, and they were all applicable to certain secondary school-aged individuals. Only the expression “age dependent” implies that adults were included in this context. Based on this, their positioning in NAP can be seen as either a subset of secondary school-aged students, or as a minor group that required no independent section for their pathways.

In sum, adults were accorded minor status in NAP, and when specifically referred to, they were palpably portrayed as lacking knowledge and skills.

Thus far, it has been observed that NAP learners’ academic success and achievement were consistently viewed as limited or partial. However, much to the contrary of this observation, a normative scenario was provided in both drafts, that “new arrivals” would eventually become happy in their new environment after facing culture shock and difficulties (see the figure below).
There was an assumption that eventually these students would be “happy and able to cope” and/or “settled in the community”. This view is at odds with the pessimistic predictions about language proficiency development and academic achievement identified earlier. There was a conceptual leap from NAP learners’ limited success and mountainous challenges to eventual settlement with happiness.

5.3 Discussion

The representations of “new arrivals” identified in the curriculum-related document drafts highlight a paradox in the conceptualisation of “new arrivals”. What was presented as the case with “new arrivals” were, in actuality, more like educated guesses based on seemingly homogenised generalisations. The representations were made by reference to past “new arrivals”. The drafts were essentially responding to understandings of the past and, based on these, making projections to future cases. From what could be observed from the drafts, however, the references made to “new arrivals” seemed rather impressionistic. Other than ESL Scales there was little quantification or qualification of remarks made to the traits of “new arrivals”. Given the nature of the documents, the
understandings that were most likely to be reflected in the drafts were those of a selected minority of NAP practitioners and administrators. Being largely an essentialisation of past cases, these representations may not be applicable to present or future cases. Besides, as explored in the first part of this chapter, there was little consensus as to who counted as “new arrivals”. Presenting a generalised representation of “new arrivals” was at odds with the term’s elusive definition.

Unfortunately, however, the nature of the documents makes the representations of “new arrivals” sound concrete and timeless (Iedema, 2000). The very purpose of the documents was to offer a frame of reference for future cases through representations of these learners. The degree of specificity and details attached to the liabilities of this group was such that subsequent “new arrivals” were presented as likely to match the predictive description. The drafts constructed a close relationship between the needs of “new arrivals” and the functions of NAP; the pedagogic approaches advanced in the drafts were to attend to the selected liabilities of “new arrival” student groups. It was as though the drafts (particularly the 2005 version) were attempting to produce checklists of all the areas that needed to be covered.

To some extent, generalisations and the essentialisation of the liabilities of the “new arrivals” is understandable. The drafts necessarily orientated their perspective towards the teacher-practitioners’ task, given that the documents were directed towards teachers. Specific descriptions of “new arrivals” and their needs, in this sense, reflected earnest efforts made to highly contextualise the duties of the NAP teachers. However, it was out of these efforts that NAP curriculum provision documents unwittingly represented “new arrivals” mostly in a negative light.

Unwitting or not, the potential impact of presenting a linguistically realised overview of NAP in light of student deficits warrants attention. The target readers were newly starting NAP teachers, and the primary purpose of the drafts was to induct these new teachers into the ethos of the programme. That is, the drafts were written with the premise that the represented views on “new arrivals”, and the pedagogic necessities presented, be taken up by the NAP practitioners.
This is bound to make the dominant representation of “new arrivals” prevail. At the same time, the ways “new arrivals” were represented effectively maintains the social division between “new arrivals” and NAP teachers. As the acculturation process for “new arrivals” was painted with so much need and obligation, teachers and learners were positioned at opposite ends of the rope: the teachers as representing the host society, and the learners as seeking entry to that host society.

Such representations of “new arrivals” appear to be symptomatic of the era of “mainstreaming”. To detail the challenges and needs of “new arrivals” in the process of mainstreaming, the logic had to start by first positioning the “new arrivals” outside the norm. “New arrivals” were painted as typically deficit, limited and needy. This happens to run counter to the drafts’ emphasis to “avoid contexts which encourage stereotyping and mono-cultural bias and support flexibility” (The 2005 draft, p. 13). Because the starting point of the learning areas tends to be deficit, having high expectations seems hard to come by. The issue lies not so much in whether or not to provide negative accounts of “new arrivals” in specific detail as to how this was done and in what balance.

5.4 Conclusion

Document analysis of official NAP programme statements depicted that “new arrivals” were not only vaguely defined but also differently defined across federal, state and school levels. This provides evidence for the earlier claim made about the elusiveness of “new arrivals”. The curriculum-related drafts offered insights into the empirical meaning of “new arrivals” that were largely inaccessible from widely publicised programme statements alone. This confirms that those engaged in NAP practices may share a view on just who the “new arrivals” are, while simultaneously suggesting that a specific NAP setting operates with its own configuration of “new arrivals”.

Further analysis of the drafts of the South Australian NAP curriculum-related documents has revealed that the scope of understanding of “new arrivals” could be much wider than the administrative definition of the official programme
statements. There was indication that “cultural background”, backed up by “English proficiency” and “Australian mainstream schooling experiences”, was the primary parameter for defining “new arrivals”, rather more than, or possibly irrespective of, a person’s chronological newness to Australia. “New arrivals” were consistently positioned outside the norm. They were represented as essentially deficient, limited and needy. Their role in their own learning was that of passive contributors, powerless in deciding what was appropriate or what was necessary for them. These trends were exacerbated with adult “new arrivals”. Significantly, such representations were informing pedagogic guidelines. The drafts positioned NAP students and teachers in oppositional terms, with the teachers being constructed as representing the host society, Australia. An underlying logic was that, ultimately, a “new arrival” is one that needs to accommodate with the host society. Accommodation by the host society would occur for the purpose of making “new arrivals” accommodate through education.

At this stage, only a tentative observation can be made that such representations have the potential to reflect NAP practices. It is possible that NAP classroom practices may yield a different picture of “new arrivals”. For this reason, the next two chapters will focus on what was happening in the classroom, by attending to teacher talk in the case study NAP ESL classroom.
CHAPTER 6
“NEW ARRIVALS” CONSTRUCTED THROUGH
TEACHER TALK (PART I):
Macro Pedagogic Functions

6.0 Introduction

Document analysis in the previous chapter illustrated that the general stance of New Arrivals Program (NAP) was to approach “new arrivals” as having deficiencies in what they know or what they have learnt. In the present research context, such a view of a NAP learner in the curriculum documents was both the representation of and constitutive of current NAP pedagogy. Such findings motivated me to explore whether or not the deficit model of NAP student learning was indeed operating in the current NAP pedagogic practices. One aspect of NAP pedagogic practices to be focused on is classroom teacher talk. The main purpose of analysing classroom teacher talk is to explore how a NAP teacher constructed her role in a classroom, and by implication, how she constructed the “new arrivals” in the classroom.

The present and following chapter present analysis of classroom teacher talk. This chapter concerns the first part of NAP English as a Second Language (ESL) classroom teacher talk analysis from a macro point of view, while the following chapter will follow up the findings from this chapter and conduct a micro level analysis of the selected aspects of teacher talk. Due to this inductive nature of the analytical process, each chapter will incorporate explanation of analytical categories specific to that chapter before presenting findings and discussion.

As a macro-level analysis of teacher talk, this chapter focuses on the distribution of pedagogic functions employed in the teacher talk across lessons. The chapter is divided into four parts. The first part (6.1) will present the analytical categories and procedure used in identifying macro pedagogic functions of teacher talk. The
second part (6.2) will present findings, and the third and fourth parts (6.3 and 6.4) discuss implications for the construction of “new arrivals”.

6.1 Profiling Classroom Teacher Talk: Analytical Categories and Procedure

6.1.1 Analytical Categories

Analytical categories were generated through attending to spans of teacher talk. The primary focus for profiling teacher talk at this stage was to explore the proportionality of its pedagogic functions. The categories used for analysis were Behavioural Management, Managerial, Norm-Setting, Social, Life and Sociocultural Information and Linguistic and Literacy Focus.

The generation of these categories was informed by a Bernsteinian perspective of pedagogic discourse (Bernstein, 1990; Christie, 2002). As previously reviewed in Chapter 3, Bernstein (1990) conceptualises pedagogic discourse as comprising regulative discourse and instructional discourse. The first is to do with “rules of social order, relation, and identity” and the second is to do with “rules of discursive order (selection, sequence, pace and criteria)” (Bernstein, 1990, p. 108). Within a Systemic Functional Linguistics approach, Christie (2002) has adopted and customised Bernstein’s concepts in classroom discourse analysis. Linguistically, close analysis of classroom discourse in these terms is to explore linguistic realisations of the two discourses. Broadly adopting the distinction between regulative and instructional discourses, the first four categories (Behavioural Management, Managerial, Norm-Setting and Social) are the subcategories of regulative discourse, while the remaining (Life and Sociocultural Information and Linguistic and Literacy Focus) are the subcategories of instructional discourse.

The application of a more delicate set of taxonomies to regulative and instructional discourses was based on the rationale that such an approach would be better suited to analysing NAP ESL classroom teacher discourse. As flagged in Chapter 3, the subject matter of ESL could be elusive, and instructing daily life
matters and regulatory concerns might conflate in NAP classroom pedagogy. It is expected that subcategorising regulative and instructional discourses helps to identify what constitutes primarily pedagogic concern in a NAP ESL class and what aspect(s) of regulative discourse were prominent in teacher talk.

Below are definitions and exemplifications of each category.

6.1.1.1 Categories 1: Regulative Sub-types

**Behavioural Management**

Behavioural Management talk literally refers to kinds of talk used for managing learners’ behaviour. It was typically of “here-and-now nature”, aimed at achieving instant effects of fixing the learners’ (mis)conduct to restore classroom order and ensure smooth lesson operation. It is the immediacy in its effect and the violation of rules that distinguished Behavioural Management talk from Norm-Settings (to be defined later), although in practice these two categories quite often co-occurred. Examples of Behavioural Management talk are:

(after saying “SM is is coming but he has to ( )”, with gestures to quiet down the students) “Okay okay okay o” (30 September)

(in the middle of explaining “Then we’ve got err “jobs”, “employment”, and “training””, to hush a student) “MR (a student’s name)” (30 September)

“…are you all listening?” (21 October)

As the instances show, the lexical items often do not contain linguistic clues for identifying Behavioural Management talk. Also, talk of this kind was often brief, containing only a few words and was employed abruptly when the need arose.

**Managerial Talk**

Managerial talk was used to describe types of teacher talk serving to manage the classroom operation. It covered a wide range of management practices such as making announcements, scheduling, time-keeping, previewing or reviewing classroom activities, assigning tasks or managing the learning resources. Examples of this talk are provided below.
Announcement

“Umm, in a minute I need to make a phone call to Erica, err you know the teacher from the other class. Umm so I'll be out in a moment. …” (5 August)

Scheduling

“…And then, err after that, we're going to do some excursion preparation…” (5 August)

“okay, well, shall we listen to TS gives her oral presentation now?” (1 July)

“No, our work this morning is um in a couple of different parts to begin with, …” (1 April)

Reviewing prior activities

“So we looked at the structure, we looked at the language features. Then we did this work; …” (16 September)

Time-keeping

“Okay, one more minute.” (6 May)

“So, this morning, we’re going to work until…ten past nine…” (21 October)

Managerial talk also included setting up particular learning activities or tasks.

“So the students who are doing the recount…need to finish that. The other students have got a number of different things that you can do. …” (1 April)

“When you finish all the answers to the exercises … <cut>… You need to turn to the back of the book and you need to check your answers. If, you, when you are checking your answers, if you’ve got something incorrect, something not correct, with a…highlighter, I want you to highlight that on your page” (21 October)

Switching between different types of Managerial talk was common, as the following example shows:

“… You finished? Mmm okay, okay so you finished? Right. Okay. I'll talk to the people who finished in a moment. The, other students, umm if you got this from last term, then you continue with it” (21 October)
The underlined segment of talk was classroom management in general, while the remaining referred to a specific task. However, in the interest of exploring pedagogic functions at a macro level, fine distinctions within Managerial talk were not made.

**Norm-Setting Talk**

Norm-Setting talk was the type of teacher talk aimed at presenting values, beliefs, attitudes and behaviours that were considered to be conventional, usual, socially acceptable or desirable. Norm-Setting talk also functions to present what were held as socially unacceptable or undesirable. Norms conveyed in such talk covered a wide range of domains of life in and out of educational spheres. Norm-Setting talk varied in its degree of abstraction. It can be dealing with attitudinal or conceptual matters, as seen in the instances below:

“"You know this is not a test where if you make a mistake you are in trouble; that's not the situation, is it? It will help you realise how much you remember, and if you don't remember about one of the verbs, then all this test does is it says to you, "I must check this again". …” (6 May)

“…Umm and in FACT, it is such an opportunity, WE, we Recognise this opportunity so much, that WE, the College PAYS. You pay five dollars and the college pays five dollars for you to go. That's how much, how important we think it is. You know; that's a lot of money for the College, to be, be paying. Because there's TWO hundred students, in the New Arrivals Program. So how much money is that? …Thousand dollars!” (19 August)

Both instances contain multiple norms that are being set. In the first instance, a normative conceptualisation of the nature of the test is presented in terms of what the test offers to student learning. However, this is a part of a longer stretch of Norm-Setting talk which also incorporated a socially favoured attitude towards classroom tests (on verbs) as well as an approved test-taking behaviour to adopt. In the second instance, there are at least three kinds of norms being set in an intertwined manner: an appropriate conceptualisation of the Show as a huge opportunity to learn; socially expected attitude (i.e., be grateful and/or obliged) towards the College's subsidy of the students’ entry fee; and the recognition of $1,000 as a lot of money.
Norms cover a wide range of matters outside educational contexts, as can be seen in the instances below:

you know, wra, how to write children’s books. It’s a GREAT thing, a lot of people are doing that. (1 July)

you know, you know, there’s a LARGE NUMBER of people in Australia who are, "SHE"…You’re asking HT, GI and I? Who is higher? “SHE”! No, “SHE”?…Oh, you mean, a higher number? Women…women. Men men die earlier. Men die earlier. They AREN’T as strong as woman. And women survives much longer. (21 October)

In the first instance, the teacher is endorsing the greatness of writing children’s books. This is a call for the learners to value children’s book writing much in the same way. As for the second instance, although it may first appear to be the teacher’s personal view, there are some contextual factors that signal the norm-setting element of the talk. The class was overwhelmingly dominated by male students, with only one female student. Also, one-third of the students were Sudanese. Due to such factors, the second instance of teacher talk can be regarded as a norm-setting talk in which women are seen as at least having a high standing.

Teacher evaluation of the immediate matters or circumstances was identified as Norm-Setting talk in that a particular way of looking at the circumstance/phenomenon was expressed. It can be explicit, in the first example below, while it can be subtler and cumulative, as the second example:

“Well, everyone, that was the nicest thing for me to walk in and see you all talking like that. That’s fantastic! It’s better when I go away, you relax a bit more and you all get together and talk” (6 May)

(Referring to the number of absence in class on the day) “But… What’s happened? I just don't understand it, but it's not…<cut> AK is NEVER away…<cut> This is this is a bit of a…bizarre thing, isn’t it? We’ve gone from having a class of twenty four…<cut> This is unbelievable, isn't it?” (30 September)
Further, Norm-Setting talk can express a specific conduct as seen in the instance below:

“You can talk and work together. Okay?” (2 September (2))

While this first appears as Classroom Management, it was interpreted as beyond that; it can be seen as positively endorsing collaboration as positive behaviour. Part of the reason why such an instruction was interpreted as norm-setting is that conduct such as sharing or collaboration were nominated as a learning area in the curriculum-related documents. In other words, endorsing specific conduct in specific settings reflects that such conduct has not been held as norm in this class. Further, articulating certain conduct as a norm signals its tentative/context-specific nature; specifically endorsing talking and working with peers in one setting implies that such working style is not always accepted or encouraged.

Norm-Setting talk was identified in terms of its relative saliency of the expressed norms. Unlike Behavioural Management talk, Norm-Setting talk had intended effects and relevance not restricted to immediate circumstances. In other words, Norm-Setting talk was not so much concerned with restoring the classroom order as framing and transforming the students’ ways of thinking and behaving. Also, this function is conceptualised slightly differently from Life and Sociocultural Information talk in that there was more than “informing” involved.

**Social Talk**
Social talk was the type of teacher talk concerned with achieving social purposes such as greeting or casual social chatter.

(Talking about a particular bus route) “Is it? Ah your home is the last stop? Oh okay. You’re lucky, aren’t you?” (2 September (2))

Social Talk deviates from other functions since it does not contain pedagogic objectives as such. Nevertheless, it is included under the broader
conceptualisation of regulative discourse due to its potential to create, adjust and transform social relations between the teacher and the learners.

6.1.1.2 Categories 2: Instructional Sub-types

Life and Sociocultural Information

This category referred to the instances of teacher talk that provided students with cultural information on various aspects of life and environments surrounding them. Teacher talk of this type had two major focuses. One focus was to initiate students into a new world through offering information that was seen to be new to the students. Information includes aspects of a new way of life in a new country based on a different paradigm. An example from the data is the teacher providing information on the subject, Stage 1 ESL:

“Err in Stage 1 ESL students do six assignments a semester. Um, at least six, usually six. And, of those assignments, some of them are a combination of written work, spoken work, and presentations” (21 October).

This type of Life and Sociocultural Information talk was subcategorised as Life in a New World. The phrase “a new world” was utilised here to encompass various notions of world that Australia represented and, by implication, the world learners were unfamiliar with. Various aspects of life are covered in this type of talk, ranging from abstract concepts such as democracy to more concrete matters such as educational pathways.

Another focus was to advise students of specific skills for life. An example is note-taking skills:

“when we list something, how do we write it? … do we go along the line? Right, one, under under the other. So you would write um here, and here, and here, and then if you haven’t got any space, um come, and make a list, in another column. Right? Umm, but DON’T write sentences. There’s no time for that” (2 September (1)).

This type of teacher talk was subcategorised as Life Skills Coaching. Like Life in a New World talk, “life” and “skills” covered various concepts. For example, “life”
may be life as a student in one instance, whereas in other instances it may be life of newcomers to Australia. Teacher talk of this type was generally action-oriented, while Life in a New World talk contained information without necessarily having “coaching” elements. Adopting individual learning styles, managing tasks mentally and choosing weather-appropriate clothes were all included in this type of teacher talk.

**Linguistic and Literacy Focus**

This category was used to identify instances of teacher talk that contained linguistic and or literacy instructions. A lot of instances identified in the data were explicating the meaning of lexical items:

“We had the word “relay”. A “relay” and that’s where one after the other you do something one after another. …” (6 May)

However, talk of this type also occurred at a text level, as can be seen in the specifications for composing a text:

“Umm umm in the introduction you write down whether, you know, you write down whether you agree or you disagree. Your feeling about this. …” (16 September)

As seen above, kinds of talk profiled in this category were typically concerned with the use of target language, English, at various levels.

**6.1.2 Analytical Procedure**

After coding, total numbers of occurrences of each pedagogic function were calculated based on the number of clauses/clause chunks (for a study adopting a similar basis of calculation, see Gruber, 2004). Since identifying units of analysis for spoken discourse is a complex enterprise (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004), a set of rules was applied to classify spoken discourse into countable units.

The rules are as follows:
- Independent clauses were counted as separate clauses.
- Dependent and embedded clauses were counted as part of main clauses except for the clauses starting with “if”, “when”, “so (that)” and “so long as”. The reason for this was that, being naturally occurring talk, at times these essentially dependent clauses did not have main clauses as the focus of talk shifted midway.
- Independent clauses connected with conjunctions such as “and” or “but” were also counted individually, while clause chunks consisting of a main and subordinate clauses (e.g., “And so, I know [[this looks like [[it's casual]]]]”) were grouped together and counted as one.
- False starts or restarting with different wordings were treated on a case by case basis. As a rule of thumb, whether to treat a false start as a separate clause from the subsequent teacher talk was decided on the basis of the presence (or otherwise) of both participant and process of a main/independent clause. For example, if only the participant of clauses changed within a main clause (e.g., “Now you, I've, Ms Bell has done it a little differently…”), these participants were treated as part of the same clause and counted as one clause. If both participant and process clearly appear as followed by a shift in teacher talk, this was treated as unfinished speech and counted as individual clauses.
- Pauses were again treated on a case by case basis. If a pause resulted in starting another clause with a different set of participant and process, what was uttered before the pause was treated as a separate clause. Conversely, if the teacher continued with the same clause with a pause in between, the speech was counted as consisting of one clause (chunk).
- Confirmation checks such as “Okay?”, “Right?” or “Yep?” were normally treated as an individual clause of its own.

The Table on the following page provides a snapshot of how the analysis was conducted. Transcribed teacher talk has been positioned on the left, one clause (chunk) at a time. Each function has been identified by a different colour in adjacent columns on the right. Where appropriate, up to three functions were
The segment in Table 6.1 is taken from the transcript of the 5th of August. It was the beginning of the class, where the teacher was about to circulate the attendance sheet. The segment began with the teacher's instruction on the exact way to fill in the sheet (Managerial talk: 1-5, with an element of norm-setting in 4). This instruction switched to setting a normative understanding of the meaning and the consequences of being late in work situations (Norm-Setting talk: 6-22), which was briefly interrupted by an explanation of the word “dock” (Linguistic and Literacy Focus talk: 10-12). During lines 23-24, another set of norm-setting occurred, where the teacher specified the “normal” employment status for most people (i.e., “casual employees”: 23), while predicting that a “normal” consequence for casual employees for being late would be termination of employment (24). Lines 25-30 was another norm-setting built on the earlier norm-setting. The teacher was likening NAP to work, and through this, setting punctuality as norm. Because the stretch of teacher talk (6-30) also contained an element of imparting information on work life in Australia, this stretch was interpreted as consisting of two functions, Norm-Setting and Life and Sociocultural Information (Life Skills). The rest of the teacher talk (31-33) was attending to the latecomers and repeating the instruction on attendance sheet. Therefore, it was coded as Managerial.
### Table 6.1  A Snapshot of Coding Teacher Talk on the 5 August Lesson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Clause (chunks)</th>
<th>Pedagogic Function</th>
<th>Co-occurring function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>… Now be just before anything else, um there’s the sign-on sheet here.</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Now you, I’ve, Ms Bell has done it a little differently than [what I thought].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Please take a whole square [[to write the time [[that you arrived to today]] ... and your initials]] ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Okay? ([passes around the sheet])</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yep</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Now if you arrive at work, 15 minutes late,</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>two things happen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Oh three things can happen ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>One, they DOCK your pay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>You know “dock”?</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Means they mean [[you don’t you don’t get so much money]];</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>they take some of your pay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>They DOCK your pay.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>They give you a warning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Right? ……</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>If you are late again ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>you will no longer be employed here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yep?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>And then if you ARE late again …</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>then that’s it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Finished</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Unless there’s a very good,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>because most people are working as casual employees</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>they just don’t, employ you again.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>And so, I know [[this looks like [[it’s casual]]]]</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>but … I’m, I’m here [[to work]] and so are most of you, and so we need to be clear on time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Okay?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Fine, so</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>((to that student (AN who just walked in)) You missed the talk about [[being late]].</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>And get (xxx late) this sheet?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Can you please sign in and pass it on?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS: Norm-Setting; CM: Classroom Management (Managerial); LS: Life Skills; LF: Linguistic and Literacy Focus

Three additional considerations were made in calculation. First, the scope of teacher talk was limited to the teacher-fronted situation to maintain the commonality of the setting. Second, the whole teacher talk delivered in a
teacher-fronted situation was included for analysis irrespective of its audience. That is, analysis included the instances in which the teacher addressed a selected minority of the students in a teacher-fronted situation. This was to maintain the characteristics and the flow of teacher talk. Third, lessons with little or no recorded teacher-fronted talk were eliminated from the analysis to maintain the consistency of the setting across lessons. Analysis of teacher talk of additional kinds (e.g., assisting specific students during individual work) is beyond the scope of the present investigation for it will involve a more extensive profiling procedure.

6.2 Distribution of Pedagogic Functions in Teacher Talk

6.2.1 General Trend

The results show that, on average, the most frequently employed pedagogic function in classroom teacher talk was Managerial, accounting for approximately 48% of the whole teacher talk. The second most frequently employed function was Norm-Setting, occupying just over 45%. Compared to these two, other functions were minor phenomena; their average proportions ranged from almost non-present (i.e., Behavioural Management being 1.24%) to approximately 14% (i.e., New World) (see Table 6.2 on the next page).

As identified, Managerial talk and Norm-Setting talk dominated the profiled lessons. Managerial talk was the most utilised function in eight lessons and occupied more than one-third of teacher talk in all but one lesson. Its high proportionality was quite consistent across lessons. Whenever it was the most utilised function, its proportion was over 45%. Similarly to Managerial talk, Norm-setting talk dominated. It was the most frequently utilised function in one lesson (2 September (2)) as well as being the second most frequently utilised function in nine other lessons. Norm-Setting talk occupied at least 33% of teacher talk in all the lessons transcribed.
Table 6.2 Distribution of Pedagogic Functions in Teacher Talk across 10 Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>BM</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NW</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>LF</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Apr (1)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33.90</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>75.42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-May (1)</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>51.60</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>52.14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jul (1)</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>38.44</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>59.93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Aug (1)</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>42.80</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>53.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.81</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Aug (1)</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>46.99</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22.95</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>51.13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Sep (1)</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>47.93</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>49.59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Sep (2)</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>45.36</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>34.34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>29.27</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Sep (1)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>75.40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Sep (1)</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>36.33</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>47.07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Oct (1)</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>52.82</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>53.26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4037</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>45.16</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>47.96</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>14.24</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1): first lesson; (2): second lesson; NS: Norm-Setting; M: Managerial; BM: Behavioural Management; LS: Life Skills; NW: New World; LF: Linguistic and Literacy Focus; SC: Social

Note: Normally, Life Skills and Intro to the New World talk are treated as separate entities, but in 19 August (1) they were so closely intertwined that it was not possible to specify which was which. Thus, the blank in Intro to the New World on 19 August (1) is NOT an indication that there was none occurring, but an indication that they were included in Life Skills.

Cf. Data from Three Other Lessons not Included in the Main Calculation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>BM</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>LS</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>NW</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>LF</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-May (1)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54.17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.71</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Aug (2)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Sep (2)</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>45.34</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>57.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>41.03</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>56.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4561</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>44.68</td>
<td>2333</td>
<td>48.96</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>12.61</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Life and Sociocultural Information talk, a combined percentage of Life Skills and New World talk, was of minor occurrence in the majority of lessons on average (just over 20%). This is despite the fact that its average was the third highest among functions and that this category was among the three highest functions in seven lessons. Its proportionality varied greatly across lessons. When its percentage was high, it was the first or second most frequently employed function (i.e., recorded at 51.13% on 19 August (1) and over 42% on 2 September (2)). Yet once it became the third most frequently employed function or lower, its proportionality dropped radically. It even recorded as zero on 16 September (1).
Linguistic and Literacy Focus talk was a minor function in the majority of lessons. Their occurrence was quite limited, irrespective of the topics or tasks of a lesson. Although this function was identified in every lesson, its frequency was averaged out at 8%. Its occurrence was above 10% in only three lessons, ranging from 10.32% in 6 May (1) to 13.07% in 2 September (2).

