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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The brief for this research was the mapping of existing pathways for the learning of languages other than English in the Australian context. This was undertaken with a view to “testing” the Rudd Report hypothesis that continuous language learning from Year 3 to Year 12 with time beyond 1040 hours and using an immersion model, would provide a pathway to proficiency for the 2 per cent of Australian school learners targeted to achieve excellent language learning outcomes during their school years. An additional requirement of the research was the development of alternative or ideal pathways for the attainment of second language proficiency.

The evidence for this report suggests that attempts to provide second language learning pathways through continuous study from primary through to secondary education and beyond have been largely unsuccessful. Continuous learning has not equated with cumulative learning towards proficiency. Given this finding it is suggested that a pathway to proficiency may better be facilitated by focusing on enhancing language learning through the use of a number of interventions that can be applied at different phases of learning to speed and enrich the process of language acquisition. Three interventions in particular have emerged from the research as having significant potential to enhance second language learning at program level. These are:

❂ Improved access to, and utilisation of, information technology to provide second language learners with opportunities to interact with text, (particularly viewing text), and with real target language users in overseas target language speaking communities.

❂ The utilisation of multiple target language speakers within a single formal learning context, particularly in large class contexts, in order to enhance the interactional opportunities and resources made available to classroom second language learners.

❂ The provision of in-country experiences that are designed for older school learners and that require actual language learning, rather than “site” seeing and the application of language previously learnt.

It is the contention of the research team that this notion of “pathway” is less likely to be compromised by bureaucracy and other external forces that militate against the process of language acquisition and the attainment of proficiency.

In order to draw conclusions about proficiency potential and pathways to proficiency attainment, a Proficiency Potential Framework was developed by the research team. This framework enables LOTE programs and their learners to be profiled in order to determine:

❂ How well LOTE programs and learners “fit into” their broader educational and community environments.

❂ How language is seen and used within these environments.
The key elements of the framework relate to program embedment, language deployment and learner autonomy. Program embedment is influenced by the context in which language learning happens, the language input received by learners and the teaching and learning processes that take place to convert language input into language intake. The research points to the solidity or fragility of a LOTE program being able to be determined by any aspect of, or interrelationship between these factors – context, input or intake. The research shows that being “strong” in terms of input and intake is not enough to guarantee embedment status and proficiency potential if contextual factors work against the teaching and learning process. A finding of this research is that if the context in which a LOTE program is situated does not totally support that program and its students, then the potential for proficiency to be an outcome is seriously inhibited.

The research also suggests that for proficiency to be a potential outcome listening, reading and viewing text reflecting a broad range of text types or genres needs to be made available to learners. The research team categorised input received by learners into focused, broad and selective. In analysing the research data, a link between focused input and program marginalisation was evident in many instances. A link between deployment orientation and broad input was also in evidence.

The research affirms the importance of teachers and learners being able to know, understand and utilise language learning strategies. The researchers found that where teachers and learners were able to talk about the processes associated with language teaching and language learning, there were generally better learning outcomes.

The Proficiency Potential Framework also enables language deployment by learners within a program to be evaluated against a number of output or proficiency potential elements. These elements emerged through the research and are:

- Ability to use language modes (receptive and productive, functionally and critically).
- Sociolinguistic competence (or appropriate language use).
- Sociocultural knowledge (or knowledge about the communities/societies of target language speakers).
- Knowledge about the system of the target language and the ability to apply that knowledge.
- Having attitudinal characteristics that facilitate the attainment and use of the elements listed above (eg confidence, creativity, curiosity).
- A context which supports all the other elements.

Profiling and data analysis reveal that quality and type of output and therefore deployment orientation, are conditioned by a number of factors and/or beliefs including learner age, teacher and learner attitudes, the nature of the LOTE, time allocation, class size and program type or format. The research findings point to the need for learners to develop all the output elements in order to maximise their potential to be proficient.

The research also suggest that learner autonomy or self-directedness is a factor of significance in the attainment of proficiency and that this does not necessarily correlate with age and cognitive maturity but rather with, classroom expectations and practices, learner attitudinal characteristics and/or learners being taught how to learn language.
As a result of the profiling process it is the contention of the research team that in order to maximise proficiency potential, programs need to be embedded, have a deployment orientation and be able to honour and support the development of learner autonomy.

In addition to providing information about the proficiency potential offered to learners through Australian LOTE programs, the case study profiles compiled for this research also enable the identification of patterns and trends associated with the teaching and learning of second or foreign languages in the Australian context:

❌ No direct correlation between phase of learning and embedment status is apparent.

❌ There is some evidence to suggest that school programs are less likely to provide a deployment orientation than tertiary programs.

❌ The evidence suggests that only immersion style programs in primary schools seem, at present, to be able to provide an orientation that supports the attainment of proficiency.

❌ Non-immersion style primary programs currently provide very little potential for a proficiency orientation. A finding of the research is that these programs are often characterised by list learning, game playing and only limited opportunities for learners to engage with conceptually complete meaningful text.

❌ That beyond the primary phase of learning both immersion and non-immersion style programs can offer a significant orientation towards proficiency.

❌ The research process identified lower secondary classrooms as often being dominated by the more quite modes of language use at the expense of allowing broad interaction patterns.

❌ There appears to be a strong link between class size, interaction patterns and proficiency potential.

❌ The research indicates that there is often an operational and compartmentalised approach to language teaching and learning. The findings suggest that issues of appropriacy and balance need to be addressed so that learners have the opportunity to develop all the output elements and use language critically as well as functionally.

❌ “Culture” emerges through the research as problematic, particularly in primary language programs where it is generally expressed stereotypically and where performance (for example dance, singing) and making (for example kites, origami) are the media used to present culture, or where it is often sacrificed because of other content being taught.

The research data are also rich in information about “quality” teaching and learning of LOTE. The criticality of the teacher for effective teaching and learning was confirmed by the research. The importance of the learners themselves in the process of language acquisition, particularly their attitudinal qualities and characteristics, and especially confidence, was also supported by the research. It was evident that “good learners” recognised the need to go beyond the classroom for language deployment and that they are not necessarily daunted by challenging tasks or scripted languages.
The research suggests the need for a wider application of a pedagogy that accommodates multi-level learning and that encourages interaction and collaboration between learners who are then enabled to maximise opportunities for target language usage in large class contexts. This implies the need for a teaching methodology where there is extensive target language usage in the classroom, where collaborative learning strategies are employed and where self-access and self-directed learning are an integral part of the language teaching and learning environment.

Learners involved in the research were able to provide valuable information as to how their teachers can best support them in the language acquisition process. Learners expressed a desire for their language learning experiences to be meaningful. They want to be able to relate to what they are doing. They want what they are doing to be linked to, and build upon what they have already done, and they want the language that they learn to be “real” so that they can communicate with people of similar age and interests.

Overall, the findings of the research point to a need for the first focus in any attempt to develop a proficiency orientation to be program embedment. Beyond this, a language deployment orientation and strategies and interventions for cumulative learning can be activated and utilised. It is suggested that a process of internally initiated change, supported and facilitated externally, may be a mechanism able to bring about change and the enhancement of program proficiency potential. The research indicates that the implementation of change at program level is an essential first step in the development of a coordinated and broader approach to second language proficiency in the Australian context.
PART ONE

CONTEXTUALISING THE RESEARCH
INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE RESEARCH

For more than a quarter of a century the issue of Australians studying a second or foreign language, and the need for a pool of people proficient in a second or foreign language, have been, to a greater or lesser extent, part of the national agenda. The study of languages, particularly Asian languages, has been the subject of sixteen official or semi-official reports but it has only really been in the 1990s that Languages Other Than English have become a more normal and accepted part of the curriculum for the majority of students in Australian schools. The catalysts for this curriculum change were the 1989 Hobart Declaration, the 1991 Australian Language and Literacy Policy and the 1994 National Asian Languages/Studies Strategy for Australian Schools.

The significance of the Hobart Declaration is considerable. By signing this declaration, Australia’s ministers of education agreed to common national goals for schooling in Australia. One of these goals was the establishment of Languages Other Than English (LOTE) as one of the eight key learning areas of the curriculum for schools. In effect, the Hobart Declaration began the process of legitimising and normalising the study of languages for all students within schools.

This process was both validated and continued through the publication in 1991 of the document often referred to as the White Paper. *Australia’s Language: The Australian Language and Literacy Policy,* expressly stated as its second goal that,

> The learning of languages other than English must be substantially expanded and improved to enhance educational outcomes and communication within both the Australian and the international community. (p14).

The policy also proposed that ‘the proportion of Year 12 students studying a language other than English should be increased to 25% nationally by the year 2000.’ (p17). The White Paper’s explicit reference to enhanced educational outcomes and to students studying a language through to the end of their formal schooling lent considerable weight to the notion of jurisdictions and schools both providing for, and actively fostering, the attainment of proficiency.

It has been the National Asian Languages/Studies Strategy for Australian Schools (NALSAS), however, that has been the principal source of both philosophical and financial support for LOTE as a key learning area and for having a proportion of school language learners achieve high levels of proficiency.

The strategy emerged from the 1992 Council of Australian Governments’ (COAG) discussion of the importance of proficiency in Asian languages and the understanding of Asian societies to the enhancement of Australia’s economic interests in the Asia-Pacific region. A high level working group was established to prepare a report for COAG. The report, *Asian Languages and Australia’s Economic Future,* was published in 1994 and articulates a detailed long-term strategy, (NALSAS), to improve significantly Australia’s performance in Asian languages/cultures education.

---

1. This report will be referred to as the Rudd Report after the Chairperson of the working group, Kevin Rudd.
The research that is the subject of this report was commissioned by the NALSAS Taskforce. It is part of the implementation of the National Asian Languages/Studies Strategy for Australian Schools. The research explores the notion of proficiency potential as it relates to different LOTE programs operating in Australian educational jurisdictions at primary, secondary and tertiary level. It also investigates the notion of ‘pathway’ as it relates to the attainment of high levels of language proficiency. The data from the research are rich in information about the teaching and learning of Languages Other Than English in Australia. The report synthesises this information and, within the context of the provision of pathways for the achievement of language proficiency, is able to present significant insights into best practice in LOTE teaching and learning in a context which has been significantly reshaped by the Hobart Declaration, the White Paper and NALSAS. The findings of this research also have the potential to inform decision making about the future of the teaching and learning of Languages Other Than English. Implications and recommendations are included as the final part of the report.

1.2 PROFICIENCY

As part of Recommendation 5D the Rudd Report stipulates a target of 2 per cent of Year 12 students acquiring ‘a level of proficiency equivalent to “minimal vocational proficiency”’. (p111).² This research is about this 2 per cent of students. Although it was not the specific brief of the research team to further refine what the above definition of second language (L2) proficiency means for learners in a school context, it was found necessary to consider the nature of proficiency. This has been done, not from the perspective of what tasks learners can perform when they are proficient, but from the point of view of the elements which together constitute proficiency and which impact on the proficiency potential of programs and pathways. The proficiency potential elements listed below have emerged through the research:

- Ability to use language modes (receptive and productive, functionally and critically).
- Sociolinguistic competence (or appropriate language use).
- Sociocultural knowledge (or knowledge about the communities/societies of target language speakers).
- Knowledge about the system of the target language and the ability to apply that knowledge.
- Having attitudinal characteristics that facilitate the attainment and use of the elements listed above (eg confidence, creativity, curiosity).
- A context which supports all the other elements.

The articulation of these proficiency potential elements is not an attempt to present a definitive view of what constitutes proficient language use. Rather, the emergence of these elements through the research allowed for the development of a framework through which the proficiency potential of different programs and contexts could be viewed.

² The Australian Second Language Proficiency Ratings includes the following as descriptors of what is implied by ‘minimal vocational proficiency’: Read newspapers, reports and technical material in one’s own special field and novels; Write a university level essay with some precision; Participate effectively in most informal and formal situations pertaining to social and community life; Able to get the gist of most conversations between native speakers; Undertake routine correspondence.
In order for the 2 per cent to achieve proficiency, the Rudd Report presents recommendations relating to intensities of instruction, duration of instruction and the nature of instruction in languages other than English.

In reference to planning regular school programs the Rudd Report suggests ‘approximately 2.5 hours instruction per week per class for each year of study for Years 3 to 10 and 3 hours in Years 11 to 12.’ (p.124). It goes on to state that,

the required outcome in terms of high levels of language proficiency for a small percentage of students (2% of Year 12 students) in this strategy can be achieved through programs which involve additional ‘time on task’. (p124).

Recommendation 5G of the Rudd Report urges governments to endorse ‘Year 3 as the most appropriate starting age for the study of a second language’. (p123). This recommendation suggests the need for the study of a second language to be for a significant length of time in order to attain proficiency.

The Report also supports the notion of partial immersion programs being an appropriate approach to effective teaching and learning for the attainment of proficiency. In reference to partial immersion programs the report states that,

They are excellent means of acquiring another language to high levels of proficiency for students, not merely those with particular promise aptitude or interest. (p124).

It is therefore suggested by the report that a pathway from Year 3 to Year 12 where there is provision of time beyond the minimum specifications of 1040 hours, and where immersion is the chosen model of instruction, should result in learners attaining the required degree of proficiency.

Whilst mindful of this contention the research team adopted the view that, because LOTE provision in Australia is achieved through many different program configurations, the notion of “pathway” needed to be inclusive of different models of instruction at different levels. The research team therefore chose to explore this notion of “pathway” by mapping existing pathways using the experiences of the different models at different levels. It was the intention of the research team to then use this information to construct an ideal pathway, or pathways, for the achievement of proficiency and to test these against the recommendations of the Rudd Report.

This then is the background to this research. The National Asian Languages/Studies Strategy for Australian Schools targeted 2 per cent of the school population as potentially proficient users of Asian languages. How best to provide for this 2 per cent in terms of both teaching/learning programs and learning pathways has been the subject of the research team’s investigations and the outcomes of that research is reported in the following pages.
Chapter Two

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

2.1 RESEARCH APPROACH

The methodology for this research was qualitative. Data reflect the perceptions of people interviewed as a direct part of, or in relation to, 27 Languages Other Than English (LOTE) programs in all States and Territories in Australia. Table 1 shows the number of programs by State or Territory, whether these were part of the Government or non-Government systems and the levels of schooling reflected through each case study.

Table 1 Programs by State, Territory and Jurisdictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Territory</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Non-Government</th>
<th>Level of Schooling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Primary – Lower Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Secondary – Tertiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Primary – Upper Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Primary – Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Primary – Lower Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Primary – Lower Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary – Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary – Post Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary – Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Primary – Lower Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tertiary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programs included in the research were drawn from all Australian educational jurisdictions and each State and Territory is represented in the final profile document.3

---

3. Not all programs are reported individually as some programs are described as clusters, and some had an involvement from the perspective of potential pathway provision only. The full profile document is included as Appendix A.
Initial recommendations about programs to be investigated through the research were made by state educational jurisdictions. Recommendations for the inclusion of Catholic and Independent schools were also sought from relevant organisations. Not all programs approached agreed to be included in the research. While every effort was made to find substitutes, this was not always possible. Where States or Territories seem to be under-represented, or where there appears to be a lack of balance in terms of the levels of schooling investigated, it is because programs chose not to be involved.

Final selection of programs was done on the basis of ensuring that a wide range of program types, reflective of the diversity of LOTE teaching and learning within the Australian context, was included in the research.

Critical to the research approach was the notion of “best practice”. Each of the programs included in the study was recommended to the research team on the basis of being, in some way, an example of “best practice” in the LOTE learning area. Three dimensions of “best practice” have been investigated through the research – “best practice” in program design, management and development, “best practice” in teaching, and “best practice” in learning. An exploration of the notion of “best practice” was considered, by the research team, to be an appropriate vehicle for examining the issues associated with language proficiency and language learning pathways for school students studying a LOTE in the Australian educational context.

2.2 ELEMENTS OF THE METHODOLOGY

Data about the different dimensions of “best practice” have been collected from a wide range of sources. The multiple sources of evidence used in this study are described below.

2.2.1 Case Studies

Two types of case studies were included as part of the research process – case studies of “best practice” programs and case studies of proficient Asian language users.

Case studies of “best practice” programs were the principal source of data for the research. Programs selected to be included in the case studies presented a comprehensive range of languages other than English. The principal focus of this research was Asian language proficiency, but the inclusion of European language programs was considered desirable given the extensive history of European language teaching in Australia.

Not all programs included in the research have been reported as individual case studies. Some programs have been described as clusters, and some from the perspective of potential pathway provision only.

The multiple data sources used in the “best practice” case studies were site visits, interviews, direct observation and documentation.

In addition to the “best practice” programs, three case studies of highly proficient language users were included as part of the data collection process. The purpose of these case studies was to track the learning pathways of each student in order to examine the interplay and relative importance of different aspects of the language learning process.
2.2.2 Interviews

Both individual interviews and focus group interviews were included in the research process.

Individual interviews were conducted with senior LOTE personnel from the different jurisdictions. Principals and LOTE program coordinators were also interviewed individually as were some teachers and LOTE learners.

Focus group interviews were conducted in larger programs with LOTE teachers, non-LOTE teachers with an interest or involvement in the programs, and “best” learners within the different programs.

The interview instruments were developed to elicit information concerning the characteristics of, and perceptions about the different dimensions of “best practice” in LOTE teaching and learning. These interview instruments are included as Appendix B of this report.

2.2.3 Documentation

Various forms of documentation were collected from each program involved in the research. The School/Program Profile Instrument was used to provide the research team with an overview of each educational institution, its students and staff and also, detailed information about the provision of LOTE.4

LOTE policy documents and programs were also collected, together with information about how student learning outcomes were communicated to interested parties. These documents proved to be invaluable in terms of providing information about how notions associated with “best practice” were constructed within the context of each program.

2.2.4 Literature Review

A literature review investigating national and international research and opinions on the concept of “pathway to proficiency” was undertaken. Given the prominence accorded to immersion style programs in the Rudd Report, the review focuses on immersion as a pathway to the achievement of proficiency. In addition, and in response to the findings of the research team, the review also explores in-country experience and the use of technology to enhance proficiency potential.

4. The School/Program Profile Instrument is included as part of Appendix B.
2.3 DATA ANALYSIS

A process of constant comparative analysis was used as data were collected from each State and Territory. This process was undertaken to assess trends and develop a framework for the data. The process bears comparison with “Grounded Theory” in which framework and theories emerge from the data in a constant process of comparison. The constant and rigorous application of the research instruments across all programs and the use of constant comparative analysis enabled the rigorous testing of recent data against the impressions and information previously collected.

Constant comparative analysis resulted in the emergence of the “proficiency potential elements” outlined in Section 1.2. and the development of the “Proficiency Potential Framework” described in Chapter 4. Programs investigated through the study could then be examined against the Framework. This process resulted in the profiling of both LOTE programs and LOTE learners. The Profiles provide detailed information about the programs involved in the case studies and enable the proficiency orientation of programs, and learning pathways, to be clearly identified. The complete Profiles are included as Appendix A of this report.
Chapter Three

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This literature review is a selective analysis of current trends and identifies models that have been successful in leading to higher levels of language proficiency. Particular attention is paid to the Australian situation and to the teaching of Asian languages. The review seeks to identify examples of significant innovation and initiative rather than delve into the more traditional models of LOTE teaching and learning. The review concentrates on three main areas, Immersion Principles in Language Education; Study Abroad/In-Country Study and Technology. A focus on these areas was considered appropriate given the emphasis of the Rudd Report and the findings of the research process itself.

3.2 IMMERSION PRINCIPLES IN LANGUAGE EDUCATION

3.2.1 Introduction

In writing about the growth of interest in language education in Australia since the 1970s and the government policies which have ensued, Lo Bianco suggests that ‘the primary aim of such policies has been one of breadth of provision rather than depth of quality’ (Lo Bianco 1995: xiii). Read suggests that it is this background of policy change which has prompted ‘teachers to find a more effective foreign language pedagogy’ and that one result has been the setting up of immersion programs in a number of Australian schools (Read 1996: 471).

A review of the literature on immersion education, both in Australia and overseas, immediately identifies the problem of definition. The interpretation of terms such as “immersion” and “bilingual” varies greatly, and the variety of models incorporating these concepts seems infinite. It is beyond the scope of this review to identify all of them or to attempt a definitive categorisation of immersion education worldwide. Rather, it will look at a selection of “immersion” models at primary, secondary and tertiary levels and identify those factors that have made them successful.

3.2.2 Background

In order to bring clarity to this review, it is necessary to consider some of the definitions of immersion programs and to look at the background of immersion education.

Genesee defines immersion as:

A form of bilingual education in which students who speak the language of the majority of the population receive part of their instruction through the medium of a second language and part through their first language. Generally speaking, at least 50% of instruction during a given academic year must be provided through the second language for the program to be regarded as immersion. (Genesee quoted in Berthold 1995: 1)

5. Read 1996 provides a useful overview of this problem.
On the basis of the above definition, Berthold terms programs where there is less than 50 per cent content teaching in the second language as “bilingual”, and those where only a small amount of content is taught in a second language as “content” programs (Berthold 1995: 1). Clyne and others also suggest that ‘the more limited programs employing immersion principles, i.e. with some subjects or curriculum segments taught in the target language [TL], are more correctly named “content-based” programs’ (Clyne et al 1995: 11). In Australia, however, many writers also use the term “partial immersion” to refer to these programs. Read points out that in Canada full immersion programs include an initial period of total immersion, a “language bath” in which all instruction is in the second language. “Partial immersion” there means that while students have received at least half of their instruction in L2, they have not experienced the “language bath” (Read 1996: 469).

Irrespective of the variety of immersion models, the common feature is that ‘the language teaching is content-based, i.e. the TL is the medium, not the object of study’ (Read 1996: 470). In “immersing” the student in the target language, ‘the idea is to approximate as closely as possible the conditions that made possible the acquisition of the learner’s first language, which necessitates the exclusive use of the TL’ (Berthold 1991: 26).

The language immersion concept began in Canada in 1965 in an effort to achieve maximum French language proficiency amongst Anglophone students, and it has been researched extensively over the years with favourable results. The Australian situation, however, is somewhat different because there is no one language in Australia that has the significance that French does to English-speaking Canadians (Clyne et al 1995: 11). Australia has thus developed a number of programs based on the partial-immersion or content-based principle, and similar programs have been developed in Europe, the USA, Asia and South Africa.6

3.2.3 “Immersion” Program Types

The following are examples from the range of program types that exist under the “immersion” umbrella.

Early Full Immersion

Early immersion begins at Kindergarten or Year 1 level. An Early Full Immersion (EFI) program aimed at functional bilingualism is offered by the Nanaimo-Ladysmith school in British Columbia, Canada (Anon 1991). Children from K-Year 2 are taught totally in French and are gradually taught in increasing amounts of English as they progress through elementary school. French instruction, however, continues to make up at least two-thirds of their school day. An evaluation of the program in 1988 found that Year 7 students performed above average compared to the provincial average in their ability to write the French language for communication purposes and they scored above average in areas such as verb conjugation and sentence enrichment (pp19-20).

6. Johnson and Swain 1997 provide a comprehensive overview of ‘immersion’ from an international perspective.
Late Full Immersion

Late immersion usually begins in Years 6 or 7 and may be preceded by some years of conventional instruction in the target language (Berthold 1990: 31). In the Nanaimo School District, a Late Full Immersion (LFI) program is offered to students in Year 6. They receive their entire regular curriculum in French for the first two years and on reaching secondary school, they receive up to 50% of their instruction in French (Anon 1991: 18). A 1988 writing test of Year 7 LFI students produced results lower than the provincial average in grammatical knowledge and their ability to write French for communication purposes (p21). The author believes, however, that students in the Years 7-10 EFI and LFI classes speak French well, and although their communication ‘is characterized by non-native traits, it would certainly be comprehensible and operational in situations with native speakers’ (p24). Although the students are not as proficient as Francophone students in the linguistic aspects of their speech, ‘They are functional in the French language’ (p24). The author believes it would be unrealistic to expect immersion students anywhere to achieve linguistic competencies that would make them indistinguishable from native speakers.

The Nanaimo evaluation supports Krashen’s findings that Canadian immersion students become quite competent in French and ‘approach native speakers of French on some matters’ (Krashen quoted in Berthold 1991: 29). He also found that these students ‘easily outperform students enrolled in traditional French classes (core French)’ (p28). Gray’s evaluation of an EFI program in Fredericton, New Brunswick, supported this and found that ‘in some French skills they had surpassed the [core] Grade 12 students by the end of Grade 3’ (Gray quoted in Berthold 1991: 29).

Swain’s extensive study of Canadian immersion students has found that both EFI and LFI students have similar levels of writing skills, which are poorer than those of Francophone students (Swain 1996: 94). Their weaknesses are grammatical competence and vocabulary knowledge and speaking is the weakest of the macro skill areas. Discourse skills are the least problematic and Swain concludes that ‘the receptive skills of immersion students are stronger than their productive skills’ (p94). Swain also believes that although EFI students perform better than LFI students, the differences are not as great as one would expect, given the differences in exposure time, and that this ‘supports the theoretical claim that older learners are more efficient learners with respect to some aspects of L2 learning’ (p94).

While the format of immersion language education has been developed extensively in Canada, writers such as Johnson point out that ‘the aims, implementation and outcomes of Canadian immersion programs are in many ways unique to that context’ (Johnson 1996: 112). Berthold also argues that the Australian linguistic situation is very different to that of Canada and that we should not clone their programs (quoted in Berthold 1995: 9). In the following examples from a number of countries, immersion principles have been incorporated in foreign language teaching in ways which are appropriate to what Berthold terms their own ‘linguistic demography’ (quoted in Berthold 1995: 9).
**Short Intensive Immersion**

At Wilson College, Pennsylvania, the immersion principle was combined with the Rassias Method of theatrical, dramatic language saturation in short, intensive courses in French, German and Spanish (Cormier 1988). During the ten-day courses the stress was on everyday communication and oral proficiency was emphasised. Evaluations revealed that while students enjoyed the intensity and individual attention in the courses, they were concerned about the mixed ability levels in the classes and the difficulty of absorbing such a large amount of material in such a short time (p11). While Cormier states that ‘the intensive learning was viewed as extremely effective’, he does not elaborate further on the levels of proficiency reached by students.

**Partial Immersion/Content-Based Programs**

The international literature of foreign language education contains many examples of partial immersion or content-based programs. These are as varied as the teaching of Catalan to native Spanish speakers in Catalonia (Artigal 1991) and the teaching of English to native Cantonese speakers in Hong Kong (Johnson 1996). In Australia, both Berthold and De Courcy have written extensively about local immersion programs (e.g. Berthold, 1990, 1991, 1995; De Courcy, 1991, 1993) and Fernandez has produced an extensive study of the German language immersion program at Bayswater South Primary School in Victoria (Fernandez 1992). This review will not provide an in-depth analysis of these programs but rather a summary that identifies the main characteristics, the success factors and problems of this model, particularly with reference to Australia.

Lo Bianco has suggested that there is ‘a growing body of Australian evidence for the effectiveness of immersion education and its superiority as a method (or methods) over traditional second language education’ (Lo Bianco 1995: xv). Content-based LOTE programs in which a significant proportion of the curriculum is taught through the target language are, however, still in the minority in Australia. Although the Victorian Directorate of School Education suggests that its Case Studies of LOTE Provision is too small to draw conclusions, the fact that the great majority of primary and secondary programs profiled are examples of the “language as object” model is difficult to ignore (VDSE 1995: 7). The Directorate (p7) points out that the fifty-five case studies are ‘examples of a diverse range of programs … which schools have developed to cater for different learner groups and different circumstances’, and perhaps this is significant.

The more well known immersion programs in Australia include those at Bayswater South (German, 1981-), Benowa (French, 1985-), Mt Scopus (Hebrew, 1990-), Mansfield (French, 1991-) and Kenmore (German, 1992-). These programs were all established before or at the time of the implementation of the National Policy on Languages (1987) and the Australian Language and Literacy Policy (1991). Since that time, large numbers of students have undertaken LOTE studies and perhaps rather than simply adopt Berthold’s “Benowa model”, educators are experimenting with new forms of language teaching and learning. One example is Koonawarra Primary School in Western Australia where Cambodian as a first language is taught by the content based model in Years 1-4 but Cambodian as a second language is taught by the language as object model in Year 3 (VDSE 1995). Interestingly, the stimulus for the latter course ‘came from the students themselves who asked why they were not learning the language like their Cambodian classmates’ (p96).

Other developments in Australia include the introduction of immersion programs at university level, including Asian languages such as Japanese at Griffith (De Courcy 1993) and Chinese at Edith Cowan (Read 1996).
Read refers to the trend for ‘immersion’s constituent elements [to] get distorted into various configurations in attempts to adapt the approach to Australian conditions’, and indeed this has been the case since the introduction of language immersion education in Australia in the 1980s. Benowa State High School in Queensland introduced a partial late immersion program in 1985, teaching 60% of the school program in French. The students have no prior knowledge of the language and learn ‘Mathematics, Science, Physical Education, Social Science and French in French, through years 8-10’ (Berthold 1991: 27). Another model was, however, introduced in 1990 when Mt Scopus Memorial College in Victoria began a partial late immersion program in Hebrew for students who already had seven years of traditional Hebrew studies. Since that time, many variants of immersion/content-based language education have evolved in Australia.

Berthold describes a number of immersion features incorporated in the Benowa model (Berthold 1991: 27). All teaching is through the target language; body language is often used to convey meaning; and student involvement is integral, with the class paced to their response – indeed ‘if teachers try to run a totally organised, structured class then the rate of comprehension of the students has to be sporadic’ (p28). The basis of learning in an immersion class fits Krashen’s “Language Acquisition Model” in which language competence is acquired through “comprehensible input” – ‘students are provided with digestible chunks of language that they are able to understand and hence store away for later use’ (p28). Berthold believes that the results of the French immersion classes at Benowa produce high results similar to the Canadian experience (p29).

The advantage of immersion language teaching is its influences ‘upon students’ attitudes towards study in other disciplines, in their attitudes towards other cultures, and their academic performance at school and in their mother tongue’ (Berthold 1991: 28). Students have much more contact with the target language than in a traditional language class, and as their proficiency increases, the language becomes another means of communication rather than an object of study.

Despite the advantages of immersion, though, there are also a number of difficulties. Berthold refers to resistance by school administrators, subject coordinators and other language teachers; perceived elitism; a shortage of suitable teachers and lack of immersion teacher-training; student selection; isolation of students; lack of teaching resources; choice of subjects, language and model of immersion (Berthold 1991: 30-31). De Courcy's interviews with Benowa immersion students also identified problems such as isolation/elitism, the demanding pace of the course and the need for self-discipline (De Courcy 1991: 15). The students’ attitudes were generally positive, however, and it appeared that the attitude of the rest of the school population changed as the immersion program became accepted.

The issue of perception is interesting and is relevant to Rockwell's survey on attitude to language learning among three Sydney high school classes. Rockwell found that 50% of the boys at North Sydney Boys High School were strongly against the idea of immersion programs, 28% of the students at Marrickville High School would be ‘happy to cooperate’ with such a program and 30% of the girls at Willoughby Girls High School would accept it if the language was French, 15% if it was Japanese and 5% if it was an Indian language (Rockwell 1995: 36). Although Rockwell describes these figures as ‘generally quite promising’, they do indicate that attitude is a significant factor to be taken into account in the development of LOTE programs.
In light of current government policy to improve the proficiency levels of students studying Asian languages in Australia, it is significant that De Courcy and Birch point out that the bulk of research into the proficiency of immersion students has focused on European languages and that ‘very little has involved Asian languages, in particular those using a character-based script’ (De Courcy and Birch 1993: 4). The authors state that [as of 1993] ‘no studies have considered the acquisition of written Japanese in courses where the focus is on content’ (p7). In Australia there are examples of Indonesian taught by immersion (Park Ridge State High School), but few examples of immersion programs in character-based Asian languages such as Japanese, Korean and Modern Standard Chinese.

The literature is also dominated by studies of European languages, but does reveal some Japanese and Chinese immersion programs. Read describes the LACITEP program at Central Queensland University, which is claimed to be ‘the world’s first pre-service teacher education degree program offered through immersion in Japanese’ (Read 1996: 476). The course is open to students who have the equivalent of Year 12 Japanese and teaches some subjects entirely in Japanese, some partially in Japanese and some entirely in English. Fifty to eighty percent of the program is delivered in Japanese. Read believes the course is unique and innovative in offering a language regarded as difficult for Anglophones, suggesting that ‘it is much easier to implement immersion in a cognate language’ (p477). Because the base of the program is immersion pedagogy, the students are also learning about how immersion is used to teach while they are being taught through it. Unfortunately Read does not comment on levels of proficiency reached in the course.

In 1993 Griffith University began a partial immersion BEd (LOTE-Japanese) course (De Courcy and Birch 1993; Read 1996). Students required Year 12 Japanese for entry and undertook nine subjects by immersion, including Japanese life and culture and LOTE methodology. De Courcy and Birch published a detailed study of the Griffith program in 1993. They paid particular attention to the strategies that the students employed in learning kanji and emphasised that texts used should use kana and kanji rather than romaji (De Courcy and Birch 1993: 8). Kanji posed the greatest difficulty for the students in reading. The course began in July, but it was not until November that the students began to read kanji as a concept rather than a sound, and began to develop an awareness of radicals. It was also difficult to ‘provide input which is linguistically simple enough for the students to understand but cognitively sophisticated for the age of the learners’ (p7).

The students’ main writing strategy was the translation of ideas from English to Japanese (p32). They tended to write in Japanese phonetic script as their writing of kanji was rudimentary. The authors believe that ‘it is in the area of writing that students appear to be most bereft of effective strategies’ and where they need teacher assistance (p38). After four months of using the character language word processor JEJING, the students’ attitude was more positive and they could write more kanji. They also focused on language ‘only to the extent that it helps them extract necessary meaning and complete content related tasks’ (p37).
At the end of their study, De Courcy and Birch concluded that:

> It seems that the nature of an immersion approach induces certain strategies which may not be so evident in language-focused courses and which may be ultimately beneficial to the development of fluent reading. On the other hand, it may be that there is a need to embed a degree of language focus into such a program in order to increase the range of strategies which might contribute to the development of the students’ proficiency in reading and writing (p40).

Unfortunately demand has not increased over the years for the Griffith course and in 1996 enrolments were insufficient to justify an intake. Read contrasts Griffith’s secondary teacher program with the success of Central Queensland’s primary teacher program and suggests that ‘from the point of view of both the conceptual difficulty of the content material as well as the level of language required, a secondary program would be more demanding in immersion than a primary one’ (Read 1996: 478). Her comment on the Griffith program’s lack of resources is that ‘a less well-resourced program with less TL exposure, in which “immersion” means mainly reading in Japanese, is bound to have less appeal’ (p478).

In 1992, researchers at Edith Cowan University began a collaborative project with the Guangzhou Foreign Language University in China in which they ‘sought to find out whether university students achieve greater proficiency when instruction is given intensively [condensed] or by immersion [content-based] approaches’ (Read 1996: 480). The ULTRA project researched the teaching of Chinese in Australia and English in China, and included ‘a three-way comparison of types of instruction in Chinese for beginners – a normal class, an immersion class and an intensive immersion class’ (p481). The control group, or normal class, comprised ‘the normal first year university Chinese course studying a skills/language based course for eight hours per week … for two semesters’ (McGregor 1995: 6).

The research found that ‘in general, the intensive and immersion approaches proved to be slightly more effective than normal FL instruction, but there were problems with both approaches as well’ (Read 1996: 481). It was felt that:

(a) it was unnecessary to avoid completely the use of English in such matters as vocabulary items which could not be readily demonstrated in other ways

(b) it was probably counterproductive in working with adult learners not to make some use of their knowledge of and interest in language construction in such matters as grammatical or structural problems (McGregor 1995: 20).

The researchers found that ‘high intensity of instruction appears to militate against student ability to enjoy and benefit from the immersion approach’, especially when students have other commitments such as employment, and they suggested that special strategies are required to help students through the first two or three weeks of their immersion courses when they tend to feel overwhelmed by the experience (pp20-21). The immersion group was significantly poorer in writing than the control group, though the intensive immersion group was not, and it was suggested that there may not have been enough time for the immersion students to practise skills in character writing (pp21-22).
Following some modifications to the immersion course, particularly the earlier introduction of Chinese characters and a minimal (5%) use of English for grammatical explanations, further trials were held in 1996. The results showed that the previous weakness in writing had gone – ‘there is now no significant difference between the control and the experimental group, which in turn has performed significantly better than the [1994] immersion group’ (McGregor 1997: 20). There was no reduction in speaking and listening ability and the use of English for explanations did not change the results. In fact, it was suggested that ‘it is at least possible that the time and energy saved in this way has contributed to the continuing superiority in speaking and listening which might otherwise have been affected by the extra time spent on writing’ (p21). McGregor cautions that sample numbers used in the trial, however, are small and that further testing is desirable, and that the finding on the use of English is only ‘a reasonable inference’ which requires further research (p21).

Two-Way Bilingual

Two-Way Bilingual (bilingual immersion) programs are those where English (or majority) speakers attend class all day with target language speakers and learn half the curriculum in English and half in the target language. In the US, two-way bilingual schools have existed since the early 1960s and continue to expand in number to 182 schools in 1995 (Collier 1992: 95; Christian and Whitcher quoted in Barfield 1995: 2). Some schools introduce half a day of academic instruction in each language from the first year of schooling; other schools use the minority language totally in Kindergarten, gradually adding instruction in English until by Year 4 there is half a day instruction in each language (Collier 1992: 94).

Lindholm describes the key linguistic features of two-way bilingual programs as 'long-term instruction in both languages, optimal dual language input and output, focus on an academic curriculum, integration of language arts and content areas, separation of languages for instruction [and] an additive bilingual environment' (quoted in Collier 1992: 94). Collier points out that while there has been little research into this type of program, ‘there is some research evidence that majority language students are more likely to develop native-like proficiency in their L2 speaking and writing skills when given the opportunity to study with peers who are native speakers of the target language' (p94).

Another advantage of two-way programs may be that ‘they have the potential to lessen social distance between majority and minority language students as well as to change unequal social status relations between groups’ (Genesee quoted in Collier 199: 94). In a study of graduates of a two-way Spanish-English bilingual program, Collier found that as adults both groups 'were maintaining their proficiency in Spanish and English and using both languages in professional contexts' and had social networks of speakers of both languages (p95). However, in Canadian immersion programs where Anglophones are schooled separately from Francophones, Anglophone graduates are positive toward the French spoken in France, but are less accepting of the French spoken in Canada (Collier 1992: 95). ‘They also express less interest in developing friendships with Franco-Canadians, even though they are very positive about the importance of being bilingual and bicultural (Swain & Lapkin quoted in Collier 1992: 95).

Key Elementary School in Arlington, Virginia has offered a two-way bilingual (immersion) program since 1986 (Barfield 1995). Half the day is taught in English and half in Spanish. The classes, from Kindergarten upwards, are fairly evenly made up of native speakers of both languages.
Chapter Three: A Review of the Literature

and Barfield believes this is essential to achieve full benefits of the model – even though at Key School 41% of the English-speaking students must be “bussed in” from outside the school boundaries. For some subjects team teaching and integration are employed, for example, in third grade English language arts and social studies, immersion, special education, ESL and regular non-immersion students are integrated. In fourth grade, ESL students combine with immersion students to form mathematics classes taught in Spanish.

In an extensive evaluation of the Key School program, Barfield found that overall, immersion students scored as well as or better than non-immersion students in all academic areas, especially mathematics, and including those subjects taught in Spanish (Barfield 1995: 37, 24). She describes the results of a number of skills tests administered to English and Spanish speaking students. In oral proficiency tests of Spanish, there was a wide range of levels at the lower grades but these improved as students continued in the program, with Spanish speakers scoring higher than English speakers. Fifth grade students scored higher in comprehension than in vocabulary and grammar (p17). In the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, the fourth grade class scored at fifth or sixth grade level in all areas and scored higher than non-immersion fourth graders in all thirteen subtests (p24). Teacher concerns about the program were that there are insufficient ‘opportunities to use Spanish during the day to ensure higher levels of proficiency, given that electives (eg. art, music) are in English and the students are surrounded by English when they leave the school’ (p33). There is also concern about continuity at middle and high school level, as local schools offer only modified immersion programs in Spanish.

