TITLE PAGE

Name: Louise Crossley

Title: IELP and Year 10 EAL/D Curriculum in Australia: An investigation into the adequacy of prior knowledge to international students

Degrees of the Candidate: Master of Teaching (Secondary), Master of TESOL Education,
Bachelor of Arts (Professional Writing)

Acknowledgment: Dr. Hossein Shokouhi, who has provided invaluable feedback and suggestions for my Research Paper throughout the drafting process. Dr. Shokouhi has shared useful literature, his vast knowledge of TESOL and his own time as my mentor in Research in Education (Specialisation) at Deakin University.

TABLE OF CONTENT

Title Page	1
Table of Contents	2
Abstract.....	4
CHAPTER 1	
1 Introduction	5
1.1 Research Problem	6
1.2 Research Question	6
CHAPTER 2	
2 Literature Review	6
2.1 The IELP Classroom	7
2.2 Background and Contextualisation	8
2.3 Consequences	9
2.3.1 Previous Krashen Research	9
CHAPTER 3	
3 Theoretical Framework	10
3.1 Acquisition-Learning.....	11
3.2 Monitor	11
3.3 Input.....	11
3.4 Natural Order	12
3.5 Affective Filter	12
3.6 Paradigm.....	12
CHAPTER 4	
4 Methodology	13
4.1 Data, and Collection Method.....	14
4.1.1 Data Analysis Method	15
CHAPTER 5	

5 Results of Data Analysis.....	16
5.1 Gaslighting Monitor.....	18
5.2 Acquisition Learning	21
5.3 Input & Natural order.....	26
5.4 Teacher Qualifications.....	30
5.5 Curriculum Content & Teacher Influence	30
5.6 Affective Filter	33

CHAPTER 6

6 Discussion & Findings	34
6.1 Self-Efficacy	35
6.2 Convergence.....	36
6.3 Unattainability	37
6.4 Powerlessness and a feeling of Inferiority	39

CHAPTER 7

7 Conclusion	40
--------------------	----

REFERENCES

References.....	42
-----------------	----

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: IELTS Writing band 5, descriptor	50
Appendix 2: EAL/D Writing Progression Point S3	54

TABLES

Table 1. Unfamiliar and Undefined Words.....	17
Table 2. Course Background and Decision Makers.....	21
Table 3. Course Structure and Content.....	25

Abstract

Emerging English as an additional language and dialect (EAL/D) teaching concepts suggest that the current education system for international students is lacking consistency. While the new Victorian Curriculum F-10 EAL 2020 Reporting Tool (DET, 2019), and other initiatives, show efforts being made to support students whose first language is not English, international students continue to struggle to successfully transition from language school to mainstream school education. Data is collected from IELTS Writing band 5 and EAL Developmental Continuum indicator S3 (DET, 2019). It is analysed using mostly Fairclough's (2013) but also Gee's (1999) and Foucault's (cited in Garrity, 2010) definition of Critical Discourse Analysis and supported by Krashen's Second Language Acquisition Theory (1982) for a look at the psychological impact of the transition on students. An unachievable gap between the existing IELP and EAL/D courses is showcased and found to be caused by unassociated course content, independent governing bodies and inequivalent and inefficient teacher qualifications, restricting Year 10 international students from being successful in their education. A pathway course to provide a common space (Nakata, 2011) between the curriculum expectations of the relevant governing bodies, ESOS (2018) and VCAA (2017) /ACARA (2018b), and broader qualified educators to teach the courses, are recommended.

1: Introduction

An Australian Language (English) classroom brings together a multitude of cultural combinations. It aims to reprogram learnt habits and first language transfers with a focus on teaching small, scaffolded chunks of knowledge. On the other hand, an Australian secondary school classroom consists of mixed abilities and special needs. The Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority, Foundation– Year 10 (ACARA, 2018a) consists of four primary capabilities, including critical-creative thinking; three additional capabilities, including literacy and numeracy; and eight learning areas with a focus on broader thinking and synthesising. Teachers follow the Australian (2018) or Victorian (2017) Curriculum and use strategies as specified in their teacher degree. In a language school, the English as an additional language or dialect (EAL/D) teachers use strategies to deliver the curriculum in accordance with the units of competency descriptors and the teacher's TESOL education (Australian Skills Quality Authority, 2019) (ASQA). The university degrees of TESOL and VIT registered teachers vary substantially in AQF levels (ELICOS Standards, 2018; NEAS, n.d) which impact the delivery of the courses.

It should first be noted that in this study, language programs are referred to as Intensive English Language Programs (IELP). The literature together with the writing skill, IELTS Band 5 (IELP criteria) and EAL Developmental Continuum (EAL/DC) Indicator S3 (EAL/D criteria) (DET, 2019) outcomes explore the content of these courses using mostly Fairclough (2013), but also Gee (1999) and Foucault's (1981) definition of Critical Discourse Analysis to argue that one course does not adequately prepare students for the subsequent course. Krashen's Second Language Acquisition Theory (1982, 1987) supports this by considering the students' psycholinguistic preparedness for and during this process.

After seven years of teaching IELP in a registered training organisation, I accepted a position to teach a language program in a secondary college which I have held for one-and-a-half years. This has highlighted the challenges that Year 10 secondary school international students are facing as they follow the path set out for them by our education system from language school to senior secondary colleges, and face VCE subjects with little chance to succeed. This paper argues that the university training of the teachers in these

courses as well as the curriculum being followed do not provide a manageable transition between language schools and secondary colleges.

1.1: Research Problem

The curriculum gap between language school and secondary colleges is great. It includes a leap from foundational learning to multidisciplinary education, TESOL qualified teachers to VIT registered teachers. Consequently, international students are being unfairly challenged as they transition from language school to secondary colleges, unprepared and disadvantage. Year 10 international students are not coping with the critical thinking, literacy and higher order language skills required to perform adequately at this senior level.

1.2: Research Question

Through conversations with students, their mainstream teachers and other stakeholders like the parents, admissions officer, the international welfare officer and the heads of school, it has become clear that international students are struggling with the transition between language school and EAL/D courses. This simultaneous exposure to both mainstream and language programs has shown me the difficulties these students face. This study explores the expectations and factors behind the two courses to answer the research question: How does Australia's curriculum pathway for EAL/D, international students shape learners' adequacy to succeed?

2: Literature review

The transition from language to secondary school education for international students consists of many challenges. Not only is there a change in governing bodies, from Education Services for Overseas Students (ESOS, 2018) to Victorian Institute of Teaching (VIT) but also a change in curriculum authorities, from English Language Intensive Courses for Overseas Students (ELICOS) to the Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority (VCCA) (2017) / Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA, 2018a). International students go from a classroom of specific diversities to a classroom of mixed academic and emotional needs and abilities. It should be noted that like mainstream schools, language schools have a spectrum of abilities. However, the prerequisite Literacy and

Numeracy proficiency testing or the alternative IELTS course entry testing divides abilities into Beginner, Elementary, Pre-intermediate, Intermediate and Upper-Intermediate IELP courses (ASQA, 2019) whereas the transition from IELP to mainstream EAL/D brings students of mixed English abilities into the same classroom according to their age. The pedagogy of teaching and learning, by considering students' needs (Delzer, 2015) and encouraging respectful differentiations (Tomlinson, 2011), appears to have overlooked this cohort of learners. Instead, these students transition between two independently led governing bodies who seem not to communicate in relation to curriculum relatability.

2.1: The IELP Classroom

When an IELP classroom is explicitly considered, language transfer, first language interference and overgeneralisation are some of the factors that contribute to the way these students learn (Brown, 2007). Consequently, adding the diversities of mainstream education, when students transition into an English program according to age not ability, can result in a complexity of unrealistic expectations. Therefore, learners may experience feelings of confusion, loss of motivation and self-belief which may have a long-term effect on their education success. Theories on how people learn, Pavlov's Classical Behaviourism, Piaget's Developmental Cognitive Process, and Vygotsky's Developmental theory (cited in Darling-Hammond, Rosso, Austin, & Orcutt, 2001, pp. 5-7), collaborate in their belief in consistency, whether in the form of expectations, goals or self-actualisation. This consistency is not evident in the learning pathway that many international students experience. It begins with language school and reading, writing, speaking and listening - we will call them foundational capabilities (FC). Here, they are 'macro' skills, the primary focus of the learning. When they transition to secondary school FC become 'modes', a manner in which to learn a broader skill set. In secondary school, FC becomes a vehicle to develop higher order capabilities such as critical and creative thinking (VCAA/ACARA). As a result, the transition from language school to secondary school education comes with a significant increase in the expectation of higher order thinking, a wider learning cohort and a disparate governing body. This expects students to progress from learning the fundamental elements of English to its complex functions in one unit of education. Such an abrupt transition can interfere with the suggested one-step-above-ability (Krashen, 1987) theory and instead creates a learning environment where students are overwhelmed, unprepared and confused.

2.2: Background and Contextualisation

It should be noted that substantial adjustments and options have been made or made available in this country's education system for individual learning needs. An example is the current transition from the 'Companion to AusVELS EAL Developmental Continuum' (EAL/DC) to the 'Victorian Curriculum F-10 EAL 2020 Reporting Tool' (DET, 2019). As schools are free to 'trial all or part' of the new reporting tool, and it will not orient to Victorian Curriculum F-10 until 2021 (DET), the EAL/DC is used here, and compared with the available outline of the new tool on the DET website. This initiative and other improvements in education show that teaching to the collective is now recognised as disadvantaging (Creese & Blackledge, 2010) and teaching diversities are better understood (Anderson, Foley, Sanster, Edwards & Rassool, 2016). However, the disharmonising diversities between IELP and EAL/D education continues. One suggestion is for IELP and EAL/D to amalgamate their curriculum criteria to consider the student's funds of knowledge. A closer look at the language used in the current outcomes of these programs brings attention to the courses' lack of interrelatedness and the vocabulary's inaccessibility to international students. Although these programs share an awareness of Multiple Intelligence (Gardener, 1983), visible in both ESOS (2018) and VIT education bodies with a clearly designed curriculum for all learning styles (ACARA, 2018a / VCAA, 2017; Australian Skills Quality Authority, 2017), they seem not to have considered the adequacy requirement of grammar, critical thinking and vocabulary (Table 3) for students transitioning from one course to the other. It should be noted that compared with the EAL/DC, the new 'Victorian Curriculum F-10 EAL 2020 Reporting Tool' (DET, 2019), based on the available outline on the DET website, conveys a clearer explanation of the success criteria, with a contextual statement or two to put expectations into perspective. Overall though, while improvements are being made to support EAL/D learning, they do little to minimise the expectations placed on transitioning international students and the academic gap they face between language schools and secondary colleges. A perusal of the Intensive English Language Program requirements (ELICOS, 2018) and the VCAA (2017) /ACARA (2018a) curriculum reveals a clear and substantial variance in academic demands and expectations. It could be argued that cultural interface, as Nakata (2011) refers to the common space between cultural differences (Indigenous versus non-Indigenous people, study), is necessary to correlate language schools

and secondary colleges and create a more manageable scaffolded transition, from one course to the other.