Behavioural Management talk turned out to be a much rarer function throughout the lessons, with an average of 1.24%. This is much less frequent than Social talk whose average frequency was 5.33%. However, the proportionality of Behavioural Management talk may need to be discounted. Obvious talk of this kind was absent in 6 lessons. The highest proportionality for this category was 4.01% (21 October (1)), inclusive of segments of teacher talk addressed to one particular group of learners during a group work phase.

6.2.2 The Distribution of Pedagogic Function and Pedagogic Focus

Analysis of teacher talk has so far revealed that, despite the subject label “ESL” being attached to the lessons from which teacher talk was profiled, actual teacher talk delivered in class tended to focus less on linguistic matters and more on Managerial and Norm-Setting matters. In a teacher-fronted situation, social practices offered to the learners were primarily to do with how to operate in class according to teacher’s instruction and how to be normal socioculturally or institutionally. Based on this observation, a question arises as to what constitutes ESL lessons in the present research context.

Low proportionalities accorded to Life and Sociocultural Information talk and Linguistic and Literacy Focus talk make both functions unlikely candidates for the main focus of the teacher talk. Appropriation of specific linguistic skills such as producing certain text-types and associated lexicogrammar gave way to life and sociocultural matters. Life and Sociocultural Information talk was more than twice as much as Linguistic and Literacy Focus talk, although its occurrence was less constant than the latter. However, even when combined, the average of these functions was less than 30% of the teacher talk. Their occurrence was not consistent, ranging from over 55% to as low as 4.81%. There seems to be little
correlation between the occurrence patterns of these two pedagogic functions. Besides, their occurrence was contingent upon lesson plans. For example, in the two lessons (19 August (1) and 2 Sep (2)) in which Life and Sociocultural Information talk had visibly higher proportionality than the rest, it turned out that both lessons incorporated the preparation for the excursion to The Royal Adelaide Show and the majority of the Life and Sociocultural Information talk was delivered under this topic. The occurrence of Linguistic and Literacy Focus talk was scattered across teacher talk, which suggests that this function was employed in an ad hoc manner.

This leaves the other functions employed more frequently and consistently as the likely pedagogic focus in teacher-fronted situations: Norm-Setting talk and Managerial talk. However, what necessitates the explicit foregrounding of these functions?

Dominance of these functions indicates explicit moves towards teacher control. One possible explanation for this is that the classroom operation was so difficult that the teacher always had to concentrate on management. However, the relative absence of Behavioural Management talk across lessons diminishes its plausibility. As defined earlier, disciplining would occur when the teacher judged that a smooth operation of the lesson was inhibited due to learners’ misconduct. Accordingly, the absence of disciplining indicates that the teacher found little need to discipline students in order to run lessons. This in turn suggests that the learners were not disruptive, having few behavioural issues in class. This is consistent with research findings by Ewert (2009) that show, in general, the less time spent in a host society, the fewer behavioural problems migrants tend to exert at schools. This can be corroborated by the sharp contrast identified in the frequency of occurrence between Norm-Setting talk and Behavioural Management talk. The former occurred far more frequently than the latter. Concentration of Norm-Setting talk while not having to resort to Behavioural Management talk substantiates that learners were instructed with what they were perceived to be lacking, but not what they were breaching.
Another possible explanation was that, as far as Managerial talk was concerned, there were so many housekeeping matters required in class that Managerial talk was inevitable. One possible explanation to be considered as to why there was so much Managerial talk is one which considers the amount of housekeeping talk which was required. Housekeeping involves scheduling beyond the lesson time, passing on administrative messages, organising a roster for the learners to clean the City Campus and so forth, and therefore is a sub category of Managerial talk. Perhaps there was a large amount of housekeeping talk, due to the class under observation being a home room class, and accordingly a large amount of Managerial talk. As it turned out, this explanation did not hold. A more delicate analysis of the talk classified as “Managerial” revealed that only a small proportion of it was housekeeping. Besides, the average time spent specifically on housekeeping phases was negligible across the entire classroom observations (30 lessons), with just over 5% of the whole class time, or approximately five minutes per a 100-minute lesson (see Table 6.3).

Table 6.3 covers 30 lessons, only 10 of which were available as comprehensively recorded data. Of those 10 lessons, it is clear that housekeeping phase time varies considerably, ranging from nil (unidentified) to 24 minutes. Two lessons with the longest housekeeping phase (18 February (1) and 4 March (1)) were not included as recorded data. Had all the earlier lessons observed been available for a detailed analysis of teacher talk functions, the proportion of Managerial talk would have become even higher than currently calculated. This provides reasonable grounds to assume that Managerial talk was spread across the lessons and that it was a pervasive aspect of classroom teacher talk.
Table 6.3  Time Allocation in Classroom Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Before beginning</th>
<th>Housekeeping</th>
<th>Social &amp; Life</th>
<th>Newsletter</th>
<th>Grammar focus</th>
<th>Link other subject</th>
<th>Some other/ combination</th>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Out of record</th>
<th>Notes to the lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-Feb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:48:00</td>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>0:30:00</td>
<td>&lt;incl.</td>
<td>&lt;incl.</td>
<td>0:42:00</td>
<td>0:26:00</td>
<td>1:40:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Feb</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:45:00</td>
<td>0:05:00</td>
<td>&lt;incl.</td>
<td>&lt;incl.</td>
<td>1:40:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Mar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:30:00</td>
<td>0:05:00</td>
<td>0:26:00</td>
<td>&lt;incl.</td>
<td>&lt;incl.</td>
<td>0:13:00</td>
<td>0:46:00</td>
<td>1:23:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Mar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:45:00</td>
<td>0:12:00</td>
<td>&lt;incl.</td>
<td>0:05:00</td>
<td>1:45:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Mar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:45:00</td>
<td>0:15:00</td>
<td>0:02:00</td>
<td>&lt;incl.</td>
<td>&lt;incl.</td>
<td>0:13:00</td>
<td>0:46:00</td>
<td>1:23:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-Mar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:45:00</td>
<td>0:06:00</td>
<td>&lt;incl.</td>
<td>0:24:00</td>
<td>1:15:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Apr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:45:00</td>
<td>0:11:00</td>
<td>0:05:00</td>
<td>&lt;incl.</td>
<td>0:02:00</td>
<td>1:27:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Apr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:45:00</td>
<td>0:02:00</td>
<td>&lt;incl.</td>
<td>0:13:00</td>
<td>1:43:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-May</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:45:00</td>
<td>0:15:00</td>
<td>0:01:30</td>
<td>&lt;incl.</td>
<td>0:09:00</td>
<td>0:13:00</td>
<td>0:18:30</td>
<td>0:17:00</td>
<td>0:30:25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-May</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:45:00</td>
<td>0:06:00</td>
<td>&lt;incl.</td>
<td>1:39:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-May</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:45:00</td>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>0:12:00</td>
<td>&lt;incl.</td>
<td>0:05:00</td>
<td>1:18:00</td>
<td>&lt;incl.</td>
<td>1:15:00</td>
<td>0:30:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-May</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:45:00</td>
<td>(U/I)</td>
<td>&lt;incl.</td>
<td>0:59:00</td>
<td>0:13:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Jun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:45:00</td>
<td>0:15:00</td>
<td>0:05:00</td>
<td>0:13:00</td>
<td>N/R</td>
<td>1:45:00</td>
<td>Computer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Jun</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:45:00</td>
<td>(U/I)</td>
<td>(U/I)</td>
<td>0:06:30</td>
<td>1:29:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Jun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:45:00</td>
<td>0:09:30</td>
<td>(U/I)</td>
<td>(U/I)</td>
<td>0:06:30</td>
<td>1:45:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-Jun</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:45:00</td>
<td>0:00:30</td>
<td>(U/I)</td>
<td>0:40:00</td>
<td>01:43:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jul</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2:00:00</td>
<td>0:09:27</td>
<td>0:14:50</td>
<td>0:07:30</td>
<td>0:05:57</td>
<td>1:14:19</td>
<td>0:07:37</td>
<td>1:15:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Jul</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:45:00</td>
<td>0:04:04</td>
<td>0:06:18</td>
<td>0:01:28</td>
<td>0:12:03</td>
<td>1:00:00</td>
<td>1:01:56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Aug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:30:00</td>
<td>0:08:15</td>
<td>0:24:00</td>
<td>&lt;incl.</td>
<td>0:11:50</td>
<td>0:18:15</td>
<td>1:25:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Aug</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2:00:00</td>
<td>0:10:00</td>
<td>0:05:51</td>
<td>0:01:15</td>
<td>1:08:00</td>
<td>0:00:00</td>
<td>Excursion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Aug</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2:32:14</td>
<td>0:13:00</td>
<td>0:14:50</td>
<td>&lt;incl.</td>
<td>0:11:50</td>
<td>1:06:42</td>
<td>Excursion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-Aug</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2:00:00</td>
<td>0:15:00</td>
<td>0:04:30</td>
<td>0:12:00</td>
<td>0:11:50</td>
<td>201:55</td>
<td>0:01:49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Sep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:37:58</td>
<td>(U/K)</td>
<td>0:00:50</td>
<td>0:14:50</td>
<td>0:12:00</td>
<td>1:22:14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Sep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:25:00</td>
<td>(U/K)</td>
<td>(U/K)</td>
<td>0:07:43</td>
<td>1:56:12</td>
<td>04:00:34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-Sep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:15:00</td>
<td>(U/K)</td>
<td>(U/K)</td>
<td>1:15:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Sep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:40:00</td>
<td>0:15:00</td>
<td>0:16:44</td>
<td>0:08:26</td>
<td>partly</td>
<td>0:59:51</td>
<td>partly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Sep</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:40:00</td>
<td>(U/K)</td>
<td>(U/K)</td>
<td>1:40:00</td>
<td>partly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Oct</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:58:45</td>
<td>0:03:00</td>
<td>0:04:00</td>
<td>0:02:55</td>
<td>0:05:17</td>
<td>0:33:34</td>
<td>1:02:59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-Oct</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:27:54</td>
<td>(U/K)</td>
<td>(U/K)</td>
<td>1:26:54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total-Lapse%</td>
<td>50.19</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some Other/combination: Lesson time spent on multiple tasks or activities; U/I: Unidentified; U/K: Unknown; N/R: Not recorded; incl.: included (in the other component); shaded rows: profiled lessons
Since the dominance of Norm-Setting and Managerial talk does not appear to have arisen out of immediate contextual necessity, there arises a third possible explanation for concentration on Managerial and Norm-Setting talk; that these functions were indeed the main pedagogic focus in the enacted curriculum. Assuming this to be so, exploring this possibility will provide us with more clues as to how the learners in the Red Ochre class were constructed through teacher talk. Also, the examination of how these two functions might construct possible learning objectives will shed light on the nature of NAP ESL, because “the enactment of using and producing texts in learning interactions equates to the ways in which students engage in social practices” (Mungthaisong, 2004, p. 3).

One observable phenomenon was the interplay between managerial and norm-setting, where Norm-Setting talk was brought in to justify/motivate the managerial direction. In what ways this occurred, and how they relate to actual learning areas, will be the main concerns of the following section.

6.2.3 Connectivity of Managerial and Norm-Setting Talks

The occurrence of Norm-Setting talk was often closely associated with Managerial talk. The two functions often co-occurred within one stretch of teacher talk, one switching into the other multiple times, or one nesting within the vicinity of the other. Irrespective of the connective patterns, quite noticeable was the strength of Norm-Setting talk which emerged out of Managerial talk and took over Managerial talk. This section deals with two instances which illustrate this.

The first instance illustrates how suddenly Managerial talk was taken over by Norm-Setting talk. The excerpt was taken out of 1 April, the very first lesson that recording was made for research purposes. No sooner had the teacher announced the recording of teacher talk, the teacher switched into Norm-Setting talk to impart a particular attitude to adopt in the given situation: a norm to regard somebody recording the classroom teacher talk as “quite strange”.
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Table 6.4  Excerpt from 1 April

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MANAGERIAL—Announcement</th>
<th>NORM-SETTING—Rationalising “why” the teacher is making an announcement and, by implication, “how” to conceptualise/interpret the situation that was described in the announcement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This morning, GI’s going to tape [[what I say]], because this is going to be quite strange.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As seen in Table 6.4, a causal-conditional conjunction “because” (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004) connected the second clause to the first. Informing the class of what was going to happen in class in the immediate future (i.e., Managerial talk) was accomplished in the first clause complex, which was followed by the teacher’s rationalisation (i.e., Norm-Setting talk) in the second clause. As soon as reaching the second clause, teacher talk became more than informing the immediate future phenomenon. This is because the teacher’s interpretation of that phenomenon came with the announcement.

In the Norm-Setting talk in the excerpt, the teacher was simultaneously achieving two purposes. One purpose was rationalising as to why the teacher was making her announcement at all. Another purpose was to postulate to the students how to interpret the phenomenon that was to occur (i.e., GI recording). That is, the information in the conjunctive clause was not the reason for GI’s recording. The teacher made an announcement because the act of recording classroom teacher talk was viewed as a “quite strange” phenomenon by the teacher. The main message was not that recording would take place but how to view the act of recording.

The teacher established a rational ground for her announcement in terms of the oddity of the situation, rather than the ethical obligations for human research. This leaves the researcher’s (GI) reason for recording teacher talk unaccounted for. Theoretically, information directly related to the actor of the first clause complex (i.e., GI) could have been provided as reasons for “because”. Examples
of this may be the researchers’ need to obtain recorded data or the ethical requirement of informing the participants of the recording.

Establishing a rational ground for the announcement in terms of the oddity of the situation served as a ground for a normative way (“how”) of interpreting the phenomenon in which the recording device was operating. By incorporating how to conceptualise recording within a subordinate conjunctive clause, the normative view became treated as “given”, which is less contestable. Rationalising the reason for making an announcement was also justification of an interpretation of the phenomenon described in the announcement. In this way, the focus of teacher talk was effectively switched into viewing the recording as a strange experience. Indeed, the segment immediately after the excerpt was all about how the teacher, and by implication, others also, feel when recorded:

After a little while I’ll think [[I’m going to forget [[that the tape recorder is there]] ]], but [[to start off with]] I’ll probably feel a little bit uncomfortable and that’s [[what happens [[when someone is taping you]] ]], isn’t it? …

This segment was coded as part of a longer Norm-Setting talk which followed.

The second instance illustrates a case where the Norm-Setting talk co-occurred in Managerial talk before fully taking over the Managerial talk (see Table 6.5).

Table 6.5 Excerpt (a) from 5 August (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Umm and then, umm when we,</th>
<th>MANAGERIAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>err so we’re going to the museum today</td>
<td>—making announcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(content unuttered)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umm I KNOW [[that you’ve been to the museum al, umm, last week]].</td>
<td>MANAGERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But we’re going to see a different exhibition today.</td>
<td>—making announcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MANAGERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>—reviewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NORM-SETTING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What was initially an announcement of today’s excursion to the museum took on a norm-setting element. It persuades the learners to positively accept multiple visits to the same venue in close succession on the grounds that the exhibition was different. Underlying normative thinking was two-fold: one would not feel like visiting the same museum in close succession and one shall accept the multiple visits to the museum when there is a different exhibition.

Initially, teacher talk had the lone function of Managerial talk, announcing that the class was going to the museum (again within two consecutive weeks but) to see a (different) exhibition. The elements in parenthesis, “again within two consecutive weeks but” and “different”, were brought in as the teacher talk proceeded. The teacher utilised a “concede-then-counter” rhetorical strategy (cf. J. R. Martin & White, 2005) to rationalise the second museum visit. At first, the repetitiveness of the museum visit was acknowledged (“Umm I KNOW that…”: conceding), only to be discounted with the conjunction “but” (“But we are going to see...”: countering). In the “concede” move, the teacher was assuming that going to the museum again within two consecutive weeks was apparently not expected by the students and in the process she was aligning herself with this view (J. R. Martin & White, 2005). Here, the recording suggests that her alignment with this position (i.e., assumed students’ reaction to the museum visit in question) was presented with a considerable degree of reluctance. As indicated in upper cases in the transcript, the very “conceding” element of teacher talk, “I KNOW”, was accentuated with a louder volume than the projected clause that followed (i.e., “that you’ve been to the museum al, umm, last week”). These two words were uttered more slowly than the rest, with an even distribution of the length and stress. Then in the “counter” move, the teacher stepped back, and albeit indirectly, rejected this presumed students’ position and, in return, established her position that endorsed the museum visit. In this way, the teacher construed the students as those who were “presumed to be to some degree resistant” to her “primary argumentative position” (J. R. Martin & White, 2005, p. 127). The qualifier “different” was added to the word “exhibition”.

This “concede-then-counter” part of teacher talk took on the additional function of Norm-Setting, while retaining the element of Managerial talk. As a
continuation of Managerial talk, the “concede” part served as review of past museum visits, and the “counter” part served as additional announcement that the exhibition that the class was going to see was a different one. As Norm-Setting talk, the whole part served as the teacher’s justification for scheduling in the second museum visit in close succession on the grounds that the exhibition was a different one from the last time. Making a justification was a goal-oriented move to establish a moral ground for the students to accept the legitimacy of their museum visit.

The progression of teacher talk so far has been that it initially functioned solely as Managerial, then simultaneously as Managerial and Norm-Setting. However, teacher talk eventually became singularly Norm-Setting talk, lasting for quite a few clauses that followed (see Table 6.6).
Table 6.6  Excerpt (b) from 5 August (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>And, I know [[that er that’s sort of [[going to the museum again, in such a short time]]]].</th>
<th>MANAGERIAL—Announcement &amp; NORM-SETTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUT we WERE very lucky [[to get the booking in this, exhibition]].</td>
<td>NORM-SETTING – (1) how lucky the students were to be able to go and see a particular exhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know [[we have to BOOK, [[to go to the exhibition]].]]</td>
<td>(i) establishing general administrative understanding of educational group excursions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If we go one by one, [[you know]], with a family or something, you don’t have to book. But when you go as a group, you have to book. And, so [[you know]], sometimes we have, err a teacher has to wait MONTHS, [[to be able [[to go, [[to see a particular exhibition]].]]]].</td>
<td>(ii) contrasting private visit to the museum to make clear the necessity of making bookings for educational group excursions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And the one [[we are seeing today]], is one of those very popular exhibitions.</td>
<td>(iii) emphasising the difficulty of making timely bookings for educational group excursions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So we were SO LUCKY [[to get a booking today]]. So I just said, [[“Yes I’ll take it”]].</td>
<td>(iv) providing extra information of popularity of the exhibition to establish the difficulty of making timely bookings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know? Umm and the work [[that you are doing … for this err excursion]] is, err is in exactly [[what we want you [[doing now]]]], too.</td>
<td>(NORM-SETTING – (1) how lucky the students were to be able to go and see a particular exhibition)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So, we’ll, you have err excursion to the museum.</td>
<td>NORM-SETTING – (2) how pedagogically timely and relevant it was to go and see a particular exhibition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After fully taking over Managerial talk, Norm-Setting talk became powerful, occupying a much longer stretch of teacher talk than the announcement itself. What is more, the whole segment of teacher talk was delivered in a single teacher turn without having any student uttering related comments or questions (for verification, see transcript in Appendix C). Seen from a chronological point of view, this norm-setting progressed in two strands (NORM-SETTING (1) and (2) in the table). The teacher continued her talk extensively to establish that museum trips were to be regarded positively – specifically (1) how lucky the students were to be able to go and see a particular exhibition as well as (2) how pedagogically timely and relevant it was to go and see a particular exhibition. The point (1)
progressed in four moves, by (i) establishing general administrative understanding of educational group excursions, (ii) contrasting private visit to the museum to make clear the necessity of making bookings for educational group excursions, (iii) emphasising the difficulty of making timely bookings for educational group excursions and finally (iv) providing extra information of popularity of the exhibition to establish the difficulty of making timely bookings. Also, immediately before shifting to establish the point (2), the point (1) was reiterated ("So we were SO LUCKY…") together with the teacher’s response to this “luckiness” ("So I just said…").

When viewed from a logical point of view rather than a chronological one, the chain of Norm-Setting talk illustrated above covered multiple aspects of how students were expected to handle the museum visit. The point (1) was based on (A) how difficult it could be to make a group booking for educational visits (achieved by move (iii) indicated in Table 6.6), which was further based on (a) an understanding that a group must make a booking prior to visiting the exhibition (achieved by move (i)), which was again based on (a-1) an understanding that a “group” was conceptualised as different from family or individual visitors in terms of booking (achieved by move (ii)). The point (1) was also based on (B) the understanding that the popularity of an exhibition works as a factor that affects the group booking process (achieved by step (iv)). The layers of normativity and its logic operating in this segment are presented in Figure 6.1, together with rhetorical moves (i)-(iv) that were identified in Table 6.6. Indentations represent which layer is supported by which other one(s). The idea is that the further indented ones are the supportive elements of the one less indented one.
Establishing a norm by which museum visits are to be regarded positively

Consisting of:

**NORM-SETTING**

(1) how lucky the students were to be able to go and see a particular exhibition (“BUT we WERE very lucky [[to get the booking in this exhibition]]”)

based on

(A) how difficult it was at times to make a group booking for educational visits

--achieved by (iii) emphasising the difficulty of making timely bookings for educational group excursions

(“And, so [[you know]], sometimes we have, err a teacher has to wait MONTHS, [[to be able [[to go, [[to see a particular exhibition]]]]]]”)

based on:

(a) the understanding that a group must make a booking prior to visit the exhibition

--achieved by (i) establishing general administrative understanding of educational group excursions

(“You know [[we have to BOOK, [[to go to the exhibition]]]]”)

based on:

(a-1) the understanding that group was conceptualised as opposed to family or individual visitors in terms of booking

--achieved by (ii) contrasting private visit to the museum to make clear the necessity of making bookings for educational group excursions

(“If we go one by one, [[you know]], with a family or something, you don’t have to book. But when you go as a group, you have to book”)

And, so [[you know]], sometimes we have, err a teacher has to wait MONTHS, [[to be able [[to go [[to see a particular exhibition]]]]]], (indicating (A)’s original place)

and

(B) the understanding that the popularity of the exhibition works as a factor that affects the group booking process.

--achieved by (iv) providing extra information of popularity of the exhibition to establish the difficulty of making timely bookings

(“And the one [[we are seeing today]], is one of those very popular exhibitions”)

(1') Reiteration of how lucky the students were to be able to go and see a particular exhibition (“So we were SO LUCKY [[to get a booking today]]”)

(1’’) Exemplifying how a teacher would respond to the opportunity (“So I just said, [[“Yes I’ll take it”]]. You know?”)

and

**NORM-SETTING**

(2) how pedagogically timely and relevant it was to go and see a particular exhibition

(“Umm and the work [[that you are doing … for this err excursion]] is, err is in exactly [[what we want you [[doing now]]]], too”)

Figure 6.1 Rationalisation Structure of Excerpt (b) from 5 August (1)
The above segment from 5 August (1) exemplifies how an announcement (Managerial talk) was turned into a moral and value lecture that specified how to think, feel and behave in a particular way in a particular circumstance (Norm-Setting talk). Managerial talk here served as a platform for generating Norm-Setting talk, which, as a result, became the primary focus of teacher talk.

Analysis of the connectivity between Managerial talk and Norm-Setting talk thus far adds support to the possibility that these two functions were the central concern of the teacher's pedagogy. The particular choices the teacher made in logic and noteworthiness of certain aspects of a particular topic at hand occurred for a reason. In the first instance, it appears that the teacher assumed the authority of officialising her feeling about being recorded. She also assumed the right to deduce generalisation out of her feeling. There is a trade-off for this choice-making in teacher talk. The reason why the recording was taking place was left untouched. In the second instance, incorporating a chain of Norm-Setting talk achieved multiple outcomes. The primary outcome was that the teacher justified the museum visit through presenting to the students administrative and educational reasons that supported the scheduling. However, in doing this, she constructed the learners as potentially resistant to the museum visit, having to be persuaded before agreeing to come out for an excursion. Furthermore, the students were constructed as potentially ungrateful to the institutional arrangements, due to their lack of understanding of the intricacies of institutional conventions and circumstances surrounding the teacher. The bi-product of this was that the teacher, either knowingly or unknowingly, presented to the learners how much background information was required for them to understand the whole context - and specifically the cultural value which ‘normally’ attaches to museum visits - that only the teacher understood or was aware of.

6.3 NAP ESL – Identifying its Content and Teacher Role

Up to now it has been argued that the teacher’s main pedagogic concern was to manage the classroom and to set norms for the students. Additionally, managing classrooms and setting norms were not independently working categories but
were often operating in tandem. Based on the findings, a parallel can be established with the findings of Schinke-Llano (1983), in that students with (perceived) limited target language proficiency received a large proportion of managerial talk. Because the class was an ESL class, the parallel findings established with Schinke-Llano’s (1983) research on content-area classes are compelling. Firstly, the teacher’s concentration on managerial matters was not the product of contrastive observation of the ESL learners’ lag behind, or incomprehension of, the instruction in relation to other peers. Being an ESL class, there were no native or well advanced second language speaking peers in this research context. Secondly, the teacher’s managerial focus with the linguistically developing ESL learners was not specific to the content-area lessons. It is likely that by virtue of being perceived as limited English proficiency students, the learners received far more managerial instructions irrespective of subject area or peer formation.

Crucially, the observations above echo Freebody and colleagues’ findings (1995) that managerial matters, everyday commonsense knowledge and moral orders dominated the teacher talk delivered in the literacy programs in low socio-economic schools. They also report that such an orientation of teacher talk occurred at the expense of literacy knowledge and skills—the learning goals inscribed in the curriculum. As a result, attending to curriculum learning goals tended to be incidental, and establishing moral order was promoted as a learning outcome irrespective of its relevance to the stated curriculum learning outcomes (Freebody, et al., 1995). Indeed, such a reversal of pedagogic focus was also observed in the present investigation. Norm-Setting talk took precedence over Linguistic and Literacy Focus talk, and was incorporated at virtually any moment of teacher talk. In return, Linguistic and Literacy Focus talk was a minor component of teacher talk throughout the profiled lessons. Life and Sociocultural Information was intense at times, and due to this, an argument may be made that the teacher was paying more attention to cultural aspects than linguistic aspects. However, this is an unlikely explanation because their occurrence was inconsistent across lessons.
A primary role of the teacher arising out of these considerations is that of shepherding, an analogy synonymous to the “pastoral” role (Christie, 1999a, after Hunter 1994; Love, 2001) of the teacher identified in the subject English. Christie (1999a) observes that, “contrary to much received wisdom about developing self expression in students, English teachers take up a ‘pastoral’ role towards their students, essentially supervising them as they adopt ethically acceptable positions” (pp. 167-169). Under such a construct, “ethical’ skills are implicated in the teaching of ‘literate’ skills” (Love, 2001, p.213). Considering the parallelism established with literacy programs researched by Freebody et al. (1995), it can be surmised that the same was occurring in the present ESL class. The teacher appears to have assumed a great deal of authority, superiority and responsibility over the ways learners operate. Then, it was only a natural consequence that Managerial and Norm-Setting talk became dominant irrespective of lesson organisation, while Linguistic and Literacy Focus, as well as Life and Sociocultural Information, became incidental.