Language For Specific Purposes

There is a growing demand in educational institutions and private companies for programs teaching target languages for specific purposes. Read believes that the increasing demand in Europe for courses such as Italian for Business heightens the ‘widespread recognition among teachers and course designers that language is never used in a vacuum but is necessarily bound to a communicative context’ (Read 1991: 70).

During the 1980s, linguists from the University of Paris I (Sorbonne) and Napier University in Edinburgh developed “Fondamentalement”, a course of French for scientists, doctors and engineers. The scientists wanted to be able to read technical information in French and to converse with their French-speaking colleagues. What was required was ‘an oral active approach which would permit professional communication at a useful level of competence’ (McNaughton and Todd 1993: 72). The French linguists developed a series of audiovisual units centred on a theme that would prompt spontaneous communication amongst a class of specialists. ‘The object was not to teach specialised vocabulary … but to allow the acquisition of a corpus of structures common to the expression of scientific thought, and independent of particular specialisms’ (p72). The units deal with concepts common to a number of scientific disciplines and operate at a notional level.

Before “Fondamentalement” was introduced at Napier, it was necessary to run a more traditional bridging course to raise the students from Scottish O Grade standard to ‘the basic language required to form sentences in scientific French’ (p73). This course was taught in French and students were encouraged to use French in discussion. “Fondamentalement” requires a certain level of linguistic competence if students are to obtain full benefit from the program. The course runs for about two hours per week for two terms or in intensive mode over five evenings Monday-Friday and all day Saturday. It has been found that the level in ‘Fondamentalement’ varies
depending on the group participating (they may come from local industries) and that ‘the group
dynamic in the type of teaching situation creates great problems for a linguist preferring a strict
control of the learning situation’ (p73).

The course at Napier has grown in popularity amongst staff and students, and the University is
now authorised to prepare students for the examinations of the ‘Certificat de franÁais des
professions scientifiques et techniques’ de la Chambre de Commerce et d’Industrie de Paris.

Teaching of Specific Subjects Through the Target Language/Section Bilingue

Another model of content-based or immersion language education is the teaching of a single
subject through the target language. Some writers refer to this model as “section bilingue” and
Hawkins suggests that the concept grew out of the Franco-German treaty of co-operation in 1969
(Hawkins 1988: 43). Students may have already studied the language previously through
traditional methods or undertake the program in addition to a regular language class.

The Blessed George Napier School in Banbury, Oxfordshire trialled a program of teaching
geography and cookery in French to a first year class (Whiter 1988: 68). It was thought to be more
meaningful for students to acquire knowledge and skills through the medium of French rather
than simply through French language lessons, though they also took a French language class. This
was the students’ first contact with a foreign language and because of this they were ‘not inhibited
by the idea that what they said might not be acceptable’ (p69). While the teachers always spoke
in French, students were allowed to speak in English for the first few weeks, then for a period in
‘franglais’ and then about half way through the year ‘their spoken French took off’ (p70).

By the end of the year, the students were producing language in the natural way but also
beginning to monitor what they were saying and applying some of what they had learnt in their
French language lessons. Whiter believes that it is difficult to measure the students’ proficiency
level. Sometimes their language approached Fifth or Sixth Form level but at other times they had
problems with Second Form material. Generally, however, the students’ listening comprehension
reached the level of above average ability fourth/fifth years and in reading comprehension they
were at third/fourth year level, though in restricted areas of vocabulary (p70). Writing was difficult
to measure as much of it was copywriting, but it probably reached a good second year level – more
ambitious but less accurate. Speaking skills were quite different to those in traditional classes
because they were called on to use the language quite differently and ‘franglais’ was tolerated for a
while (p70). The students were very positive about the experience and the teachers concluded
‘that there had been no loss in terms of content or skills (in geography and cookery) while the
gains in language competence had been enormous’ (p70).

At Heathside [comprehensive] School in Surrey a “section bilingue” was established in which
motivated students with an aptitude for languages were selected for a three year course in which
geography was taught in French (Morley 1988). It is interesting that the school negotiated a
special GCSE dual certificate in French/Geography for the course. The students at Heathside had
previously studied French in a traditional course for two years. At the end of the first “section
bilingue” year, teachers felt they were succeeding in their aim of breaking down artificial barriers
and using language for communication when students made comments such as, ‘I don’t think I’m
going to a section bilingue lesson any more, I think of it as a geography lesson’ (p64). The two main
achievements were firstly that the concentration levels of all students improved, particularly
among the weaker students; secondly, listening skills improved daily, though students were
sometimes frustrated when they could not reach the same level of speaking competence as they could in listening (p65). There was also progress in reading, though less dramatic than with listening skills. It was felt by Morley that there were therefore gains in the students’ learning, although not even gains.

There are a number of other examples of “sections bilingue”, such as the teaching of business studies in Spanish at Millais School, West Sussex (Estebanez and Feltham 1995). An interesting feature of the course is that it is taught and examined in Spanish, with the final GCSE exam being a translation into Spanish of the English version. The ‘students receive a GCSE Business Studies qualification with an official Letter of Credit from ULEAC certifying that the course and the exam were conducted through the medium of Spanish’ (P47). Estebanez and Feltham believe that the advantage of this model is that ‘the tasks to be carried out in a foreign language match their maturity as students better than buying ice-cream or finding the way to a railway station in a conventional GCSE course’ (p49).

The authors also raise the important question of where does this fast lane take the students – ‘A sense of continuity in the fast lane is essential if we are going to avoid the growth of frustration in the students. Otherwise, they may question the raison d’etre of such an intensive course which takes them to the same destination as an ordinary Spanish GCSE course’ (p50). The students were surveyed about their preferred options for continuing Spanish. Seventeen out of the 22 chose to study A-level Spanish in two years, with 13 simultaneously preparing to take the Diploma of Spain’s Instituto Cervantes. With Europe’s mobile labour force, ‘it is emerging that if you want to work in/with a country other than your own, the best qualification to have is that of the country concerned’ (p50).

### 3.2.4 Conclusion

A review of the literature reveals a staggering variety of programs and program types that operate under a broad interpretation of the title “immersion”. In general, responses to immersion programs are positive and there has been extensive research of European language immersion programs. Asian language immersion programs and programs with a specialist or vocational focus have been less well researched and evaluated.

The complexities of nomenclature for “immersion” style programs are very evident in the literature. In the context of this report, the term “immersion” will be used to describe all programs investigated through the case studies where there is significant content taught through a language other than English.
3.3 STUDY ABROAD/IN-COUNTRY STUDY

3.3.1 Introduction

One means by which educators have attempted to increase the proficiency levels of their LOTE students is through a period of study abroad, or in-country study. A review of the literature, however, indicates that there are great differences between these programs. While many are believed to be beneficial in a holistic sense, there seems to be little constructive research into the linguistic benefits of such programs. The following overview will look at the types of in-country study, addressing particular attention to the issue of language proficiency.

Research on immersion programs in Anglophone Alberta, Canada, has shown that students in the program needed to spend time in a Francophone area ‘for the program to have its fullest impact and success’ (Jones quoted in De Courcy 1991: 13). Similarly, Read believes that ‘a major problem for language teaching and learning in Australia is the lack of a domain for use of the target language … because although Australia is a multicultural society, it does not contain any large unassimilated group for whom a language other than English is the first language’ (Read 1996: 472). Immersion schools in Queensland found that while immersion programs bring students closer to a real-life language situation, the students still lack contact with native speakers of the target language (Davies 1996: 63). At the tertiary level, Hill writes of ‘the difficulties faced by Australian students attempting to develop fluency in Asian languages within conventional degree structures using the range of orthodox classroom teaching practices’ (Hill 1994: 32). The two main types of courses that have been developed to address these problems are Short Intensive Courses and Extended Courses.

3.3.2 Short Intensive Courses

Short intensive courses ranging from one to six weeks are part of LOTE programs at school, tertiary and community level in many countries. At school level, these are often part of formal language-student exchange programs. In the Glastonbury School System in Connecticut, all students study at least one foreign language beginning in elementary school (Brown 1995). They can study Spanish from Third Grade and Russian from Seventh Grade, and can participate in three-week stays at sister schools in Mexico and Russia. At Eltham College in London, language students are able to participate in 3-4 week exchanges with schools in France or Germany, or in an intensive one week visit to France (Earl 1988). In Australia, students from Years 9 to 12 at a number of immersion schools have been involved in exchanges. Benowa and Mansfield State High Schools and The Southport School (Queensland) regularly have exchanges with schools in French-speaking New Caledonia. Students at Kenmore State High School have visited Kassel in Germany, and Park Ridge State High School has sent students to a sister school in Saemarang (sic), Indonesia (Davies 1995).

The literature on short intensive courses indicates that students certainly benefit from the experience, particularly on a social and cultural level. While those benefits are laudable, the real issue is the extent to which these visits result in an increase in the language proficiency of students. In interviews with Benowa students who had visited New Caledonia, De Courcy found that Year 11 and 12 students believed that as well as improving their accents, ‘they learnt the slang that they had not been exposed to in an Australian classroom’ (De Courcy 1991: 13). One Year 11 student said enthusiastically that ‘We had all this French coming in every day and you’d
wake up in the morning and you'd wonder what time it was and you'd look at your watch and you'd say it in French!' (Quoted in De Courcy, p13).

Mansfield teachers claimed that students returned from New Caledonia with a higher level of motivation toward their language program and with a higher communicative ability in French, particularly in oral/aural aspects (Davies 1995: 67). Davies writes that students from Southport and Kenmore also made progress in their language speaking ability. He does not, however, indicate that any formal studies have been done to actually measure these increases in proficiency or the rate of retention. Similarly, Hill mentions that teachers value short study tours ‘because they improve student retention rates in the transition from Years 10 to 11’, but does not state whether these retention rates have been measured (Hill 1994: 49).

There are a number of questionable aspects of short intensive courses in relation to the study of the target language. Students often spend a considerable proportion of their time in-country going on excursions. For example Kenmore students visiting Kassel spent three of their five weeks at school and two weeks touring; students from Park Ridge spent only four days at their sister school during their three week visit to Indonesia (Davies 1995: 71, 73). While this mix would obviously be enjoyable and have many other benefits, in-country experience in this format is unlikely to significantly enhance a student’s proficiency. Also, students may experience difficulties on their visit. Davies writes of the Benowa visits that ‘The difference in curriculum, together with the more sophisticated language used in the foreign classroom, makes it difficult for students on exchange to follow proceedings when attending classes with their correspondants … On occasions, students can become disruptive when they lose interest in the lesson and chat among themselves’ (Davies 1995: 65). Davies (p65) also reports that ‘interruptions caused by excursions result in a lack of continuity’, so one must question whether the current structure of these short in-country visits involving young students is really conducive to the improvement of language proficiency.

As with all language programs, the success of short intensive courses depends on how they are integrated into the curriculum in a constructive effort to improve linguistic skills. London’s Eltham College offers its in-country courses at Sixth form level because it believes that by that level students are more ready to converse freely and ‘even though genuine fluency is some way off, pupils are at least predisposed towards it’ (Earl 1988: 33). In light of the Queensland experience with young high school students, it is significant that Earl writes:

| That old idea of a pleasant family stay based on a “home-to-home” exchange is excellent as far as it goes, especially for pupils in their early teens, but its defect is that time has to be whiled away on tourist trails and anodine pursuits, whereas
| Sixth formers need orientation to maximise the benefit of their stay (Earl 1988: 33). |

In Eltham’s one-week intensive visits to France ‘learning to discover vocabulary, phrase and location is at the core’ and the emphasis is on communication (Earl 1988: 36). Debriefing sessions allow for the correction of grammatical errors and the classroom-type reinforcement of language naturally acquired. Some students claim in later years that the linguistic fluency that they gained on their in-country visits was higher than they were ever able to regain at university (p36).

Another type of intensive course is what Hill describes as the "short/vacation course" and Rice the “intensive-immersion language program” (Hill 1994: 32; Rice 1994: 45). One example is the Salatiga Program in which Sydney University has collaborated since 1974 with Satya Wacana Christian University in Salatiga, Indonesia to run short vacation courses in the Indonesian
language. Other Australian universities to offer similar courses in Indonesia include Monash, Western Sydney and Edith Cowan. These courses are usually of four to six weeks duration and may give students academic credit. The courses are open to the public, but are particularly popular with teachers of Indonesian who use them as upgrading courses during school holidays. Unfortunately, although both Hill and Rice refer to the growing popularity of this type of course, they do not really discuss the levels of proficiency which participants are able to reach. Rice, however, does write that with the Monash/Universitas Gadjah Mada program, ‘more than half of the students either return to Indonesia for work or study or, back in Australia, continue with the language’ (Rice 1994: 51).

3.3.3 Extended Courses

The second type of in-country study is the extended course. Perhaps it is significant that in a search of the literature, most of the references to this type of course were found in Australian sources. It is apparent that extended in-country study is becoming increasingly important in Australian tertiary language courses, particularly in Asian languages. For example, Rice mentions that between 1989 and 1993, the number of Australian universities offering in-country programs in Indonesia went from 2 to 8, and the number of programs from 4 to 18. He attributes this to the rapid increase in the number of students at all levels studying Indonesian since the late 1980s, which has created a larger pool of potential in-country participants (Rice 1994: 48).

While most extended courses appear to be at tertiary level, there are some examples of extended study being undertaken by secondary school students. Davies writes of the relationship between the immersion Southport School in Queensland and a school in Toulouse, France (Davies 1995). In 1994, five students from Years 9 and 10 spent between a term and a semester at school in Toulouse, ‘developing linguistic skills well beyond what one could expect, even from students studying in French immersion’ (p70). When students from Kenmore State High School spent three weeks at a school in Germany in 1994, four students chose to extend their visit to a total of five months, which ‘provided them with the opportunity to further refine their language skills, develop strong friendships and a greater understanding of German culture’ (p71). Unfortunately Davies does not delve further into the issue of language development and whether extended in-country language courses for school students are practicable and beneficial to levels of proficiency.

In the last decade, different types of extended courses have developed as part of a number of degree courses at Australian universities, including Asian languages, Asian studies and teacher education (LOTE). Hill describes a ‘parallel multi-locational’ course begun at the Northern Territory University 1991, in which students elect to take the first four semesters of Indonesian language study either on-campus in Darwin or condensed over four to five weeks in-country in Kupang [West Timor] (Hill 1994: 35). In 1993 James Cook University ran what Hill has described as an ‘intensive/immersion bilateral’ course (p36). Students undertook a twelve week intensive Indonesian course (twenty hours per week) in Townsville, followed by twelve weeks of special courses for foreigners at Universitas Diponegoro in Semarang. The course provided an ‘opportunity for a novice to achieve a high level of language competence in one academic year’ (p36).

Read describes a compulsory in-country practicum of three to five months run as part of the LACITEP program at Central Queensland University (Read 1996: 477). The University offers a pre-service teacher education degree through immersion in Japanese. Practicum students board with Japanese families, undertake intensive Japanese language studies, fieldwork as a teacher
assistant in a Japanese school and a research project. It is hoped that the program will encourage further contact with Japan.

One of the problems which has been identified with earlier in-county programs is that while they are effective in increasing confidence in speaking, students ‘tend to remain essentially in an expatriate enclave and cluster socially by origin’ (Stange quoted in Read 1996: 479). In response, a number of Australian universities developed programs in which students studied in a normal program at an overseas university. They were therefore required to learn academic subjects via the target language and learn language by immersion.

In 1990 Murdoch University pioneered a four-year Bachelor of Asian Studies degree in which students of Indonesian, Japanese and Chinese were required to spend two semesters in-country. Students of Indonesian spent their first in-country semester in ‘a sixteen-week intensive course in Indonesian for foreigners at the IKIP in Malang while in the second semester students selected undergraduate courses at Gadjah Mada University’ (Hill 1994: 37). Hill believes that the benefit of this type of program is that it ‘recognises the particular time demands of advanced language acquisition’ and provides students with a broader range of experiences (p37). The study of a range of subjects in Indonesian also strengthens non-language interests. Although there had been no formal evaluation of the Murdoch program by 1994, student reports ‘have been uniformly glowing’ and they ‘achieve a level of language competence and an ability to function in Indonesian society that is unlike anything that can be acquired by students studying in conventional classrooms in Australia’ (p40). In fact, Rice believes that ‘a semester's study in-country is equivalent to about two years' study in a standard Indonesian course in Australia and a two-semester course is roughly equivalent to four years' study’ (Rice 1994: 58).

The success of the Murdoch model has resulted in the establishment of a consortium to manage extended course placement in Indonesia. The Australian Consortium for In Country Indonesian Studies (ACICIS) was formed in 1994. It is made up of sixteen Australian member universities and is currently hosted by Murdoch University. Its aim is ‘to broaden in-country study options available for Australian students of Indonesian studies’ and it facilitates placements, supports students in the field and assists in the development of course accreditation and funding (ACICIS 1997: [3]). The ACICIS programs are seen as an integral part of university studies rather than ‘an optional extra’ (p3). They have been running since the beginning of 1995 and are currently offered at a number of institutions including Universitas Gadjah Madah (Yogyakarta) and Universitas Muhammadiyah (Malang) (Anonymous 1997: 11). Programs include the Intensive Language Program for Foreigners; Immersion Program; Field Study Program; Language Teachers’ Program and Practical Arts Program.

The ACICIS Immersion Program is offered to students with a background of two years of Indonesian language study. ‘Through immersion in normal courses language learning takes place organically, extending vocabulary and fluency by building knowledge within a field of study pertinent to each student’s interests’, such as Islam in Indonesia and Women and Development (ACICIS 1997: [6]). One student sums up the advantages of the ACICIS program: ‘By living in Indonesia for a semester, learning to cope with the cultural differences at home and at university, with the bureaucracy, with the problems of communication, the lack of facilities – language becomes part of life, not just words in a book’ (quoted in Anonymous 1997: 13).
3.3.4 Conclusion

It can be seen from the literature that there is a wide variety of in-country courses at school and tertiary level. At school level short study tours are a valuable experience for students in a holistic sense and as a motivator both pre- and post-tour. There seems to be a need for more discussion, however, about the linguistic benefits of such tours. There are also a number of practical considerations that would preclude this type of program being incorporated into LOTEs on a large scale. The organisation of these tours is time-consuming and costs are a major factor. The tours mentioned by Davies included $800 for Mansfield Senior High School's three weeks in New Caledonia, $2950 for Kenmore's five weeks in Germany and $2200 for Park Ridge's three weeks in Indonesia (Davies 1995: 67-72). Clearly these costs would be beyond the reach of many parents.

At tertiary level, Rice raises issues such as the need to establish proficiency rating scales for in-country courses, concern about numbers of contact hours and the need to establish realistic and meaningful program objectives (Rice 1994). Hill mentions some of the practical problems, including funding and the difficulty for students who study part-time or have work/family commitments to undertake prolonged periods of study overseas (Hill 1994). If, however, Rice is correct in his estimation of the level of proficiency gained by one or two semesters in-country compared with the study of a language in Australia, it would seem that in-country study is a major factor in the attainment of high levels of language proficiency and must be considered in future developments.

3.4 TECHNOLOGY

3.4.1 Introduction

In a report of 1996, the National Board of Employment, Education and Training (NBEET) suggested that ‘research indicates that there is fragmented and ad hoc use of technological resources to enhance the teaching and learning of languages in Australia’ (NBEET 1996: 214). A review of the literature, however, shows that this situation is not confined to Australia and that language teachers elsewhere are also grappling with the implications of technological advancements. But technology is a resource or a tool; it is not a language teaching process or method and will not replace the human element in language teaching (NBEET 1996: 37; Garrett 1991: 75). It does, however, have an important part to play within the context of curriculum and in the success of language programs.

The following overview of the use of technology in LOTE programs in Australia and overseas is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather to provide a range of examples illustrating success factors which support the wider language curriculum and contribute to higher levels of proficiency. Emphasis will be on the effective application of technology rather than detailed technical descriptions. Examples will cover a variety of levels of sophistication and will include interactive technologies such as computer based teaching software, and technological tools such as word processing systems.
3.4.2 Background

The technology available to language teachers has changed dramatically from the early audio-based language laboratories used for drilling students in the target language. In fact, Victoria believes that today’s computerised language laboratory is more than an updated version of the old technology, but rather represents ‘a fundamental shift in the teaching paradigm’ (Victoria 1995: 13). The successful integration of technology requires new perspectives and new theories (Garrett 1991: 92), and a reassessment of the role of both the teacher and the student. It requires a ‘shift from thinking of technology as assisting instruction to thinking of it as supporting learning’ (Garrett 1991: 95). Today’s technology enables the student to take more responsibility and control of the learning process and alters the role of the teacher to that of a resource person who has the opportunity to observe more of the learning process in action and to help guide that action (Victoria 1995: 13; Willetts 1992).

Technology, though, remains a tool, and the effectiveness of its use ‘depends on appropriate use by informed educators’ (Willetts 1992). The proliferation of new hardware and software systems and the challenge of integrating them into the language curriculum frightens some teachers and inspires others. In fact a 1989 UK study found that language teachers, along with teachers of PE and drama, were the least confident users of Information Technology (Bourne and Hagger-Vaughan 1993: 51). Garrett believes that at the extremes there are the ‘conservative teachers [who] fear that the technology will weaken or interfere with their control of the class’ and the enthusiastic converts who ‘sometimes get carried away by the sheer fascination with the new capabilities and “computerize” activities whose pedagogical value is doubtful’ (Garrett 1991: 92). In between those extremes there must be teachers who use technology to make learning more effective, rather than just for its own sake, and support its use with sound pedagogy and excellent teaching practice (NBEET 1996: ix, xiii).

3.4.3 Interactive Technologies

One of the major changes which technology has supported in language teaching has been the shift from teacher-centred learning to student-centred learning (Webster and Horrigan, 1993: 31). The versatility of the computer enables language learning to be much more interactive than in the past. Interactive technologies may require all involved users to engage in an activity at the same time (e.g., internet chat), may allow users to communicate with time delays between messages (e.g., discussion lists) or be standalone for use without a communication system (e.g., computer assisted instruction) (NBEET 1996: 19).

The following are examples of interactive technologies and the ways they have been incorporated into successful LOTE programs at primary, secondary and tertiary levels.

Computer Assisted Language Learning

At the University of Bradford (UK), Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) was used in a class of beginners learning Spanish (White and Palfreyman 1994). The students were divided into groups to provide support for what was for some a new and threatening environment, and in the hope that it would stimulate oral communication in Spanish. Frustration was reduced by the use of user-friendly, menu driven programs that allowed easy access to material and diagrams of the keyboard layout. Student feedback was favourable. The students enjoyed working together in a more focussed way than in other group activities. ‘Even the less open-ended exercises produced
discussion and Spanish was often used as students read from the computer screen and then suggested possible answers' (p76). Few students translated material into English before answering, and they appreciated the CALL focus on accuracy and the ability to receive immediate feedback without the stress of a classroom. The conclusion of the course coordinators was that the use of computers benefited staff and teachers and ‘added a new and exciting dimension to the experience of teaching and learning Spanish’ (p78).

A study was conducted at a UK Sixth Form College to evaluate the use of CALL in reinforcing the teaching of French grammar (Allan 1990). The particular point tested was the use of the relative pronoun. A quarter of the students in the class were taught by the traditional method and completed written exercises which were discussed in class. The others were taught the same way but reinforcement and practice was done on the computer using GAPKIT and PELE-MELE software. All of the students were tested before and after the study, and the results indicated that the computer group had learned the work more thoroughly. Although the validity of this assertion needs to be tested more thoroughly in follow-up research, the study does provide information about how the students felt about this method of learning. Eighty percent of the students ‘felt that the computer helped them understand the work better’ and ‘91% said that they liked the way the computer went back over the work which they got wrong’ (p73). Use of the computer was a strong motivating force that allowed students to work at their own pace and saved embarrassment if they did not know the answers. The researcher concluded that the use of CALL ‘offers the possibility of providing stimulating student-centred learning, its use entailing the shift of emphasis from didactic teaching to the role of the teacher as an enabler’ (p74).

One problem faced by students of Modern Standard Chinese (MSC) is the difficulty of learning the Chinese characters. Lee describes the use of a software program called MacZi, developed at the University of New South Wales (Lee 1996). The program combines sound, graphics and animation to teach beginning students a basic vocabulary of 600 characters. It aims to provide interactive instruction and drills of tasks such as tone-sound discrimination, character recognition and the use of pinyin for elementary writing – tasks which are usually covered in a teacher-centred style of instruction (p19). The onus is on the students ‘to be aware of what skills are to be learned, how to go about learning them, and how to evaluate their own progress’ (p19). MacZi enables students to practise characters until they have mastered them, including animated stroke order. Lee reports that 90% of the students thought that the Character Set module helped them learn radicals, and 85% that it helped them learn stroke order. The Tone Tester module was thought to be effective by 79% of the students, although 92% felt that it should be combined with the support of a native-speaking teacher to help demonstrate the pronunciation of sounds (p25). Lee sees the CALL software as supporting classroom learning by allowing students to practise characters and vocabulary before they go into the classroom, thus better managing their own learning (p34).

At the University of Turin in Italy, computers have been used in the teaching of foreign languages since 1981 (Borello 1990). They are used for testing and classroom reinforcement in the form of exercises based on classroom lessons. The area that has been most effective, however, has been ‘recovery’. This includes allowing students to make up missed lessons; allowing older students returning to study to clarify aspects of instruction without feeling embarrassed; and helping students with a negative attitude to the language to learn in a user-friendly environment. The other aspect of recovery is enabling students who have difficulties with particular areas of a lesson.
to work through exercises at their own speed. The computer program includes messages from the teacher; for example, a student who makes careless spelling mistakes may be told to pay greater attention. 'Messages can be attuned to the relationship that the teacher has with the class' – formal, humorous, gently sarcastic – to 'help to make the relationship with the computer more human, and amusing' (p490). Borello reports that student opinions on the programs have been 'clearly favourable' (p493).

While the literature includes examples of the successful use of CALL, there are some writers who do suggest a need for caution. Ross believes that with some CALL programs, the students' main objective is to compete with each other to obtain the highest scores, thus 'putting the whole thing on a par with “Space Invaders”'. When the whole business turns into a game in this way, the learning process suffers' (Ross 1991: 65). Green cautions that there is still 'a misunderstanding about learning through and learning about', and that there is a danger that students may learn more about computers than languages (Green 1991: 61). He also refers to the lack of computer literacy of some language teachers and their fear of making mistakes in front of a class and being humiliated. Interestingly, though, he has found that the opposite is often the case, and that 'Where the teacher is genuinely learning alongside the pupil, and where the pupils can actually help the teacher by sometimes being more proficient, this can actually help classroom management rather than hinder it' (p61). McKenna has a more negative attitude toward CALL, referring to 'the minimal interaction offered by its toy-value’ and ‘glorified vocabulary drills’. Perhaps the answer is that as in any other area, the standard of CALL programs varies, and the 'the teacher's role has become even more important, to help guide the students through the various mazes created by the wide range of technology now generally available' (Ross 1991: 65).

**Interactive multimedia**

At Alyth High School in Tayside, Scotland, teachers created a series of interactive videodiscs (IV) to use with French language students. They found that IV combined the elements of existing technology (audiotapes, computers, television and video) and capitalised on their advantages to offer a more realistic and powerful linguistic resource (McColl 1992: 25). McColl believes that IV creates a 'microworld' in which the students can become deeply engaged in a way that is difficult to achieve by traditional means. Menus allow students to choose their own way to work through material, which includes speaking activities, interaction with material on the screen or with other students, and role-playing. IV was successful because it involved students in 'looking, listening, reading, writing and speaking. They … also had to make decisions, solve problems, do research [and] work cooperatively' (p26). However, despite the benefits, McColl is concerned that financial constraints may prohibit schools from purchasing IV workstations in adequate numbers to enable IV to be fully integrated into the language syllabus.

Goodison believes that despite uncertainties about the future development of IV, 'there is a pressing need for some form of IV listening comprehension work to be introduced into the classroom' (Goodison 1990: 70). At Wolverhampton Polytechnic, IV was developed for use with two French classes. In the BA Modern Languages class it was found that a twenty-minute film using IV could generate up to 100 minutes of discussion and argument. In the BA in Languages, Business and Information Technology course, a 10-15 minute role play on a business studies theme, performed by a native speaker, also generates about 100 minutes of work. Goodison believes that this system 'promotes the negotiation of meaning between all the participants in the session' and that working with IV as a member of a group rather than individually develops
communicative skills as well as extending linguistic knowledge (p69). The production of IV by
the teacher also enables the matching of linguistic and conceptual levels of the source material
with the group with which it will be used.

At the University of Pennsylvania, students are using a project called Cinema, in which a
computer combined with videodiscs of foreign language films is used to improve listening and
looking skills (Watkins 1991). There are IVs in six languages and they are continually revised and
tailored to the needs of different classes. The film itself is shown in the top portion of the screen,
while the bottom section may include a summary of what is on the screen, a transcript of a
conversation, teacher’s notes and a list of additional resources which can also be called up (pA19).
Because speech in the films is that of native speakers and is fast, ‘students become quite proficient
in hearing a rapidly spoken language sequence’ (A18). Teachers find that the use of IV that is
both entertaining and interactive ‘takes the passivity out of using instructional films’. They
describe it as ‘value added’ rather than a substitute for a language instructor in the classroom,
however, and also express concern about the costs involved (pA20).

A number of successful interactive multimedia programs have been developed in Australia.
Macquarie University developed Kantaro I: Japanese Language Kanji Acquisition Course Package by
Interactive multimedia computer, for use with beginning students at secondary and tertiary level
(NBEET 1996: 100). The software is designed to assist students to study 200 Kanji characters
under the supervision of a teacher, and includes ‘cognitive games, audio, still and animated
graphics’ (p101). Positive results include a 74% increase in the number of Kanji acquired in the
first twenty hours of class and a better understanding of the link between Kanji and its meaning;
students are able to choose modules at their own level of knowledge and work on them at their
own pace; stroke order receives more attention, and the teacher is freed to deal with the particular
difficulties of individual students (p101).

Other Australian projects include an interactive multimedia (CD-ROM) program on German
theatre for advanced German students at Adelaide and Monash universities, and a University of
Queensland project developing interactive videodiscs for the teaching of French, German,

Availability of interactive multimedia packages for the teaching and learning of LOTE is
increasing exponentially and the use of such packages is becoming more common place in the
second language classroom.

**Video**

While it may be tempting to embrace the sophisticated technology already reviewed, the
literature indicates that there is still a place in language teaching for more basic (but also less
costly) technology such as the video camera.

At Bristol Cathedral School (UK), the video camera is used in foreign language classes primarily
to stimulate speaking (Pearson 1990). It provides students with an incentive to practise and then
perform well. Students are filmed participating in debates, game shows and chat shows, and
individual students also enjoy being filmed as a ‘roving reporter’, presenting a television advert or
the news. All of these events encourage students to use different tenses, strengthen vocabulary
and practise basic structures, and ‘success at mastering basic phrases on the screen can greatly
boost their confidence’ (p71).
At Portsmouth Polytechnic, second year French students in groups of four or five produce a ten minute video in French plus a written dossier, on a contemporary French topic (Coleman 1992). Formats have included news broadcasts, a current affairs report and a weather forecast. The project is designed to promote reading, writing, listening and speaking, and Coleman believes that ‘student choice of topic guarantees a degree of commitment and psychological involvement favourable to language acquisition’ (p37). Feedback from students indicated that they believed by a ratio of 3:1 that their French had been improved. The majority felt the project was worthwhile and enjoyed it, and found it increased their knowledge of France. Coleman would, however, like to improve the project by incorporating more formal research promoting ‘intensive, purposeful reading of authentic texts’ and thus an improvement in reading skills; he would also like to see more French spoken during the project, as this varied from ‘a lot’ to ‘not at all’ (p37).

Science students studying French at the University of Brighton produced a class video on the theme ‘A weekend in Paris’ (Broady and Le Duc 1995). The project stimulated them to use their limited knowledge of French and watching the finished video was valuable in showing them how far their French had progressed since the beginning of the course (p75). The students also wrote individual reports evaluating their role in the project and what they had learned from it, and ‘they felt confident they could now produce more complex French than that exemplified in their video’ (p75). Broady and Le Duc concluded that the use of video recording activities in learner-centred teaching has ‘potential for language learning because they motivate learners to use their target language resources in a personal way to produce a tangible outcome’ (p77).

Finally, in a general review of the use of the video camera in language teaching, Klapper makes the point that video recording (as opposed to audio recording) captures ‘the whole communicative performance, the paralinguistic as well as the linguistic – ie gesture, facial expression, posture …, all of which add context, force and … content to what is being communicated’ (Klapper 1991: 12). He also points out that on video it is easier to interpret the silences in a performance, to see what physical reactions mean, whether amusement, surprise or panic (p12).

The Internet (Net)

The interactive features of the Internet are being explored more and more and used by LOTE teachers and learners. The following examples show ways in which this rapidly developing technology is being successfully incorporated into the language curriculum.

Internet Chat (IRC, MUDs, MOOs, MUSHs)

One way in which the Internet has revolutionised communication is by enabling people to mimic traditional interaction electronically in real time (White 1996c). A variety of programs enable people to respond to each other immediately in text, by hearing the voice of their partners or by seeing them. Internet Relay Chat is a text-based program that allows people to use the keyboard to chat with each other in real time. White reports that it is being used successfully by language teachers in the United States. Other programs being used are CU-See Me, a real time program which enables video conferencing via the Internet, and Webtalk, which enables language students to converse by voice over the Internet through a computer and modem (White 1996c).

Another innovative development is the MOO, or Multi-user domains, Object-Oriented, which White describes as a ‘virtual language classroom’ (White 1996b: 17). Users across the world can interact simultaneously at the same site in a particular environment, such as a language-specific
virtual classroom. There are a number of MOO sites set up for language learning, such as Le MOO Français (French) and MOOsáico (Portuguese), the advantage being that participants must use the language of the particular MOO.

A similar type of program is the MUSH. Queensland University of Technology has used a German MUSH based in Stuttgart for real time conversation with native German speakers (NBEET 1996: 91). UNItopia includes a virtual version of the city of Stuttgart, through which the students can navigate, and an extensive fantasy world called Magyra in which students can engage in imaginative role-playing and interaction with each other. The MUSH has been used as ‘an “immersion” model for teaching computer based communication skills to final year students in the target language’ (p91). While MUSHs are currently text based, future directions of this type of program may include 3D Virtual Reality imagery (p97). While the Queensland project was too small to be effectively evaluated, students did find it interesting and productive. There are, however, questions about the feasibility of this type of program because of the amount of time and funds needed and the computer skills required of the language teachers (p97).

Email

One of the most common uses of the Internet is email, and increasing numbers of language teachers have developed models to incorporate it into their teaching. At a South Australian school, students of German correspond via email with native German speakers in two schools in Germany. While Year 8 and 9 students only send quick messages (because of limited time), Year 11 and 12 students spend 1-2 lessons every two weeks composing and sending their email letters (NBEET 1996: 98). This activity has been included in the curriculum as an assessment task in letter writing in German. The advantage of email correspondence is that the students see immediate purpose and usefulness of communication in German and it enables ‘real’ student exchanges. It also emphasises student-directed learning, establishes direct links between students and increases retention rates (p98). Obstacles include the lack of access to computers for large groups of students and the lack of time for project management and the development of new modules (p98).

In another South Australian project, non-native and native speakers of Indonesian at different schools in the same city correspond by email. Email was chosen because ‘it provided reasons for writing, an audience for native speakers and authentic text for non-native speakers. It was considered a fast, efficient means for communication which was closer to spoken language than most other forms’ (NBEET 1996: 99). The chatty, informal nature of email simulated spoken discourse, generated authentic written material and provided opportunities for both planned and unplanned language use with a real audience in a spirit of collaborative learning (p99).

At West Chester University (USA), email is used to facilitate writing assignments in a Commercial Spanish course (Varricchio 1992). Although email was used mainly in a ‘functional’ way for the writing and return of assignments and the circulation of teacher’s notes and comments, it provides an interesting example of the integration of subject and language tuition. Varricchio believes that the course was successful in providing the students with valuable skills related to their knowledge of business, and post-test results indicated that they ‘were successful in learning technical concepts in a foreign language through many varied writing assignments completed with the aid of a PC and E-mail’ (p6).
Discussion lists

There are an increasing number of electronic discussion lists that focus on language learning. Marcos (1994) sees these as being of use for language teachers to discuss issues such as teaching methodology, to make contact with other colleagues and to locate native speakers of various languages. It is also possible, however, for students, particularly at university level, to participate in the lists. Marcos mentions both a Polish list (HYPERLINK mailto: DONOSY@NDCVX.CC.ND.EDU DONOSY@NDCVX.CC.ND.EDU) and a Chinese list (HYPERLINK mailto: CHINESE@KENYON.EDU CHINESE@KENYON.EDU) which promotes communication between teachers and students.

The World Wide Web

One of the most exciting and rapidly expanding aspects of the Internet is the World Wide Web (Web). It incorporates hypermedia which allows users to interact along non-linear routes, 'with different levels naturally linked so that the learner can intuitively follow her own path in whatever direction or whatever depth is appropriate to her as an individual. What is already known to the individual is left implicit, and what is to be learned can be discovered' (McKenna and Seeve-McKenna 1992: 71). While there are many Web sites of relevance to the learning and teaching of LOTEs, below are two examples that use features that could be successfully incorporated into language curriculum.

IndoLinx is a Web site which links Australian and Indonesian schools (Morrison 1997). The project is sponsored by the Victorian Department of Education and is made up of a resource centre for teachers of Indonesian and a WEB Link Center (sic) providing participating schools with Internet partners for email, IRC, sound and video-conferencing. The site provides links to Indonesian newspapers and magazines on the Net, to live Indonesian radio and to other homepages relating to Indonesian. Morrison suggests that the Indonesian cooking sites included could be usefully incorporated in assignment writing and that the Indonesian shopping mall site would be great for setting vocabulary tasks. There is a list of Australian primary and secondary schools registered with IndoLinx and student work can be published on the site. It is possible to have a live interactive chat with other students, and there is a message page where teachers of Indonesian can leave messages or questions for each other. Future plans include a chat page, mail-list page, discussion group and video-conference page.

Virginia Commonwealth University (USA) has developed a Web server that provides information on its Department of Foreign Languages and foreign language resources on the Web. It also serves as a local delivery system for multimedia materials (Godwin-Jones). As well as links to interesting Internet resources, the site includes locally developed language learning materials, including some foreign language texts incorporating illustrations and sound recordings. Sites include some related to Russian and Latin American studies, which are recently introduced minors, and links with partner universities in France and Brazil. There is also an audio-based introduction to Arabic; a collection of Chinese literature; an interactive English-German dictionary; a searchable collection of German literature; and an introductory course in Welsh.

The Department of Foreign Languages also uses its Web server as a local delivery system for multimedia materials, with NCSA Mosaic as its front-end. It has developed a range of multimedia material for language learning, including graphics, digital audio and video. Examples are hypertext editions of texts with accompanying digital audio recordings; digitised clips of foreign news
broadcasts taped off satellite and annotated with exercises, vocabulary and transcripts; and multimedia modules on target countries. Godwin-Jones provides a useful description of the way in which this material can be used pedagogically – for example, ‘pages can be cloned so that the original text and two different translations are displayed simultaneously thus allowing the user to compare different ways of translating the same text’. He concludes that as access to information sources increases, the role of teachers will change to being ‘“knowledge managers”, helping students to navigate to what will be truly useful for their needs’.

