INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS' ACADEMIC LEARNING IN MAINSTREAM CLASSROOMS: A CASE STUDY

By

BILJANA PETROVIC

A thesis
submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington
in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Education

Victoria University of Wellington

2019

Abstract

This study sought to explore the academic learning experiences of a group of secondary international students. A number of schools provide education to international students in this country, however little attention has been paid to exploring this group of students' academic learning. This study addressed the subject with two questions: *What are international ELL students' perspectives on their mainstream academic learning;* and *What do mainstream teachers report facilitate these students' learning?* I used a case study approach to examine the five students' and four teachers' experiences in their unique settings (Lichtman, 2013), as reported by them (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011). I transcribed and coded the interviews. According to both teachers and students, group activities and the teachers' scaffolding via one-to-one oral discussions or written feedback were the most productive learning strategies for students. From the perspective of Vygotsky's (1978) concept of the Zone of Proximal Development, the students appeared to move towards independent learning through supported interactions with their peers and teachers to achieve the learning outcomes in their mainstream subjects.

*Key words***:** international secondary students**,** case study, academic learning, English Language Learners, ZPD, scaffolding,

Acknowledgements

I have been fortunate to have two professors as supervisors who provided me with a lot of encouragement, guidance and patience. I am grateful to both Dr Margaret Gleeson and Dr Carolyn Tait for their insightful mentoring and constructive support.

I am very thankful to the Board of Trustees of the school and the teacher participants who gave me great insights and supported me throughout my research. With special thanks to the Director of the International College and the international student participants who made this research possible and valuable.

I am immensely grateful to be a recipient of the NZ Secondary Teachers' Study Award, as a teacher at Mairehau High School. Thank you to the Board of Trustees and the Principal, Harry Romana, for their support.

I am thankful to my daughters who motivated me with their own theses and for supporting me with their love and help with proofreading. I am also thankful to my husband for his love, support and understanding of my enthusiastic work.

In memory of my parents, especially of my mother
who supported my ambitions from early on

Contents

Appendixes

List of figures and tables

Chapter 1. International Students' Academic Learning

in Mainstream Classrooms: A Case Study

New Zealand (NZ) hosts around 16,000 fee-paying international students at the secondary school level each year (Ministry of Education (MOE), 2014). International full fee-paying students are those who come on a temporary visa to study in this country. Students from Asia constitute the majority of international secondary students; for example, in 2015 China (34%) and Japan (16%) were the two top countries of origin for international students in New Zealand secondary schools (MOE, 2014). Many of these students learn English as an additional language (EAL) and can be considered English language learners (ELLs). The increasing number of international students who are ELLs necessitates that schools find effective ways to support the academic learning of students with such diverse linguistic backgrounds (Reeves, 2006). ELLs need "explicit and extensive teaching of vocabulary, sentence and text" (MOE, 2007a, p.16) when they are new to an English medium environment. This is reinforced through the New Zealand Code of Practice for international students. The Ministry of Education expects that educational instruction must be tailored to meet these students' expectations, English proficiency, and academic ability (MOE, 2016). However, there is limited data about the key challenges faced by international students (Glass, Buus, & Braskamp, 2013).

The aim of this research is to provide some insights into how a group of secondary international students learn their academic subjects and how a group of content teachers manage the learning of international students in their classes. Teachers participating in the research did not currently teach the international students participating in this research.

Chapter 2. Literature Review

This review will consider theories relating to sociocultural understanding of learning that underpin this study, as well as some studies that informs learning and teaching ELLs.

Background

International students for the purpose of this study are those students who have not yet attained English language proficiency at the level of their school peers who have English as their first language (English Language Learners, 2013). ELLs can face challenges that may affect their educational performance during their secondary schooling (Butcher & McGrath, 2004; Zhang & Brunton, 2007). In particular, they are expected to learn academic subject content while developing their academic English at the same time, and this may present a "cognitive overload" for some students (Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2005, p.378). Because of this, more insight into these students' learning experiences in specific content areas is needed (Genesee et al., 2005; Glass et al., 2013; Kim, 2013; Roy, Lu, & Loo, 2016).

Theoretical Considerations

In this section, the concepts related to Social-Cultural Theory (SCT) and Community of Practice theory (CoP) that framed this study will be discussed and explored in relation to ELLs teaching and learning. The sociocultural perspective views learning in interactions, not only between people but also as products of interaction with the resources of the learning environment, including the use of technology (Goos, 2005).

Social–Cultural Theory. The Sociocultural Theory of Mind (cited in Bier, 2015) was originally developed by psychologist Lev S. Vygotsky (1896-1934). This theory emphasises the social nature of learning and is interpreted in education to mean that teacher-student and student-student interactions are an important part of the teaching and learning process in the classroom. This understanding of collaborative learning has been extended to language

learning in recent years where these interactions promote second language acquisition (Walqui, 2006).

Co-construction of meaning through communication is a critical aspect of socio-cultural theory (Riviera & Barboza, 2016), and this is achieved through working within a student's zone of proximal development.

The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). A socio-cultural approach to second language learning is commonly used to explore teachers' approaches to ELLs in their classrooms (Johnson, 2009). A basic understanding from SCT (Walqui, 2006), is that learning precedes development and so students should be challenged to stretch their efforts beyond their current stage of development. This area of stretch occurs within the zone of proximal development (ZPD). The ZPD is the space between the amount (and level) of work a student can perform alone and that which s/he can achieve with help from another person. From the perspective of second language development, it is important to create opportunities for meaningful interactive support from peers or teachers within students' ZPD. The ZPD is the space for scaffolding, and the co-construction of new knowledge in interactions (Walqui & van Lier, 2010).

Scaffolding. Scaffolding in the socio-cultural sense is described by Walqui (2006) as a means to understand second language learning. Walqui and Heritage (2012) illustrate how instructional support can be offered within ELLs' ZPD by scaffolding the features of academic language during interaction between teachers and students, so that ELLs can learn the language of a subject, including its concepts, procedures and processes.

Gibbons (2002) shares a similar conception of scaffolding. She explains scaffolding as a teacher-student constructed foundation built up through their mutual interactions and talk. In Gibbons' (2002) research into the mainstream elementary classroom practices, students supported each other's learning by working in a group on a science task. They

shared their previous knowledge and understanding of the topic using informal language. The teacher engaged the students in discussing their findings aloud and guided their reporting towards a more academic explanation of the topic. In the following stage, students reported what they did (in an experiment), and also explained how they did it using more complex structures and some of the new academic words they had learnt during the activity. This suggests that one scaffold for the students' understanding of the lesson was initially provided through discussion with their peers. The teacher scaffolded related academic language to the content-learning through her interactions with individual students. Gibbons draws on this study to illustrate the importance of sociocultural principles in promoting language learning such as students' participation in cooperative learning and interactive activities.

The issue of Second Language Acquisition (SLA). There are different perspectives on the process of second language acquisition (SLA). L2 learners have their unique personality, identity, and cultural background (Pica, 2005) that may imply that affective factors might influence their learning in an additional language(s). SLA has been mainly defined by constructivists as the mental processes of learning skills through "attention, conscious awareness and practice" (p.19) but that communication and comprehension exercises may not lead to successful acquisition of second language. Input, output and feedback are considered to be influential but currently researchers and teachers understand SLA to be a sociocultural process (Walqui & van Lier, 2010).

Content - Language teaching and learning. In recent years, a socio-cultural understanding of learning has dominated research in educational linguistics. New approaches in communicative language teaching and systemic functional linguistics (van Lier & Walqui, 2012) recognize that ELLs develop communicative language skills when they have multiple opportunities to use the target language. The authors emphasized that conversational

language may have a supporting role in students' development of academic language (Walqui & van Lier, 2010) as there is "intermingling of conversational and academic language" (p. 50). When native English speakers use conversational language in explaining and discussing academic tasks while working together with ELLs, their informal language may help ELLs to comprehend the tasks more easily and faster.

Specific teacher knowledge is required to provide adequate pedagogical support, including opportunities for interaction, for increasingly diverse classes. Bunch (2013) and Abebe (2013) explain that language teaching approaches should be incorporated into teaching of the content subjects. Drawing on an extensive literature review, Abebe concludes that teachers may need to undertake professional development to help them gain pedagogical language knowledge and skills that include linguistic knowledge to be able to understand what ELL students need to learn and develop. Bunch stresses that teachers of ELL students need to realise that language knowledge skills are "the principal content of their professional practice" (Bunch, 2013, p. 307).

It is important to encourage ELL students to use resources in their first language (L1) because these may give additional context to the contexts used in classroom texts in their second language (L2). For example, ELL students may identify with materials in their L2 that use familiar graphics to illustrate new academic concepts (Lesser & Winsor, 2009).

According to Kim (2013), teachers can also help students to make links to their previous learning by using strategic pedagogical approaches. Kim (2013) suggested that for improving secondary ELLs' learning outcomes, both language development and academic learning support programs are needed. Kim's (2013) findings indicated that a majority of the study participants who were from a Spanish-speaking background and were students at one Texas district's high school, had insufficient English proficiency for learning content subjects. Relating to international students' barriers to learning, the student participants from

Kim's study reported that their most critical barriers to their academic learning were academic vocabulary and writing skills. They reported that their interactions with English native speakers helped them the most to improve their levels of English proficiency. Also, they reported that their once-a week tutorials helped them to improve their vocabulary skills. It seems that for academic success of secondary level ELLs regardless of their backgrounds, it is crucial to provide to this group of learners consistent support. ELLs need support for learning academic content, as well as for the development of their academic vocabulary and writing skills (Kim, 2013).

Some academic terms might have different meanings in different academic contexts, but if students learn concepts in their first language, they can make connections to this knowledge in their new language (Lesser & Winsor, 2009). However, even though knowledge of something in one language can be applied to another language, and this prior learning can enhance learning in a second or third language, "teachers cannot assume that transfer is automatic" (Kim, 2013, p.15). So, teachers need to teach ELLs how to learn in the new language.

Kibler and Hardigree (2017) also identify specific skills required by teachers of ELL students. They demonstrated through an eight-year longitudinal case study that teachers must understand how ELLs develop writing skills, and that an L2 student's improvement in writing skills is likely to be slow. Their participants, students whose first language was Spanish, reported in interviews that using argumentative writing skills was the most challenging task for them. Kibler and Hardigree concluded that the quality of instruction influences the rate of progress of ELLs' writing skills.

Furthermore, Janzen (2008) conducted an extensive review of the academic demands (linguistic, sociocultural, and pedagogical) presented by different learning areas. This author concluded that, based on evidence from empirical studies, each curriculum area, whether it be

Maths, English, History or Social Science, has its own specific linguistic and pedagogical demands including developing academic vocabulary.

These studies suggest that subject teachers need to be aware of the language demands of their subject and how language is learnt so they can modify teaching activities and assist ELLs.

Learning language and subject content in secondary school. Teachers have dual obligations under the New Zealand Curriculum principles and competencies to teach ELLs using appropriate quality instructional approaches (MOE, 2007 b). However, teaching ELLs in secondary schools is a complex task as these groups of learners must learn curriculum subjects through English, which for them is an additional language.

For ELL students to understand subject-specific concepts and procedures they must engage in both cognitive and linguistic learning (Walqui & van Lier, 2010). ELLs need additional support from their teachers to learn subject specific content while acquiring the appropriate academic language for different types of text and academic purposes. Subject teachers' understanding of these two aspects has a direct influence on their ability to provide quality content area instruction to ELLs (Yang, 2008).

From the perspective of second language learning, language learning tasks should be integrated with all content area tasks and activities (Gibbons, 2002). It is a content teacher's professional obligation to provide not only content teaching, but also on-going language teaching support to ELL students. This is because ELLs may not be familiar with specific academic registers, they need specific scaffolding to learn school-related content and content-related academic language.

The Community of Practice (CoP). Wenger's notion of Communities of practice is a theory of socially situated learning that arose from wider sociocultural understandings of learning. This sociocultural theory provides an additional theoretical lens for this study. The concept of community of practice is related to participation (Wenger, 1998), where "groups of people share a concern, a set of problems, or a passion about a topic, and who deepen their knowledge and expertise in this area by interacting on an ongoing basis" (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002, p.4).

Wenger's communities of practice theory explains that learning occurs through the social processes of negotiating meaning. According to Gay (2002), building a community of diverse learners is part of culturally responsive teaching, and a group's function might be seen as a "mutual aid society" (Gay, 2002, p.110). Newcomers are apprenticed into the community through participating in a joint enterprise under the guidance of more knowledgeable members. International students can practice more the language of particular subjects through participation in their class communities as they interact more with their local peers.

Research on instructional practices for ELLs. Several studies show the importance of teachers' instructional practices in assisting ELLs' learning. Gilliland's (2015) findings showed that two teachers of transitional classes at two California high schools demonstrated a lack of appropriate pedagogical knowledge of ELLs' language learning development needs. The teachers did not explicitly teach academic subject language, which led to their students lacking much needed academic support towards their transition to mainstream classes. These teachers acknowledged that the demands of academic writing tasks were a challenge for these students, but they were not aware how to prepare students for the processes of academic writing in mainstream subjects. This experience suggests that teachers' limited understanding

of language learning may make it difficult for them to support students' academic learning, illustrating the importance of understanding learning theories related to SLA.

Teachers may be reluctant to engage in learning about language. Reeves's (2006) study revealed that half of the total participants (i.e. of 279 high school teachers from four schools located in the southern eastern part of United States) were aware that they needed to have training in current instructional practices in working with ESL students, however had no interest in receiving it. The participant teachers reported on a five-point Likert scale whether they had positive attitudes towards modification of courses. Although some of them reported having difficulties developing effective instruction for ELLs, they expressed a slightly positive attitude toward the inclusion of ELLs in their classes and a neutral attitude toward professional development to work with ELLs. Participants also showed some tolerance toward modifying their courses to help their ELL students to learn (including limiting the curriculum content). However, ambivalent practices like these are considered less than optimal for ELLs by most researchers in the field, including Gibbons (2002) who recommends scaffolding (amplification) rather than simplifying tasks for ELLs.

Scaffolding by using modelling and feedback is a part of teachers' instructional practice. Teacher scaffolding is an important way of supporting and guiding learners through their ZPD, from what they can do without support to what they can achieve unaided (McLeod, 2019).

Teacher feedback, especially on ELL students' writing, is also an important way to support students' through their ZPD (Silva & Matsuda, 2010). "It is a conversation about the learning that has occurred" (MOE, 2012, p.1), an integral part of learning and instruction (Chandler, 2003). Feedback must be given at the right level for the learner, as if there is a complete lack of understanding of the matter, then providing feedback will not be effective (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). For example, critical feedback may not be effective for everyone

Shute (2008). Advanced learners will benefit more from facilitated feedback, such as a suggestion or a comment, while for some learners who need more support, directive feedback is necessary. This is because directive feedback, such as formative feedback, may be delivered with the use of models that can help in learner's understanding, especially at the start of their learning. Besides the teachers' pedagogical approaches (Kim & Garcia, 2014; Lesser & Winsor, 2009), ELL students' self–regulated learning and motivational beliefs (Pintrich, 1995) are also influential factors on the quality of their learning.

Self- regulated learning is motivated by both cognitive factors, such as confidence and goals, and by external conditions coined by Ryan and Deci (2000) as "external to self" (p.69). The fulfilment of either extrinsic or intrinsic motivation or behaviour depends on the learner's planned outcomes. For intrinsic motivation, the individual's personal enjoyment and satisfaction may be the only goal. However, for extrinsic motivation there are some external regulative forces, such as the learner's need to complete the study or to fulfil an obligation imposed by their parents. Ryan and Deci emphasised the importance of self-regulation in achieving the individual's intended outcomes.

The premise of this model, as explained by Pintrich (2003), is that an individuals' achievement motivation is characterised by three needs: their inner need to achieve their competencies in accomplishing an outcome (competence), their need to self-determine their own behaviour (autonomy), and their need to feel they belong (relatedness). In accordance with this model of self-determined, needs based learning, international students as ELLs can "use one language to shed light on another" (Walqui & van Lier, 2010, p. 59) as well as other cognitive and social resources to be successful in their academic learning (Pintrich, 2003). Students are cognitively engaged in learning as they use their thinking and processing strategies, such as maps, for their conceptual understanding or they employ their elaboration skills and self-monitoring strategies to learn the content of their subjects at school. Students'

thinking is developed further through their social interactions in a variety of classroom learning contexts, and under the influence of different contextual factors, as viewed through a sociocultural perspective.

There is need for more research to be done to find out how secondary ELL students learn their academic subjects and how their content teachers manage the learning of these students in New Zealand secondary school classrooms. This study aims to add to this literature.

As illustrated in this review, teaching and learning the academic language of high school curricula can be demanding for both ELLs and the teachers working with them. These potential challenges require further exploration. Specifically, as Thiessen and Cook (2007) pointed out, further research needs to be done to "uncover the kinds of variations in student experience that they may obtain within and across subject matter" (p.50).