Furthermore, managerial and norm-setting functions seem to be foregrounded in the curriculum-related documents which were previously analysed. By virtue of foregrounding perceived liabilities of “new arrivals” in the curriculum-related documents, NAP’s objectives are two-fold: how to change the learners’ orientations where they deviate from the norm, and how to minimise the deficiency where they lack knowledge or experience. The teacher’s eyes were naturally set to focus on Managerial and Norm-Setting talk. There is a research report that argues that, whatever the content may be, teacher’s focus on the ‘content’ may be cut short because of other, often unexpected matters that they have to attend to in the daily business of classroom life (Comber, 1999). There is an argument that managerial matters dominating teacher talk is common (Thwaite & Rivalland, 2009). There is also an argument that classroom management is at the heart of language classes and that it is inseparable from the whole classroom operation (T. Wright, 2005).

A teacher’s primary role is instantiation in lesson ‘content’. Two conclusions can be made as to what constitutes this component called “ESL” in the current case. One is that there were two strands, namely, learning target language skills and
learning norms of various kinds, coexisting in “ESL” lessons and that the relationship between the two is quite tenuous in practice. Another conclusion is that, despite calling itself “ESL”, what counts as ESL content was in fact vaguely conceptualised in NAP, and that there was no clear cut division between content and non-content matters in practice. These two conclusions are not contradictory. The ‘content’ of the subject is primarily simulating the formal, institutionalised learning itself, of which focus on linguistic development may at times constitute a part. Christie (1999a, p.168) asserts that ill-defined subjects like English make it “impossible to give it substance for teaching purposes” because there is no clear difference “from the more general concerns of daily living”. By this she means that there is no specialised discourse emerging out of the teaching of English.

This is not to deny the place of daily life matters in ESL class. Rather, the point is that, where daily life matters are foregrounded independent of linguistic development in class, there can be a mismatch between what the subject heading traditionally connotes and what is delivered. The teacher may be clear about what and how she is conducting lessons, yet this may not be clear to the learners. In fact, NAP ESL lessons’ definitional vagueness surfaced in the ways learners responded to activities. It was observed that some learners became confused with the way lessons were organised, in particular, with respect to extremely flexible lesson time management and frequent excursions. Some other learners showed enthusiasm in more explicitly language-based activities such as individual grammar exercises. One of them went so far as to declare that the grammar was what he was coming to ESL classes for. Such reactions from learners foreground more than the narrowly conceptualised notion of language learning they possessed. They foreground a mismatch between learners’ ideals for ESL lesson and actual lessons.

However, making sense of such a mismatch in relation to ‘content’ issues of ESL is a complex enterprise. If one takes a position to identify ESL content as that defined by the curriculum statement, then it follows that managerial and norm-setting matters are qualified as content by virtue of the curriculum-related documents endorsing them. The present finding on the distribution of pedagogic function exemplifies that the teacher was fulfilling her pedagogic role. By contrast,
if one takes a position that defining ‘content’ for language classroom requires more profound considerations (e.g., Christie, 2002), the matter goes beyond the compatibility of planned curriculum and enacted curriculum. What is presented as main teaching/learning objectives in an enacted curriculum entails their own implications. The role that the teacher was playing needs further delineation, as well as the implication of prioritising managerial and norm-setting functions over others.

Another point to be focussed on is that the primary teacher role and NAP ESL content identified here have a lot to do with the construction of a NAP learner.

6.4 The Image of a “New Arrival” Learner: Preliminary Observations

Based on the teacher’s shepherding role emerging out of teacher talk, several preliminary observations can be made in regard to the teacher’s construction of the learners. First, the dominance in Classroom Management talk across lessons indicates that the learners were viewed as lacking the understanding of common classroom practices. Their prior educational-institutional experiences were assessed to be insignificant to such an extent that detailed instruction was required for the learners to operate normally and appropriately in class.

Second, the prevalence of Norm-Setting talk indicates that the learners were viewed as lacking common sense principles to operate normally in society. As part of a shepherding role, the teacher was operating as an etiquette and values coach, whose task was to specify to the students what was normal to do, think, feel, and behave. One image of the learners arising out of this is that they were in dire need of norm instructions, incapable of operating normally without overt instructions. In this sense, Norm-Setting talk functioned as a “new arrivals” marker. The more the teacher concentrated on norms, the more marked the learners became in the communities addressed in teacher talk.

Third, the learners were viewed as potentially non-compliant, requiring moral lectures. This is despite the very low occurrence of Behavioural Management talk,
which is itself an indication of the non-disruptive nature of the learners. A straightforward observation based on how the teacher talk turned out is that the dominance of Managerial and Norm-Setting talk was due primarily to the learners’ perceived deficiency rather than their disruptiveness in class. By virtue of not having to resort to disciplinary actions, the teacher was able to run the lessons without major disturbances. During observations, too, the unfolding of lessons appeared to be smooth and largely in a manner that the teacher had set up. However, as seen in the excerpt from 5 August (b) on consecutive museum visits, some parts of teacher talk indicated that the teacher was anticipating the learners’ non-compliance to institutional decisions. Norm-Setting talk was utilised to prevent their non-compliant behaviour from occurring. This fluctuating image of learner may be the trigger of Norm-Setting talk.

Fourth, learners were constructed as in need of developing classroom behaviours and normative thinking rather than of improving their English. The consistently low percentage of Linguistic and Literacy Focus and Life and Sociocultural Information talk reflects their low-priority status. Also, the rather independently-occurring nature of Norm-Setting talk suggests that linguistic/literacy matters and norms were not necessarily integrated.

### 6.5 Some Concluding Remarks and Prospective

Profiling NAP ESL classroom teacher talk at a macro level has revealed that the two dominant pedagogic functions were managerial and norm-setting in nature. These two functions showed consistency in their high proportionality across lessons. They also appeared to be operating in tandem with each other. The picture of the classroom emerging out of the findings was different from what may be traditionally held as a language class. The prevalence of Norm-Setting talk suggests that the primary pedagogic goal was not so much about developing language skills or creating one’s own understanding of texts as being able to operate within a certain interpretive framework. Teaching was consistently oriented towards specifying certain frameworks for interpretation. There was a particular configuration of ‘content’ and ‘the goal’ operating in the enacted ESL curriculum in this NAP class. This configuration may be different from what is
conventionally held as ESL. Accordingly, the role that the teacher was playing was different. Such findings provoke questions as to what constitutes the ESL component of NAP in the current case under investigation.

The teacher-learner role relationships emerging out of teacher talk was asymmetrical, with the teacher assuming power, authority and responsibility over the ways learners operate both institutionally and socially. Amongst the pedagogic functions of teacher talk, Norm-Setting talk stands out as playing a key role in constructing a particular pedagogic relationship between the teacher and learners, as well as in imparting particular morals and values. Investigation on these elements requires more linguistically-oriented analysis. This will be the focus of next chapter.
CHAPTER 7
“NEW ARRIVALS” CONSTRUCTED THROUGH
TEACHER TALK (PART II):
Further Exploration of Norm-Setting Talk

7.0 Introduction

Analysis of teacher talk at a macro-function level revealed that, across ten lessons, teacher talk serving to set norms for the learners (Norm-Setting talk) and to manage classroom business (Managerial talk) were the two most frequently employed functions. One of the key findings was that Norm-Setting talk tended to be associated with Managerial talk. A preliminary conclusion on the notion of ‘new-arrival-ness’ proposed at the end of the last chapter was that the “new arrival” learners were viewed as those who were in need of extensive instruction on sociocultural norms, educational norms and day-to-day educational and institutional practices. This sparked my interest to follow up such macro-level observations and explore further the nature of the Norm-Setting talk, documenting what kinds of norms are being expressed and advocated in teacher talk.

This chapter sets out to demonstrate how Norm-Setting talk might contribute to set practices and a set of ethos of being a particular kind of student in class, and by implication, a particular kind of “new arrival”. Its focus is on the types of norms expressed in teacher talk across lessons as well as their range and patterns.

The chapter consists of six sections. Section 7.1 outlines the concept of norms and presents a rationale for exploring norms. Section 7.2 explains the process of profiling norms, followed by the presentation of analytical categories. Section 7.3 presents general trends in the types of norms which were observed across the analysed lessons. The presentation of five selected classroom episodes will follow in section 7.4 to illustrate how multiple norms were set. Finally in 7.5, the interpretation of the range of norms is presented to arrive at the description of the construction of ‘new-arrival-ness’.
7.1 Rationale for Exploring Norms

Norms are reflections of what are seen to be ‘normal’ behaviour and attitudes within a particular community or social setting. The perception of normality is not a neutral practice, and it is culturally bound and context specific. Normality takes on normative elements, thereby carrying a certain value and/or moral assessment. In philosophical terms, a distinction is made between “normality” and “normativity”, with the former conceptualised as what is normal and the latter as what ought to be normal, i.e. what is seen as “socially acceptable” (Ernst, 2006; Phillips, 2003; Waldschmidt, 2005). Yet in practice, determining what is normal takes on evaluative and prescriptive elements (Ernst, 2006), and the “conflation of ‘is’ and ‘ought’” (Ernst, 2006, p. 4) occurs. Hence “normal and normativity are therefore intrinsically linked in the sense that the concept of the ‘normal’ always implies a moral code that sets a normative standard” (Ernst, 2006, p. 6). On this point, Phillips (2003) argues that normality takes on normativity when justified with reason. Seen this way, the act of setting norms can be an act of conveying certain value and/or moral assessment, thereby spelling out what counts as legitimate forms of thinking, feeling and acting. This suggests that evaluative language use underpins Norm-Setting talk, and therefore, analytically, the Appraisal framework (J. R. Martin, 1997, 2003; J. R. Martin & Rose, 2003; J. R. Martin & White, 2005; White, 2005a) can be usefully applied to unpack evaluative language use.

The concept of norms is underscored by the notions of “rules for interaction” and “norms of interpretation” (Hymes, 1986; Saville-Troike, 2003) established in the field of ethnography of communication, for their property to “implicate the belief system of a community” (Hymes, 1986, p. 64). “Rules for interaction” have been defined as proprieties that need to be observed, where “prescriptive statements of behavior, of how people ‘should’ act...are tied to the shared value of the speech community” (Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 123). “Norms of interpretation” are defined as “the common knowledge, the relevant cultural presuppositions, or shared understandings, which allow particular inferences to be drawn about what is to be taken literally, what discounted, etc” (Saville-Troike, 2003, pp. 110-111).
However, “rules for interaction” and “norms of interpretation” refer to what is already shared and operating. Notions of rules and norms are essentially implicit in nature, because the stance of ethnography of communication is to find out what it is that an individual needs to know to be able to operate normally and competently in a given communicative event. For this reason, Saville-Troike (2003) notes that spelling out such rules “require[s] more indirect elicitation and identification”, and the rules “are often discoverable in reactions to their violation by others, and feelings that contrary behavior is ‘impolite’ or ‘odd’ in some respect” (p. 123). The need to explicitly present or articulate norms indicates that they are not shared.

Based on these theoretical premises, acts of setting norms in classrooms reflect teachers’ assessments of what norms are yet to be shared, and what rules are yet to be recognised, ignored, or not observed on the part of their learners. Choosing what norms to be set, what ways of thinking and acting to focus upon govern pedagogic practices. Articulated norms, then, interface with other aspects of education, including the general NAP curriculum and, as shall be seen, learning tasks. Exploring norms sheds light on the image of learners projected through their perceived need to access norms.

7.2 Generating Analytical Categories

7.2.1 Process and Exemplification

Identification and categorisation of norms was carried out by adopting a mixed method of top-down and bottom-up approaches to discourse. The first step (Step 1) was a top-down approach, which was used to identify macro pedagogic functions (explained in the previous chapter). The unit for analysis was a span of teacher talk. Norm-Setting talk was initially defined notionally, in relation to other macro pedagogic functions. As outlined in Chapter 6, teacher talk was extracted from the classroom transcript, split into major clause chunks and entered on the left (see Table 7.1). Identified macro pedagogic functions were colour-coded in the adjacent column(s).
Table 7.1  Sample Coding Steps 1 and 2 (Data taken from the 5 August lesson)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Clause/Clause Chunk</th>
<th>Pedagogic Function(s)</th>
<th>Imparted norms (SCNs)</th>
<th>Imparted norms (EDNs)</th>
<th>Appraising items</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Judgement</th>
<th>Appreciation</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Graduation</th>
<th>Appraised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Um there are many many things [[that carry his name]].</td>
<td>NW NS</td>
<td>CONT.</td>
<td>(whole)</td>
<td>high force (many, many)</td>
<td>Mawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And there is ONE thing [[that carries his face]].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(whole)</td>
<td>sharpen (one)</td>
<td>Mawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>That we <em>would all like to have</em>.</td>
<td></td>
<td>positive attitude towards $100 note</td>
<td>would like +des to invoke judge +nom</td>
<td>high force (all)</td>
<td>One thing, like to have that thing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We <em>would like to have many, many</em> of these.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>would like +des to invoke judge +nom</td>
<td>high force (many, many) (above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>His face is on the $100 note ...</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(whole)</td>
<td>+nom +val</td>
<td>$100 note, Mawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Alright? Now</td>
<td>compliance</td>
<td></td>
<td>alright</td>
<td>+prop</td>
<td>C&amp;C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td><em>Every time we've got $100 note</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>appropriate conceptualisation of a particular emotional response towards obtaining a $100 note</td>
<td>(whole)</td>
<td>high force (every time)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>() ooooh, Mmm… (old) MAN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(whole)</td>
<td>valuing $100 note, Mawson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>what a good man.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(whole)</td>
<td>(above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SCNs: Sociocultural norms; EDNs: Educational norms; NW: New world talk; NS: Norm-Setting talk; CONT.: continuation of the previously identified norm; +: positive appraisal; -: negative appraisal; des: desire; hap: happiness; judge: judgement; nom: normality; prop: propriety; apprec: appreciation; val: valuation; C&C: comprehension and compliance. All the abbreviations used in the coding are explained in Appendix H.
The subsequent steps (Steps 2 and 3) were based on a bottom-up approach, in which linguistic components of each clause (chunk) of Norm-Setting talk were focused upon. Because the focus was on Norm-Setting talk (identified in yellow), only the corresponding teacher talk instances were analysed in these steps. A complete set of coding of teacher talk across ten lessons (extension of Table 7.1) can be found in Appendix H.

Step 2 consisted of three micro-steps. In Step 2.1, evaluative elements of teacher’s Norm-Setting talk were identified and classified by using the APPRAISAL framework (J. R. Martin, 1997, 2003; J. R. Martin & Rose, 2003; J. R. Martin & White, 2005; White, 2005a). Primary focus was placed on the elements of ATTITUDE (Affect, Judgement and Appreciation), since norms were closely tied to certain values, ideals and/or expected principles. To do this, first, parts of the teacher talk that carried evaluative elements were identified in bold fonts, and they were also spelt out under “Appraising Items” (see Table 7.1 above). These items were then classified as Affect, Judgement or Appreciation in their respective columns. ENGAGEMENT and GRADUATION were identified using underlining, and then classified under relevant columns. What (or who) was being appraised was spelt out in the “Appraised” column located on the right of the table. In this way, Step 2.1 was designed to serve two purposes. One purpose was to linguistically demonstrate the attitudinal use of language which underpins the Norm-Setting talk. The other purpose was to identify specific kinds of ATTITUDE expressed, from which to arrive at a more abstract category for grouping norms (to be explained in Step 3).

Step 2.2 was to label the norms by reference to identified ATTITUDEEs within a span of teacher talk. Norms were labelled as a combination of “Cognition Type” and “Practice Area”. “Cognition Type” attended to what attitude one was expected to hold, and “Practice Area” referred to what one should hold that particular attitude towards. Norms were spelt out this way, so that, later on, the items under “Practice Area” could be extracted for further classification.

Using the segment of teacher talk displayed in Table 7.1 as an example, the labelling process for Step 2.2 is explained as follows. This segment of teacher talk
was part of the teacher’s explanation on Douglas Mawson. Because the talk was initially filled with positive evaluation of Mawson, a norm expressed in teacher talk was identified as “positive attitude towards (Cognition Type) Douglas Mawson” (Practice Area). Yet subsequent teacher talk was not directly related to Mawson but to $100 notes; it denoted how one values $100 notes (i.e. “That we would all like to have. We would like to have many, many of these.” and beyond). Accordingly, a norm expressed in this part was identified as “positive attitude towards $100 note”. When teacher talk reached “Every time we’ve got $100 note ( ) oooohh, Mmm… (old) MAN, what a good man”, the focus slightly shifted to describe how one would normally react when obtaining a $100 note with reference to Mawson whose face appears on it. In other words, this description of emotional reaction was based on the assumption that it is (and therefore it probably ‘should’ be) a happy experience for one to have $100 notes. This part of teacher talk was thus coded as “appropriate conceptualisation of a particular emotional response towards obtaining a $100 note”. While labelling imparted norms, classifications were made as to whether they related to the sociocultural domain (SCNs: sociocultural norms) or the educational domain (EDNs: educational norms). In the example supplied above, attitude towards Douglas Mawson and $100 notes were all judged to belong to the sociocultural domain, and thus they were entered in the “Imparted Norms (SCNs)” column of Table 7.1.

In Step 2.3, the scope of each ATTITUDE (i.e. whether it continues to operate in subsequent clauses) was considered within a particular span of teacher talk. Preceding and following spans were also taken into consideration. Where a continuation of the previously identified ATTITUDE was witnessed in other parts of teacher talk, it was coded as CONT. In the example provided in Table 7.1, the selected segment of teacher talk was a continuation of a positive description of Sir Douglas Mawson that had started several turns earlier (“and Douglas Mawson is a very famous person in South Australia” (Turn 209) and beyond, see Transcript in Appendix D). Thus, the “positive attitude towards Sir Douglas Mawson” encompassing the first two clause chunks on the table (“Um there are many many things...that carries his face”) were identified as CONT. Subsequent clause chunks on $100 notes were identified as a new norm-setting.
ATTITUDES and their labelling were also cross-referenced at a lesson level, and where duplications and repetitions were noted, they were coded as DUPE (not applicable in the instance in Table 7.1). DUPE was mostly related to the teacher ensuring learners’ understanding or compliance with “alright?” “okay?” etc. These moves were grouped together as “Compliance” under “Imparted Norms (SCNs)” in the table.

Although Steps 2.1 to 2.3 have been explained individually, in actual coding practice, they were carried out cyclically. Multiple revisions were made by repeating these three micro-steps.

Step 3 involved categorising ATTITUDES into more general (value) Orientations. This is where the dual coding style of “Cognition Types” and “Practicing Areas” was made use of. The step itself consisted of two co-occurring, cyclical micro-steps – 3.1 and 3.2. Categories for Orientations were generated through multiple grouping attempts of the labelled ATTITUDES. Step 3.1 involved grouping together similar ATTITUDES to generate more abstracted labelling at a lesson level. Step 3.2 involved grouping together these lesson-specific labels and generating further abstracted labelling.

To illustrate the process taken in Step 3.1 and 3.2, the case of the 1 April lesson will be explained here. Table 7.2 contains the first three norms identified in this lesson after Step 2. The norms are marked as A, B and C under the “Imparted Norms (SCNs/EDNs)” columns.
Table 7.2  First Three Norms Identified in the 1 April Lesson Data (after Step 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Clause/Clause Chunk</th>
<th>Pedagogic Function(s)</th>
<th>Imparted norms (SCNs)</th>
<th>Imparted norms (EDNs)</th>
<th>Appraising Items</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Judgement</th>
<th>Appreciation</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Graduation</th>
<th>Appraised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>This morning, GI's going to tape [[what I say]], because this is going to be quite strange.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After a little while I'll think [[I'm going to forget [[that the tape recorder is there]]]].</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[but] [to start off with] I'll probably feel a little bit uncomfortable</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and that's [[what happens [[when someone is taping you]]]].</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>isn't it? You start or [[when somebody is watching]]</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>you start of [[being very careful]] and after a while you feel more comfortable</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and relax a little bit</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and you're a bit more normal.</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[[You know]], [[what's happening here]] is,</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When all norms identified in the entire lesson were initially spelt out under “Imparted Norms (SCNs/EDNs)” in the spreadsheet, they were transferred to another table in order of appearance, for further scrutiny. In the 1 April lesson data, a total of 12 norms were identified. In the beginning, the table to which all 12 norms were transferred looked like the one below (Table 7.3). The letters A-L appearing at the left of SCN and EDN columns were the identification tags added for ease of illustration. They also represent the order of appearance of the norms, with “A” being appearing first and “L” last.

Table 7.3 Sample Coding Step 3.1 (Data taken from the 1 April lesson)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imparted norms (SCNs)</th>
<th>Imparted norms (EDNs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognition types</td>
<td>Practice areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. appropriate</td>
<td>the nature of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpretation of</td>
<td>situation (recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>classroom teacher talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>as strange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. appropriate</td>
<td>a particular emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conceptualisation of</td>
<td>response towards being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. appropriate</td>
<td>the situation - its</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conceptualisation of</td>
<td>relevance and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>implication on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students’ future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>educational experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. appropriate</td>
<td>presentation as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conceptualisation of</td>
<td>standard educational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. appropriate</td>
<td>appropriate/correct/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognition of</td>
<td>relevant contribution/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>comment/an answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>will be acknowledged/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>affirmed/p raised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. appropriate</td>
<td>organisation skills -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognition of</td>
<td>responsible management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of provided materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. appropriate</td>
<td>available assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognition of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. appropriate</td>
<td>the access to assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognition of</td>
<td>(who can obtain assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and who cannot, how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>much)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. negative</td>
<td>leaving work incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitude towards</td>
<td>[keenness to learn]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. appropriate</td>
<td>approval of a potentially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognition of</td>
<td>“unacceptable” behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i.e. leaving incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>work) being contingent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>upon teacher’s decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. appropriate</td>
<td>organisation skills –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognition of</td>
<td>adopting a particular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>filing protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. appropriate</td>
<td>sharing/equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conceptualisation of</td>
<td>access to treats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.3 is a snapshot of work-in-progress in Step 3.1. Once all the imparted norms from the entire lesson were entered in the table, considerations were made
as to whether classifying certain norms into either category (SCNs/EDNs) best represented their nature, and whether some norms could possibly be grouped together under a bigger category. Specific to the 1 April lesson, this meant that:

- A and B were assessed to be under one macro theme of how to handle the situation of being recorded in the institutional settings. Thus, they were grouped under “Institutional Practices”.

- G and H were initially placed under EDNs due to their relationship with learners’ work. However, it was later decided that they should be shifted to SCNs because identifying and accessing available assistance in a structured condition would cover situations outside the classroom. Moreover, G and H were assessed to belong to different SCN categories, with G being concerned with one's dependency on other's assistance and H being concerned with institutionally-regulated distribution of assistance.

A similar process was applied to the nine other lessons, and they were cross-referenced (part of Step 3.2). Labels used for “Orientations” were generated and adapted through continuous cross-referencing.

Both Step 3.1 and 3.2 informed each other, and adjustments were made multiple times to reach consistency and systematicity at both levels. Some adjustments were also made on the distinction between Socioculturally-oriented (SCNs) and Educationally-oriented norms (EDNs). In some instances a decision was made to double-code a particular ATTITUDE as both SCNs and EDNs. Where ambiguity was noted, anything that could be translated into wider sociocultural contexts was classified under SCNs. For example, “managing previously supplied handouts” identified in the 1 April lesson was classified under a socioculturally-oriented norm of “Organisation Skills”, although the handouts referred to classroom handouts.

The resultant categorisations of norms for the 1 April lesson have been provided in Table 7.4 below. The letters A-L correspond to those identified in the Table 7.3.
### Table 7.4  Sample Coding Step 3.2 (Data taken from the 1 April lesson)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imparted Norms (SCNs)</th>
<th>Cognition Types</th>
<th>Practice Areas</th>
<th>Imparted Norms (EDNs)</th>
<th>Cognition Types</th>
<th>Practice Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orientations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Orientations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Virtues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Order</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- teacher to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>evaluate students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- recognition of one’s dependency on others and support receiving from others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- recognition of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>available assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) more assistance (two researchers helping)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- teacher to officialise meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- recognition of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- handling the situation of being recorded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>available assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) the access to assistance (who can obtain assistance and who cannot, how much)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learner Mentality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ideals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>negative attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- reluctance to leave work incomplete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>towards leaving work incomplete</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- managing supplied handouts/materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>responsible management of provided materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- filing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>adopting a particular filing protocol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Admittedly, just as Steps 3.1 and 3.2 were co-occurring and cyclical, macro Steps (1, 2 and 3) were also cyclical in nature, as visualised below:

![Visualisation of Steps 1-3](image)

**Figure 7.1 Visualisation of Steps 1-3**

The entire table of SCNs and EDNs classified from each lesson (extended version of Table 7.4) can be found in Appendix I. Categories generated after Step 3 was complete for all ten lessons will be presented in the next section.