3.4.4 Technological Tools

While much is said about the use of Information Technology (IT) in the classroom, White and Wacha believe that there are not enough LOTE departments incorporating IT into their programs. The problems include ‘Teachers with too few resources and too little time, the increasing demands of educational bureaucracies and the reluctance that many modern language teachers feel about change after having seen many fads come and go’ (White and Wacha 1992: 40).

White and Wacha describe a project in which teacher-education students from Birmingham Polytechnic worked with a high ability Year 10 French class at Smethwick Hall Boys’ High School in the UK. The school students worked in groups of four to use a microcomputer to produce a ‘teen’ magazine and they used word processing skills to access a range of desktop publishing software. The students were involved in a variety of tasks using the target language, including writing letters requesting information; conducting mock interviews; writing, performing and recording their own French ‘Rap’ song and compiling and distributing a questionnaire (p41). While the authors found that the students enjoyed the project and practised real-life skills, they also found that the learning of language skills did not become the highest priority in the process of the project (p42). Although the students did gain IT skills, social/group work skills and creative/imaginative skills, French was not used as much in the classroom as had been hoped.

White and Wacha intend to redefine and refine the project and suggest that ‘If we are to meet the real needs of pupils in the learning of modern foreign languages we need to be one step ahead of the game at all times’ (p42).

In an article creatively entitled ‘Le hamster a mangé mon pneu’, Atkinson describes a project involving four high schools in the Bristol, UK area. The aim of the project was to determine ‘how creative writing could be integrated into the teaching and learning of languages’ and how it could be supported by the use of IT (Atkinson 1992: 68). The students used word processing for their French creative writing assignments. They liked the ease of correction and it was suggested that this encouraged a more adventurous approach to writing. The students were willing to spend more time on their writing when using IT and one group of students requested additional writing lessons (p70). They wrote better in pairs than as individuals and were eager to read the work of others and to have their own work read (p69). It is interesting to note that while grammar was an issue for the students, ‘their desire to understand was motivated by the need to use it to enhance their work rather than to get good marks in a test or an examination’ (p70). Atkinson concluded that the project was successful in demonstrating the value of IT as a support for creative writing in a LOTE, and the value of such writing to enhance language learning (p70).

Jenkins and Servel-Way also support the use of content-free software (for example, word processor, database, spreadsheet), because in this way students must take some responsibility for providing the content and ‘will be encouraged to be more actively involved in the learning
process’ (Jenkins and Servel-Way 1990: 75). It also provides an open-ended learning environment in which the teacher can develop and extend the activities according to the student (p75).

### 3.4.5 Conclusion

In an article on the logistics of language and technology in schools, White seeks to balance the advantages of embracing the new technologies with the practicalities of some of the problems involved (White 1996a). He points out that today’s communication revolution is dramatically altering how we as humans interrelate, collaborate, teach, learn, and carry out research. If one of education’s main objectives is to prepare students to succeed in their environments, then it is imperative that new technologies are adopted quickly into schools, and that their use is an integral part of any future curriculum (White 1996a: 20).

It can be seen from this review that there are some highly innovative teachers successfully integrating technology into the language curriculum in a meaningful and productive way. As White points out, though, there are also problems such as a lack of computers and software in schools; budget problems; teachers constrained by time and insufficient training; and ‘a lack of understanding or knowledge by school staff of the relevance of computers in language education’ so that ‘language teachers are “the last in the queue” to gain computer access’ (White 1996a: 20). If educators wish to develop successful models for the study of LOTEs that will lead to higher levels of proficiency in languages, it is essential that these problems be addressed so that full advantage can be taken of today’s technology.

A review of the literature reveals that there is great diversity in terms of access to hardware, software and adequate teacher training in the LOTE area. The ‘playing-field’ is certainly not even, and while some teachers work at the cutting edge of technology, others battle for computer time in overcrowded laboratories. The factor that is most prominent, however, is the attitude of the LOTE teacher. The successful teachers are those who focus on the solutions rather than on the problems; who define and refine their programs to achieve maximum results; and who use their initiative to take advantage of whatever technology is available to help promote proficiency amongst their students. As Garrett suggests, while technology does offer the potential for the enhancement of LOTE learning, ‘It is not just a matter of spending money, of consulting experts, and … not a matter of waiting for more sophisticated machinery or programming techniques’. Priorities in language learning can be supported by the intelligent use of technology, ‘But these will not be accomplished unless and until teachers themselves take the initiative to think through what the technology should be able to do for them and for their students and make their needs known’ (Garrett 1991: 95).
3.5 CONCLUSION

Immersion or content-based language programs, in-country study and technology are three significant area of LOTE teaching and learning. A review of the literature reveals that they all provide examples of effective ways of contributing to the attainment of high levels of target language proficiency. Clyne suggests that 'the diverse ethnolinguistic composition of Australia, the differing language needs of the different sections of the community, and limitations in human and material resources have led to experimentation with a variety of models for the teaching of primary school second languages' (in Fernandez 1992: iii). Similar experimentation has taken place at secondary and tertiary level. Read, however, cautions against 'experimentation with new forms of language teaching and learning in the absence of ongoing research validating the effectiveness of programs'. This review has sought to identify existing research, particularly in relation to Asian languages and to reinforce the need for future research into those strategies that are optimal for promoting full foreign language development.
PART TWO

A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR DETERMINING PROFICIENCY AS A POTENTIAL OUTCOME
THE PROFICIENCY POTENTIAL FRAMEWORK

4.1 BACKGROUND TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE FRAMEWORK

Any attempt to explore issues and concepts associated with “pathways to proficient language use” requires an engagement with the principles, practices and models that have been a part of the theory and practice of second language teaching and learning. Conceptual frameworks of language teaching and learning, and models that endeavour to describe the development of second language proficiency have emerged on a regular basis through the history of the field of applied linguistics. Well known models include Strevens’ (1976) model of the language learning/language teaching process, Stern's (1983) model for second language teaching, the Hamers and Blanc (1982) bilingual development model, Gardner's (1983) socioeducational model of bilingual proficiency and Bachman and Palmer's (1996) theoretical model of language ability. These and other models attempt to articulate the interrelationship of factors such as the nature of language, attitude, context, aptitude, motivation, teaching, learning, policy, curriculum and various other components or interpretations of components in determining a successful language learning outcome. In spite of considerable work in the area no one framework appears to adequately describes language teaching and learning and the attainment of proficiency. The different theoretical models and frameworks do, however, serve to demonstrate the complexity of the second/foreign language teaching and learning process.

This multiplicity of understandings at the conceptual level is reflected in the ways in which language teaching and learning is operationalised “on the ground”. As a consequence there is a range of program types through which languages other than English are represented in Australian curricula. The original contention of the research team was that an examination of these different program models or program types would provide both significant information about existing language learning pathways, together with information about potential “ideal” pathways to language proficiency. This appeared to be a reasonable contention. It also seemed reasonable to use the terms ‘language object’ and ‘content based’ (Clyne et al. 1995) as an initial way of discriminating between different program types. These terms have become common place, within the Australian context, both to describe and evaluate different LOTE programs. The key determinant for program differentiation in this model is the role of language – language learning for its own sake (language object) or language as a vehicle for the learning of some other content (content based). An additional determinant considered useful in describing and evaluating LOTE program type was the extent to which target language use was a feature within the classroom context.

The existing theoretical constructs of language teaching and learning and the program type determinants described above were helpful in enabling the research team to select a wide variety of programs for investigation through the research. Their applicability in terms of predicting the potential of programs to have proficiency as a possible outcome has, however, proven to be limited. Constant comparative analysis of the research data indicated the need for a different frame of reference. A new conceptual framework was needed in order to explain how different factors impact on the learning of a language other than English in the Australian context, and
how these different factors or elements, interrelate in determining the proficiency potential of a program.

The development of this new conceptual understanding was not intended to represent some stated ideal model of language teaching and learning but rather to present a framework which would focus attention on the factors, or elements, that have emerged from the research as being significant indicators of proficiency potential.

4.2 ELEMENTS OF THE FRAMEWORK

The research instruments required all interviewees to engage with the notion of “best practice” in LOTE teaching and learning. Information was elicited about what “best practice” programs look like, what “best learners” in “best practice” programs are able to do, and what “best teachers” do in order to facilitate language learning.

The conditions and processes associated with the conversion of language input into intake and then to language output, emerged from responses to the interview questions, as the principal factors in determining if there was potential for proficiency to be a language learning outcome for a community of learners within a particular LOTE program. In addition, factors such as the broader context in which language teaching and learning takes place, the nature of the input received by language learners, and the particular attitudinal qualities or characteristics of individual language learners were revealed as being significant.

In order to represent these findings, and to be able to describe how these different factors interact to either enhance or diminish proficiency potential, the research team developed a process by which programs and learners could be categorised within a framework.

Categorisation within the Proficiency Potential Framework was based on answering the following questions:

- How well were programs and learners able to ‘fit’ into their broader educational and community environments?
- How was language seen and used in these environments?

In order to break down and investigate these questions, a number of designations were developed. The Proficiency Potential Framework uses the terms “embedded” and “marginalised” to describe the solidity or fragility of a program and the learning and teaching within that program.

In addition, “deployment orientation”, is used as a category to portray the focus of language use by both teachers and learners. The extent to which language is used for real and meaningful purposes and encourages learners to use, adapt and expand their linguistic resource determines the “deployment orientation” of a program.

Also encompassed within the Framework is the notion of “learner autonomy” and its relationship to the experience of learning, and to the potential that this provides for becoming proficient.

A diagramatic representation of the Proficiency Potential Framework, together with further elaboration of its categories and constituent parts is presented on the following page.
The extent to which programs are marginalised or embedded within schools or systems is determined by factors relating to context, input and the processes associated with the conversion of input into intake.

Deployment versus Non-deployment Orientation

Prabhu (1991: 54) defines deployment as ‘a knowledge of the world handled through language’. Marginalised and embedded programs both have the potential to have either a deployment or non-deployment orientation. Our research indicates, however, that it is only embedded programs with a deployment orientation that have real potential for proficiency as an outcome for a community of language learners.

Deployment orientation is identifiable through elements of output. Output is defined in this framework through the responses provided by the interviewees. There was consistent reference to the ability of learners to use language modes appropriately and effectively for real communication. There was also an identification of the need for this language use to reveal an ever-evolving knowledge and understanding of the system of the target language. Also included was the requirement for language use to be appropriate from a sociolinguistic perspective. In addition, output was described as needing to reflect a knowledge and understanding of the sociocultural or non-linguistic features of target language speaking communities. Finally, output was seen as a reflection of the attitudinal characteristics and metalinguistic awareness of a language learner. These elements, together with factors which contextualise output (for example, support provided through the environment, the school or system, the home etc) collectively, and in balance, constitute the elements of proficiency identified through this research.

Learners fall along a continuum which runs from dependence to autonomy and which is punctuated by reference points which mark opportunities for learners to develop a codependent relationship, opt for autonomy, or move towards becoming an autonomous learner.

The extent to which a program nurtures the development of autonomy in learning is linked to the potential of that program to have learner proficiency as an outcome.
4.3 MARGINALISATION AND EMBEDMENT INDICATORS

4.3.1 An Overview of the Indicators

The extent to which programs are marginalised or embedded within schools, organisations or systems is determined by the language teaching/learning context, the language input and the processes associated with the conversion of language input into intake. Perceptions of, and information about, “what exists” and “what happens” in terms of context, input and intake, provide significant indicators as to the proficiency potential of LOTE programs. The research points to the solidity or fragility of a LOTE program being able to be determined by any aspect of, or interrelationship between context, input or intake. The research shows that being “strong” in terms of input and intake is not enough to guarantee embedment status and proficiency potential if contextual factors militate against the teaching and learning process.

The ways in which factors associated with context, input and intake can serve as proficiency potential indicators are explored in sections 4.3.2, 4.3.3 and 4.3.4.

4.3.2 Context

Stern (1983:48) stated that ‘in language teaching we have to operate with four key concepts: language, learning, teaching and context.’ There is considerable overlap between the Stern elements and our marginalisation/embedment indicators (context, input and conversion of input into intake). There are, however, issues of interpretation and order that make for fundamental differences in any discussion of learner proficiency as a possible program outcome. Stern, with other researchers of bilingual education and language acquisition and learning, represents the process hierarchically – language first and context last. It seems that the criticality of context in shaping language outcomes has not been adequately acknowledged. Language teaching and learning has not tended to be seen within its wider educational and political context. Issues associated with politics, economics, the nature of educational institutions and learning environments, status and power, positions and inter-relationships have too often been overshadowed by the debate about the nature of language and the methodology required in order to teach and learn it (Phillipson 1992). A finding of this research is that, if the context in which a LOTE program is situated does not totally support that program and its students, the potential for proficiency to be an outcome is seriously inhibited.

Bartlett and Erben (1995:28) talk of various contexts as ‘frames’ which shape the outcomes of learning. Presented below are a number of cameos from the research, that depict some of the different frames encountered by the research team. Each cameo includes information about the program and context being reflected, together with implications for proficiency as a potential outcome for the particular community of LOTE learners presented “in cameo”.

Pathways for Australian school students to achieve high levels of proficiency in Asian Languages
Context Cameo 1

Good

Fantastic

Excellent

We can go home and teach it to other people.

These were words chosen by a group of primary learners to describe their feelings about their two plus years of LOTE learning through a partial immersion program. Their enjoyment of the program was obvious and their receptive language ability was certainly attested to by their teachers. These students were in a program that should have provided the potential for the attainment of proficiency.

All of these students, however, are seriously questioning whether they will continue in the immersion program. They had a common concern. None of the schools that provide students for the program take proper account of the commitment and learning that happens within the immersion environment. For one student there was resentment about having to do science twice. She does Science in immersion and then she does it again in her regular classroom. For other students there was a concern about missing out on other work when attending the immersion program – we have to catch up.

There is considerable learning taking place within this program. The program is, however, marginalised because of a context that fails to provide a coordinated approach to the mainstream curriculum and immersion language learning of program participants. This impacts on the overall proficiency potential the program has to offer.
**Context Cameo 2**

In year 8 we could teach the year 12's...it was really great

We went from having minimal English in immersion classes to minimal Indonesian in Indonesian classes

A third to half of the vocab has been lost, but you don't tend to concentrate because you know you will get your A.

Topics are really pathetic.

I've lost a lot of confidence...you revert back to easy, basic language

Going back to mainstream...we don't put the language to use any more.

We need an outlet where we can keep up the level that we have got...Now it is theory – before it was practical

This articulate and able group of learners feels let down. These students have been learning in a context where an immersion program is provided in the lower secondary years but where there is no such provision in the senior years of schooling. The students perceive their learning and their abilities to be unappreciated and unrecognised by their school and the wider educational community.

In addition to the negative affective impact, student interviews indicate both a lack of language extension, and an inability of learners to maintain previous language levels. In effect, the context of this program provides a “negative pathway” where learners have both confidence and language ability eroded.

In this instance the infrastructure is unable to support a cumulative language learning experience for this group of students. This context marginalises the program and limits its proficiency potential.
The above examples “in cameo” highlight a number of the factors that relate to the context of LOTE teaching and learning. They illustrate how these factors can impact to either embed or marginalise programs. The examples provided are not exhaustive but serve to draw attention to the significance of factors, which in isolation, or from a particular viewpoint, may not necessarily seem intrinsic to the notion of proficiency but which have the capacity to impact markedly on proficiency potential.
4.3.3 Input

The samples of oral and written language to which a learner is exposed while learning or using a particular target language is referred to as input (Ellis 1997:139). Many authors have explored the role of input in second language acquisition. Particularly well known is the work of Stephen Krashen who has described access to comprehensible input as being a necessary condition for acquisition to take place. According to Krashen, comprehensible input enables learners to push their interlanguage limits by becoming ‘actively involved with the input’ (Krashen 1981:46).

The importance of comprehensible input in the language acquisition process is acknowledged through this research, but so too is the significance of learners having the opportunity to engage with, and explore a variety of input. For proficiency to be a potential program outcome, listening, reading and viewing text, reflecting a broad range of text-types or genres, needs to be made available to learners. Successful participation in the life of a target language speaking community is contingent upon an ability to work with the text-type or genre of that community (Christie & Rothery 1990). It is this which makes community and language real and which provides access for outsiders.

Teachers and learners involved in this research were all asked to describe the input learners received. Responses reinforced the importance of input in the process of language learning and also highlighted the link between input, embedment and proficiency potential. The research team found that the TL input, provided by programs to their learners, could be broadly broken into the three different categories described below:

**Diagram 2 Categories of Target Language Input**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focused Input</th>
<th>Characteristic of a program where learners have unintentionally restricted access to TL input. Programs where learners work predominantly from a textbook or from work sheets are examples of a focused input program.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broad Input</td>
<td>Characteristic of a program where learners receive a wide range of listening, reading and viewing input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective Input</td>
<td>Characteristic of a program where a conscious choice is made to limit input so as to enable a particular outcome. Immersion programs are examples of selective input programs because subject content is a fundamental determinant of input. Programs where input is selected for the purpose of enhancing prospects of success in an examination are also selective input programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In analysing the research data, a link between Focused Input and program marginalisation was evident in many instances. “Best learners” talked about hating textbooks. They’re boring was a comment repeated on numerous occasions. Remarks were also made about how They’re not motivating and All we read is passages in class. The learner perception being presented through these sorts of comments is one of frustration. Successful learners were expressing discontent at being denied access to variety in their target language input and therefore having the “realness” of their language learning experience compromised and marginalised.
Excessive dependence on textbooks or worksheets, through Focused Input, was also a characteristic of programs subject to limited resourcing and there was often a strong connection between this and other indicators of program marginalisation.

Programs where Focused Input predominated seemed to limit learner access to real, meaningful and varied text. As such, proficiency potential within these programs was reduced.

4.3.4 Input into Intake

Intake refers to that portion of input that learners attend to and take, first into short term memory, and subsequently, given the right conditions, into their interlanguage (Ellis 1997:140). The conversion of input into intake is dependent upon the teaching and learning processes that are operationalised through programs and by learners. There is an attitudinal dimension to teaching and learning which is also significant.

Teacher and learner perceptions of this conversion process were a focus of the interview phase of this research. Teachers were asked for their perceptions of how “good” learners learn and how they as teachers help. Learners were asked to describe what they could do in their LOTE and how they got to be able to do these things.

These questions elicited information about perceptions of the processes involved in language learning and about the roles, responsibilities and attitudes of all participants. Responses ranged from long silences, to comments on time allocated to the LOTE, to tasks undertaken, right through to detailed information about language learning skills and strategies. A strong correlation in learner and teacher responses was noted. Where teachers were able to articulate the processes involved in teaching and learning so too could their learners. In general, the converse was also true.

What emerged from the research was that interviewees constructed their understanding of the input to intake process from a number of different perspectives. There was the “it just happens” perspective were there was little or no consciousness of the processes involved.

Like osmosis. She’s soaking it up
I went on exchange
When the children spoke, they were showing that they had converted input to intake.
They do LOTE for an hour.
Where did this come from? I haven’t taught them this.
Good question…What do I do?…It’s in the methodology…lots of reading, lots of writing…lots of practice.

There was also the “attitudinal or personal perspective” where the personal qualities or characteristics of teachers and/or learners were seen as being the critical element in the input to intake process.

Having the right attitude…having a go, liking it.
Believe in yourself…believe that you can do it.
Confidence has so much to do with it. If you lack confidence and you are too scared to be wrong, then you don’t move out of your comfort zone.
It depends on how the teachers make you feel…like are you comfortable?…If they muck around and stuff then you feel like it’s easier to have a go and it doesn’t matter if you make mistakes.

Being a good teacher is much more important than being a native speaker.

Perseverance

I did it for three years in primary school but I wasn’t really learning because the teacher was lousy.

The teacher makes it fun…if we do well we play a game.

For some teachers and learners the “learning how to learn and teaching how to learn” perspective was very strong. These interviewees demonstrated an awareness of the importance of cognition and metacognition and were able to talk lucidly about language teaching and learning skills and strategies.

Immersion kids aren’t special…mainstream kids should be taught how to learn too.

Doing immersion basically gave me study skills – learning techniques were there.

It’s good when teachers teach you ways to learn the language like giving you ways of remembering words.

You’ve got to learn how to work out from a different structure.

It’s cumulative – it didn’t just click.

We want to be taught strategies to learn…the kamus [dictionary] is the strategy.

Know how to transfer the language to new contexts.

Strategies for working out what patterns are – key structures, grammar, spelling

I do lots of things in order but then I take them out of order to see if they understand.

The fourth perspective identified was one that incorporated and extended all of the perspectives described above. This “holistic perspective” acknowledges the complexity of the process of converting input to intake and the interrelatedness of the different dimensions of teaching and learning. The number of LOTE teachers and learners who were able to articulate a “holistic perspective” was disappointingly limited given that the research was conducted in programs regarded as being “best practice”. In the word of one student however,

You need to like the teacher to be able to learn…If you have a teacher who is not suited to your way of learning then it won’t work….You need to have a teacher who is a bit relaxed and informal because it takes the pressure off you to perform…Makes you use language that has been learnt before and takes you into new contexts. – you use what you have learnt previously in other applications.

And from a teacher some of the ways she facilitates the conversion of input into intake:

Repetition – different forms of repetition – there is a pattern so that students know what is coming. I think this is important …Drilling, record on a cassette what we have learnt and then they can listen at home….All classroom instructions in TL and they learn very quickly what they mean. Games – in context , real – whole class drill and then drilling each other.
By letting the kids know what they can do…By teaching in context…Group reading – I read them books and the kids guess from cues, songs are very important…use of rhymes…I ask kids to play teacher and they make people talk…and there is more and more and more…

The diversity of responses to the question of input to intake is a reflection of the very different conceptual and interpretive levels of those interviewed for this research. We found both teachers and learners who were able to provide insightful responses and who demonstrated an awareness of, and an ability to deal effectively with the complexities associated with language learning. We also, however, found teachers and learners who had very little understanding of the processes at work in the conversion of language input into language intake. Limited understanding of these processes impacts on an ability to generate, and work in, an environment that supports the attainment of proficiency and can have a bearing on the extent to which a program is perceived by administrators, teachers and learners as one deserving the status of embedment.

The above examples illustrate how program embedment or marginalisation status impacts on proficiency potential and can be effected by context, input and intake processes. The other principal dimension of the Proficiency Potential Framework is Deployment Orientation and this will be discussed in Section 4.4.

4.4 DEPLOYMENT VERSUS NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION

4.4.1 Defining Deployment

Prabhu (1991: 54) defines deployment as ‘a knowledge of the world handled through language’. He states that deployment involves,

learners handling information and developing knowledge about the world, by drawing on what information and knowledge they already have, what cognitive abilities of inferring, reasoning, relating etc, they possess, and what linguistic resources they command (p54).

Given the above definition, the research team considered “deployment orientation” to be a useful way of describing how language is handled in different language learning contexts and programs. The research showed that both marginalised and embedded programs had the potential to have either a deployment or non-deployment orientation and that, in some instances, deployment and non-deployment orientation could be found within the same program.

4.4.2 Deployment Orientation and Output

In the Proficiency Potential Framework “deployment orientation” is identifiable through “output.” In recent years the importance of output in language acquisition has been the focus of much attention for applied linguists. Research has made it clear ‘that an input rich, communicatively oriented classroom does not provide all that is needed for the development of targetlike proficiency’ (Swain 1998:65). Output has been acknowledged as essential to language acquisition and to the attainment of proficiency. As de Courcy (1997:54) reminds us, however, ‘…output that facilitates language acquisition involves more than just speaking or writing the language’.
4.4.3 The Output Elements

The need for a broader definition of “output” has been supported by this research. “Output” is therefore defined in this framework through the responses provided by the interviewees.

In these responses there was consistent reference to the ability of learners to use language modes appropriately and effectively for real communication. There was also an identification of the need for this language use to reveal an ever-evolving knowledge and understanding of the system of the target language. Also included was the requirement for language use to be appropriate from a sociolinguistic perspective. In addition, output was described as needing to reflect a knowledge and understanding of the sociocultural or non-linguistic features of target language speaking communities. Finally, output was seen as a reflection of the attitudinal characteristics and metalinguistic awareness of a language learner. These elements, together with factors which contextualise output (for example, support provided through the environment, the school or system, and the home) collectively, and in balance, constitute the elements of proficiency identified through this research.

A further clarification of these output elements is presented below:

Use of the Language Modes

Appropriate and effective use of the language modes involves complex and multiple interactions between text and individuals, or groups of individuals, who listen, speak, read, write or view either separately or in combination, to express, interpret or negotiate meaning. These interactions require language to be used both functionally and critically and they are influenced by the context of language use, its users and its purpose.

The System of the Target Language

Language learners come to recognise the patterns and rules of the target language that emerge as they interact with text to make meaning. They develop the ability to apply this knowledge and understanding, in an ever-evolving way, in order to create their own texts.

Sociolinguistic Understanding

Because language is a complex social practice that reflects and reinforces shared understandings about actions, values, beliefs and attitudes, it is important that language learners come to both recognise and use language that is intrinsic to the social practices of target language speaking communities.

Sociocultural Understanding

Language learners also need to develop knowledge of non-linguistic aspects of target language speaking communities. These include knowledge of the natural and physical environments as well as the social, economic, historical and political environments of these communities.
Attitudinal Characteristics and Metalinguistic Awareness

Personal attributes or characteristics such as confidence, creativity and curiosity influence output, as does the ability of learners to use language to learn about language use.

The output elements must not, however, be regarded as separate decontextualised skills. In terms of proficiency they must be viewed collectively as a means of reflecting a set of situated cultural practices. LOTE education for proficiency should therefore be viewed as the operationalising of the output elements as a process of socialisation of LOTE learners into the authentic language practices of a target language speaking community. The extent to which this socialisation takes place will significantly influence program proficiency potential.

All learners and teachers involved in this research were asked to describe learner output. In addition, the research team endeavoured to collect documentation from participant programs on how learner output was recorded and reported to both learners and, where appropriate, to other interested parties. Data analysis indicates learner output and program deployment orientation to be significant. Presented below are two illustrations of how the nature and quality of output is able to influence program deployment orientation and proficiency potential.

Illustration 1

I can say the names of lots of animals and I know the colours and we’re learning to count.

This response from a Year 4 student, when asked what she could do in her LOTE, suggests that the language output of this student and her peers is dominated by the articulation of single words grouped thematically. When asked how she got to be able to do these things her reply was,

We play lots of games and do some work sheets.

While this student and her classmates intimated that they very much enjoyed learning LOTE, their output was clearly limited.

Interviews with older students in the same program indicated that they had moved on to other themes – we can do shopping and sport – but that there was still a focus on being able to output words rather than on the construction of meaningful text.

This pattern was evident in a number of the programs included in the research, principally but not exclusively, in primary school contexts. Evidence of the output elements beyond the articulation of single words was extremely limited in these programs as was deployment orientation and proficiency potential.
Quality output encompassing the elements identified in this research has the capacity to impact on the ability of a program to have proficiency as a potential outcome for its learners. Output is, however, intimately linked to, and interacts with, the other elements of the Proficiency Potential Framework. This is represented diagrammatically below.

**Illustration 2**

*She said that the animals in the wild can take care of themselves…but domestic animals need to be taken care of, yes. People don’t know much about why…*

This is a primary school student translating the LOTE output of one of her peers who is describing in TL what she has been learning in class.

This is in marked contrast with Illustration 1. Learners in this second program were confidently able to demonstrate use of the output elements in class, and also through talking about their language learning experiences:

*Yes, I should think that I’m very good understanding [sic] but sometimes the sentences don’t come out right.*

*On April Fool’s Day you get a fish and you put it on people’s back and that’s a French tradition and then…*

*…construct more sentences and things like that…and like you said, learn avoir and all that sort of things.*

*…it helps you very much and also it probably helps you a lot with some other European languages, like it’s a lot the same…*

**A diagrammatic representation of the process of conversion of input to intake to output.**
4.5 LEARNER AUTONOMY

The final dimension of the Proficiency Potential Framework is the notion of “learner autonomy” and its relationship to the experience of learning and to the potential that this provides for becoming proficient. Program coordinators were asked to identify “best learners”. No criteria were provided to make this selection, other than they would be representative of the approximately 2 per cent of best learners nationally.

These best learners were asked:
- what they could do in their LOTE
- how they came to be able to do these things
- what else they would like to be able to do, and
- how they would like to learn this.

The interpretation of the data revealed that “best” learners fell along a continuum, running from dependence to autonomy.

“Dependent” learners were involved in tasks designed and presented by the teacher. They found it difficult to articulate learning goals, and were not involved in decisions about what would be learned, what materials would be used, or how learning would happen. They relied for their rewards on teacher approval, which was conditional on meeting the needs of the teacher. They valued giving the teacher the ‘correct’ response, and avoided responding if there was a likelihood of being ‘wrong’. The teacher was seen as being responsible for the learning, and there appeared to be an acceptance by both parties that learning would result if the teacher’s demands were met.

“Autonomous” learners had needs that were clearly articulated and respected. They appeared to have developed skills to monitor the progress of their own learning, were able to articulate the strategies they were using, and evaluate the effectiveness of those strategies. They accepted that they had a responsibility to create an environment that supported their learning, and found opportunities inside and outside the classroom to practise their skills. They were risk takers who used the making of errors as a learning strategy.

“Dependent” learners were generally unable to answer the four questions above without considerable pressing on the part of the interviewer. As might be expected, the majority of learners in primary programs, particularly lower primary, have been styled by us in this way. The question we had was whether being a “dependent” learner was part of the natural order for young learners, or whether it was an artefact of the program design.

At the other end of the continuum, we found “autonomous” learners. These students had very clear answers to the four questions, frequently at odds with the demands of the program in which they found themselves.
### 4.5.1. Characterising Dependant Learners

Dependence was evident in terms of one or more of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Learner Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher behaviour</td>
<td>We are behind schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Japanese, we do mainly grammar and writing in class. The periods go for one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hour and the teacher tries to break it up so we do oral for half and grammar for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>half, or writing for half and listening for half.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Previously, when we did an oral in class, the teacher asked questions and we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>had to write the answers down, then she checked it by writing it down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I can say lots of words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The teacher teaches us, plays games, writes words on the board, and underneath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>he writes the English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I could learn better if the teacher could explain the words better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textual materials</td>
<td>Teachers make you write stuff out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers are lazy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They use textbooks cause it helps them control the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We’re not used to informal language use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Our old teacher used to print off home pages for us in Japanese. This would be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>better than reading from books because it is a thing of today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics/themes</td>
<td>Japanese is not as advanced as French.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Japanese we talk about our hobbies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It’s always the family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topics are really pathetic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher(s) closely controlled the inputs the students received (which were often written), and the outputs they were expected (and trained) to produce. Teacher approval seemed to be the motivator for these “best learners”, rather than intrinsic satisfaction with achieving communication goals. Teacher behaviour that sustained learner dependence appeared to be unrelated to the proficiency of the teacher in the language, and was equally true of background speakers. English was used in preference to the target language, even where the teacher was a background speaker. It seemed that 'best learners' in these programs were those students who did what they were told, or in one case work out what the homework is before I give it to them.

Textual materials. There was a good deal of reliance on the textbook (often only one) which provided the content for the program. This appeared to be more to satisfy the teachers need for content, or was expected of the teacher by the administration as a means of holding the teacher accountable for ‘covering the course’ along the same lines as content based subjects. University entrance exams and the like were often cited by secondary teachers as the goal, and the texts chosen were those associated with these exams.
4.5.2 Characterising Autonomous Learners

Learner autonomy tended to be related to learners;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Learner Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Making language use real, and working through a rich, rather than impoverished, language environment. Comments from “good learners”, often included illustrations of how they moved their language beyond that which was expected of them within the regular learning context. Good and autonomous learners sought additional, and diverse text, and they constructed opportunities for real rather than contrived language use. There is a sense of them wanting to push themselves and their language into both new texts and new contexts.</td>
<td>Spontaneous conversation now – it’s real. Got to learn to think in Japanese. You’ve got to use it all the time…I have to be surrounded by the language to learn. Surrounded by language and culture. …the ‘beyond the classroom’ learning that was taking place. …chatlines on the internet are a more natural way to communicate. Going back to mainstream – we don’t put the language to use anymore. I would try to immerse myself in as much culture as possible In French, we have a totally French environment. The best bit is at the end of the class, when the teacher just chats to us. She asks us about what we are doing on the weekend, and we have to respond in French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with all the proficiency elements. Interviews where learner comments about language use either incorporated the different proficiency elements spontaneously, or reflected a holistic interpretation of language, suggested both knowledge and autonomy. There was a “naturalness” about language demonstrated in these interviews that was not reflected in other discussions.</td>
<td>It provided the perfect shell, structure and environment for me to actively be engaged in Indonesian both, linguistically and culturally in order to fast track a lot of learning skills… Came out in Indonesian when I thought it was English. Mixed codes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Factors

Paying attention to the processes associated with language acquisition. Some learners interviewed had no capacity to articulate any aspect of how they learnt their LOTE – they did what they were expected to do. For others the “learning how to learn” dimension and the need to “learn about language through language use” was very clearly articulated. For these learners there was a real identification of “self” as the facilitator of the language learning process rather than having to be dependent on some “other” to teach it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Learner Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paying attention to the processes associated with language acquisition. Some learners interviewed had no capacity to articulate any aspect of how they learnt their LOTE – they did what they were expected to do. For others the “learning how to learn” dimension and the need to “learn about language through language use” was very clearly articulated. For these learners there was a real identification of “self” as the facilitator of the language learning process rather than having to be dependent on some “other” to teach it.</td>
<td>Confidence and a willingness to play with the language are crucial factors. Interesting coping with different teachers and getting different accents – broke down some of the ‘Javaneseness’ of the experience. Learning by myself. You have to improve on your own standards. One thing I did myself to develop my reading skills was read English novels in translation. Think and reflect on your own learning. Find out through context. Trying to remember new words using mental pictures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being passionate about their language learning. To interview very good learners was to interview people whose passion, enthusiasm and commitment flowed through their discussion of language learning. Again the emphasis on “self” was evident. They talked very personally rather than as a member of a particular learner cohort.</td>
<td>They [the students] make their own Japanese environment in Australia. Find out from native speakers about their culture. The more we are exposed to culture, the more motivation. So many opportunities out of class. …got into the youth culture…colloquial register indicates proficiency for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to operate in, and understand themselves through, a culturally different environment. This is the final testament to autonomy. In this context “self” continues to be reflected through interview comments but it is “knowing about self” and “seeing self” operate effectively in a different cultural context which is the focus.</td>
<td>The myth about Javanese being ‘halus’ [refined] and ‘sopan’ [polite] was quite revealing – ‘politeness’ is very culturally constructed. …fit into society – don’t stand out as being a foreigner. The ‘Javaneseness’ of my language now is obvious. Think and reflect on your own experiences in the culture. What it means to become culturally literate in Japanese. They can position themselves in that society to learn from it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.3 Reference points along the continuum

We have identified several reference points along the continuum from “dependence” to “autonomy”. The points are described as dependence, co-dependence, opting into autonomy, transition to autonomy and autonomy. Characteristics of learners grouped according to these reference points are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Describing learners through the reference points along the continuum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>Opting into autonomy</th>
<th>Transition to autonomy</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependence</strong>&lt;br&gt;Uncritical acceptance of program input, whether broad, focused or selective.&lt;br&gt;Repetition is major learning strategy.&lt;br&gt;Belief that involvement in teacher-directed activities and doing homework will lead to achievement of the goal, which is ‘to speak the language’.&lt;br&gt;Target culture described stereotypically&lt;br&gt;Intake is restricted to what the student considers necessary to meet teacher or program needs.</td>
<td><strong>Opting into autonomy</strong>&lt;br&gt;Able to articulate broad learning goals, and engage in situations perceived as relevant to the attainment of these goals.&lt;br&gt;Development of learning strategies based on growing understanding of language as a system and personal learning preferences.&lt;br&gt;Realisation that engagement with the target language and culture is the key to being able to ‘speak the language’.&lt;br&gt;Identification with superficial aspects of the target culture either at a personal or vocational level (or both).</td>
<td><strong>Transition to autonomy</strong>&lt;br&gt;Learning goals become more diffuse and specific as the realisation comes that ‘speaking the language’ is no longer adequate to describe learner needs.&lt;br&gt;Understanding of the need for a literacy rich environment, and the development of strategies to extract meaning from this environment and interact socially within it.&lt;br&gt;Development of relationships within the target culture&lt;br&gt;Tourist experience of the target culture.</td>
<td><strong>Autonomy</strong>&lt;br&gt;Takes full personal responsibility for attaining proficiency levels related to own goals.&lt;br&gt;Understanding of what it means to become culturally literate in another culture.&lt;br&gt;Process of enculturation and knowledge of how to position self in another society to learn from it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 THE FUNCTIONING OF THE FRAMEWORK

This chapter has described the evolution of a framework that enables the proficiency potential of a LOTE program to be categorised using indicators that relate to program embedment, deployment orientation and learner autonomy. The different aspects of the Framework have been explored, and examples of the different indicators and how they can impact on programs, have been included.

The Framework emerged through the constant comparative analysis of the research data, and its functioning has been monitored against a variety of programs and circumstances. The Framework takes account of, and reflects the reality of the teaching and learning of languages other than English in the Australian context. It functions to present an overview of a program and its learners in such a way as to provide accessible information about proficiency potential. How the Framework has been applied in this research is the subject of the next chapter.
APPLICATION OF THE FRAMEWORK – PROGRAM AND LEARNER PROFILES

5.1 PROFILING PROGRAMS AND LEARNERS

The “best practice” programs included in this research have been profiled for their proficiency potential. This chapter includes a description of the profiling process, a summary of the profiles depicting both proficiency orientation and learning pathways, and a discussion of the findings of the profiling process in terms of program proficiency potential.

The twenty seven programs that make up this “best practice” sample are reported here as twenty four separate case studies. The discrepancy in numbers is a result of some programs being reported as clusters, some individually and some from the perspective of potential pathway provision only.

The profile for each case study includes information about embedment status, deployment orientation and the learner cohort. Illustrators relating to “context”, “input”, “intake” and “output” are included, as is information pertaining to the learner groups. The tabulation of this information is in dot point and includes extensive quotation from interviewees. In almost every instance more than one researcher was involved with each program. This has enabled the profiles to reflect and record perceptions and information from multiple viewpoints and has allowed each profile to be ‘tested’ in terms of the indicators and information provided. The completed profiles are included as Appendix A of this report.

5.2 THE PROFILES IN SUMMARY

For ease of access in recognising information and determining trends, a summary of the completed profiles is included in this section. The following pages present a tabulation of information about both programs and learners set against the Proficiency Potential Framework. This tabulation presents a profile of each program, or cluster of programs, together with their learners.

Programs are described according to the embedment and marginalisation indicators and deployment orientation. Learners are described according to the reference points on the learner continuum. It is acknowledged that different learners will demonstrate different degrees of autonomy in any program. It is our contention, however, that embedment and marginalisation factors, together with the deployment orientation of a program, will condition a majority of learners. The reference point for learners within the profiles is therefore an expression of the condition of most learners within a particular cohort.

Programs are recorded by case study initial and not by name. This is done in order to protect the confidentiality of all individuals and programs involved in this research.

Appendix A is entitled A Profile of LOTE Programs and Learners: Proficiency Potential in the Australian Educational Context.
The summary grid below contains information about each of the case studies in relation to both the Proficiency Potential Framework and to the LOTE learning pathways that exist for students in each program.

Case studies are shaded to reflect the general proficiency orientation of the programs examined:

- □ No evidence of a proficiency orientation.
- □ Proficiency orientation limited.
- □ Significant orientation towards proficiency.
- □ Orientation supports the attainment of proficiency.

A system of arrows is used to indicate the pathways that exist for learners. The positioning of the arrows demonstrates both previous (the first arrow) and post (the second arrow) pathways, and the extent to which the pathways support the attainment of proficiency as a final outcome.