Participants in this study shared their views on what they considered to be effective practice in teaching ELLs in mainstream classrooms and identified what challenges they faced in this area. By presenting the experiences of both international students and teachers, this research hopes to contribute to a better understanding of learning and teaching ELLs in a New Zealand high school setting.

Research questions

This study addressed the following questions:

1) What are international students' perspectives on their mainstream academic learning:

    a. How do international students report learning in their mainstream subjects?

    b. What do international students report as helping them to learn?

    c. What do international students perceive to be the main barriers for their learning?

2) What are mainstream teachers' perspectives on how international students learn their

   subjects:

   a. What do mainstream teachers report facilitates these students' learning?

   b. What do teachers perceive to be the main barriers for international students' academic learning in their classes?

In a later section of this report, I present the findings of this study and link them to these research questions.

Chapter 3. Methodology

There are three main sections in this chapter. The introduction provides reasoning for the chosen study design. It includes the theoretical notions and philosophical underpinnings of the study, which utilises the benefits of using a case study approach. The research process is described and then the trustworthiness, reflexivity and ethics of this study are explained.

This is a qualitative research study. Qualitative research is defined by Lichtman (2013) as a "way of knowing in which a researcher gathers, organizes, and interprets information obtained from humans using his or her eyes and ears as filters" (p.7). This research uses in-depth interviews to provide a description and understanding of international students' academic learning in mainstream classrooms. Sociocultural theory underpins this research and reflects my beliefs that an individual learns through interactions with knowledgeable others (Gibbons, 2008, Zahavi, 2012). The learning context in this study may be conceptualised as the 'inter-cultural' space created when student participants bring with them study experiences from their school world in their home country to their host country's school world, and engage in their host country's cultures and its cultural products (Kormos, Csizer, & Iwainiec, 2014). The classroom is a space of "joint participation of the instructor and the learner" (Salmen & Hawkens, 2013, p.4). This quote expresses the sociocultural notion of community of practice whereby teachers introduce new students to the cultural practices of their subject by involving

them actively in it. By observing international students' learning in their interactions with other students and by interacting with them, teachers learn about these learners' current abilities in their subject, and figure out through which "space" they can best assist and guide them in their learning development (Scott & Palincsar, 2013).

The qualitative interpretive paradigm is characterized by examining and understanding the individuals' experiences where researchers aspired to "understand the subjective world of human experience" (Cohen, et al., 2011, p.17). A case study approach is an in-depth examination of a personal experience (Lichtman, 2013).

Case study

A qualitative case study approach is used in this study. The choice to use a case study for this qualitative study aligns with Creswell's (2003; 2012) view that methodology ought to be appropriate to answer the research questions. Case study involves a rich description of the subject researched seen through the eyes of the participants (Cohen et al., 2011).

This study aimed to explain the phenomenon of international students' academic learning in their mainstream subjects through both teachers' and students' perspectives. The objective of this study was to gain more understanding and shed light on the experience of being ELL learner and an ELL teacher, and to draw some inferences from the similarities and differences (Laws & McLeod, 2004). In this sense, this study could therefore be classified as an "explanatory, intrinsic case study" (Pearson et al., 2015).

This research is an embedded case study with two units (Yin, 1989). In "the embedded multiple-case design" different sub-units may be involved, but each unit is kept separate (Cohen, et al., 2011, p.291). This study is a single-case study with an embedded design (Yin, 2009). According to Yin (2009), there are two main types of the case study design: 1) a single-case study that can have a holistic or embedded design and 2) a multiple-case study with a

holistic or embedded design. Applying Yin's approach, the design of this case is represented in the following figure 1.

Figure 1: Single- case study with an embedded design

Embedded unit of analysis 1	**Embedded unit of analysis 2**
Teachers' sets of interview responses	Students' sets of interview responses
↓	↓

Report → **FINDINGS** ← Report

Source: Adapted and modified from Yin (2009, p.46)

There are two groups of participants. Four teacher participants' sets of interview responses represent one embedded unit of analysis. Five student participants' sets of interview responses represent the second unit of analysis. The data from each of these two groups of participants were analysed and reported as the study's findings.

I originally planned to compare and contrast the participants' experiences of different subjects as different subjects have different academic language demands. Additionally, by including different subject perspectives, a higher level of triangulation was possible. However, the subject teachers and their students appeared to share similar experiences so I decided not to separate the cases according to subjects, but to instead look at the different experiences of teachers and their ELL students. Thus, conclusions were drawn and explained in relation to the findings from both groups of participants.

Research Methods

The following section is about the recruitment process and the data collection process.

The participants. International students and mainstream teachers from one local public school were recruited. Five international students and four teachers agreed to participate in this study. There were 14 interviews in total, with ten interviews being held

with five students and four with teachers. The focus learning areas for the interviews were: Science, Geography, Physical Education, Mathematics and English.

Participant selection. A purposeful sampling approach was used for selecting participants in this study. According to Creswell (2003) purposeful sampling helps a researcher to discover a phenomenon by choosing the right people and the right places to meet the purpose of the research. Recruiting from one organizational context according to Ritchie, Lewis, and Elam (2003) is a good basis for building understanding on an issue in depth because different perspectives on common issues can be explored. The research was conducted in one local school. The school facilitated research by providing a suitable site and encouraging support that assisted me in conducting the study. The school also provided appropriate spaces for the interviews. All of this contributed to an environment where the participants willingly shared their experiences.

Four teachers and five students met the selection criteria to participate in this research. The criteria for selecting the teacher participants were:

- They were mainstream teachers of senior subjects.
- They had two (or more) years of experience in teaching (and had more than one international student in their classes).

The student participants recruited for the study were those whose English proficiency allowed them to reflect on their study as an international student (Pearson, Albon, & Hubbal, 2015), and provide insights into it (Langley & Royer, 2006).

The criteria for selecting the student participants were:

- They were international students.
- They were ELLs.
- They were not international students on a short stay at school.
- They attended senior subjects/were working towards NCEA level 1 or 2.

- They attended the school whose principal agreed that I could conduct the research.

- They were over 16 years old and could give informed consent to participate.

I distributed the information sheets and consent forms (Appendix D-L) to the Board of Trustees, the principal, and the teacher participants. The director of the school's international college gave information sheets to potential student participants in this study. One teacher gave the information sheets to potential teacher participants in this study. These documents were "clearly worded" (Haines, 2017, p. 223) to ensure that these participants understood the purpose of the study.

To ensure diversity (Ritchie et al., 2003), I invited a mix of students from different Asian countries to participate. The student participants had a range of abilities and curriculum levels. One additional student who participated in the first interview was not invited for the second interview because of her short-stay visa status. All teacher participants were New Zealanders, however one was originally from another country. The teacher participants were not teaching the student participants in the year in which this research was done. The participants in this study reflected on their own unique experiences and shared these experiences with me, the researcher, during interviews.

Data collection. I chose a longitudinal type of data collection, in the sense defined by Lewis (2003) of "having" more than one episode of data collected (p.76). The data from the student participants were collected from two semi-structured (face-to-face) interviews that lasted approximately one hour each. The data from teacher participants were audio-recorded from one semi-structured interview. Before each interview, I checked whether the participants had any questions, and then collected the signed consent forms. Having two interviews with students was important to ascertain whether there might be change in quality of the participants' experience over time (Lewis, 2003). Also, the students showed more confidence and openness to share their experiences in the second interview after becoming

familiar with the interview process. All student participants stated that they experienced positive feelings from their participation in the interviews. After the second interview one student from China said that the interview questions stimulated her to think more consciously about things that help her to learn better. Another student from Japan stated that this experience was useful to him because it helped him to reflect on how he learns, and to compare with this way of learning to the learning in his country. The third participant appreciated the opportunity to practice his English and to build up confidence in his speaking abilities.

Semi-structured interviews allow qualitative researchers to pursue a response in detail (Gill, Stewart, Treasure, & Chadwick, 2008) in order to achieve their purpose. The participants had the right to choose not to answer any questions. I did not tell the students about my teaching background but it was useful to be able to bring a basic understanding of the context and the topics to this study (Roberts, 2009).

Type of data. The data came from transcriptions of the fourteen audio-recorded interviews that I held with the participants. The second source of data for analysis were the written notes I made during the interviews. An additional source of data was the journal entry-email produced by one student. This reflective journal entry which complemented data from the interviews, was useful for my analysis. I also included notes from my reflective journal with my field notes. These multiple sources of data enabled me to increase the trustworthiness of this study.

Interviews. Semi-structured, in-depth interviews were used as they suit the qualitative nature of the research questions (Cohen et al., 2011). I used an unstructured response approach and prompted participants with open questions in order to enable discussion to develop (McIntosh & Morse, 2015). This allowed for responses from the participants that I had not anticipated (Gill, Stewart, Treasure, & Chadwick, 2008). Some introductory

questions, follow up questions, probing questions, specifying questions, direct questions, indirect questions and structuring questions were used in the interviews (Kvale, 2007). The content, order and sequencing of each question was different as it depended on the flow of the discussion. Different question prompts were used for different participants.

I started each interview by reminding the participants of my ethical responsibilities and then asked the participants if they had any questions or issues to clarify regarding their interview (s). I reminded them that our interviews will be audio-recorded and that they had the right not to answer any of my interview questions.

I opened the interview by explaining what the purpose and the topic of the interview was, and then asked the participants simple background questions, as was suggested in the literature (Newton, 2010).

The interview flow then continued with some easy questions to build up trust with the interviewees, providing more sensitivity (Kvale, 2007).The open questions at the end of the interview gave an opportunity for participants to add something important to them that I may not have asked (Gill et al., 2008). For example, I asked all student participants what their best advice to a newcomer regarding academic learning in the mainstream classrooms would be.

I used some of Conte's (2009) general prompts including the two-word conversational phrases such as *tell me* to start the interview in an open way leaving a space for the interviewees to answer in different way. I dressed in a professional manner, as managing appropriate appearance is one of the means of creating and building rapport and trust (Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995). I made a conscious effort to keep eye contact while asking questions despite writing notes. It is important to look at participants with empathy to let them know you are interested in what s/he is saying (Conte, 2008). McIntosh and Morse (2015) point out that the interviewer's presence influences the depth of the participants' responses, so the researcher's appearance, use of body language, and use of encouraging

words like "yeah" were aimed to promote rapport and to foster a sense of my interest in their answers.

Prompts can include encouraging feedback, nods, and even appropriate laughing (Ryan & Dundon, 2008). Ryan and Dundon researched rapport development during qualitative interviews in 52 cases. Their findings showed that the quality of data generated from an interview was affected by the relationship between researchers and participants. In their study, they found five stages of rapport building; opening the interview, searching for more understanding on a topic, establishing empathy, more natural conversation and closing the interview. My interviews generally followed this pattern.

Not everything can be anticipated before the research has begun, noted Bogdan and Biklen (2003) and it is not always possible to determine which questions will prove to be important or adequate before knowing the given social grouping (Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995). In this study, the semi-structured questions allowed me to gain a detailed picture of the study participants' experience.

I transcribed each interview word by word. I also shared my transcripts with the participants so that they could verify the trustworthiness of them.

Data Analysis

This data analysis section includes a detailed description of the multiple stages of data analysis, including the process of coding and developing analytical response categories. The purpose of this analysis was to select, describe, interpret and present the study participants' perspectives, seeing them as individual, unique experiences from an authentic high school educational context, but conflating the data to protect their identity. I employed an inductive, thematic analysis in this study. I coded each of the interviews individually, and initially analysed them separately. The themes that emerged were used to explain the participants' perspectives as seen later in the findings and discussion chapter.

Coding approach

This study used an interpretive approach to coding that suits its "data-driven-approach" (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006, p.82) using a general inductive analysis. This involved my preparing data by transcribing each of the participant's interviews, and then reading and re-reading the transcribed data multiple times in order to help to understand its meanings and to extract the core themes (Thomas, 2006). This was a process of working with data (Taylor-Powel & Renner, 2003) closely and reflectively.

I started the analysis by examining the participants' own words, in order to be able to use this 'naturally occurring data' to discover themes that could provide some answers to the research questions. I used an open coding approach coding strategy initially. Since the coding system needs to suit the nature of the research question (Gu, 2013), Saldaña's (2013b) two-cycle coding model was an appropriate strategy for this study, aimed at providing in-depth description of the case (Corbin & Strauss, 1990).

Theoretical considerations. Regarding the analytical procedure and protocols of doing thematic analysis, there have been some debates over whether to use a manual or electronic system or both ways. The question is which of the two ways of coding, manual coding on paper or coding using the NVivo software, suits the researcher's work in order to gain better understanding of data. However, in Basit's (2003) view, it can be helpful to compare manually and electronically coded categories for achieving a higher level of accuracy in qualitative research. Welsh (2002) also recommends that both methods be used at different stages of the analysis to gain a better understanding of the data.

I analysed data from this study using a staged coding procedure with both manual and electronic modes, Saldaña's (2013b) two cycle coding approach was adapted and modified for this study, utilising pre-coding, axial coding and focus coding. Each individual participant's data were analyzed, followed by an analysis across the two groups, teacher and

student participants. This open coding approach helps in achieving precision and "breaking through subjectivity and bias" (Corbin & Strauss, 1990, p.13). It allowed me to be reflexive and revisit data, and to organize data from initial coding to thematic coding. I used both manual and electronic method (using NVivo) for developing response categories that led to discovering the main themes arising from this research. By using both methods I was able to approach my data more closely and to examine it more analytically (Yin, 2015).

Developing response categories. I created a coding scheme with some examples to help me plan my analysis that follows. As Williams and Ormond (2010) point out, the research process is a critical, systematic way of seeking explanations to describe a phenomenon, but research is also a creative process. I coded two transcripts per student participant and one transcript per teacher participant. The following chart illustrate the main approach that I used in the planning stage of my coding:

Process-Stages	**Outcomes**
● Analytical reflections	Clusters are compared for commonalities.
● Pattern coding	Patterns are identified.
● Focus coding	Core themes are identified.

Manual coding. I decided to do manual coding first because I was already deeply engaged in reading notes and transcribing the interviews, and I became familiar enough with the data to be able to categorize them. During the process of data selection and coding, I brainstormed the key points on paper and highlighted some of the participants' key words in the file notes that I created during the interviews. Charmaz (2014) points out that researchers (following the interpretive tradition) start their analysis during the data collection process. I created a manual coding framework by establishing "broad categories of conceptual ideas" (Sheridan, 2016, p. 6), relying on the theoretical traditions that support manual coding design. My manually coded categories are presented in the following table.

Table 1

Manual coding

Response categories	Themes Indicators
Student participants	
Source of data:	Student Interviews:10 (two interviews with each participant); Journal: 1
Response categories	**Themes Indicators**
Ways of understanding	*Ways of experiencing*
Category 1	Perspectives: Feelings and Attitudes/ Prior experience/Perceptions
Category 2	Engagement approaches: Content/Language learning
Category 3	Contextual learning: Study strategies/ Support
Teacher participants	
Source of data:	Teacher Interviews: 4 (one interview with each participant)
Response categories	**Themes Indicators**
Ways of understanding	*Ways of experiencing*
Category 1	Perspectives: Feelings and Attitudes/Prior experience/Perceptions
Category 2	Engagement approaches: Instructional practices
Category 3	Contextual teaching: Strategies/ School support
Elements for analysis - related to the research questions	
Q1. Perspectives	Students: 5 Teachers: 4
Q2. Enablers	Students: 5 Teachers: 4
Q3. Challenges	Students: 5 Teachers: 4

I established broad categories from the data that I searched manually. I initially used paper to brainstorm and to conceptualise the three main categories that could represent my data. I recalled the main ideas that arose as I was transcribing the interviews and I scanned through hard copies of all of my transcripts repeatedly to get a deeper sense of the participants' meanings. I named the first category *perspectives* because my research was aimed to explore the participants' perspectives. The approach that I used for developing this category was in line with Bazeley and Jackson's (2003) thought that is important to create categories with a "view ahead" (p.24).

The second and third categories, reflected sociocultural views on learning, as ideas of *personal engagement* and *contextual learnings surfaced as recurring concepts.* After that I created a few sub-categories under each of the three general categories in order to cluster thematically similar data together. For example, I put the data from my first participant's

transcripts into these categories on the paper and then I input them into the computer. I organized the data from this participant's transcripts in the following way:

- I used three colours to highlight the data files: blue for 'perspectives', red for 'engagement' and green for 'contextual learning'.

- I named three general categories/nodes to serve me as a general umbrella for storing the data related to a category. Category 1: Perspectives; Category 2: Engagement; Category 3: Contextual learning.

- I created some subcategories (sub-nodes) for storing thematically similar data: 1) Perspectives sub-nodes: Feelings and Attitudes/ Prior Experience /Perceptions (Assumptions and Expectations); 2) Engagement approaches sub-nodes: Content /Language Learning; 3) Contextual learning sub-nodes: Study strategies/ School support.

For manual coding I named the node categories and subcategories as presented above and then I input participants' data into the category where I thought it belonged. The data that I chose was taken from the participants' transcripts and the email entries from one student participant as well as handwritten notes from my own reflective journal.