2.3: Consequences

Brown (2007) states that learners have a need for self-efficacy to feel capable of gaining success before they can devote themselves to achieving success. Therefore, the current transition process can affect student's motivation too, since for them success is more difficult to achieve. Krashen's Input Hypothesis theory (1982, 1987) further suggests that learning is less likely if the challenge is greater than one step above ability. As Year 10 EAL/D secondary school expectations are, as explained earlier, substantially more demanding than the academic expectations of language school learning, these students are likely to lack motivation and the best opportunity to learn.

2.3.1: Previous Krashen Research

Other studies have used Krashen's psychological Second Language Theory (1982) to provide an extrinsic and intrinsic look at the phenomena of the research. Yuan's (2018) English Language Multimedia Teaching Model used Krashen's theory (1982) to investigate 'teacher-student', 'student-student' and 'student-computer' interactions in search of an "advanced, mature and efficient new teaching mode...for the improvement of college English teaching systems" (p. 199). The researcher used Krashen's Input Hypothesis to determine if the Multimedia Teaching Model could support English acquisition with an input of learning at comprehensible limits. A study based in China; Yuan investigated multimedia teaching as an alternative to teacher-centred English language learning. The researcher used Krashen's Comprehensible Input to expose students to what they know and will learn, and Comprehensible Output by English language use and feedback. Questioning the exemplification of 'teacher-answering' (p. 198) modes, Yuan disputed the teacher centred approach whereby the teacher dominates the classroom and explored an alternative with Comprehensible Input and Output with an aim to improve English language acquisition.

In the same way, I use Input (Krashen, 1982) to determine if EAL/D (VCAA, 2017/ACARA, 2018a) is more than one step above the learning level of the preceding IELP (ELICOS, 2018) curriculum. This is done by exploring the vocabulary, requirements and standards of the

expected outcomes of both courses. In the same way, Yuan (2018) explored teacher domination, this research considers societal power (Fairclough, 2001) in curriculum writing using Krashen's Theory (1982) as a set of language learning instructions. With Critical Discourse Analysis as a methodology (Williamson, Given & Scifleet, 2018; Wodak & Mayer, 2009), which I will explain in greater detail later, Krashen's Input, Affective Filter, Monitor, Acquisition-Learning and Natural Order Hypothesis provide a language learning lens with which to observe the impact that the curriculum can have on students' wellbeing and learning. This is done by not only exploring language levels through vocabulary and teaching methods but also language dominance (Fairclough, 2013) through word history (Foucault, 1981) and word usability and importance (Gee, 1999).

3: Theoretical Framework

Krashen developed the Second Language Acquisition Theory in the late 70's and early 80's (1982). Since then, it has been widely used in second language research and teaching Yuan, 2018), albeit questioned by other theorists. The theory consists of five hypothesis' that imply that language learning flourishes when it is natural, manageable, stress-free and organised (Krashen). It goes further to suggest that rigorous grammatical rules are not necessary nor prolonged formal teaching to obtain the target language, but a natural and meaningful approach is more effective (Dervic & Spahic, 2018). With this in mind, Krashen's theory inspects the IELP (ELICOS, 2018) using IELTS Band 5, and EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b) curriculum using EAL/DC Continuum S3 Indicator (DET, 2019) to explore questions such as: Do the expectations of IELTS and EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b) curriculum work together to provide a manageable progression from one course to the other? Do they agree in content and assessment modes, whether content-based, experience-based or outcome-based (Readman & Allen, 2013), for optimum language acquisition? Do the governing bodies relate in language use and grammatical mood and what effect does this language use have on students' emotional state and self-confidence? These questions relate closely to Krashen's theory (1982) and will assist in answering the ultimate questions: How does Australia's curriculum pathway for EAL/international students shape learners' adequacy to succeed? However, before it is possible to analyse the curriculum, Krashen's five-pronged theory must be clear.

Acquisition-Learning

The Acquisition-Learning hypothesis distinguishes the difference between natural learning and academic learning. According to Krashen (1982), acquisition is natural learning; to communicate and understand like a child with its first language. Whereas academic learning focuses on the grammar and structure of a second language. Krashen proposes that acquisition is more important than academic learning, and strict grammatical rules and formal English language teaching is not necessary as formal teaching is simply a checking system. However, not everyone agrees with this. Linguists Barry Mc Laughlin (1978, 1987) and Kevin Gregg (1984) argue that the Language Acquisition Device (LAD) is not fully operational in older students; therefore, academic learning may be a better option for them. Fellow linguist Noam Chomsky (1975) concurs by claiming that the older you get the more limited your access to LAD. In contrast, linguists Johanne Paradis et al (1994) and Shalom Schwartz (1992) support Krashen's claim that information is derived unconsciously, and natural learning is more effective because LAD can only receive natural input.

Monitor

The Monitor hypothesis provides the link in the Acquisition-Learning hypothesis where the acquisition is the speech while the monitor works as an editor of speech, to plan, edit and correct. As a result, Krashen (1982) warns that learners can over-use their monitor by being too cautious and self -analysing when speaking; they can under-use their monitor by being over reliant on what sounds right; and they can optimally use their monitor by speaking mindfully. Krashen believes that language learners learn best when they are not anxious and in a comfortable environment as a result of an optimally working monitor.

Input

The Input Hypothesis is, according to Krashen (1982), the core hypothesis that explains how second language learning takes place. Concentrating on acquisition, not learning, it articulates the need for learners to be challenged to progress in their language acquisition. However, the challenge must be just one step beyond learner's English language competency or Comprehensible Input, as Krashen referred to language that learners grasp while not fully understand (1982). Therefore, this hypothesis implies that attempts at language learning greater than one step above ability barriers the learning.

Natural Order

The Natural Order hypothesis is based on findings which take the view that the acquisition of grammatical form follows a 'natural order' and is predictable (Dulay & Burt, 1974; Fathman, 1975; Makino cited in Krashen, 1987). Krashen goes on to say that some grammatical parts are acquired earlier than others regardless of learner's age, learning history and background. Ultimately, this hypothesis implies that grammar acquisition follows a natural order and is usually achieved without the need for intensive teaching intervention.

Affective Filter

The Affective Filter Hypothesis reflects Krashen's (1982) belief that various elements impede on second language learning. Key factors such as motivation, self-confidence and anxiety are believed to alter the learning process. Low motivation, self-belief and high anxiety increases the Affective Filter and blocks learning and Comprehensible input from being used.

3.6: Paradigm

An Interpretivist paradigm is adopted to elucidate the curriculum writing outcomes of the two programs, IELTS (ELICOS, 2018) and EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b). As Lincoln and Guba (1985) attest, the interpretivist paradigm allows various interpretations of a study. Therefore, this paradigm is used to perceive the curriculum on evidence and my professional experience. The nature of this paradigm provides the scope in which to examine the effects that the courses have on each other with the flexibility of professional interpretation. Moreover, as the interpretivist paradigm takes a social science approach and concentrates on people's actions (Gray, 2004), it affiliates well with Fairclough (2013) and Gee's (1999) socialistic views. The order of importance and level of power of Fairclough and Gee's socialistic views are interpreted by my own professional beliefs and therefore altered by who I am. Overall, the interpretivist paradigm appropriately links with Fairclough (2013) and Gee's (1999) view that 'reality is socially constructed' (Mertens, 2005, p.12). In a similar way, Krashen's (1982) psychological perspective of the international students with his Second Language Acquisition Theory requires my interpretation of human eventualities (Gray, 2004). Hence, an interpretivist approach is considered suitable.

4: Methodology

Critical Discourse Analysis takes a distinctive, critical stance by analysing discourse for its dominance, purpose and point of view (Williamson, Given & Scifleet, 2018; Wodak & Mayer, 2009). In this research, Fairclough's (2013) work and his definition of discourse is particularly drawn from as a means to use a broader perspective to analyse the curriculum outcomes in IELP (ELICOS, 2018) and EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b) courses. Fairclough's (2013) attention on societal power, the author and the vocabulary, together with Krashen's (1982) focus on Acquisition, Language Monitor, Comprehensible Input, Natural Order and Affective Filter provide an intrinsic and extrinsic perspective of IELP (ELICOS, 2018) transition to EAL/D (ACARA, 2018c). Foucault's (1981) notion of discourse analysis adds a broader scope and an archaeological perspective which can support Fairclough's (2013) views by identifying the history of the power behind the discourse and how it gained its notoriety. The differentiations are made by the interpretations of the word 'discourse' as specific societal power (Fairclough) or centred on etymology (Foucault, cited in Garity, 2010, p. 155). In the same way that Yuan (2018) investigated a less power-driven teaching mode for language learning, this study incorporates the various definitions of discourse with Krashen's hypothesis (1982, 1987) to explore the factors that help or hinder language development. It considers the power and domination together with the history and the priorities of the Language School and Secondary College environments and the varying teacher qualifications, to critically analyse the governing bodies and their antecedent curriculum to determine the discourse effects on international students' intrinsic and extrinsic progress.

Firstly, the discourse is analysed as statements that can be connectable, relatable and redistributed; aligning with Foucault's (1981) definition that discourse is usable, living and reliable. This is also referred to as small 'd' (discourse) by Gee (1999), which will be explained later; therefore, corroborating the belief that discourse is commonly understood. Secondly, the curriculum is analysed as text with a history - evolving and subjectable (Foucault, 1981) which Gee (1999) refers to as big D (Discourse) which will also be explained later. The multiple definitions of discourse (Fairclough, 2013; Foucault, 1989; Gee, 1999) provide a broader look at the language used in the curriculums to thoroughly explore its uses and comprehension by international students. Overall, these factors further explore the effects of

the curriculum in transition and whether it falls within one step above (Krashen, 1987) the antecedent course.

Exploring the above mentioned provides a lens into the backgrounds of the teaching institutes and their regulators and explores how this has influenced the discourse, shaped the benchmarks and considered the audience. It is worthwhile to take a closer look at Gee's (1999) categories of discourse. Gee's small 'd'/ big 'D' labels reflect a proper noun/common noun concept with the lower case/upper case symbols. Exploring this suggests a hierarchy of importance making the history of the discourse more significant than the utterances. This puts attention on the prioritisation of the institutes in relation to writing curriculum and the variation between learning environments, discourse choice and structure. Foucault (cited in Garrity, 2010) states that discourse 'requires a certain change of viewpoint and attitude to be recognised and examined in itself' (as cited in Garrity, 2010, p. 124); consequently, making the priorities chosen by the institutes evidence of their viewpoints. The intention of the discourse is therefore important and effects the subject, its clarity and how it is received by international students. Foucault's (1972) 'surfaces of emergence' state that the categories, classifications and authorities of the discourse matter in their definition as 'we are not dealing with the same madmen' (1972; 2002, p.35). With this visual statement, Foucault (1972) aptly labels the conflicting goals and expectations of these supposed pathway courses with the word 'madmen'.

4.1: Data, and Collection Method

The data was collected from IELTS Progression Point Indicators and EAL Companion to AusVELS Developmental Continuum Indicators (VCAA, 2017). The writing indicators were selected above speaking and listening modes, as AusVELS combines the indicators whereas IELTS has separate indicators for each; therefore, limitations in the comparison would have transpired. Reading was a reasonable choice, and writing was chosen over reading for no important reason. The level, IELTS indicator 5 and AusVELS Progression Point S3, were selected to align with the courses' English language scale value as explained later in this paper.