### 7.2.2 Generated Analytical Categories

The macro-labels generated under SCNs and EDNs and the guiding principles for identifying each label are presented in Table 7.5 below, together with examples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Explanations of Taxonomic Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S C N s</td>
<td>Civic Virtues – &lt;towards others&gt; and &lt;from others&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This category encompasses principles for conducting oneself in a civic community. Particular focus is on how to relate to other community members. Principles are self-directed obligations, but they are either working outwards (from oneself “towards others”) or inwards (“from others” to oneself). That is, the former concerns those attitudes or behaviours one should apply towards others, while the latter functions reflexively to acknowledge support and contributions from others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;Towards Others&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- sensitivity in sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“You must not write in the textbook, okay, that’s not used (to) like that. Okay? Those are terribly expensive books …&lt;cut&gt; If somebody else’s done that, it causes err that’s not good for you, is it? It’s terrible…” (21 October)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;From Others&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- recognition of one’s dependency on others and support receiving from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“you know that they came fr from the the two people came from (organization name), &lt;cut&gt; Now they haven’t forgotten your responses and they wanted you to know. &lt;cut&gt; they’re going to start working &lt;cut&gt; to see what they can improve. And already they’ve been doing some things for some people at College, &lt;cut&gt; Umm and so umm it’s good our partnership with them &lt;cut&gt;” (30 September)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This category covers both mental attitude (such as community-mindedness) and physical behaviour (such as what is generally counted as civic skills). Physical behaviour is seen as the manifestation of mental attitude.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Explanations of Taxonomic Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Tastes</td>
<td>This category denotes a particular preferential system (things to like, things not to like). Based on the assumption that likes and dislikes are in many parts culture-specific, norms included in this category are seen as an assemblage of culturally-appropriate/expected perspectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- value for money &amp; abstinence (junk food)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“there’s rubbish, junk food.” (19 August)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- valuing extra-curricular learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“So many different classes at in different places &lt;cut&gt; I’ve done that one! &lt;cut&gt; Mm, you start talking about () and I think, “Yeah I’ve done this one, I’ve done this” they’re so interesting” (1 July)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contrary to the first category (Civic Virtues), the category is conceptualised as others-directed in nature, without necessarily taking account of dealing with others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Wisdom/Educated guess</td>
<td>This category denotes a set of knowledge and experience which informs individuals’ certain ways to operate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- psychological mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“of course if you’re feeling confused, confusion can then become anger. You can be angry with the teacher for not explaining it to you, and that err that emotion then might stop you from being able to do the work” (6 May)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It is an assemblage of culturally-constructed knowledge that informs an individual to think, feel, behave and act in a given culture in a capable way. This includes capacity to reason and capacity to pre-empt likely outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etiquette</td>
<td>This category is concerned with manners and rules to be applied when dealing with other individuals from outside the classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- communication manners and avoiding taboos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“You need to ask them if they will … be happy to answer your questions about their job. Right, not personal questions so much, but questions about their work. (laughs) and you see there’s nothing there about money (laughs) Oh, sensitive subject (laughs) Always a sensitive subject” (21 October)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This category is a combination of Civic Virtues and Cultural Wisdom. Elements are assembled together for their recursive and intertwined nature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frugality</td>
<td>This category deals with principles and ethos to operate humbly in an economic sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- pursuing freebies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I DO look for everything [(that’s free)], and I try all the food [(that’s free)], ((makes hand gestures of picking up food and throwing it into her mouth)) have a taste, a little bit of this, a little bit of that, &lt;cut&gt; but, [(you know)], [(buying food at the Show)], is, a really, ()” (2 September (2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This category is a combination of Cultural Tastes and Cultural Wisdom. The concept of being frugal here is seen as a form of streetwise-ness, in the aspects of strategies for economic survival rather than virtues for living.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Practices</td>
<td>This category encompasses rules, protocols and general understandings surrounding practices in institutional settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- break protocols (lunch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“That’s okay with me so long as it’s a LUNCH break and it’s not going and playing the electronic games at the cinema or, or playing poker machines or…um things like that. Okay?” (5 August)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unlike the preceding categories, this category is primarily based upon specific contexts to which norms apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Explanations of Taxonomic Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Organisation Skills** | This category denotes principles and protocols that were ascribed to manage materials, artefacts and personal administration in particular ways.  
- map and itinerary  
  "Okay, now, honestly, I really do want you to bring, these, pages with you, to the Show. Alright? <cut> Okay, so, please bring these with you. Fold them up, put them in the pocket…okay? So, if you hold this up, you can put it in the pocket." (2 September (2))  
This category is closely related to Institutional Practices. Its primary focus is specific skills mostly applicable to specific institutional contexts, though some of them are also useful in other contexts. |
| **Learner mentality – <ideals> and <tendencies>** | This category contains twin notions of learner traits. The former “ideals” denotes ideal traits of learners, while the latter “tendencies” denotes typical untoward traits ascribed to the learners’ learning habits. The semantics of ideals here are essentially pragmatic. Ideal does not mean producing best learning. Rather, it means making classroom activities go most smoothly. Tendencies are typically negative in nature. They are either breaching the norm or absence of the expected norm.  
- <ideals>  
  - reluctance to leave work incomplete  
    "But you might say, “But I haven’t finished this, I haven’t finished all of this”.“ (1 April)  
- <tendencies>  
  - procrastination  
    "I’ve given you a short timeline because I don’t want you to say, “Ah, I’ll do it next week” or “Err, I’ll I’ll leave that err” and it doesn’t happen, err” (21 October) |
| **Classroom Ethos** | This category encompasses a set of attitudinal principles to create the classroom as a particular learning forum.  
- collective responsibility  
  "Umm…okay, so, some grammar…err, yes, after what happened with err books yesterday, so what I’ve done is I’ve gone in and err .. ((laughing)) Yeah! Oh yeah, that’s right, nobody reminded me! We’ve got all organised, booking to go and get grammar books (issue) yesterday, and I explained that, but we forgot, suddenly it was the end of the lesson.” (30 September) |
| **Classroom Operational Protocols** | This category involves a set of more practically oriented principles that learners were directed to adopt in order to run the classroom smoothly.  
- "I want you to stop now. If you’re not finished, don’t worry….I just want you to stop now. You don’t want to stop do you?” (6 May) |
| **Classroom Social Order** | This category deals with aspects of teacher-student relationship which have implications on the ways meanings are assigned and negotiated.  
- teacher to officialise meaning  
  "So we’ve done a lot of things [[to prepare]] for this." (16 September)  
  "GI and HT have an EXCUSE, no one else does” (16 September) |
| **Standard Educational Practices** | This category encompasses rules, protocols and general understandings surrounding practices in educational settings.  
- presentation and recording  
  "when you go into uh through our course and when you go into Stage 1 or…Year 11, Year 12, when you go to university you will have to stand up and you will have to give a presentation to the students in your class and it will be taped. Sometimes it’ll be taped with a little tape recorder, sometimes it will be videoed.” (1 April) |
Commentaries

It should be noted that generated categories emerged out of a specific set of classroom teacher talk data, and as such, they were contingent and specific to the data. The intention here was primarily to highlight the characteristics of norms, but not to account for every aspect of social life by the generated categories.

“Learner Mentality” was included under SCNs for its perceived applicability to the social domains outside educational spheres. Many of the identified mentalities were in close reference to work ethics, and many others were connected with social relevance of some sort, both of which essentially originated from sociocultural considerations.

7.3 Findings – General Trend

The identification and classification of norms across lessons foregrounded a consistent prioritisation of SCNs in teacher’s norm-setting. This can be seen in the extensiveness of the generated SCNs as opposed to EDNs (see Tables 7.6 and 7.7 below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCNs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Tastes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- preference to certain words (“slightly”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- respecting politicians/ceremony guests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- valuing extra-curricular learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- valuing writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- valuing children's books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- valuing Rotary Camps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- finding a particular museum exhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- possessing a particular money sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- adopting market economy principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- value adding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- favouring the Show*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Wisdom/ Educated-Guess</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adelaide winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- welcoming rain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- choice of appropriate clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- based on weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- based on activity/occasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- checking weather forecasts to inform one's decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- recognising popularity and educational relevance of a museum exhibition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- anticipating weather improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- recognising what counts as utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- knowing what constitutes sexual health matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learner Mentality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- reluctance to leave work incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- mental toughness/positive attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- keen to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- reflectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- diligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- eager to complete courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- eager to attend graduation ceremonies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- eager to do tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- receptivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- compliance and independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- excited about catching trains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Civic Virtues**

*<Towards Others>*
- equity
- praising peers (skills / achievements)
- collectively celebrating peers’ opportunities / achievements
- collaboration
- tolerance to others
- consideration for others
- sensitivity in sharing self
- self-help and courtesy to others
- sensitivity towards ownership

*<From Others>*
- recognition of one’s dependency on others and support receiving from others
  - Aus society/community as generous, caring and helpful towards newcomers (local politician TKT, Aus youth community, subsidy from The College, support organisation, researchers-assising work)
  - the teacher as considerate and/or accommodating with learners

**Cultural Tastes**
- value for money & abstinence (rides, Sideshows, junk food)
- valuing farming in Australia
- valuing convenience (living close to the final bus stop as lucky)
- valuing efficiency (killing two birds in one stone)
- loving to work
- preference to paid work
- preference to full-time work
- willingness to establish oneself from obscurity
- possessing a particular sense of time
- sexism (female supremacy)
- protection of one’s face

* 19 August and 2 September (2) contained numerous aspects/displays of the Show being endorsed.

**Cultural Wisdom/Educated-Guess**
- psychological mechanisms
- pragmatism
- principles of language use
- use of imperatives when giving instructions
- frequent use of “cute”
- common use of “boulevard” in English
- expecting French speaker to identify French word in English
- origin of “boulevard”
- recognition of words with patterns
- frequent use of “category” in Maths and Science
- common use of “utilities” in Business Management, Book-keeping and Economics
- distinguishing “polite” and “Polites”
- semantic sensitivity
  - “value adding” and “recycling”
  - “subsidy” and “relief package”
  - “newness” of location change
  - “agenda” and “itinerary”
  - “cute” and “beautiful”
  - “bizarre”
  - pre-empting
- predicting the predictability
- the nature of interviews with researchers
- the nature of competitions in the Show
- likelihood of winning when gambling
- eligible cooking for competition
- life expectancy

**Learner Mentality**

*<Ideals>*
- eager to access information on occupation
- eager to go on excursions
- keen to access “behind the scenes”
- eager to access additional information
- interested in Hyatt Hotel laundry
- keen to participate in the competitions at the Show
- taking responsibility for creating trouble
- autonomy
- humbleness/demonstrating apologetic manner
- keen to do extra work at home
- keen to do self-learning
- learning from school students

*<Tendencies>*
- having difficulty in learning
- stressed about giving presentations
- troubled in handling filing equipment
- having difficulty in following columns
- procrastination
- naïve view towards work and life
- opting for easy solutions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frugality</th>
<th>Etiquette</th>
<th>Institutional Practices</th>
<th>Organisation Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- restraining expenses</td>
<td>- politeness towards visitors</td>
<td>- handling the situation of being recorded</td>
<td>- managing supplied materials/handouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- pursuing freebies</td>
<td>- appropriate greeting</td>
<td>- library lending and renewing</td>
<td>- filing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- welcoming subsidy</td>
<td>- not too rude</td>
<td>- keeping communal resources</td>
<td>- desk arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- equating “cheap” with “free”</td>
<td>- politeness towards tour guide</td>
<td>- the nature of workshops</td>
<td>- seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- taking own food and drink around</td>
<td>- communication manners</td>
<td>- presentation manners</td>
<td>- punctuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- avoiding taboos</td>
<td>- break protocols</td>
<td>- responsible time management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Wisdom / Educated-Guess</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- available facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- communication difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- nature of migrants’ experiences in Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- multiliteracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- finding indexes on the map helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- survey results listed in order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- telling paper quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- attention to details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- appropriate food choice (as lunch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- gaining body warmth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- assessing distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- economical and realistic thinking in handling data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- monetary value of the book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- identifying interview candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- jobs at College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- work hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- OH&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- worker entitlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- work benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- work and family life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- arranging interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- social hierarchy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- handling the situation of being recorded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- library lending and renewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- keeping communal resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the nature of workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- presentation manners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- break protocols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- pragmatic scheduling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- group booking protocols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- group tickets rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- group excursion rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- weather contingency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- treatment of original documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- contact hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- business hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- attendance/absence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- sex-based grouping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- handling extra elements to task</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- managing supplied materials/handouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- filing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- desk arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- seating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- punctuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- responsible time management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- note-taking protocols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- filing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- planning and time management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- preparation to leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- pre-emptive scheduling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- map and itinerary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- compacting information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7.7 EDNs Generated from Teacher Talk across 10 Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDNs</th>
<th>Classroom ethos</th>
<th>Classroom operational protocols</th>
<th>Classroom social order</th>
<th>Standard educational practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-active engagement in talk</td>
<td>-balancing teacher talk and student talk</td>
<td>-teacher to evaluate students</td>
<td>-presentation and recording</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-inquisitive about teacher’s intension</td>
<td>-attentive listening to teacher</td>
<td>-teacher to officialise meaning</td>
<td>-test-taking procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-having faith in learning tasks</td>
<td>-keeping trying until teacher satisfies</td>
<td>-compliance to teacher</td>
<td>-test-taking behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-compassionate to the teacher</td>
<td>-non-pedantic attitude</td>
<td>-acceptance of teacher reasoning</td>
<td>-test-taking techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-individual variability</td>
<td>-reading between lines</td>
<td>-teacher enabler</td>
<td>-fieldwork/research-based learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-sensitivity towards feeling</td>
<td>-timing of students’ talk in class</td>
<td>-teacher to define educational irrelevance</td>
<td>-use of school computers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-diligence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-using (scrap) paper for notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-being earnest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-use of English in fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-wasting no time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-retrieval/demonstration of teacher’s earlier input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-having a go</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-collective responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-motivated to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-inquisitive about the amount of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The range of SCNs, both in the macro-labels and their subcategories are more extensive than EDNs. Of those, Civic Virtues, Cultural Tastes, Cultural Wisdom and Learner Mentality were more extensive than other SCNs. The predominance of SCNs can also be seen at a lesson level, where SCNs outnumbered EDNs by a significant margin in most lessons (see Table 7.8).

Table 7.8 The Identified Occurrence of SCNs and EDNs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Apr</th>
<th>6 May</th>
<th>1 Jul</th>
<th>5 Aug</th>
<th>19 Aug</th>
<th>2 Sep1</th>
<th>2 Sep2</th>
<th>16 Sep</th>
<th>30 Sep</th>
<th>21 Oct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCNs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDNs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of norm types in each lesson roughly corresponded to the duration (hence amount) of teacher-fronted talk.

Viewed from a year-long perspective, the range and regularity of SCNs profiled in ten lessons were more or less constant. There was no sign of SCNs reducing or diminishing as time passed. If anything, SCNs were slightly on the rise in the
latter half of the lessons. Admittedly, there are variables that make blanket comparisons between lessons difficult. The length of teacher-fronted talk and learning topics and activities specific to lessons were such variables. Still, the persistent nature of SCNs is of note in that it looks as though the more the learners spent time in NAP, the more sociocultural norms that the learners were likely to be exposed to.

The SCNs’ much higher proportionality than the EDNs suggests that the teacher’s primary orientation was to present what she held as normal and socially approved ways of operating in the outer, Australian society. EDNs often played a supporting role, enabling the teacher to create a particular educational forum in which she concentrated on setting SCNs. Inserting “Classroom social order – compliance to teacher” items such as “Right?” or “Yeah?” in between SCNs was illustrative of this.

In total, SCNs were set almost three times more than EDNs. No lesson had teacher talk that almost exclusively focused upon EDNs, although the opposite can be seen in several lessons (e.g. 2 September (2)). Of the lessons, 6 May stood out for its near-even distribution of SCNs and EDNs. A possible reason for this was identified in the characteristics of the organisation of each lesson (see Activities in Table 7.9).
Table 7.9 Captured Main Learning Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Lesson</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>SCNs</th>
<th>EDNs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 April</td>
<td>Catch-up lesson &amp; Lesson of Tasks – individual composition and/or individual tasks [LONG TASK]</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 May</td>
<td>Mixture – series of administration, grammar test, vocabulary review, a combination of small-scale gap-filling task and reflection on learning, continued work on Genre</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 July</td>
<td>Administrations &amp; Catch-up lesson – finishing oral presentation, individual presentation feedback &amp; independent reading comprehension task, farewell to two leaving learners [LONG TASK]</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 August</td>
<td>Preparation lesson – pre-exursion briefing and pre-exursion task (reading comprehension) [LONG TASK]</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 August</td>
<td>Mixture – series of administration, pre-exursion briefing (the Show -round 1), (and then continued work on Genre (not included in transcription)) [LONG TASK]</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 September (1)</td>
<td>Preparation lesson &amp; excursion – pre-exursion briefing, (then off to the excursion (not included in transcription)) [LONG TASK – excursion]</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 September (2)</td>
<td>Preparation lesson – pre-exursion briefing (the Show -round 2 – continued from 19 August) and pre-exursion task [LONG TOPIC]</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 September</td>
<td>Catch-up lesson – individual composition [LONG TASK]</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 September</td>
<td>Administrations &amp; Lesson of Tasks – accessing classroom survey results, assortment of tasks of individual choice (including grammar drills) [LONG TASK]</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 October</td>
<td>Mixture – individual grammar drills (same style as 30 September), Stage 1 assignment trial (practice of practice) [LONG TASK]</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: LONG TASK: learners spent longer than 1 hour mostly on their own (either individually or in groups) carrying out task(s)
LONG TOPIC: one topic covered the majority of the lesson time

The table shows that the lessons that had far more SCNs than EDNs were organised with either “LONG TASKS”, “LONG TOPIC”, “pre-exursion briefings” or a combination of these. 6 May did not have any of these elements. The vast majority of the lessons (8 out of 10) had “LONG TASKS”. Only 6 May and 2 September (2) did not consist of “LONG TASKS”. However, 2 September (2) was organised around a “LONG TOPIC”, where the majority of its lesson time was spent on one single topic (the excursion to The Royal Adelaide Show). It also had “pre-exursion briefings”.

204
Cross-referencing the norm orientations with lesson organisations provokes the following observations. First, it is notable that planning long tasks resulted in a richness of SCNs instead of EDNs. This suggests that the teacher’s attention was drawn to sociocultural normative thinking during task briefing as well as teacher talk of other occasions. However, second, it remains inconclusive whether teacher’s task briefings were the main factor for the concentration on SCNs. Data from 19 August do not contain the teacher’s task briefing. Only a portion of teacher-fronted interaction was available for this lesson due to multiple interruptions in the earlier stages of the lesson. In contrast, “pre-excursion briefings” are likely to contribute to the increase on SCNs since all the lessons that had “pre-excursion briefings”, including 19 August, clearly had more SCNs than EDNs.

A finer analysis of the distribution of the macro SCNs in each lesson further underpins the pervasiveness of some SCNs over others. Judging from their regularity of occurrence, some SCNs appeared to be a consistent focus across topics and contexts, whereas others were relatively context-dependent (see Table 7.10).

Table 7.10  Distribution of SCNs across Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>CW/EG</th>
<th>LM-i</th>
<th>LM-t</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>IP</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 April</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 May</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 July</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Aug</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Aug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sep (1)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sep (2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Sep</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Sep</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurrence/10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CV: Civic Virtues; CT: Cultural Tastes; CW/EG: Cultural Wisdom/Educated Guesses; LM-i: Learner Mentality <ideals>; LM-t: Learner Mentality <tendencies>; E: Etiquette; F: Frugality; IP: Institutional Practices; OS: Organisation Skills
All but “Frugality” were identified in more than half of the profiled lessons. Of those, “Learner Mentality <Ideals>” was profiled in every lesson, “Civic Virtues” in nine lessons, and “Cultural Wisdom/Educated Guess”, “Institutional Practices” and “Organisation skills” in eight lessons. By contrast, “Frugality” was identified in only two lessons. When comparing “Etiquette” and “Frugality”, two SCNs with the lowest regularities of occurrence, it can be seen that the difference lies in the specificity of context in which each SCN occurred. “Etiquette” was set in multiple contexts, while “Frugality” was set in specific reference to the excursion to the Royal Adelaide Show only. There does not appear to be a recognisable relationship between the regularity of occurrence of a given SCN and the number of clause complexes serving to set a given SCN.

The regular occurrences of certain SCNs suggest that these SCNs are mapped around pedagogic foci of Ms Smith’s English as a Second Language (ESL) lessons in The Red Ochre Class. This is particularly so where regularity, frequency and wide range of subcategories are combined. “Civic Virtues”, “Cultural Tastes”, “Cultural Wisdom/Educated Guess” and “Learner Mentality” stand out on account of their widespread occurrence. Also notable is the consistency of occurrence of “Institutional Practices” and “Organisation Skills”. Being contextually-organised categories, these two SCNs exemplify that the teacher’s attention was constantly drawn to institutional and organisational aspects of the learners’ lives, although their range of subcategories was not as wide as the first three.

Of those pervasive SCNs, “Learner Mentality” had the most obvious implications for the construction of a NAP learner. The consistent occurrence of the <Ideal> type in every lesson evidenced that the teacher candidly presented to the current learners the specific traits of an ideal learner. She did this through spelling out what attitudes an ideal learner should hold and how they should behave. As shown in Table 7.11, the ideal learner traits consist of both versatile and specific elements, ranging from “resolution” to “interested in Hyatt Hotel laundry”.
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Table 7.11 Identified Learner Mentalities from 10 Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&lt;Ideals&gt;</th>
<th>&lt;Tendencies&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-reluctance to leave work</td>
<td>-having difficulty in learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incomplete</td>
<td>-stressed about giving presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-resolution</td>
<td>-troubled in handling filing equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mental toughness/positive attitude</td>
<td>-having difficulty in following columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-keen to learn</td>
<td>-procrastination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-reflectivity</td>
<td>-naive view towards work and life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-diligence</td>
<td>-opting for easy solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-eager to complete courses</td>
<td>-having difficulty in learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-eager to attend graduation ceremonies</td>
<td>-taking responsibility for creating trouble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-eager to do tests</td>
<td>-autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-receptivity</td>
<td>-humbleness/demonstrating apologetic manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-compliance and independence</td>
<td>-keen to do extra work at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-excited about catching trains</td>
<td>-keen to do self-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-eager to access information on occupation</td>
<td>-learning from school students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-eager to go on excursions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some were more context-independent characteristics of a good learner, while others could be interpreted as attitudes which were expected of a NAP learner. Although no specific reference to NAP was made, eagerness in finding out occupations and going on excursions were inseparable from lesson plans that paid considerable attention to occupations and excursions. In five out of ten lessons, the picture of an ideal learner was accentuated with “Learner Mentality <Tendency>”, the unwelcomed traits of the learners. Because these traits represent a breach or a lack of the expected learner attitudes, the traits such as “procrastination” or “opting for easy solutions” were presented in direct reference to the current learners. In other words, <Ideal> represent what the current learners were not, and <Tendency> represent what the learners were like instead. There was a stark contrast between ideal learners and what the current learners were like. That many more ideals than tendencies were presented indicates how much the Red class learners were expected to achieve.

Up to this point, trends in norm-setting talk have been discussed in fairly general terms with particular focus on SCNs. In practice, however, norm-setting talk was a complex enterprise, incorporating a complex web of norms being set one after another. Such norm networks are manifestations of the ways the learners were
constructed. The next section will focus on how certain norms were combined in particular segments of teacher talk.

7.4 Norm Networks

Norms were often incorporated in a complex fashion in a given segment of teacher talk. Often, one norm provoked the other. Norms were either strengthened or justified by additional norms brought in. As a result, by the end of a specific segment of teacher talk, multiple norms of different types were being set. It is not too giant a step to take to observe how the “new arrival” learners were being constructed out of these norms.

Five episodes were chosen to illustrate how this occurs. The episodes were chosen to cover a wide timeframe as well as variety. They were taken from a total of six lessons over six months, covering various aspects of life. This selection was itself a reflection of how continuous norm-setting was an everyday matter for the learners.

7.4.1 New Arrivals and Weather-Compatible Clothing

An episode from 6 May concerned everyday life matters (SCNs). It had several normative messages when the teacher structured the learners’ thoughts on winter clothing (see Table 7.12).
Table 7.12  Coding of an Episode from 6 May

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Chunks</th>
<th>Imparted Norms (SCNs)</th>
<th>Appraising items</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Judgement</th>
<th>Appreciation</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Graduation</th>
<th>Appraised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You know I saw you [[walking to school]] this morning</td>
<td>recognition of appropriate clothes choice according to weather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>contract-proclaim-concur (you know)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and I thought: [&quot;Oh my gosh SQ's wearing T-shirt&quot;]</td>
<td>1) negative attitude towards wearing T-shirts in cold weather</td>
<td>[Oh my gosh]</td>
<td>-sec to invoke</td>
<td>-val</td>
<td>expand entertain (I thought)</td>
<td>SQ wearing T-shirt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm cold</td>
<td>cold</td>
<td>-sec to invoke</td>
<td>-react qual</td>
<td>weather</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and I've got long sleeves on</td>
<td>2) positive attitude towards wearing long sleeves in cold weather</td>
<td>long sleeves</td>
<td>+react qual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>long sleeves on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and this is nice and thick</td>
<td>3) appropriate conceptualisation of what counts as warm clothes</td>
<td>nice, thick</td>
<td>+react qual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>long sleeves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So um yeah so now's a good time [[to be looking in shops [[to be finding some nice warm clothes]]]],</td>
<td>4) appropriate recognition of timing and need to purchase warm clothes</td>
<td>nice warm</td>
<td>+prop</td>
<td>+val (good time) to invoke judge on +prop +react qual (nice warm)</td>
<td>low force (some)</td>
<td>look in shops and find some nice warm clothes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you know, for example, err PK's—PK's sweatshirt, that's a really nice warm sweatshirt</td>
<td>3) DUPE</td>
<td>nice warm</td>
<td>+react qual</td>
<td>contract-proclaim-concur (you know)</td>
<td>high force (really)</td>
<td>PK's sweatshirt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and ME's got her nice warm jacket</td>
<td></td>
<td>nice warm</td>
<td>+react qual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ME's jacket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and SX's got his jacket good for [[stopping the wind]],</td>
<td></td>
<td>good for stopping the wind</td>
<td>+react qual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SX's jacket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yep, so you need to be thinking now [[what are you going to be wearing in winter]]</td>
<td>4) DUPE</td>
<td>need to</td>
<td>+prop</td>
<td>expand entertain (need to)</td>
<td>thinking what to wear in winter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>because</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's quite funny,</td>
<td></td>
<td>quite funny</td>
<td>+react qual</td>
<td></td>
<td>med force (quite)</td>
<td>students from cold places feeling cold in Adelaide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you know, sometimes, students have come from very cold places,</td>
<td></td>
<td>(whole)</td>
<td>-react qual (very cold)</td>
<td>contract-proclaim-concur (you know)</td>
<td>low force (sometimes)</td>
<td>high force (very)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but still in Adelaide they feel [[that winter is very cold]]</td>
<td></td>
<td>(whole)</td>
<td>+nom</td>
<td>-react qual (very cold)</td>
<td>contract-disclaim-concur (but, still)</td>
<td>high force (very)</td>
<td>feeling Adelaide winter is very cold, Adelaide winter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Under the overall norm of “recognition of appropriate clothes choice according to weather” (“Life Skills – clothing and weather”), at least five micro-norms were being set:

1. negative attitude towards wearing T-shirts in cold weather
2. positive attitude towards wearing long sleeves in cold weather
3. appropriate conceptualisation of what counts as warm clothes
4. appropriate recognition of timing and need to purchase warm clothes
5. appropriate recognition of Adelaide winter being cold for everyone

The episode opened with 1, when the teacher gave an anecdotal account of her emotional reaction against a particular student (SQ) wearing a T-shirt. This formed the basis to build 2 and 3, with reference to the teacher who, contrary to SQ, was wearing “long sleeves” (2) that was deemed appropriate (3: “nice and thick”). Then 4 (“now’s a good time to…”) was built upon the preceding micro-norms, as if to say the learners were collectively unaware of the need to prepare for the warm clothes. Interestingly, however, examples of good clothing (PK’s sweatshirt, ME’s jacket and SX’s jacket) were drawn out of the very learners who were being collectively subjected to norm-setting on winter clothing. After repeating 4, this time by directly obligating the learners (“you need to be thinking now”), the teacher rationalised her instruction with 5, a normative recognition that people will find Adelaide winter “very cold”.