Coding with NVivo. The second coding process was to enter data into NVivo files and create some nodes for analytical purposes. I created a memo for storing information on how to use some of NVivo's functions. I also created three general categories and the sub-categories in NVivo under the same names that I used for manual coding. Going through this process of finding the appropriate data from original transcripts and placing them into a particular category or sub-category, I realised that I needed to rename some of the sub-categories because I did not have enough the significant data to put into it. For example, I changed the sub-category of *Feelings and Attitudes* to *Attitudes* as I could not find much data about the participants' feelings. After I coded data in NVivo, I created some analytical

memos then I printed the list of coded data and I coded them again in pencil as suggested by Marshal (2002) in order to compare and analyse closely, word-for-word the narrative data (Taylor-Powel & Renner, 2003). The following is an example that illustrates how I approached to coding of the individual data in NVivo.

NVivo Coding – An example of coding

Section for coding:

The teacher participant's response to the question about his contribution to different aspects of his international students' successes.

Stages:

Precoding- In vivo coding

● Scholarship exam (Objective)

● Setting the scholarship exam in Science (Teacher's/Student's action)

● Writing references (Teacher's action)

● Attentive and work hard (Student's action/attitudes)

● Managed to get a scholarship (Student's success)

❶ Axial Coding – Label: Build up the framework

● Setting scholars in Science (Student's action)

● Build up the framework/Writing references (Teacher's actions)

❷ Focus Coding-Theme: Teacher's support (Help for scholars in Science)

I constantly compared the coded data of individual participants to see which were similar and needed to go into a particular coded category. Also, the true meanings of the participants' phrases could not have been understood without reflecting back to the original

section of data and checking it in conjunction with other parts of the participant's whole response.

The following section will explain how I fulfilled the research criteria of trustworthiness and reflexivity, and the ethical principles that I adhered to throughout this research.

Trustworthiness

Qualitative case study research is not expected to lead to generalisations, but rather to the identification of patterns (Chenail, 2011). Charmaz (2014) pointed out that 'interpreting' in qualitative research is about understanding someone's experience, not reproducing it and presenting it as one's own.

This study seeks to uncover some insightful findings that may be transferable. It draws on Lincoln and Guba's (1981) four aspects of trustworthiness: Truth value, Applicability, Consistency and Neutrality. In order to assess these four aspects, four criteria were used: confidence, transferability, dependability and conformability (Lincoln & Guba, 1981, p. 80). In the following table I apply Lincoln and Guba's criteria for trustworthiness (see column one), and Shenton's (2004) provisions for promoting trustworthiness in qualitative research.

Table 2

Applying Lincoln and Guba's Research Criteria

Lincoln &Guba's Criteria*/Definitions* Source: Lincoln &Guba (1981, p.80)	Strategies to meet Lincoln &Guba's criteria Source: Shenton (2004, p.73)	Applying Lincoln and Guba's criteria to this study – some examples
CREDIBILTY (Confidence) *Establish confidence in the "truth" of the findings.*	Familiarity with the culture of participating organisations. Triangulation via use of different methods, different types of informants and/or different sites. Tactics to help ensure honesty in informants.	An accurate and detailed description of each participant's subjective experience (e.g. quotations). Site triangulation: having multiple participants/Recruitment of the participants was voluntary, so the respondents were willing to share their experiences/A voice recorder was used during the interview.
TRANSFERABILITY *Determine the degree to which the findings may have applicability in other contexts or with other respondents.*	Iterative questioning in data collection dialogues.	Responses to the research question may be resonate with experiences in different contexts and lead to other researchers conducting studies in a similar setting.
DEPENDABILITY *Determine whether the findings are consistent and could be repeated.*	Debriefing sessions between researcher and superiors.	Sufficient details are provided about methodology so that another researcher could follow the same methodological steps.
CONFIRMABILITY *A degree of neutrality of the extent to which the findings of a study are shaped by the respondents and not researcher bias, motivation, or interest.*	Use of "reflective commentary" Description of background, qualifications and experience of the researcher. Member checks of data collected and interpretations /theories.	Conclusions about the findings connected to literature. Ongoing feedback, supervision and the guidance was provided by the supervisors throughout the research. The transcripts and coding were shared with the supervisors. NVivo software used for the analysis (allowing me to observe it in a holistic way). Reflexivity throughout the entire research.

According to Ash and Clayton (2004), it is important that researchers provide a detailed explanation of the research processes and the details of the experience in a way that someone who did not have that experience can understand it. I have provided a detailed description of what I did during the analysis process to straighten the credibility if this study.

Some of the strategies that helped to maximise "trustworthiness" included the use of both different procedures, a manual and electronic coding using different functions of NVivo

for coding data, and multiple interviews at different times (Johnson, 1997). The use of multiple interviews at different times provided richer data, leading towards a better understanding of what was unique to a person's experience.

The data triangulation was achieved by having multiple sources for eliciting data: interviews with multiple students and teachers, my interview notes and one student's journal.

Also, further triangulation occurred through conducting two semi-structured interviews with each of the student participants over a period of six months.

Furthermore, I shared a copy of the interview transcript with them so they could reflect back on their interviews and verify the accuracy. I also shared the transcripts with my supervisors, so they were able to gain an insight into the richness of the collected data. A better sense of triangulation is presented in a later section on data collection and analysis.

Reflexivity

Reflexivity, as defined by Ortlipp (2008), is researching in a critical reflective mode by critically reflecting on what researchers bring to their research and how this influences the outcomes of a study. It is likely that a researcher has initial knowledge about the topic that stimulates them to continue developing their understanding of it. Approaching the context of the study with some prior knowledge is imperative, states Roberts (2009). Having some knowledge about the research topic helps the researcher to better understand the reality, sensitivity and complexity of the issues involved in studying a situation or setting.

I am a teacher but not currently teaching at the participating school. This allowed me to position myself as a person without power to influence either students or teachers to participate as I did not know any of the participants in my research.

Also, as a person from a non-English speaking background, I speak with an accent and the interview participants also have an accent different to that of native English speakers.

This fact could have been a stimulating factor for participants to speak more freely without worrying about mispronunciation or grammatical mistakes.

Some of the strategies that maximised reflexivity included my regular self-reflection (Johnson, 1997). Using critical reflection regarding the possible biases that I may have had as a teacher, I approached this analysis as an opportunity for developing my intercultural competencies, rather than through the prism of my personal or professionally perceived intercultural understanding or experience.

Creswell (2003) states that a qualitative researcher's interpretations of the findings are not separable from their prior understandings, contexts or backgrounds. Since I had some experience in teaching international students in the past, my choice of a semi-structured interview as the method in this study, which requires asking open-ended questions ensured that I sought the participants' experiences rather than imposing my own (Cohen et al., 2011). This helped prevent me from leading the participants into giving expected responses. Also, the supervisors' feedback was useful in reminding me to avoid speaking more than the participant which we had identified as a potential weakness of the first interview with my first student participant. I also discussed the thematic coding (Henry, Casserly, Coady, & Marshall, 2008) with the supervisors to question some of my (possible) *taken-for-granted assumptions*.

Adding to this, in the later analysis, I reflected on the literature review, relevant theories and practices, linking them with this study's empirical evidence to inform my own interpretations (Zahavi, 2012).

Ethics

Ethics approval for this study was gained from the Victoria University Human Ethics Committee (VUW HEC). Permission to carry out this study was sought from the Board of Trustees and the Principal of the participating school.

The total interview period was six months during 2018. The first interviews with the students were held in May and the second interviews over two months, between September and October. The teacher interviews were held during a period of four months, between July and October.

All nine participants (five senior students, years 11-12, and four mainstream teachers) signed a consent form, with all participants having the opportunity to ask questions before being interviewed. I created my own consent forms (see Appendix D-F) following the University Human Ethics Committees' fundamental ethics principles, including the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. The consent form reminded the participants that their participation was voluntary, and their identity and the confidentiality of their interview responses would remain confidential. The information sheets were written in simple, clear language because the participants needed to have a clear understanding to make informed decisions and give consent (Resnik, 2009). In the consent forms and the information sheets, my contact details were provided, which also mentioned that the VUW HEC gave approval for the research. The participants were aware that they could clarify issues and ask questions if needed. I fully considered all ethics stated in the consent form throughout all of the aspects of the research.

I distributed to the participants a list of semi-structured questions before the interview so they could familiarize themselves with them, ask questions if needed, and choose a subject they wanted to discuss. Since students with limited English may be considered vulnerable (Lichtman, 2013), I provided several opportunities for student participants to clarify any issues related to the research. As Cohen, Manion., & Morrison, 2011 pointed out "researchers must be clear (and reflect) on the ethics of the research, especially the case study researcher, who is often "privy to confidential or sensitive matters" (p.296).

At the beginning of each interview I reminded the participants about my ethical obligations to them, as regular reflection on the requirements from the consent helps to

ensure that ethical and methodological requirements are followed (Miller & Bell, 2012). Also, I reminded the participants about the interview protocol, including that their conversation would be audio recorded. During the interview, I made a conscious effort to give participants space to answer the questions, allowing participants to avoid answering questions if they were unready or unable to do so. I also avoided assuming that student participants understood the meaning of the questions, and used different wording to make questions more clear, or rephrased and repeated back their answers to make sure that the essence of their statements were captured correctly during the interview.

The students' and teachers' confidentiality and privacy was assured, with a pseudonym used for each of them. I used only a word "teacher" and "student" because of confidentiality issues. The identity of the school was kept confidential as well. I even sent the name of the school in a letter to the research supervisors by post instead of sending it via email to keep its identity safeguarded. I also took out all identifiable data from the transcripts before emailing them to the research supervisors. In this way, the identity and confidentially of data of the human participants in this study were safeguarded. Legal questions such as freedom of expression and data protection (Cohen et al., 2011) were not overlooked during the research.

All relevant research documentation that was stored on the computer in Microsoft or NVivo software was protected by secure password access. I kept the consent forms containing the participants' identifiable data in a secure place at home, and destroyed them in due course.

Regarding the rules of ethics in relation to the organization of the interview, the setting was appropriate as the researcher held all student interviews at school. They were organised with support from the International College's director and school office staff. I

held interviews with two teacher participants at school as well, and with other teacher

participants in a nearby place as per mutual agreement with them.

These examples demonstrate that I followed the ethics principles in the manner

required by the ethical conduct of the research. I was also fully aware that any misconduct on

the side of the researcher is punishable by New Zealand law.

Chapter 4. Analysis of Findings

Two major themes emerged. The first theme is the participants' transition from their original educational system to their host learning environment. The second theme relates to the dual tasks faced by students of learning a new language and a new subject. I use the following metaphorical titles to capture the sense of these two themes:

Theme 1: Puzzles and pedagogical crafts

Theme 2: The group matters, the group matters

In the following section, key ideas within these two themes are reported and some similarities and differences across the two groups of participants, teachers and students, are identified.

Theme 1: Puzzles and pedagogical crafts

Teachers and students demonstrated awareness that international students face continuous adaptation, not only to a new country but also to a new educational system. As one teacher commented:

> *Students not only change country, but they also change the entire education system, it is hard. They need to engage with and understand New Zealand education system, and maybe the differences between their and our country…some rationale behind why we do things.* (Teacher)

> *Learning in a foreign environment takes a lot [of adjusting].* (Teacher)

Several factors played an important role in the academic transition of international students participating in this study, including their previous experience, self-efficacy and the support of others. Students employed their own strategies to deal with their academic transition issues, including the use of first language resources to support their learning. Teacher participants used different pedagogical approaches and instructional strategies to facilitate the academic learning of their international students and support them with this transition.

Effects of students' previous experiences. Teacher and student participants both acknowledged that learning a new language and new subject matter placed huge demands on learners. Lack of experience in practising some skills, such as critical thinking, was believed to add to the difficulty of international students' mainstream learning and understanding.

Teachers recognised that there are notable differences in the way teaching and learning is done in New Zealand compared to the way international students were taught in their own countries. One teacher pointed out that

> *There is a significant difference in the way international students are used to learning versus what we are doing here, and one of the things they are not used to is actually coming and asking for help.* (Teacher)

Another teacher reported that students seemed to have different expectations of the role of a teacher. He illustrated this by sharing a situation that had occurred in his class. He offered help to one international student, however the student responded that he could do it by himself. Since this student did not pass the assessment, the teacher reminded him that he could ask questions to clarify things before the assessment, but the student replied: "Oh, I did not know that I was allowed to ask you. I thought I was not allowed to ask".

Aside from different expectations and other challenges that come from the students' previous backgrounds and experiences, teachers acknowledged that students' use of their L1 may be a useful learning tool especially when they first come to school in New Zealand. They described the students' use of their native language as a part of their process to extract meaning from new words. Teachers noticed that students used their first language for developing their understanding of concepts in their subjects by communicating and interacting with peers in the same language, and using dictionaries and textbooks written in that language. One teacher pointed out that

> *Often, they will have a dictionary…and they will put words they do not know into their dialect.* (Teacher)

As students shared:

> *I learn it from Thai language, I learn in Thai language and then I read it in English again.* (Student)

> *I look at my own language explanation…because sometimes in English explanations I got terrible and I do not understand.* (Student)

Teachers also found that international students needed to deal not only with two languages,

but also with reconciling different concepts:

> *They come with concepts or previous knowledge that is different, so it is important to understand the ways that they were taught, and then try to come up with the solutions.* (Teacher)

Regarding understanding concepts, one teacher commented that

> *It is not the concept that is difficult, or the problem that is difficult, it is language acting as a barrier.*

One teacher pointed out that, according to his experience, international students

> *Do not have potentially enough words, so new words are really hard to acquire. But if they already know a large number of English words, learning new words is a lot more attainable.*

Regarding second language learning tasks, including building vocabulary, all of the

participants agreed that for these tasks, students need extra time. On top of this are the

literacy demands of NCEA assessments, which make it more difficult for students to achieve

NCEA standards, as reported by the participants.

International students usually come from top schools where they are "used to getting

top grades" (Teacher). They need to adjust to New Zealand's grade system (Not achieved,

Achieved, Merit, and Excellence) which is different to their previous 'pass-fail' grade

system. One student stated that the opportunity to progress from Achieved to Excellence is

better than a pass-fail grade system, which gives no opportunity to improve results, as in their

own country.

Regarding the NCEA based system, some teachers commented that

> *NCEA is time demanding for both the teacher and the pupils …our excellent questions require a lot more time for our students but for international students it*

will be even more because they have that translating job they need to do. (Teacher)

It is different types of assessments. So just because somebody has struggled with the written side of things, that doesn't mean to say that's the only one way that they can get their knowledge and understanding out. So, that's where we back it with a verbal assessment. (Teacher)

It is not necessary always about the grade; it is about improving their skills. (Teacher)

It is important to be academically focused. It is very important, but we are not in a business of making students pass tests without having the necessary skills required to succeed in a real life… And that is the outcome of the curriculum "Lifelong Learners". (Teacher)

Teachers emphasised that international students are developing their skills by doing NCEA assessments and they offered some orally assessed units to those students who, as ELLs, need some additional time to respond to the demands of the written assessment tasks.

Most students reported that their personal motivation for their desired assessment outcomes kept them on task. One student said, "I want to achieve, and I want to achieve a higher grade than 'Achieved'. So yeah, it is maybe desire forcing me to do that" (Student). However, another student stated that he hated learning English but needed because of the admission requirements of the college he wanted to attend in his country of origin.

All students acknowledged that it was essential for them to build up a positive sense of self-confidence when it comes to their ability to perform within the context of the classroom. Some students provided examples from their experiences when their perceived ability to meet the challenges related to the use of L2 had an impact on their involvement and self-esteem.

I think confidence is very important. When I think I can't make [a] great, great sentence, and sometimes I lose my confidence... I feel a little ashamed because Kiwis can all understand; they make mistakes but not like this. (Student)

Some of them shared that they felt a lack of confidence which prevented them from asking questions.

You need to be active in class…although you do not like to ask questions, you need

to be focused on that…do not feel embarrassed to ask a question. I felt that a little bit last year but now I do not. (Student)

One student explained her perspective on raising questions in the following way:

You need to like put hand up before any others. And, that means you got no time to think. That means you need to like, combine your sentence and the words together and also correctly. I think that is a big practice for me. That is physically when I finish my answer, my face is flushed…it is not about my techniques, but it is about my speaking.

Based on these students' reported views, it seems that they valued an inclusive and supportive class environment where they can feel comfortable to ask questions and/ or learn from their mistakes.

Strategies used by students. The student participants shared their most effective learning strategies. Most reported that they used their prior knowledge of the subject and textbooks written in their native language as a basic foundation on which they built knowledge and skills in their mainstream secondary classroom contexts. Some students had studied their current mainstream subjects before in their home countries. One student said he had studied the subject that was the focus of his interview for four years. "Because I was very good at this subject before, I chose this subject" (Student). Another student stated that she uses books written in her native language for Science, Chemistry, Biology and for Maths.

In contrast, one student did not find much use of her Biology text book in her native language because, she said, "it help me a little bit, but it didn't help me much because the things are different" (Student). However, this student acknowledged that rather than using the L1 textbooks, she used online resources in her original language.