Since qualitative data collection enables the naturalistic learning experience (Willig, 2009) and the naturalistic setting of the classroom experience to be recorded (Haug, 1987), it is deemed suitable for this research and its Interpretivist Paradigm. As the study considers teacher education and emotional experiences of international student, this method is believed to be a good choice. Moreover, as the data collected requires some interpretation by the researcher (Willig, 2009), qualitative research is deemed appropriate for this purpose too. However, Willig (2009) argues that this means of data collection is susceptible to universalisation where social norms can influence behaviour and generalisability by the researcher. Therefore, special attention is given to consider all stakeholders, creators, deliverers and recipients. I am satisfied that the considerations made are demonstrative of 'new ways of thinking about what constitutes truth' while conformed by Fairclough (2013), Foucault (1972) and Gee's (1990; 1999) definition of discourse in the Critical Discourse Analysis of the curriculum. In addition, as the expected productivity and emotional experiences of international students in response to the curriculum transition is a lived experience, a qualitative method aligns well to also consider Krashen's (1982) psychological theory and my interpretation of the data which is unique to me.

4.1.1: Data Analysis Method

The IELP (ELICOS) through IELTS Band 5 (Appendix 1) and the EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b) through EAL/DC Progression Point S3 (DET, n.d) (Appendix 2) are coded with a pre-developed coding framework (Gibbs, 2010) guided by Krashen's theory (1982; 1987). The coding framework consists of challenge levels (Input), teaching and learning modes (Acquisition-Learning), self-confidence (Monitor), teaching and learning order and emphasis (Natural Order), motivation and anxiety (Affective Filter).

In response to Mc Laughlin's (1978, 1987) claim that it is very difficult to measure language data and equate it to learning step increments, the following information is provided to demonstrate it is possible.

IELTS Band 5 and EAL/DC S3 are considered comparable with reference to the Intensive English Language Program Guide (Department of Education and Early Childhood Development 2010) (DEECD) which states that IELP 'Intermediate (equates to EAL/DC progression points) S2-3' (p. 13). Moreover, the Australian Education Assessment Service

(AEAS) equates IELTS band 5 with AEAS score 46-56 and puts IELP Intermediate at AEAS score 46-60 and therefore at IELTS band 5 level. As DEECD considers S3 to require 'Intensive + ESL Support' (p. 13) and S4 'Advanced + 'mainstream' (P.13), S3 is considered equal or slightly above IELTS band 5/IELP Intermediate level which provides an achievable gap between these courses and therefore suitable to demonstrate learning step increments (Mc Laughlin, 1978, 1987).

It is important to mention that while EAL/DC is transitioning into the 'Victorian Curriculum F-10 EAL 2020 Reporting Tool', DET (2019) confirms that the stages of language 'S' correlate with the new 'C' indicators (DET, 2019). Therefore, the $i + 1$ (Krashen 1982) explanation above remains relevant by replacing 'S3' with 'C3' (DET, 2019) in the new reporting tool.

The data is analysed using Krashen's Second Language Acquisition Theory (1982; 1987) as a descriptor. Also, a qualitative approach is taken using primarily Fairclough (2013), but also Foucault (1972) and Gee's (1999) definition of discourse for a Critical Discourse Analysis of the curriculum: The chunks of text identified as similar are collated to represent the same phenomenon (Gibbs, 2010). This is construed with Krashen's $i + 1$ hypothesis (1982). The continuum levels provide a measure to determine one-step-above ability exit from language school and entry to Year 10 secondary school for international students. Ambiguous words are examined using perfect/comparative/superlative principles to explore their ability to represent neutral, better, worse, excellent feedback/clear direction to international students.

5: Results of the Data Analysis

Krashen's Theory (1982) provides a basis to conduct Critical Discourse Analysis by looking at the IELP (ELICOS) and Year 10 secondary school EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b) curriculum from multiple viewpoints from the perspective of international students. As mentioned earlier, Critical Discourse Analysis influenced primarily by Fairclough (2013), along with Foucault (1972) and Gee (1999) is used to ascertain curriculum outcomes for language accessibility, curriculum suitability and influence with a particular focus on 'unfamiliar and undefined

words' 'course background and decision making' 'course structure and content' and 'students' effect'.

The table below contains words in the IELTS and EAL/D descriptors that are identified as either above students' current ability or are ambiguous in definition. It is assumed that students understand the various grammatical forms of words and therefore words that appear in the Cambridge English Vocabulary List (CEVL) in one form are considered usable in every form. As mentioned above, the CEVL equates an IELTS band 5-6 (2020, p.2) to its list of words and therefore orients to the scale of the courses being examined. It is used to demonstrate the unattainability of this language for international students and the psychological consequence (Krashen, 1982).

Table 1. Unfamiliar and Undefined Words

Words in IELTS descriptors not in Cambridge English Vocabulary List	Words in EAL/D descriptors not in Cambridge English Vocabulary List	Undefined words in descriptors (IELTS words are coded red and IELP coded blue).
Academic, Recounts, Mechanically (this specific meaning not listed), Overview, Impede, Variable, Tendency, Partially, Format, Inappropriate, Expresses, Drawn (this specific meaning not listed), Sufficiently, Inadequate, Inaccurate, Overall, Over-use, Cohesive,	Communicate, Range, Support, Imaginative, Narrative, Awareness, Recount, Elements, Structure, Storyline, Character, Linkage, Argument, Familiar, Structure, Incorporating, Sources, Visual, Stimulus, Diagram, Summarise, Variety, Curriculum, Sequence,	Partially, May, Inappropriate, Some, Sufficiently, Inadequate, Irrelevant, Over-use, Less common, Rarely, Appropriate, Firm control, Effectively, Some, Attempts, Growing, Developing, Sufficient, Extensive, Knowledge, Basic, Reasonable, Range, Increasing, Improve

Substitution	Biography, Demonstrate, Audience, Content, Influence, Avoid, Express, Layout, Coherent, Colloquial, Range, Cartoon, Idiomatic, Effectively, Consistently, Humour, Attempts, Sophistication, Cultural, Sensibility, Plump, Metalanguage, Linguistic, Persuade, Classify, Qualify, Formulaic, Abbreviations, Paraphrasing, Extensive, Construct, Relative Clause, Conjunctions, Verbs, Passives, Conditionals, Conventions, Punctuation, Full stops, Commas, Colon, Exclamation mark, Question Mark, Accuracy, Syntax Responsibility, Proofread, Redraft, Audience, Cues, Timeline, Graphic organiser, Conventions, Distinguish, Graphaphonic,	
--------------	---	--

5.1: Gaslighting Monitor

Unfamiliar and undefined words in the IELTS and EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b) curriculum can have a negative effect on the psychological self-efficacy and Monitor use (Krashen, 1982) of

international students. Teachers are given societal power (Fairclough, 2013) by the governing bodies of these courses with the use of words which teachers can subjectively interpret, potentially causing students to second guess themselves when speaking.

The right column in Table 1 documents words which can be widely interpreted, colour coded to identify which curriculum they belong – IELTS words are coded red and IELP are blue. The Table reflects a higher number of undefined words in the EAL/D (ACARA, 2018c) curriculum with a total of 16 identified whereas the IELTS (representing IELP) curriculum contains 11 words. This implies that while both curricula empower (Fairclough, 2013) teachers to put their own value and their own evaluation on student submissions, the EAL/D does this at a greater scale. Encouragingly, the new ‘Victorian Curriculum F-10 EAL 2020 Reporting Tool’ (DET, 2019), available to ‘trial all or part’ this year in 2020 until its full replacement of EAL/DC in 2021, shows a vast improvement in contextualising expectations according to its published outline. Until then, the current indicators which consist of a collective list of subjective quantifiers, modifiers and opinion words that make up the undefined word list in Table 1. risks inconsistencies from teacher to teacher and course to course. This represents the power (Fairclough, 2013) that teachers from ESOS and VIT education backgrounds are given over students’ success and failure. For instance, when international students are given undefined words like ‘partially’ and ‘sufficient’ (Table 1) in their feedback, they are unable to question results as they are restricted from the specific meaning of the words which only the teachers assessing the submissions can provide. Therefore, they are also restricted from developing the skills to self-monitor due to the inconsistencies between teacher to teacher definitions of what is ‘effective’ and ‘sufficient’ (Table 1).

To demonstrate the impossibility of these descriptor words providing international students with clear academic guidelines, the ‘perfect’ ‘comparative’ and ‘superlative’ adjective forms are used to examine the undefined words in Table 1. By adding the comparative and superlative - more/less, most/least, the ambiguity of what is provided as a descriptor to students and/or teachers is clear. When words from Table 1. like ‘less common’ are examined this way, the need for a comparative noun or a superlative context is obvious. For example, ‘less common’ (Table 1) requires another noun to modify its meaning. Without a comparative noun, the phrase is as undefined as a hanging sentence. Therefore, since the

exemplar for the adjective's perfect form is omitted, the standard for words in Table 1, like 'common' are undefined. Notably, since grammatical words like 'verbs' 'conditionals' and 'exclamation mark' are included in the middle column – EAL/DC list of unfamiliar words - in Table 1, it is especially important that governing bodies clarify meanings and not make assumptions of what constitutes common vocabulary for international students. By failing to clarify vocabulary for students, ESOS and VCAA (2017) /ACARA (2018a) exercise society power (Fairclough, 2013) by choosing discourse that empower teachers over students with open to interpretation descriptors and indicators. It should be noted that while the EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b) outcomes are written for teachers and the IELTS outcomes are for students, both curriculums contain obscurities that disempower students either directly by reading requirements that they do not understand, or indirectly, by being assessed with discourse that teachers can define by their own interpretation and reuse in their own rubric.

In a similar way, the IELTS/EAL/DC descriptor words not in Cambridge English Vocabulary List (CEVL) in the left and middle column in Table 1, demonstrate the usability (Gee, 1999) and interpretability of the discourse for international students. The CEVL, a respected creator of resources for International students, assigns an English language level of between A1 to B2 CEFR to its vocabulary in this document and confirms this is equivalent to IELTS band 5-6 (2020, p.2). This not only verifies the scaling comparisons of CEFR to IELTS but also verifies the English level of the vocabulary as within the focus range of this study, being band 5 (IELTS) and S3 (EAL/DC) when referred back to the above DEECD and AEAS conversion information. Therefore, words in the left and middle column of Table 1. can be assumed above the English comprehensibility of international students. Overall, the data in Table 1. preludes to a risk in curriculum usability (Gee 1999) and students feeling incapables of gaining success (Brown, 2007). As a consequence, students either overuse their monitor (Krashen, 1982) or become unreasonable in their self-correction (Mc Laughlin, 1987) from the unintelligibility of the courses' success criteria.

Ultimately, this study reveals words used in the curricula that not only limit usability (Gee, 1999) but assign authoritarian power (Fairclough, 2013) to teachers, and potentially trigger students to over-use their monitor (Krashen, 1982). Arguably, these words not only empower (Fairclough, 2013) the assessor to define words with no clear definition but can harm

international students' psychological wellness with ambiguous words and unclear expectations that can make them feel like they have a deficit (Comber & Kamler, 2004). It does not help that educators from these two courses come from ESOS and VIT backgrounds and interpret the criteria based on their arguably incompatible descriptors, educational backgrounds and discretions, leaving students with a pathway of fluctuating standards. These inconsistencies could have a negative effect on how students view their own performance which Brown (2007) calls situational self-esteem, and ultimately make them overuse their monitor (Krashen, 1982) and barrier their English language learning.