The layer of micro-norms created a contrast between the learners and the teacher. Right from the beginning, SQ and the teacher in long sleeves were directly contrasted. This resulted in representing SQ as unaware of, or even breaching, the normative behaviour under the particular weather. A subsequent shift to “obligatory” general life skills advice on purchasing winter clothes characterised the teacher as a “knower” and the learners collectively as lacking the knowledge.

Also, this episode shows that there was probably a preconception on the part of the teacher that the learners lack knowledge in weather-appropriate clothing. One single student wearing a T-shirt was enough to provoke the teacher’s concern about the whole learners’ welfare on this matter.
7.4.2 New Arrivals and Intellectually Demanding Reading Tasks

An episode from 1 July on a reading comprehension task had three EDNs laid one after another. The task was assigned as concurrent with their individual feedback session with the teacher on their previously held oral presentation. The specific span for this episode starts in Turn 266 in Excerpt 7.1 below (underlined), and the Norm-Setting talk under investigation is indicated in bold type. The breakdown of the Norm-Setting talk is presented in Table 7.13.

Excerpt 7.1

264. T: Umm, okay, so here you’ve got, there’s some, err you CAN WRITE on these paper. Umm so there’s something to read, there’s some, short answers here, multiple choice, we call those multiple choice, so you can choose one of the answers, one of those A, B, C or D, umm and it says, “put a TICK”. What the TICK looks like?
265. ((a short silence))
266. T: Good, ((laughs slightly)) okay, and then umm on the back, there is some more multiple choice, but then we get down to, “Work it out” and “What do you think?”. Now these are not short answers. These are longer answers, you’ll need some note paper
267. S: Okay
268. T: write your answers and (.). Okay?……umm, and you know, give that a good, good err amount of attention, and err good try at those ones, they’re not short, not simple answers. Umm especially the ones “What do you think?”, that’s coming out of here ((pointing out her head))….Right?
269. S: oh
270. T: Right, yeah? Write your mind, your own ideas. Okay, so, while you are doing that…

The teacher interpreted for the learners that the required answers were “not short” but “longer” (Turn 266). This led to another requirement that these longer answers must be written on the “note paper”, unlike the preceding answers that learners were allowed to write directly on the task sheet (264).

The three micro EDNs were brought in after this in Turn 268. The first norm “resolute attitude towards answering questions” came in as a command “…… umm, and you know, give that a good, good err amount of attention, and err good try at those ones)”. This is concerned with the area of “Classroom ethos”, in that one must earnestly try to answer the question. The two subsequent norms,
“recognition of the nature of the questions” and “recognition of the intellectual demand on answering questions”, were set subsequently. They constituted the basis for the first norm, in that they were the teacher’s definition of the nature of the questions (“they’re not short, not simple answers”) and associated “recognition of the intellectual demand on answering questions” (“that’s coming out of here ((pointing out her head))…”).

The use of “not short” and “not simple”, instead of “long” and “complex”, created a direct opposition to the preceding comprehension questions (e.g. “short” in Turn 264). This conveyed an assumption that the non-short, non-simple nature of the question was unexpected for the learners. Teacher talk on the intellectual demand of these questions consisted of both verbal and nonverbal elements. As a non-verbal move, the teacher points at her head to indicate where the answer should originate from, thereby practically telling learners to use their brain. As a verbal move, the teacher subsequently demanded learners’ comprehension of and compliance to the norms (“Right?” “Right, yeah?”). Again, there was an assumption that without such a prompt, the learners were left in the dark as to how to generate an answer.
Table 7.13  Coding of an Episode from 1 July

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Clause/Clause Chunk</th>
<th>Pedagogic Function(s)</th>
<th>Imparted norms (SCNs)</th>
<th>Imparted norms (EDNs)</th>
<th>Appraising items</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Judgement</th>
<th>Appreciation</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Graduation</th>
<th>Appraised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>but then we get down to, [&quot;Work it out&quot;] and [&quot;What do you think?&quot;].</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Now these are not short answers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>These are longer answers, you’ll need some note paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>write your answers and ()</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Okay?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>…… umm, and [&quot;you know&quot;], give that a good, good err amount of attention, and err good try at those ones,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they’re not short, not simple answers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Umm especially the ones [&quot;What do you think&quot;],</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that’s coming out of here…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Right, yeah?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write your mind, your own ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compliance | Okay | +Prop | Contract-proclaim-concur (you know) | Med force | Giving good amount of attention and good try | C&C |

Resolution attitude towards answering questions | Good etc | +Prop ([give that…] +ten [good attention and try]) | Contract-disclaim-deny (not) | Sharpen focus (especially) | Answers |

Recognition of the nature of the questions | Not short, not simple | Neg +Val | Contract-disclaim-deny (not) | | Sharpen focus (especially) |

Recognition of the intellectual demand on answering questions | (Whole) | +Val | Contract-proclaim-concur (you know) | Med force | Giving good amount of attention and good try | C&C |

Right? 270 | CM |
While the learners were left on their own to carry out the act of reading and comprehending the text, detailed instruction was provided on how to decipher the nature of comprehension questions before the learners accessed the text. Thus, the learners were constructed as those lacking the knowledge base for properly engaging with the reading questions. As part of assigning a task, the teacher's attention was drawn to thinking how to think, thereby setting up a normative sense-making framework for the learners before they engaged with the task. However, the question is whether the learners were capable of using their brain and write down their opinions if they had to be told that they would have to use their brain and think about specific questions.

### 7.4.3 New Arrivals and Institutional Intricacies Behind Excursions

The third episode is a “take-two” of the 5 August pre-excursion briefings explored in the previous chapter. Previously taken up as a showcase instance of Managerial talk being taken over by Norm-Setting talk, the same instance has been chosen, this time as a showcase instance of SCN-rich pre-excursion briefings. As identified earlier in this chapter, pre-excursion briefings were a major factor for influencing the SCN-EDN ratio, and they were witnessed in four lessons (5 August, 19 August, 2 September (1) and (2)).

The episode shows how the teacher constructs a normative attitude towards an educational excursion through both explicit and implicit means. As underlined in Excerpt 7.2 below, the excursion site (a museum exhibition of Douglas Mawson) was explicitly appraised as “very interesting”, and this was immediately followed by the teacher’s “hope” that the learners “enjoy the exhibition”. Before teacher talk reached this explicit appraisal, however, there were more extensive yet implicit norm-setting moments (indicated in bold font). The teacher stressed how difficult it was to secure a booking for the particular museum exhibition. The details of coding are shown in the Table 7.14.

**Excerpt 7.2**

6. T: How about a break at about ten o’clock?
7. S: fifteen minutes break
8. T: YEAH, fifteen minutes break.
9. S: Why=
10. T: =That's long enough for coffee and stretch your legs and…….go to a loo?
11. S: ( )
12. T: ((laughs)) Umm, and yeah, and have err you know, a bit of a chat? And then we'll go to the museum, because, I mean, you'll be talking to each other as we are going to the museum anyway. Umm and then, umm when we, err so we're going to the museum today umm I KNOW that you've been to the museum al, umm, last week. But we're going to see a different exhibition today. And, I know that err that's sort of going to the museum again, in such a short time, BUT we WERE very lucky to get the booking in this, exhibition. You know we have to BOOK, to go to the exhibition. If we go one by one, you know, with a family or something, you don't have to book. But when you go as a group, you have to book. And, so you know, sometimes we have, err a teacher has to wait MONTHS, to be able to go, to see a particular exhibition. And the one we are seeing today, is one of those very popular exhibitions. So we were SO LUCKY to get a booking today. So I just said, “Yes I'll take it”. You know? Umm and the work that you are doing….for this err excursion is, err is in exactly what we want you doing now, too. So, well, you have err excursion to the museum. Now, I haven't put an exact time when to return, because, umm, this exhibition CAN take quite a lot of time to do that. Right There is um, I think, four, four or five pages in the exercises to do, there's umm, It's a VERY interesting exhibition. I hope you enjoy it too. But I so I haven't set a time when to come back so that we DO have enough time to look at it properly (taken from 5 August, turns 6-12)
Table 7.14 Coding of an Episode from 5 August

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turn</th>
<th>Clause/Clause Chunk</th>
<th>Pedagogic Function(s)</th>
<th>Imparted norms (SCNs)</th>
<th>Appraising items</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Judgement</th>
<th>Appreciation</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
<th>Graduation</th>
<th>Appraised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>umm I KNOW [[that you’ve been to the museum al, umm, last week]].</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1) anticipation of negative attitude towards a repeat trip to the museum 2) positive acceptance of multiple visits to the same venue in close succession</td>
<td>different</td>
<td>+val</td>
<td>contract-disclaim-counter (but)</td>
<td>softened focus (sort of), high force (such a short time)</td>
<td>today’s museum visit</td>
<td>exhibiton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>But we’re going to see a different exhibition today.</td>
<td>CM</td>
<td>a) different exhibition</td>
<td>very lucky</td>
<td>+nom</td>
<td>contract-disclaim-counter (but)</td>
<td>high force (very)</td>
<td>we, getting booking for this exhibition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And, I know [[that er that’s sort of [[going to the museum again, in such a short time]]]].</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>sort of going to the museum again…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUT we WERE very lucky [[to get the booking in this, exhibition]].</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>b) lucky to secure booking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You know [[we have to BOOK, [[to go to the exhibition]]]].</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>recognition of the requirement of booking for a group excursion</td>
<td>have to</td>
<td>+prop</td>
<td>contract-proclaim-concur (you know) expand-entertain (have to)</td>
<td>soft focus (or something)</td>
<td>(above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If we go one by one, [[you know]], with a family or something.</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) no booking required for individual visitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>you don’t have to book.</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) booking required for groups</td>
<td>don’t have to</td>
<td>neg +prop</td>
<td>contract-disclaim-counter (but)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>But when you go as a group,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>you have to book.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And, so [[you know], sometimes we have,</td>
<td></td>
<td>recognition of the difficulty in securing a group booking</td>
<td>have to</td>
<td>+prop</td>
<td>contract-proclaim-concur (you know) low force (sometimes)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(above)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turn</td>
<td>Clause/Clause Chunk</td>
<td>Pedagogic Function(s)</td>
<td>Imparted norms (SCNs)</td>
<td>Appraising items</td>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>Judgement</td>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>Graduation</td>
<td>Appraised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>err a teacher has to wait <strong>MONTHS</strong>, [[to be able [[to go, [[to see a particular exhibition]]]]]].</td>
<td>for this particular exhibition</td>
<td>has to</td>
<td>+prop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And the one [[we are seeing today]], is one of those very popular exhibitions.</td>
<td>recognition of the popularity of the particular exhibition</td>
<td>popular</td>
<td></td>
<td>+val</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So we were <strong>SO LUCKY</strong> [[to get a booking today]].</td>
<td>positive appraisal of the booking</td>
<td>lucky</td>
<td></td>
<td>+nom</td>
<td>+val</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>So I just said, [[&quot;Yes I'll take it&quot;]].</td>
<td>positive appraisal of the teacher's pragmatic attitude to secure booking for the group</td>
<td>Yes I'll take it</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ten</td>
<td>contract-disclaim-counter (just)</td>
<td>high force (just)</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You know?</td>
<td>compliance</td>
<td>you know</td>
<td></td>
<td>+prop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Umm and the work [[that you are doing ... for this err excursion]] is, err is in <strong>exactly</strong> [[what we want you [[doing now]]]] too.</td>
<td>appropriate recognition of the educational relevance of exhibition</td>
<td>in exactly what we want you doing now</td>
<td></td>
<td>+val</td>
<td>contract-proclaim-pronounce (exactly)</td>
<td>sharpen focus (exactly)</td>
<td>The work that students are doing for today's exhibition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The rationalisation structure of the relevance of museum visit explicated in the previous chapter was simultaneously the presentation of norm-networks (see Figure 7.2 below). Bold fonts with square brackets indicate SCN macro labels, bold fonts without brackets indicate the individually spelt out norms (corresponds to the Table 7.14 above), italicised parts indicate actual teacher talk and non-italicised normal fonts correspond to the rationalisation structure identified in Figure 6.1 in the previous chapter.

1. **[Institutional practices – pragmatic scheduling]**
   - Positive acceptance of multiple visits to the same venue in close succession
     - **a)** Different exhibition ("But we’re going to see a different exhibition today")
     - **b)** Lucky to secure booking
       - How lucky the students were to be able to go and see a particular exhibition ("BUT we WERE very lucky [[to get the booking in this, exhibition]]")

2. **[Institutional practices – group booking protocols]**
   - Recognition of the requirement of booking for a group excursion
     - a) No booking required for individual visitors
       - The understanding that a group must make a booking prior to visit the exhibition ("You know [[we have to BOOK, [[to go to the exhibition]]]]")
     - b) Booking required for groups
       - (a-1 continues) ("But when you go as a group, you have to book")

3. **[Cultural wisdom/educated guess]**
   - Recognition of the difficulty of securing booking for the exhibition
     - (A) How difficult it was at times to make a group booking for educational visits ("And, so [[you know]], sometimes we have, err a teacher has to wait MONTHLY, [[to be able, [[to go, [[to see a particular exhibition]]]]]]")
   - Recognition of the popularity of the particular exhibition
     - (B) The understanding that the popularity of the exhibition works as a factor that affects the group booking process ("And the one [[we are seeing today]], is one of those very popular exhibitions")

4. **Positive appraisal of securing a booking for the exhibition**
   - Reiteration of how lucky the students were to be able to go and see a particular exhibition ("So we were SO LUCKY [[to get a booking today]]")

5. **Positive appraisal of the teacher’s pragmatic attitude to secure booking for the group**
   - Exemplifying how a teacher would respond to the opportunity ("So I just said, [[“Yes I’ll take it”]]. You know?")

6. **[Cultural wisdom/educated guess]**
   - Appropriate recognition of the educational relevance of exhibition
     - How pedagogically timely and relevant it was to go and see a particular exhibition ("Umm and the work [[that you are doing … for this err excursion]] is, err is in exactly [[what we want you [[doing now]]]], too")

Figure 7.2 Spelt out Norms from the 5 August Episode
The figure represents how complexly the norms were connected to one another. Some were in a parallel relationship and others were in a hierarchical relationship, with the indented ones supporting the preceding one. There was a switch from “Institutional practices” SCNs into “Cultural wisdom/educated guess” SCNs as the talk proceeded. Three main arguments for constructing the relevance of a consecutive museum visit were presented at the beginning (2 and 3) and at the very end of the episode (12). They were: the exhibition was different (2); lucky to secure booking (3); and relevant for the upcoming unit of work (12).

As touched on in the previous chapter, the learners were viewed as potentially non-compliant, hardly appreciating their good fortune to be able to access the museum exhibition. Teacher’s norm-setting was seen as a pre-emptive measure to prevent the learners from thinking about questioning “why museum again”. Judging from how the norms were laid, the learners’ lack of appreciation was thought to be deriving from their lack of knowledge of the difficulty in securing a group booking. However, not only were they viewed as lacking knowledge, but also not knowing the institutional norm of making a group booking in the first place, not to mention the knowledge of the popularity of the exhibition.

Two additional characteristics of this segment complicate the picture of “new arrival” students. One is that the whole reasoning and series of norm-setting occurred within one long teacher turn. The teacher was “asserting” the relevance of the consecutive museum visit, “explaining” the reasons that support the relevance, “introducing” normative understanding of institutional practices and “persuading” learners to accept the teacher’s reasoning at the same time. Each element (1-12 in Figure 7.2) was successively presented with little pause in between. Moreover, the selected segment was sandwiched between preceding and antecedent talk. The audio-recorded data shows no sign of learners interrupting or inserting their say during this segment. The teacher’s explanation was complex, requiring deciphering of logic. This means that while the teacher did not seem to expect learners to be operating on socially approved grounds, she nevertheless expected learners to be capable of handling the logic she was weaving.
Another characteristic is that many of the normative elements presented to the learners were something that only the teacher would possess knowledge of or understanding about in the classroom. For example, backstage information on how long a teacher has to wait for a particular exhibition (8) is a type of knowledge possessed only by educational practitioners. Thus, the teacher was obliging the learners to possess a particular attitude out of conditions quite external to them. Likewise, the details of the exhibition were provided in a much later stage of the lesson. This means that the learners had little clue as to what made the museum visit pedagogically timely and relevant (12). In this way, the learners had little clue as to whether the teacher’s rationalisation was reasonable, but they were to take what teacher said at face value.

7.4.4 New Arrivals and Frugality

The fourth episode was concerned with Frugality and occurred during the pre-excursion briefing on the Royal Adelaide Show (the Show). In many ways this episode is distinctive. It encompasses two pre-excursion briefings on the Show (19 August and 2 September (2)). 2 September (2), the second briefing, was a “LONG TOPIC” lesson, and almost the entire lesson time (100 minutes) was spent on the preparation for the excursion. Also, if 6 May was seen as one end of the continuum in terms of the balance between SCNs and EDNs (i.e. nearly even), 2 September (2) was the other end of the same continuum, consisting of ten times more SCNs than EDNs.

Frugality was emphasised in both sessions. It emerged as consisting of sub-elements of restraining expenses, pursuing freebies, welcoming subsidy, equating ‘cheap’ with ‘free’ and taking own food and drink around (see Tables 7.15 and 7.16 below).
Table 7.15  Frugality Identified in the 19 August Lesson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imparted Norms (SCNs)</th>
<th>Cognition types</th>
<th>Practice areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frugality</td>
<td>negative attitude towards</td>
<td>sideshows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- restraining expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) (rides) not included in the excursion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) too expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) waste of money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recognition of</td>
<td>the need to be cautious in spending money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>positive anticipation of and attitude towards</td>
<td>accessing a lot of freebies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appropriate attitude towards</td>
<td>the word &quot;subsidy&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.16  Frugality Identified in the 2 September (2) Lesson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imparted norms (SCNs)</th>
<th>Cognition types</th>
<th>Practice areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frugality</td>
<td>negative attitude towards</td>
<td>going on the rides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- restraining expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) ride as too expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) what aspect of rides is interesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) the “appropriate” way of enjoying the rides - looking at peoples' faces and body expressions when on rides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negative attitude towards</td>
<td>participating in sideshow competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>appropriate conceptualisation of</td>
<td>food and drink at the show as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) too expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) purchasing them as waste of money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>negative attitude towards</td>
<td>buying food and drink at the Show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- equating “cheap” with “free”</td>
<td>appropriate conceptualisation of</td>
<td>what kind of food is “cheap” (i.e. free)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- pursuing freebies</td>
<td>appropriate conceptualisation of</td>
<td>looking for every free offer as smart consumer practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>positive attitude towards</td>
<td>trying every free offer (but not buying)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- taking own food and drink around</td>
<td>appropriate and competent attitude towards</td>
<td>bringing own food and drink to the Show</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frugality was one of the few norm areas where negative attitudes were encouraged. Components of Frugality were contextualised within selected domains of the Show including sideshows (rides and games), eating (free offer, food and drink) as well as ticket fee (welcoming subsidy). Within those domains, Rides, Games (“Competitions” in the teacher’s words) and Food were the main focal points upon which norms were set. Micro-norms set in each focal point were presented in Table 7.17, 18, 19 respectively.
Table 7.17 Norm-Setting on Frugality (Rides)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>now those rides, are <strong>pretty expensive.</strong></th>
<th>(i) deeming rides too expensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The tickets, for some of them are are <strong>over eight dollars.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ten …</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((nods, and then in a dismissive, indifferent tone)) <strong>yeah, whatever.</strong></td>
<td>(ii) negative attitude towards going on the rides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>So … ((stops talking, looks at Ss while rotating both palms inwards and outwards with somewhat suggestive facial expression))</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((as two Ss speak, slightly takes her eyes off Ss, but still maintains her hand movement and slightly shrugs her shoulder, then <strong>grins meaningfully</strong>)) think about it,</td>
<td>CONT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(you) just think about it ((chuckles)) …</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((shakes her head)) I <strong>never go on the rides.</strong></td>
<td>(iii) acceptable way of &quot;enjoying&quot; rides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((keeps shaking her head)) I'm <strong>not a ride's</strong> ((shakes her head)) Err ((pushes both palms out in front of her to indicate a feeling of rejection. Facing TS)) <strong>not a ride's person.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((takes her eyes off TS and looks slightly sideways)) But I <strong>do like [[to err look]].</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Err standing and look at the people's faces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((noddling, looking around the room with a grin)) you know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((noddling, in a louder voice, talking over Ss)) mm, <strong>very entertaining.</strong></td>
<td>(iv) positive anticipation of and attitude towards looking at peoples' faces and body expressions when on rides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((starts walking, shaking her body sideways to mock an affected passenger coming out of the rides)) they get off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and, the, <strong>some</strong> people are wobbly and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((stops the body movement.)) Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((chuckles, slowly stepping forward and then backwards as she plays with the pen at hand)) that's <strong>quite</strong> funny.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yeah, ((looks around, moves around her right arm in shapes similar to a figure of eight)) and it's <strong>interesting</strong> [[to watch the little children on the lifts, special children's rides]], too,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they're, ((moves her right hand with an index finger pointed in a u-shape as she continues)) [[you know!]], just doing a little bit ((stops her hand movement, then uses both hands to indicate excitement))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and they're <strong>so scared, and so excited</strong> ((starts walking to the centre front))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and, so ((after a few steps, comes back to where she was a moment ago)) that's err that's an <strong>interesting things at the show.</strong></td>
<td>(v) appropriate conceptualisation of what aspect of rides is interesting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for Rides, the teacher firstly defined them as “pretty expensive” (i), thereby imparting an appropriate way to conceptualise the rides. This was followed by its exemplification by presenting the ticket price. The teacher then discouraged the learners to possess interest in going on rides (ii) with verbalised “so...” with non-verbal, suggestive behaviour. The teacher supplied her personal disliking of the rides to support her suggestion. The teacher then spent a longer time specifying an ‘appropriate’ way to enjoy the rides (iii) with “But I do like to err
look”, together with her emphasis on how entertaining it is to look at people’s faces when on rides (iv). This worked as an exemplification of what aspects of the ride were funny, which, after an extensive account of this point, the teacher concluded as “an interesting things (sic) at the show” (v). Overall, it looks as though the teacher had been attempting to divert the learners from going on rides to watching rides.

Norm-Setting on Frugality through Games consisted only of the negative side of the games (see vi-ix in Table 7.18). Unlike Rides, there was no ‘appropriate’ way of enjoying the games specified. As a result, games were concluded as “[TO be careful about [[what you spend your money on the Show]] ]”.

Table 7.18 Norm-Setting on Frugality (Games)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vi-ix</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(puts up her right index finger then pushes it down)) One thing I I will say though, (opens her left palm and looks at it while using right index finger to count the points she is making)) err (looks up)) about, (holds her left middle finger with right hand)) um (slightly looks around the room)) …</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(points at the projector with her left arm)) in the Carnival, there’re (puts up her right index finger in the air while extending her left arm to put the whiteboard marker on the desk near her)) some competitions in the Carnival,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(looks down, leans forward and puts both hands on the desk directly in front of her)) [[you know]], they mark out (looks up while moving both hands to indicate a square shape on the desk)) a ten dollar note, [[s sitting on the box]],</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(stands back up with both hands indicating a shape of a hoop)) and you’ve got a hoop,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(makes a gesture of throwing hoops)) you throw the hoop, so that ((leans forward and points at the desk in front of her)) it goes over the money?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((in a very soft voice)) <strong>Not many</strong> people <strong>win</strong> that money.</td>
<td>(vi) appropriate conceptualisation of the likelihood of winning the sideshow competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((nodding)) Alright?</td>
<td>(vii) negative attitude towards participating in sideshow competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So ((opens both palms towards Ss, then suggestively)) mm</td>
<td>(viii) appropriate conceptualisation of the likelihood of winning the sideshow competitions (CONT.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((maintaining the shape she made with her both hands, and moves the hands forward as she talks)) <strong>The HOOP must be exactly the right angle …</strong> ((stops her hand gesture)) <strong>[just to go]</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((folds her hands in front of her belly)) so that’s … ((talks over NR)) [[TO be careful about [[what you spend your money on the Show]] ]].</td>
<td>(ix) negative attitude towards participating in sideshow competitions (DUPE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Immediately after Norm-setting talk on games, Norm-setting talk on approaching food began. The teacher went straight into defining food at the Show as “not cheap” (x).