- □ No clear pathway.
- □ A clear learning pathway.
- □ A clear learning pathway which supports the attainment of proficiency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Marginalised</th>
<th>Embedded</th>
<th>Deployment Orientation</th>
<th>Non-Deployment Orientation</th>
<th>Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Study U</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Primary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study Q</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Primary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study R</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Primary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study S</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Primary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study F</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Primary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study G</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>Year 6 and beyond</td>
<td>Opting into autonomy in year 5, and had reverted to dependence in year 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Primary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study C</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ Immersion learners</td>
<td>✓ Non-immersion learners</td>
<td>Dependence and co-dependence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Primary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study I</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-dependence through to opting into autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Primary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study X</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Most of the older learners opting into autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Primary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dependence and co-dependence. Some of the older learners are opting into autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Primary and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study B</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dependence or Co-dependence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Primary and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learners are scattered from dependence to transition to autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Primary and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study A</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Majority of learners were dependent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Secondary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lower Secondary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Best learners were in transition to autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Secondary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ Immersion learners</td>
<td>✓ Non-immersion learners</td>
<td>Dependence and codependence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Secondary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Secondary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Best learners were in transition to autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Secondary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ Immersion learners</td>
<td>✓ Non-immersion learners</td>
<td>Dependence, co-dependence and opting into autonomy depending on their learning experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Secondary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomous or in transition to autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Secondary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Majority of learners were co-dependent or opting into autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Secondary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ In some languages in some years</td>
<td>✓ In some languages in some years</td>
<td>Co-dependence to autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tertiary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomous or in transition to autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tertiary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Majority of learners are autonomous.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 THE PROFICIENCY POTENTIAL OF AUSTRALIAN LOTE PROGRAMS

An examination of the Profiles 'in summary' provides information about the proficiency potential offered to learners through Australian LOTE programs. It also enables the identification of patterns and trends that are associated with the teaching and learning of second or foreign languages. These trends help characterise LOTE as it has evolved and developed through the ‘90s now that it is a more regular part of Australian curriculum.

The initial discussion of information from the Profiles ‘in summary’ will focus on the proficiency potential indicators. Significant trends and patterns impacting on the attainment of proficiency will then be identified and described.

5.3.1 Embedment Status and LOTE Programs in the Australian Context

Table 3 presents a breakdown of embedment status in relation to the “best practice” case studies analysed through this research. The figures indicate that there is no direct correlation between phase of learning (for example primary as opposed to secondary), and embedment status. There is an almost equal split in all phases.

Table 3 Embedment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase of Learning</th>
<th>Total number of case studies</th>
<th>Marginalised</th>
<th>Embedded</th>
<th>Evidence of both orientations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data analysis indicates that embedment status is related much more significantly to contextual issues that impact on how programs are operationalised and how teaching and learning are enabled and enacted.

Contextual Support

Contextual issues identified through this study relate to the ways in which LOTE learning is supported. The different dimensions of support include:

- Support from “significant others” (including system and school administrators, community, colleagues and students).
- Support in terms of power dynamics and relationships, (both personal and from a learning area perspective).
- Support through resourcing and infrastructure.

The comments from interviewees, included below, illustrate the importance of contextual support to embedment status and proficiency potential.
Support from “significant others”

Support for teachers – team building – valuing everyone’s input.

This comment comes from a LOTE teacher who feels that she is well supported by her principal and who also believes that she is able to support teachers who are less experienced.

There were other examples, however, where this same degree of support from “significant others” was not in evidence. For example,

**LOTE is not a priority for him [the principal] and so it’s not seen as being important by kids and parents.**

In instances such as this, a connection between this lack of support and the potential for program embedment, was perceived.

Support in terms of power dynamics and relationships

A lot of things are beyond our control.

Isn’t that the way it’s supposed to be?

It is the perception of the research team that the significance of relationships, and the power dynamics implicit in relationships, is often overlooked or undervalued as a key determinant of successful outcomes for programs, for teachers and for learners. Positions and relationships and status and power relative to these positions and relationships were often found to be unchallenged by interviewees, regardless of implications for the embedment status of programs.

**It is very difficult having the Head of Soc Ed [Studies of Society and Environment] as your Head of LOTE. He doesn’t understand the area and has no respect for us.**

Comment from a very experienced teacher.

**Relationships can be difficult – they expect me to make all the decisions about what they should do in class but they want to do it in the way that they would do it back home.**

Comment from a LOTE program coordinator reflecting the relationship that she has with her team of native speaker teachers.

**Everyone keeps changing – I am the only constant.**

Comment from a LOTE program coordinator who finds that the constant turnover of staff in her program, (because of their contractual conditions), impacts on relationships and on the effectiveness of the program.

**A side dish to normal classes.**

Comment from a Year 11 “best learner” who is describing his relationship to his study of LOTE and LOTE’s relationship and status, as he sees it, to curriculum and his overall education.

Different aspects of “power” and of “relationships” are depicted through the statements quoted above. In each instance the comments suggest that the strength of a LOTE program can be compromised by relational factors.
Support through resourcing and infrastructure

Respondants in interviews saw resourcing and infrastructure as obvious and necessary in the provision of contextual support for LOTE teaching and learning. Comments abounded and included,

Depend less on good will and have access to more money.

The perception of this teacher was that the provision of additional financial support could counter other elements acting against program success.

The school is gazetted and has a council but there are some questions about its future – It’s supported by NALSAS money.

In this instance a school principal was well aware that the short-term provision of funds, (the building of a program on “soft money”), was no guarantee of program success or continuance.

All this stuff should be there when setting up a program.

This comment from a LOTE program coordinator highlights the need for resourcing and infrastructure to be built into a program from the very beginning. Her experience was that “playing catch up” from the point of view of resources weakened a program. The specific example she provided was that of the provision of a sink. Such a request could appear either to be as necessary, of little significance, or an extravagance, depending on who was viewing the request. From her perspective, however, the lack of a sink undermined the solidity of a primary immersion program where science was the principle content area through which language was taught.

The above example demonstrates how small, but impacting factors, can easily be overlooked. The other examples highlight the link between a supportive context, program embedment and proficiency potential.

Input and Embedment

The general discussion of the Proficiency Potential Framework included in Chapter 4 made reference to Focused Input and its possible relationship with program marginalisation. A detailed analysis of the Profiles reinforces this connection as well as highlighting the lack of Broad Input in marginalised programs. In only one example from the case studies was there evidence of Broad Input in a marginalised program, and this was within a program that also featured Selective and Focused input at different phases of learning. This finding suggests that there may be considerable merit in teachers and program coordinators examining the nature of the input learners receive. An assessment of expediency, accident or appropriacy in terms of input selection and its relationship to intended program outcomes, may be useful when examining programs and their proficiency potential.

Some interesting comments about input are included below:

leads to good Year 12 results – not proficiency.

Comment from a teacher about a ‘selective input’ program where input was chosen deliberately in order to maximise the opportunities for learners to succeed in their final examinations.
They lack daily vocab – I would like to include more to make their language more balanced.

This comment, made by a teacher in an immersion program, and endorsed by her colleagues, highlights the limitations that can accompany the use of selective input where a particular content area is used as the principle medium for the teaching and learning of LOTE.

Suara Siswa [the National Curriculum Guidelines for Indonesian] because that’s what you’re supposed to do.

This teacher comment reflects an unquestioning acceptance about input and classroom practice to the exclusion of the particular needs, interests and circumstances of her learner group.

Words, sentences and cultural awareness.

This is one teacher’s perception of what input should be.

I teach in the TL…authentic material – children’s books, fashion magazines, songs, video – some authentic, some to teach language, other native speakers (to talk about their country, to participate with the kids so that they can hear two adults interacting in the TL, read to the kids and participate in games), children’s books and songs used every lesson – video occasionally, plus artefacts and realia, plus stories, postcards, maps of France…

This is another teacher’s interpretation of input. Here she describes the ‘broad input’ provided to learners through her primary LOTE program.

Input to Intake

There is little evidence from the Profiles of either teachers or learners within marginalised programs being able to talk about input to intake. This finding is not surprising given that overall, there was a disappointing response to the questions relating to the input to intake processes. The lack of evidence from within marginalised programs should, however, be viewed against this overall finding, rather than as a particular reflection of, and indicator for, marginalisation.

There was one noticeable exception to this pattern. Case Study I is a marginalised program. Marginalisation status for this program is essentially a consequence of a number of contextual issues that counteract, and ultimately outweigh, the many positive aspects of the program.

In Case Study I, even very young learners talked animatedly about what they could do with their LOTE, how they got to be able to do these things, and what they did to reinforce, expand and use their second language knowledge. These learners were selected for this program, not on the basis of their intellectual capacity or their language ability, but on how they worked. In the words of the program coordinator,

Study habits and work habits are more important than achievement – we look for kids who have confidence and can solve problems.

Observation of, and interviews with, learners in this program supported this contention. Year 3 learners interacted confidently with native speakers using only the TL both within and beyond the classroom. The learners appeared to be articulate, inquisitive and wanting to be challenged.
Case Study I serves as an example of how proficiency potential can be seriously compromised through program marginalisation, in spite of the quality of teaching and learning that is characteristic of a program.

The Profiles ‘in summary’ reveal program embedment status to be the result of the interrelationship and interaction of a number of factors and indicators. The profiling process has also yielded significant evidence that supports the contention that marginalisation can seriously impact on the potential of a program to offer proficiency as a potential outcome for its learners.

5.3.2 The Deployment Orientation of Australian LOTE Programs

Table 4 presents a breakdown of deployment orientation in relation to the “best practice” case studies analysed through this research. The figures are relatively indeterminate with regard to the relationship between deployment orientation and phases of learning, but there is some suggestion that school programs are less likely to provide a deployment orientation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase of Learning</th>
<th>Total number of case studies</th>
<th>Deployment</th>
<th>Non-deployment</th>
<th>Evidence of both orientations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Profiling and data analysis did reveal that quality and type of output, and therefore deployment orientation is, however, conditioned by a number of other factors or beliefs. These include learner age, teacher and learner attitudes, the nature of the LOTE, time allocation, class size, and also, program type or format. These factors will be explored in this section.

Age

Many of the teachers interviewed for the research communicated a strong belief in the need to provide very young learners with a fun and active LOTE learning environment. The intrinsic merit of this notion is not under question, but the data indicate that there may be some consequences of this belief pattern that can impact negatively on deployment orientation and proficiency potential.

The interview transcripts from primary programs show learner output to be very often characterised by game playing, song singing, and other active and rehearsal or performance oriented tasks. There is often very little evidence of writing, only limited opportunities for learners to put the words together, and considerable emphasis on “culture” which is reflected predominantly through a “food, festival, folktales” perspective.

Young primary LOTE learners indicate that they enjoy language represented through these experiences. Comments from some older primary learners and from secondary learners, reflecting on their primary experiences, suggest that age brings a growing awareness of their LOTE output being very limited.

When I really started to learn LOTE…
At the other end of the spectrum, tertiary learners interviewed commented on being required to read and write too much and often about topics which they found unappealing.

There are too many sejarahs [readings about history] – sejarahs, sejarahs and more sejarahs.

Even if what we do in lectures is boring in-country means you can walk out of class and use the language.

Assumptions about age and its implications for LOTE learning may need to be checked, and teachers at all levels may well find an “input, output, expectation analysis” a useful exercise to undertake with their learners.

Teacher and Learner Attitudes

Transcript analysis and program profiling also revealed that output could be conditioned by attitudinal factors.

The willingness of learners “to output” their LOTE was shown to be influenced by how they felt about their teacher.

I like the teacher and that made it better.

It’s better when we have her...when we have her we can get to say things.

Perceptions of relevance, interest and need were also shown to impact on the ability of learners to output.

I want to write about something that means something to me.

I’m sick of the family – all we ever do is the family.

I want to be able to talk to people and to understand them when they speak fast.

French class is great because we get to talk about issues and about our future and our dreams. I had to give a talk about abortion in French.

How they feel about themselves, as learners, was also shown to be important in facilitating language output.

You need to be committed to the language. You need to step out of your comfort zone. You can’t be afraid of making a fool of yourself.

In addition, teacher beliefs emerged as a factor able to condition and control learner output. A teacher explained that the reason she asked her learners to write words out over and over again was because,

When I did it this is what I had to do.

In another instance a classroom teacher reported that because the LOTE teacher felt it necessary to be able to “show” what his learners could do, written output was the dominant output form sought from language learners.

Being tied to written accountability – this ties him back...two to three weeks just to test.

The importance of learner and teacher attitudes was very much in evidence from the case studies and a clear link could be established between attitude and language deployment.
Language being learnt

Whether a language is cognate or non-cognate, scripted or non-scripted can impact on attitudes, perceptions and also quality and type of learner output.

A Year 12 learner of Japanese stated that,

\[ \text{In Japanese we spend heaps of time doing writing. It is very difficult. The writing is really difficult because there are three scripts: Kanji, the Chinese alphabet has over 15000 characters. You have to learn combinations of pictures. The other two alphabets spell out words.} \]

A Year 11 learner of Japanese had this to say.

\[ \ldots\text{you learn the alphabet and people say it is sort of hard to learn but actually you learn it in a couple of weeks and it sort of stays with you and you don’t forget it and it’s not hard, it’s like learning, you have the alphabet which you are learning then sort of learning how to use numbers for maths it’s not something, it seems hard, but once you actually can do it, you know…} \]

And different attitudes and perceptions are evident from the following excerpt taken from the transcript of an interview with a number of Year 11 and Year 12 students.

\begin{quote}
Student 1
German is probably the easiest language I like to have because it is so similar to English and the accent isn’t as hard as French.
\end{quote}

Strong disagreement from other students.

\begin{quote}
Interviewer
You disagree?
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Student 2
I think German is harder.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Student 3
I think we all probably think the other language is more difficult. I think Chinese is easier.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Interviewer
Is the difficulty or easiness important? Does that matter?
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Student 3
If it is interesting, I think not, but if what you are doing is boring it becomes a bit of a grind.
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
Student 2
It depends if you are going to take on the challenge.
\end{quote}

The perceptions of older learners about what makes language easy or hard, and the extent to which the degree of difficulty is important, clearly differ.
As for younger “best learners”:

- It’s great to learn something different.
- Fun, different, exciting.
- He always talks to us in Japanese except when people are naughty or when we are learning origami.
- There are three alphabets and we are learning two of them. Kanji is too advanced for our year level.

What the research team noticed from the interviews with primary “best learners” of scripted languages was that reference to difficulty was noticeably absent. At primary level there also appeared to be less concern about language output being diminished or adversely effected by script. Whether the same could be said of how learners other than “best learners”, perceive their language ability was not addressed within the perimeters of this particular study.

Teacher perceptions about the characteristics of particular languages also impacted on learner output. A number of comments from teachers are presented below.

- One of the reasons we introduced Indonesian was because it is considered easier.
  Primary Principal.

- The Chinese language is just so much more elegant than English.
  Non-native teacher of Chinese.

- The students often find the European languages less disconcerting because they can often recognise words.
  Head of a Language Department

- Japanese is a very hard language to learn.
  Native speaking teacher of Japanese.

- My language is very difficult for Australians to learn.
  Native speaking teacher of Chinese

Images and expectations associated with particular languages certainly emerged from the research as having an impact on learner output. Interestingly, “good learners” seemed less concerned about perceived difficulties than were some of their teachers. In some instances it appeared that teachers of Japanese and Chinese, (particularly native speaking teachers), reinforced the message about the difficulty of scripted languages. Perhaps, inadvertently, such messages can make language learning seem more daunting.

A link between the language of study and task type and appropriacy was also established. One Year 11 student compared her French learning with her study of Japanese,

- Japanese is not as advanced. In Japanese we talk about our hobbies.

This learner was not negative about this situation, simply describing it as,

- …that’s just the way it is.
There was also evidence highlighting the need to match the characteristics of language with appropriate output tasks. From a senior secondary student of Japanese,

Sometimes in assessments, I can’t answer the questions because I can’t even read them.

Evidence also indicated that output could be effected by factors that are not generally recognised, or not considered to be particularly significant.

Sometimes I think it is easier with a male speaker, you pick up the Chinese, because I had a female teacher, she, her voice was obviously a lot higher, and it was harder to copy what she was saying.

The ability of learners to deploy language and to operationalise the different output elements is effected by the language being learnt and the perceptions held about particular languages. Our research suggests that these differences are important in terms of expectation and task appropriacy but that for “best learners” this may not be as problematic as is sometimes portrayed.

**Time Allocation**

A number of studies have sought to identify the length of time required to learn different second languages. Nicholas et al. (1993) cites work conducted by the US Foreign Services Institute. Figures based on this work suggest that,

...some form of minimal social proficiency could take up to 1,320 hours in the case of Arabic, Chinese, Japanese or Korean, or as little as 660 hours in the case of Farsi, Greek, Hindi, Indonesian/Malay or Urdu (p94).

This information implies that deployment orientation is at least partially conditioned by time allocated to language learning and that different languages require greater or lesser amounts. Within the context of the programs included in this research, time differential tended to relate to program type (for example immersion as opposed to language object) and not to language of study.

Teachers interviewed clearly perceived time to be significant in terms of quality output. Learner perceptions tended to emphasis interest, extension and output task type rather than the number of hours involved in language learning.

I like doing new and interesting things.
Be focused. Extend yourself
I hate writing about my family story. We have to do it each year.

“Good learners” recognise the need to enhance their deployment opportunities and to do this beyond the classroom.

My grammar is not so good. I need more people to practice on. That’s why we are having an exchange student come to stay with us.

Constantly immerse yourself in an aspect of the language, the culture, native speakers.

Opportunities to fast track language learning and to be involved in “real” language deployment were also acknowledged and very much appreciated by learners who had had beneficial in-country experiences. For one Year 10 student who had five years of language learning prior to going in-country there was the sense that,

When I arrived in Indonesia I knew nothing.
And from a tertiary learner,

> It’s only in retrospect that I can grasp how much I learnt during that period.

The research suggests that time allocation must be interpreted to include time commitment beyond the classroom, and quality use of time, for there to be a true representation of the link between time, output and deployment orientation.

**Program Type or Format**

Through the profiling process information emerged relating to program type, or format, and output. In primary and lower secondary non-immersion programs, interviewee responses, together with classroom observation, suggested a link between program type and quality and quantity of output. Both tended to be limited in programs of this nature.

In immersion programs the issue appears to be different. Quality and quantity are present but there is the issue of balance in terms of the output elements. The profiles indicate that attention to content within an immersion program can result in the dominance of some of the output elements and the near exclusion of others. Comments from immersion teachers express both an understanding of, and concern about this situation.

> We don’t teach that part. [Reference to culture]

> At Years 5 and 6 it would be good to focus more on output.

> How to combine the LOTE and immersion class is the point.

> Tidy up what they are learning – more form focus at higher level.

Quality and balance in output elements emerge from the research as issues needing to be considered in order to maximise the proficiency potential offered through LOTE programs.

**Class Size**

An interesting finding from the research is that class size may determine the output focus within particular programs and at particular levels of learning. The profiles suggest that, for secondary teachers working with a class of thirty, writing rather than speaking may seem a more manageable option. For tertiary teachers dealing with first and second year students, writing is also attractive because of class size and a perceived need to focus on this particular aspect of language use.

In the post compulsory years of schooling, and the upper years of tertiary education, smaller classes of learners present as a better environment for collaborative learning and the development of a more balanced focus with regard to the output elements.

The factors discussed above, (age, attitudes, language of study, time allocation, program type and class size), all work together to help determine language output and therefore define the deployment orientation of a particular program. The research show us that learner output in any program can be reviewed against these factors and that such a review can determine if learner output is appropriate and in balance.
5.3.3 Autonomy and Australia’s “Best” LOTE Learners

The development of the Learner Continuum as the third element of the Proficiency Potential Framework raised questions concerning the connection between age, cognition and autonomy, together with implications for proficiency potential, particularly for the 2 per cent learner target group of this research. The question we had was whether being a “dependent” learner was part of the natural order for young learners, or whether it was an artefact of program design and the accompanying teaching/learning practices.

The construction of program and learner profiles for the “best practice” programs enabled us to see that dependence does not have to be the characteristic state through which young language learners work. In Case Studies G, X and I the learner cohorts are beyond dependence. The evidence suggests that learners in these programs are either selected because they have personal attributes and learning styles which lend themselves to the development of autonomy (Case Study I), or they are consciously taught how to become self-directed and involved in their own learning (Case Studies G and X). These programs support and highlight the attitudinal characteristics of language learning and the importance of the development of metalinguistic awareness. Case Studies G, X and I illustrate the significant of these particular output elements for language deployment and proficiency potential.

It is interesting to note, however, that if support for this orientation towards self-direction is withdrawn, then young learners may revert to a state of dependence. This was particularly evident in Case Study G where after Year 5, learners were no longer involved in making decisions about their language learning program, they were no longer encouraged to experiment in their language use, and their study had become seemingly purposeless.

In Year 5 we learnt so much more...This year it's just review.

...doesn't have any meaning for [sic] it.

Evidence of this was also forthcoming from a learner who had moved out of Case Study X into a secondary schooling program that was unable to support continuous language learning through a self-directed ethos.

It's a bit boring now because they've [students with limited previous exposure to the LOTE] caught up.

The importance of teaching learners how to learn language in a self-directed way was also shown to be significant, through the profiling process, for older learners. Case Studies J and M are secondary programs where the teaching style of staff is crafted to reduce learner dependence on the teacher and engage learners with a broad range of input and output task types as well as encouraging learners to critique their own language learning experiences.

So students thinking about their own thinking, reflecting on their reflective practice and we are talking a lot about reflective practice for adults, we are going into reflective practice for school children.

...we are making students more conscious of learning how to learn, even though I'm sure teachers have always helped students, given them strategies for how to succeed in their learning, and getting the information in their head, but I think now we are starting to adopt a common language across all the departments.

There is a very clear connection between learners who are beyond dependence and co-dependence.
and an ability to deploy language. Programs that support the development of this orientation challenge and respect learners, and involve them critically in all aspects of the language learning process. The Profiles indicate that these programs have a significant orientation towards the attainment of proficiency and that learners studying in these programs possess or develop the characteristics to place them in the 2 per cent of learners who are the principle concern of this study.

5.4 PROGRAM TYPE AND PROFICIENCY POTENTIAL

The embedment indicators, factors and conditions relating to deployment orientation, and learner placement on the autonomy continuum, were used collectively to determine the proficiency potential offered through the case studies included in the research. The potential of each case study is recorded through the shading on the Profiles ‘in summary’. Table 5 uses the information from the Profiles and reports the relationship between program proficiency potential and the different phases of learning.8

An examination of the statistics presented in Table 5 suggests that there is a correlation between programs constructed for older learners and an orientation that supports the attainment of proficiency. No such correlation is evident, however, when examining the programs constructed for younger learners. It was therefore decided to examine the phases of learning split, in terms of program type, to determine if this was a significant factor. Table 6 reflects the split between immersion style programs and non-immersion programs.9

Table 5 Proficiency Potential – by Phases of Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase of Learning</th>
<th>No evidence of proficiency orientation</th>
<th>Proficiency orientation limited</th>
<th>Significant orientation towards proficiency</th>
<th>Orientation supports the attainment of proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Proficiency Potential by – Phases of Learning and Program Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase of Learning</th>
<th>No evidence of proficiency orientation</th>
<th>Proficiency orientation limited</th>
<th>Significant orientation towards proficiency</th>
<th>Orientation supports the attainment of proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>Non-Immersion</td>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>Non-Immersion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 The profiling process revealed that some programs offered different proficiency potential at different levels or stages. Variations have been included in the statistics for Table 5.

9 The phrase “immersion style program” is used here to describe programs characterised by maximum TL usage, significant contact time, and other curriculum content being delivered through the second language. Beyond these characteristics there was considerable variety in terms of how “immersion style programs” were enacted within the broader school curriculum.
The findings presented in Table 6 are indeed interesting. In terms of proficiency potential as reflected through the case studies included in this research, the evidence suggests that:

- At primary level it is only an immersion style program that has the capacity to offer a significant orientation towards proficiency.
- Beyond primary level, non-immersion style programs also have the potential to provide a significant orientation that will lead towards proficiency.

This finding has significant implications for the planning and implementation of LOTE programs. It suggests that, where the program rationale is to provide an orientation to support the attainment of proficiency, the style or type of program, particularly in the primary phase of learning, becomes an important consideration. Program type should not, however, be viewed in isolation from embedment status, deployment orientation and the autonomy continuum as the significance of these factors has already been demonstrated.

### 5.5 PHASES OF LEARNING AND PROFICIENCY POTENTIAL

Not only has the profiling process been able to provide the research team with significant information about individual programs and their learner cohorts, it has also enabled the compilation of “snap shots” of teaching and learning at each learning phase. These “snap shots” capture many of the issues and factors relating to proficiency potential, described previously in this chapter, and they enable an overview of what formal LOTE learning is like within the Australian educational context.

**Primary**

*Fun, different, exciting – we learn a different song each day.*

Say my name, describe people, count, tell the time, bargaining, sport, transport, money.

Primary school you do a lot more games and such – a lot of self-esteem stuff.

We just kept doing the same things over again each year...you know – greetings and things.

Sing songs, say hello, know the animals, say and write my name.

...colour in sheets in primary school – I only knew about five words.

I was shoved into learning Japanese in years 6 and 7. We just learnt the alphabets and made origami.

Pretty fun, but hard sometimes.

It's much better than Social Studies and health – they're not fun.

We didn't really learn language – it was just some things about culture.

This is a representative sample of comments about primary school LOTE learning, from “best” learners in ‘language object’ programs included in this study. These learners communicate the notion of LOTE being fun, (for at least the first few years), of there being games, singing and other practical activities. Quality and quantity of output is limited and there is a sense of ‘dabbling’ with the different output elements. There is also little evidence of learners feeling their learning to be cumulative.
Lower Secondary

Introduce myself, tell them what you like, write about your family, talk about some simple things.

First term we did the verbs, second term we did Pocahontas…and stuff like that.

It’s interesting…You are learning the culture and stuff like that as well as the language.

I’d like to do more culture.

I’d like to use the computer more…I reckon it would be good to talk to people overseas.

You sit there and write, write, write all day.

We read, read, read.

Speaking tests…write it out and then memorise it.

The above comments provide a synthesis of learning at this level. In general there is a focus on reading and writing with oral output tending to comprise short, simple utterances or conversations. Attention to cultural aspects varies with some learners able to articulate significant information and others have very limited knowledge indeed. There is often a sense of learner output being restricted, either consciously or subconsciously, to the more quiet aspects of language production. An explanation provided by one learner was that we Do this exercise and then that exercise…they use textbooks cause it helps them control the class.

Upper Secondary

I love doing the oral. We have 8 or 10 assessments per term, I really enjoy the orals and the role plays. I like trying to think of the slang.

In Japanese we do mainly grammar and writing in class. The periods go for one hour and the teacher tries to break it up so we do oral for half and grammar for half, or writing for half and listening for half.

Conversing, writing letters to people my own age

In French we do speaking, listening and reading in class. Writing is generally after school.

Japanese suffers from the fact that you can’t really talk about controversial issues. We have to talk about Fred’s skiing accident and the traditional foods of Japan.

…we learn our grammar and everything but we also learn things that are actually going to be useful for speaking the language if you’re in the country.

I was finding it very interesting that our teacher does topics that are relevant to us, like we have observation sheets and environment and current affairs and all those sorts of things.

Sociolinguistic knowledge? Very little before I went away – I learnt ‘enggah’ in year 12 from an Indonesian friend – got none of this in class.

Maybe concentrate on culture too much…stereotypical, old textbooks.

And you’ve got a smaller class, that’s really good.

We have pairs so like every three or four lessons the teacher says we have pair work now…not writing, just speaking to each other so we can get used to it, used to saying and used to hearing.
Upper secondary programs appear to offer much more balance in terms of the language modes. In general there are increased opportunities for oral output with learners expressing a preference to be able to deal with issues that are pertinent, relevant or controversial. The difficulties associated with the output modes and scripted languages are acknowledged and accepted by learners. Being able to communicate using more informal or ‘real’ registers is considered, by learners, to be desirable, and demonstrates an increased awareness of the need for language to be appropriate to context. Learners are also increasingly aware of the need for their language use to illustrate sociocultural knowledge beyond the stereotypical, together with an evolving ability to apply the target language system.

**Tertiary**

I would have liked more emphasis on speaking.

Conversation class was really useless. – question and answer, not conversation.

Paragraphs on familiar topics, and letters…some translation…transcripts into English.

Respond to prompted questions and statements in familiar areas and I could piece together enough information to say meaningful things in non-familiar areas.

I haven’t been to Japan at this stage. You really have to go to Japan to figure that one out. [sociolinguistic knowledge]

I …learnt [sociocultural knowledge] a fair bit in theory which was interesting but it remained fairly meaningless.

Every day, a lot of contact hours – Listening, reading, answering questions.

So many written exercises – we did a lot of writing.

At this level learners report diminished opportunities for oral output and a reemphasis on writing when making comparisons with their secondary language learning experiences. They communicate a sense of their language learning becoming much more formal again. There also tends to be a less holistic treatment of the output elements, particularly sociocultural knowledge which tends to be separated from language study.

These “snap shots” derived from the profiling process, reflect the ‘standard’ language learning pathway provided to the majority of Australian learners who study from primary through to tertiary level. The “snap shots” do not take account of variations such as those afforded through immersion style programs or in-country study. They do, however, encapsulate what is the ‘norm’ for most Australian learners. The questions of whether the ‘norm’ is enough, and the extent to which this ‘norm’ provides, or should provide for proficiency potential, must be considered for future LOTE provision.
5.6 PROFICIENCY POTENTIAL AND THE FRAMEWORK: CONCLUSION

5.6.1 The Framework as an Audit Tool

The process of profiling LOTE programs and learners in relation to proficiency, by using the Proficiency Potential Framework, has enabled the development of a rich and comprehensive picture of LOTE as it is experienced in a variety of contexts and settings in Australia. In addition, it has also enabled the identification and exploration of factors, elements and conditions that impact on LOTE teaching and learning and that can either enhance or detract from the LOTE learning experience.

As a consequence of this process, and in the context of the case studies included in the research, it has been possible to;

❂ determine embedment status,
❂ describe deployment orientation and
❂ characterise communities of LOTE learners.

As a result of this profiling process it is the contention of the research team that in order to maximise proficiency potential, programs need to be embedded, have a deployment orientation and be able to support and honour the development of learner autonomy.

This contention is supported by the following examples taken from the case studies included in the research:

❂ Case Study I is a program where proficiency potential is compromised because negative and debilitating contextual factors preclude program embedment.
❂ Case Study F demonstrates that program embedment is no guarantee of a significant language deployment orientation.
❂ Case Study C serves as an example of a program that is both embedded and has a deployment orientation but where learners are not actively supported to become autonomous.
❂ Case Study V is a program whose orientation supports the attainment of proficiency and where the program is embedded, has a deployment orientation, and members of the learning community are either autonomous or in transition to autonomy.

In effect we have used the Proficiency Potential Framework to audit the case studies for their proficiency potential. It is the belief of the research team, however, that the Framework mechanism can have a more general application for the review of LOTE programs by jurisdictions, program coordinators and also LOTE teachers. The Framework can be a useful tool to ‘test’ programs for their ability to best provide for learners within their individual LOTE learning contexts.
5.6.2. Proficiency Potential and the Notions of Challenge and Support.

In concluding this chapter reference must be made to “challenge” and “support”. These notions emerge through profiling and data analysis, as being critical for “best” learners to learn effectively within programs able to be accurately described as “best” practice programs. To provide for the attainment of proficiency is in itself a challenge. To do it in a way that offers both challenge and support for learners and teachers involved in the process is an issue to be confronted by all educational jurisdictions. Chapter 5 has presented findings pertinent to this issue and additional areas will be explored in the proceeding chapters of this report.
APPLICATION OF THE FRAMEWORK – IMPLICATIONS FOR PATHWAYS

6.1 ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT PATHWAYS

In addition to being profiled for their proficiency potential, the “best practice” programs included in this research have been “tagged” according to their ‘pathway’ status. The arrows inserted in the Profiles ‘in summary’ (pp 81-84) indicate if, and how, programs fit into a LOTE learning sequence extending across different phases of learning. The arrows included in the Profiles ‘in summary’ are to be interpreted in the following way:

-  No clear pathway.
-  A clear learning pathway.
-  A clear learning pathway which supports the attainment of proficiency.

In this chapter the concept of ‘pathway’ will be explored in detail. Beliefs and assumptions about the nature and significance of ‘pathways’ for LOTE learning will be examined, and the ‘pathways’ as they have been tagged and plotted will be described. Assumptions and beliefs will then be ‘tested’ against the findings of the research and some conclusions will be drawn about ‘pathways’ and their relationship to the attainment of proficiency.

The Report of the National Enquiry into the Employment and Supply of Teachers of Languages Other than English entitled Languages at the Crossroads stated that,

Language learning is inherently sequential...In part because of this, language learning takes time...A condition of developing effective language teaching and learning programs is that they extend through primary and secondary education and that the two sectors of education must cooperate to achieve the desired ends (Nicholas et al. 1993: 175).

This report expresses the belief that pathways for language study that cross the different phases of school learning are essential for effective language learning and the attainment of proficiency. Similar sentiments, but with a specific emphasis on immersion programs, are expressed in the Rudd Report itself:

The working group considers that to achieve the desired high level proficiency outcomes, several years continuous immersion study is required...Programs commencing in primary school should be a minimum of four years duration and those commencing in secondary school should be a minimum of three years duration. A small number should commence in primary school and continue to the end of formal schooling (Rudd 1994: 126,127).
The research team too assumed that this notion of ‘continuous’ learning across the different phases was very important. We did, however, adopt the view that, in terms of investigating ideal language learning pathways, an interpretation of pathway that was rather broader than ‘continuous immersion study’, might well be useful. The inclusion of a wide variety of program types, operating through all the phases of learning, was seen as an optimum means of mapping ‘the current’ in order to determine the ‘could be’ of LOTE learning pathways to proficiency.

6.2 PROGRAM PROFILES AND PATHWAYS

The interview questions posed to principals and LOTE program coordinators, as part of the data collection phase for the compilation of the program profiles, elicited specific information relating to pre and post language learning pathways for learners in the “best practice” programs included in the research. Additional information about prior and post learning opportunities also emerged out of learner interviews as learners talked about what they could do, how they got to be able to do various things, and about what they wished to be able to do in the future. The compilation of this information allowed the research team to then “map” and “tag” each program for its capacity to provide a clear learning pathway for students.

The pathway “mapping” and “tagging” process yielded the following information:

❄ Even though the research team was investigating programs recommended as “best practice” programs, clear learning pathways were not always available for learners. Only 5 out of the 12 primary case studies, and 5 of the 12 secondary case studies, provided clear pathways for learners.

❄ That in only four case studies was a clear learning pathway, supporting the attainment of proficiency, identified.

❄ No primary or lower secondary programs featured pathways supporting the attainment of proficiency.

❄ In only one case study was there both a pre and post learning pathway supporting the attainment of proficiency (Case Study V).

The very obvious lack of provision for continuous, quality LOTE learning in Australia is both clearly depicted by the research, and staggering, given the assumptions made and the recommendations provided, through the 1993 and 1994 reports cited above. The research presents a real paucity of pathways for the school LOTE learners of Australia. This is a significant issue.

The question of the quality of the existing pathways also deserves to be explored more fully. Learner and teacher comments enabled a comprehensive overview of the opportunities and experiences offered to “best learners” within existing pathways. An analysis of this information has resulted in pathways being able to be described as neutral, negative or positive. Some characteristics of these different pathways are portrayed below.
6.2.1 Neutral Pathways

In answer to the question, “What can you do with your LOTE?” the following responses were recorded from students in a primary LOTE program:

Year 5 student
Say my name, describe people, count, tell the time, bargaining, sport, transport, money.

Year 6 student
Pretty much the same as them.

Year 7 student
That stuff – but we can do surfing too.

There are some gains and some differences reported by these three learners from different year groups and different classes. The variations, however, are barely perceptible. The researchers investigating this program were concerned that the learner responses were not, in fact, an accurate reflection of the experiences and knowledge of the students, but further questioning in the TL, together with the teacher interview, confirmed that the perceptions of the learners were indeed justified. In this particular program, this almost imperceptible language development and growth is the product of a deliberate teaching process. The LOTE teacher found that it was easier for him to plan collectively, according to whether learners were middle or upper primary, rather than to organise separately for the different year groups. The result was a sameness about the learning within a rather “neutral” learning pathway – and this sadly, within a school where the LOTE program was totally embedded and supported.

A different example of a neutral pathway is presented through the following learner comments:

I feel a bit held back because of the different levels.

I don’t like doing the easy stuff in a multi-grade class.

These students are members of a multi-age grouping class where the Year three, four and fives are all provided with exactly the same learning experiences regardless of previous language exposure. Learner comments suggest that the teacher, even though very experienced, is unable to accommodate the different learner levels. “Best learners” continued to enjoy the LOTE but they were very aware of this non-uniform class having to be uniform in their LOTE learning.

A third example comes from a program where the learning of different year levels is reflected through how many TL numbers they know.

Year 3
Count up to 10.

Year 4
Count to 20 – I would like to be able to count more.

Year 5
Count to 30.

In yet another program the learners reported using the same textbook in their first year of high school as they had for their primary LOTE learning. In fact, it appeared that the same textbook had been the basis of their program for at least four years of language study.
To have so many different neutral pathway scenarios emerging from the research suggests that LOTE learning, for many primary learners and also lower secondary learners, is a process where actual language acquisition is incredibly, but needlessly, slow. In each of the above examples learning is continuous over a number of years but the gains are few. What we see is LOTE learners running “in neutral” with many of them desperately wanting to be put “in gear” with the opportunity to move forward.

### 6.2.2 Negative Pathways

Whereas “neutral pathways” suggest either marking time, or some small movement forward, there are examples from the case studies of “negative pathways”. In these instances learners are “in reverse”.

- We went from minimal English in immersion classes to minimal Indonesian in Indonesian classes.
- I’ve lost a lot of confidence – you revert back to easy basic language.
- Going back to mainstream – we don’t put the language to use any more.
- We have the resources but we don’t use them enough.
- Writing has gone.

In a number of interviews, ex-immersion learners reflected on their prior learning experience. In the case of older learners they communicated a sense of being let down, and of ‘going backwards’ linguistically – *lost all the vocab I had before – about 30%*. They also expressed both anxiety and resentment about losing, not only language, but also confidence and self-esteem. They felt disappointed by there being no pathway for them, and their very articulate comments served to enforce the merit of Rudd Report Recommendation 5H.2 which states that,

> There should be provision for all students exiting immersion programs to continue their language study at advanced level (1994: 127).

With younger ex-immersion learners there was a slightly different sense. Their comments seemed to suggest that perhaps they had not yet necessarily appreciated the advantage that they had had. There was not so much a feeling of being ‘let down’ but rather one of the others now ‘catching up’. Whilst obviously not getting the language extension and expansion they deserved, these younger ex-immersion learners appeared to be considerably less devastated than their older counterparts.

Although particularly evident where immersion learners are “mainstreamed”, the concept of negative pathway is not exclusively an immersion phenomenon. A group of secondary students who had recently returned from a sojourn in a TL speaking community reported being *bored shitless* by their school language program.
6.2.3 Positive Pathways

Only a very few examples of “positive pathways” were forthcoming from the research and these were all associated with upper secondary and tertiary LOTE programs. At this level there appeared to be more preparedness to take account of previous experience and greater concern with the idea of providing meaningful learning experiences as opposed to “fun” or “well managed and controlled” experiences. Teachers talk about achievement and examinations. There is also an enhanced perception of the possible relationship between LOTE and life beyond formal education.