5.2: Acquisition-Learning

In this section, I argue that EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b) takes both an 'acquisition' and a 'learning' (Krashen, 1982) approach with a clear audience of Australian children (MCEEYA, 2008) (Table 1). While IELP (through IELTS outcomes) targets 'overseas students' (National Code 2018) using a 'learning' (Krashen, 1982) approach.

Perusing the history of ELICOS (2018) (the overarching name for IELP courses) with Standards that are made legislative under ESOS (ASQA) reveals a consistent focus on English language foundation (Table 1). Since the establishment of ELICOS in 2011 (Table 2), the pedagogy that Krashen (1982) refers to as 'learning' has mostly been used, with discourse in the curriculum that organises international students in 'appropriate... language proficiency level' (Standard P. 3) (Table 2) to teach targeted English components. Evidence of this is in popular IELP textbooks such as Pearson Speakout (Clare & Wilson, 2015) books, which lists grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, reading, writing, listening and speaking, as individual parts so students learn (Krashen, 1982) grammatical formulas and purposes.

The table below documents the history of IELP and EAL/D courses adjacent to Foucault (1972) and Fairclough's (2013) definition of discourse.

Table 2. Course Background and Decision Makers

Related Critical Discourse Analysis	Melbourne Declaration of Education Goals for Young Australians (MCEEYA 2008)	Education Services for Overseas Students (Registration Charges) Act 1997
History (Foucault 1972)	<p>'In 1989 the Australian Education Council ...adopted 10 Common and Agreed National Goals for Schooling in Australia... Each State and Territory used the principles of the... Declaration. ... The declaration provided the guiding principles for the development of a national school curriculum (Foundation to Year 10) that is called the Australian Curriculum' (Killen 2012)</p> <p>Melbourne Declaration Goals (2008)</p> <p>The Education Goals for Young Australians</p> <p>Goal 1 Australian schooling promotes equity and excellence</p> <p>Goal 2 All young Australians become successful learners, confident and creative individuals, and active and informed citizens</p> <p>– successful learners</p> <p>– confident and creative</p>	<p>In July 2011 the ELICOS Standards were made legislative instruments under ESOS. All ELICOS providers are now required to meet the Standards to be registered on CRICOS.</p> <p>The department undertook public consultation on proposed revisions to the ELICOS Standards from 14 July 2017 to 11 August 2017.</p> <p>National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students, 2018</p> <p>Standard 9 - Completion with expected duration</p> <p>The provider monitors each student's progress closely. It takes action, where required, to make sure the student can complete a course within the expected duration, as specified on the CoE. The provider must have documented policies and</p>

<p>Power (Fairclough 2013)</p>	<p>individuals – active and informed citizens</p> <p>As a nation Australia values the central role of education in building a democratic, equitable and just society— a society that is prosperous, cohesive and culturally diverse, and that values Australia’s Indigenous cultures as a key part of the nation’s history, present and future (MCEEYA 2008)</p>	<p>procedures which cover how students’ loads will be monitored and what actions the provider will take to keep students on track (National Code 2018)</p> <p>Standard 10 - Monitoring Course Progress</p> <p>All providers must have a documented intervention strategy, which must be made available to staff and students. At a minimum, the intervention strategy must be activated where the student has failed or is deemed not yet competent in 50 per cent or more of the units attempted in any study period. Providers may choose to intervene at any point before the end of a study period if outlined in their course progress policy and/or intervention strategy (National Code 2018)</p> <p>ELICOS Standards (2018)</p> <p>Standard P3 – Teaching ELICOS</p>
--------------------------------	--	--

		<p>P3.1 The provider must have policies and procedures in place to ensure that:</p> <p>1) students are placed in a class appropriate to their current language proficiency level, learning goals and learning needs and consistent with their written agreement...</p> <p>not exceed 1:18 per class</p>
--	--	---

The National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students (The National Code) (2018) 'monitor each student's progress, closely' (Standard 9,) (Table 2) and expects students to demonstrate English development within a specified time. This outcome based (Readman & Allen, 2013) expectation, which has been stipulated in the ELICOS Standards since its foundation, further implies a learning (Krashen, 1982) curriculum with consistent attention on progress in grammar, writing and speaking structures. The excerpt in the right column in Table 2 - the National Code, Standard 10 - further demonstrates an attention on student progress and enforces a minimum success rate, with a required 'competent in 50 per cent or more of the units attempted' (Standard 10, National Code, 2018) to meet Standards (2018) (Table 2) and visa conditions. Furthermore, the excerpt of the ELICOS Standard 'P3.1, 2018' (right column, Table 2) details class sizes of no more than 18 students per teacher ratio. This commitment to creating an environment that differentiates (Tomlinson, 2011) for a niche cohort of only international students, small classes, at a precise English level, further demonstrates a structured environment where strict grammatical elements are taught in a defined time to a defined audience.

It is important to note that the General Capabilities are taught to both international students in EAL/D courses and to native students in mainstream English (ACARA, 2018a). This exposes

international students who transition to EAL/D to content that as stated in the Melbourne Declaration (MCEEYA, 2018) targets ‘young Australians’ (Table 2). Basing the curriculum on ‘Australia(n) values’ (MCEEYA) (Table 2) and its definition of ‘democratic, equitable and just society’ (MCEEYA) (Table 2) gives ACARA the power (Fairclough, 2013) to expect international students studying EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b) to have acquired (Krashen, 1982) the same prior knowledge as native students and have the same definition of values (Table 2) when even the notion of happiness differs from East to the West (Taylor & Tiley, 2013). This expectation is evident in the MCEEYA (2018) heading ‘The Education Goals for Young Australians’ and in the beginning of Goal 2 ‘All Young Australians...’. With a commitment to action that includes ‘Confident and Creative Individuals’ and “confident... creative...active’ (Goal 2, MCEEYA, 2008) (right column, Table 2) citizens. The words used in MCEEYA (2008) clearly target a creative mindset assuming acquisition (Krashen, 1982) of curriculum that international students can only learn (Krashen, 1982). The argument that Krashen’s (1982) Language Acquisition Device (LAD) is not fully operational in older students (Mc Laughlin, 1978, 1987; Gregg, 1984; Chomsky, 1975) adds the age of these students as a barrier to the already challenging transition into a course that is not targeted to them.

It should be noted that ELICOS courses were not legislated until 2011 as stipulated by the information cited from the Education Services for Overseas Students (Registration Charges) Act 1997 (Table 2), whereas MCEEYA (2008) was created from a decision made in 1989 (Killen, 2012) (Table 2). This is important in comparison, as ELICOS is substantially new in adhering to compliances with a history (Foucault, 1972) potentially less defined in its expectation than ACARA. This suggests that while ELICOS may be particularly focused on not only building a student profile but congregating profiles that are alike, it has had less experience in refining what works and what does not.

Data excerpts from standards, and expert citation (Table 2) reveal a demonstration of power (Fairclough, 2013) in both ACARA (2018b) and ELICOS history that reflects curriculum for a targeted audience - IELP, ELICOS courses target international students (National Code, 2018) whereas ACARA, even EAL/DC by association, targets young Australians (MCEEYA, 2008) (Table 2). However, as ELICOS courses have only international students of a specific English ability in the classroom, it can be argued that this action does not disadvantage anyone in

this environment. On the other hand, in the mainstream environment, if attention is paid to just one cohort, it penalises another, particularly when teacher feedback discredits minds that are not creative. Ultimately, this perspective reveals a jarring pathway for international students from ELICOS Standards (2018) to the Goals of the MCEEYA (2008) (Table 2). An expectation to move from a course established to ‘provide...education and training to international students’ (National Code, 2018) and learn (Krashen, 1982) the structure of the English language, to a course that sensationalises ‘The Education Goals for Young Australians’ (MCEEYA, 2008) and scaffolds prior knowledge to support acquisition (Krashen, 1982), is not only inconstant but potentially unattainable for some international students.

5.3: Input and Natural Order

The Input and in less detail, the Natural Order (Krashen 1982) of IELP to EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b) courses are explored with the perspective of Fairclough’s Societal Power (2013) and Gee’s (1999) discourse Usability. The one step above ability Input theory (Krashen, 1982) compares the courses’ structure and content, including by whom they are delivered (Table 3). With the hierarchal scale of importance in the small ‘d’/big D’ notion (Gee) and the proper noun/common noun concept mentioned earlier, this section examines the consequence of both varying teacher qualifications and course expectations. This is done by considering the teachers’ differing qualifications (Table 3) and its impact on the discourse, its perceived Natural Order (Krashen, 1982) and its usability (Gee, 1999). Furthermore, the wider curriculum is viewed with Fairclough’s Power (2013) relating to the MCEEYA, its focus on Australian children (Table 2), and MCEEYA’s guiding influence on ACARA (Table 2). These combined methodologies work well in this instance as an omniscient look at the course transition, the decision makers, the structure of the teaching and the specific information, to determine if the courses are within Krashen’s (1982) one step above ability suggestion.

The table below compares the relationship between teacher qualifications, exposure to curriculum and course duration with discourse used.

Table 3. Course Structures and Content

Course	Teacher Education	Curriculum Components	Course Duration	Level specific curriculum discourse (taken from the curriculums). Colour coded in red, for critical thinking, purple, for vocabulary, and green, for grammar.
EAL/D	Bachelor of Education or; -Primary Degree + Master of Education Note that for both courses, two units of study in EAL earns EAL as a Method and four units of study in EAL earns EAL as a Specialisation (VIT)	ACARA -MCEEYA -AusVELS -Critical and Creative thinking capability -Personal and Social capability (ACARA) -Literacy -Numeracy	1 year	Taken from EAL/DC S3 Descriptor Communicates a range of ideas, opinions and information through a range of text types after teacher modelling -Write an argument with supporting information, linkage and coherent development of ideas -Write factual text and organise ideas -Write reports incorporating ideas...

				<p>Text may still include oral terms like colloquial language</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Use some colloquial, idiomatic and humour -Uses a growing vocabulary and a developing metalanguage -Uses a range of English grammar appropriate to text
IELP	<p>Primary degree + Post Graduate TESOL qualification with practicum and/or experience in the field or;</p> <p>-A teaching degree with TESOL/EAL as a Method (ESOS 2018)</p>	<p>-Registered Training Organisation (RTO) (design courses aimed at relevant English level with Reading, Writing, Speaking, Listening elements)</p> <p>-IELTS (equivalences)</p> <p>-ELICOS/ESOS (Standards met)</p>	10 to 12 weeks per level	<p>Taken from the IELTS Band 5 Descriptor</p> <p>Detail may be mechanical or no description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Expresses position but development not always clear and may not have a conclusion -Presents limited ideas that are not sufficiently developed and may have irrelevant detail <p>Key points/Bullet points present but</p>

		-ASQA (Visa requirements) -Literacy -Numeracy		might be inadequately covered -Uses adequate range of vocabulary, some less common though not always accurately -Uses a mix of simple and complex sentence forms -Makes some error in grammar and punctuation but rarely reduces clarity -Expresses position but development not always clear and may not have a conclusion -Presents limited ideas that are not sufficiently developed and may have irrelevant detail
--	--	---	--	---

It is first important to explain Input (Krashen, 1982) in context where 'i' (being the current level of competency of the learner) +1 (being the next level up) is a good gauging field (Crossley, 2019). The Australian education system for international students in providing this pathway structure (Table 3) must assume that 'i' is at the IELTS band 5 level of English (Table 3) and IELP intermediate (which is the IELP course level that aligns with the IELTS 5 band, as justified earlier). The '+1' is assumed the proposed EAL/D, S3 (ACARA, 2018b) (Table 3) level and capable of Year 10 secondary school. In theory this looks transitionally friendly; however, this section pays close attention to the 'i' to determine if the +1 is more than one step greater in challenge level for these students.