Table 7.19 Norm-Setting on Frugality (Food)

| (opens her left palm and points at the ring finger with right index finger)) Now there's a lot of food at the show, ((nods once, slowly)) | (x) 1) deeming food and drink at the show too expensive
| ((tapping the ring finger with the right index finger)) It's NOT, ((starts looking around)) cheap food. | (x) 2) negative attitude towards buying food and drink at the Show
| (turns her face to JW) NOT, cheap, | (xi) 2) negative attitude towards buying food and drink at the Show
| ((tapping the ring finger with the right index finger accordingly to the intonation)) the FOOD costs MORE than ((sticks her right thumb out, and directs her right thumb towards outside)) outside. | (xii) appropriate conceptualisation of what food is "cheap" (cheap means free)
| So for example, ((makes a shape of a container with both hands)) if you buy a packet of, | (xiii) recognition of food and drink at the Show as too expensive (DUPE)
| how much does a packet of chips usually cost? ((looks at TS)) | (xiv) 1) acknowledgement of the quality of food available for purchase at the Show
| two dollars. | (xv) 2) deeming purchasing good food at the Show too expensive (DUPE)
| (looks directly in front)) So well at the Show, I'm sure, ((shakes her head as well as looking around)) [[it's three dollars or three fifty or (] | (xvi) deeming food and drink at the show too expensive (DUPE)
| (looks at JW, after a slight pause)) honey's cheap ((points at JW with left index finger)) | (xvii) 1) negative attitude towards buying food and drink at the Show
| honey is free. | (xviii) 1) negative attitude towards buying food and drink at the Show
| ((some hand gesture close to her mouth)) ( | (xix) recognition of food and drink at the Show as too expensive (DUPE)
| you buy them, | (xx) 2) deeming purchasing good food at the Show too expensive (DUPE)
| ((makes a shape of a big jar(?) with both hands, and starts nodding)) yeah, um that, then it's good price. | (xxi) recognition of food and drink at the Show as too expensive (DUPE)
| You () some | (xxii) recognition of food and drink at the Show as too expensive (DUPE)
| Yes, yes | (xxiii) recognition of food and drink at the Show as too expensive (DUPE)
| ((mostly maintaining the shape of a big jar she made with her both hands as she speaks)) you can buy some fabulous food good, | (xxiv) 1) acknowledgement of the quality of food available for purchase at the Show
| they are, good, | (xxv) 2) deeming purchasing good food at the Show too expensive (DUPE)
| err [(you know?), some good | (xxvi) deeming food and drink at the show too expensive (DUPE)
| but not. | (xxvii) 1) negative attitude towards buying food and drink at the Show
| [[you know]], big. | (xxviii) 1) negative attitude towards buying food and drink at the Show
| so you PAY, | (xxix) 1) negative attitude towards buying food and drink at the Show
| cost them, | (xxx) 1) negative attitude towards buying food and drink at the Show
| () | (xxxi) recognition of food and drink at the Show as too expensive (DUPE)
| but | (xxxii) recognition of food and drink at the Show as too expensive (DUPE)
| ((keeps talking while Ss are talking)) and [[as I said]], ((shows her both palms at Ss and presses the air a little. This movement is recursive)) the FOOD is not cheap at the Show, | (xxxiii) recognition of food and drink at the Show as too expensive (DUPE)
| drinks are not cheap. | (xxxiv) 1) negative attitude towards buying food and drink at the Show
| ((maintaining her both palm wide open and shown to Ss)) What am I | (xxxv) 1) negative attitude towards buying food and drink at the Show
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>doing?</th>
<th>buying food and drink at the Show (DUPE) (xviii) 2) appropriate and competent attitude bringing own food and drink to the Show</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am I buying, my my lunch at the Show?</td>
<td>No, I will have my little backpack, and in my little backpack, I will have my food and my drink,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((shaking her head)) Okay?</td>
<td>Because there's NO WAY [[that I'm wasting my money on food and drink at the Show]].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((maintains the distance between both arms, points both index fingers outwards and shakes the fingers)) I DO look for everything [[that's free]].</td>
<td>Right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and I try all the food [[that's free]], (makes hand gestures of picking up food and throwing it into her mouth) have a taste, a little bit of this, a little bit of that,</td>
<td>(xvi) 1) positive attitude towards trying every free offer (xxi) 2) conceptualisation of looking for every free offer as smart consumer practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(places her both palms towards Ss) some things are free,</td>
<td>(xxii) deeming purchasing food and drink at the Show a waste of money (DUPE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(places her both palms towards Ss and shakes her palms) [[you know]], [[buying food at the Show]], is, a really, ( )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This talk marked the beginning of discouraging the learners from buying food at the Show (xi). After an exemplification of how much extra the same item might cost in the Show, there was clarification as to whether honey was “cheap”, what was meant by “cheap” (“free”) (xii), and what honey was cheap (free tasting honey) (xiii). After essentially a repetition of the expensive nature of the food (xiv-xvi), the teacher set norms of taking own food and drink around (xvii, xviii). She then articulated negative attitude towards buying food and drink at the Show (DUPE) (xix) and her attitude of deeming purchasing food and drink at the Show a waste of money (xx) through an emphatic declaration “Because there’s NO WAY [[that I’m wasting my money on food and drink at the Show]]”. The teacher’s focus on food and drink matters continued. She promoted a positive attitude towards trying every free offer (xxi) with a nonverbal gesture of picking up food and putting it on the mouth. The network of norms and the logic uniting them in this FOOD segment was such that an act of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
looking for everything free and trying all the free food was endorsed as smart consumer practice (xxii). The teacher repeated how expensive and what a waste of money it was to purchase food at the Show to close her talk on food (xxiii).

This episode illustrates how the teacher was shaping the students’ Show experiences in a particular way. Anything that involves money at the Show was subjected to Frugality norm-setting, which constituted a part of the ‘appropriate’ way to approach the Show. The teacher’s continual use of “I” conveys the ‘role model’ character the teacher was assuming in class. Many of the ‘appropriate’ ways of enjoying the potentially money-consuming elements of the Show without spending money were spelt out with the teacher as the main actor (―I‖). This positions the learners as the opposite end of the continuum (“you”), who were not only uninformed about the inflated prices at the Show but also incapable of making sensible decisions about their own expenditures. The precise descriptions on exactly what the teacher would do in taking her own food and drink (xvii- ) were the reflection of the learners’ area of incompetence.

7.4.5 New Arrivals and Lifestyle Prospects

An episode from 21 October concerns lifestyle prospects. It contains a series of norms surrounding an issue to do with work commitments and their potential impact on family life. This episode was one of the rare moments where the learners opposed the teacher in a direct manner. The interpretation of the data suggests that the teacher saw the students’ contestation as a sign of cultural naïvety.

The episode occurred during a teacher’s task briefing of a unit of work “Work in Australia”. In elaborating on the potential effect of work on family life, the teacher drew on a ‘showcase’ example of a hardworking, married couple whose work commitments were such that they hardly had time to spend together at home (starting from “Remember I told you about…” in Turn 295 in Table 7.20). This sparked the learners’ opposition to such a lifestyle, which led to a chain of teacher student disagreements (Turns 296 onwards). Norms set in teacher talk are indicated in the right column of the table.
Table 7.20  Norm-Setting on Lifestyle Prospects (21 October)

295.  T  Yeah, for example, if the person is working as a CASUAL worker, and they’re going to be phoned up by the, by their supervisor, the supervisor is gonna say, “Ahm, can you come in tonight, from…seven, till, till eleven?” …Err if a person’s got, got a, a family, or family commitments, then that, that might be, quite difficult, they might have to get somebody else to look after the children, somebody else to pick up their children from the school. Umm…so, you know, sometimes it really does make a difference to family life. Remember I told you a bit about some people wor, working in the factory where one…um where the wife is working in the day shift, the husband’s working in the night shift, or the afternoon shift; when she is leaving, he is coming to work, and they see each other in the car park…and that’s when they say, you know, “You’ve gotta pick up the children and so and so sick and this has to be paid” and, and off they go.

296.  TS  What’s the (wedding) for?

297.  SS  ([laughs with a sympathetic tone])

298.  T  ([repeating TS’s utterance, laughing]) What’s (the wedding) for...appropriate anticipation of negative effects of casual work on family life a) controlled by abrupt/random work commitments b) clashing with family commitments c) extra task to get organised positive acceptance of leading a tough, hard-working life style bearing impact on family life

299.  S  Life!

300 &302  T  That’s () [[you know]],...for some people this is ((in a much louder voice to talk over S’s)) A WAY, of, of [[managing]].

301 & 303  S  (=()=

304.  T  for some people this is ((in a much louder voice to talk over S’s)) A WAY, of, of [[managing]].

305.  MR  =That’s not the way=

306.  T  they’ve done very, very well...and some people have done this, b) this is a stepping stone to success

307.  TS  ((almost sighing)) Uhh

308.  T  Yeah...for some people this is ((in a much louder voice to talk over S’s)) A WAY, of, of [[managing]].

309.  MR  It doesn’t work

310.  T  It works ()...Comprehension and compliance

311.  MR  If you see wife for fifteen minutes for a day, what is that?

312.  T  ([laughs])...And some people have done this, CONT.

313.  TS  ([laughs slightly])...that’s ([you know])...positive acceptance of getting to know Australian working lifestyle is a shocking experience for the students

314.  TS  Yeah... Fifteen minutes a day!

315.  T  Oh, well, for me, fifteen, [[seeing my husband for fifteen minutes a day]] would be wonderful, e) teacher as example of managing long distance marriage wouldn’t it CONT.

316.  SS  ([laughs])

317.  T  that’ll be something new... Fifteen minutes a day!

318.  SS  ([laughs slightly])

319.  T  Are you shocked? ((chuckles))...positive acceptance that getting to know
The episode had three stages, each marked by a newly incorporated norm. First, the teacher informed the learners of appropriate anticipation of negative effects of casual work on family life (Turn 295). Second, as the learners refuted this norm, she set out to persuade the learners of positive acceptance of leading a tough, hard-working life style bearing impact on family life (Turns 295-318). Third, as the learners ceased contesting, the teacher wrapped up the scene with the concluding remark that signified positive acceptance that getting to know Australian working lifestyle is a shocking experience for the students (319).

An overall macro norm that encompassed the episode was that of Cultural Tastes, which pertains to willingness to establish themselves from obscurity (see Appendix I). The teacher’s message was that working hard at the expense of family togetherness should be regarded as “a way of managing” ((a) normal/common to do this: 304), which “works” (310) for some people to establish themselves ((b) this is a stepping stone to success: 304-6). There was a particular construal of a “new arrival” learner who is expected to be prepared for a hard-working life, potentially by sacrificing family togetherness.

A parallel theme of this segment was how the students’ contestation was received by the teacher. Every time learners contested the teacher (second stage), the teacher took up the learners’ utterances to set or reinforce norms with additional details. Starting from showing an amused reaction to TS’s question (“What’s the (wedding) for?”), from Turn 300 to 306, the teacher kept talking over the learners to reinforce her value position. As the students’ contestation reached the rejection of lifestyle altogether (“That’s not the life ( )”: 313), the teacher resorted to her personally held, empirical value to back up herself: “Oh, well, for me, fifteen, [[seeing my husband for fifteen minutes a day]] would be wonderful, wouldn’t it. That’ll be something new! Gosh!” (315 and 317). As the learners’ objection had ceased, the teacher concluded this contested segment with the comment “Are you shocked?” with a chuckle (319).

It appears that the teacher’s laugh served two functions. One function was to admit that the teacher’s own position was somewhat unusual or unexpected. The other function was to express her sense of amusement. While the teacher’s laughs
denoted her recognition of the point of contention, they also signalled her amused reaction towards students’ contestations. The potential effect of her final comment in 319 is to characterise TS, MR and others who opposed to the lifestyle the teacher endorsed as unprepared for a hard-working life that might be awaiting them. The learners were positioned as those who were caught unawares by this unusual lifestyle. By implication, these students were positioned as inexperienced (i.e., Learner Mentality <tendencies> of possessing a naïve view towards work and life).

Crucially, both the teacher’s and learners’ value positions derived from their real life experiences which were not too dissimilar from each other, nor from the exemplar hard-working couple. TS, one of the outspoken learners in this episode, was a newly wed who was resentful of having hardly any time to spend with her husband. The teacher and her husband had been living separately due to work commitments.Interestingly, however, both parties used their experience to impose the opposite value positions, and the teacher’s position was ultimately reinforced more strongly than the students’. There was a particular power difference between the teacher and the students, in which the former had the last word.

The five episodes presented above illustrated how multiple norms were articulated to the learners in a complex manner and how norm networks constructed particular images of the learners. Admittedly, the ways norms were networked were contingent upon how the teacher talk proceeded on particular occasions. There appeared to be no set patterns in how norms were combined, other than the wide-ranging nature of norm-setting with weighted sociocultural orientations. In other words, tracking how each episode unfolded was possible only on a case by case basis. This nevertheless suggests the dynamic, pervasive nature of norm-setting practices in this class.

7.5 Assumed Teacher’s Role Constructing Learners’ Role
The style of teacher talk had a lot to do with why there was no recognisable pattern in norm-setting talk. Generally, her talk style was fairly casual and less rigidly structured, compared to highly formulaic exchanges such as
Initiation-Response-Feedback (IRF) patterns (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1975). Teacher talk was rather spontaneous with frequent topic shifts, going back and forth between the different topics multiple times. This style reflected a constant incorporation of norms in teacher talk as well as enabling it.

Clearly, Norm-Setting talk was organised with specific reference to its recipients, the NAP learners, in a setting where they were collectively addressed. As explained in Chapters 4 and 6, the classroom setting chosen for analysis was a teacher-fronted situation, where the teacher primarily addressed matters that were presumably relevant for all the learners. The bottom line is that the teacher would not have chosen to bring out specific norms collectively a) if she had thought they were applicable to only one or two learners, and b) unless she had seen relevance in them. Seen this way, the episode on 6 May on winter clothing provides a striking instance where the need to prepare winter clothes was collectively informed to the whole class, including the ones already in winter clothes.

The concentration of SCNs and their wide coverage of aspects suggest that how to lead life in officially endorsed ways constituted a major learning outcome in the enacted curriculum. The teacher assumed rights and authority in directly intervening, as well as attempting to alter, the learners’ lifestyle. The proportionality of macro and micro pedagogic functions indicate that this sociocultural norm-setter’s role was central to the overall teacher role. Admittedly, some norm-setting instances overlapped with what are generally called ‘advice’, through which the learners were provided with tips for a better life. Still, the robustness of Norm-Setting talk and its pervasiveness suggest that advice was given with the premise that it would be taken. Whether the advice was offered as ‘a’ way to conduct oneself or ‘the’ way to adopt makes a great difference in the way the advice was realised linguistically. The analysis over two chapters has been dedicated to illustrate that teacher talk was often oriented to specifying ‘the’ way to think, behave and feel.

The nature of norm-setting was pre-emptive and mono-logic, each in two senses. It was pre-emptive in that, firstly, the teacher often incorporated norm-setting
irrespective of learners’ reaction to her preceding talk. The teacher possessed control over topic nomination and changes. She often supplied explanation, rationalisation or justification of her reasoning without learners’ request, as if to have anticipated them. This is as though the teacher had held preconceived patterns of the unfolding of her instructional ‘story’. The episode from 5 August in which the teacher justified another museum visit is typical of this pattern. Secondly, norm-setting was pre-emptive in that the norms were set as conceptual frameworks for the learners, shaping the possible learners’ practices before they took place. This is as though the learners would have had no idea what to do without it. The complexity of norm networks represents how a “norm-setting switch” operated on the part of the teacher, the switch that became activated as she addressed the learners.

Norm-Setting talk was mono-logic, firstly in the sense that it occurred in sustained teacher monologues. Secondly, it often reflected a single logic constructed by the teacher. Norms were presented as practically non-negotiable, that is, presented as something to be adopted rather than to negotiate. As the above norm-network episodes showed, a norm functioned as a premise for another. Besides, as illustrated in the episode of 5 August, the overarching norms sometimes involved persuading the learners to appropriately recognise and accept the teacher’s decision or meaningfulness of what the teacher was (going to be) doing. The information that only she knew was brought in while the teacher practically obliged the learners’ cooperation.

Viewing norm-setting as pre-emptive, mono-logic teacher practice suggests a tension between freedom and control. Provisions of preset ideas and operational frames have the aspect of enabling the learners to function normally, appropriately or adequately. However, this is simultaneously constraining, for it narrows down the scope of meaning-making that could otherwise be available to the learners. Enabling is embedded in constraining. Taking a pre-exursion briefing as an instance, spelling out the norms expected to be observed in a given excursion was simultaneously constructing the very nature of the excursion. In the Frugality case (Episode 4), what not to do was clearly incorporated in the briefing. Thus, just as much as norm-setting talk might pave a way for the
learners to engage with the excursion, it also contracted the kinds of things the learners could experience. Prefabricated value positions and their application ranges restrict alternative perspectives (Cummins, 2000).

The constraining aspect of norm-setting further suggests that the teacher expected the learners to be compliant and operate in a normative way she specified. Norm-setting was the practice of marking a distinction between ‘my/our’ way and ‘not my/our’ way. The teacher was always situated within ‘my/our’ way (norm), and the learners were constantly positioned in the latter, being invited into the former through the medium of teacher’s norm-setting. The relationship between the teacher and the learners was thus predicated upon a gap constantly constructed between them.

The above observations foreground the teacher’s roles emerging out of her talk. The teacher was constructed as an authoritative knower, who takes control over the ‘what’ and ‘how’ of the matters in life in general as well as in class. Her role was to “impart knowledge of skills that he or she possesses to learners who do not yet have these skills” (Cummins, 1991). The enacted curriculum through teacher talk was mapped around the “‘cultural literacy’ of the society” (Cummins, 2000, p.256) which links to the norms that a culturally-competent individual possesses. Further, crucially, the teacher was always the one who possesses the knowledge and power to construct reasoning. Hence the teacher’s explanation of the background that necessitated certain actions, unpacking and digesting for the learners the notions, activities and reasoning that they were to engage with. These link to the finding in Chapter 5 that the general stance to operate a NAP program was based upon a deficit view of the learners; the learners were constructed as deficient and facing difficulties (Wallace, 2006), and the resultant pedagogy was directed at fixing the problems.

However, a complicating matter is that the casual talking style made it look like the norm-setting episodes arose out of and within genuine, naturally-occurring teacher-student interaction (cf. Cummins, 1989). Moreover, the norm-setting practices reflect the teacher’s assumed role of providing “guidance and

---

8 Due to the article being an electronic source, the page number is not supplied.
facilitation” (Cummins, 1989, p. 115) to the learners. This means that there was no clear cut division between the teacher’s exercising authority and activating a facilitating role, two elements which are often conceptualised as distinct from each other (Cummins, 1989). The teacher’s guidance and facilitation role was expressed in the form of shepherding, which takes “control of student learning by the teacher” (Cummins, 1989, p. 115), instead of avoiding it. In other words, imparting knowledge was equated with guiding/facilitating learners’ knowledge. This works because learners were constructed as deficient.

Seen this way, the learners were set up as passive receivers of Norm-Setting talk. Many aspects of their life in and outside of the classroom were subjected to norm-setting. As seen in the episode on 21 October, learners’ contestation was to be interpreted as further norm-setting needs, either as non-compliant behaviour or a deeper deficiency in cultural knowledge.

In retrospect, talk was concerned with present, future or timeless matters. Burgoyne and Hull (2007) state that focussing on here-and-now matters is common practice in migrant education programmes, noting that it results from the educators’ avoidance of tapping into the past that certain students might not wish to deal with. While this is noted, the students’ present was still clearly based on their past. The overall curriculum approach to focus on what the students currently do not possess was reflective of the students’ past experiences (or lack thereof). The difference is its indirectness, by saying that immediate student needs are focused upon, making reference to the students’ past.

### 7.6 Conclusion

The analysis of the norms being set in teacher talk illustrated the complexity underlying instruction in the NAP ESL classroom. The classroom was a site where learners were exposed to normalising exercises mediated by teacher talk. As far as teacher-fronted situations were concerned, these exercises constituted the main objectives of pedagogy as well as serving as justifications/rationalisations for teacher instruction. Classroom life is one particular form of social life, and certain classroom practices project life outside
the classroom. In this sense, sociocultural norms have their place in classroom pedagogy. Yet this is one thing, and whether, or how much, sociocultural norms constitute the direct, main target of pedagogy is quite another. What can be said about the Red Ochre class is that being normal was presented as an important prerequisite not only to strive educationally but also to lead life beyond the four walls of the classroom. The distinction between everyday life and institutional life was blurred. Norm-Setting talk is simultaneously a 1) reflection of what the teacher thinks normal, and 2) reflection of what the teacher deems necessary to set for the students. The flip side of the coin is that attending to the prerequisite sends out the message that the learners are incapable of actual doing. Under this construct, the paradox is that it is only when the teacher no longer attends to the norms that the learners are able to operate normally. The learners are “not there” yet so long as the teacher’s primary attention is drawn to set the norms.

Assuming rights and authority in setting norms is not an arbitrary practice. Accordingly, selecting what norms to set and what norms to leave out is not arbitrary either. Teaching other individuals norms creates an asymmetrical relationship between the norm-setter and the norm-receivers, with the former positioned as superior to the latter. However, this asymmetrical relationship is simultaneously the basis of Norm-Setting talk. That is, for Norm-Setting talk to occur, the asymmetrical relationship must already be assumed and the roles assigned by such a relationship inform, or even prompt, the teacher to set norms.

The implications for learners are significant. Learners were constructed as socioculturally and institutionally needy, although they were viewed as receptive to norms being set. Their utterances in class were incorporated into the norm-setting processes. Depending on how they responded to the teacher, they were constructed as either uninformed, holding inappropriate assumptions or non-compliant. Having said this, as much as such observations were primarily derived from one teacher’s Norm-Setting talk, teacher talk was responding to curriculum requirements. After all, teacher talk had two sides: teacher’s response to (hence reflection of) curriculum requirements and teacher’s efforts to create a particular learning environment of which the teacher was in charge.
CHAPTER 8
“NEW ARRIVALS” CONSTRUCTED THROUGH WRITTEN TASKS

8.0 Introduction

The analysis so far suggests a consistent construal of “new arrivals” across data. In the drafts of the New Arrivals Program (NAP) curriculum documents, “new arrivals” emerged as socioculturally deficient, being subjected to receive instruction on social norms, shared values and appropriate behaviours. The analysis of pedagogy from the angle of classroom teacher talk has yielded outcomes that linked with the findings from the NAP documents. These developments motivate an additional exploration of NAP practices, this time with written (assessment) tasks. It is expected that findings from the written tasks would allow triangulation of the construal of the students from three programme components, curriculum, pedagogy and assessment.

Accordingly, this chapter investigates the ways in which the “new arrival” students were positioned in the written tasks, casting another light on the way they were constructed. The primary focus is on the final assessment task on Exposition, where the students were required to produce an argumentative essay by way of a response to a proposition (selected from a set of propositions) about some aspect of Australia or life in Australia. It is acknowledged that observations from one assessment instance might not apply to other instances. The findings from the final assessment task will therefore be just a snapshot of one of many ways in which the “new arrivals” were construed. Even so, the case of final assessment stands out from other tasks. It carried a recognisable significance and primacy within the task set; the final assessment produced an extreme pattern in the students’ argumentative positions. All the propositions provided for the students to respond to either asserted something positive about life in Australia or asserted some obligation on the part of those newly arrived in Australia. All sixteen students chose to argue for the chosen proposition, despite the theoretical
premise of the Exposition text-type that there will usually be multiple positions which can be adopted on an issue and that therefore it is available to writers to choose to argue either “for” or “against”.

Specifically, analysis yields compelling evidence that the final task characterised “new arrivals” as particular social subjects in Australia with specific roles to play in an Australian society. The students are being positioned to take a positive view of the Australian society, while observing their obligation as newcomer migrants. A positive view of Australian society and the obligations placed on migrants were both inscribed in the task topics. The ways the task prompt was organised constrained the available value positions the students were able to take.

8.1 Major Written Tasks at The College

8.1.1 Text-Type Focus and Topics

Before proceeding to the analysis of the final assessment task, a brief account of the nature of the series of written tasks may be helpful in contextualising the final task.

The students were required to complete a number of written tasks throughout the year. There were four text-types they mainly engaged with: Recount, Biography, Letters to the Editor and Exposition. These text-types were set for the DECS-mandated, summative assessments in each term (cf. DECS, 2007b). The other text-types addressed in class included Description and Character Study. The target text-types and associated topics are listed in the table below:

Table 8.1 Text-Type Focus in Each Term

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target text-type</td>
<td>Recount</td>
<td>Biography</td>
<td>Letters to the Editor</td>
<td>Exposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics sample and practice</td>
<td>Weekend activities</td>
<td>Albert Einstein*</td>
<td>The Royal Adelaide Show Costs $100 million to Stage*</td>
<td>(unidentified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excursion to the Brickworks Market*</td>
<td>Amy Johnson*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Kingsford Smith*</td>
<td>Henry Lawson*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics summative assessment</td>
<td>Excursion to Glenelg*</td>
<td>Evonne Goolagong Cawley*</td>
<td>The City Campus Should be Discontinued</td>
<td>9 topics to choose from: e.g. Australia is ‘the lucky country’*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*: Australian/Western topics
The text-types were arranged in a way that learning to present information by following temporal sequences preceded learning to advance arguments. The major text-types fall into two broad categories. The text-types from Term 1 and 2 act to present accounts of sequences of events in time. Term 1 (Recount) involves sequences of events experienced by the writer, while Term 2 (Biography) concerns larger scale sequences of events experienced by socially significant individuals. The text-types from Terms 3 and 4 are broadly argumentative or persuasive. They involve the writer making a case for or against a particular viewpoint (see also Callaghan, et al., 1993; Knapp & Watkins, 2005). Structurally, the first two text-types had their information chronologically ordered (activity sequences) (J. R. Martin, 1992), while the latter two did not. That is, whereas the unfolding of the “text time” and “field (reading) time” were paralleled in the first two, “internal unfolding” of the text was the norm in the latter two (J. R. Martin, 1997).

8.1.2 Overall Expectations Embedded in the Assessment Tasks

One characteristic of The College’s genre-based syllabus is that all topics and text-types were pre-set for the students. A single text-type was often both the starting point and an end product of a syllabus (cf. Derewianka, 2003). It was an established pattern that the students were presented with a specific topic to work on, with a specific text-type to produce. The only exception pertaining to the topic choice was the final assessment task, offering multiple topic choices.

In addition to text-types and topics, the information to be included in the texts tended to be supplied in class. The Biography tasks were typically organised around information that was selected and offered by The College. The summative task for this genre on Evonne Goolagong Cawley highlights this, in that the students were prompted to reassemble the information from a video that they were shown on site.

Another characteristic of the written tasks is that many of them shared the overall function of cultural orientation to Australia and some Western elements (all indicated with “*” in Table 8.1). Two Recount topics as well as one Letters to
the Editor topic were tied directly to the recent College-offered excursions to local attractions and places of interest. In Biography tasks, almost all the individuals chosen as the topics were Australian figures. The only exceptions were European figures, Albert Einstein and Amy Johnson. This explicit focus on Australian figures continued in Term 3 in a unit of work on another text-type. The students were prompted to address yet another Australian figure, Sir Douglas Mawson. This was observed in a one-off task on a “Character Study” genre, in which a writer describes the personality and characteristics of a particular individual. Topics set for Exposition were also closely tied to selected aspects of Australian society. More specifically, they were all matters to do with Australia and migrants, as shall be demonstrated later.

As cultural orientation was frequently incorporated into the assessment process, students were prompted to demonstrate in their texts what they learned from their cultural orientation to Australia. Further, the cultural orientation tasks in Terms 1 and 2 were directed towards the positive appraisal of the subject matter, due to the connection between topics and text-type choices. Recounts and Biographies are regarded as “prosodic appraisal” in J. R. Martin’s terms (1992, 1997), in which the texts were likely to contain elements of positive evaluations of subject matters by virtue of writing about them. With Recounts, the places of interest and students’ experiences were appraised. Similarly, Biography tasks were as much about mastering text-types as learning and scribing the achievements of selected (Australian) figures. The work on Sir Douglas Mawson in a Character Study task in Term 3 could be interpreted in a similar way. It was observed that learning adjectives was tightly incorporated into making positive appraisals of Mawson.

It is against the backdrop of such task setting that the students engaged with the tasks on argumentative or persuasive text-types. The nature of text-types necessitated the students to advance a particular point of view by incorporating value-laden discourses. While the ways in which the tasks were played out vary, the final assessment task exhibited very complex ways in which the status of being a “new arrival” was enmeshed in the task setting.
8.2 Final Assessment Task as Constructing Australian “New Arrivals”

8.2.1 Engaging with Argumentative Text-Types

The Red Ochre class students engaged with two expository genres during the latter half of the school year. Term 3 focussed on Letters to the Editor, while Term 4 focussed on what DECS termed Exposition. Both belonging to the “factual genre” of Argument (Knapp & Watkins, 2005; J. R. Martin, 1985), these two text-types consist only of a one-sided argument (Coffin, 2004; Knapp & Watkins, 2005; J. R. Martin, 1985). They share a feature that they “make no attempt to balance arguments for and against an issue, no matter how controversial the proposition” (Coffin, 2004, p. 232). This feature is in a marked contrast with that of the text-type of Discussion, where a writer “evaluates two or more opposing propositions in order to make a judgement as to which is more viable” (Coffin, 2004, p. 232). It is to be noted that The Red Ochre class students did not work on producing Discussion texts.