Our research findings suggest that the dominance of “neutral pathways” over “positive pathways” seriously compromises any intention of creating opportunities for the attainment of proficiency within the school system. In addition, the existence of “negative pathways” not only dissipates language learning but also erodes those attitudinal qualities that have emerged from the research, as being so significant in the proficiency potential equation.

6.3 PATHWAY AS CONTINUOUS LEARNING

The above findings give rise to the question of why continuous language learning pathways have been so spectacularly unsuccessful in the Australian context. Why has “flatline” learning through neutral pathways become characteristic of Australian language learning programs with proficiency remaining elusive at the vertex of some imagined continuous pathway? The research findings suggest three principal reasons for this phenomenon and these will be discussed in sections 6.3.1, 6.3.2 and 6.3.3.

6.3.1 The culture of ‘can’t’

It is the contention of the research team that the implementation of LOTE as a key learning area in Australian curricula has been accompanied by the development of a “culture of can’t”. Dimensions of the “culture of can’t” include:

- Can’t because it’s all too hard. It hasn’t been done in Australia before.
  
  ...but the curriculum is so bound up meeting all the different requirements, it was a major concession at the time for all the faculties to agree on the elective line. I still have to fight to get it up in the electives. (Comment from a deputy principal.)

- Can’t because it won’t be accepted.

  I wonder why we are doing this. Kids should be learning their own language first. There is enough to do without having them learn another language. (Comment from a generalist primary teacher)

- Can’t because it’s not relevant.

  ...not much use of the language outside the classroom...the population is too Anglicised. (Comment from a principal.)

  They think this is not an appropriate place to use Indonesian because it’s not normally used around here. (Comment from a LOTE teacher.)
Can’t because the students won’t understand if the teacher speaks in the LOTE.

*I aspire to use the target language all the time but I worry that the kids won’t accept it and will become confused.* (Comment from a secondary LOTE teacher.)

Can’t because we only have this much time so why bother.

*Teachers do the best they can with the time and resource constraints.* (Comment from a principal.)

*What can you do with two half hour sessions a week?* (Comment from a primary LOTE teacher.)

Can’t because Asian languages are too difficult.

*[Learners have to be] good overall… the ability to spend time memorising especially with characters.* (Comment from a teacher of Chinese.)

The implementation of LOTE as a key learning area has certainly required massive change. Accompanying this change has been the need to negotiate many complex and demanding issues. The difficulties associated with this process are certainly not undervalued or underestimated by the research team. What we wish to highlight, however, is that the “culture of can’t” which operates as an impediment to continuous, quality language learning, can be a reflection of mindset rather than of problem. That is not to say that mindsets are not problems but they should not be insurmountable. Expressions of ‘too hard’, ‘too difficult’ deserve to be examined carefully for their validity and then perhaps contrasted with the following learner comment:

*…the notion of being bilingual or trilingual in this school is nothing to get excited about.*

### 6.3.2 Recognition of Prior Learning

Prior learning is another aspect of LOTE implementation and the construction of learning pathways that deserves discussion. To acknowledge prior learning is to acknowledge the existence of a pathway. Unfortunately, the research suggests that all too frequently LOTE pathways have been overlooked and the previous knowledge and experience of learners, completely disregarded. “Best learners” are very aware of having their second language knowledge ignored:

*We just keep doing the same things over again each year… you know – greetings and things.*

*Bored out of my mind.*

*Environment, family, tourism – I think you do tourism every year.*

The issue of prior learning is also of concern for senior curriculum officers and teachers within the LOTE learning area:

*…like building on what kids have done before rather than going backwards and starting again which unfortunately is a feature of a lot of LOTE programs in our State at the moment – in Australia actually.*

*Therefore bloody carnivale or days of the week for nine years in a row becomes a bit hard to swallow by kids… and I know what my bloody name is, so I don’t need to tell you.*
The vehemence of the above comment is testament to the extent of the problem. So why is it that the acknowledgment of prior learning is such a difficulty in the area of LOTE? The previous discussion of negative and neutral pathways has explored some of the reasons but there are other factors at work.

Considerable evidence of programs being dominated by focused input has emerged from the research. There is also evidence of LOTE learning being constructed in some programs as repetition and rote rather than as complex and cognitive. The profiled case studies suggest that programs where these two characteristics are present have an increased potential for prior knowledge to be discounted. These particular orientations to LOTE learning work against the notion of language acquisition being cumulative and developmental and thus the significance of prior learning is diminished.

There is also the perception on the part of some teachers that what has been done before has not been done well enough. Whilst in terms of the output elements and language use, this may, in some instances, be a valid conclusion, it does not stop learners from feeling that they are doing it all again. The impact this then has on the ability of learners to want to do it all again deserves to be considered.

The research suggests, however, that to some extent, the sheer novelty of LOTE being a learning area extending across all the phases of learning is, of itself, the reason for failure to take account of prior learning. There is evidence from the case studies of secondary teachers using textbooks designed for beginning secondary language learners with students who are not beginners, and who have considerable primary background. One teacher's response was that's the text that was here when I came to the school.

Case Study W is an example where a number of the factors identified above have combined to obfuscate prior knowledge and work against the provision of a positive pathway. Case Study W is a most interesting case study because it presents a perfectly articulated pathway that provides only a limited proficiency orientation. A 'mini profile' of Case Study W is presented below:

Case Study W

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Embedded</th>
<th>Non-deployment orientation</th>
<th>Dependent Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle stage of a pathway for LOTE learning from primary to tertiary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused with a heavy topic and textbook emphasis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intake</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little evidence of consciousness about metacognition and metalanguage from either staff or learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Described by learners with significant and continuous language learning as being in association with topics like food, animals, shopping. TL usage is essentially confined to the classroom. Learners are able to describe sociolinguistic and sociocultural conventions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Majority of learners were dependent and did not present as confident users of either their L1 or their L2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Study W presents a picture of continuous language learning over many years resulting in limited output related to a small number of topic areas which appear to have been studied again and again. The learner group was uncritically accepting of both the pattern and the pathway.

Case Study V presents a very different picture. Again we have a perfectly articulated pathway but this time the pathway acknowledges and builds on prior learning and supports the attainment of proficiency. A ‘mini profile’ of Case Study V is presented below:

**Case Study V**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Embedded</th>
<th>Deployment orientation</th>
<th>Autonomous or Transition to being Autonomous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong>&lt;br&gt;LOTE focus is of long standing. Courses are designed to provide for a wide range of learners – beginners to background speakers&lt;br&gt;Very good relationship with local tertiary institution</td>
<td><strong>Output</strong>&lt;br&gt;Output of advanced learners is described in terms of dreaming/thinking in the language, perform plays, read novels, analyse poetry and tell jokes in the TL.</td>
<td><strong>Learners in this program tended to be autonomous or in transition to autonomy. In addition there is evidence of learners really thinking about what it means to be 'bi-culturally literate'.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input</strong>&lt;br&gt;Broad with language courses designed ‘in house’ to meet the needs of and acknowledge the prior learning of different learner cohorts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intake</strong>&lt;br&gt;Learners described as hard working with a ‘flair’ for languages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The learners interviewed from Case Study V were two school years ahead of those from Case Study W. In terms of their language ability, however, they were light years ahead. The profiles indicate a variety of reasons for this situation but significant among them is that the prior learning of the students of Case Study V was recognised and built upon.

*It’s the continuity. To have it is the key*

These were the words of a Case Study principal. The evidence suggests, however, that just because you have the key does not mean that the door will automatically open – you have to be able to turn the lock.

**6.3.3 The Critical Juncture Points**

Much of the previous discussion has been concerned with the issue of prior learning in contexts where there should have been a pathway. In this section the focus will change to examine the issue of critical juncture points. The transition from one phase of learning to the next and from one program type to another will be discussed.
A finding of the research is that the critical juncture points are critical issues. The evidence tells us that the transitions are not well managed and that this has a significant impact on the proficiency potential of programs and pathways. Section 6.2.2 presents the views of a number of learners for whom a critical juncture point between phases of learning has meant both a change in program type and movement into a negative pathway.

This is perhaps the most extreme example, but it is by no means the only situation were student learning and proficiency potential are compromised by poor management of the critical juncture points. Learners from the program described through Case Study F may find themselves in a ‘taster program’ of the LOTE they have been learning in primary school as they move into the local high school program. Learners in Case Study C do not yet know whether the local high school will accommodate and acknowledge their previous experiences.

But even when the disadvantage to learners appears to be less pronounced, the research indicates that a process of homogenisation takes place. Diverse experiences of language learning tend to be accommodated through teaching approaches designed for uniformity. Many teachers are discomforted by having to deal with diversity and many learners find acquiescence the easiest path. For proficiency potential the result can be dramatic. Critical juncture points translate to a reorientation towards mediocrity through enforced slow down or “plateauing” in the language acquisition process.

The question then is how best to manage the critical juncture points? The provision of a clear learning pathway may go some way to smoothing the interface between these critical juncture points but the pathway in itself, is no guarantee. The predominance of neutral pathways in our pathway profiles indicates that management of the critical juncture points is an issue for programs, teachers and learners as much, if not more, than for jurisdictions and districts.

LOTE teachers interviewed as part of the research process were asked to comment on changes that they would like to make to their programs and their teaching to enhance student learning.

Responses from teachers working in non-deployment orientation programs, with neutral or no clear learning pathways, were particularly interesting. A representative sample of their responses is presented below.

What we’re trying to embrace at the moment is IT [information technology], you know, much more emphasis on IT…

Nothing really. I would like to see more technology in the classroom.

Assessment. When I started I did the ‘end of unit test’ – now I assess their speaking.

More time – I would like more time.

The kids would be more confident and feel capable.

More collaboration would be good – especially for programs and assessment.

…two groups sitting in their own groups – really teaching two groups at once – one on revision, one on new material.

I’m trying to include a multiplicity of tasks – I’m trying it out.

Have some multilevel curriculum packages that I could swing in.
In only three responses was there any reference to improving provision for learners who come to their programs with different abilities and diverse prior language learning experiences. The noticeable absence of this as an obvious priority suggests that teachers need to be made more aware of the criticality of this issue, particularly at program juncture points. It also seems reasonable to conclude that professional development activities designed for LOTE teachers, focus on this area. Teachers need to be able to develop appropriate strategies for multilevel classes. They also need to know how to support their learners to become more independent and self-directed in their language learning. Attention to this area has the capacity to both smooth transition and provide better outcomes for second language learners.

The research shows that the continuous study of a LOTE, bridging the primary and secondary phases of learning, has not been the success that was predicted. Pathways for continuous learning have been largely ineffective. The reasons for this are encapsulated in the different dimensions of the “culture of can’t”, failure to acknowledge and build upon prior language learning, and the poor management of critical juncture points. This failure has, to an extent, tarnished the image of LOTE as a key learning area and reduced its credibility as a vehicle for the provision of language proficiency. Whilst this reality deserves to be acknowledged, perhaps the words of a senior curriculum officer for LOTE in one of Australia’s educational jurisdictions also deserve to be considered:

I believe we need to look at the way that the education system as a whole manages those critical juncture points in the learning of students, because I don’t believe that the notion of dismissing prior learning is only prevalent in languages. I think it is equally applicable to Maths as it is to English, as it is to Technology – whatever. So there is some cultural shift that needs to occur.

For the area of Languages Other Than English this notion of ‘cultural shift’ needs to incorporate a view of effective LOTE teaching and learning that goes beyond the concept of continuous. Language learning needs to be cumulative and it is this notion that shall be explored in the following section.
6.4 PATHWAY AS CUMULATIVE LEARNING

I did it for three years in primary school but it wasn’t really learning.

For this student continuous learning did not equate with cumulative learning. In fact, she was not even prepared to recognise her experience as ‘learning’ at all. So what then is the nature of cumulative LOTE learning? Does it have to be continuous and sequential and how does it relate to the development of a pathway to language proficiency?

Themes, topics, words, games, role-play are all ways used by interviewees, both teachers and learners, to describe LOTE learning. Another theme or topic and more words, games and role-plays are also presented as means through which LOTE learning is extended or continued. Classroom second language learning through this type of approach often, however, does not mean cumulative language learning. The successive additions presented through this approach may not provide language users ‘with the ability, or capacity, to create and interpret discourse’ (Bachman and Palmer 1996: 67). Opportunities also may not be forthcoming for learners to further develop and extend the interim systems they construct in the process of acquiring a second language (Ellis 1997: 140). For language learning to be cumulative, language use must be in these terms and be inclusive of all the output elements.

Classroom language learning can provide for cumulative language development, (as is evidenced by deployment orientation as recorded in the profiles), but there are other avenues for second language acquisition (for example in-country study), where the experiences can be cumulative but not necessarily classroom based. Any notion of “pathway as cumulative learning” must therefore accommodate beyond classroom experiences that are not necessarily bound to a notion of linear progression through the phases of learning.

6.4.1 Individual Profiles and Pathways

In order further to explore this broader notion of pathway and cumulative learning, a number of individual case studies were constructed. Three language learners have been profiled. All three learners are now proficient language users with language skills at interpreting and translating level. They have been profiled in order to track and contrast their language learning experiences as a means of providing information about the extent to which language learning has to be continuous and sequential. All three learners studied in-country. They came to their in-country course through different pathways and were in their early 20s when they studied together in Indonesia.

Learner S

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Qualities:</td>
<td>Quiet and very conscious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior language learning experiences:</td>
<td>5 years of high school learning with excellent results in university entrance language examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 semesters of very successful university study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learner M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Qualities:</td>
<td>Outgoing and gregarious. Reasonably conscientious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior language learning experiences:</td>
<td>No school language learning. 4 semesters of very successful university study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learner Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal Qualities:</td>
<td>Adaptable but not overly gregarious. Study motivated by wanting to know rather than by wanting to do well academically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior language learning experiences:</td>
<td>No high school learning. No university study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information provided above shows us that Learner S had six and a half years more language learning than Learner Y did, and four and a half years more language learning than that of Learner M. According to Learner M, however, at the conclusion of their in-country program, Learner Y’s ability to speak and listen was incredible – It utterly surpassed our ability. In comparing herself with Learner S, Learner M stated that she has a broader vocabulary but there isn’t much of a difference apart from that.

Whilst these comments are not intended to provide a detailed analysis of the ability of these three learners to deploy their Indonesian language knowledge through the output elements, it is clear that Learner S’s school language learning experiences counted for little in terms of the attainment of language proficiency. All of those years of very successful school study seemed to have benefited Learner S only to the extent of accelerating her to the point where she went to Indonesia in her second year of university study and not in her third.

The experience of Learner S against those of Learner M and Learner Y brings into contention the assumption that continuous language learning over many years of schooling facilitates the attainment of proficiency. In the light of the experiences of these three learners one could, in fact, be forgiven for wondering about the benefits of long-term school study of LOTE. How are school language learners advantaged, what second language knowledge do they gain and exactly what is valued in formal study contexts?

I had learnt a fair bit of theory which was interesting but remained fairly meaningless.

[In-country experience] consolidated the language.

Standard Indonesian was easy. The not so standard were difficult…acronyms were a continual source of problems.

Only formal before.

Patterns already formed from the classroom and no way to break them.

Respond to prompted questions in familiar areas and initiate questions and statements in familiar areas and I could piece together enough information to say meaningful things in non-familiar areas – a little.
These responses from Learner M and Learner S give us some insight into the language knowledge that they brought to Indonesia from their formal learning contexts – predictable language use, language as theory, formal language use and patterns that had become habits that were not necessarily advantageous.

Learners S and M perceived a continuous and sequential classroom based learning pathway to have only limited proficiency potential. Improvement related much more to situated learning rather than classroom learning. They saw classrooms as very contained learning environments that limited the capacity for language learning to be cumulative. In contrast, their 'beyond the classroom' situation afforded the opportunity for language learning to be expansive, and inclusive of scope for rapid cumulative learning.

But why was Learner Y ultimately so much more fluent, and how was it that he was able to develop his proficiency so quickly?

He was very comfortable in Indonesian cultural space and people space endlessly.

Not shy but not outgoing – he is someone who slips between the gaps – if there is a space he slots into it. He wouldn't see any problem with environment – any environment we were in he would slip into it.

He wanted to do it and a lot of us needed to think back into our own cultural defences – he didn’t.

To compare these remarks about Learner Y with autonomous learners as described in Section 4.5.2 suggests that it was Learner Y's autonomy that enabled him to take full advantage of the opportunity presented for expansive and quick cumulative learning.

The experiences of these three individual learners serves to reinforce the notion that the attainment of proficiency is not so much about the provision of time and continuity but it is about the provision and utilisation of opportunity. A variety of situations and circumstances have been documented through this research, all with different capacities to either support or detract from a proficiency orientation. How the learners, themselves are able to utilise these situations, and the personal attributes that they bring to their circumstances, impacts on proficiency potential and the capacity for cumulative learning.
6.5 REDEFINING ‘PATHWAY’

An orthodoxy has developed which suggests that learning a language for a long period of time and starting when you are very young will result in proficiency. Our research challenges this orthodoxy. The evidence from this research project does not support the notion of continuous learning through the different phases of learning, as being an efficient and effective pathway to proficiency. The research suggests a different notion of pathway – pathway as cumulative learning rather than continuous learning. In this chapter in-country study has been identified as one mechanism for effective cumulative second language learning. There are others. Through the research process, a number of positive avenues/events/interferences in the second language learning process have been identified. It is the contention of the research team that, within the total educational experience, these events or interventions seem to have the capacity to significantly enhance proficiency potential. It may be that cumulative learning towards proficiency can better be provided through coordinated, well-organised utilisation of these intervention and enhancement elements than through continuous learning from the early years of schooling.

The intervention and enhancement elements will be the subject of Part Three of this report. Their utilisation as specific events and strategies in the teaching and learning of LOTE within the Australian context will be examined. Prior to that discussion, however, it is appropriate to turn again to the program and learner profiles. Chapter Six has documented the general ineffectiveness of existing pathways for continuous second language learning here in Australia. The program and learner profiles provide perceptions and evidence pertaining to quality LOTE teaching and learning. This information will be discussed in Chapter Seven and may serve to strengthen and improve LOTE’s existing continuous pathways.
THE PROFILES AND THE TEACHING AND LEARNING OF LOTE

7.1 QUALITY SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHING AND LEARNING

Envisioning a future with 2 per cent of Australian school LOTE learners becoming proficient users of a second language is the notion that inspired the Pathways to Proficiency research project. In addition to envisioning, however, this project deals with enacting. The research data are rich in information about teaching and learning. Teacher and learner comments provide insights into how all involved in the teaching/learning process see their roles – how both teachers and learners understand and think about teachers and teaching and about learners and learning.

The information derived from the project therefore enables comment on the issue of quality second language teaching and learning. It is not, however, the intention of this chapter to provide some sort of definitive analysis of, and prescription for, quality second/foreign language teaching and learning practice. The intention behind the chapter is to use the research to highlight critical issues associated with language teaching and learning. These issues have emerged from the research – from interviews, from observation and from documentation. The discussion in this chapter is informed by a process of critical reflection on the part of all those involved in the research. Teachers and learners have exposed so much of themselves, their practices and their beliefs through the research, that collectively their responses provide significant insights into what makes for quality language learning outcomes and enhanced proficiency potential.

This chapter uses the research to talk about the criticality of the teacher and the teaching processes applied in classroom contexts. The focus then moves to learners and learning in order to present an overview of significant issues associated with promoting and supporting quality second language teaching and learning in Australian LOTE classrooms.

7.2 THE CRITICALITY OF THE TEACHER

I believe that the best LOTE programs are those with the best LOTE teachers. It doesn't matter what the program type is, it doesn't matter how much effort or work has gone into establishing the program, it really depends on the quality of the teacher. The quality of the teacher is about their proficiency in the language and their ability to teach.

Senior Curriculum Officer for LOTE

...so you know, its just liking kids and being enthusiastic and knowing your subject matter and wanting to convey that to the kids. I mean what I want to do is actually, you know, instil in the kids the love for learning and the love for learning languages and that's really sort of our mission in a way.

LOTE Program Coordinator

Being a good teacher is much more important than being a native speaker.

Year 10 LOTE student
It depends on how the teachers make you feel…like are you comfortable…If they muck around and stuff then you feel like it’s easier to have a go and it doesn’t matter if you make mistakes.
Year 8 LOTE student

She really got into all the stuff she did and she got us all pumped up.
Year 6 LOTE student.

These remarks articulate many of the different dimensions encompassed in being a “good” LOTE teacher. Language proficiency, teaching ability, enthusiasm and commitment, and the capacity to make learners feel inspired by, and comfortable with the experience of language learning, are all qualities able to contribute to “good” teaching and a proclivity for learners to learn.

Through the research we had access to a pool of teachers in possession of many different qualities and knowledges and who had a raft of different experiences with, and perceptions of, language teaching and learning. We also had access to their learners and to their experiences and perceptions. In combination, teachers and “best learners” from “best practice” programs support the contention that critical to the success of any classroom based language learning program, is the teacher. In Section 7.2, this issue of teacher criticality will be explored within the context of the findings of the research project.

7.2.1 Teacher Knowledge

Considerable confusion and debate surround the use of the term ‘teacher knowledge’ in conjunction with the teaching of second or foreign languages. It is not our intention to contribute to that debate in this volume. Instead, in examining the criticality of “good” teachers, a conceptualisation of language teacher knowledge as the intersection of multiple knowledges is assumed. In view of the research methodology and its findings, however, two areas of that knowledge – experiential and relational – deserve to be highlighted.

‘Experiential knowledge’ relates to the teaching professional’s ongoing experience (Wallace 1991: 17). This research required the contribution of this knowledge, through interview, reflection and in some instances, through what could almost be described as teacher narrative. The accumulated and considered experiential knowledge of the many teachers involved in this research has been a very valuable source of information about what teachers value about themselves and their teaching, and what they consider should be valued by their learners.

We do lots of reading…Noddy, Asterix, books written myself…basal reader type books.
I want the students to like the class – that’s the most important thing.
We have four different tests each term – one for each of the macros.
Writing exercises – they need words and sentence structure.
They need to work very hard – that is the only way they will succeed.

These teacher comments suggest the imprint of memories derived from the teachers’ own learning experiences. They imply a transposition of values from previous role and context to one that is different. They suggest that the experiential knowledge of teachers is sometimes dominated by earlier rather than ongoing experience. The research team feels that this is an accurate reflection of the role of teacher experiential knowledge in some of the case studies included in the research.

10. A comprehensive treatment of this issue is provided by Simpson Norris International in their 1999 report prepared for the NALSAS Taskforce. The report is entitled Language Teacher Proficiency or Teacher Language Proficiency? An Environmental Scan of Information Relating to the Competencies / Qualities / Knowledges Required to be an Effective Language Teacher.
In these instances there was a conservatism about the programs that worked against the elements described in the Proficiency Potential Framework and the attainment of proficiency.

By ‘relational knowledge’ Webb and Blond mean ‘the interaction of the knowledge of two persons that happens when they are in-relation…the interdependence of teachers and students in learning…together in a special relationship in learning’ (1995: 614). They go on to talk about teacher knowledge as ‘dynamic and interactive with the knowing of students with whom the teacher is in-relation’ (p 624). The importance of ‘knowing in-relation’ to providing an environment supportive of language acquisition is strongly reflected through the research.

I want to take him [the teacher] with me [a primary student moving into a secondary program].

In French, we have a totally French environment. The best bit is at the end of the class, when the teacher just chats to us [in the TL].

I did a translation job in X for my teacher because he couldn’t do it. It’s great for other people to have faith in you.

Relational knowledge has shown itself, through the research, to have significant consequences both for student learning and also for teacher development. The data suggest, however, that in some instances these consequences are negative because the relational aspect is not always considered – sacrificed instead to such things as the syllabus, to a transmission model of language teaching, or simply to a lack of appreciation of its significance.

We don’t have the time to do the fun things they did in primary school.

Quick to grasp what you have said and they retain the knowledge.

Why interview students?

Through the area of relational knowledge we have also been able to identify areas of discordance between that which is espoused or imagined by teachers, and that which is perceived by others, particularly students, with whom they are ‘in-relation’. The teacher at one school believed that students valued and wanted to be able to,

…write books, to write poetry, to present plays, to sing, to dance, to join in national competitions…

But the learners emphasised a desire to,

Speak

…confidently have a conversation.

Many such incidents were encountered during the research. Expectations, interests or perceptions of teachers and their learners often seemed to lack congruence.

Knowledge ‘in-relation’ also emerged as problematic in the area of recording and reporting the outcomes of student second language learning. One teacher confidently spoke of the heavy emphasis he had on oral communication skills within his program and yet the report form had ‘speaking’ attracting 30 per cent of the final assessment. In other programs there were instances where language learning outcomes were not reported on at all and learner output was described by phrases like,

…is a pleasant, hardworking student who is a pleasure to teach.
Relational knowledge is not an expression of what is right or wrong. It is about being aware, and being able to reconstruct both knowledge and relationships through a process of continuing awareness and reflection. The experience of our knowledge ‘in-relation’ to the teachers that we interviewed through the research process reinforced, for us, the importance of knowing and experiencing ‘in-relation’ for providing a language learning environment able to nurture proficiency.

The revelation and explication of their experiential and relational knowledge has been the process through which teachers, involved in this research, have highlighted the qualities, the knowledges and the skills they consider to be required for “successful” LOTE teaching. By sharing with the research team what they know about teaching language, together with the ways in which they acquired that knowledge, the teachers themselves have generated an image of practice – warts and all. Again the criticality of the teacher is highlighted, but so too is the need for the development of a practice where teaching is for cumulative learning, and where the context is multi-level classes in which learner success will, to a large extent, be determined by teacher and learner knowledge ‘in-relation’.

7.2.2 Teaching for Cumulative Learning in Multi-level Contexts

Senior Curriculum officer for LOTE

It’s not good in multi-level classes because the teacher spends too much time telling kids off and you just sit there waiting for the others to catch up or you are just told to go and read stuff.
Year 10 student

In classes where everyone is at the same level and wants to learn it’s easier.
Year 11 student

Jurisdictional curriculum officers, learners and some LOTE teachers are very aware of the limitations imposed on proficiency potential through learning environments that are not supportive of cumulative, multi-level learning. The research suggests the need for a wider application of a pedagogy that encourages interaction and collaboration between learners who are then enabled to maximise opportunities for target language usage in large class contexts. Discussed below are a number of areas that relate to the development and actualisation of such pedagogy.

The utilisation of a teaching methodology that maximises speaking turns and interactional opportunities for learners.

Most researchers in the field of second language acquisition recognise classroom interaction as having the potential to create opportunities for second language acquisition.

Many teachers, however, are unsure of how to maximise this potential within their own classrooms. Classroom language development involves second language acquisition processes and classroom interactions (Ellis 1988). Teachers need to be comfortable with both of these dimensions. The research suggests that many teachers are not. Limited responses to questions
associated with language acquisition processes imply that asking teachers to juggle acquisition and interaction within standard teaching paradigms, that are often dominated by classroom management, is a big ask. Teachers traditionally use language to control communication not necessarily to spawn it. Norms of participation have tended to be established by teachers and often for management purposes. Learners are then required to ‘fit their communicative behaviour into the structure of classroom events’ (Johnson 1995: 39). The ways in which teachers use language to control patterns of classroom communication and behaviour are both intended and unforeseen. The consequence, however, is that teachers shape the ways in which learners communicate and participate in classroom activities and that often these ways do not support acquisition and the attainment of proficiency.

An increasing number of studies are being undertaken in the area of classroom second language development. From studies conducted to date, it is possible to list a number of findings that impact specifically on the ability to create a classroom and communication environment where opportunities for learner TL interaction can be maximised. Studies conducted in formal classroom settings reveal that:

- The style of teacher talk differs from genuine communication used in the real world – more of a transmission model than a communicative model – more statements than questions, more display than referential questions, more ‘here and now’ topics, more comprehension checks than clarification checks (Allwright & Bailey 1991: 141).
- Little extended talk occurs in language classes and only a narrow range of speech acts are used (Ellis 1992: 20).
- Teacher question types result in reduced opportunities for sustained interaction (Long & Sato 1983: 283).
- Classroom learners tend to have errors corrected formally rather than as a procedural device in the construction of discourse (Ellis 1988: 214).

The environment of classroom language learning does not give classroom learners the same opportunities that exist in normal language use environments to create and interpret discourse. It is therefore incumbent upon LOTE teachers to manufacture an environment that can at least enhance real and meaningful interactional opportunities. The use of target language, collaborative learning strategies and self-access and self-directed learning are recommended.

**TL usage in LOTE classrooms**

Without input learners cannot output. Extensive reference has already been made in this report to the need for learners to have exposure to ‘broad input’ and for them to be given opportunities to develop and work with all of the output elements. Classroom target language use, however, deserves additional comment.

Now we hope in all our LOTE Programs the teachers are teaching in and through the language but we know that doesn’t always happen, so I think that is really fairly key and the methodology that they use are critical.

Senior Curriculum Officer for LOTE

The research team found that in programs where there was no, or limited, proficiency orientation, target language use by teachers and learners was also often very limited.
Some teachers do – some don’t… We want the teachers to use it – we’re not phased by it.

This comment from a Year 8 learner is interesting because she expresses a notion that we heard often. “Best” learners actually crave opportunities to use language. They want to be able to understand when they [fluent speakers] talk and be able to confidently have a conversation. Learners talked a great deal about wanting to really be able to use the language. It seems, however, that in many programs with a non-deployment orientation language teaching is a process of teaching ‘about’ the language rather than actually teaching it. In primary schools particularly, learners often had very limited access to ‘natural’ and conceptually complete text and they were even more limited in opportunities to output the target language.

Conversations with “best” learners, about maximising target language use within classroom contexts, highlighted the following:

❂ The need for teachers to use ‘real’ language spoken at normal speed. Learners talked about teachers talking too slowly, or of them having to listen to tapes that were too slow, and as a result they were not used to hearing them [native speakers] talk…they talk too fast.

❂ The need for learners to have opportunities to put the words together. Older primary learners particularly were acutely aware of this often not being a characteristic of their language leaning program.

❂ Learners were very often not given the opportunity to ‘redraft’ their oral work and they would really like to be able to do this in order to be able to develop their skills.

❂ Learners want more access to expert speakers of their LOTE. Regardless of how they felt about their own teacher, “best” LOTE learners talked about wanting to have opportunities to communicate with other speakers of the LOTE. They were particularly keen to have opportunities to do this within the classroom context.

Target language usage is a critical determinant for deployment orientation. Learners want the TL to be used in class, and they need the TL to be used if there is to be any potential for the attainment of proficiency.

Collaborative Learning

In Section 5.5 of this report, a “snap shot” of lower secondary classrooms revealed them to be characterised by a focus on the more quiet aspects of language production. Learner comments were at times quite scathing about the lack of opportunities provided for TL talk.

The research data indicate that collaborative learning, within large class contexts is not the norm. Vygotskian theory and second language acquisition theory suggest however, that it should be. If we accept that learning occurs naturally and effectively in collaborative, dialogic interaction with others – peers as well as adults or experts (Vygotsky 1987), and if we accept that interaction and the negotiation of meaning facilitate language acquisition (cf. Long 1980, Ellis 1997), then collaborative learning deserves to become an everyday manner of learning in LOTE classrooms.

This is not the forum for a detailed discussion of collaborative learning strategies. Suffice it to say, that in order for learners to be given maximum opportunity to interact with, and through the target language, collaborative, and learning centred principles need to be espoused and practised in second language classrooms. This will necessitate support for both teachers and learners in order that they become comfortable with language learning facilitated in this way.
Self-Access Learning

The difficulties posed by the “multilevelness” of many LOTE classrooms have already been discussed in this report (Section 6.3.3). There is a very clear need for teacher professional development to address this area to provide for cumulative learning for all learners, and to break from the pattern of homogenisation that exists at present.

The promotion of self-access access learning is an important consideration in this area. As a manifestation of the development of “self-directness”, teaching for self-access learning becomes even more important. There was really very little evidence of this in the research. There is some evidence of computer enhanced language learning (CELL) having a significant role to play:

I think that CELL [computer enhanced language learning] enables the students to work at their own pace at their own level. It can extend some students, it can provide remedial assistance for other students as well and that really caters for the individual differences of students which I think when you do have bigger classes it is really hard, even though we have 50 minute lessons which is long enough to get around and see how well every single student is going…

But beyond CELL the researchers encountered little by way of classroom arrangements or strategies designed to facilitate self-access learning in large class contexts.

Consideration needs to be given to ways of setting up and managing multiple activities and multiple tasks within a single classroom. The use of different learning stations within whole class contexts deserves to be promoted. Learning stations can be an effective way of enabling learner collaboration and cooperation. They also provide opportunities for TL interaction and for managing learning that can be either focused on a particular language mode or that demands inter-mode language use. The classroom with one group of learners watching a TL cartoon or soapie in one corner with another group working on a role-play, another group sending a TL email and yet another group engaged in a shared reading task, is all too uncommon.

Self-access and multilevel learning can also be accommodated through task design. It seemed to the researchers that there was very little evidence of multi-level tasking in the programs investigated. The use of authentic or genuine text and the development of multilevel tasks to accompany the texts are ways of enabling learners, with different experiences and at different interlanguage levels, to work for individual enhancement in terms of output. Multi-level tasking, however, is not just about requiring ‘better’ learners to do more. It is about enabling learners to access, decode and make meaning from text at their own level, and its about engaging learners in negotiation tasks which demand ‘pushed output’ (Doughty and Williams 1998: p238). Long and Robinson (1998), state that task design should enable the exploitation of ‘opportunities that arise naturally from the interaction of learners and tasks’ (p23). Task design is therefore a complex process demanding the intersection of multiple knowledges associated with second language acquisition theory, genre theory, collaborative learning, curriculum design and, of course, TL knowledge. It is a process that requires teachers to go beyond the standard offerings provided by LOTE textbooks and asks much of them in terms of time, commitment and understanding. Again, this is an area where the researchers felt that teachers needed support, as it seems currently to be at the fringes of teachers’ work, rather than a focus.

Collaborative, self-access learning in classrooms where naturalistic TL usage predominates was pinpointed by the research as an area of need in order to support cumulative learning in multi-
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level classrooms. For speaking turns and interactional opportunities to be maximised, however, the learning environment must also be conducive to learners wanting to learn. In the words of one LOTE teacher,

*It doesn’t matter how big or small the class is, or how much confidence you have or they have, it depends on the dynamics of the class…it is your job as the teacher to encourage and nurture the appropriate atmosphere and environment.*

**Taking learners beyond the technical considerations**

An additional area identified by the research team relates to evidence of a LOTE pedagogy that is often dominated by “technical considerations”. The research suggests that proficiency potential in some LOTE programs is being compromised by a concentration on the “operational” side of second language learning which can tend to take precedence over the “cultural” and “critical” aspects of L2 acquisition. Such pedagogy distorts the balance of language and limits the ability of learners to deploy and develop all the output elements.

**Appropriacy and balance – language modes, text types, register, topic areas**

L2 teaching and learning often seemed, to the research team, to have the effect of compartmentalising elements of the target language into operational units. Many of these “compartments” have already been identified – the compartment of word learning in primary contexts, the compartment for writing in lower secondary, the thematic compartment, the grammar compartment or the culture compartment. There seems to be a need for language to be appreciated, in one sense more holistically, but in another as a communication tool that is used in different ways for different purposes. There was a very strong sense from the interviews that many learners did not conceive of “language” in this way. It is the contention of the research team that issues of appropriacy and balance in terms of use and purpose of the different language modes, or combinations of modes, in relation to text type and register deserve to be more clearly defined through curriculum design and implementation.

Interestingly, several teachers commented that their efforts to be holistic and thorough in their language teaching were compromised by assessment. One teacher stated that,

*I feel probably one of the big negatives of teaching languages at the moment is the amount of assessment we have to do. I believe that students could become even more proficient if we had more time to deal with the day to day of teaching rather than having a program interrupted so often by assessment.*

There is certainly evidence to support this view, not only in terms of the time involved, but also as a result of the mechanisms used. Very many reports highlighted this operational and compartmentalised approach. Two such samples are presented below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria specified in a primary LOTE report</th>
<th>Criteria specified in a secondary LOTE report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Uses words and some phrases. Partakes in cultural activities. | • Aural  
• Oral  
• Reading  
• Writing  
• Culture |
The compartmentalisation of specific aspects of language appears to be common practice within different program types, at different phases of learning and for a variety of reasons aligned with how curriculum is conceived, constructed, enacted and reported. Questions about appropriacy and balance do perhaps need to be asked more frequently in order to support learners to develop proficiency rather than competence in particular aspects of language use.

**Cultural and Critical as well as Operational**

*I think you need to have been to the country so that you have a window into someone else’s perception so that they really can understand how the language works because you can’t separate culture from language and really you can’t just get it from learning yourself in an isolated area.*

This student has quite accurately perceived that you cannot separate culture from language and yet this is precisely what continues to happen in many classrooms. In a large number of the primary programs investigated culture was expressed through the “F words” – food, festivals and folktales – and target language speakers were portrayed through stereotypical, quaint and very non-contemporary images. This was particularly true for the Asian languages. Origami, gamelan, kimono – are the ways through which many of our primary learners ‘know’ the cultures of Asia.

It seemed to the research team that there were several reasons for this. In the first instance it is a reflection of how language has ‘always’ been taught. You ‘always’ learn about traditions, music, food and the like. It seems also that teachers connect traditions to performance and to actions, like singing, cooking and making. The third reason that became apparent is that culture is one of the casualties of the efforts on the parts of the jurisdictions to train and provide teachers, particularly of primary LOTEs. Many of these teachers can’t get beyond the “F words” because they don’t yet have the knowledge to be able to do so. Both primary principals and primary LOTE teachers passed remarks about still studying during interviews in which teacher attributes were discussed.

The cultural dimension of L2 literacy acquisition also appears, in a different sense, to be problematic in primary immersion programs. Even though, as the coordinator of one primary immersion program said,* native speaker teachers give you the whole cultural environment of the language because everything they do is culturally appropriate,* both teachers and students expressed a desire for the inclusion of culture in a more overt way.

*I would like to learn more about Japan.*

A learner

*We haven’t really got the time to do more on culture.*

A teacher

Certainly immersion programs reduce the risk of other languages and cultures being trivialised. It would appear however that culture through language, and balance with regard to culture and the other output elements, is an issue for primary language programs.

Cultural and critical L2 literacy appears to be better addressed in the senior secondary and tertiary phases of learning but learners still comment on wanting more:

*I can read a book in French and understand it even if I can’t get the grammar…but we have to understand the deeper meaning.*
Hands on current affairs stuff. Japan is always in the news. It makes Japan relevant.

I would try to immerse myself in as much culture as possible.

Learn more about Japan as a country.

The evidence from the research suggests that in-country experience is the domain for the development of cultural literacy for Australian LOTE learners. The question to be asked is if this is entirely appropriate? Whilst acknowledging in-country experience as the most obvious way of addressing the cultural output element, the question still remains as to whether enough is done in terms of cultural and critical literacy within classrooms, or whether the operational focus precludes attention to other significant aspects of second language literacy.

**Ability to work in different program configurations**

The discussion in this chapter has been directed towards highlighting issues, emerging from the research, that are associated with teaching for cumulative learning, particularly in multi-level contexts. The criticality of who the person is who is doing the teaching has been well established. How this relates to different program types, and diverse teaching and learning contexts, is the next focus.

The researchers would contend that the pedagogy described in this chapter is applicable in all classroom language learning contexts and that it is inclusive of both background or native speaking teachers, and non-background speaking teachers. In an ideal world LOTE teachers would be as comfortable in a primary program as they would in an upper secondary immersion program. The world of course, is not ideal and as a result there are implications for some program types that deserve further elaboration.