5.4: Teacher Qualifications

A specific difference in the IELP and EAL/D courses is the educators. The left column in Table 3 lists the teacher qualifications required to work as a secondary teacher and ELICOS teacher in Australia. The table lists the units of study requirement for EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b) qualification in a secondary setting. A basic internet search for a Bachelor or Master of Education at any university will verify that to gain an EAL/TESOL qualification in a Bachelor/Master of Education, two units of study are required as a method and four units of study are required to specialise in this area. The education requirement for TESOL teachers in a language school, like VIT registered EAL teachers, can be a Bachelor of Education and an EAL/TESOL method or specialisation, but they can also gain qualification with a primary degree and accredited TESOL credentials (ELICOS Standards, 2018) (Table 3). To be considered a 'senior academic leader' in a language school environment, a postgraduate TESOL qualification is required (ELICOS Standards, 2018; NEAS n.d.). Another basic Google search will confirm that postgraduate certificates and diplomas are AQF 8 and consist of between 4 to 8 units of study. Therefore, teachers across the two courses hold inequivalent knowledge. Qualifications range from a Master of Education with an EAL/TESOL specialisation, equating to 4 at AQF 9 level TESOL units of study, to a Bachelor of Education with EAL/TESOL as a Method, equating to 2 at AQF 7 level TESOL units of study. Moreover, a recognised TESOL course for those with a primary degree (ELICOS Standards, 2018; NEAS n.d.) equates to AQF 6 in its overall degree but Certificate 4 in TESOL and therefore only AQF 4 (Australian Qualifications Framework n.d.) level in this method. Ultimately, mainstream curriculum (ACARA, 2018a /VCAA, 2017) expects teachers to distinguish and teach 'sufficient control of stress, rhythm and intonation' (DET, 2019) with as little as two EAL/TESOL units of study. These units, from my experience, are crammed with information about culture and power, implications of the English modes, morphological, syntactical and phonological structures of English, and the intensive attention that is given to teaching spoken English is brief and inadequate. The above mentioned makes it clear that the discourse in the EAL and IELP curriculum is being delivered by diversely educated teachers.

5.5: Curriculum content and teacher influence

When the teachers' education above and the undefined words discussed earlier (Table 1) are considered, it is clear that the content of the courses are not consistently interpreted which

can affect the scaffolding of the knowledge being delivered. However, before we concentrate on the impact that the teacher education and experience have on the Input and Natural Order of the curriculum (Krashen, 1982), we will look at the way some of the curriculum from the two courses align. On the right side of Table 3, I have colour coded selected sections from the IELTS writing band 5 descriptor and the EAL/DC S3 indicator to highlight the learning intentions of the EAL/D and IELTS courses.

The key is as follows...

1. Green: grammar
2. Red: critical thinking
3. Purple: vocabulary

The green and the purple curricula in Table 3, are comparable across the IELTS and EAL courses. This is clear because the grammar requirements move progressively from expecting a 'mix of simple and complex sentences...(with) some errors in grammar and punctuation' (IELTS) (Table 3) to 'us(ing) a range of grammar appropriate to text' (EAL/DC) (Table 3). While the words 'some' 'range' and 'appropriate', as discussed in the Monitor section (Table 1), are undefined and give teachers the power (Fairclough, 2013) to interpret based on their own education, the usability (Gee, 1999) of this discourse in relation to Input is $i + 1$ (Krashen, 1982). Similarly, the vocabulary expectations in the two courses transition from 'adequate range of vocabulary, some less common though not always accurate...' (IELTS) (Table 3) to a 'growing vocabulary and a developing metalanguage (but) text may still include ...colloquial language...' (EAL/DC) (Table 3). Again, this transition is manageable in its expectation and no more than one step above the other (Krashen, 1982) in complexity. It must be noted that, as 'literacy cannot be reduced to a single identity...' (Green & Lee cited in Green & Beavis, 2012, p. 24), the grammar and vocabulary 'i' to $+1$ progression (Krashen, 1982) in these courses are supported by my professional interpretation of the descriptors and indicators, as a senior TESOL educator with 9 years' experience in the field.

Looking at the red, critical thinking, category in Table 3, it can be argued that here, the General Capability that exists within ACARA (2018c), 'Critical and Creative Thinking', influences the expectations of the courses and creates a greater than Input ' $+1$ ' (Krashen,

1982) gap between IELP and EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b). When we compare the different critical thinking expectations of the two courses (Table 3), the IELP course (represented by IELTS) expects writing with ‘...mechanical or no description... limited ideas that are not sufficiently developed and may have irrelevant detail’ (Table 3) whereas the EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b) course has higher order thinking expectations of ‘write(ing) an argument with supporting information linkage and coherent development of ideas...(and) factual text ...’ (EAL/DC) (Table 3). I argue that an expectation to critically and creatively think is not only minimal or absent in the preceding IELP course but also not ‘cultur(ally)-fair’ and does not consider what international students are likely to have previously learnt (Klenowski, 2009, pp. 77-93) or acquired (Krashen, 1982). It is unlikely that students would have been previously exposed to this form of education if they came from a rationalist model (Yan, & He, 2010) of teaching and learning that values process thinking over creative thinking. This highlights the power (Fairclough, 2013) that ACARA has to expect all students, including international students, to learn ‘motivation, confidence and skills to use critical and creative thinking purposefully’ (Critical and Creative Thinking General Capability) (2018c)) (Table 3), even when they may not have come from a country that considers these skills, ‘purposeful..’.

This higher order thinking requirement brings us back to teacher qualifications where teaching critical and creative thinking with an AQF 4 TESOL qualification will look differently when taught by a teacher with an AQF 9. Education and subjectivity can also vary the interpretation and appreciation of critical thinking. Viewed by teachers that look at this unspecific, general capability from a plethora of beliefs and knowledge, it becomes a buzz phrase that is overused and misunderstood. The varying exposure that teachers have to curricula and frameworks where with a Bachelor of Education gives them knowledge about ACARA (2018d), General Capabilities, and EAL/DC (2018b) above teachers that take alternate pathways. Even though the Intensive English Language Program Guide (DEECD) discusses the need to consider ‘topics from across the (Australian) curriculum’ (p. 209) when developing IELTS courses, it overlooks this reality that not all TESOL teachers have been exposed to the curriculum during their education. Therefore, the teachers’ interpretation not only contributes to the gap that exists between IELP and EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b) critical and creative thinking expectations, but also is important when Krashen’s Natural Order (1982) is considered. Ultimately, minimally TESOL qualified teachers may not consider the

acquisition/learning (Krashen) differences and expect international students to grasp curriculum in the same way as native students who may find it more natural. Here, a teacher with a Bachelor of Education might refer to Green's 3 D Model of Literacy (2002) which is a common theory in an Education degree while teachers with a post graduate certificate or diploma in TESOL are more likely to turn to Cummins, Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP) (1986). Such disuniting teacher knowledge is likely to impact the structure of the teaching and give teachers the societal power (Krashen, 1982) to interpret, influence and deliver the Natural Order (Krashen) of the curriculum based on what theories, frameworks, experts and curriculum they have been exposed to in their own education. This implicates the usability (Gee, 1999) of the knowledge scaffolding and order for international students.

5.6: Affective Filter

With support from Krashen's (1982) four hypotheses' above, the Affective Filter (Krashen, 1982) can be analysed from the perspective of societal power (Fairclough, 1997). As this hypothesis (Krashen, 1982) is increased by lack of motivation, lack of self-confidence and high anxiety, the societal power (Fairclough, 2013) that this research has revealed is likely to cause such self-barriers.

As discussed in the Monitor section above, power (Fairclough, 2013) is given to teachers by the undefined words in the curriculums, and the inclusion of words that do not appear in the Cambridge Assessment English Vocabulary List (2020) (Table 1). As has been noted, this list is considered high frequency for international students at IELTS band 5 and S3 EAL/DC level (Cambridge Assessment English Vocabulary List) (Table 1). Therefore, the words outside of this list (Table 1) that appear in the above courses can likely effect students' self-belief to achieve success (Brown, 2007) and their self-confidence (Krashen, 1982)). While as we know, Zafar (2009) questions how the filter can decide which language components to let in and filter out, the inaccessible components of the IELP descriptor and EAL/DC indicator to international students is arguably causing self-doubt that barriers learning.

As mentioned in the Acquisition-learning (Krashen, 1982) section, the Melbourne Declaration (2018) and its power (Fairclough, 2013) over the Australian Curriculum (Table 2)

and therefore EAL/DC indicators, indirectly expects international students to acquire (Krashen, 1982) knowledge designed for Australian children (MCEEYA, 2018) (Table 2); whereas, the preceding IELTS (Table 2) course is designed for international students and takes a learning (Krashen, 1982) approach. This effects the Input (Krashen, 1982) of the course contents and the 'self-efficacy' and 'competence' (Mamot, Syme and others as cited in Martin, Rowling & Walker, 2014) of the students when the course being entered has assumptions of what the students should know, which is likely to cause anxiety and loss of motivation (Krashen, 1982).

As already talked about in the Input (Krashen 1984) paragraphs, the introduction of critical thinking with the Critical and Creative Thinking General Capability in the ACARA (2018c), misaligns the expectations of the courses from IELP and EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b), and questions if the ACARA (2018a) is overusing its power (Fairclough 2013) in its arguably unrealistic expectation that international students' progress in a curriculum not previously learnt (Klenowski, 2009, pp-77-93) or acquired (Krashen 1982).

As discussed in the Natural Order (Krashen, 1982) above, teachers across IELP and EAL/D courses have an education range of AQF 4 to AQF 9 (Australian Qualifications Framework, n.d.) and have access to different theories, frameworks and curriculums. This vast range of abilities and reference to literature can fluctuate the societal power (Fairclough, 2013) of the teachers and effect teacher-student relationships depending on the education of past and future teachers that the students are taught by. These relationships are believed to be important for improving motivation and achievement for students, in minority groups in particular (Averill, 2012).

6: Discussion of findings

This research explored the psychological (Krashen, 1982) and Social (Fairclough, 2013; Gee, 1999; Foucault, 1972) challenges that Year 10 secondary international students studying in Australia face as they transition from IELP to EAL/D (ACARA) courses. Analysing the curriculum outcomes of IELTS writing band 5 and EAL/DC writing indicator S3 identified four areas of concern.