Another student also stated that the use of Internet websites and tools in his original language was a useful strategy for his English language learning.

I looked up on the Internet in my own language. I look up the topics... it is just easier to understand. I just sometimes watch movie or and then, put English subtitle to my like favourite video. If it is in Japanese, I still put English subtitles, and I can learn how, like this English word works. (Student)

Students stated that their L1 resources were mainly useful to them for translating purposes and extracting meanings from the class texts.

Learning strategies that are based on the use of their first language were especially useful to student participants who reported significant struggle in using L2. The student participants who reported that their English proficiency level was higher, as well as their NCEA achievement grades, did not rely much on resources from their origin countries.

All students reported that they used the internet and email as communication and learning tools at school and remotely from home. This includes a variety of multimedia learning materials and applications for language learning. A few student participants reported that they interacted with their teachers via email, having their questions answered or written feedback provided to them.

Some students reported that they used the computer as their 'language-learning tool' because it helped them to practice language independently at home, in their own time. They used some free or paid applications not only to find the meaning of words, but also to learn pronunciation through communicating with groups and individuals. One student uses the application TED for practicing both listening and speaking. Another student mentioned that they have some practice online like the 'Education Perfect' and 'e-Learn'.

Students also used their own self-regulative strategies to develop their self-efficacy, including through talking with others. One student used the following words when she talked with her classmates and a homestay about her accent

> *It is like different [people] got different accent as I got, I am not a local Kiwi ...[there] is English, British English, American English and maybe New Zealand English, and all three got difference so as I know what I say is right.*

Alongside encouragement received from their families and peers, students acknowledged that they receive support from their teachers by, for example, getting verbal encouragement or encouraging written feedback on their work from them.

Strategies used by teachers. According to teachers' accounts of their teaching international students, it seems that teachers facilitated these students' learning and mentored them in their individual development. All teachers showed that their basic practice was oriented towards guiding international students to engage in regular activities, jointly learn and share their understandings and resources with peers.

In addition, teachers explained how they facilitated the students' learning environment by providing a positive classroom atmosphere to help them effectively overcome their transitional gaps. They evaluated the students' English language levels and assisted them in overcoming them by using specific instructional and pedagogical practices. They assisted these students, for instance, with one-to-one support sessions and conferencing, helping them to develop their language capability using a step-by-step approach on an on-going basis.

One teacher participant reported that he teaches his international students how to write sentences in a proper structure; he tells them how to start a sentence or how to write prepositional phrases. Once they have got that, he said, he helps them to write a paragraph, for example by explaining to them how to link the first sentence to the question, then the following sentence to the context and how to add some examples after that. It seems that this kind of this teacher's 'scaffold instruction' serves as a model to international students that improves their understanding of academic writing forms and styles. According to the teacher's reported experience, international students who were struggling with their English writing at the start of the year, after they used this scaffolding technique repeatedly over the year, were able to pass their class assessment at the end of the year.

Teachers' pedagogical approaches included fostering the students' independence while promoting their inclusion and participation in class, through building a rapport with them and using specifically designed strategies to support their individual learning needs.

Building a rapport. In facilitating international students' learning in a new language and with a new context, all teachers said that it is important to understand the ways international students were taught in their original countries because

> *They are coming from an entirely different education system, they are struggling with the language…they are struggling with the culture.* (Teacher)

All teacher participants drew attention to the importance of knowing the students' cultural backgrounds.

> *To me as a teacher, one of the key things is to make sure that I understand a little bit about their background ...where they come from, what is their culture.* (Teacher)

All teacher participants reported that finding a common ground of understanding and building relationships while working with international students in their classrooms helped these ELLs to succeed. One teacher stated

> *If you do not have a good relationship you don't expect to see progress... if you don't have these conversations with them to actually get a sense of where they are at then you can't really then say whether your teaching is effective or not for them.* (Teacher)

Two teachers gave the example of helping students build up their confidence through ensuring that the student knows the answer to their question, and only then asking the student the question in front of the class.

Most teachers reported that they felt that by establishing good relationships with their international students, they had an opportunity to learn more about their interests and future goals. They used this kind of information as a starting point for designing learning programmes and activities that were tailored to specific students. For example, when one teacher learned that a student wanted to go back to his original country to build a house one day, he incorporated the design of a house into the topic that they were doing in class.

One teacher stated:

> *Once I got the relationship with them; making them laugh is a big way to engage them.*

Another teacher pointed out that establishing a good relationship helps him to see "where their mind set is to be able to get the best out of that" (Teacher). The teacher elaborated:

> *I am teaching them they need to be responsible for their own learning and to make them feel... if they got any questions about their work or about their assignments, they can come and talk to me... it is kind of like teaching them life skills along the way.*

Consequently, students reported a positive view of their teachers. One student described her teacher as **"**really ...passionate and really nice, kind… here I think teacher is like, I mean responsible" (Student).

Interactions between teachers and international students were reported by both groups of participants as a vital channel for improving their teaching and learning practices.

An inclusive classroom environment. Teachers also facilitate working conditions and learning environments for international students. The classroom environments were described by all teachers as interactive and supportive. Class procedures, such as regular greetings, are created to demonstrate mutual respect and a welcoming environment for international students commented one teacher.

Teachers were aware that international students do not always feel comfortable with using English in class. Their main responses were to give students more time to think, and to make sure they did not call on them in class until they were sure these students had the correct answers.

> *It is better giving them time to process it mentally before they speak it because it can obviously be quite difficult…. I give them thirty seconds to think about it, maybe talk to their neighbour…and then I will ask...* (Teacher)

Also, this teacher mentioned that he always is looking for the opportunity to read out the written work of international students when it is good.

The interactive nature of the class environment enabled students also to learn to express their abilities through demonstrating their skills in relating to others or participating with others. As teachers pointed out:

It is about how they work in a team… interact with other people getting them to be involved… feel part of it and connected. (Teacher)

It is just getting them to be involved and included… there are a lot of group discussions and so they have to be engaged. (Teacher)

A culture in the classroom where failing is not considered as 'falling down' was encouraged, said one teacher, with all other teachers making similar comments. One teacher recalled from his practice that there have been some students who have been afraid of failure and unwilling to try something due to this. As this teacher elaborated,

Creating a culture in a classroom where is okay to try and okay to fail…
Get the small successes at the start... small successes at the start give them room
to work forward.

Based on the teachers' reported views, it seems that they strive to create an environment for the international students where they are actively involved in their learning through their participation and interactions in class.

Strategies for meeting language needs. Regarding strategies specifically designed to meet the students' language needs, teachers reported that they needed to use different medias and multiple forms of the same instructions, as well as adjusting their teaching styles.

With respect to presentation style, some teacher participants reported that they needed to adjust to a new pace of talking. "I am limited by the language I speak and often internationals will say 'slow down", one teacher said. This teacher shared that his main strategy to overcome this challenge has been

keeping points up on the projector so that if they do not catch what I said the first time they could refer to that…You can get [the content] audible, you can get it printed, you can get it on a screen…take photos of what is on the board. So, there are many

different ways to refer back to it… lots of times they will take photos of what's on the board so then they can process it in their own time again.

One teacher also said that he speaks quickly, and he uses PowerPoint because it "backs everything up" (Teacher).

Some teachers reported that students find it useful to take photos of what is on the white board in case they missed something they could not hear or understand. One student mentioned that his teacher sometimes speaks very quickly and

sometimes I can't get it... And, he often …after the lesson or after of what he said, he asks [s] me and answer[s] my question…and sometimes …he will ask and teach me again.

One teacher pointed out that vocabulary lists are usually displayed on the white board and that he usually has "five words that might be really important for the international people to know that they just might not know" (Teacher). They are an important teaching tool because if the students miss the key words, they miss the whole lesson. As another teacher elaborated, "Using the right words in the right places is quite important" (Teacher).

Some scaffolding activities are reported by teachers as good teaching tools. As one teacher elaborated, by giving them the scaffold, an example of how to fill in the missing words, they are enabled to do it themselves. He illustrated this by saying that when students gain more confidence, he writes less while they write more. One student mentioned that the teacher gives them, "like [a] work sheet filled out in part, and some is left blank and it is like follow the model... the words are really different, you write until you are right" (Student).

All teachers reported that they used the internet as a tool to facilitate international students' content learning, as well as to provide some language instructions to them. They also used it as a pedagogical tool to encourage these students to use their English more confidently. For example, one teacher said that he used email to enable some shy students to pose questions. He also sent them feedback related to their writing. Another teacher pointed out:

> *We've got "OneNote" and I put all my power points, videos and notes there…so basically, they are digitally available to the pupils outside of class time… if they ever miss anything, the digital version always is there.*

Students agreed,

> *Teachers can put some… the key points into "OneNote…for example standards, we can know what is this standard, what is this unit, what I should learn.* (Student)

Teachers reported that involving international students in practical activities is useful to them. Hands on activities are good for international students because they "are making observation inferences to conduct and have an idea of the theory" (Teacher).

Some teachers found that by differentiating the lesson's outcome and programmes, they help international students learn. However, one teacher stated that *"it is important to differentiate but too much differentiation I believe causes separation"* (Teacher). Another teacher pointed out that differentiating the lesson outcomes could be useful to some students because of their language barriers. However, this teacher emphasised that it is important to set up the same learning outcomes for all students but provide more support for some of them because

> *If you do differentiate your instruction in the class, they often miss some stuff they really need later on down the track. So becomes a little bit of a snowball effect... the best thing is just getting outside help…Getting the teacher aides.*

One-to-one-support. One-to-one support was found by both teachers and students to be an effective means of learning. Most teachers expressed the view that, based on their experience in teaching international students, written or oral feedback and on-going conferencing with a student are among the most successful strategies that help international students to improve their understanding and writing skills. During class time, one student said, "I listen and he will, like, write down an example on my, like, piece of paper or on my text book and show me how to do it" (Student).

Teachers encouraged a range of one-to-one conversations and dialogues with their international students during class, but also provided on-going individual support during

lunch tutorial sessions and through feedback via email outside of class. They expressed the view that talking through a task with these students and going through the whole learning process together is a powerful means of support which produces greater understanding. For example, having a question and answer tutoring session during lunchtime provided an opportunity for catching up and going through some examples. This helped students to understand exactly what they needed to do. "These conversations help the teachers gain a sense of where the students are at" (Teacher). One teacher explained that having tutorials helps to see whether his international students are actually gaining an understanding. According to another teacher their students were not given enough opportunity to exercise critical thinking in their home countries,

> *I spend some time with them at lunch time, going through what is actually required for them to understand exactly what they need to do.* (Teacher)

When one teacher talked about his tutoring sessions with individual students, he described a session where teacher and student deconstructed questions and concepts together, after which the student needed to work through the key problems and words independently, deconstructing their meaning and showing line by line working. In this way, students gave their own answers and shared their own views, leading to the development of critical thinking skills. Students then came back to discuss their work and any problems in the next tutoring session.

A few students confirmed their teachers used the internet as a communication tool to help them to better understand the subject content when they learn at home. One student explained, "I can email them like what we need to do, because teacher said we can do that before 12 o'clock and that she will give us advice about …something to improve, something you are good enough at, things like that". (Student)

All teachers reported that they contact their international department to get extra help for their international students, especially for a student who is struggling. Some teachers

pointed out that students' families and homestays are supportive and that people at the

school's early learning intervention centre are there to help out as well.

> *People at International College spend a lot of time on these students' integration. For an international who is disengaged, I refer this student to the college and also I mention it at the teacher-parent interviews.* (Teacher)

> *When some of the internationals struggle to stay awake in class, I have conversations with the International College just to see what is happening in there.* (Teacher)

One student said that he talks to his parents via We-Chat every day and they send

encouraging words to him, while he is able to ask his homestay to help him to understand the

meaning of new words. "I stay [with a] Kiwi home stay. And last year I talked with her about

one hour, one hour every day". (Student)

Theme 2: The group matters, the group matters

All students reported that they value group work with their classmates. Their views

are best expressed in the title of this section which is composed of the words said by one

student participant "The group, the group matters". (Student)

Interactions with students. International students in this study reported that they

had a range of opportunities to interact with other students and to learn from their first-

language peers, and that this was very beneficial to them.

> *Sometimes if you do not understand just go and ask friends. They will explain it to you and how to do it, like get better in this activity.* (Student)

Another student pointed out that his classmates help him by explaining the meaning

of words he doesn't know.

The student participants reported that they also interacted with peers from origin or

other countries who were more experienced in the New Zealand classroom. These students

shared with us that they like to get help from their friends who are from their own country.

> *It is like, in my class…we got some Chinese people who already study here for year and they are really kind and they are happy to help. And I feel happy about that. And I have another good friend. She is not Kiwi but she is good, she is really good at English, and I talk with her very much.* (Student)

One student explained that his classmates who are originally from his own country are "describing more easy English" (Student). "In English they need to use long sentence[s] to explain and they need to use the word I cannot understand, but in Chinese they use just a few words for that," elaborated this student. Another student shared that he asks his Thai friend who knows English well to explain things to him again.

Students also have some interactions with their peers outside of class when they do practical activities together. This type of involvement helps international students not only to learn with and from their peers, but also to develop their confidence, which leads to improving their self-efficacy and self-esteem. This is illustrated through an example described by one student:

> We have, like, practiced outside and they show me how far on the line of the map. We write down the timeline, and write some main idea and some of the events… very, very powerful. When I finish this map, I feel confident. (Student)

It seems that the friends' help is vital support to students whose English is not strong, as one student said, it helps them as they "give me the right directions, show me what they did today, show me their work" (Student). Also, as this student also pointed out, "group work is great for improving confidence" (Student).

As group work and other types of inside-outside interactions between international and domestic students are reported to be empowering learning conditions for international students, targeted support by teachers to provide the conditions for these student-to-student interactions is crucial.

Active participation. Teacher participants stated that they tried to involve international students in supportive groups where they can feel a sense of achievement. As one teacher noted, "when these students have an opportunity to integrate correctly, their learning [it] actually becomes so much more efficient…". (Teacher)

Collaborative class activities, as reported by both students and teachers, were facilitated by all teacher participants and seen by both groups as opportunities for students to learn from one another. When facilitating students' collaborative learning activities, the teachers demonstrated an expectation that all students should actively participate in class. All international student participants were encouraged by their teachers to participate actively and equitably with their peers in class discussion activities.

As international students were participating in pair-group setting activities productively with their native English peers on an on-going basis, one student commented that "Group is like …to ask ... I can ask anyone… if someone don't know like … teach each other so it is helpful" (Student). One teacher noted that "sometimes internationals are surrounded by Kiwis or Non-English first language speakers and at other times they like to be in their own groups as well". (Teacher)

Teachers shared some of their experiences in facilitating such group activities that allowed international students to participate and to build up relationships with their hosts and more experienced international students from their own or other countries. For example some of them stated that they always make sure that they do not ask international students to respond to their questions unless they give them some additional time to translate and process the request. One teacher stated that with some students "I would proactively ask them to participate if I know they feel comfortable…Unless I know them particularly well, I will not ...ask them questions in class and turn them on in front of the class" (Teacher).

Producing a positively relational class environment included "creating a network of support" (Teacher), and allowing bilingualism in class. Students could talk to other people who spoke the same language in class to understand the concepts or the meaning of a new word.

> *We try buddy internationals up. Often an international likes working with other*
> *internationals. So, if one pupil has a slightly higher English comprehension*
> *ability they can then translate back to their language. So it is a case by case. (Techer)*

One teacher pointed out that when he puts two students of different language abilities who knew the same language next to each other, their pair work is "producing a comfortable environment for the students; if he needs to ask her a question they can have that conversation and she can tell him how to ask questions" (Teacher). Alternatively, another teacher pointed out that sometimes he splits internationals who share the same culture up because of concern that they went off-task when communicating in their L1. "They will sit and talk to each other in their own language. I put them next to a pupil whom I know is going to encourage them to do the best they can" (Teacher).

According to the main themes that emerged from the teachers' and students' shared accounts of their practices, it is evident that it is important that a student's background is understood. Vocabulary and literacy development has been an ongoing issue and challenging task for international students and their teachers. In responding to this issue, these two groups of participants use different strategies. However, using the Internet is agreed upon by teachers and students to be a tool that increases students' learning outcomes. Students use the Internet for translating purposes and to better understand the content and concepts in class and at home. Teachers also use different computer applications such as OneNote or PowerPoint to help students to catch up with the content and/or to overcome some difficulties in understanding oral instructions in class.

Regarding the learning environment, teachers reported that they strive to provide an interactive and safe environment for international students where they can learn alongside their English native speaking peers and are supported individually through different types of scaffolding support, the tutorial session feedback and conferencing.

Developing relationships and continuing interactions between international students, their peers and their teachers is found to be the most powerful pedagogical craft that all three actors use in their mainstream classroom communities.

Chapter 5. Discussion

In this chapter, I discuss the findings with reference to literature. Firstly, the research questions are addressed and then Vygotsky's (1978) concept of the ZPD and Wenger's (2010) community of practice are used as a way to understand the findings.