The previous discussion of culture illuminated a number of issues. It is of concern that the linguistic knowledge (including sociolinguistic and sociocultural knowledge) of a number of the teachers interviewed for the research was acknowledged by them as being less than desirable. Equally, the teaching skills of some of the native speaker teachers working in the “best practice” programs was, on occasions, brought under scrutiny during interviews. Again the question of balance surfaces. There is evidence from the research of teacher language proficiency being both beneficial and detrimental to the learning of students. The profiling process suggests that in some instances increased language proficiency on the part of the teacher would have had the potential to positively influence the program deployment orientation. There is also evidence that being a native speaker is not necessarily enough to guarantee deployment orientation and provide support for language learners. Information gathered through the research process points to the need for background speaker teachers, particularly of Asian languages, to feel comfortable with the aspects of pedagogy described in this chapter. This appeared to be particularly significant in immersion programs where the issue was compounded by the requirement for learners to be provided with input that was linguistically accessible yet cognitively appropriate for the age of the learners.
7.2.3 Conclusion

This research has identified a whole range of factors that impact on proficiency potential and pathway orientation. This section has examined one of those factors – the teacher. Who the teacher is, and what knowledges, skills, attributes he/she brings to any formal LOTE learning context has been shown to influence the nature of the LOTE learning experience and the quality of learning outcomes. Within this section and, in light of the evidence from the research, a number of issues related to teacher knowledge and LOTE pedagogy have been discussed from the perspective of facilitating cumulative rather than merely continuous learning within Australian classrooms. In Section 7.3 another significant factor will be investigated – the learner.

7.3 ACKNOWLEDGING THE LEARNER

I love the idea of communicating.

Learning a language is cool – it makes you feel good, special, you get to connect with other people.

Learner attitudes and perceptions about learning, together with what they bring to second language classrooms, and how they think, talk, act and interact in and beyond those classrooms, contribute significantly to the dynamics of communication and learning in the second language acquisition experience.

The role of the learner, and the attributes that the learner brings to, and uses in, acquiring language is sometimes overshadowed by other factors associated with the teaching and learning experience. In this section the focus will be on the learner. The learner's role in learning for the attainment of proficiency will be acknowledged. How teachers can best support the efforts of the learner as they endeavour to do this will also be examined.

In acknowledging ‘the learner’ it must be said that their perceptions, insights and attributes contributed greatly to the richness of the data collected during the research phase for this project. Australia’s “best learners” have had a great deal to say about language teaching and learning, and what they have said has been both informative and incisive.

7.3.1 Learner Knowledge

In Section 7.2 Webb and Blond’s (1995) construction of teacher knowledge as relational knowledge was discussed. In talking about relational knowledge they say ‘What is radical about this view is that an individual’s knowledge is no longer conceived of as bounded and separate from the knowing of the other person’s (with whom they are in relation)’ (p624). Webb and Blond describe knowledge as ‘dynamic, constructed and being reconstructed’ (p 624). Teachers’ learners must therefore be seen as being critical to this process of knowledge construction. The process must also be seen as being just as much then about ‘learner knowledge’ as it is about ‘teacher knowledge’.

In talking about ‘learner knowledge’ we have drawn on the research data to identify key areas associated with what learners have, and what they bring to their relationship with their teacher. Significant amongst these are the elements of learners’ developing second language knowledge (interlanguage), personal and attitudinal characteristics, and their disposition towards autonomy. Learner autonomy is an integral part of the Proficiency Potential Framework and attitudinal and
metacognitive dimensions, and attitudinal and metalinguistic dimensions have been identified, in this research, as very much a part of the language intake to output process and thus, the evolution of learner interlanguage as part of language acquisition and towards the development of proficiency.

**Interlanguage**

In describing why he moved from being teacher to second language acquisition researcher Rod Ellis has had this to say:

> This made me aware that the learner had his own way of doing things which could not easily be subverted by teaching…I still conceived of teaching as the transmission of linguistic knowledge (Ellis 1988: vii).

Ellis’ notion of subverting by teaching is an interesting one and it strengthens the need for the recognition of what learners know about learning, and how they acquire that knowledge, to be both acknowledged and fostered in second language teaching and learning. Ellis was being confounded by the clash between what he was doing to his learners and how they themselves were evolving their own language knowledge. There is evidence from the research that this clash is not an uncommon phenomenon. Teacher interviews revealed that the ‘transmission of linguistic knowledge’ model continues to be apparent within the teaching of LOTE in Australian jurisdictions and that this manifestation of the language teaching process, can be frustrating for “best learners”. Acknowledgment of interlanguage as a reflection of each individual’s language development and of each learner’s own efforts to progress that development, seem to be important. Spada and Lightbown (1993), describe interlanguage as follows:

> It may have characteristics of the learner’s native language, characteristics of the second language, and some characteristics which seem to be very general and tend to occur in all or most interlanguage systems. Interlanguages are systematic, but they are dynamic, continually evolving as learners receive more input and revise their hypotheses about the second language. (p 122-3).

The above definition highlights the dynamic and evolutionary characteristics of interlanguage as well as how interlanguage development positions both learner and teacher in the process. Awareness and acknowledgment of this has the potential to enhance the teaching and learning of languages for all those ‘in-relation’ in the process.

**Attitudinal Attributes**

As part of the interview process “best learners” were asked about what they could do in their LOTE and how they got to be able to do these things. Teachers were asked what “best learners” look like. The responses to these questions brought the attitudinal characteristics or attributes associated with language learning very much to the fore. One teacher described “best learners” in the following terms:

> …outgoing and mix and speak, but their mistakes are inconsequential to them. I think that is very important. The ability to manipulate the language in every way, so they are not just tied to the topics they have been taught, an instinctive grasp of the grammar.

Personality traits and language learning skills and abilities are combined in this statement.
For another teacher “best learners” are,

Active, active in learning.

Again, this comment implies both physical and mental characteristics that work together to help learners learn.

As for comments from learners, mention was made of attitudinal elements and characteristics such as enthusiasm, commitment, creativity, and curiosity:

You need to be curious about the language and the people who speak it.

Learning a language is a creative process.

You need to be committed to the language. You need to step out of your comfort zone. You can’t be afraid of making a fool of yourself.

One word, however, was heard again and again from teachers, but on many more occasions, from the learners themselves. Confidence emerged as being a critical attitudinal element. Learner comments about confidence included,

You need to be confident…

Confidence has so much to do with it. If you lack confidence and you are too scared to be wrong, then you don’t move out of your comfort zone.

You’ve got to have confidence in your own abilities.

The importance of learner confidence was also reinforced by one learner, who described a consequence of moving from an immersion program into a negative learning pathway as being,

I’ve lost a lot of confidence…

It became clear from the research that, in order to acknowledge “good learning” and “good learners”, attitudinal attributes and characteristics, particularly confidence, had to be recognised as a significant dimension of the construct of ‘learner knowledge’.

**Autonomy, Self-direction and Empowerment.**

Hey – what about the little kids – we can do stuff too.

This comment was directed by a Year 3 learner to a member of the research team who she considered to be focusing too much attention on older learners, to the exclusion of younger learners, in an interview situation. Not only does her comment amply demonstrate the significant of confidence as a learner attribute, but it also highlights the importance of qualities such as autonomy and empowerment for language learners. This Year 3 learner had been studying her LOTE for six months in an immersion program where learners were selected, not because of their intelligence, but because of personal qualities such as confidence and self-direction which, it was thought, would help in language learning. Learner output supported this contention within this context, and there is evidence from many of the case studies, and through all the phases of learning, of similar findings.

The importance of autonomy and empowerment for learners and language learning, and the need to teach for autonomy, are discussed in Section 5.3.3. In the context of this section, and in acknowledging the learner and positive learner attributes, the following comments are useful.
Self-motivation. Best learners seem to be, they don’t need to be told what to do, to take notes or whatever, they just take notes while you are speaking or while you have written anything on the board they are learning it themselves, constantly trying to apply their own skills.

...get them to discover it themselves. The best language learners are really quick to identify those patterns and can apply them successfully, say the first or second time, they are really quick.

I think also that the best language learners identify patterns easily.

The ability to manipulate the language in every way, so they are not just tied to the topics they have been taught.

It’s about challenge.

Qualities and attributes that learners have and need in order to be able to learn language were clearly articulated by both teachers and learners throughout the interview phase of this research. Collectively the information identifies elements of learner knowledge considered to be important for good learners wishing to also be effective learners.

7.3.2 Fostering and Supporting Language Learners

Qualities and attributes for good learning are of themselves, however, only a single aspect of learner knowledge. There is a need to again return to the concept of relational knowledge in order to explore how the relationship between teacher and learner can foster and support second language learning and the attainment of proficiency.

In Section 7.2 a number of pedagogical considerations were explored within the context of supporting cumulative language learning. Beyond these considerations, several other areas have been identified, through the research, particularly through information provided by “best learners”. “Best learners” have been very clear about what they consider to be useful for them as support for their language learning and for working towards the attainment of proficiency. Learners constantly expressed the desire for their learning experiences to be meaningful. They also wanted their learning to be focused on, and reflected through real language rather than textbook or formal language. In addition, a number of learners expressed the desire to be taught how to learn. These are the areas that will be explored in this section.

Making it Meaningful

The need for language learning to be meaningful was articulated frequently by learners as is evidenced by the numerous learner comments already cited in this report. For learners meaningful meant that they should in some way be able to relate to what they were doing, that there be some associations, and that it be seen as linking to, and building on what they had already done. There was also some reference from students to curriculum content in LOTE being tied more closely to curriculum content in other areas in order to enhance the learning experience. This sentiment was also expressed by a number of teachers and administrators. A senior curriculum officer for LOTE commented that,

I feel strongly that we need to form links with other areas of the curriculum. I think it is important that we maintain or identify what the outcomes are for language and for the other area.... Don't just integrate for the sake of integrating. And how the links actually do help kids in their learning.
A different interpretation of integration was provided by the head of a LOTE department who spoke about, starting to adopt a common language across all the departments now in the whole school. This comment was made in reference to a whole school policy associated with developing learning skills in students. One of the effects of the policy was described as enabling both learners and teachers to make connections with each other and with other areas of the curriculum thereby encouraging a more cohesive approach to learning.

Drawn together these comments and sentiments present an interpretation of ‘meaningful’ learning that is multi-faceted and that promises benefits beyond the learning of language.

‘Real’ Language

The analysis of interview transcripts shows very clearly that learners believe that their language learning experiences should enable them to interact with target language text that is genuine, contemporary, reflective of popular culture and that is not contrived or manufactured for second language learning. Comments abound. Learners want to learn ‘real’ language. Secondary school learners particularly are vocal about wanting to learn language that will enable them to communicate immediately with people of their own age and interests. Secondary learners want exposure to colloquial language and they want to be able to incorporate its use into their own language output.

When asked about why he wanted to learn colloquial language, or slang, one learner responded that,

'It's fun, it's interesting and you feel more confident when you speak to someone, you sort of fill in all the gaps. It makes it a lot more natural sounding, so you are not sort of speaking plain, boring sentences.'

Another secondary learner made the observation that.

…slang becomes common usage.

Secondary or tertiary learners who had had in-country experience were particularly attuned to the contrast between the language that they had been exposed to in formal learning settings and the language that they encountered within real TL speaking communities:

Classroom Japanese is very different from real Japanese. For my first month on exchange I talked about the weather. For the second month, I talked about flowers. Everyone thought I really loved flowers, but it was just because I couldn’t say anything else.

…you learnt to speak the colloquial Indonesian that Indonesians use, not the Shakespearian Indonesian that we learnt in the classroom.

Comments from secondary and tertiary learners drew attention to the issue of genuine opportunities for engagement with ‘the real thing’ rather than decontextualised language and/or formal language being still too limited. It would appear, however, that in many instances this is not because of a lack of resources, but rather because of there being an impediment in peoples’ thinking about teaching and the actual practices of teaching and learning. A senior LOTE curriculum officer described the introduction of informal register in her jurisdiction in the following terms:

We have used the plain form which caused great controversy when we first did it. We had taken advice from the Japan Foundation and tertiary institutions, but a number of the Japanese teachers, the Nihonjin [native Japanese] teachers and assistants, were beside themselves, and some of the teachers who had done university courses but weren’t familiar
with this conversational genre. We did the research, and said look this is how kids speak. These are the things kids talk about.

But this is not just about Japanese, or about LOTE, but rather about education in general where real or natural discourses are often not incorporated into the discourses of school. Such exclusion is a damaging phenomenon within the overall educational context. Within LOTE education it is, however, particularly damaging. By making the real, natural and mature discourses of TL speaking communities remote to second language learners, LOTE learning can have its relevance and appeal contested. “Best learner” comments are testament to this. But what of other LOTE learners who are not “best learners”? For them denial of relevance and realness may act as a considerable disincentive.

The research suggests then that in acknowledging the learner there is a need to take account of the strong desire expressed by learners (particularly secondary and tertiary learners) to engage with genuine or authentic text and real discourses. To enable learners to do this would seem to be a positive way of enhancing LOTE programs, of fostering and supporting LOTE learners, and of focusing on the issue of proficiency. In the words of one tertiary learner,

Colloquial register indicates proficiency for me.

Teaching Learners How to Learn

O’Malley and Chamot in the preface of their 1990 book entitled Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition state that one of their goals in writing was to,

Respond to the need among second language teachers for guidance on how to present instruction that capitalises on the knowledge and skills students bring to classrooms and encourage the development of new and more effective strategies for learning (ix).

In this statement O’Malley and Chamot clearly acknowledge the significance of learner knowledge. They also identify the need for teacher knowledge and learner knowledge to interact to further develop learner strategies. The profiling process undertaken as part of this research supports this need. An examination of the case studies included in the profiles suggests that a significant aspect of producing quality output is the ability of both language teachers and language learners to focus on, and be able to talk about learning – about metacognition and metalanguage. The profiles also indicate that programs in which this is a feature are, in the current LOTE teaching and learning climate, the exception rather than the rule.

The concept of teaching learners how to learn is not new. After all, ‘Learning how-to-learn’ was one of the five broad goal areas of The Australian Language Levels Guidelines. The Guidelines have had a significant impact on the construction of language teaching and learning in the Australian context since publication in 1988. Our research suggests, however, that in the area of learning how to learn there has been little impact. In reference to current practices Ely is right to assert that working with learners’ language learning strategies ‘is actually a fundamental shift in the language teaching/learning paradigm’ (1994: 335).

Interviews for this research provide evidence of very young “best learners” having learner knowledge about how to learn:

We get to guess what the teacher is saying, write names, class, year, rules of the classroom.

You get a picture of it from looking at words you know.
There is also evidence that suggests that this knowledge is not always adequately fostered and supported. In a number of case studies it appeared to the researchers that the proficiency orientation of programs was likely to be compromised by the inability of teachers to take learners further in the learning skills and strategies domain.

In other programs the efforts of teachers to teach learners how to learn was acknowledged and appreciated:

> I think good teaching plays a part in it too. You can have some very intelligent and able students who are not going to benefit if they are not going to be taught correctly.

> It's good when teachers teach you ways to learn the language.

Teaching learners how to learn as a requirement of supporting learners towards a deployment orientation for their language use has emerged, through the research, as an area of concern. The need for Ely's ‘fundamental shift’ is apparent if learners are to be supported towards the attainment of proficiency.

### 7.3.3 Conclusion

The action of acknowledging the learner, and empowering the learner as ‘an autonomous, self-directed language acquirer’ (Ely 1994: 335), will for some LOTE teachers require a re-conceptualisation of their role ‘in-relation’ to the role of their learners. The creation of this new relationship and the concomitant generation of a different learning environment may place considerable demands on some language teachers but, in turn, there is the promise of much from LOTE’s “best learners”.

In this chapter, and through the process of profiling both programs and learners, a great deal of information pertaining to quality teaching and learning of LOTE has been explored. Teacher and learner comments served as a particularly rich source of information and have enabled the identification of certain aspects of language teaching and learning that have a direct bearing on cumulative learning and on learning for proficiency. These have been examined through reflection on teacher criticality and on acknowledging and valuing learners. The importance of the relationship between teacher and learner has been discussed, as have potential ways for the relationship to be enriched through the actions and interactions of teachers with their learners individually and collectively.
PART THREE

INTERVENTIONS AND ENHANCEMENT ELEMENTS: INCREASING PROFICIENCY POTENTIAL
INTERVENTIONS AND ENHANCEMENT ELEMENTS

8.1 INTRODUCTION

The evidence from this research project does not support the notion of continuous learning through the different phases of learning, as being an efficient and effective pathway to proficiency. LOTE provision configured in this way may provide learners with a continuous experience of a LOTE, but the research suggests that it is unlikely to provide learners with a sufficiently cumulative experience to enable the development of language proficiency. As a result of this finding, the research team has chosen to redefine “pathway” to emphasise the notion of cumulative rather than continuous learning. In the preceding chapter the notion of teaching for cumulative learning in multi-level contexts was explored. In this chapter the notion of teaching for cumulative learning to enhance proficiency potential will be examined.

Through the project, the research team has had the opportunity to engage with administrators, teachers and learners in a variety of LOTE programs representative of the language learning experiences currently available to students within the Australian educational context. By researching these programs, members of the research team have been able to identify a number of mechanisms that seem to have the capacity to impact on language learning outcomes. The mechanisms encountered will be described in this chapter and evaluated for their ability to contribute to LOTE program proficiency potential.

Central to the evaluation of these mechanisms are the notions of intervention and enhancement. All these mechanisms can intervene in the LOTE learning process to alter the experiences of the learners. This does not automatically imply, however, that the mechanisms enhance proficiency potential.

8.2 FAST TRACKING INDIVIDUAL LEARNERS

The capacity of immersion as a mechanism for fast tracking and enhancing language development for a community of LOTE learners has been dealt with elsewhere in this report. The concern here is with the notion of fast tracking, or “leap-frogging” individual learners whose language knowledge significantly exceeds that of her or his class peers. There was little evidence in the research to suggest that individual fast tracking is seen as a sensible and viable proposal. The predominant culture of schools appears to be “frog marching” rather than “fast tracking”. Because the culture of schools is one where learners of similar age, regardless of experience, progress collectively, there appears to be little appetite to develop mechanisms that “really” rather than “rhetorically” take account of different levels of learner knowledge. The fast tracking option was raised in discussion with a number of teachers and administrators who saw it as being extremely complex given timetabling and staffing constraints. The move to outcomes-based education in a number of jurisdictions did not promise much at the time. Perhaps further “down the track” the concept of “fast track” may be explored more vigorously as a mechanism for acknowledging learner knowledge and supporting the attainment of proficiency.
8.3 THE LANGUAGE SCHOOL CONCEPT

Language schools as an intervention designed to raise the profile of LOTE as a curriculum area, and enhance the learning outcomes of LOTE students, are a part of the second language learning landscape in a number of jurisdictions. Two such schools were included in this research. Both were profiled as marginalised, and both principals appeared to be under considerable pressure in maintaining their programs. There was reference to the need for political nous and the constant struggle to seek and then keep students who enrolled of their own volition. The limited number of language contact hours was also seen to be problematic for both of these schools. Both programs appeared to be “on the edge” rather than as a focal point for LOTE. Both programs provided “an out” for mainstream schools that were unable, or unwilling, to provide particular LOTE requirements. Neither school, however, appeared to be in the business of LOTE provision for proficiency.

For the language school concept to really “have teeth” in terms of the enhancement of learning outcomes and the attainment of proficiency, it would seem that there is a need, in the first instance, to guarantee the embedment of such programs. Beyond this, processes associated with student selection, timetabling, and curriculum design and management, seem to need to be re-examined against the notion of proficiency attainment rather than just against the notion of language provision.

8.4 SPECIAL GRANTS

In a number of jurisdictions grants are allocated to schools, programs, teachers and learners. These grants are made for the purpose of language outcome enhancement and cover a whole raft of options and initiatives. Schools receive grants to improve their resources, to evaluate their programs, to undertake action research projects or curriculum design projects, to support in-country trips and to develop school relationships and exchanges. Teachers receive financial assistance for in-country visits and for professional development, and learners receive scholarships for in-country study and exchange.

Special grants such as the ones mentioned above intervene in the language teaching and learning process but they may not necessarily enhance. The issues with any of these grants are quality assurance and accountability. In one jurisdiction where there has been a system of resource grant allocation for LOTE, a need to tighten accountability procedures has been identified because of a number of instances where it has been difficult to guarantee that funds are actually dispersed as intended. The Senior LOTE Curriculum Officer for this jurisdiction also expressed concerns about the relationship between resource provision and quality learning outcomes. The point was made that having resources was no guarantee of a quality teaching and learning program.

In another jurisdiction quality assurance and accountability associated with grants were described in the following terms:

Well, they do need to send us a financial accountability statement…they’re meant to say in their application how they plan to evaluate the project and what sort of report they will provide back to us…We try to make that a reflective sort of report so that its information that’s useful for other teachers here.
This comment seems to suggest that whilst they’re meant to and we try to make, that there are difficulties in guaranteeing quality and accountability and making the lessons of various experiences available for other individuals, programs and schools.

Special grants seem to have potential to enhance program outcomes and proficiency orientation and there is the promise of real gains for language learners. Jurisdictional experience tends to suggest, however, that quality and accountability can be issues, and that conditions for receipt of grants need to be carefully considered in order to provide maximum benefit for LOTE learners and for LOTE programs in general.

8.5 LANGUAGES FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSE PROGRAMS

No school program included in this research could be described as a “language for specific purpose” program. There were, however, examples from the tertiary sector where learners were able to focus their language learning either professionally or for interest. These tertiary languages for specific purpose programs included learning within Australia and also special purpose courses conducted overseas.

Teachers and learners interviewed were positive about their specific purpose courses. When asked about the strengths and weaknesses of his specific purpose program one coordinator replied that the students developed,

…good professional knowledge, good language knowledge, sociocultural area is not as strong as people who do Arts degrees and this has lead to a continual tinkering around the edge to improve this aspect…I don’t think there are major changes needed because they are a good product.

Students in this program did not consider that they were particularly disadvantaged in the sociocultural area. The response of one student was that,

I find out from native speakers about their culture – pollution, ceremonies, lifestyles.

Other students were also positive about their specific purpose courses. A teacher of Indonesian spoke of the benefits of being in an in-country program where she was required to spend time in classrooms in Indonesian as well as in a lecture and study program:

It’s made a real difference for me – particularly in terms of my ability to use appropriate Indonesian in my own classroom.

Learner M also raised the issue of languages for specific purpose courses. When asked about what else she would like to be able to do with in her LOTE learning she replied,

Repeat the process [in-country study] in a slightly more focused way now that I have interest and skills in certain areas, for example, my interest in teaching has developed and continued, as has my interest in multimedia as a teaching tool and to incorporate both in an Indonesia related environment whereby I have the language skills that require a higher level of expression and technical jargon would be of great benefit.

Languages for specific purpose programs are reported by tertiary learners as positive interventions that enhance proficiency. As to whether there is a place for such programs within the schooling system, is a decision for individual jurisdictions to make.
All the interventions described above have the potential to be enhancement elements, but all are also subject to system and jurisdictional constraints that have the capacity to complicate implementation and operational processes, and compromise intended outcomes. In Sections 8.6, 8.7 and 8.8 of this report, different interventions will be described. Although these all require substantial resourcing, they seem to be less bound by bureaucracy and system constraints. It is suggested that these interventions may have a very real capacity to enhance at program level and to support the development of proficiency.

8.6 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

When asking learners about what they could do with their LOTE, very few responses were recorded that in any way, referred to being able to communicate via information technology. The research team considered this to be a significant omission given that the society in which the majority of learners live is one dominated by information technology. In a world where the culture of youth is one of Nintendo, Play Station, video, film, music and computers why is it that these media are under-represented in learner responses and seemingly under-utilised in schools? Reasons for this can be postulated – lack of resources, an aging teaching force which is perhaps out of touch with its client base and for whom IT is an area that is uncomfortable. In reality, however, reasons are unimportant. What really matters is that opportunities to engage learners on their own terms, and to make language learning and target language use real, immediate and meaningful, are being missed.

Learners are viewers. They view text constantly on TV, video and computer screens and yet within formal language learning settings, the observations of the research team suggest that, on the whole, second language learners view very little. In the words of one LOTE program coordinator,

*Viewing text is not used in Indonesian and therefore the kids don’t realise the value.*

Improved access to, and utilisation of, information technology to provide second language learners with opportunities to interact with viewing text seem to be very necessary and to promise enhancement of the output elements. Two areas of information technology, in particular – satellite and the internet – appear to have the potential to significantly enhance language learning experiences and language learning outcomes.

8.6.1 Satellite

Very few of the programs included in the research had satellite links. Those that did, and that used them in the context of LOTE, seemed to be able to provide their learners with a much richer language learning environment. Being able to see the language, speakers of the language and the places where the language was spoken, provided learners with a more complete, real and contemporary appreciation of the language that they were learning. One senior secondary learner commented that,

*It’s so different from any other subject, you watch movies, and you are gaining an overall appreciation for the language, the culture especially.*

Lower secondary learners who were asked about what they thought it would be like to use real Indonesian TV shows in their language classes were excited by the prospect and thought that it
would be *really cool*. It is interesting to note that this particular group of learners came from a school where there was a satellite connection in the principal’s office. The connection was never used for teaching/learning purposes.

Members of the research team also talked with a number of teachers about satellite and the use of viewing text. For some it was not considered to be an option because the resources were not available to support its use. For others there were concerns that the text that would then be viewed would be too difficult for learners, and that the language represented would be incompatible with the target language as taught and examined. For yet others, the use of viewing text just hadn’t really been considered.

It seemed that beyond the restrictions that were imposed by obtaining physical access to satellite, there were considerable impediments to its effective use for the enhancement of language learning outcomes. Interviews with teachers suggested a need for teachers to be able to feel comfortable with the medium, and with how best to use it to enable learners to decode and make meaning from authentic viewing text.

Despite the impediments, its very successful use in some programs indicates that viewing text through satellite provides richness of input that is able to have a marked impact on the ability of learners to intake and then output.

### 8.6.2 Internet

The internet, its uses and its impact on our lives are expanding exponentially. It is changing our world and it has changed the way in which second or foreign languages are learnt and can be used.

Section 3.4.3 of this report explains some of the ways the internet can enhance language learning. In this section the emphasis is on seeing the internet, particularly email, and chat groups and discussion lists, as a way for learners to experience a second language and overseas target language speaking communities as a part of the here and now. The internet provides opportunities for “kids to talk with TL speaking kids”. The internet can go a long way to satisfying the demands of learners about what they think language learning should be about, and they can have their desire for LOTE to be real realised.

> I’d like to use the computer more – I reckon it would be good to talk to people overseas.

> Our old teacher used to print off home pages for us in Japanese. This would be better than reading from books because it is a thing of today.

In some quarters, however, there is still not the understanding of how active a part of communication a computer can be. Computers are still seen, *not as a teaching thing but to consolidate what they had learnt* – *for extension work*. Or, as one LOTE program coordinator put it, *we have access to computers if teachers chose to use them* – *and they don’t*. Potential for language enhancement can also be compromised by poor connections with Asian countries like Indonesia and China. These are currently unreliable but will improve.

Computer technology in general, and the internet in particular, has the capacity to significantly enhance proficiency potential. The tyranny of distance has always been a difficulty in terms of access and relevance for second or foreign language learners in Australia, but the tyranny of distance is no longer there.

Information technology, and especially the interactive components of that technology, can make
the experience of language and culture very real and very dynamic. Because of information technology Australian language learners now have access to avenues for language learning, practice and use that in the past were unimaginable. As such, information technology must promise the enhancement of proficiency potential in Australian LOTE programs.

8.7 MULTIPLE TARGET LANGUAGE SPEAKERS

The research team also identified the use of a number of target language speakers within a single formal learning context as another mechanism able to nurture and support cumulative learning. The idea of having language assistants or community members in classrooms is certainly not new but it is the contention of the research team that in many instances, these valuable assets to language development are significantly under-utilised. The multiple roles of multiple target language speakers will be explored in this section, as will a number of different ways that multiple speakers can be furnished for second language programs.

In the previous section the concept of multiple speakers was presented through the notion of space – cyber and satellite. Here it is about physical presence. To have a fluent speaker of the target language physically present in a classroom is different from that presented through the dimension of space. The importance of this was made evident to the researchers on many occasions through interview. One Year 11 student forthrightly stated that,

> Face-to-face contact with a person who speaks it is the only way you can do it – not using a kit or a CD-rom.

From a younger learner who was studying via a satellite language program there was the comment that,

> It's better when we have her – the videos are boring.

Learner perspectives indicate that, regardless of the communication opportunities presented through other mechanisms employed, having a physically present model of fluent TL usage is very important if a program is to be effective. To have more than one fluent speaker should then serve to add to program effectiveness presuming that the multiple speakers are used to best advantage.

Learners were able to identify ways in which multiple TL speakers were of benefit in their language learning:

> It's added extra things, like they often tell you something about something you didn't know about the culture, it's the cultural aspect as well.

> ...and just noticing how she talks once you have been over there where really the language teachers don't, they sort of have accents but do not have the natural things that Germans will always say sort of like just their ums and arghs and the way they put them in.

> A lot to do with their tone...you get the different accents.

Their comments suggest that native or background speakers import an authenticity to the experience that might not be there in other circumstances. The advantages for the development of the sociolinguistic and sociocultural output elements were also highlighted through these remarks.
A senior curriculum officer for LOTE also commented on the advantages of multiple TL speakers in the following terms:

If there are two teachers, or more than one teacher in the school then the possibility of bringing in visitors who speak the language – people from the community, people from overseas – so that the students don’t become dependent on one voice and one person that they are an interlocutor with.

Beyond being seen as authentic and varied expert users of the TL, additional target language speakers can play a vital role in resource production. Much as teacher assistants do in the classrooms of early childhood L1 learners, a native or fluent speaker of the L2 can be pivotal in producing the resources that enable a classroom to be L2 literacy rich. One LOTE department head explained the importance of this role:

They [native speakers] are also called upon to produce resources, particularly in the Asian languages so that the materials the students are dealing with, be they assessment materials or day-to-day classroom resources are very much what would be termed authentic materials – quite correct and quite natural. I think this is extremely important.

As a result of what has been found from the research, however, it would seem that there is yet another very important role. The findings of the research present a very good argument for the use of multiple TL speakers within the context of large classes in order to broaden classroom and target language interaction patterns. Section 5.5 identifies limited interaction patterns that are representative of some classroom, particularly lower secondary classrooms, as being problematic for the attainment of proficiency. By having one or more TL speakers other than him or herself, within the classroom, a teacher can feel more confident about, and comfortable with, classroom activities that are more diffuse. The evidence from the research suggests that TL speakers are only seldom used in this way. They appear to be used either in small, quite separate groups or with individuals. They also appear to be used predominantly with older learners to provide practice for oral examination purposes.

For any of the roles described above, it is important that TL speakers be trained for the role. It should not be assumed that either they know it by virtue of being an expert speaker or that training is unimportant and unnecessary given that the expert speaker works “under” the supervision of a teacher. Information provided to the research team and our own observations, suggest, however, that all too frequently there is very little training provided. It also seems that because teachers see other TL speakers who are assisting them as yet another responsibility, the TL speakers are not always accorded the authority or expert status that, with appropriate training, they should be able to command. In effect what appears to sometimes happen is that the other TL speaker becomes just another member of the class group for whom the teacher is responsible. Any advantages gained by having an additional TL speaker within the classroom context can be offset by this particular pattern.

Three models for the utilisation of multiple TL speakers within large class contexts will be outlined in the sections below.
8.7.1 Community Members

Multiple speakers in class contexts can be achieved through the utilisation of community members who are native or fluent speakers of the LOTE. Given the very multicultural nature of Australian society there is a resource within many local communities that deserves to be tapped so that the experience of learners can be enriched and so that links between schools and communities can be cemented.

Most teachers would acknowledge, however, that the use of community members is not about “wheeling in” exhibit A – native speaker – and asking them to “front” a whole class. Community members can do much to enhance the LOTE experience. The simple act of being involved in conversation with the teacher and allowing the learners to “eavesdrop” is useful. Having TL speaking community members work with the class in activities associated with culture can also be extremely helpful provided that the teacher ensures a construction of culture that is non-stereotypical. In addition, utilising community members to work with groups and individuals can be rewarding provided that community members accepting such roles are thoroughly briefed, well prepared, and that both learners and community members are comfortable in the learning environment and the interactional relationship created.

8.7.2 Teacher Assistants

We all have the opportunity to speak to a native speaker on a weekly basis.

Teacher assistants have for a very long time been a part of the Australian language learning context. They are provided through either exchange arrangements, inter-governmental agreements or are furnished locally. Many of the programs included in the research incorporated teacher assistants. Comments from teachers working with assistants were in some instances affirming and in others, concerning.

Areas of concern seemed to relate to the issues raised in Section 7.2.2 about the development of pedagogy able to promote interactional opportunities. Several teachers were concerned that the expert language model was not complemented with a good teaching model and that this compromised the use of assistants. It appeared to the researchers that although these difficulties were evident in all phases of learning, the impact was more pronounced with primary and lower secondary learners who appeared less able effectively to counter any shortcomings.

Concern was also expressed in two instances that assistant teachers on exchange were more interested in their English than the target language development of learners. Again, within a tertiary context this was viewed as being less problematic with one learner explaining that,

We learn Japanese from teacher assistants – they learn English from us.

There were other contexts where the use of assistants was viewed most favourably. In the words of one departmental head,

We have certain facilities here that do not exist at other schools. For example, one of our leading facilities, on the human level, we have an assistant in each of the four languages who are paid by the school to teach here between 12 and 15 hours a week, or 10 and 15 hours a week, and all our students, especially in the upper school have a chance to go and speak with them on an individual basis or small group basis, once a week, which has got to be a terrific aid to improved ability in the listening and speaking skills.
Described here are ‘language withdrawal classes’ where 6 or 7 learners work in a group with an assistant for 20 to 25 minutes each week. The school perceives there to be significant gains for learners through the use of this arrangement although, again, the focus appears to be on older students.

Overall, the provision of teacher assistants was acknowledged as a useful intervention. The research suggests, however, that teacher assistants are not as useful as they might be in terms of enhancing proficiency potential. There was little evidence of their effective utilisation in large class contexts and the experiences of teachers suggests that both teachers and teacher assistants would benefit from training directed towards maximising the potential offered through the numerous teacher assistant programs available.

8.7.3 Peer Tutors

The third model for the utilisation of multiple TL speakers to be described here is that of including peer tutors in LOTE programs. This model is a recent innovation used in Case Study T. The rationale for the establishment of the program was to attract high school leavers to a particular university. It was quickly realised however, that by having a number of very able and relatively young (most are in their early twenties) target language speakers working in classrooms, there were significant benefits for language learners. The majority of peer tutors are recently returned from in-country study in either Japan or Indonesia. This means that they bring with them a language ability that has emerged out of both formal in-country study and extensive contact with real, contemporary language and culture. This was described as providing freshness and authenticity. School language learners were most positive about sharing the experiences of, and working with peer tutors in their language classrooms. Teachers, too, spoke favourably about the arrangement. Case Study J is looking to providing an induction program for both teachers and peer tutors so that benefits can be maximised. The university is also looking at the possibility of providing peer tutors with accreditation towards their degrees.

Although in its infancy this peer tutoring program is an intervention that seems to have the potential to enhance both the experience of second language learning and the language outcomes achieved. The program is being carefully monitored by the university and is also being supported by the state educational jurisdiction.

The case studies included in this research demonstrate that multiple target language speakers within LOTE classrooms can be configured in a variety of ways and can involve native or background speakers and non-native speakers who have considerable language expertise. Learner comments describe the benefits provided by native speakers. Learners are also able to acknowledge the advantages of non-native speakers:

I’d say a person who has learnt it as their second language would be better because they are much more able to teach it to you because you are learning a second language as well, whereas the person who is learning it as their first language, you just pick it up you don’t sort of remember learning apart from at school you might learn about certain structures and things in English you just pick up most of what you speak by what’s going on around you.

The use of multiple target language speakers in a classroom is not unproblematic but there is evidence to support the contention that if well utilised, these interventions can lead to considerable enhancement. Being able to be well utilised, particularly within large class contexts,
needs to have emerged as an issue. If this issue is able to be resolved then the use of multiple TL
speakers in single classes seems to offer the promise of enhanced outcomes for learners.
It is not an economic proposition to have well trained, highly competent multiple speakers in all
classrooms. For programs where proficiency is seen as the potential outcome however, it appears to
the research team that this would be both desirable and productive.

8.8 IN-COUNTRY EXPERIENCES

Spending time in a country where the target language is spoken emerged constantly from the
research as a mechanism that not only intervened in language learning, but one that actually
enhanced outcomes for learners. This was particularly true of older learners most of whom “raved”
about their experiences and the benefits provided by being in-country. Only one upper secondary
student was less than fulsome in his praise of the experience stating that going to Japan did not do
much beyond pronunciation and culture.

In discussing in-country experience as an intervention and an enhancement element, and the
relationship it has to cumulative learning and proficiency potential, in-country visits will be
examined as excursions, exchanges, and also as extended periods of study and residency overseas.
Age and language experience will be investigated in connection with the benefits of being in-
country.

8.8.1 Excursions to TL speaking communities

Learners interviewed for the research had access to target language speaking communities through
excursions that were offered in a variety of ways. Excursions tended to be arranged for school
holiday periods, or for one or two week blocks. These sorts of excursions seemed to take a variety
of different forms:

❂ Learners toured a number of different places. The focus appeared to be on site seeing rather
than necessarily language learning.

❂ Learners localised their activities but the emphasis remained on seeing and experiencing
rather than on language use.

❂ Learners localised their activities and were required to actually learn language rather than just
visit and attempt to apply language that had been previously learnt.

The effectiveness of these different approaches was reported to the research team. For the first two
options, the excursions were described as providing a carrot but also as making it,

...a reality because sitting in a classroom you learn the language and maybe you do meet
someone from China or Korea or Japan, but the reality that you have been learning about
is there.

The third option was described as one that went beyond motivation and enabled real language
learning that could enhance language outcomes and promote proficiency potential. In one
jurisdiction this particular form of excursion has been adopted and resourced as a mechanism able
to significantly enhance learning. Hundreds of senior secondary students are supported each year
on the following conditions:
It has to be ten days of structured language learning. It can’t happen at more than two venues…and they had to demonstrate to us [the jurisdiction] how it fitted into the language program at the school.

Information from the jurisdiction supports this concept as being successful and well worthwhile for older learners who have significant prior learning. It was also pointed out that, because the jurisdiction funds the programs, students who would otherwise not have access to overseas travel are able to benefit both personally and linguistically.

Overseas excursions to target language speaking communities for primary school learners do not appear to have the same benefits. A number of primary learners with such experience were interviewed. These learners seemed unable to talk at length about their experiences. One was unsure of where he had actually been. Another described his time in the TL speaking country as,

\[\text{We went shopping and shopping and shopping.}\]

The findings suggest then that in-country excursions are better left till the later phases of learning and that with a real language learning focus, are a form of intervention that can enhance output.

8.8.2 Exchanges

Teacher and student exchanges are mechanisms that seem to have the capacity to be positive interventions for language learning. Teachers who have been on exchange talk about the benefits in terms of their own language fluency and language maintenance, sociocultural and sociolinguistic knowledge, and their ability to make learning meaningful for their learners. Upper secondary learners tend to extol the virtues of exchange and seem to ooze confidence as a result of their exchange experiences. A selection of the many positive comments made by learners about exchange are presented below:

\[\text{I did an exchange. It makes class a lot easier. I know more natural language.}\]

\[\text{Because I went on exchange to Japan, when other people in the class are talking about ‘the cat sat on the mat’, I can go a bit further and describe the mat.}\]

\[\text{After exchange my marks went from 70\% to 94\%. Things became relevant. I wasn’t just looking at photos in books, they were real places. I also have a better understanding of how to pick words now.}\]

\[\text{Exchange is seriously the best way to learn a language. My Swedish friend had never spoken Japanese and went home from Japan absolutely fluent. It motivates you to want to do more.}\]

\[\text{When I arrived in Indonesia I knew nothing.}\]

\[\text{I went to Japan in the Christmas holidays for six weeks on an exchange, so I was staying with a family for the whole six weeks, which definitely opens your eyes and teaches you a hell of a lot about the culture and that. It just shows you that you really can use the language in a lot of subjects like maths and things. You are constantly searching for a reason for learning it and yes, it was something you could use.}\]
Exchange can also mean a process of twinning with an overseas school. There is evidence from the research that this can mean benefits not only in terms of the opportunities that can be provided by going in-country, but also as a result of having students and teachers from overseas TL speaking communities working and learning in the Australian context. According to one student,

*We have had two lots of two exchange students at home for one week and four days. These short visits helped develop confidence in speaking to real Japanese people.*

Exchanges for older learners, and also for teachers, come through the research as being very positive intervention mechanisms with a real capacity to speed cumulative learning.