6.1: Self-efficacy

By analysing the curriculum with Fairclough's (2013) power, Gee's (1999) usability in Critical Discourse Analysis, and Krashen's (1982) Monitor hypothesis, the independence of international students is questioned. A number of undefined and ambiguous words were identified in both IELP and EAL/D writing outcomes leading to a concern for student comprehension. As mentioned, and quantified earlier, 12.4% of words in the EAL/DC course and 6.01% of words in the IELP course were not recognised in the Cambridge Assessment English Vocabulary list (2020) which encompass the expected word bank of students studying at the level of these courses. At a glance, this may not seem like a big number of ambiguous words. However, when the overall wordcount is considered, 316 words in the IELTS, band 5, writing descriptor (Appendix 1) and 641 words in the EAL/DC S3 indicator, this becomes one of many barriers mentioned in this study that collectively limit students' English learning success. Ultimately, it reveals a problem in student usability (Gee, 1999), particularly when 'the goal of language learning is communicative competence' (Richards 2002, p.50). This linguistic term for fluent English grammar and usage is difficult to achieve when students cannot comprehend what is expected of them. Put another way, both curriculums in some ways lack audience suitability and are likely to be ambiguous to students and barrier their independents. This may cause them to question their ability to gain success (Brown, 2007) and lose confidence. An inclusive curriculum might refer to a document like the Cambridge Vocabulary list (2020) instead of creating curriculum outcomes for international students with language beyond what is familiar to them.

Equally problematic are the undefined words (Table 1) found in EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b) and the words found in IELTS curriculum (Table 1). These 'quantifiers' ['some' 'less...'] 'modifiers' ['partially' 'may'] 'jargon' ['syntax' 'metalanguage'] and 'opinion' ['sufficiently' 'effectively'] words (Murphy, 2012) (Table 1) are open to the interpretation and education of teachers and blurs the success criteria for these students further, giving power (Fairclough, 2013) to the teachers and disempowering students with an abstract set of requirements that can minimise their success and damage their self-esteem (Brown, 2007). Consequently, this may cause students to overcorrect (Krashen, 1982) their mistakes or over hesitate before answering questions and limit their independence. While the new 'Victorian Curriculum F-10 EAL 2020 Reporting Tool' (DET, 2019), shows signs of addressing some of the issues

mentioned in the EAL/D curriculum, at present, both courses contain words that are open to interpretation.

6.2: Convergence

The compatibility of IELP to EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b) as pathway courses were examined through their history (Foucault, 1972) to determine their correspondence. The governing bodies' societal power (Fairclough, 2013) and their backgrounds were also considered for their influence on the curriculum and its accessibility. Krashen's Acquisition-Learning (1982) was the overarching lens used to determine student appropriateness by exploring the forms of Krashen's theory that the courses inhabit.

A significant finding here is that the ACARA (2018a) was created with the guiding principles of the Declaration (Killen, 2012) (Table 2). This history (Foucault, 1972) reveals a clear focus on 'young Australians' (MCEEYA, 2018) (Table 1) indisputable by the mention of 'Young Australian' in the Declaration title and the word 'Australian' in both of its goals. Therefore, as the ACARA (2018a) was formed by the belief system and the societal power (Fairclough, 2013) of the Declaration, and EAL/DC is part of the ACARA (2018b), the focus audience remains 'young Australians' (MCEEYA) despite EAL/DC being for international students. This position is evident in the EAL/D curriculum itself with similar expectations as its English subject counterpart albeit simpler (ACARA).

When Krashen's (1982) definition of acquisition is recalled, to learn naturally and unconsciously, a barrier for international students is revealed. While learning, by Krashen's definition, is indisputably intended by the ACARA (2018a), the focus on 'Australian children' (MCEEYA 2018) suggests that acquisition (Krashen, 1982) is also expected as a construct from 'Parents, carers and families' being included in the Melbourne Declaration as important contributors to a child's education. It can be argued that acquisition, by Krashen's definition, is therefore inferred and equally important. Ultimately, international students are potentially expected to acquire knowledge like their native peers despite the differences in cultures (Taylor & Tiley, 2013).

On the other hand, the research confirms that the ESOS curriculum was created for international students (National Code, 2018). Together with differing audiences, this curriculum contrasts EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b) with specific learning (Krashen, 1982) requirements that international students must meet to keep their visa registration (National Code, 2018). Targeted language levels in each class and the observations of student progress (National Code) show an outcome based (Readman & Allen, 2013) curriculum with close attention on learning (Krashen, 1982).

The transition from an international student focused (ESOS) to an Australian child (MCEEYA) focused curriculum is revealed. This research also revealed a transition for international students that begins with a learning environment that teaches specific, targeted modes to 'learn' (Krashen, 1987), and transitions to a learning environment that arguably assumes that students will 'acquire' (Krashen, 1982) the information like their native classmates.

6.3: Unattainability

The likelihood of success for international students was examined with Krashen's Input and Natural Order hypotheses (1982) and with Fairclough (2013) and Gee's (1999) Critical Discourse Analysis. The one step above ability Input theory (Krashen 1982) compared not only the content but the teacher qualifications, their exposure to curriculums and their relevant AQF levels to reach a clear conclusion of the curriculums and how they are being interpreted and delivered.

A close look at the vocabulary, grammar and critical thinking expectations of the courses identified an acceptable one step above ability challenge between IELP and EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b) in the vocabulary and grammar areas. The grammar components progress between the courses from 'some errors' (IELTS) (Table 3) to content 'appropriate to text' (EAL/DC) (Table 3). Similarly, the vocabulary expectation was found to be manageable in expecting students to develop from 'adequate range of vocabulary (that is) not always accurate' (IELTS) (Table 3) to a 'growing vocabulary and a developing metalanguage ...' (EAL/DC) (Table 3). When this transition is compared with other English language scales like Australian Core Skills Framework (ACSF) (n.d.), TOEFL (n.d.) and Cambridge English Scale (n.d.), it can be professionally determined that these expectations from one course to the other are at

Krashen's (1982) one step above recommendation. Unlike the critical thinking expectations of the courses which at IELP level merely expects 'mechanical...limited ideas' and insufficiency (IELTS) (Table 3). While at EAL/D (ACARA) level, a sophisticated 'linkage and coherent development of ideas' (EAL/DC) (Table 3) are expected. This substantial leap from guided thinking to higher order thinking when compared against the same scales above, are not considered one step above the other in Krashen's (1982) theory or at a manageable usability (Gee, 1999) level for international students exiting IELP to enter EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b).

When the critical thinking gap is combined with the broad qualifications gap among these teachers, it becomes clear that successful transition from IELP to EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b) is, based on my many years' experience, unattainable for many international students. While I have seen this myself, it is difficult to cite due to the profit that comes with these students (Nyland & Forbes-Mewett, 2013). Teacher qualifications in these settings substantially vary; from a minimum of a primary degree and a TESOL certificate to a holder of a Master in TESOL Education. This makes the TESOL specific knowledge among these educators at a broad range of AQF 4 to AQF 9. Equally problematic is the differing exposure to curriculum and literature that these teachers experience in relation to their specific education pathway which makes reading and delivering the curriculums very different from one teacher to the next. This is particularly concerning when we compare VIT registered teachers with an understanding of the ACARA (2018a), with TESOL qualified teachers who, depending on their education pathway, may not have been exposed to critical thinking theories (Critical and Creative Capability, 2018c). This teacher inconsistency has international students entering language school courses that 'teach-down' (Fekjaer & Birkelund, 2007) at the teacher's own knowledge of critical thinking capabilities and exit at a level expected to meet the academic requirements of senior secondary school. The teachers that students transition to potentially have a 5 level AQF advantage or disadvantage and the societal power (Fairclough, 2013) to interpret curriculum and deliver it according to their own abilities. However, while the critical thinking knowledge of a VIT registered teacher may be more advanced than a language schoolteacher, the TESOL knowledge may decrease in secondary school teachers, depending on the education pathway that they have taken. This variation of knowledge gives all teachers the societal power (Fairclough) to scaffold the curriculum at what they interpret as

Natural Order (Krashen, 1982). A minimally qualified TESOL teacher may have limited knowledge about the most effective learning systematisation for international students and expect the students to demonstrate critical thinking skills that they do not have. Ultimately the fluctuating strengths and weaknesses of the teachers in these courses can contribute to this inconsistent transition, and barrier student success.

6.4: Powerlessness and a feeling of inferiority

The attention on societal power (Fairclough, 2013) in this research across the IELP and EAL/D (ACARA) courses reveals a number of areas where governing bodies have implemented curriculum that teachers can interpret and execute at their own discretion. This clear teacher-centred power (Fairclough) can arguably disempower students with an unstable success criterion. Consequently, students feel powerless to measure their own progress (Brown, 2007) and feel inferior to teachers who have privilege of curriculum requirements.

This privilege comes in the form of undefined and ambiguous words (Table 1) (Cambridge Assessment Vocabulary List 2020) found in both IELP (IELTS) and EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b) that confine students to the interpretation of each teacher at their discretion and education. The contrasting audience for which the curriculums were written make international students the focus of one course (ESOS) and arguably overlooked by the focus on 'Australian children' (MCEEYA) in the other. Add to this the greater than +1 (Krashen, 1982) critical thinking (ACARA b) requirement of EAL/D from IELP and the diversity of teachers' education, and international students are likely to have an increased Affective Filter (Krashen, 1982) from high anxiety, low motivation and self-belief.

The risk here is not only to the education of international students and how an increased Affective Filter (Krashen, 1982) can barrier their learning, but also how this inferiority might be perceived as they enter EAL/D (ACARA, 2018b), by teachers. Churchill et al. (2015) believes that the majority of mainstream teachers are Anglo Saxon and middle classed. Therefore, their inability to culturally relate to international students, may confuse inferiority for disinterest or boredom. This may in turn effect teacher/student relationships and cause a greater decline in students' motivation (Averill, 2012) and an increase in feelings of

inferiority. Therefore, by addressing the other areas flagged by this study, a potential solution to stop the feelings of inferiority can be utilised.

7: Conclusion

This study has underpinned a need for a more manageable and fruitful transition for international students between IELP and EAL/D courses. Results concur that the existing pathway for these students is not working. The ongoing development of EAL/D initiatives with the new 'Victorian Curriculum F-10 EAL 2020 Reporting Tool' (DET, 2019) shows signs of addressing some of these issues and steps are clearly being taken to help these students. Containing better defined words and examples of the expectations, this new version Reporting Tool (DET) is being trialled this year and will be fully released in 2021. However, when the research question is asked again: *How does Australia's curriculum pathway for EAL/international students shape learners' adequacy to succeed?* The answer must be that it does not shape them to succeed. While this research is limited by its focus on only the writing component of these courses, and reading, speaking and listening is not addressed, the findings are enough to warrant a closer look at this learning process. It is important to realise that Australia has no nationally agreed and consistent mechanism for identifying, assessing or reporting on English language learners (Australian Council of TESOL Associations). This may be the reason why the IELP to EAL/D (ACARA, 2018) transition and its ineffectiveness has been overlooked until now. A close look at the associated curriculum outcomes for these courses and the educators who teach them clearly reveals an inconsistency and an inefficiency in qualifications that barrier international students' success. While standardising TESOL teacher qualifications may be one option to address this issue, another option might be to introduce a pathway course that focuses on Input (Krashen, 1982) currently unattainable in this transition. A course that is taught by specialist teachers in both Australian Curriculum and TESOL methodology, with a unit of study in teachers' education that specifically focuses on teaching the art of speaking and pronunciation. This could better equip international students to become fluent in English and flourish from the Victorian/Australian curriculum. A collegial relationship between ACARA/VCAA and ESOS organisations can initiate more research that can enrich Asia and Australia's Engagement

with Asia, Cross-curriculum priorities (ACARA, 2018c) towards a more effective global minded Australian curriculum.

.