The Research Questions

This study was guided by two research questions that asked how a group of mainstream secondary international students reported their learning experiences, and how a group of teachers reported the learning experiences of their international students. Each research question was addressed by considering enablers and barriers.

Research question one. The first question was: *What are international students' perspectives on their mainstream academic learning*? This study found that the student participants believed that self-study, including the use of their L1 textbooks, helped them to interpret curriculum content and to develop their L2 proficiency. Furthermore, the students reported that in-class cooperative group activities and their teachers' specific support were enablers that positively influenced their successful transition to a New Zealand classroom and supported their academic learning.

Enablers. All the students acknowledged that both independent learning and learning interactions with their peers were very useful to them, as was support from their teachers.

Student participants reported that they perceived their self-study had been a significant factor that contributed to their academic success. All of the students commented on how their own efforts and personal learning strategies contributed to achieving their learning outcomes. For example, some of the students reported that they found it useful to use textbooks in their own language for better understanding of the topics, along with online resources written in their L1. Textbooks written in L1 were useful learning tools because the subject-specific content was explained in their own language and presented in a way that was

familiar to them. Students reported that these texts helped them in understanding topics and concepts that they had already studied in their own country. Thus, using the L1 textbooks could be seen as an individual strategy that the students use to activate their prior knowledge. These resources may also help them overcome some of their challenges relating to academic content language and understanding of the topics.

Walqui and van Lier (2010) suggest that one of the quality teaching principles is to engage ELLs in quality interactions to go "beyond brief single responses, and to elaborate, illustrate and connect to their interlocutors' ideas" (p. 85) that help them to explore and connect the ideas and deeper their learning and enhance their understanding. The Student participants reported that their interactions with peers and teachers and the support that they received from them, were important to them and helped them to adjust to new ways of learning in their new environment.

These students reported that they had a variety of opportunities to engage in classroom activities. Their interactions included working alongside English-speaking peers in such activities. Students often commented that relationships and communications with their peers were important because it helped them to understand the content better, helped them to improve their L2 and confidence in using it. International students reported that their peers help them to extract the meanings from the text, explain things by showing them their work, or help them to understand new words. They also help them to practice their pronunciation when they are reviewing vocabulary with them using the flash cards. Their peers shared with them their experience in doing regular class assessments. Some students with low English proficiency reported that their peers also shared with them their regular class work and their answers so that they could use them as a check point when they are figuring out the solutions to these tasks by themselves at home. Group activities in which international ELLs learned

along with their peers helped them build up their self-confidence, as well as to manage their workload as it is shared among the members of the group.

Students felt that they needed to ask their teachers to explain some things and that the teachers' support to help them comprehend the subject content and to write a required piece of work was vital to them. The importance of receiving specific support from their teachers on an ongoing basis could be illustrated through the student's statement that even though she recorded the teachers' lesson and copied the notes from the board, she could not comprehend some things working alone at home until the teacher explained these point by point again talking to her individually.

Teachers also acknowledged that it is important to them to be able to help their international students. They shared some pedagogical ways of supporting their international students. For example, teachers demonstrated that they had ongoing conversations and dialogue with the students. They considered that approaching these students in class to see if they needed help to understand instructions enabled these students to progress academically. Also, the teachers expressed the view that involving their international students in group work and class discussion where they were given time to process things and answer questions without stress, was valuable.

Furthermore, vocabulary was believed to be a major drawback to learning. According to all teachers, the international students in their classes over the years did not have a good grasp of general English vocabulary or enough academic words to build up new words. To overcome these vocabulary barriers teachers made use of visual clues or included diagrams in their vocabulary sheets to accompany the written words, and displayed and explained the key words. Teachers expected that international students would need to make extra efforts to learn their subject specific academic words at home and they helped them by providing the class materials via OneNote digitally to them.

Also, teachers considered it important to encourage their international students to take responsibility to ask questions if they do not understand what exactly they needed to do to complete the task or an assessment. To help them to progress with their understanding, teachers provided multiple ways and tools for the students to refer back to later. This process of amplifying the learning experience (Walqui & van Lier, 2010) included giving them printed and audio materials or displaying teaching points, words or explanation notes on the screen.

In addition, teachers considered that they empowered their international students' learning by sitting with them and deconstructing tasks with them, by discussing the meaning of a new word, developing questions, or exploring concepts. In these one-to-one sessions, they used a step-by-step approach and different techniques to connect these students' new learning to their previous knowledge and their future goals, or what Walqui and van Lier (2010) refer to as "engaging students in generative disciplinary skills"(p.84).

Teachers felt that was vital to have a sense where their international students were up to in their learning and understanding to build on their current abilities and to teach them effectively. Having individual sessions with the students helped the teachers to engage these students in critical thinking by analysing their work with them.

Beside these multiple strategies to help students to learn their subjects, teachers were aware that international students were learning in a classroom culture that is quite different to the one they are used to, so they helped these students to approach their new learning by building on their previous knowledge and experiences. They encouraged these students to tell the teachers when they were struggling so as to help them, and to have conversations with their classmates or students from other classes.

Students shared that, in addition to an interactive classroom environment, they valued teachers' individualised instruction in the form of tutoring sessions or written feedback. The

teachers believed that quality teaching to ELLs included a focus on feedback when students

were engaged in constructive conferencing with their teachers, or when they received written

feedback that helped students to address their language. There was evidence in the students'

statements that they believed their teacher's feedback helped them with their language

learning. All students reported that their teachers gave them regular oral or written feedback.

One student pointed out that he was not able to understand the main idea of the text, and he

needed continual help from his teachers to understand how to incorporate specific details into

his written work. The students also found it useful to send to their teachers' questions via

email to clarify the things and receive individual feedback about their progress in their

content learning or issues in their understanding of the content related language. The majority

of students reported that teachers helped them to find and fix mistakes in their writing and

that they were able to self-correct their writing mistakes or improve internal assessment

results after they received feedback from their teachers in person or in written form, including

communication via emails.

Both teachers and students reported that they valued specifically designed tutorials,

conversations and dialogue in class. Some specific examples that teachers and students

reported as scaffolding were "cloze exercises: in which part of the sentences are taken out, for

international students to use for revising content. Some students mentioned that these

exercises where they need to fill the missing words help them to understand the concepts.

Also, some students found techniques useful such as a crossword at the end of the unit to

review vocabulary. Some students found the teacher's review worksheets with a summary of

the topic very helpful. These worksheets helped them to structure their revision because as

one student pointed out, these activities enabled the student to see what they knew and what

they did not know yet. This helped the students self-assess their own learning. Some students

mentioned that it was important for them to practice papers from previous NCEA

examination and then check their answers with the teachers. One student pointed out that her teacher's assessment feedback helped her to improve her grade since her previous year.

Barriers. The students' analysis of their own learning indicated that their most persistent learning difficulties were related to insufficient proficiency in their L2 for understanding new concepts in English and expressing themselves in English. They especially struggled to produce academic writing. The student participants emphasised that they needed significantly more time than local students to complete their written tasks and assessments. The teachers felt that international students needed extra learning support to overcome gaps in their subject learning and to improve their English language competence in order to make progress towards a higher level of academic achievement.

Walqui and van Lier (2010) point out that language does not involve only a list of words or grammatical rules so that providing a list of vocabulary of new academic words is not enough. Language is also a social process. Thus, if teachers incorporate, for example, students' previous learning and their recounts of personal experiences into collaborative class discussions, this can help these learners to comprehend a particular topic better.

Another example for learning a new topic is providing opportunities for students to build up their knowledge on the subject through their own research. According to Walqui and van Lier (2010), it seems that connecting academic topics and exploring them in relation to different contexts leads to higher levels of understanding for ELLs, in terms of both the content of the subject and of using academic language in different contexts appropriately.

Research question two. The second question was: *What are mainstream teachers' perspectives on how international ELL students learn their subject*s? The teachers shared their views and experience about what they found useful to support their international students' learning. Gleeson and Davison (2016) noted that "teacher beliefs and knowledge solidify in response to influences from their teaching context" (p.46).

In their role as facilitators, teachers reported that they guided international ELL students to develop their ability to become autonomous learners, for example, by making their lessons available on One Note so that these students are able to continue their learning at home. The teachers reported that scaffolding learning with examples and models, as well as using multiple forms of delivering the same instructions, were useful approaches in teaching international students. These approaches indirectly offered meaningful support for language learning in that they were able to "provide students with activities that are robust, but flexible enough to allow multiple entry points" (Walqui & van Lier, 2010, p.84).

These teachers' perspectives are in the line with the core notion of sociocultural theory that learners need support to transition through their ZPD so that their full potential that is realised over time. This support is designed to enable students to perform independently.

Walqui and Lier (2010) consider that teachers' support that is adjusted to a learner's needs enables a learner's "gradual owning of processes, ideas, and language" (p.10). Teachers can support their learners including ELLs to operate in their ZPD at their proximal abilities levels and help them to drive their own learning independently relating it to the four tenets of sociocultural theory.

I presented some of Walgui and Lier's views in the following table. In the first two columns of the table I used Walqui and van Lier's words. In column two there are Walqui and van Lier's five principles of quality teaching for English learners. In column three, which I named "The principles' focus", I entered the authors' quotes that (in my opinion) best represent their relevant ideas and messages.

Table 3

Tenets of sociocultural theory and the principles of quality teaching for ELLs

Tenets of Sociocultural Theory	Principles of Quality Teaching for ELLs	The principles' focus	The principles relating to my study -some examples
❶ Development follows learning (therefore, teaching precedes development)	*Principle 1* Sustain Academic Rigor	ELLs need support to achieve disciplinary knowledge.	Teaching ELLs central concepts and ways to connect the ideas.
❷ Participation in activity is central in the development of knowledge	*Principle 2* Hold high expectations	ELLs need be treated as academically capable.	Providing high challenge tasks (Full details not provided /Students do NCEA.
❸ Participation in activity progresses from apprenticeship to appropriation, or from the social to the individual plan	*Principle 3* Engage ELLs in Quality Teaching and Student Interactions	ELLs need to interact with their peers/teachers.	Involving ELLs in interactions that are on-going and purposeful.
❹ Learning can be observed as changes in participation over time.	*Principle 4* Sustain a language focus	ELLs need support to learn academic language in a sustainable way.	Providing individual support/Amplifying by presenting information in different ways/using models/examples
(From Walqui & van Lier, 2010, pp.6-10; 81-100)	*Principle 5* Develop a quality curriculum	ELLs and their needs should be considered in the design of the curriculum.	Considering students' previous academic backgrounds/skills.

Enablers. Teachers were aware that the design of the learning environment played a significant role. Teachers' experiences suggested that students' attitudes, motivation, and confidence were likely to vary from student to student. All teachers emphasised the importance of making sure international students felt welcome and they tried to convey that they were available to correct students' mistakes without fearing failure. Some teachers reported that they needed to adjust their fast-paced way of speaking to the listening ability of the students.

According to Gibbons (2002), it is crucial that ELL students are treated as capable as students in terms of their ability to do the same tasks as their L1 peers despite their level of their English. Walqui and van Lier (2010) refer to this as "holding high expectations" (p.84). However, in order to learn "the specialised register of curriculum subjects" (Gibbons, 2002,

p.19), or what Walqui and van Lier classify as sustaining a language focus, ELL students need instruction and support for learning disciplinary language. The participant teachers did try to amplify rather than simplify the tasks for ELL students. Teachers believed that it would facilitate the language learning process within their subjects if they engaged students in quality interactions (Walqui & van Lier, 2010, p.85) and so they used particular instructional approaches such as pairing up the international students with their more language capable peers, and providing individual written or oral feedback during regular tutoring sessions outside lessons.

One approach common to the teachers in this study was to provide extra tuition outside class time. Teacher-student tutoring sessions during lunchtime, and help offered to individual students after school, were reported by all teachers as significant learning enablers for their international students. These interactions with teachers and peers were seen by both sets of participants to be a channel that helped to increase students' understanding.

Furthermore, these teacher-student tutoring sessions were felt to provide crucial encouragement and support to help ELLs to become independent learners. During conferencing, they helped students, for example, to notice the type of grammatical mistakes or to help them to understand the core concepts and ideas so that they can continue their learning by themselves. They noted that their international students also used online resources, including dictionaries written in their L1, for their independent work at home. They believed that this enabled students to learn unfamiliar words at home and be more prepared for new learning in class. Teachers worried about the demands of new vocabulary on learners and felt that online dictionaries were an excellent resource.

Developing writing in a particular genre structure and academic vocabulary are recognised widely as the most challenging task for international students (Wilcox, 2011). In secondary school, every subject has specific language features and different writing focuses.

For example, while describing, explaining, and summarising are aspects of writing in different subjects such as Social studies, English, and Science, the focus on writing in Mathematics is to use specific language for solving problems and calculating. There has been some debate relating to the question of what kind of content teachers' writing instruction helps ELLs to cope with the writing demands of their content subjects. Content teachers tend to reduce the writing tasks that they assign to ELLs in terms of these tasks' cognitive demands or their length instead of the more desirable approach to use a scaffold to help these students to understand more complex academic writing in their content area (Wilcox, 2011).

Barriers. The main barrier that mainstream teachers perceived for international students' academic learning was their students' English literacy skills. They believed that in their subjects, these students' lack of academic vocabulary in L2 had the most significant impact on their learning and represented the biggest instructional challenge for them as well. All teachers reported that students lacked sufficient academic English vocabulary and that this inhibited building up new subject-specific academic vocabulary. Thus, teachers felt that these ELLs needed to address their vocabulary gaps first to be able to understand more advanced academic concepts and ideas. Some teachers reported that they usually gave vocabulary lists for the lessons to their international students in advance to help them to prepare for the next unit. Teacher expressed an awareness of and demonstrated through some examples their efforts to help their international students to learn academic vocabulary and to improve their writing skills. One teacher for example, explained that when he writes the key words from the lesson on white board and discusses their meaning with the students then ask them to compose the definition of the new concept using these words he helps all his students to learn new words but also to practise to write. Sometimes, instead of providing only a simple list of vocabulary words, this teacher found it more useful to give international students a visual version of the new concept, such as a diagram, so that students need to use

their own words to describe it. In this way, he helps to focus on the understanding of the content matter that they might by using their translators and then they can express their understanding in the written form. Thus, this teacher helps international students to use their previous knowledge and to show they know the current matter, not doing it in an opposite way by learning English first to be able to demonstrate that they know the required content, concept, or skills. Students also benefited from their participation in the class activities because their English native speaking peers helped them to understand the meanings of the new words and the tasks' instructions.

Therefore, the teachers supported their ELL students by building on their prior knowledge, sustaining academic rigour, holding high expectations and particularly in engaging learners in quality interactions.

Learning in a community of practice

Through their participation in classroom activities, learning among other students, international students become the members of their subjects' community of practice. Each content class was a CoP because the class's practice was built up by the students through their mutual engagement and their learning relationships with the expert who is the teacher.

Wenger (1998) defines the relationship between practice and community through three dimensions: "mutual engagement, a joint enterprise, and a shared repertoire of ways of doing things" (p. 49). Practice is seen as the property of the community and is a source of its coherence.

In a CoP, learning is seen as an enterprise that is created by those participants who share their work together, produce shared outcomes together, and create a new identity together. Wenger (1998) pointed out that members of communities represent a social entity because they work together and share their practices and resources. Sharing their individual

ways of thinking and doing things together can be interpreted as students sharing and extending their repertoire of resources. Since student participants reported that they studied some of their current subjects before and some of them pointed out that the ways of explaining the things were different in their own countries, they could bring that experience into their class communities. This study suggests that as the student participants jointly studied with peers in their classrooms, were mutually engaged in completing class activities sharing their resources. These students were able to develop their relationships with other members of the class community as they shared mutual practices and resources.

Joint enterprise. The international students were learning in their different class communities. These class communities represent a "joint enterprise" (Wenger, 1998) because they were all engaged in learning a particular subject matter. These CoP were comprised of both first language speakers and second language speakers of English. According to Wenger (1998), members of a community of practice engage in joint enterprises that are bound together over time to learn and to create new knowledge. Their participation is based on their shared interest and their individual contribution to collective learning.

In this study, the student participants, alongside other members of these class communities, were engaged in sharing, learning and creating a shared identity. Teacher participants acted as experts in their class communities by facilitating all students' learning. They facilitated an environment for cooperation and creation of new knowledge and new identity. The joint enterprise initiated by teachers also extended to the one-to-one interactions with ELLs outside formal classes.

Mutual engagement. Student participants were engaged in their class communities' joint activities to solve problems together with others. In these communities, learners, including international students, helped one another in contributing to the task. These classrooms became a place of mutual engagement with academic enterprises for different

groups of school friends (Farnsworth, Kleanthous & Wenger-Trayner, 2016). Student

participants called their classmates 'friends', pointing out that some of them were native

English-speaking peers and others were more experienced international students from their

own or other countries. These communities' members were engaged in developing their

practice, within which students had opportunities for critical discussion, and both first-

language learners and second-language learners were encouraged by teachers to equitably

participate. It appeared that teachers played a proactive role in encouraging and making sure

that all international students were jointly engaged in classroom interactions with their other

classmates. The students also expressed their feelings of satisfaction from their involvement

in group activities. One student illustrated this by recalling one example where he felt great

because he was able to help his group's friends to complete the task, despite his limited

English proficiency.