### 8.8.3 Extended In-country Study

Significant information about the benefits of extended in-country study has already been included in this report. In Section 4.3.2 extended in-country study was explored as a beneficial context for language learning. In Section 6.4.1 the individual learner profiles of Learners M, S and Y also supported extended in-country as a successful mechanism to speed or reinforce and “naturalise” second language learning. The role of the learner was also examined in order to highlight the importance of attitudinal characteristics and learner autonomy. One learner, reflecting on her extended in-county experience, incorporated all of these elements as well as contrasting language learning in this way as against her formal school language learning program. She described her experience as one of,

*...slowly eroded my past fear of articulating in Indonesian and developing confidence which came with a better understanding of the culture. I find it easier to talk Indonesian in Indonesia rather than here – I have this fear that I am going to be judged – it comes from my experiences learning French. Indonesians will accept you as a learner.*

Extended in-country study, as an option for tertiary learners, would seem from the research to have very significant advantages. In some instances, given the right conditions and the right learners, it appears to be able to provide a mechanism for learning that can take a learner from zero language knowledge to proficient language use in a relatively short space of time. For the majority of learners it provides a real context that supports real and natural language and enables the “theory” of formal learning settings to be challenged and contested and reconstructed.
8.9 CONCLUSION

The interventions discussed in this chapter do not necessarily present an exhaustive list of interventions that can be used to improve the learning of Australia’s second language learners. They are, however, the interventions that were either mentioned or observed through the research.

It appears to the research team that a number of these interventions are very much bound by bureaucratic and other constraints and that to utilise fast-tracking, language schools and language for specific purpose programs in school settings may be difficult and ultimately not as successful as desired. On the other hand, the evidence seems to suggest that at program rather than necessarily at system level, information technology, the use of multiple TL speakers and in-country experience for older learners, can be very rewarding for learners, for teachers and programs in general. These interventions have been observed to deliver very tangible benefits and deserve to be constructed and utilised as enhancement elements rather than just as interventions.

For the 2 per cent of learners to be targeted for proficiency, the use of these mechanisms collectively, within a pedagogical paradigm that supports collaborative and self-directed learning for target language deployment within an embedded program, would seem to promise proficiency potential. Given the totality of the research findings, however, and the fact that embedment and deployment are rare bedfellows, it may be that this is unrealistic.

The research presents LOTE in this country as being complex and segmented and at the mercy of a whole range of pressures, perceptions and demands. The research team has been able to investigate an extensive range of program types and pathway configurations. Out of this has emerged a picture of LOTE teaching and learning as it has evolved over the past decade. There is evidence of innovation. There is evidence of success. There is evidence of frustration and anxiety. For proficiency, there is very little evidence of continuous learning through the phases of school learning being particularly beneficial. There is considerable evidence of in-country experience speeding and enriching language learning and being exceedingly beneficial. This whole range of experiences suggests that this may be an appropriate moment to take stock of the goals for LOTE as a learning area, and the outcomes that are considered desirable for LOTE learners at each, and all the phases of learning. In the final chapter of this report implications of the research findings for LOTE’s future and for planning at national, jurisdictional and program level will be addressed.
Chapter Nine

IMPLICATIONS OF THE RESEARCH AT
NATIONAL, JURISDICTIONAL AND PROGRAM LEVEL

9.1 INTRODUCTION

The focus of the previous chapter was on identifying interventions that had the capacity to significantly enhance learner outcomes and proficiency potential at program level and without necessarily having to be bureaucratised or compromised by bureaucratic processes. It seemed to the researchers that whilst the interventions described required considerable resourcing, they presented as avenues, or pathways, for cumulative LOTE learning that could stand “within” programs rather than be dependent upon too many factors “beyond”. But there has to be a “beyond” program dimension. This chapter is concerned with this dimension and how the information gathered through the research, and reflected in the findings of this report, can be of assistance in informing future directions for LOTE in the Australian educational context.

In collecting the data on the “best practice” programs as identified by the jurisdictions, the researchers were struck with the variety of programs and, in some instances, the extent of innovation that has been occurring within this nation. Much of the innovation is attributable to funding provided through the National Asian Languages and Studies in Australian Schools (NALSAS) Taskforce. Many of these innovations do, of themselves, represent interesting initiatives in LOTE and are useful attempts to address language proficiency and pathways through which proficiency can be attained. There was a sense, however, of the innovations being uncoordinated and disconnected, and that LOTE programs and pathways were not constructed on the basis of thinking through issues associated both with program embedment and second language deployment. There was also a sense of principals and program coordinators being concerned about the future, both in terms of program status and language learning outcomes. The researchers encountered comments about the longevity of programs and innovations – about what would happen if/when funding was curtailed or discontinued.

While these general impressions were not part of the data specified for the research, they led to three conclusions on the part of the research team:

1. The first is that the NALSAS funding program so far appears to have been relatively successful in encouraging innovation in program design and delivery at both school and system level, providing a far richer base of program types for this research than would have been the case only five years earlier.

2. The second is that in spite of the above, language outcomes and proficiency potential are generally limited.

3. The third is a reasonable expectation that marginalised programs are likely to disappear when external resources are withdrawn.
These conclusions need to be held against the other broad findings of the research, as considered in earlier chapters, and summarised briefly below:

4. That the belief institutionalised in Australian schools and systems that “continuous” LOTE learning will enhance learning outcomes and proficiency potential is not borne out by the research, but that there is evidence to suggest that “cumulative” LOTE learning can enhance proficiency.

5. That the teacher is identified as a critical factor influencing potential for proficiency, yet this factor in turn will be influenced by the context in which LOTE learning takes place, by marginalisation and embedment factors, and by the program style adopted at different phases of learning.

6. That the learner, her or his personal attributes and qualities and abilities, particularly with regard to knowing how to learn, is integral for the attainment of proficiency.

7. That interventions can be applied at any time in the LOTE learning process that have the capacity to significantly enhance particular outcomes.

These conclusions form the context within which implications at national, jurisdiction and program level are considered.

9.2 FROM INNOVATION TO EMBEDMENT

The impression of the research team was that, given the apparent success of the funding program in producing examples of innovation in LOTE program design and delivery, and given the overall findings of the research, there is now sufficient data available to inform a review of policy objectives and attendant funding implications if this is considered a desirable course of action.

The research points, however, to some objectives that are more likely to lead to value for money outcomes than do others. For example, it would appear that attempts to influence proficiency, or indeed any other outcomes, would need to include some process for influencing the contexts within which LOTE learning occurs. One conclusion from an earlier report was that LOTE teachers were probably doing better than might be expected, considering the lack of support many were experiencing in the contexts within which they work. It is reasonable to predict that large amounts of money could be spent on LOTE, the effects of which would probably be entirely offset by unsupportive contexts similar to a significant number of contexts encountered during this research. If unsupportive contexts are to be found so readily in schools exemplifying “best practice”, what kind of contexts are to be found elsewhere in the LOTE teaching and learning landscape? It is suggested that funding provision would need to address marginalisation and embedment factors at program level as a first step towards developing a proficiency orientation.

For the researchers the concept of marginalisation reflects a way of thinking about change which is widespread in inwardly focused bureaucracies. It is sometimes referred to as the “add-on” model of change, where new things are constantly added on, usually as the result of an external stimulus such as funding or direction. The result of change viewed and initiated through this process is that people become busier trying to accommodate new requirements and activities that are often perceived as

being impositions that are problematic. They see as the solution to their “problem”, additional external resources. When these are not forthcoming, they become demoralised, stressed, and work quality is effected. Case Study U is one example where this pattern was very much in evidence.

Organisations which operate decision making processes based on an “add-on” approach to change generally cannot make decisions that initiate, terminate, re-structure or combine programs in new ways, because they lack the skills necessary to evaluate and activate their activities against specified outcomes.

Embedment, on the other hand, appears to reflect a way of thinking where programs and activities within an organisation are carefully measured against the purpose of the organisation, and the outcomes it wishes to achieve. Maintaining the status quo is not allowed to dictate decision making, and all activities of the organisation are under constant review and question. Case Study J is an example of one such organisation where embedment is guaranteed through this process.

Embedded programs encountered during the research were not dependent on external or supplemental funding and were reflective of a practice of re-distributing existing resources to accommodate new priorities. External funding was not considered essential to program continuation but rather as a mechanism to support interventions that were considered desirable for the enhancement of outcomes already being pursued.

Given the findings of the research it would seem that funding which leads to the embedment of more programs is more likely to improve the return on investment than funding which creates marginalised programs. The additional benefit would be that it is impossible to embed a program without attention to the context that supports it. The impression of embedded programs, from the research, was of a significantly higher level of teacher and student motivation, which in turn usually offered increased potential for a proficiency orientation. Marginalised programs, regardless of their deployment orientation, can be created or removed, it seems, without altering the context.

Decisions which might be taken at national and jurisdictional level to influence proficiency outcomes through firstly tackling embedment will need to take into account a highly complex inter-relationship of factors. These will include the culture of schools and school systems, decision making processes, power structures, perceptions, skills, and the resistance which can be anticipated in relation to any change attempt, particularly in organisations with a long history of institutionalised processes.

In order to consider how to proceed strategically in such a way as to ultimately achieve the desired impact on proficiency, the proposal for this research included a force field analysis. The original intention was to apply this at national level but it may even be advantageous to consider it for individual jurisdictions. Force field analysis is a planning tool designed to help analyse events and problems from an action point of view. It has evolved out of a systems approach to problems. The basic idea for this approach is generally attributed to Kurt Lewin (1997) whose “field theory” described a field of forces or pressures acting on any particular event at any particular time. Lewin argues that all situations can be seen as being in temporary equilibrium, where the forces acting to change the situation are balanced by the forces acting to resist the change. This view of events is a dynamic one, which sees temporariness in all things. It offers the opportunity of seeing apparently intractable problems as being potentially changeable, if the forces can be identified, and their strength or direction changed.
Such an approach to problem solving, of course, flies in the face of the culture of stable institutions. Problem solving in bureaucracies can be a process of removing or obstructing efforts to change the status quo. The researchers believe that if decision making at national and jurisdictional level models a process of analysis based on the possibility of being able to influence change in highly complex social situations, there is a possibility of influencing decision making processes at other levels. This would be, for example, the kind of decision making a school would have to learn to do in order to embed a LOTE program which is currently marginalised. The need for skills to implement embedment of a program will be largely irrelevant until decisions are taken for action to occur.

9.3 TOWARDS DEPLOYMENT AND PROFICIENCY

The research clearly points to the relationship between proficiency outcomes and deployment orientation in a program. The decision to review a program and then adopt a deployment orientation within that program is an example of decision making for change that occurs at program level. It is to be expected that such a decision is unlikely to be made in the absence of some kind of negotiated process designed to enrol teachers in the change and enable them to feel positive about it. The process would need to take account of the resources necessary for professional development and for the enhancement of student learning through the classroom, and through the inclusion of interventions. Without such a process, the decision to change orientation would be unlikely to be implemented, or if implemented, be unlikely to succeed, unless the enthusiasm of teachers and their existing knowledge and predispositions led them to make the changes regardless.

The fact that this can happen is evident from the research. A number of programs clearly have a deployment orientation, because that is the way teachers chose to design them. The knowledge necessary for non-deployment programs to be re-oriented towards deployment is available, in many instances, within the existing teacher knowledge of LOTE teachers. In other instances there may be a need for supplementation. It is suggested that the application of the Proficiency Potential Framework together with other information pertaining to quality LOTE teaching and learning contained in this report, may be useful in reorienting programs towards better language learning outcomes.

The questions that need to be answered, then, seem to be:

- What national objectives will now be pursued in relation to proficiency given the findings of the research?
- How will effort be coordinated at national, jurisdiction and program level in order to pursue these objectives?
- What strategy will be adopted to bring about the necessary changes, considering the difficulty of change in bureaucratic structures?
- What resources will be applied to support this strategy?
- How will the implementation of the strategy be monitored?
- How will we know when the objectives have been achieved?
9.4 A PROCESS FOR CHANGE

The researchers’ previous work in facilitating change in communities and organisations suggests that there are some principles for the early stages of a process that, if followed, can significantly enhance the likelihood of success. These are:

- Keep it small.
- Work with the people who have the potential to be successful.
- Work with the strengths of the people involved.

As the benefits of the process become apparent, the people involved become role models for others.

If these principles are accepted, a process could be adopted along the following lines:

1. Targets, policies and objectives for the teaching and learning of Languages Other Than English in Australian schools are reviewed against the findings of the research and other demands and directions of change.

2. That on confirmation of proficiency goals an analysis (using Force Field Analysis as the mechanism), be undertaken of the factors able to be influenced that are likely to assist in the achievement of stipulated goals.

3. Using the conclusions of that analysis, a representative group is set up to develop a coordinated action strategy. (Our suggestion would be to include people in the group with knowledge of, and experience in, successful change in the school system. If the group were restricted to LOTE experts, it is likely that efforts to influence context would fail as they have so many times in the past in many curriculum areas. The researchers gained the impression that the climate for internally initiated innovation supported externally may be more favourable now than in the past.)

4. Part of the action strategy could be to encourage school leaders and LOTE teachers to use the Proficiency Potential Framework as an audit tool to allow them to assess the extent to which their programs are oriented toward proficiency. Given this information, teaching professionals in schools might well decide for themselves that change is desirable, thus leading to internally initiated change. Given the desire to change coming from within, and the provision of some external support, it may be that the process of change can be accelerated. The model being suggested here is that schools identified by the representative group described above could be supported to:
   - Gather information at the local level (the instruments used in this research can be easily adapted for this purpose).
   - Consider the information in line with school, jurisdictional and national objectives.
   - Consider the resources available, and the benefits to stakeholders.
   - Decide to express an interest in participating in a pilot project.

5. A pilot project (or series of pilots) could be set up with a limited number of schools/educational institutions in each. Potential participants could be invited to apply to take part and would be selected on the basis of their interest, a set of criteria, and as much information about the outcomes and resources of the pilots as possible.
6. Each pilot could then be facilitated through a planning phase, for which some resources could be provided. The outcome of this phase would be a proposal, containing at a minimum the following elements:

- The objectives of the pilot, in terms of embedment and proficiency
- A methodology
- A statement of how it would recognise and monitor progress to its objectives
- A calculation of the external resources it would require, and for how long
- A statement of how the pilot would be managed

7. A condition of the funding could be regular reviews to learn from the experiences of the pilots. A mechanism could also be provided to exchange information between the pilots. The representative group could take responsibility for monitoring the implementation of the strategy and periodically consider the information emerging from the pilots. It could then make decisions such as determining whether to extend the process, or move it in a particular direction to ensure that national objectives are being met.

9.5 WHY THIS PROCESS?

There are of course many ways of proceeding with the information provided in this report. The process outlined above is an example of only one method for turning strategic information into action, by using information and support, to motivate change.

Our experience is that strategic and complex change occurs through people choosing to take action individually and in groups at every level. The more choice of actions they have (within minimal necessary constraints which they understand and accept) the more likely they are to act. If support is provided in the form of resources that they (not someone else) identify as their needs, the change process is generally accelerated.

Three key elements, of course, are the effectiveness of communication between the participants, provision of information, and clear knowledge of the objectives.

Our recommendation is that the NALSAS Taskforce proceeds to an action stage as quickly as possible if it wishes to enhance LOTE proficiency outcomes in Australia. We further recommend the use of processes that have been developed to bring about change in human systems, even though they may be foreign to the mainstream educational culture of Australian school systems. Our thinking is that LOTE educators, more than any other group of teachers, understand culture and “what it is to be foreign”. Why not recognise this for the strength it is, and use knowledge of it and experience in it to start to chip away at a culture that seems to value uniformity and mediocrity over achievement and proficiency?
9.6 THE FUTURE

The starting point for the research was the investigation, through the literature, of current trends in second language teaching and learning together with “successful” models, and significant initiatives that have been implemented in the area. The information obtained through the literature, together with the context provided by the Rudd Report and the assumptions implicit in the recommendations of that report, provided the basis for the development and execution of this study. The findings of the report support some of the notions expressed through the literature but they contest a number of the assumptions that have become the orthodoxy of teaching for second language proficiency. It is hoped that this report serves to further illuminate and enrich the debate about the nature of proficiency, its desirability as a goal for school language learners and the possible pathways that can be constructed to assist in its attainment.

This report can, however, be viewed beyond pathways and proficiency potential. Our investigation of these dimensions of language teaching and learning has enabled the emergence of a story – the story of what has happened to LOTE since it has come of age and since it has been the recipient of considerable attention and financial support. Multiple perspectives and interactions are reflected through the report, multiple perspectives and interactions impact on how LOTE teaching and learning has been constructed and enacted in the past, and multiple perspectives and interactions will determine LOTE’s future. It is hoped that this report enables critical reflection on what has been and on what is the here and now, and that it informs a move towards maturity for Language Other Than English as a key learning area within the Australian educational context.


Simpson Norris International. (1999). Language Teacher Proficiency or Teacher Language Proficiency? An Environmental Scan of Information Relating to the Competencies/Qualities/Knowledges required to be an Effective Language Teacher. A report prepared for the NALSAS Taskforce.


Appendix A

A Profile of LOTE Programs and Learners: Proficiency Potential in the Australian Educational Context
Thirty programs representing all levels of LOTE learning from primary to tertiary were included in the research. Programs were drawn from all jurisdictions and all states have representation in the profile document. Not all programs are reported individually as some programs are described as clusters, and some had an involvement from the perspective of potential pathway provision only.

Initial recommendations about programs to be investigated through the research were made by State educational jurisdictions. Recommendations for the inclusion of Catholic and Independent schools was also sought from the relevant organisations. Not all programs approached agreed to be included in the research and participation from one state was disappointing.

Final selection of programs was done on the basis of ensuring that a wide range of program types, reflective of the diversity of LOTE teaching and learning within the Australia context, was included in the research.

The following pages present a tabulation of information about both programs and learners set against the Proficiency Potential Framework. This tabulation presents a profile of each program, or cluster of programs, together with their learners.

Programs are described according to the embedment and marginalisation indicators and deployment orientation. Learners are described according to the reference points in the learner continuum. It is acknowledged that different learners will demonstrate different degrees of autonomy in any program. It is our contention, however, that embedment and marginalisation factors, together with the deployment orientation of a program, will condition a majority of learners. The reference point for learners within the profiles is therefore an expression of the condition of most learners within a particular cohort.

Programs are recorded by case study initial and not by name. This is done in order to protect the confidentiality of all individuals and programs involved in this research.
**Case Study U (Primary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGINALISED</th>
<th>EMBEDDED</th>
<th>DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>THE LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Illustrators:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom activities fostered dependence – sheets to work from and colour in, games, repetition and the teacher makes us write things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• One high school and three primary schools comprise the cluster. Only two of the schools were willing to be included in the research. One of the principals made it very clear that LOTE was not a priority for his school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It was clear that without NALSAS funding, this program would not exist, and if the funding is withdrawn, will probably cease to exist.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focused</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited TL input from teacher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Charts in some classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hiragana cards, sheets to work from and colour in, games, repetition and the teacher makes us write things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intake</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The major strategies were doing things like drawing, speaking aloud, playing and making games.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conversion of input to intake described as it happens when students have a go. I can talk until I am blue in the face but it won’t happen unless they try things. Beyond this, little understanding of the need to teach learners how to learn a language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Case Study Q (Primary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGINALISED</th>
<th>EMBEDDED</th>
<th>DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>THE LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Illustrators:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learners were dependent. Their teacher described them as noisy, their eyes sparkle, they jump out of their seats... I don’t think they realise whether they’re learning or not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The principal is aware of the marginalisation of this program and is endeavouring to bring about changes by restructuring to make the LOTE teacher more a part of the total school program. He would like to have LOTE integrated with elements of other learning areas but this is beyond the current capacity of the LOTE teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Input was selective and topic based, as a result of the remote delivery model being used. There were videos, and the teacher had discontinued the use of a worksheet since returning from China.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intake</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher saw language learning as a structured, patterning process. The ability to see the patterns would enable them to learn more. Their ear has to be attuned to language — and sometimes they’re the worst listeners. And they take in things that are repeated, easy to remember, follow a pattern, structured. See it as a challenge to learn without being taught. They’ve got this thing and they can manipulate it, use it. They can see the patterns, they’ve got the power to get past this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• They respond to greetings, what is your favourite food? They need to use the structure correctly and in a different context.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher felt that she was able to create situations where they talk. They test each other. I break it down into smaller components, drill the hard bit, add bits around it. Meaningful things – activities that relate to them personally – birthdays etc. but output was described as using correctly the responses you want.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher was also integrating Chinese with dance, music and art. It’s about understanding cultural background.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Illustrators:

**Context**
- Despite a very supportive principal, and the fact that LOTE is a planning priority for the school, it is marginalised because it depends on an on-going allocation of funds $180 per day out of our small budget which employs a specialist teacher. While the principal is prepared to do everything to keep the program rolling, if the funds are withdrawn, he expects to wind it up.

**Input**
- Input was selective and topic-based, as a result of the remote delivery model being used. Video broadcasts were the basis of the program, and the teacher selected again from that material.
- There were Chinese folk tales in the library, beginner tapes, a community person, Access Asia, Chinese painting, calendars and artifacts around the school.

**Intake**
- The teacher was unable to offer comments on the process.
- The students described the process as: You watch a program, do a subject, the teacher gets us to say them, and we stay on the same subject for about three weeks until it’s in our heads.

### Output
- Output was described as sentence patterns. Not so much to acquire a second language, as to acquire cultural awareness.
- Output was further clarified as numbers, colours, the question word knowing the tones, reading pinyin, and knowing what’s Mandarin and what’s not.
- The program was seen to make them tolerant.

### The Learners
- Learners were dependent. Learners just followed the program as laid out. There was no involvement of learners in any form of curriculum negotiation.
### Case Study S (Primary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGINALISED</th>
<th>EMBEDDED</th>
<th>DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>THE LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Illustrators:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learners in this program were dependent. The structure of the program and its place within the school did not support the development of autonomy in learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The teacher had limited time with classes and was not a native speaker. She was still undertaking university studies while teaching the language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The school has as many classrooms as there are classrooms so the teacher was itinerant in the school. There appeared to be little support for her or for the language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The time for the language had been reduced in 1998 because of a cut in funding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Input was selective and topic based as a result of the remote delivery model being used. There were videos, and the teacher had used worksheets that were available through the model.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher used a repetitive process, meaning the students simply patterned what they heard, what was on the video, and the worksheets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teacher did not use the language a great deal in the room, because of limited experience in it. They watch a video one lesson with their class teacher, and then I work with them the other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrators:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It's better when we have her. The videos are boring. Nothing happens and that Panda is really boring.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We just sit and watch. When we have her, we can get to say things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It's good when get to put things on in front of people, like singing the songs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A classroom teacher said: I wonder why we are doing this. Kids should be learning their own language first. There is enough to do without having them learn another language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students were able to say names of various animals, to say greetings and ask names. When asked to converse with each other, they were able to do so as long as the conversation was limited to the areas described.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Case Study F (Primary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGINALISED</th>
<th>EMBEDDED</th>
<th>DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>THE LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Illustrators: Context • Asia and the LOTE evident when entering the school office and throughout the school. • The LOTE, together with Asian studies, was unanimously voted by the staff as the number one priority for the school three years ago. • Program is highly visible and valued • Continual reference by all interviewees to importance of enthusiasm and effort of the LOTE teacher in making it work.</td>
<td>✓ Illustrators: Output • Learners referred to what they could do by theme (We can do shopping) and could not articulate what they would like to be able to do. • Heavy emphasis on writing (because of accountability). Teacher tied up for two to three weeks just to test. • Although classroom teachers remain in the classroom when the LOTE specialist is there, and although many actively participate and learn in the LOTE lessons, none integrate LOTE into other areas of the curriculum. There is more of a link with the Access Asia stuff than there is with LOTE.</td>
<td>Learners in this program were dependent. Learners were unquestioning of what happened in the program – they just did it and it was better than social studies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Focused • Teacher tries for maximum TL usage but reference was made by both learners and other staff members to another teacher who had worked in the program who used a lot less English and did a lot more oral work. • In addition to teacher input, two textbooks used as principle sources of input. • Staff talked about worksheets used throughout the lessons. • Principal talked of LOTE speakers bringing both language and culture to the school and of the opportunities presented each year for students to go in-country for a week – Incursions and excursions are of value.</td>
<td>Intake • Very little evidence of either teachers or learners being aware of the processes involved in learning to learn a language. Only one learner able to offer a response – you get a picture of it from looking at words you know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Pathways for Australian school students to achieve high levels of proficiency in Asian Languages
## Case Study G (Primary)

### MARGINALISED

**Yr 6 and beyond Illustrators:**

- **Context**
  - In year 6, the program was described as maintenance and the time had dropped to 3 periods per week of specialist teacher input. The class teachers had little involvement or commitment, and the integration appeared less effective. The program was marginalised. Boundaries broken down by integration were raised again by year 6.

### EMBEDDED

**Yr 5 Illustrators:**

- **Context**
  - The year 5 program was embedded, as a result of a staff review process that did away with a marginalised French program of one lesson per week. It consists of one year intensive, with one lesson per day provided by a specialist teacher.
  - The class teachers are part of the program, not release time. They had learned to speak the language, and used it in the classroom outside LOTE classes – they can’t go to the bathroom unless they ask in Indonesian.

### DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION

**For Yr 5 Illustrators:**

- **Output**
  - With the class teachers in year 5, there was considerable deployment of the language. Teachers gave instructions in Indonesian much of the time, and occasional parts of some lessons were in Indonesian. They even modelled language use amongst themselves in front of the class – We use repartee – it’s in the air. They try to listen.
  - Learner output goes through phases in the early stages you can’t shut them up; they get more intellectual about it; when they started writing, some wrote and wrote and wrote. It didn’t always make sense.
  - We create lots of tasks where they get success quite quickly, albeit contrived. There are lots of little steps.

### NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION

**For Yr 6 and beyond Illustrators:**

- **Output**
  - By year 6, the situation had changed to non-deployment.
    - It dissipates in year 6.
    - They think this is not an appropriate place to use Indonesian - because it’s not normally used around here.

### THE LEARNERS

Best learners were opting into autonomy in year 5, and had reverted to dependence in year 6.

- In year 5, learners were involved in making decisions about the program. Can’t just go to a ready made text for this program. We have to make up our own program. There’s a degree of experimentation. We’re going to try this, and see what happens. Tell us what you thought.

- Risk takers excel.
  - We allow all to take risks, and we model it by telling them when we are trying new things and get them to give us feedback.
  - Inquisitive ones rocket ahead. Why is it like that? What is that word? What’s he saying?
  - In year 5 we learnt so much more. Everything he said was in Indonesian. This year it’s just review. She’s not even helping us study for our Dux test.
  - I want to do bongos dancing. She showed us this stuff, a kris, doesn’t have any meaning for it. We used to do Gamelan. She left us with the music teacher; she doesn’t care.
  - We are all carrying on next year because there’s a good teacher in the senior school.

---

### Appendix A: A profile of LOTE Programs and Learners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illustrators:</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Intake</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yr 6 and beyond</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In year 6, the program was described as maintenance and the time had dropped to 3 periods per week of specialist teacher input. The class teachers had little involvement or commitment, and the integration appeared less effective. The program was marginalised. Boundaries broken down by integration were raised again by year 6.</td>
<td>Very limited LOTE usage. No reinforcement of language when specialist LOTE teacher not present.</td>
<td>Ability of learners to convert input into intake significantly influenced by the learners’ dislike of the specialist LOTE teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yr 5</strong></td>
<td>The year 5 program was embedded, as a result of a staff review process that did away with a marginalised French program of one lesson per week. It consists of one year intensive, with one lesson per day provided by a specialist teacher. The class teachers are part of the program, not release time. They had learned to speak the language, and used it in the classroom outside LOTE classes – they can’t go to the bathroom unless they ask in Indonesian.</td>
<td>Input provided by specialist teacher was focused, while input from the class teachers in year 5 and the specialist teachers of art and dance etc. beyond specialist LOTE lessons was broad.</td>
<td>The year 5 teachers were clearly reflecting on their own experience of learning the language, and apparently relating it to the teaching of language skills in normal classes. There was therefore attention paid to learning how to learn, although this did not appear to be shared by the specialist teacher who appeared to be operating from the ‘it just happens’ perspective.</td>
<td>With the class teachers in year 5, there was considerable deployment of the language. Teachers gave instructions in Indonesian much of the time, and occasional parts of some lessons were in Indonesian. They even modelled language use amongst themselves in front of the class – We use repartee – it’s in the air. They try to listen. Learner output goes through phases in the early stages you can’t shut them up; they get more intellectual about it; when they started writing, some wrote and wrote and wrote. It didn’t always make sense. We create lots of tasks where they get success quite quickly, albeit contrived. There are lots of little steps.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Case Study C (Primary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGINALISED</th>
<th>EMBEDDED</th>
<th>DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>THE LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The principal wanted it to succeed. She was strong, and clear about what was being done and why.</td>
<td>• Total TL usage by teacher except when people are naughty or when we are learning origami, meant there was a reason for learners to use the language – to understand the teacher.</td>
<td>• Total TL usage by teacher except when people are naughty or when we are learning origami, meant there was a reason for learners to use the language – to understand the teacher.</td>
<td>• Teacher found it difficult to describe what learners could do – spoke in attitudinal terms rather than about language modes. Students talked about fun, game playing and the like.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There appears to be a pathway for learners through a local non-government school although the local government secondary school did seem to be reluctant to have to provide a pathway for learners from the primary school.</td>
<td>• Learners had no hesitation in using the language. They were happy to demonstrate, wanted to use it, and were keen to correct each other, which they usually did. We had a lot of demonstrations of the use of the language.</td>
<td>• Learners had no hesitation in using the language. They were happy to demonstrate, wanted to use it, and were keen to correct each other, which they usually did.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Immersion learners had an obvious and deep respect for their teacher — When I go to year 6 and year 7 and high school, I wish I could take him with me.</td>
<td>• Learners converse on the internet.</td>
<td>• Learners converse on the internet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input</strong></td>
<td><strong>Focused for non-immersion learners</strong></td>
<td><strong>Focused for non-immersion learners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Selective for immersion learners</td>
<td>• Principle medium of instruction is English although the teacher is starting to pick up on TL instructions from the immersion teacher.</td>
<td>• Principle medium of instruction is English although the teacher is starting to pick up on TL instructions from the immersion teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Total TL input for immersion learners from background speaker teacher and a teacher’s aid and also we have a visitor once or twice a month and we ask them questions in English and the teacher translates.</td>
<td>• Some background speaker visitors used to provide input.</td>
<td>• Some background speaker visitors used to provide input.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Society and environment content area.</td>
<td>• Immersion teacher spoke of, and demonstrated a full range of inputs.</td>
<td>• Immersion teacher spoke of, and demonstrated a full range of inputs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Immersion teacher spoke of, and demonstrated a full range of inputs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focused</strong></td>
<td><strong>Focused</strong></td>
<td><strong>Focused</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Selective for immersion learners</td>
<td>• Principle medium of instruction is English although the teacher is starting to pick up on TL instructions from the immersion teacher.</td>
<td>• Principle medium of instruction is English although the teacher is starting to pick up on TL instructions from the immersion teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Total TL input for immersion learners from background speaker teacher and a teacher’s aid and also we have a visitor once or twice a month and we ask them questions in English and the teacher translates.</td>
<td>• Some background speaker visitors used to provide input.</td>
<td>• Some background speaker visitors used to provide input.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Society and environment content area.</td>
<td>• Immersion teacher spoke of, and demonstrated a full range of inputs.</td>
<td>• Immersion teacher spoke of, and demonstrated a full range of inputs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Immersion teacher spoke of, and demonstrated a full range of inputs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learners are clustered at the dependence and co-dependence reference points.**
**Case Study 1 (Primary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGINALISED</th>
<th>EMBEDDED</th>
<th>DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>THE LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>The very young learners in this program are best described through the co-dependent reference point. Learners who have been in the program for a number of years are opting into autonomy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Illustrators:**

**Context**
- The program is cross-jurisdictional and draws its students from a number of feeder schools. The program is dependent on grants from the three educational jurisdictions and this seems to be organized almost through an "old boy" style network. Financial support from one of the systems is almost tokenistic. This set up limits the strength of the program infrastructure.
- Additional resources would significantly enhance the program. Science is the focus but there isn’t a sink.
- Lack of liaison and cooperation between the feeder schools, in terms of providing a learner timetable that is supportive and acknowledging of the LOTE commitment, is also a factor.
- Program coordination is not a full-time position and this has an impact.
- Teachers are on two-year contracts and receive little orientation to the program. Their expectations can also be in conflict with the reality of the program.

**Input**
- Science, technology and the visual and performing arts are the content areas of the program. Science was chosen as the principle focus over social studies because of the orientation (to boys). Social studies was not considered to be a good starting point because of the difficulty of LOTE being the focus e.g. ‘my family’.
- Major source of input is background speaker talk – all teachers are background speakers – Background speakers give you the whole cultural environment of Japanese – everything they do is culturally appropriate.

**Intake**
- Both learners and teachers are able to talk about the process. From a year 3 student – we get to guess what the teacher is saying. From teachers – They learn deduction skills so that they can think by themselves, and the student has to be patient as well...can’t have any affective barrier.
- Games are used to consolidate vocab and to enhance cooperation so that learners can support each other in the learning process.

**Output**
- Total TL usage by teachers with a requirement for yr 5 learners to speak using TL exclusively for 2 hours in the afternoon.
- Not much about the TL speaking country – When I get older I would like to learn more about...
- Learners are able to distinguish the different styles of language straight away.
- They lack daily vocabulary, I would like to include more to make their language more balanced.
- At yrs 5 and 6 it would be good to focus more on output.
- Tidy up what they are learning – more form focus at higher level.
- At yrs 5 and 6 learners can express feelings, make questions, still have small particle problems, but can make sentences with small grammatical mistakes, and make complex sentences with a mixture of TL and English. They can understand almost anything I’m talking.

The very young learners in this program are best described through the co-dependent reference point. Learners who have been in the program for a number of years are opting into autonomy.
- The selection criteria for acceptance into the program appear to be significant. Study habits and work habits are more important than achievement – we look for kids who can solve problems independently.
- Confidence comes through as very significant – the program coordinator talked of a little girl who was very intelligent but didn’t have the confidence to cope with the use of the target language.
**Case Study X (Primary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGINALISED</th>
<th>EMBEDDED</th>
<th>DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>THE LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ![Checkmark] Illustrateds:  
* Context  
  - Described by the principal as a bilingual program, all classes taught by a pair of teachers one of whom is a TL speaker.  
  - Program is supported by the whole school community. Staff talk about:  
    - a common philosophy and we all believe in it  
    - parents are involved and we focus on communication with parents  
    - people want it to work  
  - There is a whole school focus on using an integrated curriculum approach and on teaching students how to learn.  
* Input  
  - Input to a large extent determined by decisions relating to which elements of the integrated curriculum were to be taught in the TL.  
  - Learners exposed to extensive TL input from teachers.  
  - Other input sources included TL videos, internet and CD Rom.  
* Intake  
  - There is a whole school focus on curriculum construction and pedagogical practice being informed by Gardner’s theory of Multiple Intelligences.  
  - There is evidence of learners using metalanguage.  |
| ![Checkmark] Illustrateds:  
* Output  
  - There is evidence of a deployment orientation being a focus within the classroom with upper primary learners being confident about doing the following things:  
    - Most learners are able to read picture books in TL with some able to read chapter books.  
    - They can make meaning from complex spoken text which relates to the curriculum content they learn through the TL. She said that animals in the wild can take care of themselves but domestic animals need to be taken care of…  
    - They are encouraged to convey meaning about curriculum content in TL eg Next term we have to make a video because we’re doing sound and special effects and things like that and all the script has to be in French.  
    - Most are confident that they have the ability to carry out day to day transactions eg ask directions, buy things etc.  
    - Learners are aware that their output is not native-like and are comfortable with trying to use the language. Yes, I should think that I’m very good understanding but sometimes the sentences don’t come out right.  
  - Learners have some knowledge of TL speaking communities’ traditions and customs.  
  - Output does, however, seem to be largely confined to the classroom. We don’t usually talk in French in the playground, only in here.  |
| Most of the older learners in this program demonstrate the characteristics of learners who are opting into autonomy. |
**Case Study N** (Primary and Secondary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGINALISED</th>
<th>EMBEDDED</th>
<th>DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>THE LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Illustrators:**

**Context**
- LOTE as a learning area is embedded in the school. Primary offerings are very much in the order of ‘LOTE experience’ programs rather than forming a foundation for a program with a proficiency orientation.
- There have been attempts to do interesting things with the LOTE but these initiatives have been rather piecemeal and have had only limited success. There is a sense of LOTE catering for the ‘middle of the road’.
- There are plans to move to some integration of LOTE with other learning areas eg science and multimedia.

**Input**
- Focused
- Principle source of input is from prescribed texts.
- TL input from teachers is more restricted than learners would like.

**Intake**
- Very traditional approach to the teaching and learning of LOTE with little articulation by either teachers or learners of the processes involved in language learning.

**Illustrators:**

**Output**
- Learners comment on wanting to be able to use the TL more in the classroom.
- Year 11 and 12 students who had recently been to France expressed total boredom with the program.
- Lower secondary learners who had significant previous experience of their LOTE commented on their ability to output being diminished by the orientation of the program.

**Dependence and codependence** are the principal reference points for learners in this program. Some of the older learners are opting into autonomy principally as a result of recent in-country experience.
### Case Study B (Primary and Secondary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGINALISED</th>
<th>EMBEDDED</th>
<th>DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>THE LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Illustrators:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funded through NALSAS with some question as to the program’s sustainability without special funds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality teachers are not easy to access and there are no designated classrooms for LOTE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teachers were controlled rather than supported by program coordinator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Very limited contact time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Most teachers admit to using TL less than 50% of the time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited by ‘borrowed’ learning environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Textbook or worksheet based for most teachers – one using email tutorial group to enhance the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the right jargon used – team teaching, negotiated curriculum, cooperative learning – but evidence does not support the contention that this is what happened.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not much attention to learning strategies from most teachers – multi level classes are taught as two groups: one does revision, one on new material.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Illustrators:

**Context**

- Most learners unable to articulate clearly what they could do.
- The phrase ‘fiddling round the edges’ was used and seemed appropriate.
- Older learners achieved good year 12 results, not proficiency. Younger learners respond to well rehearsed questions, write descriptions of themselves and other people...I know this is awful but I teach the verbs.
- One teacher measured output by how many sentences they can speak.
- Little reference to culture beyond doing festivals and dancing.

**Output**

- Dependence or Co-dependence were the principal reference points for learners in this program. Most learners just did what the teacher told them to do.
**Case Study D (Primary and Secondary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGINALISED</th>
<th>EMBEDDED</th>
<th>DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>THE LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learners are scattered from dependence to transition to autonomy. It is only the older learners, and generally those who have had the experience of being on exchange who are moving to autonomy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Illustrators: Context
- Program has been in operation since 1974.
- Compulsory for two years in secondary school.
- Active sister school program in TL community since 1982.
- According to coordinator …don’t think anyone would dare say don’t teach Japanese anymore.
- Continuing, beginning and accelerated classes operate in secondary school in order to accommodate learner needs and experiences.