References

- ACARA. (2018a). *General Capabilities: Critical and creative thinking*. Retrieved 20 August 2020, from <http://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/f-10-curriculum/general-capabilities/critical-and-creative-thinking>
- ACARA. (2018b). *Senior-secondary curriculum English as an additional language or dialect*. Retrieved 20 August 2020, from <https://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/senior-secondary-curriculum/english/english-as-an-additional-language-or-dialect/>
- ACARA (2018c). *Asia and Australia's engagement with Asia- Cross-curriculum priorities*. Retrieved 28 September 2020, from <https://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/f-10-curriculum/cross-curriculum-priorities/asia-and-australia-s-engagement-with-asia/>
- Anderson, C., Foley, Y., Sanster, P., Edwards, V., & Rassool, N. (2016). *Policy, pedagogy and pupil perception; EAL in Scotland and England*. Edinburgh: The University of Edinburgh.
- ASQA. (2019). *Regulatory strategy 2019-2*. Retrieved 20 August 2020, from [asqa_regulatory_strategy_2019-21.pdf](#)
- Australian Catholic University. (2008). *Scoping students to approaches to student wellbeing*. Ballarat: Erebus International.
- Australian Qualifications Framework. (AQF) (n.d). Retrieved 20 August 2020, from <https://www.aqf.edu.au/>
- Australian Core Skills Framework. (ACSF) (n.d.). Retrieved 14 August 2020, from

<https://www.employment.gov.au/australian-core-skills-framework>

Australian Government, Department of Education, Skills and Employment (DESE). (n.d).

Disability Standards for Education 2005. Retrieved 20 August 2020, from

<https://www.education.gov.au/disability-standards-education-2005>

Averill, R. (2012). Caring teaching practices in multiethnic mathematics classrooms:

Attending to health and well-being. *Mathematics Education Research Journal*, 24(2), 105-128.

Baqeel, N. A. (2020). Improving student motivation and attitudes in learning English as a

second language; Literature as pleasurable reading: Applying Garner's theory of

Multiple Intelligences and Krashen's Filter Hypothesis. *Yanbu: Arab World English Journal*, 14(1.4), 37-51.

Brown, D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. NY: Pearson Education Inc.

Cambridge Assessment English. (n.d). Retrieved 20 August 2020, from

<https://www.cambridgeenglish.org/exams-and-tests/cambridge-english-scale/institutions/>

Chomsky, N. (1975). *Reflections on language*. NY: Pantheon Books.

Churchill, R., Godinho, S., Johnson, N., Keddi, A, Lets, W., Lowe, K., & Vick, M. (2015). *Learner diversity pedagogy and educational equity*, Teaching: Making a Difference. NY: Wiley.

Comber, B. & Kamler, B. (2008). *Getting out of Deficit: Pedagogies of reconnection*.

School of Education. Queensland: The University of Queensland.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging and Identity in Educational

Setting. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, 20-35.

- Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, 18-36.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Rosso, J, Austin, K & Orcutt, S (2001). *How People Learn: Introduction to Learning Theories*. Calif: Stanford University School of Education.
- Delzer, K. (2015). *Reimagining Classrooms: Teachers as Learners and Students as Leaders*. TEDX Fargo. Retrieved 20 August 2020, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w6vVXmwYvgs>
- Department of Education and Early Childhood Development. (DEECD). (2010). *Intensive English Language Program Guide*. Vic: State Government.
- Department of Education and Training (DET). (2019). *EAL Developmental Continuum P-10*. Retrieved 20 August 2020, from <https://www.education.vic.gov.au/school/teachers/support/diversity/eal/continuum/Pages/secondary.aspx>
- Department of Education and Training (DET). (2019). *“Victorian Curriculum F-10 EAL 2020 Reporting Tool*. Retrieved August 2020, from <https://www.education.vic.gov.au/school/teachers/support/diversity/eal/Pages/ealreport.aspx>
- Dervic, M., & Spahic, N. (2018). *An Evaluation of Five Key Aspects of the Language Acquisition (LA) – A Critical Review of Krashen’s Theory*. Sarajevo, Bosnia: International Burch University.
- ELICOS Standards. (2018). Retrieved 20 August 2020, from <https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/F2017L01349>
- ESOS. (2018) *Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000*. Retrieved 20 August 2020, from <https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/C2018C00210>

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*. Harlow: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. NY: Routledge.

Fekjaer, S. & Birkelund, G. (2007). Does the ethnic composition of upper secondary schools influence educational achievement and attainment? A multilevel analysis of the Norwegian case. *European Sociological Review*, 23(3), 309-323.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and discourse on language*. NY, America: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1981). *The order of discourse*. Boston, America: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Gardener, H. (1983). Retrieved 20 August 2020, from <http://multipleintelligencesoasis.org/>

Garrity, Z. (2010). *Discourse Analysis, Foucault and Social Work Identifying Some Methodological Complexities*. Sussex: University of Sussex

Gee, J. P. (1990; 1999). *An Introduction to discourse analysis*. NY: Routledge.

Gibbs, R. (2010). *Alan Bryman's 4 stages of qualitative analysis* [video file], University of Huddersfield. Retrieved 20 August 2020, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7x7VuQxPfpk>

Gray, D, E. (2004). *Doing Research in the Real World*. NY: SAGE.

Gregg, K. R. (1984). Krashen's monitor and Occam's razor. *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 5: 79-100.

Green, B., & Beavis, C. (2012). *Literacy in 3D, an integrated perspective in theory and practice*. Camberwell: ACER.

- Haug, F. (1987). *Female sexualization: A collective work of memory*. London: Verso Press
- Killen, R., (2012). *Effective Teaching Strategies: Lessons from Research and Practice*. Boston: Cengage Learning.
- Klenowski, V. (2009). *Australian Indigenous students: addressing equity issues in Assessment*. Teaching Education, 20 (1), 77-93.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. California: University of Southern California
- Krashen, S. D. (1987). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall International.
- Lanphar, E., & Fitzsimmons, P. F. (2011). When there's love inside there's a reason why: Emotion as the core of authentic learning in one middle school classroom. *Literacy Learning: The Middle Years Journal*. 19, (2), 35-40.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. London: SAGE.
- Martin, G., Rowling, L., & Walker, I. (2002). Indigenous mental health promotions: politics, paradox and practicalities, *Mental Health Promotion and young peoples; concepts and practise*. NY: McGraw-Hill.
- McLaughlin, B. (1987). Theories of second-language learning. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 9 (1), 106-108.
- Mcleod, J., & Wright, K. (2014). *Rethinking youth wellbeing: Critical perspectives*.

Retrieved 20 August 2020, from <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/deakin/detail.action?docID=1966775>

MCEEYA. (2008). Retrieved 20 August 2020, from http://www.curriculum.edu.au/verve/_Resources/National_Declaration_on_the_Educational_Goals_for_Young_Australians.pdf

Mertens, D.M. (2005). *Research methods in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative and qualitative approaches*. (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Murphy, R. (2012). *English grammar in use*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press

Nakata, M. (2011). The pathways for indigenous education in the Australian curriculum framework. *Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, vol. 40, 1-8.

National Code National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students, (2018). Retrieved 20 August 2020, from <https://internationaleducation.gov.au/Regulatory-Information/Education-Services-for-Overseas-Students-ESOS-Framework/National-Legislative-Code/Page/default.aspx>

NEAS, (2020). Retrieved 20 August 2020, from <https://neas.org.au/>

Nyland, C. & Forbes-Mewett, H. (2013). Governing the international student experience: Lessons from the international Australian education model. *Academic Management learning & Education*, 12(4), 656-673.

Paradis, J., Nocoladis, E., Crago, M., & Genesee, F. (2010). Bilingual children's acquisition of the past tense: a usage-based approach [digital]. *Journal of Child Language*, 38(3), 554-578.

Clare, A., & Wilson, J., (2015). *Speakout* 2nd Edition. United Kingdom: Pearson.

Readman, K., & Allen, B. (2013). *Practical planning and assessment*. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Richards, J. (2002). 30 Years of TEFL/TESL: A Personal Reflection. *TEFLIN Journal*, 33, 10.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Societal Psychology*, 25, 1-65 .

Taylor, L., & Tilley, S. (2013). Happiness: at what cost? *Journal of the International Society for Teacher Education*, 17(1), 72-84.

TOFL. (n.d). Retrieved 20 August 2020, from <http://toefl.acertestinghub.com.au/about-toefl-lbt-test>

Tomlinson, C. (2011). *MED in differentiation* [Youtube]. Retrieved 20 August 2020, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6xH0K3Z-dbo>

Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority (2017). *English: Rationale and Aims - Victorian Curriculum: Foundation-10*. Retrieved 20 August 2020, from <https://victoriancurriculum.vcaa.vic.edu.au/english/introduction/rationale-and-aims>.

Williamson, K., Given, L., & Scifleet, P., (2018). *Qualitative Data Analysis, Research Method*, 2nd Edition. NSW: Charles Sturt University Research.

Willig, C. (2001). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology: Adventures in theory and method*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). *Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory, and methodology 1*. Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis. Retrieved 29

September 2020, from

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265678850_Critical_Discourse_Analysis_History_Agenda_Theory_and_Methodology_1

Yan, C., & He, C. (2010). Transforming the existing model of teaching practicum: a study of Chinese EFL student teachers' perceptions. *Journal of Education for Teaching, International Research and Pedagogy*, 36, 57-73.

Yuan, F. (2018). *An English language multimedia teaching model based on Krashen's theory*. International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning, Changzhou: Hohai University.

Zafar, M. (2009). *English and empowerment in the developing world*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Appendix 1: IELTS Writing Band 5 Descriptor

IELTS Task 1 Writing assessment criteria (band descriptors – public version)

Band	Task achievement	Coherence and cohesion
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully satisfies all the requirements of the task Clearly presents a fully developed response 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses cohesion in such a way that it attracts no attention Skilfully manages paragraphing
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Covers all requirements of the task sufficiently Presents, highlights and illustrates key features / bullet points clearly and appropriately 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sequences information and ideas logically Manages all aspects of cohesion well Uses paragraphing sufficiently and appropriately
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Covers the requirements of the task (Academic) presents a clear overview of main trends, differences or stages (General training) presents a clear purpose, with the tone consistent and appropriate Clearly presents and highlights key features / bullet points but could be more fully extended 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Logically organises information and ideas; there is clear progression throughout Uses a range of cohesive devices appropriately although there may be some under-/over-use
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses the requirements of the task (Academic) presents an overview with information appropriately selected (General training) presents a purpose that is generally clear; there may be inconsistencies in tone Presents and adequately highlights key features / bullet points but details may be irrelevant, inappropriate or inaccurate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arranges information and ideas coherently and there is a clear overall progression Uses cohesive devices effectively, but cohesion within and/or between sentences may be faulty or mechanical May not always use referencing clearly or appropriately
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally addresses the task; the format may be inappropriate in places (Academic) recounts detail mechanically with no clear overview; there may be no data to support the description (General training) may present a purpose for the letter that is unclear at times; the tone may be variable and sometimes inappropriate Presents, but inadequately covers, key features / bullet points; there may be a tendency to focus on details 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presents information with some organisation but there may be a lack of overall progression Makes inadequate, inaccurate or over-use of cohesive devices May be repetitive because of lack of referencing and substitution
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attempts to address the task but does not cover all key features / bullet points; the format may be inappropriate (General training) fails to clearly explain the purpose of the letter; the tone may be inappropriate May confuse key features / bullet points with detail; parts may be unclear, irrelevant, repetitive or inaccurate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presents information and ideas but these are not arranged coherently and there is no clear progression in the response Uses some basic cohesive devices but these may be inaccurate or repetitive
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to address the task, which may have been completely misunderstood Presents limited ideas which may be largely irrelevant/ repetitive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not organise ideas logically May use a very limited range of cohesive devices, and those used may not indicate a logical relationship between ideas
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answer is barely related to the task 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has very little control of organisational features
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answer is completely unrelated to the task 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to communicate any message
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not attend Does not attempt the task in any way Writes a totally memorised response 	