Shared repertoire. International students were engaged in joint activities which

resulted in their increased knowledge and understanding of concepts. They also had an

opportunity to develop new learning practices together through their task-based interactions

with peers and teachers. Students created new knowledge together, sharpening understanding

by working with less or more capable classmates with the use of available resources

including their L1.

Personal resources and learning environment

In this section, I argue that there is a complex interplay between the personal

resources a student brings to learning and the learning environment. This is in the line of

Vygotsky's (1978) principles of the existence of two developmental levels in every

individual's learning.

The students' personal resources. International students bring a level of English

language proficiency and prior knowledge of the learning areas they will be studying. The

student participants reported that they used prior knowledge about the content, accessed L1 resources, and conducted on-going vocabulary work at home.

Students reported that their own learning strategies, such as the use of their time management skills for independent learning in their L1 at home, were an important part of their learning process, along with subject-drive learning opportunities including their peers' support.

Students also reported that they were able to seek assistance from their teachers. Some teachers reported that they encouraged their students to take responsibility for their learning and to approach them when they needed help.

The learning environment. A school environment that encourages co-operative behaviour can also have a powerful influence on a learner's language use and development (Stern, 1983). In schools where teachers organise and encourage interactive learning, international students in their classes have more opportunity to practise their L2 learning as they work cooperatively with their native English-speaking peers. Through their collaborative activities, these students often manage "accuracy-fluency transactions" (Walqui & van Lier, 2010).They discover the meanings while at the same time they resolve some grammatical problems and other linguistic issues over time. They illustrated their point by providing an example when three students were developing their own story based on an illustration. While they were structuring the story they were correcting each other' grammatical errors such as missing a plural form or lack of a subject-verb agreement.

Some teacher participants noted some of their students who struggled with the language at the start had enough English language to pass the assessments at the end of the year. Teachers expressed their views that, besides the well-known fact that second language acquisition takes time, once international students adjusted to their new learning environment they become more confident to use their English and to be engaged in the learning activities.

All teachers emphasised it is important that they have an ongoing dialogue and good relationship with their international students in class and that they observe their work and help them with their learning during the class. Students and teachers reported that once students feel more comfortable to ask questions in class to clarify things they progress better. And, by doing so, one teacher commented, they are showing their own responsibility for learning and are building the key competencies as expected.

Also, teachers used their tutorial conversations and dialogues with students to go through any questions, and in this way lead students to ask questions and clarify meanings. Students shared that they asked teachers after class, send emails or talked to them during tutorials, about how and what they needed to do to write correct answers and learn to fix their grammar mistakes by themselves. This concept of teacher feedback is also important because in writing at secondary school level, all students are required to clearly understand different types of English academic genres (Silva & Matsuda, 2010). Student participants reported that, for example, explanations and arguments were the most challenging tasks for them as they were not familiar with these genres of writing. Gleeson's (2015) research indicates that teachers of ELLs need to understand how the English language works in a particular school subject to be able to help their students to develop the language skills needed for "thinking and metacognition, and for interpersonal communication in specific school contexts" (p.105).

There are different types of scaffolding opportunities for students. Teacher scaffolding helps students to produce an understanding for themselves. The core defining feature of scaffolding in tutoring interactions is to ascertain the learner's current level, and adjust the instructions to the learners' ability (Walqui & van Lier, 2010). These authors pointed out that the scaffolding structure could be used to support and facilitate learning. They emphasised that, regardless of whether it is a planned or unplanned scaffolding task, it should have such flexible structure that allows the learners' expression of creativity and

innovation that encourages their "emergent autonomy" (p.25). Walqui and van Lier (2010) also stated that teacher scaffolding, such as designing collaborative scaffolding activities, should provide a well-needed balance of challenge and support for the L2 learners. Giving, for example, error feedback can facilitate second language acquisition in some circumstances (Chandler, 2003). Student participants reported that when they, for instance, worked collaboratively with their peers on completing their research-based-shared-tasks, they were able to share their new knowledge and "create zones of proximal development for each other" (Walqui &van Lier, 2010).

Some of the teacher participants reported that they used different scaffolds to help their international students to learn to write complete and appropriate sentences or a paragraph using key words and supporting details. Students believed that models and examples were good learning tools because they provided clear guidance on what and how to write. They reported that teachers also helped them by using simple sentences and telling them how to put the main ideas and supporting details into their writing.

Hyland and Hyland (2019) analyses teachers' feedback on writing in terms of what it means to ELLs. The authors' view is that although teachers' feedback on students' writing is positively influential factor on their learning, it is unlikely that it will lead to their language improvement in the long run. The authors pointed out that the grammar correction or written feedback on a specific linguistic feature is found useful to ELLs. They also consider that conferencing is a powerful form of feedback, because through negotiations that occurs in the two-way student-teacher conversations, there is an opportunity for the students to ask questions and clarify things. However there is an issue how well either teachers or students are skilled for the interactive nature of conferencing as, for instance, students may not have oral or interactive ability to benefit from this type of teachers' feedback.

In this study, teachers reported that they used their scaffolding tutorial conversations and dialogues with their international students to go through any questions, and this way led these students to asking questions and clarifying meanings. One teacher mentioned that he found the tutorial discussion with his students to be a very useful teaching and learning tool. Some of the teachers found it useful to make a framework with the key words that express the concept, followed by an example that expresses the ideas clearly and a deconstruction of the questions with the students during their conferencing with their students.

All students reported that the teachers' examples and models helped them to understand the subject matter. All students and most teacher participants reported that for purposes of writing in an appropriate way, they found that having 'a sentence-and-paragraph-model answer' helped international students to learn how to write the expected answers.

This is in line with the findings from comprehensive US literature review encompassing 500 studies of ELLs' learning (Kim, 2013), which suggests that instructional modification and explicit teaching of components of literacy, such as vocabulary, are significant in supporting learning for ELLs.

Also, Wilcox's (2011) findings, related to the experience of a group of secondary ELL's with their content-area subjects within one urban U. S. district, suggested that there was the need for integration of the appropriate scaffolding of subject-specific genre writing into content areas at secondary level. Walqui and van Lier (2010) also highlighted that even native speakers are not always skilled enough to use English appropriately in different context and for different purposes. This task is, according to these authors, even harder for ELLs because they have different levels of abilities and skills that influences the ways in which they use their English. They need a high level of support from their teachers that raises the need for them to include language focus in their regular teaching, alongside scaffolding and engaging activities to support academic language development. Using appropriate

scaffolding techniques for teaching a genre-based writing is recommended by Hyland &Hyland (2019) as well.

Teacher participants reported that beside their individualised scaffolding instructions to ELLs, they also intended to create an environment for students' engagement and for practicing their language, in order to help them develop their "identity of being a capable student and language user" (Walqui & van Lier, 2010, p.77). They achieved this mainly by making sure that all international student participated actively in class activities and discussion.

Walqui and van Lier (2010) stated that engaging international students in the same tasks that their English-speaking peers do in the classroom is important because it provides a sense of achieving in class. However, it may represent a challenge and create a need for support for ELLs if they are to achieve at the level of the mainstream cohort. The authors stress that a notion of scaffolding "entitles support that, by being "just right" allows the creation of novel performance, or action that promise new learning" (p.20).

Teachers stated that international students' language and literacy levels have often been below those required for learning regular secondary curriculum. Hence, there is a need to adjust the class tasks to these students' L2 ability level. However, the fact is that both ELL and non-ELL students need to do the same assessments so that both groups of learners, including international students, need to be able to manage those tasks that will lead them towards achieving the required curriculum assessment targets and outcomes.

The student participants' movement between their personal, directed learning and their cooperative learning with others helped them to progress towards finding autonomy. As Walqui and van Lier (2010) pointed out, ELLs engagement in an activity has a clear goal, and "every step naturally feeds into the next step" (p. 37). The teachers' or peers' support is gradually removed, as the process of taking on more independent actions occurs. The teacher

participants commented that there has been some evidence in their practice that students were able to achieve more as their year progressed.

Viewing the student participants' responses from the perspective of Vygotsky's ZPD, it appeared that the context significantly shaped their learning experience. Assistance from teachers, for instance in the form of tutorial sessions and collaborative work with more competent English-speaking peers, were among the most important influences in assisting students' understanding. Through these interactions, these students also practised their social and academic language skills and built up their self-confidence to use their L2.

Chapter 6. Conclusion and Implications

Conclusion

The goal of this study was to provide some insights into academic learning of a group of international students' from one high school, as reported and seen through the prism of their own experience and the teachers' shared practices. Some sociocultural principles such as learning through meaningful interactions that underlined this study were present in the participants' learning and teaching practices. The case study approach and two research questions guided this qualitative interpretive study. The purpose behind the first question was to shed more light on what this group of ELL students believed helped them to learn, as well as what they thought were significant barriers to their learning. The intention for the second research question was to find out about different teachers' practices and their views on their international students' learning.

The data that addressed the first research question indicated that the most influential factors in their learning were both their self-directed learning and context-related influences including their interactive learning with their peers and teachers' proactive support in the form of individual sessions or written feedback. The students' needed to develop their L2 while learning academic subjects that required significant effort and extra time. This was seen by all of the study participants to be the most challenging factor in international students' academic learning.

The teachers' responses indicated their awareness of the need to actively support international students' learning on an on-going basis. Their multiple forms of delivering the same instructions, tutoring sessions and feedbacks including the use of scaffolds with examples and models were believed to be significant enablers in their practices to support their international students' learning. Building students' independence was reinforced through the use of the Internet, according to both teachers and students.

Implications for Practice

These findings may help in gaining a better understanding of how international students learn in secondary mainstream classrooms. As a result of this work, I am more convinced that it is important to give both teachers and students' perspectives due weight to ensure appropriate support and pedagogical practices are used to ensure the success of ELLs.

In this study, both teachers' and students' perspectives on the same topic are explored and the findings gave some indications on how a 'match' between international students' needs and the teachers' response to their needs can be achieved. For example, when student participants stated that their cooperative learning though their interactions supported them in their learning and teacher participants confirmed that as well, then this same view from both sides might indicate that 'interactions' are a valuable form of learning for this group of international students.

Student participants believed that the level of their engagement increased in proportion to their own persistent learning efforts and attitudes, and that their interactions with both their peers and their teachers were crucial components of their learning. The teachers believed that their expertise to organize a positive classroom environment and to develop relationships with international students, as well as provide them with individualised support, helped them to empower these students' successful academic learning in their classrooms. All five student participants expressed positive attitudes towards their teachers and school, and were satisfied with their learning experience.

I feel that this experience of learning from the student and teacher participants' shared practices and perspectives on international students' learning in their New Zealand based classrooms has empowered my teaching practice, helping me to be more aware of specific strategies that help international students to overcome their transitional gaps.

I also have gained not only more empathy with the learners and understanding of teaching high school international students, but also a greater understanding of the importance of collaboration in international students' learning.This study suggests that both students and teachers exercise a great deal of mutual effort in working together and to a continual commitment to learning.

Limitations of the study

This research's findings are not generalizable. However, it was not the purpose of this research to produce findings that are applicable to other times, other students, or other schools. Since different people experience the process of the same thing differently (Bogdan & Bikley, 2003), international students have their unique ways of experiencing their academic learning. Their own perspectives and experiences may change over time, due to the changes in their contexts of learning, time, or conditions for learning. However, these participants' accounts could contribute to secondary school teachers' reflective thoughts and actions, as well as be meaningful to international students to serve them as a reflective tool on their learning.

Teacher participants shared some of their perspectives, as well as some examples from their teaching practice about what has helped their international students to learn and what have been some of major obstacles to their learning. Exploring the secondary content teachers' specific strategies and approaches in teaching international students in their mainstream classes could be research focus of some future studies.

Future research needs

Second language learners have to face additional challenges in their learning environments when they acquire new knowledge and skills through non-native language (Baker & Baker, 2009).

Both groups of research participants highlighted that international students as ELLs needed significantly more time to learn class content than other mainstream students. This finding suggests that pursuing research in investigating the possibilities and ways of supporting academic language learning in the context of formal qualification-based assessments would be meaningful. Some future research may look at ways of adapting assessment practices for international students in recognition of their additional language needs.

Also, since this study gave insight into how a group of international students learn in a New Zealand school, this research might provoke further exploration of this phenomenon in other secondary school settings.

References

Abebe, W. Y. (2013). Fostering academic genre knowledge of EFL Learners through

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL). *International Journal of Society,

Culture & Language, 1*(2), 133-144.

Ash, S. L., & Clayton, P. H. (2004). The articulated learning: An approach to guided

reflection and assessment. *Innovative Higher Education*, *29*(2), 137-154. Retrieved

from https://www. scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/9644/

Basit, T. (2003). Manual or electronic? The role of coding in qualitative data analysis.

Educational Research, 45(2), 143-154.

https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0013188032000133548

Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative study methodology: Study design and

implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, *13*(4),

544-559. Retrieved from https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tgr/vol 13/iss4/2.

Bazeley, P., & Jackson, K. (2013). *Quantitative data analysis with NVIVO* (2nd ed.). London,

England: SAGE Publications

Bennet, J. (2003). *Evaluation methods in research.* London, England: Continuum

Bogdan, R, C., & Biklen, S. K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to

theories and methods* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education Group.

Bier, A., (2015). An exploration of the link between language and cognition:

From Vygotsky's Sociocultural Theory to CLIL. *Educizione Linguistica.Language

Education (4),* 72-83, Retrieved from https://dx.org. 10.14277/2280-67921194

Bruner, J. (1987). Prologue to the English edition. In R.W. Rieber & A. S. Carton (Eds.). *The

collected works of L.S. Vygotsky. Volume 1 Problems of general Psychology including

the volume Thinking and Speech* (pp.1-16). New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Butcher, A., & McGrath, T. (2004). International students in New Zealand: Needs and responses. *International Education Journal*, *5*(4), 540-550. Retrieved from https://www.research gate.net/…/228777442

Bunch, G. C. (2013). Pedagogical language knowledge: Preparing mainstream teachers for English learning in the new standards era. *Review of Research in Education 37*(1), 298-341. https://dx.doi.org/10.3102/009/732X12461772

Charmaz, K. (1996). Grounded Theory. In J. A. Smith, R. Harre, & L.van Langenhove (Eds.). *Rethinking Methods in Psychology* (pp. 27-49). London, England: SAGE Publications.

Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory*. London, England: SAGE Publications

Chandler, J, (2003). The efficacy of various kinds of error feedback for improvement in the accuracy and fluency of L2 student writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing 12*, 267-296. Retrieved from https://www.10.1016/s1060-37443(03)0038-9

Chenail, R. J. (2011). Ten steps for conceptualizing and conducting qualitative research studies in a pragmatically curious manner. *The Qualitative Report, 16*(6), 1715-1732. Retrieved from https://www. nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol16/iss6/13

Conte, C. (2009). *Advanced techniques for counselling and psychotherapy*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing company.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research Methods in Education* (7th ed.)*.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Corbin J. M., & Strauss, A. (1990). Grounded theory research: Procedures, canons, and evaluative criteria. *Qualitative Sociology, 13*(1), 3-21. https://dx.doi.org/10. 1007/BF00988593

Creswell, J. W (2003). *Research Design, Qualitative and Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Cage.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research planning, conducting and evaluating qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory Into Practice, 39*(3), 124-130. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/1477543

English-Language Learner. (2013, August 29). In *The Glossary of Education Reform.* Retrieved from https://www.edglossary.org/English-language-learner.

Farnsworth, V., Kleanthous, I., & Wenger-Trayner, E. (2016). Communities of practice as a social theory of learning: A conversation with Etienne Wenger. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *64*(2), 139-160. Retrieved from https://scholar.google.co.nz/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Farnsworth%2C+V.+282016%29.

Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *5*(1), 80-92. https://dx. doi.org/10.1177/160940690600

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education 53*(2), 106-116. Retrieved from http://jte.sagepub.com

Genesee, F., Lindholm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2005). English language learners in U.S. schools: An overview of research findings. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, *10*(4), 363-385. https://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15327671ESPR1004_2

Gerring, J. (2004). What is a case study and what is it good for? *The American Political Science Review,* 98(2),341-354. https://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0003055404001182

Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding Language Scaffolding Learning: Teaching Second Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom*. (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heineman.