The summative assessment task on Letters to the Editor (Term 3) enabled the students to exhibit their capabilities in crafting their arguments appropriately. The topic was about arguing for closing down the City Campus or maintaining it. It was worded as "The City Campus Should be Discontinued", and as such, the default proposition expressed in the topic was the affirmative position for the campus closure. Eleven students argued against the campus closure, while five argued for it. In other words, the students of the former group demonstrated that they were capable of arguing against the default proposition expressed in the topic. The latter group, in arguing for the default proposition, demonstrated that they were capable of advancing negative evaluations of the educational institution that they were enrolled in.

Despite the logical progression from the Letters to the Editor to Exposition, the ways in which these two text-types were realised in students’ texts varied greatly. A central point concerns the availability of both sides of the argument to the students. Whilst there is evidence that the students were encouraged to consider counter positions as they engaged with the Letters to the Editor text-type, the
crucial understanding that there were two positions available did not appear to have been carried through to the Exposition task.

More specifically, the options of being able to choose either to agree or disagree with the propositions seemed to be very much underplayed in this final assessment task. All 16 students, regardless of the topic selected, chose to take an affirmative position to the proposition. This occurred even through the students had previously demonstrated their capability of choosing either an affirmative or dissenting position in their Letters to the Editor tasks.

8.2.2 The Task Setting and the Overview of the Topics

Being the final written assessment task, composing Exposition was a high-stakes task. Scales based on this assessment were to inform an individual student’s exit NAP Scale, upon which recommendations on their pathway after NAP would be made. This task offered multiple topic choices. The task sheet has been reproduced below. An alphabetical indexing of the topics has been added for ease of identification. Also note that the first topic had been crossed out in the original task sheet (See Figure 8.1).

**THE COLLEGE’S NAME**

**NEW ARRIVALS PROGRAM**

Name: 

Date: 

**Moderated Assessment Task: Semester 2, 4th Term**

**Task Description:** Write an exposition on one of the topics below

Length: 250-350 words

- (0) that computers were the best invention of the 20th century
- (a) that people should pass a test in spoken and written English before they can become citizens of Australia
- (b) that South Australia should take more migrants and refugees each year
- (c) that Australia is ‘the lucky country’
- (d) that Adelaide is one of the best cities in the world
- (e) that Australia is the land of freedom and opportunity
- (f) that Adelaide’s transport system is fantastic
- (g) that migrants and refugees should be spread throughout the suburbs and not be allowed to settle in large numbers in the same suburb
- (h) that Adelaide has plenty of facilities and opportunities for young people and families
- (i) that excursions are a vital part of the New Arrivals Program

Figure 8.1 Task Description for Exposition
On the surface, many of the arguments here are based on relative values and are contestable. Some of them are ideas that have been widely refuted. For example, topic (a), “that people should pass a test in spoken and written English before they can become citizens of Australia”, was being publicly debated around the time the students began the assessment task. The idea had attracted numerous opposing opinions submitted to the Federal Government from linguists (e.g., McNamara, 2006) as well as private organisations.

While some topics might assume both value positions as equally viable, others appear to be oriented towards one value position rather more than the other. One topic that appeared to signal its affirmative stance as a strongly preferred value position is (i), “that excursions are a vital part of the New Arrivals Program”. Contextual factors suggest strongly that this position was endorsed institutionally. The Red Ochre class went on a number of excursions, and anecdotal teacher account stated that part of the reason to use the City Campus was to make it easier to hold excursions around the CBD. The 2005 curriculum-related draft, analysed in Chapter 5, stated that excursions “are crucial to the work of new arrivals” and that they “provide essential orientation to the community and are the basis for the real purposes of developing English language” (p. 23). Given excursions were strongly advocated, it would seem that arguing against the proposition put forward in this topic could constitute a resistance towards the institutionally-sanctioned value position.

Topics (c) and (f) appear to be nuanced, which could be interpreted as implying their antitheses as preferred value positions. With topic (f), the deliberate use of “fantastic” in the proposition might connote a sense of cynicism. So might the quotation used in topic (c) around “‘the lucky country’”. However, as it turned out, the potential ‘invitations’ for counter positions were either ineffective or not picked up by the students, since all the students who picked these two topics affirmed the propositions.

It seems that these two topics, together with a few more, require a high degree of linguistic and/or local knowledge to consider counter-argument positions. Topic (c) would firstly require a student writer to recognise the use of single quotation
marks (') around “the lucky country” as insinuating certain connotations. Not only this, the topic would also require the writer to possess the knowledge that the use of “the lucky country” derives from Donald Horne’s (1964) work, if he or she is to grasp the precise irony inscribed in these wordings. Recognising these backgrounds would position the writer to come up with convincing reasons for either position. Similarly, with topic (f), the use of the word from everyday discourse, “fantastic”, needs to be recognised if one is to detect the possible sign of cynicism. In addition, topics such as (a), (b) and (g) would require substantial knowledge on current affairs on Australian immigration issues and contesting views expressed from different sectors.

Seen in this light, it is noteworthy that the students’ accumulated experience of local affairs did not prompt any of them to take a counter position. It is possible that the potential invitations for a counter position inscribed in some topics were too subtle to be picked up. Yet given that the students were already residing in Australia, one would expect that the contestability of the topics would equally derive from the potential writers’ accumulated knowledge of local current affairs. For example, students who were having to negotiate the public bus services might well refute the idea of topic (f) that the Adelaide’s transport system is fantastic. Likewise, students who had accessed local news reports on facility shortages in public schools or trends in youth unemployment rates could observe that Adelaide having “plenty of facilities and opportunities” (topic (h)) was an idealised notion. Instead, as it turned out, the propositions advanced in the topics were treated by the students as ‘conclusions’ given to them.

One potential contributing factor to this is the mood choice in the task prompt. All the topics were presented in a declarative mood, while the task prompt, “Write an exposition on one of the topics below”, was presented in the imperative mood. According to Knapp and Watkins (2005), an optimal way to make explicit that there are two sides to an argument is to use interrogative forms, or questions in assigning tasks, such as “do you agree?” or “what is your opinion?”. Although there was nothing in the task sheet to suggest that the students were expected to agree with the propositions, equally, to the best of the researcher’s knowledge, there was no surrounding text which invited the students
to consider both argumentative positions. Thus, it might be that the use of declarative mood has transformed the mere presentation of the assessment topics as an advancement of certain propositions, including the nuanced or hyperbolic ones (i.e., (c) and (f)). That is, the default value positions might have been already advanced by virtue of the use of the declarative mood.

However, this feature alone does not fully account for why the students invariably chose an affirmative position in the final task. The lead-up tasks for expository genres also had their topics presented in the declarative mood, yet, with teacher instruction, some students managed to choose a counter position to compose their texts.

It appears that the very viability of dissenting positions has been affected by the students’ particular social positioning implicated in the topics. Seen as a text, the topics were not a set of randomly selected arguments; they had a clear message of the appreciation of Australia and the obligations of migrants.

8.2.3 Positioning of the “New Arrivals” in the Topics

The topics contained clear ideological stances towards the social positioning of “new arrivals”. A lexicogrammatical analysis of the topics is presented in Figure 8.2. Participants of the main clauses are all italicised, and those which are modalised are indicated with bold fonts. In addition, those Participants implicitly referring to “new arrivals” are underlined. All the processes of the main clauses are underlined, and those other than relational processes are subsequently shaded. Modalities are indicated with rectangular boxes.
(f) -that computers were the best invention of the 20th century

(a) -that **people** **should** pass a test in spoken and written English before they can become citizens of Australia

(b) -that **South Australia** **should** take more **migrants and refugees** each year

(c) -that **Australia** is ‘the lucky country’

(d) -that **Adelaide** is one of the best cities in the world

(e) -that **Australia** is the land of freedom and opportunity

(f) -that **Adelaide’s transport system** is fantastic

(g) -that **migrants and refugees** **should** be **spread** throughout the suburbs and **not be allowed** to settle in large numbers in the same suburb

(h) -that **Adelaide** has plenty of facilities and opportunities for young people and families

(i) -that **excursions** are a vital part of the New Arrivals Program

Figure 8.2 Task Description for Exposition with Lexicogrammatical Analysis

All nine topics operate within the Field of “new arrivals” and their life in Australia”. Six are appraisals of selected aspects of Australia ((c), (d), (e), (f), (h) and (i)). Topic (i) is included in this category from the aspect that acknowledging the significance of excursions in NAP is appreciating privileges that Australia offers to “new arrivals”. The other three are obligations involved in immigration to Australia ((a)(b)(g)). Only these three topics contained specific references to migrants, refugees and alike (see underlined, italicised parts), and, by implication, “new arrivals”. This overall immigration-related Field has emerged because topic (f), originally located at the top of the list, was crossed out before the task was administered. It carried information that was least related to the identified Field. Crossing out this topic turned the assortment of the rest of the topics into a coherent ‘text’, as it were. This suggests that there was a decision made to limit the assessment within the Field of “new arrivals” and their life in Australia.

Additional lexicogrammatical features of the topics present several indications pertaining to the general positioning of the “new arrivals”. First, “new arrivals” are realised as being under certain obligations, judging from the way modality is selectively used in the topics (see boxed parts). Only the topics which contained implied references to “new arrivals” are modalised, and “should” is used in all cases. Two of them ((a) and (g)) have “should” in association with specific people positioned as Participants of the main clause. They are “people” who wish to
become Australian citizens, thus a certain portion of migrants in topic (a), and “migrants and refugees” in topic (g). These topics are the only cases where “new arrivals” are, albeit implicitly, positioned as Participants. In the third case, topic (b), “should” is attached to an institution, “(the government of) South Australia”. This institution is located as the Participant (Agent) acting upon “migrants and refugees” (Goal). Because “should” places a sense of obligation onto the Participant of a clause in which it is used (Halliday, 1994; J. R. Martin & Rose, 2003), all three topics in which this modal verb is used are concerned with obligations pertaining to the “treatment” of “new arrivals”. Interestingly, no student chose topic (b), while two each chose topics (a) and (g).

Second, all but one topic are presented in positive polarity. The only topic that presents a negative polarity is the one with “new arrivals” as Participant (g). Because of its peculiarity, this also can be seen as an instance of ideological positioning of “new arrivals”.

Third, all but one topic are in the active voice. The only topic that uses passive voice is (g), the participant of which is “new arrivals”. In addition, most processes used in the propositions are relational processes (is, has, are), realising bare assertions on the way things are. What is more, these relational processes are invariably utilised when the participant of the clause is Australia or what it offers (Australia, Adelaide, Adelaide’s transport system, excursions). Other processes used are material processes (pass, take, spread, allow), and they are invariably used with the modality “should”.

Fourth, “new arrivals” appear in the topics as powerless subjects. When they are implicated as the Goal (topic (b)), their being accepted by South Australia or otherwise was in the hands of the state government (Agent). Even when positioned as participants (topics (a) and (g)), their agency is restricted. In topic (a), their agentive power is less dynamic than it would otherwise be, for, arguably, the conduct of “passing” an English test occurs in an institutional context created by others. Although they can effect their own future by passing a test, their action will not influence other individuals. In topic (g), because it is constructed in the passive voice, “new arrivals” are positioned as subjects to be
manipulated by other individuals who are either a collective authority (South Australia) or an unidentified group.

Taken all together, it can be interpreted that, within the Field of “new arrivals” and their life in Australia”, there are two parallel macro-level arguments operating:

- “New arrivals” of some kind
  - should do xxx (obligations), should not do xxx (regulations).
- Australia (or what Australia offers)
  - is/are (something permanent, attractive and appealing).

Figure 8.3 Macro-Level Arguments Underpinning Exposition Topics

These two arguments form an overall ideology that Australia is a great place to live and “new arrivals” are required to observe certain obligations. Contextualised this way, the use of declarative moods throughout the topics becomes a likely contributing factor in realising this ideology.

Seen in this light, the possibility arises that this underlying ideology influenced the way students approached the topics, even if they were aware that there were two value positions available for them. Because students were “new arrivals”, who are part of “migrants and refugees”, making sense of any of the topics would have meant finding themselves located within the topics. Thus, when it came to talk about Australia, the students were faced with themselves prompted to appreciate their life in Australia with direct reference to particular aspects of their lives (topics (c)(d)(e)(f)(h)(i)). By contrast, when it came to talk about migrants, they were prompted not only to accept the obligations that surround them but also to acknowledge and argue for such obligations. They were also faced with demanding from themselves the fulfilment of obligations (topics (a)(g)), or, demanding local government to accept more of them coming in (topic (b)), portraying themselves as needy. Thus, the students were positioned in a unique relationship with the overall ideological arguments underpinning the topics.
There is another factor that seems to be affecting the plausibility of the students’ stance choice: the arguments advanced in each topic are, by virtue of their nature, standing without projecting clauses. Thus, for example, the students were presented with “that people should pass a test in spoken and written English before they can become citizens of Australia” and not with “Some media commentators have recently asserted that people should pass a test in spoken and written English before they can become citizens of Australia”. Arguments without projecting clauses obscure who is producing them. Due to this, the participants of the clauses of the actual arguments have the potential to take on different personas depending on who the authors of the Expositions are. Therefore, when an Australian-born, so-called ‘Anglo-Celtic’ individual argues that “new arrivals” should speak English, the group “new arrivals” becomes objectified and distanced from the actual author because the author is talking about somebody else. By contrast, when a “new arrival” makes the same argument with exactly the same wording, the “new arrivals” group becomes subjectified and embraces the author. That is, that “new arrival” is talking about him/herself and obliging him/herself with his/her own words (see Figure 8.4).

An Australian-born, Anglo Celtic individual argues

DIFFERENT

[[ that “new arrivals” should speak English in Australia ]].

A “new arrival” argues

SAME (or included)

[[ that “new arrivals” should speak English in Australia ]].

Figure 8.4 Implicit Relationships between Participants

This also applies directly to the bold assertions on the way things are. “New arrivals” arguing “Australia is the land of freedom and opportunity” would connote implications quite different from local people saying the same. If an Australian-born, ‘Anglo-Celtic’ individual says this, it is advertising Australia to other individuals, or, advancing propaganda. However, if a “new arrival” does the same, this can at least mean three things: “new arrivals” are confirming for
themselves that the proposition is the case; or they are promoting Australia to somebody based on their experience and belief; or they are appealing to somebody else that they have internalised that proposition. Since it was an assessment context, all three were possible. They are producing a mantra, as it were. Thus, depending on who utters a particular proposition, the implication and the significance of the proposition, and its role in constructing subject positioning, can vary greatly.

Based on these features, it seems likely that the equal availability of both value positions was underplayed in practice, if not entirely ruled out. The students not only had the regulation from the assigned text-types but also had contextual constraints which determined which side to take. Because the “new arrivals” are positioned as less dynamic or less agentive in the topics with inscribed obligations, it does not seem likely that the students would consider two value positions as equal options, let alone choosing to assume a counter position. Instead, it seems that the students’ institutional positioning might well have prompted them to affirm the proposition. The task sheet might have functioned as a demand for affirmation, even if the students had been well informed with the nature (social purpose) of the text-type.

8.2.4 Students’ Stance-Taking

The argumentative stances that the students took in the final assessment yielded unique patterns. As mentioned earlier, no student took a counter position towards the proposition expressed in their topic. No one chose topic (b), the only topic that obligates South Australia in the treatment of “new arrivals”. The other topic not chosen by students was topic (h), which was about appraising Adelaide’s ample “facilities and opportunities for young people and families”. However, topics (d) and (f), two other topics concerned with positive appraisals of Adelaide, attracted the highest number of students (five and four, respectively).

Further, cross-referenced with their choices of value positions in the City Campus topic for the Letters to the Editor task, again, only topics (d) and (f) attracted students from both the pro City Campus position (i.e. arguing that the
City Campus should NOT be discontinued) and con City Campus position (i.e. arguing that the City Campus SHOULD be discontinued). No one from the value position that argued for the campus closure (con-City Campus students) chose the topics in which migrants were obliged to do certain things. What is more, all but one of the con-City Campus students received better Scales on the Exposition task than the Letter to the Editor task, and the remaining one received the same Scale. Within the students who argued against the campus closure (pro-City Campus Students), three received better Scales, four stayed the same and four received lower Scales.

Interestingly, three out of four pro-City Campus students who received lower Scales chose the topics that attracted both pro- and con-City Campus students. Further, while only one pro-City Campus student received better Scales in these topics, three out of four con-City Campus students received better Scales (see Table 8.2).

Table 8.2  Students’ Choice of Exposition Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value positions previously taken</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Exposition topics chosen</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-City Campus</td>
<td>JW, DL, AB, TS, SM, AN, AK, YL, GC, BK, ΔH</td>
<td>(a) English test* (d) one of the best cities (e) land of f &amp; o (f) transport system (g) migrant spread* (i) Excursion</td>
<td>fused with con-CC peers fused with con-CC peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con-City Campus</td>
<td>YA, NR, PK, MR</td>
<td>(c) lucky country (d) one of the best cities (f) transport system</td>
<td>fused with pro-CC peers fused with pro-CC peers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* : “Obligation” topics
Highlighted: topics chosen by both pro-City Campus and con-City Campus students
Boxed students: improved Scales from Term 3
Underlined students: decreased Scales from Term 3

This generates two observations. First, those who chose to foreground the negatives about the City Campus in the previous task did not choose to endorse particularly contestable propositions on migrants’ obligations. They instead chose
to focus on the positives of the “appraisal” topic of their choice. Second, their negotiation around value positions stopped at that point, however. Instead of refusing to argue for ideological propositions, these con-City Campus students, not to mention their pro-City Campus peers, were swayed to choose a topic that they could agree with—or they could pretend that they agreed with. Their decision seemed to have paid off, insofar as most of them received better Scales than they had on the City Campus task. By contrast, pro-City Campus students who chose “appraisal” topics were not so successful, even though, arguably, they continued to focus on positives about the specific subject matter.

Thus, how the final assessment was played out was two-fold. Those who chose to criticise their institution’s facility (in the earlier task) seemed swayed to focus on the positives about their host country. Meanwhile, those who chose to refute the proposition in the City Campus task (i.e. to argue against the propositions “that the City Campus should be discontinued”) did not choose to refute the propositions in the final assessment task. This analysis seems to confirm that, indeed, the students interpreted that choosing to refute the propositions in the final assessment on Exposition was not an option. More significantly, by choosing to argue for the topic of their choice, the students situated themselves within the ideological proposition realised in the topic.

This situation strongly suggests the possibility that the students were, technically speaking, not encouraged to advance any argument that countered the propositions asserted in the topics. It raises the question as to whether the students’ act of taking sides was dependent on the teacher’s explicit instruction. That is, one would wonder whether the students would have been likely to have been drawn to affirm the propositions as they appear on the task sheet unless explicitly encouraged not to do so. One indication for this, albeit very subtle, is their treatment of the subject heading in their texts. A recognisable portion of the students (7 out of 16) simply copied their chosen Exposition topic option word-for-word onto their subject heading, including “that” at the beginning. Similarly, in their lead-up exercise to Letters to the Editor on The City Campus, students from both value positions copied the default proposition “The City Campus Should be Discontinued” as their subject heading. Although their chosen
value positions can be retrieved from the body of their texts, strictly speaking, their ‘titles’ did not quite function as part of their argument. This signals a possibility that the students either failed to demonstrate their understanding of the social purpose of the text-type, or did not have a grasp of it fully.

8.2.5 Pedagogic Orientations

From the viewpoint of genre pedagogy, two issues emerge as potential influencing factors for the students’ all-affirmative stance taking. One issue concerns the treatment of the availability of argumentative positions. While no instructional data were available on the final assessment task, it was documented in the Letters to the Editor tasks that an instruction was made that the students were to choose pro or con position on an issue. Based on this, there are at least three possibilities that went on in the final assessment task instruction. Each possibility is discussed below in relation to implications on the students’ task performance.

The first possibility is that the teacher did not instruct the students explicitly that they were free to choose either side of the argument. This could mean that the availability of both value positions was assumed at least on the teacher’s part. Given their prior task experiences on choosing value positions, it might be that the students were expected to operate on the same premise without being explicitly reminded. If this is the case, the resultant students’ stance choices seem to highlight just how powerful the mood choice and the ideological positioning of the "new arrivals" could be. Conversely, this would indicate that, despite the logical continuity of the text-types between Letters to the Editor and Exposition, the premise of the availability of two argumentative positions was not carried through.

The second possibility is that the teacher did remind the students of the availability of both value positions, but the students still chose affirmative positions only. If this was the case, it could be that the declarative mood choice in the propositions advanced in the topics and the ideological positioning of the "new arrivals" implied in the topics influenced very strongly the way the students
chose their argumentative position. Also, it might be suggested that the students chose the proposition that they could agree with, or at least pretend that they did, rather than choosing to argue against the ideology.

The third possibility is that the teacher instructed the students to agree with the proposition of the topic of their choice. If so, such an act would most strongly resonate with the overall ideological positioning of the "new arrivals". The students’ all-affirmative stance-taking would come across as their ‘compliance’ to the instruction. The students’ topic choices would once again suggest that the students chose the proposition that they could agree on, or at least pretend that they did. Also, this would imply that the crucial premise of the social purpose of expositions was tainted; two argumentative positions were not made viable in practice.

Another pedagogical issue is that allowing only one text-type option might have inadvertently contributed to the realisation of the ideology underpinning the topics. The ideological positioning of “new arrivals” seems to owe much to the fact that the topics were connected with a text-type that only allows for one-sided arguments, that is, Exposition. Also, the requirements for presenting the appropriate text-type structure were quite strong in this context. Out of the need to master text-types, the students had virtually no choice of choosing alternative text-types. As exemplified in the final assessment task prompt (“Write an exposition...”), tasks were about writing a specific text-type. The well-formedness of the text-type and the students’ manipulation of genre-appropriate linguistic resources were assessed against benchmarks specified in the ESL Scope and Scales (Department of Education Training and Employment (DETE), 2002). Deviating from the target text-types would therefore be consequential to the students’ individual Scales. This contrasts with other assessment contexts where the choice of text-types is either implicit or virtually open to the writers (cf. Coffin, 2004; Mickan, 2003).
8.3 **Commentary: Intertextually Constructed “New Arrivals”**

If one is to embed the findings from the final assessment task within year-long task arrangements, the interrelationship between the topics, text-types and writer-reader relationship suggests a possible construction of ‘new-arrival-ness’. As suggested by J. R. Martin (2000), the context in which written tasks were carried out operated as “an interdiscursive resource of social actions” (p. 296). The final task encapsulated more than learning to produce expository texts. The key Field underpinning the task topics throughout the year was appraising Australian matters. Topics were not randomly set. They played a particularly significant role in framing what the students were required to learn and do in carrying out the task. Clearly, the written tasks prompted students to demonstrate their understanding of Australia. It therefore seems that implicit in the connections between written tasks and school excursions or culturally significant figures were the expectations for the students’ appropriation of, and the positive handling of, culturally relevant information.

From this observation alone, a particular positioning of the students can already be noted. They were positioned as receptors of what Australia offers them. At the same time, they were positioned as active contributors to the appraisal through producing written texts. This was uniformly the case during the first two terms; their primary role in producing Recount and Biography was to faithfully reproduce what they were presented with, not only in terms of textual structure but also in terms of Australia. However, quite possibly, adequately responding to an expectation of cultural orientation involved more than assembling the information. The students’ texts were filled with information that was deliberately selected. As Fairclough (Fairclough, 2003) observes, choosing to include certain information involves leaving out other information that is deemed less relevant. The students’ texts acted to endorse the topics’ relevance, and ultimately, the cultural orientation itself. By producing Recounts and Biographies, the students endorsed that the writer’s school-offered excursion experiences or life of selected figures were worth knowing, and therefore, telling. There was DECS’ expectation for Recounts to be entertaining (DETE, 2002), which suggests that simply
‘recounting’ the past event in a chronological order may not constitute a good Recount.

In this light, the resultant function of the final assessment task becomes of paramount significance. The analysis of task sheet and students’ choice of affirmative positions present compelling evidence that the final task set was quite constraining in terms of the ways students’ arguments could be presented. In terms of the Field, they were located within the common theme of migrants and Australian life. In terms of lexicogrammar, the topics were couched in terms that were constraining and implicational for the students’ assumed social positions. This raises a possibility that the students were constructed as particular social subjects who were expected to operate within a specific ideological position presented to them.

Having every single student argue for an ideological proposition weakened the significance of producing Expositions. On paper, the social purpose of arguing for a point of view and persuade a reader takes effect most strongly when two sides of an argument are viable. If everyone was set to agree on a proposition, there would be little need for an argument. Thus, ideally, there would have been internal disagreements in class, where students presented both sides of an argument in some topics just as they did in the City Campus task. However, as it turned out, the students’ texts showed no clash of opinions over the issues included in the final assessment task. It is true that having students present an argument on the topics made the topics stand as debatable. Yet, the students’ stance choices did not fully illustrate the complexities of the topics. Instead of debating matters themselves as a heterogeneous mix of individuals, the students ended up functioning as a collective group, arguing for specific ideological stances together. Their potential opponents were all situated outside the class.

The assortment of ideological topics raises the question as to whether the students had felt comfortable to advance an open criticism of what seemed to be the dominant ideology of the host country, particularly when prompted to only present one-sided arguments. The task was operationalised in a specific institutional context with topics in which the writers were heavily implicated. It is
true that some students did previously demonstrate their capability of choosing to advance negative evaluations of their institution. However, this could be read as an outcome of a strategy to keep agreeing with what was advanced in the default wording of a topic. After all, con-City Campus students kept agreeing with the proposition over two consecutive summative tasks. Similarly, the pro-City Campus students’ choice to agree with the Exposition topics could be interpreted as a strategy to handle contentious topics. It might be that they kept choosing an argumentative position that would be potentially favoured by, or dominant in, the institution or by certain segments of the host society.

As a possible observation, there might have been an underlying assumption that propositions put forward in the appraisal topics would be accepted by the students. As demonstrated in the lexicogrammatical analysis, the overall message of the social positioning of “new arrivals” was clear. Besides, the degree of sophistication required to decipher subtle clues in topics (c) and (f) does not seem to match the image of students constructed through teacher talk. Being constructed as needing instruction on basic winter clothing, for example, seems to be at odds with being expected to pick up the irony contained in the quotations around “the lucky country”. Further still, crafting counter arguments for some of the propositions appeared to be complex logically, requiring extraneous efforts to come up with propositions. For example, refuting topic (d), Adelaide is one of the best cities in the world, can be either to say that Adelaide is not one of the best or to say that it is one of the worst.