### Input
- Selective – learners generally score very well in yr 12 exams and input is selected to support this success.
- Considerable TL input from teachers – described as immersion style but spasmodic because some lessons are not language based. All the teacher talk ‘prattle’ is in Japanese.
- Looking to integrate TL more with other areas eg Home Economics, Art, History, PE.
- There are plans to establish a multi-media room to enhance the input available to learners.

### Intake
- Learners are able to identify some strategies that they use – pick out key words, ask them to repeat. One learner talked of little memory things – put it to a song – rhythmic. Another said just use language – find a Japanese person and talk to them.

### Illustrators: Output
- Opportunities are engineered for learners to output in real and useful contexts background speaking teacher assistants, other contacts with background speakers, sister school relationship with exchange program, internet links.
- Younger learners said that they were able to introduce myself, tell them what you like, write about your family, talk about simple things.
- Other learners commented on their output in view of their exchange experiences. …could figure out what they were saying and make myself understood and learnt in three weeks over there what took four years here.
- Learners were able to both output confidently and articulate the importance of confidence in using a LOTE.
- Cultural output is acknowledged as important by learners but seems limited and accounts for 10% in terms of school assessment.
## Case Study A

(Secondary Pathways for Australian school students to achieve high levels of proficiency in Asian Languages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGINALISED</th>
<th>EMBEDDED</th>
<th>DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>THE LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Illustrators:**

**Context**
- LOTE as part of the Social Education department
- Neither program nor staff valued by the principal

**Input**
- Focused
  - Broken satellite link in principal's office
  - Text books provide principal source of input for learners. Learners would like to be able to understand when they talk.

**Intake**
- Difficult for teachers and learners to describe processes involved in converting input to intake

|                   |          |                         |                             |              |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------------|                             |              |
| ✓                  |          |                         |                             |              |

**Illustrators:**

**Output**
- Learners found it very difficult to articulate what they could do in the language – long pause before responding
- Teachers and learners talked about ‘tests’ – vocabulary tests, comprehension passage with questions at the end, writing sentences about pictures, oral tests where you have to give the word for.
- Learners able to demonstrate some knowledge of religious and ethnic diversity of TL speakers.

Learners who had been involved in in-country exchange were opting into autonomy. Majority of learners were dependent.

Fun until we had a change of teacher. Do this exercise and then that exercise.
### Case Study W (Lower Secondary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGINALISED</th>
<th>EMBEDDED</th>
<th>DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>THE LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Illustrators:</td>
<td>✓ Illustrators:</td>
<td>✓ Illustrators:</td>
<td>✓ Illustrators:</td>
<td>The majority of learners, in all three years of schooling which constitute this phase, are dependent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Output *</td>
<td>Intake</td>
<td></td>
<td>For the most part there is uncritical acceptance of focused input, and repetition and rote as the principal tools of language learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This program provides the middle stage of an established pathway for LOTE learning from primary to tertiary. Teachers within this program also teach in the senior college – the next stage of the pathway.</td>
<td>• Learners role play and play games extensively.</td>
<td>• Very little evidence of consciousness about metacognition and metalanguage from either staff or learners. Process of intake described by one teacher as I think it’s when they can actually reproduce it without me having to stand there and provide them with every single word, that’s the actual point that they have learnt something and they’ve remembered what they’ve learnt. Both learners and teachers talk about just learn by heart and you have to just memorise a lot of things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• LOTE is compulsory in the first year of secondary schooling.</td>
<td>• the kids get to do a lot of oral practice role plays.</td>
<td>• For the most part there is uncritical acceptance of focused input, and repetition and rote as the principal tools of language learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A lot of evidence of Asian LOTE in the physical environment of the school – displays, signs etc.</td>
<td>• I find that there is a lot of emphasis on role play, there is a lot of emphasis on oral communication&amp; it’s not always easy because its always much easier to give written work and give out sheets and check single words.</td>
<td>• Also, very little evidence of learners being confident and comfortable with risk taking although teachers talk about this being important.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A sense, however, that the vibrancy and commitment of the head of the LOTE department is a critical element. The principal stated I am a firm believer that the program runs through the dynamism of the people who are running it. The principal is talking about his Head of Department with no reference to himself or any possible role that he could play in the success of the program.</td>
<td>• We do role plays, learn how to bargain in Indonesian, learn about the marketing stuff...[a learner with in excess of 6 years learning experience]</td>
<td>• Target language output is essentially confined to the classroom except for school in-country trips and camps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All teachers are background or fluent speakers.</td>
<td>• Input Focused</td>
<td>• Learners are able to describe significant sociolinguistic and sociocultural conventions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong Access Asia school</td>
<td>• A heavy topic and textbook emphasis – What do you mean, the topics they cover?</td>
<td>• Learners do not present as confident uses of either their L1 or their L2. …because it’s really confusing sometimes because we mix things around and feel stupid.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Very little evidence of consciousness about metacognition and metalanguage from either staff or learners. Process of intake described by one teacher as I think it’s when they can actually reproduce it without me having to stand there and provide them with every single word, that’s the actual point that they have learnt something and they’ve remembered what they’ve learnt. Both learners and teachers talk about just learn by heart and you have to just memorise a lot of things.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix A: A profile of LOTE Programs and Learners**
Case Study M (Secondary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGINALISED</th>
<th>EMBEDDED</th>
<th>DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>THE LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Illustrators: Context</td>
<td>✓ Illustrators: Output</td>
<td>✓ Illustrators: Output</td>
<td>✓ Illustrators: Output</td>
<td>Best learners were in transition to autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Very stable department, strongly supported by principal. Very well resourced. No part time staff. Additional funds provided to employ native speakers in term 3 for conversation practice. Long time sister school relationship with Japan, founder of French exchange. Timetable very sympathetic to languages. Compulsory in year 8, students encouraged to ‘opt in’ to a LOTE regardless of previous background at any stage in schooling – for example, top student in year 10 started in year 9.</td>
<td>• Language is deployed in response to interactional opportunities presented through a range of text and task types. Background speakers, and exchange opportunities, together with the use and metatalk and the development of metacognitive strategies. Students are able to: – converse confidently – read with understanding – have a way of getting what they want without English, have strategies for paraphrasing – work out the meaning of new vocabulary – re-use what they already know to fit the question.</td>
<td>• Output was described in terms of correctness and there was a priority of satisfying the demands of tertiary entrance examinations rather than real world use. The output that was valued was reasonably detailed, and used a broad range of vocabulary – contained some errors.</td>
<td>• The teaching style of all the staff was intentionally crafted through the efforts of the head of department to engage learners with text and provide opportunities to converse, reducing their dependence on the teacher – not that much up front teaching. Learners regarded LOTE as more than the study of a language, it was about people and culture as well. They: – saw exchanges as the best way to learn a language – felt that a personal commitment to the LOTE was necessary – were clear in the purposes they had for learning LOTE – wanted more natural materials in classes, with less emphasis on the textbook and more on newspapers, videos and cartoons – wanted better use of technology – wanted more access to native speakers – believed oral more important than written – believed memorising to be a key tool – this did not mean rote learning – wanted to teacher to use mainly the LOTE in class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Plays, video cameras, badge machines, printers, Japanese PAL system videos, reading trolleys, books, magazines and library stocks. Silent reading lessons, self paced work, group work, pair work. As much as possible in target language. Kids have ownership of the classrooms – they get materials, make games. It is an attractive and text rich environment. Keep being surrounded by it.</td>
<td>• Input Broad</td>
<td>• Output</td>
<td>• Intake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There was evidence of a variety of perspectives, incorporating elements of osmosis to knowledge of metacognitive aspects of language acquisition.</td>
<td>• Attitude was thought to be important, and a holistic view was apparent. – Making the knowledge their own. – They have a vocab book, where they write for themselves what they have learned. There are no handouts. – Correct sentences are banked in the vocab books. – Mistakes I’ll never make again.</td>
<td>• They have a vocab book, where they write for themselves what they have learned. There are no handouts. – Correct sentences are banked in the vocab books. – Mistakes I’ll never make again.</td>
<td>• Learners regarded LOTE as more than the study of a language, it was about people and culture as well. They: – saw exchanges as the best way to learn a language – felt that a personal commitment to the LOTE was necessary – were clear in the purposes they had for learning LOTE – wanted more natural materials in classes, with less emphasis on the textbook and more on newspapers, videos and cartoons – wanted better use of technology – wanted more access to native speakers – believed oral more important than written – believed memorising to be a key tool – this did not mean rote learning – wanted to teacher to use mainly the LOTE in class.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Case Study O (Secondary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MARGINALISED</strong></th>
<th><strong>EMBEDDED</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Illustrators:</td>
<td>✓ Immersion learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Illustrators:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A year 7 French partial immersion program operates in one of five French classes in year 7.</td>
<td>Output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The school language program is embedded, but the immersion program, in part because of its newness and difference, is probably marginalised.</td>
<td>• There appear to be some limitations on output due to the class comprising beginners through to some learners with 5 years of French. Students interviewed said they would like French to be used a lot more, but some of the kids are just learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• French is one of three language options for learners in their first year of secondary school.</td>
<td>• The best learners were able to distinguish the different styles of language straight away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The immersion program is in its first year of operation. One class of 24 students chose to take it. Three of these are from a government school that has an immersion program in French. Fifty per cent of student time is spent learning subjects in French.</td>
<td>• The range of students means that some lack vocabulary. The better speakers were useful at the start of the program to help them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• At present there is no guarantee the immersion program can be extended to year 8. This is an expensive program to run. At the same time, people involved want it to continue into year 8 at least.</td>
<td>• A student said, I liked it at the start because I knew a lot more than the other kids and helped them at the start. It’s a lot boring now because they’ve caught up.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Input**

Selective for immersion stream and focused for mainstream learners.

• The teacher is a background speaker of French, using the TL at all times she is with the class. French was evident in all aspects of the classroom, including visual displays.

• She appears to use the full range of possible available inputs, although she spoke of the heavy workload in creating the program and the necessary resources for student use. These people are wonderfully committed. The Program would not be possible without their hard work.

**Intake**

• The teacher was very aware of the processes involved, speaking of them with clarity.

• At the same time, there was an expressed sense that intake was limited by the range of abilities within the class – from three students with five years experience of learning French through immersion to students beginning French. There was a modification of strategies to accommodate this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</strong></th>
<th><strong>NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</strong></th>
<th><strong>THE LEARNERS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Non-immersion learners</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dependence and codependence describe learners in this program. It is interesting to note that for learners with significant previous experience of TL learning that there appears to have been a backward slide from a point of transition to autonomy to a codependent position in the teaching/learning relationship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix A: A profile of LOTE Programs and Learners
**Case Study P (Secondary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGINALISED</th>
<th>EMBEDDED</th>
<th>DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>THE LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Illustrators:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Illustrators:</td>
<td>Learners in this program exhibited characteristics of dependency. Their approach to LOTE was quite mechanistic and routine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Even though planning and implementation was well resourced, well implemented, and articulated with feeder primaries, this program is marginalised because its survival depended on the support of a deputy principal. The ideal would be a little more time in year 8, but the curriculum is so bound up meeting all the different requirements, it was a major concession at the time for all the faculties to agree on the elective line. I still have to fight to get it up in the electives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Output in the program was described as vocabulary and sentence structures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Best learners made the following comments:</td>
<td>• Learners said:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Input in this program was primarily focused on a textbook and worksheets developed by the teacher – I cobble and adapt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– It’d be fun if it was more practical.</td>
<td>– When do we need to have the homework done?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There was some attention to classical Chinese poetry, a book of plays and 'culture' videos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– We should be able to read things.</td>
<td>– We're behind schedule, they want to pump more stuff into you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students said: There's lots of games because she can't control the class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– We'd understand a lot more if we did different things other than writing.</td>
<td>– It is a bit boring sometimes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intake</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– I'd like to be able to fit in, live like they do, I'd like to be able to communicate really well, understand their culture, know the stories behind it.</td>
<td>– You sit there and write off the board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Very much the 'it just happens' perspective. The teacher described the process of how good learners learn as innate. They are good overall. At junior level, she described it as the ability to spend time memorizing especially with characters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The teacher said that, I set standards and insist they achieve them, and There's not much singing – it's not cool to sing. An additional point was, it's important to be able to write characters well.</td>
<td>– The family topic drags on too long. We only know pets, families and sport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The teacher said;</td>
<td>• The teacher said;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– They take things in quietly. Given a word and a structure and an explanation, they can substitute new words. Then they run with it themselves.</td>
<td>– They take things in quietly. Given a word and a structure and an explanation, they can substitute new words. Then they run with it themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– They answer my questions, write characters well.</td>
<td>– They answer my questions, write characters well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– Work is well organised... A lot do extra work – they know my patterns, and get one jump ahead... I select the most useful characters and structures, I know which they need to recognise. Otherwise they'd be overloaded.</td>
<td>– Work is well organised... A lot do extra work – they know my patterns, and get one jump ahead... I select the most useful characters and structures, I know which they need to recognise. Otherwise they'd be overloaded.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Case Study J (Secondary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGINALISED</th>
<th>EMBEDDED</th>
<th>DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>THE LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Illustrators: Context • Extremely well resourced. • The school has native speaker assistants, who work with small groups and produce authentic materials. • The teachers speak in the LOTE in the staff room, and there are two LOTE departments, one Asian languages and the other European. • At least one language is compulsory up to year 10. • Exchange programs are of long-standing, and are well publicised and well subscribed. • There is a computer enhanced learning facility specifically designed for LOTE. • LOTE staff room discussion focuses on students and programs. There is not much faith placed in the state systems of assessment and reporting, and the school has designed its own approaches to these.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Illustrators: Output • Through the use of background speaker assistants, the integration of its exchange activities, and the focus on metacognition and metalinguage, this program appeared to capture benefits of a deployment orientation, even though the actual teaching program was restricted by operating within a culture of academic achievement, focused on success in external examinations rather than real language use. • Teachers described learner output as: – More restricted than what I’d like to see. What they produce is what you ask them to produce, not much more than that. – It’s heartening to see them when the 6 week exchange is in the school, trying to converse.</td>
<td>Best learners were in transition to autonomy. By the time they reached years 11 and 12, some were articulating aspects of transition. They were described by teachers as having the following characteristics: – Self-motivated, don’t need to be told what to do – Note takers – Refine their own skills – Ask questions – Prepared to be involved – this may include the less able, but enthusiasm doesn’t make them more able – Identify patterns easily. Not this is the rule, they can induce patterns – Make associations – linking with prior knowledge Students said of themselves: – There’s a lot more to say about learning a language than any other subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input Input was broad, with selectiveness related to the requirements of the external examinations. – Vocab is the essence – we point out that it is the key to success – Teacher-driven input consists of grammatical structure, vocabulary – they are critically important. We still believe in the grammar based approach. – The internet is not necessarily important, it helps to see it is authentic language use. – We constantly model the language in use. – We use magazines, SBS news, authentic reading materials prepared by assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Case Study J (Secondary) continued…**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marginalised</th>
<th>Embedded</th>
<th>Deployment Orientation</th>
<th>Non-Deployment Orientation</th>
<th>The Learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intake</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The entire school has adopted a program to give the staff a common language across subject areas for talking about how students learn.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The learners were very clear about what they could do in the LOTE:</td>
<td></td>
<td>• I can understand a lot more than I can say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Junior students have 55 minutes per week of study skills, planning, and personal organisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Visiting the country to talk to native speakers is the most important thing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a conscious level of learning how to learn which came through talking to both students and staff as can be seen from remarks like, You’ve got to learn how to work out from a different structure.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• It’s extra added things – the cultural aspects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attitude was also recognised as being important – just got to learn sentence structures in Chinese. I learned by rote and I like to consolidate by reading. Also, it’s more difficult to talk in front of a large group.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• I am becoming more discriminating in things like tone, different accents from different regions. Little things from between sentences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Stop thinking in English and start thinking in another language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The gaps feel more important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Being able to blend is important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If you go there, you use gap fillers, you’re part of the community and the culture, not standing out as foreigners. When you blend in, you’re really getting there.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• You need to understand their context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The ultimate is not to be recognized as a foreigner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Interest will overcome difficulty – it’s about challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Being able to have a genuine conversation with some sort of meaning gives you a sense of achievement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• People of your own age you can actually talk to them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Case Study H (Secondary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGINALISED</th>
<th>EMBEDDED</th>
<th>DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>THE LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Illustrators:</td>
<td>✓ for immersion stream Illustrators:</td>
<td>✓ mainstream Illustrators:</td>
<td>Learners spread across dependence, co-dependence and opting into autonomy depending on their learning experiences. Older learners who have had the experience of immersion generally fall into the opting into autonomy category. Mainstream, older learners are generally co-dependent and lower secondary learners, dependent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Listening is very good at normal speed and their speaking far outstrips the non-immersion learners. They have more vocabulary than the mainstream learners but analysis is not good. In writing they manipulate syntax extremely well. Not a lot of evidence to support the contention of learners having good socio-cultural understandings.</td>
<td>Listening is very good at normal speed and their speaking far outstrips the non-immersion learners. They have more vocabulary than the mainstream learners but analysis is not good. In writing they manipulate syntax extremely well. Not a lot of evidence to support the contention of learners having good socio-cultural understandings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program is supported by the administration and coordinator is perceived as a ‘seller’ of the program but the obvious lack of a pathway for learners undermines the program.</td>
<td>• Program effectiveness is limited by time and resource constraints – teachers do the best they can with the time and resource constraints.</td>
<td>• Program effectiveness is limited by time and resource constraints – teachers do the best they can with the time and resource constraints.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program appears to be, to a large extent, dependent on the energy of the program coordinator.</td>
<td>• Program appears to be, to a large extent, dependent on the energy of the program coordinator.</td>
<td>• Program appears to be, to a large extent, dependent on the energy of the program coordinator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input</td>
<td>Selective for immersion learners</td>
<td>Selective for immersion learners</td>
<td>Selective for immersion learners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are, however, problems with developing appropriate input materials together with the use of appropriate teaching and learning strategies. Time constraints, and lack of experience and knowledge by immersion teachers make for difficulties, particularly with regard to balancing the cognitive demands of the content material with the linguistic level of the learners. The issue of context embedded/reduced text and teaching is problematic for teachers and learners.</td>
<td>• There are, however, problems with developing appropriate input materials together with the use of appropriate teaching and learning strategies. Time constraints, and lack of experience and knowledge by immersion teachers make for difficulties, particularly with regard to balancing the cognitive demands of the content material with the linguistic level of the learners. The issue of context embedded/reduced text and teaching is problematic for teachers and learners.</td>
<td>• There are, however, problems with developing appropriate input materials together with the use of appropriate teaching and learning strategies. Time constraints, and lack of experience and knowledge by immersion teachers make for difficulties, particularly with regard to balancing the cognitive demands of the content material with the linguistic level of the learners. The issue of context embedded/reduced text and teaching is problematic for teachers and learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Satellite link and computers available but not utilised by immersion teachers.</td>
<td>• Satellite link and computers available but not utilised by immersion teachers.</td>
<td>• Satellite link and computers available but not utilised by immersion teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exchange teacher being used to develop a maths curriculum and is underutilised with regard to providing input and getting learners to talk.</td>
<td>• Exchange teacher being used to develop a maths curriculum and is underutilised with regard to providing input and getting learners to talk.</td>
<td>• Exchange teacher being used to develop a maths curriculum and is underutilised with regard to providing input and getting learners to talk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused for lower secondary mainstream learners.</td>
<td>Focused for lower secondary mainstream learners.</td>
<td>Focused for lower secondary mainstream learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• These learners receive input essentially through textbooks. There are a large number of staff teaching at this level with most making only limited use of the TL in class.</td>
<td>• These learners receive input essentially through textbooks. There are a large number of staff teaching at this level with most making only limited use of the TL in class.</td>
<td>• These learners receive input essentially through textbooks. There are a large number of staff teaching at this level with most making only limited use of the TL in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad at post-compulsory level.</td>
<td>Broad at post-compulsory level.</td>
<td>Broad at post-compulsory level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• These learners are exposed to a broad range of text including viewing text via satellite.</td>
<td>• These learners are exposed to a broad range of text including viewing text via satellite.</td>
<td>• These learners are exposed to a broad range of text including viewing text via satellite.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Illustrators: Context
- Very highly regarded within its jurisdiction and very successful academically. Well we know a lot of students only came here to learn languages, we know that.
- LOTE focus is of long standing and eight languages are currently offered. Seen as a 'language college'.
- Courses are designed to provide for a wide range of learners – beginners through to background speakers.
- All teachers are fluent in their language. There is not one teacher that students don’t have confidence in.
- Very good relationship with local tertiary institution. …it creates a sense of, we know where you are going…we know who the teachers are, we know the sorts of subjects that you might be able to do and there is a sense of, from here, we can guide you into the next stage…
- Principal is very supportive of languages and will provide teachers with ‘time off’ for in-country experience but there is no financial support for their travel.
- ‘Twin school’ arrangements exist for some Asian languages.
- Strong Access Asia program compliments the study of Asian languages.

### Illustrators: Output
- The environment supports language deployment. At this school it’s kind of weird, you feel out of place if you don’t speak two languages.
- Output of advanced learners is described in the following terms: Dream/think in the language, perform plays, read novels, analyse poetry, can tell jokes in the TL, I can understand the commentary of the Commonwealth Games.
- Lots of comments from learners about the importance of the cultural dimension of output eg It’s through language that you learn about people. Less comment from teachers who tended to focus on the more obvious aspects of culture (food etc) and who talked about cultural projects in English.

### Input
- Language courses are designed ‘in house’ and are not dependent on text books. Well, we don’t really give them text books, we have text that we use but the course is written in ways that we haven’t actually found text books that we can go from page 1 to page 100.

### Description of Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGINALISED</th>
<th>EMBEDDED</th>
<th>DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>THE LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learners in this program tend to be autonomous or in transition to autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>• A real work ethic seems to be part of LOTE in this context. Teachers work hard and students work hard. Self-direction is assumed and not taught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• In addition there is evidence of learners really thinking about what it means to be ‘bi-cultural/literate’ as is evidenced from the quotes below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• We need to be in the country to make the next leap. It’s the difference between being able to speak the language and talk to the people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• It’s through language that you learn about the people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• With three languages what can’t you do? Think of all the opportunities you have in English and then triple that.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learners in this program tend to be autonomous or in transition to autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A real work ethic seems to be part of LOTE in this context. Teachers work hard and students work hard. Self-direction is assumed and not taught.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In addition there is evidence of learners really thinking about what it means to be ‘bi-cultural/literate’ as is evidenced from the quotes below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• We need to be in the country to make the next leap. It’s the difference between being able to speak the language and talk to the people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It’s through language that you learn about the people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• With three languages what can’t you do? Think of all the opportunities you have in English and then triple that.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Case Study V (Secondary College) continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGINALISED</th>
<th>EMBEDDED</th>
<th>DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>THE LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Input relates to standard themes and topics – …they will always begin with my family and my school and my house and my pets…it’s just those normal sorts of topics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extensive TL input from teachers, background speakers and exchange students. …the notion of being bilingual or trilingual in this school is nothing to get excited or surprised about.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Magazines, videos, SBS, newspapers, CD Rom, authentic texts from TL speaking communities – Try and surround them with as much as you can.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited access to input via computer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intake</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not much evidence of either teachers or learners being able to talk about intake in terms broader than learners being good students who work hard. Teachers talk about;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Simply have a flair for the language and they love the culture as well and are highly motivated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Generally kids who are good at languages are usually good at other subjects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I think they have to have patience, good listening skills…listen and repeat, listen and repeat…reinforcing is very important.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• My particular one thing is to encourage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It becomes part of them. Hopefully by the fact that what they do is relevant. Kids talk about;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Being in country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exposure to native speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• …like learning words to a song – just started to know it after you’ve heard it a lot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• …a lot of vocab tests, lots of homework…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … need to keep up the language constantly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• … teacher, excellent I wanted to do well in it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Case Study E (Secondary College)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGINALISED</th>
<th>EMBEDDED</th>
<th>DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>THE LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Illustrators:</td>
<td>✓ Illustrators:</td>
<td>✓ Illustrators:</td>
<td>✓ Illustrators:</td>
<td>The 'best learners' in this program were in transition to autonomy. Majority of learners were codependent or opting into autonomy. Dependence was not a characteristic of learners in this program more a reflection of the way the program was structured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Semi open-access school with large language offering for secondary and adult re-entry learners including accelerated language courses.</td>
<td>• Output constructed by learners as summative tasks – We learn something and then we use it: homework, tests, summative assessment.</td>
<td>• School needs to seek enrolments and then keep them as students are there of their own volition.</td>
<td>• Learners expressed a desire to have ‘real life’ situations set up – role plays – prepared and unprepared.</td>
<td>• Learners are able to describe their output – talk about myself, describe what a person is doing, describe what you did today/yesterday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School needs to seek enrolments and then keep them as students are there of their own volition.</td>
<td>• Learners are able to describe their output – talk about myself, describe what a person is doing, describe what you did today/yesterday.</td>
<td>• Principal talks of the need for political nous to consolidate, and maintain the school and its programs.</td>
<td>• Output evidences some cultural awareness of LOTE speaking communities – you know what is expected.</td>
<td><strong>Input</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learners see limited contact as a difficulty – much rather learn LOTE at school because you can talk to teachers in between lessons to clarify or follow up.</td>
<td><strong>Intake</strong></td>
<td><strong>Input</strong></td>
<td><strong>Intake</strong></td>
<td><strong>Input</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Effort required is also acknowledged – You get out of it what you put in.</td>
<td>• Teachers prepare written packages for students for each lesson.</td>
<td>• Learners talk about the strategies they use – signs on objects at home, visualising, comparing notes with other students, think about what’s being taught.</td>
<td>• Effort required is also acknowledged – You get out of it what you put in.</td>
<td>• Learners are able to describe their output – talk about myself, describe what a person is doing, describe what you did today/yesterday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Input</strong></td>
<td><strong>Intake</strong></td>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
<td><strong>Intake</strong></td>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective</td>
<td>Learners talk about the strategies they use – signs on objects at home, visualising, comparing notes with other students, think about what’s being taught.</td>
<td>Learners talk about the strategies they use – signs on objects at home, visualising, comparing notes with other students, think about what’s being taught.</td>
<td>Learners are able to describe their output – talk about myself, describe what a person is doing, describe what you did today/yesterday.</td>
<td>Learners are able to describe their output – talk about myself, describe what a person is doing, describe what you did today/yesterday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intake</strong></td>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
<td><strong>Intake</strong></td>
<td><strong>Output</strong></td>
<td><strong>Intake</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners talk about the strategies they use – signs on objects at home, visualising, comparing notes with other students, think about what’s being taught.</td>
<td>Learners are able to describe their output – talk about myself, describe what a person is doing, describe what you did today/yesterday.</td>
<td>Learners are able to describe their output – talk about myself, describe what a person is doing, describe what you did today/yesterday.</td>
<td>Learners are able to describe their output – talk about myself, describe what a person is doing, describe what you did today/yesterday.</td>
<td>Learners are able to describe their output – talk about myself, describe what a person is doing, describe what you did today/yesterday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort required is also acknowledged – You get out of it what you put in.</td>
<td>Effort required is also acknowledged – You get out of it what you put in.</td>
<td>Effort required is also acknowledged – You get out of it what you put in.</td>
<td>Effort required is also acknowledged – You get out of it what you put in.</td>
<td>Effort required is also acknowledged – You get out of it what you put in.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Case Study T (Tertiary)

### MARGINALISED

- ✓ Illustrators: Context
  - This is a tertiary program in which a number of Asian languages are offered.
  - The standard tertiary program configuration is enhanced by a number of options aimed at improving the quality of the program and increasing the potential of the program to produce proficient speakers. These options include in-country study for one or two semesters, business enhancement programs where students gain work experience with expat companies, student internships, and opportunities for students to be involved in peer tutoring programs in school language classes.

### EMBEDDED

- ✓ In some languages in some years.

### DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION

- Illustrators: Output
  - The Head of School talks about the impact of the in-country year within the program being evident through the general maturity, confidence, and competence of the students emerging from the four year degree. He stated that by linking conventional area studies with the opportunity of living and studying in Asia we are able to inject a clear practical element into the training.
  - Many students exiting the program with in-country experience have interpreting and translating credentials – returning students have an unsurpassed record in the International Japanese Language Proficiency Examination.

### NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION

- ✓ In some languages in some years.

### THE LEARNERS

- Illustrators: Output
  - Students who have not included in-country study in their program talk of having a good understanding of the grammar of the languages they have studied.
  - Students who have not included in-country study in their program also talk in terms of a lack of confidence or an inability to comfortably deploy their language.

Learners in this program demonstrate characteristics ranging from co-dependency to autonomy. Most learners who include in-country experience as part of their formal program of study become autonomous.
Case Study L (Tertiary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGINALISED</th>
<th>EMBEDDED</th>
<th>DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>THE LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Illustrators:</td>
<td>✓ Illustrators:</td>
<td>✓ Illustrators:</td>
<td>✓ Illustrators:</td>
<td>• The program is structured to support the development of autonomous learners. Learners enter the program from different reference points but tend to exit as either autonomous or in transition to autonomy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Input</td>
<td>Broad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This program brokers and supports in-country study, for a semester or a year, for tertiary students wishing to study in Indonesia.</td>
<td>• Having a full time resident director provides supervision in the most flexible of senses. Students must output but they are supported and extended – each according to need.</td>
<td>Learners are forced to</td>
<td>Learners are forced to engage with language in both academic contexts and daily living contexts – situated learning and classroom learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The program is well organised and has been well supported by students and the university from which the program operates. If this level of support can continue then the program will remain embedded. There are concerns, however, that the situation in Indonesia may impact on student participation rates and on the ability to resource the program. If these concerns are realised then the program may find itself marginalised.</td>
<td>• Learners exiting the program are described, in general, as having high level language skills. Many graduates have interpreting and translating credentials and live and work in a variety of contexts including, Indonesia, DFAT, AUSAID, Trade, postgraduate studies, teaching etc.</td>
<td>provide the ideal language lab for the curious minded student. The program is not an enclave course...living in the society and not visiting it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intake</td>
<td>Input</td>
<td>Intake</td>
<td>Broad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners are able to talk about the process, making comparisons between how the process of converting input to intake is facilitated in different cultural contexts.</td>
<td>Learners are forced to engage with language in both academic contexts and daily living contexts – situated learning and classroom learning.</td>
<td>Learners are able to talk about the process, making comparisons between how the process of converting input to intake is facilitated in different cultural contexts.</td>
<td>Learners are forced to engage with language in both academic contexts and daily living contexts – situated learning and classroom learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pathways for Australian school students to achieve high levels of proficiency in Asian Languages
### Case Study K (Tertiary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARGINALISED</th>
<th>EMBEDDED</th>
<th>DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>NON-DEPLOYMENT ORIENTATION</th>
<th>THE LEARNERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Illustrators:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Learners in this program are autonomous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrators:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Context</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The self-learning comes through again and again in the interviews with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• This is a tertiary</td>
<td></td>
<td>• In high school kids blame the teacher – you didn’t teach this. Here, you can’t blame anyone. You have to do it yourself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>immersion program that</td>
<td></td>
<td>• We are told to be independent learners – make our own Japanese environment in Australia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>enables learners to</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Learners are also very aware of the importance of an ability to work in with their culture and abide by their rules and customs…respect for their language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>develop subject expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and TL knowledge together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• There are generous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>practical opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for learners to apply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>their knowledge in both</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Teachers and learners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>express a high degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of satisfaction with,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and enthusiasm for the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>program. The Centre is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the team – no one person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>makes the program go…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>they do it because they</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>want to do it – they</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>enjoy it. There is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reference to bonding is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a necessary part of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>making the whole thing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>work and … giving us</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>as much exposure to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese and Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>people as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Selective because of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nature of the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Within program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>perimeters there is a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>broad range of input from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a large number of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>background and non-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>background speakers of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the TL.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Learner’s work with an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>extensive range of text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>types.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The program structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>forces learners to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>independent and develop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>strategies for converting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>input into intake –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning to use own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>initiative. Learners are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>able to describe the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>process as it is for them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>including learn more from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>your mistakes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Students exiting the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>program describe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>themselves as having high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>level language skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>particularly listening.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ability to output</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>demonstrating sociocultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>knowledge is more limited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>than students would like –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>they want to be able to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>talk about other subjects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>politics etc… I’d like to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>go really deep, not just</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>superficial.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Writing skills are very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>good although there is a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>focus on the text types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of the profession.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Students who graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>from this course have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>confidence in doing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 100% employment rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of graduates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

School Profile Instrument
Key Questions for Senior Curriculum Officers
Principal/Program Coordinator Perceptions Interview
Teacher Perceptions Interview
Learner Perceptions Interview
Tertiary Program Coordinator Interview
Tertiary Learner Interview
SCHOOL PROFILE INSTRUMENT

1. Please provide the following general school details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School:</th>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>Postcode:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Telephone:</td>
<td>Fax:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Type:</td>
<td>Year Levels:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Numbers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male:</td>
<td>Female:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Numbers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male:</td>
<td>Female:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please Tick Those Categories Which Apply to Your School:

- ☐ Rural Location:
- ☐ Metropolitan Location:
- ☐ Government:
- ☐ Non-Government:
- ☐ Gender Specific:
- ☐ Co-Educational:

2. Please provide a description of the student population:

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
### SCHOOL PROFILE INSTRUMENT

3. Please provide a description of the local community (eg socio-economic characteristics):

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

4. Please provide details of the major ethnic groups represented in your school:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Approx Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Please provide details of the languages* offered at your school:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asian Language</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>Background Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lote 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Insert Name of LOTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lote 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Insert Name of LOTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lote 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Insert Name of LOTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lote 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Insert Name of LOTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lote 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Insert Name of LOTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the principle focus of the research is on Asian Languages this focus is not exclusive. It is “best practice” in LOTE that is under investigation.

6. Please provide language enrolment details by year level:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Level</th>
<th>LOTE 1</th>
<th>LOTE 2</th>
<th>LOTE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCHOOL PROFILE INSTRUMENT

7. Please provide a staffing profile for each language. (e.g., How many people teach each LOTE, is there provision for teacher assistants, in what ways do other staff complement the LOTE programs?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOTE 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOTE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOTE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SCHOOL PROFILE INSTRUMENT

8. Please provide information on the provision of LOTE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Level</th>
<th>Time Allocation</th>
<th>Intensity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOTE 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCHOOL PROFILE INSTRUMENT

9. What is the teaching mode of delivery (eg face-to-face, distance education, telematics, etc)?

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

10. Please include a brief description of your LOTE program type (eg content based, language based, integrated etc)?

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

11. What makes LOTE in your school special?

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________
Thank you for taking the time to complete this School Profile Instrument. Please return this instrument and the following documents (if available) to the contact person shown on the bottom of the form:

- Current School Development Plan
- LOTE Department Plan/Policy
- Curriculum Handbook
- LOTE Teaching/Learning programs
- Any other documentation which you consider may be of interest to this research project.

**Contact Person:**
Lindy Norris  
Project Director  
NALSAS Research Project  
Centre for Curriculum & Professional Development  
Institute of Education  
Murdoch University  
South Street  
MURDOCH 6150  
Telephone: 08 9360 2849  
Fax: 08 9360 6280  
Email: norris@murdoch.edu.au
KEY QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS WITH SENIOR CURRICULUM OFFICERS

- What are the best LOTE programs (or program types) which operate in your jurisdiction?
- Why are these the best programs? What are the success factors?
- Where are these types of programs happening?
PRINCIPAL/PROGRAM COORDINATOR
PERCEPTIONS INTERVIEW

(INDIVIDUAL and FOCUS GROUP)

Questions

About the program

∙ Why does your school have this LOTE program?
∙ How is your LOTE program structured?
∙ Why do you offer your LOTE program in this particular way?
∙ Your program has been identified as a ‘Best Practice’ program:
  – What is it about the structure that makes this a ‘Best Practice’ program?
  – What is it about the teacher(s) that makes this a ‘Best Practice’ program?
  – What is it about the learners that makes this a ‘Best Practice’ program?
∙ If you made changes to this program what would they be, and what would you like to see as the outcomes?
∙ When would you like these changes to be achieved?
∙ What would be necessary for these changes to take place? (internal and external)

About pathways for learners

∙ What opportunities have there been, or will there be, for learners to study their LOTE either prior to, or after their involvement in this current program?
∙ Do these opportunities facilitate the attainment of high levels of proficiency? Why/why not?
∙ Is there anything else that you would like to say?
TEACHER PERCEPTIONS INTERVIEW

(INDIVIDUAL or FOCUS GROUPS OF LOTE TEACHERS)

About the programs
- Your program has been described as a ‘Best Practice’ program. Why do you feel this program is perceived as a ‘Best Practice’ program?
- What changes would you like to see made to enhance this program (to make it an ‘even better practice program’)? (internal and external)

About the teachers
- What do you believe you have that contributes to this ‘Best Practice’ program and makes you a good LOTE teacher?
- Where did you get these attributes?
- What do you want to be doing differently in the future? By When?
- What do you think you will do to bring this about?

About their learners
- What do ‘best learners’ look like in your ‘Best Practice’ program?
  - What input do they get?
  - How do these learners convert this ‘input’ into ‘intake’? (ie Teachers perceptions of how ‘good’ learners learn and how they as teachers help.)
  - Describe learner output.
  - Describe what you think learner output would look like if you;
    a) made the changes you talked about before?
    b) made the changes in yourself that you talked about previously.
- Is there anything else that you would like to say?
TEACHER PERCEPTIONS INTERVIEW

(FOCUS GROUP – to be used with clusters, or in schools where non-LOTE teachers are extensively involved with the LOTE program)

About the programs

◆ Your program has been described as a ‘Best Practice’ program. Why do you feel this program is perceived as a ‘Best Practice’ program?
◆ What changes would you like to see made to enhance this program (to make it an ‘even better practice program’)? (internal and external)

About the teachers

◆ What do you believe you have that contributes to this ‘Best Practice’ program.
◆ Where did you get these attributes?
◆ What do you want to be doing differently in the future? By When?
◆ What do you think you will do to bring this about?

About the learners

◆ What ‘best learners’ look like in your ‘Best Practice’ program?
  – What input do they get?
  – How do these learners convert this ‘input’ into ‘intake’? (i.e. Teachers perceptions of how ‘good’ learners learn and how they as teachers help.)
◆ Is there anything else that you would like to say?
LEARNER PERCEPTIONS INTERVIEW

(FOCUS GROUP 4-6 ‘best learners’)

❂ What is it like learning this LOTE?
❂ Tell me about some of the things that you can do in your LOTE?
❂ How did you get to be able to do these things?
❂ What would you like to be able to do in the LOTE?
❂ If things were the way you wanted them to be, how would this help you to be able to do these things?
❂ Is there anything else that you would like to say?
Questions

❖ Your program has been identified as a program which has the potential to facilitate the attainment of high levels of language proficiency. What is it about the structure of your program that enables this?

❖ If you made changes to this program what would they be, and what would you like to see as the outcomes?

❖ When would you like these changes to be achieved?

❖ What would be necessary for these changes to take place? (internal and external considerations)

❖ Is there anything else that you would like to say?
TERTIARY LEARNER INTERVIEW

(FOCUS GROUP 4-6 learners)

❖ What is it like learning this LOTE?
❖ Describe your competence in the following areas:
  – receptive modes of language use;
  – productive modes of language use;
❖ Comment on your sociolinguistic knowledge and your ability to apply it.
❖ Comment on your sociocultural knowledge and the impact it has on your language use.
❖ How has the particular language learning program that you have been part of enabled you to improve your language proficiency?
❖ What else would you like to be able to do in the LOTE?
❖ What experiences/knowledge would you need to be able to do these things?
❖ Is there anything else that you would like to say?