Gibbons, P. (2008). "It was taught and I learned a lot": Intellectual practices and ESL learners in the middle years. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 31*(2), 155-173. Retrieved from https://collaborative learning. or./gibbons2008.pdf

Gill, P., Stewart, K., Treasure, E., & Chadwick, B. (2008). Methods of data collection in qualitative research: interviews and focus groups. *British Dental Journal, 204*(6), 291-295. Retrieved from https://dx.doi.org/10.1038/bdj.2008.192

Gilliland, B. (2015). High school teacher perspectives and practices: Second language writing. *Language and Education*, *29*(4), 287-301. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2014.10013

Glaser, B.G. (2008). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. *Grounded Theory Review: An International Journal, 3*(7). Retrieved from https://www.groundedtheoryreview.com/2008/11/29/the-constant-comparative-method-of-qualitative-analysis-a/

Glass, C. R., Buus, S., & Braskamp, L. A. (2013). *Uneven experience: What's missing and what matters for today's international students.* Chicago, IL: Global Perspective Institute. Retrieved from https://www.iie.or/opendoors

Gleeson, M. (2015). 'It's the nature of the subject': Secondary teachers' disciplinary beliefs and decisions about teaching academic language in their content classes. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, *38*(2), 104 -114. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2014.1001398

Gleeson, M., & C, Davidson (2016). A conflict between experience and professional learning: Subject teachers' beliefs about teaching English Language Learners. *RELC Journal 47*(11), 43-57. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688821666631221

Goos, M. (2005). A sociocultural analysis of the development of pre-service and beginning teachers' pedagogical identities as users of technology. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education, 8*(1), 35-59. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10857-005-0457-0

Goos. M. (2010). *A Sociocultural framework for understanding technology integration in secondary school mathematics.* Retrieved from https://espace.library.uq.edu.au.

Gu, Y. (2013). To code or not to code: Dilemmas in analysing think-aloud protocols in leaning strategies research. *Elsevier*, 43,74-81. https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2013.12.011

Guest, G., & McLellan, E. (2003). Distinguishing the trees from the forest: Applying cluster analysis to thematic qualitative data. *Field Methods, 15*(2), 186-201. https://dx. doi. org/ 10.1177/1525822XO3251188

Hattie, J., & Timperley H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research 77* (1),81-112. Retrieved from https://dx.doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

Haines, D. (2017). Ethical consideration in qualitative case study research recruiting participants with profound intellectual disabilities. *Research Ethics, 13*(3-4), 219-232. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1747016117711971

Henry, A., Casserly, A. M., Coady, M., & Marshall, H. (2008). *A phenomenological   study exploring different perspectives on inclusion within one post-primary school in the North West of Ireland.* Sligo, Ireland: St Angela's College and NUI Galway. Retrieved from https://www.tangelas.com

Herazo Riviera, J. D., & Sagre Barboza, A. (2016). The co-construction of participation through oral meditation in the EFL classroom. *Issues in Teacher's Professional Development, 18*(1), 149-163. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/

Hitchcock, G., & Hughes, D. (1995). *Research and the teacher: A qualitative introduction to school-based research.* London, England: Routledge.

Hyland, K., & Hyland. F. (2019. Contexts and issues in feedback on L2 writing. K, Hyland & F. Hyland. (Eds). In *Feedback in second language writing: Context and issues*. (pp. 1-22). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. (2nd ed.)

Janzen, J. (2008). Teaching English language learners in the content areas. *Review of Educational Research*, *78*(4), 1010-1038. https://dx.doi.org/10.3103/00346543083

Jasen, D. (2008). Confirmability. In L. M. Given (Ed.). *The SAGE encyclopaedia of qualitative research methods* (vols 1-10). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Johnson, K. E. (2009, May). A sociocultural perspective on second language teacher education. Paper presented at the *6th International Conference on Teacher Language Education.* Washington, DC. Retrieved from https://www.carla.umn.ed.?expandingourHorizons _Selected papers.

Johnson, L. (2006). Software and method: Reflections on teaching and using QSR NVivo in Doctoral research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, (9)*5, 379-391. http://dx.doi. org/10.1080/13645570600659433

Johnson, R. B. (1997). Examining the validity structure of qualitative research. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/246126534

Kibler, A. K., & Hardigree, C. (2017). Using evidence in L2 argumentative writing: A longitudinal case study across high school and university. *Language Learning, 67*(1), 75-109. https://dx.doi.org/10111/lang.12198 /epdf

Kim, W. G. (2013). *Long-term English language learners' history of schooling and their perceptions of learning experience.* (Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Texas, Austin, Texas). Retrieved from https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152

Kim, W. G., & Garcia, S. B. (2014). Long-term English language learners' perceptions of their language and academic learning experiences. *Remedial and Special Education*, *3*(5), 300-312. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177074193251452504

Kincheloe, J. L. (2007). In D. Thiessen., & A. Cook-Sather (Eds.), *International handbook of student experience in elementary and secondary school. An evolving field of study.* (pp.745-774*).* Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

King, A. (2008) In Vivo Coding. In L. M. Given (Ed.). *The SAGE Encyclopaedia of Qualitative Research Methods* (pp. 472-473). Retrieved from https://www. worldcat.org /title/sage-encyclopedia-of-qualitaytive-research-methoids/../233969

Kormos, J., Csizér, K., & Iwaniec, J. (2014). A mixed-method study of language-learning motivation and intercultural contact of international students. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 35*(2), 151-166. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2013.847940

Kvale, S. (2007). Conducting an interview. In S. Kvale. *Conducting an interview In: doing interviews.* (pp.52-66). London, England. SAGE Publications.

Langley, A., & Royer, I. (2006). Perspectives on doing case study research in organizations. *Dans Management*, *9*(3), (81-94). Retrieved from https://www.cairn.imfo/revire-management

Lashley, D. A., (2018). *Teaching middle-school inclusion classrooms*: *A qualitative exploratory multiple-case study* (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Phoenix). Retrieved from https://www. search.proquest.com

Lawrence, J., & Usman, T. (2013). The use of grounded theory technique as practical tool for qualitative data collection and analysis**.** *Electronic Journal of Business Research Methods: EJBRM: Reading, 11*(1), 29-40. https://www.ejbrmcom

Laws, K., & McLeod, R. (2004, July). Case study and grounded theory: Sharing some alternative qualitative research methodologies with system professionals. *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference of the systems dynamics society*, 78, 1-25. Retrieved from https://www. research gate.net/publication/255047567

Lee, J., & Shute, J. V. (2010). Personal and social-contextual factors in K-12 academic performance: An integrative perspective on student learning. *Educational Psychologist, 45*(3), 185-202. https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2010.493471

Lesser, L. M., & Winsor, M. S. (2009). English language learners in Introductory Statistics: Lessons learned from an explanatory case study of two pre-service teachers. *Statistics Educational Research Journal*, *8*(2), 25-32. Retrieved from https://iase-web.org/documents/SERJ/SERJ8(2)_Lesor_winsor.pdf

Lewis, J. (2003). The applications of qualitative method to social research. In J. Ritchie & J. Lewis (Eds.). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for Social Science students and researchers.* London, England: SAGE Publications.

Lichtman, M. (2013). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquires. *Educational Communication and Technology Journal*, *29*(2), 75-91. https://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF027667

Lo, C. O. (2016). Literature integration; An illustration of theoretical sensitivity in grounded theory studies. *American Psychological Association, 44(*2), 177-189. https://www.dx.doi.org/10.1037/hum0000029

Marshall, H. (2002). What we do when we code data? *Qualitative Research Journal, 2*(1), 56-70. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285842091What_we_ do _when_ we_ code_ data

McIntosh. M. J., & Morse, J. M. (2015). Situating and constructing diversity in semi-structured interviews. *Global Qualitative Nursing Research*, *2*, 1-12. https://dx.doi.org/ 10.1177123333936155975674

Miller, T., & Bell, L. (2012). Consenting to what? Issues of accessing and gate-keeping and "informed consent". In M. Mauthner, M.Birch, J.Jesop & T.Miller (Eds.), *Ethics in Qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 61-75). London, England: SAGE Publications.

Ministry of Education. (2007). *The New Zealand Curriculum*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education. Retrieved from https://www.nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz

Ministry of Education. (2012). *The Importance of Focused Feedback.* Retrieved from https://seniorsecondary.tki.org.nz/Science/Pedagogy/Assessment-for0learning/Focused-feedback

Ministry of Education. (2014). *International Capabilities: A summary report for schools.* Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education. Retrieved from https://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publication/international capability

Ministry of Education. (2016). *The Education (Pastoral Care of International Students) Code of Practice 2016*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education. Retrieved from https://www.nzqa.govt.nz/assets/providers

Mugisha, V. M. (2013). Culturally responsive instructional leadership: A conceptual exploration with principals of three New Zealand mainstream schools. *International Journal of Multicultural Education, 15*(2), 1-20. https://dx.doi.org/10.18251/ ijme.v15i2.645

Newton, N. (2010). *The use of semi-structured interviews in qualitative research: strengths and weaknesses.* (Doctoral Dissertations, University of Bristol). Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/1561689/The_use_of_semistructured_interviews_

O'Connor, H., & Gibson, N. (2003). A step-by-step guide to qualitative data analysis. *Pimatisiwin: A Journal of Aboriginal and Indigenous Community Health, 1*(1), 63-90. Retrieved from

https://www.Researchgate.net/publication/292432218__Step_By_Step_Guide-To-Qualitative_Data_Analysis_?enrichld=rgred

Ortlipp, M. (2008). Keeping and using reflective journals in the quality research process *The Qualitative Report*, *13*(4), 695-705.

Retrieved from https://www.nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol

Paakkari, L., Tynjälä, P., & Kannas, L. (2011). Critical aspects of student teachers' conceptions of learning. *Learning and Instruction, 21,* 705-714*.* Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/34233575/Critical_aspects_of_student_teachers_conceptions_of_learning

Pearson, M. L., Albon, S. P., & Hubbal, H. (2015). Case study methodology: Flexibility, rigour, and ethical considerations for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 6*(3), 1-8. https://dx.doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2015.3.12

Pintrich, P. R. (1995). Understanding self-regulated learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *63*, 3-12. Retrieved from https://ssrlsite.files.wordpress.com/2018/01/pintrich-1995-understanding-self-regulated-learning

Pintrich, P. R. (2003). A motivational science perspective on the role of student motivation in learning and teaching contexts. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*(4), 667-686. Retrieved from https:/www.dx.di.org/10.1037/0022-0663.95.4.667

Reeves, J. R. (2006). Secondary teacher attitudes toward including English-language learners in mainstream classrooms. *The Journal of Educational Research, 99*(3), 131-143. https://dx.doi.org/ 10.1080/00048623.2011.10722242

Resnik, D. B. (2009). Re-consenting human subjects: ethical, legal and practical issues. *Journal of Medical Ethics,35(*11), 656-657. https://dx.doi.org/10.1136? jme.

Rivers, W.M. (Ed.). (1987). *Interactive language teaching.* New York, NY: Cambridge
University Press.

Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., & Elam, G. (2003). Designing and Selection Samples. In J. Ritchie, & J.
Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative Research Practice*: *A guide for social science students and
researchers* (pp.77-109). London, England: SAGE Publications.

Roberts, M, L. (2009). Signposts on the path to learning: A phenomenological case study.
(Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee-Knoxville). Retrieved from
https://www.trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss/63

Roy, M., Lu, Z., & Loo, B. (2016, October). *Improving the international student
experience: Implications for recruitment and support.* New York: Word Education
Services. Retrieved from https://www.knowledge.wes.org/Wes-Research–Report-
Improving-student-experience

Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic
motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychological Association*,
55(1), 68-78. Retrieved from https://www.dx.doi.org/10.1037//003-066x.55.1.68

Ryan, P., & Dundon., T. (2008). Case research interviews: Eliciting superior quality data.
International Journal of Case Method Research & Application, XX(4), 443- 450.
Retrieved from https://www.wacra.org/PublicDomain/IJCRA%20xx_iv_

Saldaña, J. (2009a). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. Los Angeles, CA:
SAGE Publications.

Saldaña, J. (2013b). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. (2nd ed.). Retrieved from
https://www.researchgate.net/…guidelines…qualitative_coding_.../Saldana

Salmen, K., & Hawkes, M. (2013, November 11). Sociocultural theory. *Educational
Psychology*. (pp.1-6). Retrieved from http://www.salmen.porfolio.weebly.com

Shenton, A.K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information. 22,* 63-75. Retrieved from http://pdfs.ematic.schoolar.org

Shute, V. J. (2008). Focus on formative feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 78* (1),153-189. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654307313795

Sheridan, L. D. (2016). Examining changes in pre-service teachers' beliefs of pedagogy. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education,41*(3), 1-20. Retrieved from https://www.ro.uow.edu.au/sspapers/2035

Silva, T., & Matsuda, P. K. (Eds.). (2010). *Practicing theory in Second Language writing: L2 writing.* West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology: An overview. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 273-285). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. M. (1997). *Grounded Theory in Practice.* Thousands Oak, CA: SAGE Publications.Taylor-Powel, E., & Renner, M. (2003). *Analysing Qualitative Data*. Retrieved from http://www1.uwex.edu/ces/pubs

Thiessen, D., & Cook-Sather, A. (Eds). (2007). *International Handbook of Student Experience in Elementary and Secondary School.* Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Thomas, D. R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analysing qualitative data, *American Journal of Evaluation, 27*(2), 237-246. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1098214005283748

van Lier, L., & Walqui, A. (2012). Language and the common core state standards. Paper presented at the *Understanding Language Conference.* Retrieved from https://www.ell.stanford.edu/

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in Society*. The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walqui, A. (2006). Scaffolding instruction for English language learners: A conceptual framework. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 9*(2), 159-180. https://dx.doi.org/10/1089/13670050608668639

Walqui, A., & van Lier, L. (2010). *Scaffolding the academic success of adolescent English language learners: A pedagogy of promise.* San Francisco, CA: WestEd.

Walqui, A. & Heritage, M. (2012). Instruction for diverse group of English language learners. Paper presented at the *Understanding Language Conference.* Retrieved from https://www. ell.stanford.edu/

Welsh, E. (2002, May). Dealing with data: Using NVivo in the qualitative data analysis process. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 3*(2). Retrieved from https://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs/

Wenger, E., McDermott., & Snyder, W. M. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice.* Boston, MA.: Harvard Business School Press.

Wenger, E. (1998). C*ommunities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press

Wilcox, K. C.(2011). Writing across the curriculum for secondary English language learners: A case study. *Equinox Publishing,3,* (79-111). Retrieved from https://dx.doi.org.10.1558/wap.r/3i1.79

Williams, L. R. T, & Ormond, A. (2010). What is research? *MAI Review, 3,*1-6. Retrieved from https:// www. review.mai.ac.nz

Yang, H. (2008). On teaching strategies in second language acquisition. *US-China Education Review*, 5 (1), 61-67. Retrieved from https://www.files.eric.ed.gov/full text/ED502535

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research*: *Design and method* (2nd ed.). Beverly Hills, CA:

    SAGE Publications.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed). Thousand Oak, CA:

    SAGE

Zahavi, D. (2012). Intersubjectivity. In S. Luft & S. Overgaard (Eds.), *The Routledge*

    Companion to Phenomenology. London, England: Routledge.

    https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203816936

Zhang, Z., & Brunton, M. (2007). Differences in living and learning: Chinese international

    students in New Zealand. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *11*(2),

    124-140. https://dx.doi.or/10. 1177/102831530628983

APPENDIX A.

Interview Questions

Teacher Questioning List

Q1. How long have you been teaching this subject?

Q2. What are the main differences if any between teaching international students and native English speakers?

Q3. What do you consider to be the greatest challenges in teaching ELLs?

Q4. What have you learnt about supporting international students in your class?

Student Questioning List – 1ˢᵗ interview

Q1. How long have you been studying at this school?

Q2. Which NCEA qualifications do you hope to gain?

Q3. How do you plain to use your NCEA qualification?

Q4. How long have you been studying this subject?

Q5. What do you enjoy about this subject?

Q6. What does your teacher do that helps you to understand this subject?

Q7. Do you remember any situations when you could not understand the lesson and if so, what was the reason for that -How did you overcome this?

Q8. Tell me about a time when you felt that your teacher helped you to manage your learning?

Student Interview Questions (2nd Interview)

Q1:   Tell me about some successes you have had in learning this subject so far

- Can you give me an example

- What do you think has contributed to your success?

Q2: Is there anything you find hard to learn?

Q3: Do you remember any situations when you could not understand the lesson and if so, what was the reason for that. How did you overcome this?

Q4:   Is there anything else that helps you greatly to overcome your challenges in learning?

Q5:   What do you consider to be the biggest challenge to your NCEA achievement?

Q6:   What has helped you most in overcoming your challenges in the NCEA assessments?

Q7: Can you briefly say what specific skills you need to possess or/and develop to be successful in this subject's /NCEA assessments (eg. Mapping/English skills?

Q8: Can you recall how one of the learning tools helped you to learn faster and/or easier?

Q9: Can you briefly say what makes learning effective for you in your subject?

Q10: How does your teacher help you to understand this subject and manage your learning Can you give me some examples?

Q11: What do you think which of the four English language skills (listening/reading writing/speaking) is the most important skill in learning your subject?

- Which of this skills is the most challenging to you in learning this subject?

- Can you tell if this skill is equally important to you in learning your other subjects?

APPENDIX B.

Interview Guide

Interview Schedule

Teachers

There will be one interview with the teacher participants in the middle of _____.

Students

The first interview will be held at the beginning of _____. The follow up interview will be in the second week of _____.