Seen in this light, it is likely that the task prompted the students not only to advance one-sided arguments on the specific issues but also to operate within institutionally approved “semantic probability” (Macken-Horarik, 2005) and the rhetoric that underpins it (Cranny-Francis, 1996). As discussed in Chapter 3, it has been suggested that success in academic writing depends on how well the writer operates within the system of intertextuality in accordance with the readers/assessors’ expectations (Hamp-Lyons & Zhang, 2001). As a possibility, the ideological positioning of the “new arrivals” expressed in the task topics might have represented the institutional ideology dominant in NAP. While the Scaling of the students’ might have been based primarily on their textual
realisations, choosing to affirm the propositions could well have been in the students’ best interest. In this sense, the written tasks, particularly those assigned for assessment purposes, functioned to enact norm-setting, and the topic choices set for Exposition were the climax of the norm-setting practice.

There is a further issue which is to do with the students’ growing relationship with the texts. As reviewed in Chapter 3, an indicator of successful learning may be how well students succeed in advancing their authentic arguments in their texts, rather than satisfying embedded institutional criteria (e.g. text structures). It is argued that developing critical awareness towards texts should be part of school literacy and that this should be developed hand in hand with providing access to mainstream literacy practices (Macken-Horarik, 1998). In the case of final assessment, advancing their arguments and satisfying institutional criteria were very closely intertwined, with the latter often regulating the former. A picture emerging out of this is that, in this position, the students were unable to be ―text-critics‖, who recognise that texts are not free from ideology and deny the text’s neutrality (Freebody, 1992; Freebody & Luke, 1990). The potential seedlings of becoming a text-critic growing in the City Campus task were left undernourished. The students may have gained better control of the institutionally (culturally) appropriate ways of advancing an argument, yet their critique apparently did not extend towards the particular semantic network underpinning the whole task arrangement. At this point, one might recall one of the instructional proposals made in the curriculum provision drafts surveyed in Chapter 5: “New arrivals also need to be taught how bias and stereotype works [sic] in the Australian context so that they are able to challenge the images and messages around them” (The 2005 draft, p. 13). An inescapable irony is that the whole NAP setup being painted around a certain view of “new arrivals” is itself not neutral.

As far as the final assessment was concerned, only a portion of the students’ own viewpoints could be materialised, due to the frame set provided by the topic and text-types. Articulated appreciation of Australia and the acknowledgement of migrants’ obligations were being reified as the students’ produced Expositions. From an outsider’s point of view, constructing one-sided arguments over many
of the topics seems a hard task; the students’ experiences could well be so complex that they were not easily reducible to generate all-positive evaluation of their host country. The designated role of the students was to confirm to themselves their appreciation of Australia and their obligations as newcomers.

Such textual demands can be seen as a side effect of explicit teaching on individual text-types. They seem to reflect the pedagogic demands and constraints that classroom teachers have. At one level, the institutional message to the students was explicit. Under the overarching purpose of effecting cultural learning, one aspect was to appreciate Australia, and the other side of learning was to put themselves into their place (i.e. “new arrivals” as part of the bigger group of migrants and refugees). However, at another level, how this was being effected was partially invisible to the students, and possibly to the teacher as well. This is not least because the learning had an aspect of appropriating several text-types. To ensure the students’ mastery of different text-types, each genre would have been essentialised and prototyped. In so doing, what could have been an opportunity for critical learning may have been overlooked. “There is often ambivalent engagement (which can also be seen in many classrooms and workplaces and other coercive communities) and incomplete repertoires of shared resources that leave many assumptions unarticulated” (Barton & Tusting, 2005, p. 25).

8.4 Conclusion

Written tasks set for the Red Ochre class tended to foreground certain sociocultural aspects of Australia, enacting cultural orientation as part of the task experiences. Within such tasks, the final assessment task of Exposition presents an instance of how ideological discourses underpinning the topics shaped available responses for the students. The task topics formed a text under the Field of “migrants and their life in Australia”, while attaching specific roles and obligations to the “new arrival” students. By taking an affirmative position to the propositions, the students themselves were directly involved in the construction process.
There is a pedagogic-level concern that the ways in which a particular version of genre pedagogy was enacted unwittingly contributed to the ideological construction of “new arrivals”. Specific focus on text-types and associated textual resources enabled the students to produce appropriate text-types. In return, however, such a pedagogic focus allowed specific ideologies towards “new arrivals” to prevail, by virtue of prompting students’ engagement in producing value-laden written texts. These findings bring me to the final discussion of how this study’s findings interrelate. I will now turn to Chapter 9.
CHAPTER 9
CONCLUSION: ‘NEW-ARRIVAL-NESS’ AS EXPERIENTIAL CONSTRUCT

9.0 Introduction

This study has examined how the notion of “new arrivals” was constructed around a cohort of adult “new arrivals” in curriculum-related documents, classroom teacher talk and written tasks. Now that different dimensions of the context have been individually focused upon, this final chapter draws together the findings from the previous chapters and concludes the study. Answers to the research questions are extracted from the discussion. Since the present inquiry has been conducted as a qualitative case study, conclusions are presented here as context-specific and necessarily qualified. Theoretical and pedagogical implications for future migrant education are discussed, followed by an acknowledgement of the limitations of the study. Directions for future research are also suggested.

9.1 Final Discussion and Answers to the Research Questions

The overarching questions for the present study have been “Who is a “new arrival” to Australia?” and how the social category of “new arrivals” is construed in the various educational contexts explored in this thesis. As explained in Chapter 1, being a “new arrival” was no longer other people’s business once I realised I was treading a fine line between being a “new arrival” and a non-“new arrival” myself. I approached the meaning of “new arrivals” as an experiential construct involving social, historical, political, geographical, pedagogical and contextual contingencies. Following a Bernsteinian framework of educational codes (Bernstein, 1972), the investigation encompassed curriculum, pedagogy (classroom teacher talk) and assessment of an adult NAP ESL class.
The analysis of the New Arrivals Program (NAP) statements supported my claim that the definition of the term was elusive. In the adult sector, there was a possible equation of “new arrivals” with “refugees” being made. Potentially resonating with this equation, the main programmatic orientation seemed to be adjusted to life matters rather more than to academic matters.

The curriculum-related documents represented “new arrivals” as sociocultural outsiders. “New arrivals” were characterised as those who were not yet accustomed to Anglo-Celtic culture, irrespective of their country of origin or newness to Australia. They were constructed as facing challenges and struggling to meet societal and institutional expectations. Both commonalities and differences of “new arrivals” were viewed as the source of their challenges. The basic pedagogical orientation assumed in the documents was to compensate for their lack of sociocultural and institutional experiences. This approach results in the identification of challenges and difficulties for the “new arrivals”.

The analysis of classroom teacher talk demonstrated that norm-setting and managerial concerns dominated teacher talk, while talk on linguistic and literacy matters occurred less frequently and sporadically. This seemed to reflect the assumed extent of social competencies and classroom procedural knowledge which students lacked. A closer look at Norm-Setting talk illustrated a weighted pedagogic attention to sociocultural norms. This suggested that the teacher assumed the role of a sociocultural skills trainer, and students were constructed as in need of pedagogic intervention in life matters. Norms were embodiments of the expectations placed onto the “new arrival” students. The teacher's norm-setting was pre-emptive, framing ways of knowing, behaving and thinking for the students. They contained a socially preferred student image, and by implication, socially preferred attitudes of “new arrivals”.

The analysis of the NAP written tasks illustrated how, in the final task, a particular ideological positioning of the “new arrivals” in Australia permeated the topics and how this ideology was adopted and argued for by the students themselves. The task was part of an initiation into Australian/Western matters which underpinned many of the tasks. It was observed that the selection of
topics and target text-types framed socially preferred value positions and socially approved argumentation.

One immediate observation that can be made is that three dimensions of NAP (curriculum-related documents, classroom teacher talk and written assessment tasks) shared a common way of constructing “new arrivals”. There was a sign that NAP was conceived as pre-mainstream, compensatory education, and that social practices in NAP reflected this positioning in multiple ways. The NAP documents positioned the teacher as a representative of Australia and its educational institutions. The teachers were endowed with authority and responsibility in modifying the cultural outsiders. The teacher’s value position was therefore stronger than that of students (cf. Gutierrez, Larson, & Kreuter, 1995). “New arrivals” were viewed as needing to adopt a particular set of norms, and they were even prompted to adopt a set of ideologies dominant in mainstream Australian society in the final assessment task. There was an interaction between curriculum documents and classroom practices, which suggests that the process of devising NAP programmes reflects and constitutes society’s attitudes towards particular clientele. As Swann (1994) suggests, “social processes which occur in the classroom mirror those in the outside world” (p. 153, also Auerbach, 1993). These processes can be cyclical, or reiterative (Mehan, et al., 1986).

It was noticeable that students became actively involved in constructing their identity as “new arrivals”. Analysis of three data sets identified the progression of their involvement, in which the “new arrivals” initially appeared in documents as those who were ‘talked about’, then as those who were ‘talked to’ in classroom teacher talk, and ultimately as those who “talked about themselves” in assessments. When they were talked to in the classroom, students were complicit in making teacher’s reasoning stand (Gutierrez, et al., 1995) by registering little resistance towards her norm-setting. The final written assessment task effectively functioned as an invitation to the students to become complicit in realising the expected ideology, or, “mutually confirming scripts” (Gutierrez, et al., 1995, p. 438). Ultimately, then, the “new arrivals” were contributing to a possible resemiotisation process in which their ideological positioning in Australia was consolidated in their own written texts.
Several additional observations can be made about the nature of the NAP context. First of all, the assumed relationship between the host society and “new arrivals” was, for the most part, contrastive and hierarchical. A boundary was created between a “new arrival” and a non-“new arrival” virtually every time a reference was made to the former. There was a power difference between the two parties, where “new arrivals” were expected to accommodate to their host country. The assumed role of NAP was to mediate the accommodation process.

Yet a picture emerging out of this is that the construct of host society and that of “new arrivals” were mutually constitutive, or counterpoised (Ricento, 2004). In the curriculum-related drafts, various traits of “new arrivals” were foregrounded in comparison to what was held as norm in the mainstream. Every reference made to “new arrivals” was simultaneously constructing what a specific norm might be that “new arrivals” were assessed against. NAP teachers and students were also mutually constitutive, but with added complexities. The Red Ochre classroom was an instance where “people in interaction become environments for each other” (Husu, 2005, p. 120). Yet in the process of constructing “new arrivals”, curriculum-related drafts also created a hierarchy amongst teachers. The documents were imparting the experienced teachers’ knowledge about “new arrivals” to their less experienced counterparts. Thus, experienced teachers, inexperienced teachers and “new arrivals” all emerged as interrelational constructs with assumed, stereotypical characteristics.

Significantly, in the data analysed, it was a group of experienced NAP practitioners that constructed all three parties. It was as though a comprehensive framework for mainstream attitudes towards “new arrivals” was presented from the viewpoint of well-informed, compassionate NAP practitioners. While some mainstream assumptions were rejected, all teachers were situated within the mainstream. While certain mainstream attitudes were discouraged, other attitudes were encouraged. To assume the status of a knower, an experienced NAP teacher would have to have two types of un-knower: a new NAP teacher who might be a representative case of less informed mainstream education/society, and “new arrivals”. In other words, the differential positioning of three parties was occurring intersubjectively (Hasan, 2004b). This helps to explain why the term
“new arrivals” had definitional issues on the one hand, and yet why the term was often treated as given on the other. After all, NAP would not exist without “new arrivals”.

Such an observation leads to speculation that the construction of “new arrivals” was a more or less unplanned side effect. It is possible to imagine that, to ensure the provision of structured support and to maintain official recognition for the provision to take place (i.e. necessary funding), “new arrival” students’ deficiencies have tended to be accentuated as grounds for the support structure. As well, it is not hard to imagine that NAP practitioners would have been inclined to be pragmatic about what the students would urgently need. For example, students’ ‘adjustments’ might be quicker if everyone thought and acted within a predictable range, and the closer they were to the ‘norm’, the less they might struggle. A consistent characteristic of the three aspects of NAP was the weighted focus on life and cultural matters. There was little mention of subject/content areas in the documents. Curriculum documents foregrounded life matters as the needs of “new arrivals”, classroom teacher talk was primarily directed to these needs and many written tasks were mapped around them. This shows how NAP was oriented towards general education, and as such, academic matters were secondary. However, such an orientation simultaneously functioned to generate issues. As NAP obligates itself to fulfil mainstream life education, “new arrivals” are positioned outside the mainstream.

The findings foregrounded a paradox in the English as a Second Language (ESL)/mainstreaming/NAP pedagogy: mainstreaming can be simultaneously alienating, and the force towards conformity can cause rejection (cf. Mickan, Lucas, Davies, & Lim, 2007). Clearly, the teacher’s concentration on formalising numerous norms in class reflected the perceived disadvantage of not doing so. Her words were “not expressions of individuals, but rather statements of connection to and within their social contexts” (Husu, 2005, p. 120). In the process of inducting “new arrivals” into mainstream norms, their deviation from these norms was assumed. An act of presenting mainstream norms to “new arrivals” is simultaneously an act to construct them as outsiders. Thus, it seems that the distance between the mainstream culture and NAP students would be
maintained so long as mainstream norms were emphasised. It has been suggested that the teachers’ attempts to deal with the complexities perceived in the learners may lead to simplistic stereotyping of learners (Kumaravadivelu, 2003). It is ironic if the diversity of the learners is itself a likely force of simplistic construction of themselves.

Seen this way, a dominant pedagogic orientation of NAP would be likely to become, and will continue to be, normative. Harklau (2003) observes that migrant educational programmes “serve both explicit and implicit socializing functions, telling immigrants who they are and what their place is in their adoptive society” (p. 258). It can be added here that sensitising the students to their macro social positioning was linked with preparing students for subsequent institutional practices. Iedema (1996) stresses that “[f]or successful participation in the classroom or workplace, both students and workers need to be sensitive to how others position them” (p. 99). Thus, NAP might be playing two roles simultaneously: presenting to the students one of the effective ways of social participation, while reminding the students of their social positions as “new arrivals”. In this regard, how the final written assessment task was carried out could be seen as symbolic to the students’ newly learned way of social participation.

It is of note that “new arrival” students’ place in the adoptive society happened to be articulated by one of the participating students. Several months after exiting NAP, MR described his Year 11 student status as a “normal student”, “like anybody else”:

```
everybody have his opinions about Year 11 and but, on the end, we all...we are all...getting used to it Year 11, and we’re forgetting about NAP because that’s a natural turn, because there is no NAP anymore; we are now normal students ((raising tones as if asking for agreement)) like anybody else, and studying in Year 11 so we have to study hard as everybody else....Yeah It is a good feeling because there is, there was a, when it was NAP, that, we study English but other students are study Year 11 or Year 12, so...I felt, like they are s, superior than me because they speak better English er....and that's why I I I couldn't... ex...couldn't feel like erm...students, good students like as them, but, now, I'm feeling in the same level like them because I'm normal students
```

(Extracted from an interview with MR, 23 May 2006, underlines and emphases added)
In many ways, MR’s assessment of his shifting positions in the South Australian educational system says it all: being a NAP student was a precursor to becoming a “normal” student. For MR, graduating from “new arrival” status was the cornerstone of assuming status as a “normal”, “good” student. His use of “normal students”, “like anybody else”, “as everybody else” and “in the same level like them” (indicated in bold fonts in the excerpt) illuminates his ambivalent feeling towards being once a NAP student and his growing self-assurance of being a mainstream student. His comments depict the marked status of a “new arrival” student, which had normative and benchmarking implications.

Yet perhaps an even more striking point about MR’s remark was that he seemed to consider English proficiency as the decisive parameter of becoming “good” enough to be a “normal student”. This suggests that he thought his NAP experiences were about English learning. This is at odds with what the analyses suggest. While English proficiency was treated as the manifestation of meeting students’ needs, it was not the root cause of their needs. He seemed yet to realise that central to becoming a normal mainstream student in NAP terms had been normative ways of thinking, behaving and feeling rather than English proficiency per se. There seems to be a mismatch, then, between students’ self-perceived need for English language and the programme’s orientation to educating “new arrivals”.

On this point, the findings highlight the complexities in handling sociocultural aspects of language in migrant education. Curriculum documents provided specific instances as to how ‘newness’ to Australia could be identified as evidence of the need for NAP instruction. As identified in document analysis, as of 2005, the basis of determining someone as new to Australia was not necessarily chronological. Even those who were native to Australia could be identified as “new arrivals”. There was a reversal of logic occurring where, while English language proficiency was initially situated as a root cause for ‘newness’ to Australia, ‘newness’ was eventually situated as a root cause for proficiency. While many hold that current realities of settlement are inseparable from the matters to do with English proficiency (Cobb-Clark, 2001; Hinsliff, 2006; Khoo & McDonald, 2001), ultimately, the second logic was given more weight than the
first. Thus, the Red Ochre class students initially entered NAP based on their English proficiency, and yet what their ESL Scales signified was their “newness” to Australia which in turn signified the need for sociocultural norm-setting, which, ultimately, was treated as not sufficient evidence for students’ socialisation. Hence the dominance of the norm-setting function in ESL teacher talk. The overall orientation of NAP pedagogy was, in a sense, reversing the former pattern.

This suggests the inherently inductive nature of categorising someone a “new arrival”. The documents and teacher talk were directed towards a comprehensive coverage of students’ needs from myriad past and present “new arrivals”.

### 9.2 Issues and Implications

The first issue arising out of the present study is that any talk about “new arrivals” raises questions about the meaning of the term. The findings indicate that different NAP administrative sectors operate with slightly different definitions of “new arrivals”. Any two people may not be referring to “new arrivals” with the same understanding. Meanwhile, the general conceptualisation of “new arrivals” seemed ever growing, the scope of which appeared to expand with a particular “new arrival” group in a particular time and place.

The second issue concerns the concept of mainstreaming. Mainstreaming assumes a merging of non-mainstream elements, as represented in Figure 9.1. As the host society and “new arrivals” are mutually constitutive, the former is inseparable from the latter. Given that NAP practices are equipping “new arrivals” with mainstream norms, the process is to merge gradually into the mainstream. For “new arrivals” to be mainstreamed, they will have to be positioned initially outside the mainstream.
The findings of the study, backed up with MR’s retrospective comments, highlight the complexity of experiences in newcomer programmes. Newcomer programmes may not offer “a honeymoon period” (cf. Miller, 2003). As evident in MR’s comments (“I couldn’t… ex…couldn’t feel like erm…students, good students like as them”), students can sense their pre-mainstream status, and once developing such a sense, studying in a newcomer programme can generate dilemmas. Understanding how NAP practices function as a source of dilemma enhances our understanding of the nature of the student experience.

The findings also highlight the significance of what is held to be mainstream value-norm-belief-attitudes (VNBAs). Formal education was translated into VNBAs teaching in the classroom. It is as though such learning had to precede language and literacy learning (Gutierrez, et al., 1995). In such an environment, it was quite possible that “[s]tudents often heard managerial and behavioural topics as the object of lessons” (Freebody, et al., 1995, xv). While some hold that values education is at the core of all pedagogy (Degenhardt, 2007; Lovat, 2009), the present case study depicted how this might be enacted in everyday migrant educational practices. Explicit attention to VNBAs symbolised the students’ assumed areas of pre-competence. The analysis suggests that having a teacher as both representing mainstream norms and mainstream language left little room for asserting alternative perspectives. Setting “new arrivals” and mainstream in oppositional terms creates an hierarchical order. A question can be asked as to whether learning English needs to be equated with learning mainstream norms.
Mainstream norms may be negotiated with and scrutinised by the students. After all, aspects of life in Australia presented to the students were NAP’s particular version of this part of the world. They were not necessarily a microcosm of Australian life shared by residents.

At another level, the findings suggest that construction of the “new arrivals” could well be a systematic affair. As suggested in Chapter 5, representations of “new arrivals” in the documents were based on past cases. There was a particular view of “new arrivals” operating in NAP, so that “the context in which a text is produced will frame and structure its perception of reality” (Blackledge, 2003, p. 338). As Mehan et al. (1986) argue, it would seem that “[w]hen perceiver [NAP practitioners] and object [“new arrivals”] come together, what is perceived is a function of the interaction between culturally provided categories that the perceiver brings to the interaction and new information about the object that occurs in the interaction” (p. 86). The teachers were, then, in it to contribute to the construction of the learners in their classrooms in particular ways. Classroom teacher talk and written tasks reflected how characterisations of “new arrivals” were viewed and how their perceived needs were translated into learning activities. In particular, the analysis of written tasks highlighted the potentially powerful nature of such processes. The assumptions behind the selection of tasks can be critically evaluated (Santoro, 1999). There was a fine line between enabling the students to present their arguments in particular text-types and shaping what they could demonstrate. This case study has illustrated an instance in which shaping was realised more strongly than enabling.

The final assessment task suggested a potential side effect of the Sydney School of SFL genre-based teaching. Like tools, a genre approach can be handled in various ways. The findings suggest that its application can turn an empowerment plan into a portal for an ideological practice, which, in this case study, might have had the effect of putting learners in their place. Such a seemingly unexpected, unintended effect can happen without the knowledge of NAP practitioners. It would seem that the notion of context for writing needs to be refined, or at least expanded, to take into account the particular sociopolitical, educational context in which the students produce texts.
A significant issue is the place of English in NAP. Carter (1996) notes that with all the differences between the views on standard variety of English, “[i]t is striking how these political positions converge in certain respects and how the pedagogical positions are often identical” (p. 8). That is, somehow, what happens in class tends to remain unchanged. For assimilative purposes or mainstreaming purposes, for maintaining group solidarity (and possible homogeneity) or promoting diversity (and pluralism/heterogeneity), the main argument would seem that one must still master English. So then the ultimate question remains: In what ways current NAP ESL could be seen as different from the past era, in terms of its stance of imparting norms to Australian newcomers? Certainly, the governing immigration policy has different orientations from past ones. Yet, for equity and access or maintenance of monoculture, the emphasis on mastering the dominant language and associated norms seems to remain the same. What has been demonstrated in the set of analyses in this thesis is that with all the changes in policies and stances towards or against “new arrivals”, the core message to the NAP learners probably remains unchanged.

9.3 Limitations of The Study

The present case study presented a snapshot of human practices within a bounded context. The picture available through this approach is partial and selective, since “selectivity is endemic to data collection” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 56) in qualitative inquiry. This exploration concentrated on an educational setting, which can be seen as a natural and real-life context (Bloome, et al., 2005), but is typically set up with “the students’ and teachers’ official roles as students and teachers and do[es] not reflect their lives beyond the classroom” (Gall, et al., 2007, p. 450). As a result, non-educational settings have been left out of the scope of the study. Also, focusing on verbal data left out nonverbal data (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Such selectiveness contributes to the inherent partiality of the account. Further, while this study offers an in-situ explanation of the case of adult “new arrivals”, its findings will not necessarily hold in other cases. The credibility of the research findings is therefore limited to the current case.
This study presented an interpretation of discourses that construct ‘new-arrival-ness’. It is acknowledged that there is more than one interpretation possible. My observation was partial and selective. The current research findings were themselves a particular construction of meaning. Particular intertextual relationships were constructed between elements to describe one possible interpretation. The process involves post-hoc activities (Lemke, 1994), where links between elements were identified after observations, assisted by reflections on the observations. These limitations are inherent in interpretive research. Further research will produce testimony to the degree to which the observations, interpretations and conclusions outlined in this account can be generalised across this educational sector.

9.4 Directions for Further Research

There are various paths that subsequent research can take. One line of research that can be complementary to the current study is to explore how different ESL teachers enact role relationships in similar NAP settings. In particular, the cases with ESL teachers with experience of migration and/or non-English speaking background may yield contrasting results. Conversely, how the same ESL teacher enacts his or her role in different NAP classes might shed more light on the situated nature of teacher talk.

An off-shoot of the above inquiry would be in-depth studies of teacher talk in the content area subjects of NAP. Such a study could enable a comparison of pedagogic functions served in teacher talk between ESL and content areas. This may lead to accounts of potentially different teacher-learner role relationships. Clearly an investigation of this kind is required to arrive at a more holistic understanding of the nature of teacher-learner relationships enacted in NAP. Also, given that ESL components currently occupy a significant portion of NAP curriculum, the possible relationship between ESL and content subjects in one NAP curriculum may also be pursued in such research.

Another line of inquiry is to expand the scope of research to include Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP) cases. Conducting a case study on an AMEP
cohort may provide insightful findings that can be compared with the NAP cohort.

Further, findings from classroom teacher talk analysis may have implications on values education (civics and citizenship). There is now a growing body of research emphasising the crucial nature of values education (Degenhardt, 2007; Gill & Reid, 1999; Lovat, 2007, 2009). In the focus ESL classroom, some very explicit value teaching was going on. Exploring the possible relationship between teacher's norm-setting and a wider framework of values education might shed some light on the nature of values imparted in teacher talk.

A more significant line of research that can be built on this study concerns developing more critically oriented curriculum which incorporates critical literacy. Findings of this study suggest that what are held as norms are themselves constructs. Some norms set in class may be called into question, particularly when they are set against the “new arrivals”. Most importantly, the students can be the critics of these norms. Then one could say that the very practices going on in NAP could serve as valuable topics for critical literacy in a reflexive curriculum.

9.5 Conclusion

Being identified as an adult “new arrival” can have significant implications for a newcomers’ initial social, educational and institutional experiences in Australia. The case study “new arrivals” entered an adult NAP, in which they were viewed, addressed and constructed as “new arrivals” (Mehan, Villanueva, Hubbard, & Lintz, 1996). Accessing mainstream norms constituted their experiences.

The constructed meanings of “new arrivals” were laden with values and ideologies. ESL instruction in an adult NAP class was a site where a host society’s ideologies, expectations and attitudes towards “new arrivals” were made salient. Curriculum documents portrayed “new arrivals” as cultural outsiders in need of pedagogical intervention in life matters. Such ideologies informed classroom teacher talk, which primarily functioned to impart various sociocultural norms
and classroom procedural knowledge. Tasks were organised around ideological expectations, thereby functioning to check the adoption of normative value positions. Findings from analyses on NAP curriculum documents, classroom teacher talk and written tasks were interlinked, which suggests that there was potentially a reiterative process of attributing more or less predictable meanings to “new arrivals”. It was out of this process that I was positioned as a “new arrival”. It is likely that the distance between mainstream society and “new arrivals” continues to be maintained, so long as the meaning of “new arrivals” tends to be generated from comparisons with the norm. Further, so long as the relationship between the host society and “new arrivals” continues to be constructed around the distance between them, normative, life-focused functions of ESL may also continue. However, taking control of such an impact may be found just on the other side of the coin; willing learners and a dedicated teacher, and a number of topics and norms that can be used as points for joint critiquing in class.
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