Lexical resource	Grammatical range and accuracy
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a wide range of vocabulary with very natural and sophisticated control of lexical features; rare minor errors occur only as 'slips' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a wide range of structures with full flexibility and accuracy; rare minor errors occur only as 'slips'
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a wide range of vocabulary fluently and flexibly to convey precise meanings • Skilfully uses uncommon lexical items but there may be occasional inaccuracies in word choice and collocation • Produces rare errors in spelling and/or word formation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a wide range of structures • The majority of sentences are error-free • Makes only very occasional errors or inappropriateness
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a sufficient range of vocabulary to allow some flexibility and precision • Uses less common lexical items with some awareness of style and collocation • May produce occasional errors in word choice, spelling and/or word formation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a variety of complex structures • Produces frequent error-free sentences • Has good control of grammar and punctuation but may make a few errors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses an adequate range of vocabulary for the task • Attempts to use less common vocabulary but with some inaccuracy • Makes some errors in spelling and/or word formation, but they do not impede communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a mix of simple and complex sentence forms • Makes some errors in grammar and punctuation but they rarely reduce communication
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a limited range of vocabulary, but this is minimally adequate for the task • May make noticeable errors in spelling and/or word formation that may cause some difficulty for the reader 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses only a limited range of structures • Attempts complex sentences but these tend to be less accurate than simple sentences • May make frequent grammatical errors and punctuation may be faulty; errors can cause some difficulty for the reader
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses only basic vocabulary which may be used repetitively or which may be inappropriate for the task • Has limited control of word formation and/or spelling; errors may cause strain for the reader 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses only a very limited range of structures with only rare use of subordinate clauses • Some structures are accurate but errors predominate, and punctuation is often faulty
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses only a very limited range of words and expressions with very limited control of word formation and/or spelling; errors may severely distort the message 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts sentence forms but errors in grammar and punctuation predominate and distort the meaning
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses an extremely limited range of vocabulary; essentially no control of word formation and/or spelling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannot use sentence forms except in memorised phrases
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can only use a few isolated words 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannot use sentence forms at all

IELTS Task 2 Writing assessment criteria (band descriptors – public version)

Band	Task achievement	Coherence and cohesion
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fully addresses all parts of the task Presents a fully developed position in answer to the question with relevant, fully extended and well supported ideas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses cohesion in such a way that it attracts no attention Skillfully manages paragraphing
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficiently addresses all parts of the task Presents a well-developed response to the question with relevant, extended and supported ideas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sequences information and ideas logically Manages all aspects of cohesion well Uses paragraphing sufficiently and appropriately
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses all parts of the task Presents a clear position throughout the response Presents, extends and supports main ideas, but there may be a tendency to over generalise and/or supporting ideas may lack focus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Logically organises information and ideas; there is clear progression throughout Uses a range of cohesive devices appropriately although there may be some under-/over-use Presents a clear central topic within each paragraph
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses all parts of the task although some parts may be more fully covered than others Presents a relevant position although the conclusions may become unclear or repetitive Presents relevant main ideas but some may be inadequately developed/unclear 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arranges information and ideas coherently and there is a clear overall progression Uses cohesive devices effectively, but cohesion within and/or between sentences may be faulty or mechanical May not always use referencing clearly or appropriately Uses paragraphing, but not always logically
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses the task only partially; the format may be inappropriate in places Expresses a position but the development is not always clear and there may be no conclusions drawn Presents some main ideas but these are limited and not sufficiently developed; there may be irrelevant detail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presents information with some organisation but there may be a lack of overall progression Makes inadequate, inaccurate or over-use of cohesive devices May be repetitive because of lack of referencing and substitution May not write in paragraphs, or paragraphing may be inadequate
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responds to the task only in a minimal way or the answer is tangential; the format may be inappropriate Presents a position but this is unclear Presents some main ideas but these are difficult to identify and may be repetitive, irrelevant or not well supported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presents information and ideas but these are not arranged coherently and there is no clear progression in the response Uses some basic cohesive devices but these may be inaccurate or repetitive May not write in paragraphs or their use may be confusing
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not adequately address any part of the task Does not express a clear position Presents few ideas, which are largely undeveloped or irrelevant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not organise ideas logically May use a very limited range of cohesive devices, and those used may not indicate a logical relationship between ideas
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barely responds to the task Does not express a position May attempt to present one or two ideas but there is no development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has very little control of organisational features
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answer is completely unrelated to the task 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fails to communicate any message
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not attend Does not attempt the task in any way Writes a totally memorised response 	

IELTS Guide for Teachers

Lexical resource	Grammatical range and accuracy
Uses a wide range of vocabulary with very natural and sophisticated control of lexical features; rare minor errors occur only as 'slips'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a wide range of structures with full flexibility and accuracy; rare minor errors occur only as 'slips'
Uses a wide range of vocabulary fluently and flexibly to convey precise meanings Skilfully uses uncommon lexical items but there may be occasional inaccuracies in word choice and collocation Produces rare errors in spelling and/or word formation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a wide range of structures • The majority of sentences are error-free • Makes only very occasional errors or inappropriateness
Uses a sufficient range of vocabulary to allow some flexibility and precision Uses less common lexical items with some awareness of style and collocation May produce occasional errors in word choice, spelling and/or word formation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a variety of complex structures • Produces frequent error-free sentences • Has good control of grammar and punctuation but may make a few errors
Uses an adequate range of vocabulary for the task Attempts to use less common vocabulary but with some inaccuracy Makes some errors in spelling and/or word formation, but they do not impede communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses a mix of simple and complex sentence forms • Makes some errors in grammar and punctuation but they rarely reduce communication
Uses a limited range of vocabulary, but this is minimally adequate for the task May make noticeable errors in spelling and/or word formation that may cause some difficulty for the reader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses only a limited range of structures • Attempts complex sentences but these tend to be less accurate than simple sentences • May make frequent grammatical errors and punctuation may be faulty; errors can cause some difficulty for the reader
Uses only basic vocabulary which may be used repetitively or which may be inappropriate for the task Has limited control of word formation and/or spelling; errors may cause strain for the reader	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uses only a very limited range of structures with only rare use of subordinate clauses • Some structures are accurate but errors predominate, and punctuation is often faulty
Uses only a very limited range of words and expressions with very limited control of word formation and/or spelling errors may severely distort the message	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts sentence forms but errors in grammar and punctuation predominate and distort the meaning
Uses an extremely limited range of vocabulary; essentially no control of word formation and/or spelling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannot use sentence forms except in memorised phrases
Can only use a few isolated words	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cannot use sentence forms at all

Secondary Years 7-10 - Writing Stage S3

Indicators of progress – Stage S3: Texts and responses to texts

At the end of Stage S3, students can routinely write the following kinds of texts and respond in the following ways to texts they have read or heard:

- communicate ideas, opinions and information through a range of text types after teacher modelling and support
- write personal and imaginative texts, such as diary, narrative, personal recount, showing an awareness of elements, such as text structure/storyline and character
- write an argument and discussion, e.g. provide supporting arguments and a linkage between ideas
- write factual texts, such as informative reports on a familiar topic showing an awareness of appropriate text structure, purpose, and organisation of ideas
- write reports incorporating information from two or three sources
- use visual stimulus, such as diagrams, graphs and maps to convey information in group project work
- make summaries of a variety of texts from across the curriculum to support learning
- plan and sequence information for specific text type, e.g. report, explanation, biography.

Indicators of progress – Stage S3: Cultural conventions of language use

At the end of Stage S3, students' understanding of the contexts and purposes of texts they write is shown when they:

- demonstrate understanding of how the purpose and audience of a text can influence the content and form of the writing
- discuss language choices with regard to purpose and audience, e.g. avoid expressing personal opinions and comment in a report on an informative topic
- show awareness of a variety of language forms, e.g. how written texts usually differ from spoken, or how the layout of a web site differs from a newspaper
- write an argument and discussion showing a coherent development of ideas, with the help of modelling
- demonstrate a firm control of the structure of common school-based text types, however written language may still be characterised by some features of spoken language, e.g. colloquial usage, limited vocabulary range
- use paragraphs effectively and consistently to organise ideas
- express ideas through graphic or visual representation, e.g. a cartoon
- use some colloquial/idiomatic language and humour
- attempt to create mood and feeling with appropriate language
- have a written vocabulary which is growing in range but is limited in sophistication
- show awareness of social and cultural sensibilities in choice of words, e.g. plump/fat, man/people
- demonstrate a developing metalanguage appropriate to the content and task.

Indicators of progress – Stage S3: Linguistic structures and features

At the end of Stage S3, students' understanding of the linguistic structures and features of the texts they write is shown when they:

- have sufficient control of key linguistic structures and features to write cohesive texts for a range of purposes
- after extensive modelling, write a range of factual and imaginative text types using the appropriate overall structure
- organise writing, using topic sentences to focus a paragraph and a range of cohesive devices at the sentence and whole-text level
- use English grammar appropriate to text type, e.g. consistently use past tense when recounting a past event
- use basic knowledge of English grammatical features at the sentence level to argue and persuade, describe, classify, explain, give instructions
- use subject-verb agreement with reasonable control
- use a range of grammatical features with some confidence, e.g. compound, complex sentences, tenses, noun phrase, modality and modification
- demonstrate some control over key grammatical features, such as verb forms, passive voice, conditionals
- use a range of expressions to qualify opinions, e.g. may, might, common formulaic expressions, such as 'in my view', 'I believe'
- use appropriate abbreviations, key words and paraphrasing when taking notes with extensive teacher assistance
- construct extended sentences using simple relative clauses and a range of common conjunctions
- demonstrate conventions of punctuation, i.e. full stops, commas, colon, exclamation mark and question mark
- spell words with increasing accuracy.

Indicators of progress – Stage S3: Maintaining and negotiating communication

At the end of Stage S3, students may use the following strategies to assist them to write texts:

- demonstrate an ability to plan and edit writing with teacher and peer feedback to improve range and clarity of expression
- proofread for accuracy of expression, e.g. grammatical accuracy, spelling and punctuation
- take some responsibility for linguistic development, e.g. modify syntax after teacher correction
- review and redraft writing for clarity of meaning and appropriateness of content to audience, in response to teacher or student feedback
- employ different strategies for different writing tasks, e.g. use timelines to help plan narratives
- use graphic organiser and plan to support writing
- use knowledge of spelling conventions to help with spelling, e.g. to distinguish between mat and mate.
- apply spelling knowledge and rely on vocabulary resources
- use a range of strategies to spell words, e.g. visual cues, word patterns, graphophonic knowledge, context cues.