Interview Process

The interview will take place at the school of the participants in a quiet area during lunch time. If the students express a wish to be interviewed after school hours, permission from the school will be obtained and if necessary, the caretakers of the students will be informed.

I will start of interview using the same opening questions for all participants to gain some information comparable across the cases. However, the content, order and sequencing of all other questions might be not the same for all participants. It will depend on the flow of our discussion.

Appropriate seating for the face to face communication will be provided and it will allow me to write down my notes and to note some of a participant's non-verbal cues during the interviews.

I will consider (and respond to) any culturally or personally based request(s) from the interviewees regarding the seating or other parts of the protocol during the interview.

APPENDIX C.

STUDENTS JOURNAL WRITING – Expectations/Prompts

What is the purpose of your journal writing?

The outcome of your journal writing is reflection on your own learning process. You will report two examples of your positive learning experience in class. Reporting on learning practice that helped you to complete your activity will enhance this research's goals. Also, this is an opportunity for you to develop your ability to habitually learn to reflect on your past experience and self-guide your future learning with more confidence.

How much you will write?

There is no limit how much you will write - a few sentences or more. You do not have to worry about grammar and sentence structure, just use common English words to report your experience.

When and where you will write and submit your journal entry?

You will email one entry before the 1st interview and another one before the 2nd interview to me: petrovbilj@vuw.nz. Do not include your name in it. As a subject line use: Learning Experience

Who will read your journal emails?

Only me and my supervisors mentioned in your research information sheet/consent form. What is the topic of your journal writing?

You will chose the example (i.e activity) and record your learning experience related to it. The questions below might help you to concentrate on your writing but you can write not prompted, just explain one learning situation – what have you learned and how did you do that – self-guided and/or with teacher's or your classmates' support.

JOURNAL EMAIL PROMPTS

What did you learn?

Type of learning activity:

● Learning the content of a new topic□

● Writing (e.g., answering questions; writing a recount/summary) □

● Participating in an interactive activity (e.g., group research task) □

● Assessment □

● Other (state) _____ □

What strategies (e.g., writing notes) or study tools (e.g. websites) did you use that helped you

to complete this activity by yourself

How has your teacher (or your classmates) assisted you in this activity and helped you to

learn?

Email To: _____

Journal Entry

Describing an example of supports to my learning that I experienced class my learning

What did I learn?

What kinds of activity/resource/strategy helped me learn?

What skills did I use that helped me to complete this activity by myself (eg. writing notes)?

How did others (eg. teacher or my classmates) assist me in this activity.

APPENDIX D.

TEACHER PARTICIPANTS CONSENT FORM
This consent form will be held up to 2 years

- I have read the Information Sheet and the project has been explained to me. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I can ask further questions at any time.

- I agree to take part in an audio recorded (face-to-face) interview. I have the right to withdraw from the research at any time.

I understand that:

- The identifiable information I have provided will be destroyed on

- Any information I provide will be kept confidential to the researcher and the supervisors.

- I understand that the results will be used in a Master's report or academic publications and conferences.

- My name will not be used in reports, nor will any information that would identify me.

I would like a transcript of the interview.   Yes ☐   No ☐

I would like to receive a copy of the final report   Yes ☐   No ☐

I have added my email address and phone number below.

Signature of participant: _____ **Date:** _____

Name of participant:

Email:

Phone:

APPENDIX E.

STUDENT PARTICIPANTS CONSENT FORM
This consent form will be held up to 2 years

- I have read the Information Sheet and the project has been explained to me. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I can ask further questions at any time.

- I agree to take part in two audio recorded (face-to-face) interviews. I have the right to withdraw from the research at any time.

- I agree to send up to two journal entries (emails) to the researcher at agreed times. I will describe examples of supports to learning that I experienced in my class.

I understand that:

- The identifiable information I have provided will be destroyed on 31 May 2019.

- Any information I provide will be kept confidential by the researcher and the supervisors.

- I understand that the results will be used in a Master's report and possibly in academic publications and conferences.

- My name will not be used in reports, nor will any information that would identify me.   Yes ☐   No ☐

- I would like a transcript of the interview.   Yes ☐   No ☐

- I would like to receive a copy of the final report and   Yes ☐   No ☐

I have added my email address and phone number below.

Name of participant:

_____

Signature of participant:

_____

Date: _____

Email: _____

Mobile: _____

APPENDIX F.

SCHOOL PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

This consent form will be held up to 2 years

The school agrees to support _____'s research project which has been approved by the _____University of _____ Central Human Ethics Committee(No. _____). Based on the information sheet and the recruitment letter provided to the principal, the research involves the following:

Research Aims:

The project aims to describe and analyse international students' learning experiences in their mainstream subjects and their teachers' perspectives on teaching this group of English Language Learners (ELL). The focus of the research is on finding out how this group of ELL study their mainstream subjects.

Staff involvement in the project:

 One face to face interview will be held with three teacher participants from three different subjects. The interview will be held in the middle of. Teachers will choose the place in consultation with the researcher.

Student involvement in the project:

Two face to face interviews will be conducted with six student participants. Additionally, students may choose to send two journal notes during the period between the two interviews. The first interview will be held at the beginning of _____. The follow up interview will be in the second week of _____. The interviews will be held at school during lunch time or after school with the student's legal guardian's acknowledgement and agreement.

Publication of the research:

The results will be used in the researcher's Master's report and/or academic applications and conferences without any identifiable information about the school or the participants in the research. All data and information provided from the participants will be kept confidential to the researcher and supervisors.

APPROVAL

_____ gives permission to _____ to do her research project, which has been approved by the _____University of _____ Central Human Ethics Committee
(No. _____), at our school. She will be conducting interviews with six international students and three teachers who voluntarily agree to participate. The researcher will complete her work during _____ as per the terms and conditions agreed upon with the participants.

Signature:

 Date:

APPENDIX G.

Recruitment letter for the Principal to participate in the research

Research project:
Researcher:

Date:

Dear Principal,

Thank you for taking the time to read this recruitment letter and the enclosed information sheet about this research. I would be grateful if you could support me in doing my research at your school. If you decide to participate in my research, thank you. If you decide not to participate, thank you for your time and consideration.

If you choose to participate, I will conduct interviews with six international students who will be working on NCEA L2/L3 in mainstream classes. I want to find out about international students' and their teachers' perspectives on how international students learn different curriculum subjects with English as their additional language.

Please note that I will keep the identity of the school fully confidential. Only the data related to the participants' individual academic learning experience will be reported unless international students' share an issue with me affecting their well-being that I am obligated to report by my university's requirements/ New Zealand laws. A pseudonym will be used instead of the school's name so that its identity and reputation will be protected. The data gathered from the interviews with the participants will be kept secure and will be treated as strictly confidential.

_____

This research has been approved by the ___University of _____Central Human Ethics Committee (Approval Number: _____). If you have any concerns or questions about this research, you can contact this committee. The contact details as well as more information about this research are provided in the enclosed information sheet.

Your sincerely,

_____

Address:
Email:
Mobile:

APPENDIX H.

Recruitment letter for students to participate in the research

Dear Students,

Thank you for taking the time to read this recruitment letter and the attached information sheet that will give you more details about this research. I would be grateful if you would consider participating in my study. If you are interested in participating in this research, please fill in the recruitment card provided at the end of this letter.

My name is _____. As part of my thesis work, I am conducting interviews with students and teachers to discover their perspectives on how students, whose English is their additional language, learn mainstream subjects in secondary classrooms. If you volunteer as a participant
in this study I will ask you questions about your own learning experience in your mainstream subjects.

I will select six senior students to participate in this study. If there are more students who would like to participate in this research, I will select six of them randomly by choosing every third student by last name in alphabetical order.
_____
This research has been approved by the _____University of _____Central Human Ethics Committee (Approval Number: _____). If you have any concerns or questions about this research, you can contact this committee. The contact details as well as more information about this research are provided in the enclosed information sheet.

If you need any additional information or clarification that will help you to make your decision about participating in this research, feel free to email me at ___or contact me via my mobile:

Yours sincerely,
_____

RECRUITMENT CARD

Expression of interest to volunteer as a participant in this research

.

_____   _____   _____
Name of student   **Mobile phone**   **Email**

APPENDIX I.

Recruitment email for teachers to participate in the research

Date:

Dear Teachers,

Thank you for taking the time to read this email and the attached information sheet that will give you more details about this research. I would be grateful if you would consider participating in my study. If you are interested in participating in it, please fill in the recruitment card provided at the end of this letter and email this letter back to me so that I can schedule an
interview with you.

My name is _____. As part of my thesis work, I am conducting interviews with students and teachers to discover their perspectives on how students, whose English is an additional language, learn mainstream subjects in secondary classrooms. If you volunteer as a participant in this study, I will ask you questions about your own experiences and perspectives related to this topic. The interview will last between 30 and 40 minutes.

In your school I will select three teachers to participate in this study. If there are more teachers who would want to participate in this research, I will select three of them randomly by choosing every third teacher by last name in alphabetical order.
_____
This research has been approved by the ___ University of _____ Central Human Ethics Committee (Approval Number: _____). If you have any concerns or questions about this research, you can contact this committee. The contact details as well as more information about this research are provided in the enclosed information sheet. If you need any additional information or clarification that will help you to make your decision about participating in this research feel free to email me at _____or contact me via my mobile phone: _____.

Yours sincerely,
_____

RECRUITMENT CARD

Expression of interest to volunteer as a participant in this research

_____   _____   _____
Name of student   **Mobile phone**   **Email**

APPENDIX J.

INFORMATION SHEET FOR TEACHER PARTICIPANTS

Research:

You are invited to take part in this research. Please read this information before deciding whether or not to take part. If you decide to participate, thank you. If you decide not to participate, thank you for considering this request.

Who am I?

My name is _____ and I am a Master's student in _____ at _____.

This research project is work towards my thesis.

What is the nature and purpose of my research?

This project aims to describe and analyse international English language learners' (ELLs) learning/teaching experiences from the students' and teachers' perspectives. The focus is to understand what supports ELLs' academic learning at school. The data that you share with me during the interview will help me to understand some of the challenges and enablers related to international students' academic learning in class.

By presenting the experiences of both students and teachers in a particular subject area, this research hopes to contribute to a better understanding of learning and teaching in a New Zealand high school setting. This research has been approved by the University _____ Central Human Ethics Committee.

How can you help?

This group of international students may experience learning challenges that relate to learning in a new language. By sharing your thoughts (and reflections) on teaching them, you will contribute to further understanding what is involved in these students' learning of a particular subject.

You have been invited to participate because I believe that your experience in teaching ELLs will offer insight into effective practice in teaching ELLs in your subject area.

If you agree to take part in an interview, it will be held at a time and place convenient to you. It will last about one hour. I will ask you open-ended questions to gather data about your experiences of teaching international students in your subject area at school. I will audio record the interview with your permission and transcribe it later.

What will happen to the information you give?

The information shared during the interview is confidential. This means that the researchers named below will be aware of your identity but the research data will be kept confidential to them. Your identity will not be revealed in any reports, presentations, or public documentation.

How is anonymity/confidentiality to be guaranteed?

• Consent forms will be kept in a locked cabinet in my house.

• Electronic data and records will be stored in a password protected laptop.

• Your school name will be replaced by a general title such as "a Canterbury region HS".

• A pseudonym will be given to you at the interview (eg. Mr/Ms Black/Red) so that your real name will not be used at any stage of the interview process or after it.

Who will have access to the material collected?

• Only you, my supervisors and I will read the notes and transcript of the interview.

• The consent form, interview transcript, summaries and any recordings will be kept securely And destroyed on _____.

• The information from my research will be used in my Master's report, for academic publications and/or conferences. Your name or any information that would identify you will not be used in them.

If you accept this invitation, what are your rights as a research participant?

You do not have to accept this invitation if you do not want to. If you do decide to participate, you have the right to:

• choose not to answer any question;
• ask for the recorder to be turned off at any time during the interview;
• ask any questions about the study at any time;
• read over and comment on a written summary of the interview;
• read any reports of this research by emailing the researcher to request a copy;
• withdraw from the research at any time before the interview begins.

If you have any questions or problems, who can you contact?
If you have any questions, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact me or my research supervisors:

Student:	**Supervisors**:	
Name:	Name:	Name:
Phone:	Role:	Role:
Mobile:	School:	School:
Email:	Phone:	Phone:
	Email:	Email:

Human Ethics Committee information

If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the HEC Convenor:

APPENDIX K.

INFORMATION SHEET FOR STUDENT PARTICIPANTS

Research:

You are invited to take part in this research. The information contained in this form explains what is involved if you choose to take part in this research. You do not have to accept this invitation if you do not want to. You have the right to withdraw from it once it has started.

 Please read this information sheet and feel free to ask me any questions that would help you to make your decision whether to accept this invitation to participate in this research. If you decide to take a part in this research, thank you. If you decide not to participate, thank you for considering this request.

Who am I?
My name is _____and I am a Masters (Thesis) student at the _____. This research project is work towards gaining my Masters degree in education.

What is the nature and purpose of my research?
I want to gain insight into international students' experiences in order to learn more about their academic learning in mainstream classrooms. This study aims to contribute to an understanding of English language Learners' learning in a New Zealand high school setting. This research has been approved by the _____ University Central Human Ethics Committee.

How can you help?
By sharing your learning experience with me, you will help me to understand what it is like for you to learn academic content through English in a secondary school classroom.

If you agree to participate in this research, I will interview you twice at an interval of about three months and I will ask you will write two journal entries during that time and share these with me by email. You may choose whether to email me two journal entries or not. If you decide to do that, it will take ten minutes of your time.

The interviews will take place at your school in a quiet area during lunch time. If you wish to be interviewed after school hours, permission from the school will be obtained. During the interview I will ask you several open questions about some of the main enablers and obstacles that you have encountered in learning an academic subject. I will audio record the interview with your permission and transcribe it later. You will have an opportunity to read (and review) the transcript of the interviews if you wish to do so.

What are your rights as an interviewee & research participant?
If you decide to participate in the interview, you have the right to:

● choose not to answer any questions;
● ask for the recorder to be turned off at any time during the interview;
● ask any questions about the study at any time
● read over and comment on a written transcript of the interview;

● read a report on this research by emailing the researcher to request a copy;
● withdraw from the research at any time before the interview begins.

There will be no financial compensation for your participation. Lunch will be provided and you will receive a small present.

Please note that if you have any concerns or issues with learning please discuss these with your school. It is out of the scope of this research to help you with them.

What will happen to the information you give and who will have access to it?
The information that you provide will be kept confidential and records will be stored securely. Your confidentiality and privacy will be protected, as well. This means that:
● your name (and your school name) will not be shared with anyone except with me and my research supervisors named below. Another name (pseudonym) will be given to you at the interview (e.g. Howard) and it will be used instead of your original name during this study;
● all research material, the consent form, interview transcript and journal email will be kept securely in a locked cabinet in my house and in a password protected laptop, and will be destroyed on _____;
● the information from my research will be used in my master's report, for academic publications and/or conferences. Your name or any information that would identify you will not be used in them.

If you have any questions or problem, who can you contact?
If you have any questions, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact me or my research supervisors:

Master Thesis Student & Researcher

Name:
Email:
Mobile:
Research Supervisors:
Name: Name:
Role: Role:
School: School:
Phone: Phone:
Email: Email:

Human Ethics Committee information
If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research, you may contact the _____ University HEC Convenor.

APPENDIX L.

INFORMATION SHEET – Invitation to the school to support the research

Dear Principal,

My name is _____ and I am a Master's student in _____ at
_____University of _____. This research project is a qualitative study that
contributes to my thesis, and that I would like to undertake in your school with your support.
The details follow.

The purpose and nature of this study
The aim of the study is to explore the learning experiences of a group of international
secondary school students learning English as an additional language in their mainstream
subjects.
A significant number of schools (298 as of June 2016) provide education to international
students, the majority of whom use their NCEA qualifications as a pathway for their
subsequent post-secondary study. However, little attention in research has thus far been paid
to exploring this group of students' academic learning in secondary school classrooms. The
aim of this research is to shed some light on how these students learn different subjects.
Having been an ELL myself and having worked in different roles such as ESOL previously
and as a mainstream teacher currently, I greatly value learning about the experiences from
these areas.

Participants
The informants for this research will be six international students working at NCEA L1/ L2
and having studied for at least one year at school; two students per each subject. There will be
three teachers invited from the school. They will be reporting their experiences from the same
(three) subjects as the students, but they will not be currently teaching them.

Type of Participation
There will be two sources of data from students: two semi-structured (face -to-face)
interviews, and two journal emails. Only one interview will be held with each of the three
teachers individually. The data gathered from the respondents will be audio recorded, and
then transcribed for further descriptive analyses and interpretations. The students' and
teachers' confidentiality and privacy will be insured. A pseudonym will always be used for
all participants and the school. The consent forms and information sheet will be issued to the
participants prior to the commencement of research.

How can you help?
With your permission and suggestions, I will approach potential participants at your school
and introduce them to my research and what it involves if they wish to voluntarily participate
in it.
If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact
the_____ HEC Convenor:

Thank you for considering my request.

Contact details: