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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

Australian schools increasingly consist of speakers of diverse languages and dialects of English, many of whom struggle with acquiring standard English literacy, impacting on their learning across the curriculum. A considerable body of research continues to demonstrate that students’ everyday language and literacy practices are not reflected in schools and their communicative competence is narrowed (Compton-Lilly, 2008; Garcia & Yip, 2015; Gutierrez et al., 2011; Gutiérrez, Morales & Martinez, 2009; Rymes, 2010). This project builds on an innovative pilot study designed to investigate the relationship between multilingual children’s language practices and their potential pedagogical application in schools (D’warte, 2013).

The central research question in the project was:

How can children’s everyday language practices be mapped onto the curriculum to enhance learning outcomes for all children?

The project aimed to:

1. Map the everyday language practices of students in complex multilingual, culturally diverse classrooms
2. Develop pedagogies based on students’ everyday language practices – as recorded in the maps – to address English curriculum outcomes
3. Evaluate the impact of the processes of the mapping and pedagogical developments on student learning across the curriculum in complex linguistically and culturally diverse classrooms

The Project

Five schools were selected in the greater Western Sydney area. These schools included high enrolments of Aboriginal children and children from refugee and migrant backgrounds. The project was carried out in the following three phases to address each of the three aims.

In relation to Aim 1 of the project, eight teachers from Erehwon, Eamou, Urban and Waratah Public Schools trained as researchers to conduct mapping of students’ linguistic repertoires with students as ethnographers of their own language practice. Researchers and teachers conducted focus group interviews with students in preparation for the language mapping
activity. Students were provided with blank A3 sheets and drawing materials to produce an individual map of their everyday language practices. Analysis of the maps was carried out in a series of collaborative workshops including teachers, Aboriginal Education Officers, DEC personnel, the research team and participating students. Participants were introduced to spatial content analysis that focuses on how the images and text are arranged in relation to each other and what these spatial arrangements reveal about the where, how and why of students’ language practices (Somerville & D’warte, 2014).

In relation to Aim 2 teachers were supported to develop pedagogical activities to build on the language mapping activities in relation to the English curriculum. Teachers implemented these activities and work units and reflected on the process of implementation. They collected work samples from the students to analyse particular aspects of the implementation of the units of work and how they related to the mapping activity.

In relation to Aim 3, teachers and researchers evaluated the impact of the mapping activities and pedagogical developments on learning outcomes across the curriculum on the final professional learning day. Teachers reflected on qualitative measures such as levels of engagement, production of work, and informal assessment of student work. These reflections were recorded and transcribed for further analysis of the process.

Findings
The project identified the new theoretical framework of ‘complex multicultural classrooms’, and further development of the innovative mapping methodology as contributing to the unique findings of the study. The outcomes are addressed according to the three aims.

Aim 1: Mapping
The key findings from the mapping phase of the project are reported under the following emergent themes:

- Materiality of maps
- An alternative mode of expression
- Impact of map making on engagement
- Language maps as pedagogical
- Drawing on multimodal language practices
Students learning cultural difference
Children navigating digital and material worlds

Aim 2: Unit development and student work samples
Findings in relation to Aim 2 are reported under the following categories:
- Unit development
- Types of units
- Learning about students
- Inclusion of diverse, multimodal texts
- A focus on English outcomes
- Multimodal assessments
- Student engagement
- Intercultural understanding
- Connections and future learning

Aim 3: Evaluation
Qualitative evaluation by teachers yielded the following findings discussed in detail in the body of the report:
- Engagement engendered in the students by the project
- Improved quality of work produced by the students during and after project
- Project as the catalyst for this improvement
- Students’ attitudinal changes towards their own first language

Assessments of student work before and after the project added to the evaluation of project outcomes in relation to English learning specifically.

Cumulating activity
All students participated in an exhibition launch and student presentations of project work at Western Sydney University. Teachers commented that this was a highlight of the year for students not only connecting them to the other schools and activities of the project but expanding their worlds. Teachers remarked that students recognised ‘how their in school learning had importance in relation to their lives and their expanded worlds in relation to their connection to the university through the project’.
Future directions

- Knowing students and how they learn
  
  *Further research that identifies how building these relationships with students explicitly increased teachers’ knowledge about students and the ways students’ learn is needed.*

- Further explorations of the multimodal nature of students’ language practices
  
  *Further research is needed into pedagogical approaches that will enable students to navigate the different places and modes of their language practice and how students’ multimodal practices can be explicitly linked to learning.*

- Language and identity
  
  *Further research is indicated to understand the relationship between language, identity and learning for all students and what possibilities this offers for the development of intercultural understanding within classrooms.*

- Measurable outcomes
  
  *Further research that includes longitudinal measurable data that shows growth in learning is required.*

- Linguistic transfer
  
  *Building on this work, research that further develops and refines research and pedagogical methods that support students and teachers in making explicit links between students’ home language and English is required.*

Next Steps

The development of a Professional Learning package that details this curriculum will be produced for access by DE teachers.
INTRODUCTION

This document is designed to report on the project planning and implementation of the project Building on Children’s Linguistic Repertoires to Enrich Learning of 2015.

The Report draws on:

- Project Team Meeting Minutes and emails
- Observations, audio records, transcripts and minutes from Teachers’ Professional Development (PD) Days 1, 2 and 3 (See Appendix II)
- Transcripts from Aboriginal Education Officers’ (AEO’s) Professional Development (PD) Days 1 and 2
- Minutes from Steering Committee Meetings 1 and 2
- Audio records and transcripts of student focus group interviews
- Map artefacts, work samples, reflections and comments on teachers’ lessons and students’ learning

Background

Australian schools are increasingly sites of diverse language use and consist of speakers of many different languages and versions of English. They include culturally and linguistically diverse students from migrant, refugee, Aboriginal and Anglo-Celtic backgrounds. NAPLAN results from 2008 and 2009 demonstrate students from Language Backgrounds Other than English are falling behind students from English speaking backgrounds (Commonwealth of Australia, 2010). Many students from refugee backgrounds have low levels of English literacy, limited or no literacy in their first language, and are experiencing ongoing effects of trauma and health problems (MDA, 2011, 8). Aboriginal students experience cultural and linguistic mismatches between home and school to the extent that learning success is severely impacted (Rennie, 2010; Somerville, 2013). Many Aboriginal adolescent students, in particular, have very low levels of literacy as they enter high school. This means that their learning experiences in most secondary subjects can be one of incomprehension, lack of achievement and failure - which further undermines their self-esteem and reinforces their attitude that secondary education is irrelevant to their needs and interests (NSW AECG and NSW DET, 2004, 111-112).
Sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the English language underpins all Australian school curricula and is an essential prerequisite to learning, comprehension, writing and completion of tasks and assessment. Proficiency in English not only facilitates students’ social inclusion and the formation and maintenance of relationships with teachers and peers, but is essential to pursuing future vocational and employment pathways and successfully engaging with the broader community (MDA, 2011). Standard Australian English is important in accessing and using powerful literacies, a key aim of the Australian Curriculum: English, however the route to that power is not the same for every student or student group. Partnering with the NSW Department of Education and Communities (NSWDEC) we were interested in students’ enhanced capacity to ‘name the world’, i.e. ‘How can we identify and build on students’ language resources to enhance all students’ English learning capabilities and enrich the pedagogies of English curriculum?’.

The linguistic and cultural diversity that students display in their homes and the wider community are key strengths they can bring to learning English. International language and literacy research provides knowledge about the wider range of language and linguistic skills that children display in diverse communities (Alim & Baugh, 2007; Grieshaber, et al., 2012; Orellana, 2009). Large scale research on young people’s language practices and experiences has been important in identifying what has been commonly termed cultural ‘mismatches’ in ways of using language at home and at school (Heath, 1983; Luke, 2004; Michaels, 2005). The forms of non-standard English that Aboriginal young people use to express cultural meanings within family and community are often poorly understood by teachers, which leads to student disengagement in learning (NSWDETPSCD, 2003, 113; Somerville, 2013). Culturally and linguistically diverse student populations frequently encounter negative assumptions about their abilities to perform linguistically and academically (Ball, 2009; Comber & Kamler, 2004). On the other hand, recent work has also suggested important possibilities for connecting home and school language and learning experiences (Hull & Schultz, 2002; Orellana & Reynolds, 2008; Moje et al., 2004). Children from multicultural homes have been shown to possess language repertoires that can be a resource for literacies in English (Ferdman, 1991; Rennie, 2009), code switching and switching between languages (Martinez, 2010) and linguistic invention (Alim & Baugh, 2007).

Despite these apparent breakthroughs in understanding what students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds know and can do, a considerable body of research
continues to demonstrate that students’ language and literacy experiences and learning are commonly not reflected in schools, and their communicative competence is erased or narrowed, especially under the influence of high stakes testing (Gee, 2004; Guiterrez. et al., 2003; Lankshear & Knobel, 2003). The NSW Department of Education and Communities Multicultural Programs Unit (MPU) funded the first Australian pilot study in partnership with the Centre for Educational Research, University of Western Sydney, to investigate the relationship between multicultural children’s language practices and their potential pedagogical application in schools (D’warte, 2013). The pilot project involved 105 students and 9 teachers exploring students’ linguistic repertoires by engaging students as ethnographers of their own language practices. Findings revealed that this method supported both students and teachers learning to understand the depth and complexity of students’ linguistic understandings, skills and experiences. This led to an increase in teachers’ expectations of students’ language abilities and their metalinguistic awareness (D’warte. 2013).

THE PROJECT

The project built on this pilot study with a partnership that also includes the NSW Aboriginal Education and Community Engagement Unit. Research into the learning success of students from migrant, refugee and Aboriginal backgrounds is typically carried out as if these are three separate groups. In what we are defining as ‘complex multicultural classrooms’ all of these children learn within the one classroom and appropriate pedagogies need to be developed to enhance the learning of all students. This new study focussed on investigating the application of children’s linguistic repertoires to enhance their learning of English as key to learning success across the curriculum. The study was originally intended to provide the first year of a three-year cycle of action research funded through the Australian Research Council Linkage Scheme.

Aims of the research

The central research question in this project was:
How can children’s everyday language practices be mapped onto the curriculum to enhance learning outcomes for all children?
The project aimed to:

- Map the everyday language practices of students in complex multilingual, culturally diverse classrooms.
- Develop pedagogies based on students’ everyday language practices – as recorded in the maps – to address English curriculum outcomes.
- Evaluate the impact of the processes of the mapping and pedagogical developments on student learning across the curriculum in complex linguistically and culturally diverse classrooms.

Five schools were selected in the greater Western Sydney area. These schools include high enrolments of Aboriginal children and children from refugee and migrant backgrounds. The relevant classroom teacher in Waratah PS took on a new role in the school soon after the language mapping exercise and the case study at Waratah ends at the language mapping. One selected school withdrew from the project due to other commitments. The research methodology involved action learning, with participating teachers as co-researchers who collected data in collaboration with their students.

Design and methods

The project was carried out in the following three phases to address each of the three aims:

Aim 1: Map the everyday language practices of students in complex multilingual, culturally diverse classrooms.

In Stage 1 of the project, eight teachers from the four schools – Erehwon, Eamou, Urban and Waratah Public Schools – trained as researchers to conduct mapping of students’ linguistic repertoires with students as ethnographers of their own language practice. The participating teachers were co-researchers who collected data in collaboration with their students (Munns & Sawyer, 2013; D’warte, 2013, 2014).

Researchers and teachers conducted focus group interviews with students at the four schools in their classrooms, in order to record the initial understanding students had of the ways they use language. Community Liaison Officers and community translators assisted students with little or no English to respond in these interviews. The focus groups were preparation for the
language mapping activity that followed. Students were provided with blank A3 sheets and a range of pencils, textas and crayons to draw maps. This took place over several lessons. Each student produced an individual map of their everyday language practices, showing where and how they listen, speak, read and write, with whom and for what purposes. Students were offered a variety of examples to assist in their mapping.

In this way students were able to represent complex ideas about their language practices so that these were available for pedagogical work. Individual maps were collected and annotated for ethnicity, gender and SES status by the teachers for later reference.

Maps were then analysed by students, teachers and researchers. Students were asked to discuss the meaning of their maps with teachers and researchers. Children engaged in the analysis of their language maps in pairs and groups, through producing Venn diagrams based on the maps. Children in Erewhon PS, Eamou PS and Urban PS also took part in individual interviews with researchers. Venn diagrams were copied. All data were made available in a project Dropbox for access by DEC named investigators and the teachers, as well as the WSU researchers.

Follow-up workshops among teachers and WSU researchers involved the following:

- Researchers collaboratively analysed the maps, initially using spatial content analysis that focuses on how the images and text are arranged in relation to each other and what these spatial arrangements reveal about the where, how and why of students’ language practices (D’warte & Somerville, 2014; Somerville & D’warte, 2014). Questions around: the dominant image in this map; image and written text arrangement on the page; the nature of images and written text, and how the different elements related to each other – all guided the spatial analysis
- Analysis and commentary on all the maps by the AEOs, including those created by Aboriginal students
- Analysis of maps by officers of the NSWDEC in August, 2015
- Participating teachers from all schools, as co-researchers, met to collaboratively analyse the maps and share their programmed and implemented language lessons and work units. This occurred in the three Professional Development Days, for teachers in March, May and October, 2015.
Aim 2: Develop pedagogies based on students’ everyday language practices – as recorded in the maps – to address English curriculum outcomes

Teachers and students participated in the process of exploring how the understandings arising from the students’ language maps could inform their learning. Teachers and WSU researchers developed pedagogical activities to build on the students’ everyday language practices in relation to specific requirements of the NSW syllabus for the Australian curriculum: English K-10 (BOS, NSW, 2012). Teachers implemented these activities and work units in Stage 2 of the project and recorded the process of implementation. This work also supported teachers in addressing the Australian National Standards for Teachers, Standard 1 – Know students and how they learn – and in particular, addressed focus areas 1.3 – Students with diverse linguistic, cultural, religious and socioeconomic backgrounds – and 1.4 – Strategies for teaching Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students (AITSL, 2014).

Aim 3: Evaluate the impact of the processes of the mapping and pedagogical developments on student learning across the curriculum in complex linguistically and culturally diverse classrooms

In the final professional learning day teachers and researchers had the opportunity to evaluate the impact of the mapping and pedagogical developments on learning outcomes across the curriculum (see Appendix II). Teachers reflected on qualitative measures such as levels of engagement, production of work, and informal assessment of student work.

Teachers described the lessons, some of which were linked with both the NSW English and HSIE Syllabus outcomes and gave opportunities for students to explore, express and share the ways they used language in family, school, sporting and other contexts identified in the language maps. These units involved investigating the geography of places and the ways people interact with their environments. Additional project data were provided by student work samples that illustrated the ways pedagogy based on student language mapping addressed the English curriculum and impacted on student learning across the curriculum.
Researchers sought access to quantitative measures such as student attendance, retention, formal incidences of behavioural issues and outcomes of formal testing and assessment, however these were unavailable.

Meetings in January, March, August, 2015 and January 2016 reported to the Steering Committee on project milestones, while a dedicated Data Analysis Day was held in August 2015 to familiarise the DEC representatives on the Steering Committee about the work of the project.

Ethical issues

- As stated above, one school withdrew partially from the project without penalty due to other arrangements and commitments. Student focus group interviews and mapping were conducted with Waratah PS and the AEO continued in her role in the project until its completion.
- Student maps have been de-identified and coded numerically.
- Transcripts of student interviews de-identify students where possible.

FINDINGS

Aim 1: Mapping
In this section we consider the results of the mapping activity in which individual children in all classes created visual/spatial maps on A3 sheets of the nature and places of their everyday language practice following the preparatory focus groups.

Considerable previous research has been carried out in relation to children’s repertoires of linguistic practice using the innovative mapping method introduced by Dr D’warte in her 2013 project (Somerville & D’warte 2014; D’warte & Somerville, 2014). D’warte and Somerville together developed new ways of spatial analysis and found that while some children represent significant disconnect between their in-school and out-of-school language practices others navigate the different spaces and places of their language practice seamlessly. The characteristics of maps showing connections and those showing disconnections differ in other ways as well. In particular, maps displaying connections portray many human characters in language interaction with animated stances and smiley faces. Similar patterns of spatial representation can be seen in the maps in this study so the
question discussed in the following is: What have we found that we did not know from previous research?

New frameworks
One of the major differences in this project was the new theoretical framework of complex multicultural classrooms, classrooms that include both high Aboriginal enrolments and high culturally and linguistically diverse enrolments. The inclusion of high numbers of Aboriginal children led to engaging with the four Aboriginal Education Officers employed by these schools, and the development of a separate report to ensure that their voice is included. Three of the four schools in this study came under the category of complex multicultural classrooms and the fourth included two classes of 100% new arrivals. The maps need to be read in this context.

Innovation in methods of collaborative analysis
An innovation in the method included the recording of different layers of analysis with different participants in the project. Collaborative analysis was carried out with all participating teachers, some of the children, the Aboriginal Education Officers, the Department of Education representatives, and the research team themselves. It is important to note that each of these groups sorted the maps into entirely different categories. The eleven children who participated in mapping analysis interviews also offered a different reading of their own maps. The teachers’ collaborative analysis informed the writing of the case studies was the teachers. The collaborative analysis undertaken with the teachers was not only part of their research training but was an integral part of the pedagogical process of the project as a whole. The following summary comments are made on the basis of the teachers’ observations and the part the maps played in the overall process.

Materiality of maps
The fact that the children using drawing materials and paper created the maps was a significant part of the pedagogical process connected to improved literacy and learning outcomes. The large storage box of drawing materials provided to each class operated as a material sign in the classroom of their connection to the project, the University, and a different world of experience and aspiration. The maps produced from their creative efforts were re-worked, discussed, analysed and displayed as visual markers of the children’s identity in their worlds. This had important ramifications for their broader understanding of
language as well as creating for themselves and others a visual representation of their rich multimodal language practices.

An alternative mode of expression
For many children the maps offered an alternative mode of expression. The children in the new arrival classes had little English and the focus groups were held in their first language facilitated by community language workers, however their maps gave them a common language whereby they could communicate with their teachers and with all of the children in their class and across the project. Other English speaking children were described as ‘not pen and paper children’ and the ability to portray the nature and places of their rich everyday language practices in visual form gave them a new mode of expression leading to major changes in their performance of literacy tasks. For yet another group of students with behavioural and language disorders the maps functioned as a bridge to enable the students themselves and their teachers to cross significant barriers of communication in order to activate learning.

Impact of map making
The effect of the activity of making the language maps was immediate and significant and teachers noted the overwhelming burst of creativity as well as the students’ high levels of engagement. For the children talking about their maps opened up extraordinary and sometimes strange worlds of their multimodal language practice where the body and their senses came to the fore as they are shaped by the many relations, media and modes of their language engagement. The ways that they were able to navigate the different places and modes of their language practice appeared in part to be determined by the quality of teaching. Children in the classes of already highly engaged teachers produced a majority of maps showing lively connections across all the domains of language practice. The maps however also operated pedagogically in and of themselves with children and teachers learning through the production and reading of the language maps.

Language maps as pedagogical
For all teachers the awareness of the different ethnic languages of their students enhanced their ability to teach language skills in general and therefore their teaching of English. For the bilingual teachers of new arrivals their focus had been entirely on the acquisition of English but through the process of making the language maps and exploring their potential, they
began to realise the value of students’ first languages. The significance of language and identity, as constructed through the maps, created a shared understanding about the importance of language and identity between the Aboriginal Education Officers and the bilingual teachers in particular. For English speaking teachers the knowledge and understanding gained from the language mapping enabled them to include their students’ language and cultural practices in their teaching. The new language learning also applied to other Key Learning Areas such as maths where students were observed using their first language to understand key concepts, or where students were generally more engaged and more confident in their learning.

Drawing on multimodal language practices

Less obviously but as just as significantly, teachers becoming aware of the children’s rich multimodal language practices changed their teaching and in particular their teaching of language. The teachers moved between the different modes of expression and representation such as visual art and music as well as speaking, listening, reading and writing to open up their teaching of English print literacy. This can be seen in the wide range of student work samples resulting from units of work adapted specifically to incorporate their understandings from the language maps. The units of work interestingly combined the English literacy and HSIE curriculum drawing on the spatial understandings created by the children’s mapping of the places of their language use. The focus on place and literacy, especially when connected to the places of the students cultural heritage was particularly powerful in its impact of English language performance. Teachers described the language maps as ‘opening the door for what we were going to talk about’, creating a deeper relationship with, and understanding of language as a whole.

Students learning cultural difference

In all cases the maps functioned as pedagogical for the students as well as the teachers as they learned from each other about their different language practices. The teachers reported that they had taught social skills to the children previously but the impact would only last for the day, but with the language maps the learning continued. Students shared their cultures, customs and beliefs as part of their learning. They were observed talking to each other in the playground in their different languages, exchanging language words and being more aware of each other’s differences. Learning to accept difference on the basis of accepting their own
difference was fundamental to the learning outcomes in which children learned collectively as well as individually.

Children’s navigating digital and material worlds
The most unexpected finding came from the interviews with the children in which they analysed their own maps. These very brief interviews demonstrated the potential of the mapping of everyday language practices as a threshold to children’s multimodal language and cultural worlds. They talked about how they navigated those worlds using their visual/spatial maps as a threshold, bridging the barriers of dialect, language and culture between themselves and the interviewer. While only a small number of children were interviewed from only two of the schools, almost all of the children who were interviewed mentioned their use of digital media as part of their everyday language practices. The digital medium itself was not the important aspect of their use however, but the cultural and linguistic meanings of the activities they accessed. These included films in different languages, music of all cultural forms, collective and individual games with their own dress codes and rules and so on. This aspect of the maps signals the possibility for future research.

Aim 2: Unit Of Work and Work Samples
In this section we consider the final reflections and analysis in relation to Aim 2, the preparation and presentation of units of work and work samples. Teachers developed units of work after teachers had engaged in map analysis at PD 3.

Unit development
The developments of units were identified as being problematic for teachers. Initially teachers found the development of Units of Work that related to the language mapping processes challenging. The relationship between the preliminary mapping activities and units of works was initially not clear for some teachers, specifically linking to the stage appropriate outcomes they were required to address. Teachers also experienced various degrees of autonomy in creating units, restriction applied in the form of stage level demands, school wide themes, programs and foci. In most cases teachers were required to work with pre-designed units created for implementation within particular stages. The challenge was how to bring it all together, for one school this provided a complex task as the classes encompassed students across stages and with wide ranging degrees of proficiency in English.
Types of units
Despite these varying degrees of autonomy all teachers managed to successfully build on children’s repertoires to enhance learning, incorporating previous project activities and mapping them onto their units and continuing to build on this in the service of learning throughout their units. Three units from the project schools combined more than one subject area. This included HSIE and English in the units entitled: The Journey, Exploring Visual Literacy through Culture, and Significant Environments. A further three units focussed on the English KLA in units entitled: Developing positive relationships and celebrating what it means to be different; Language students speak in different places with different people and how that changes in different situations; and, Buttonised at Waratah, a unit focusing on visual literacy and associated metalanguage and the application of multimodal texts.

Learning about students
Evidence suggests that the focus groups and mapping activities lead all teachers to realize the need to acknowledge and build on students’ full linguistic and cultural knowledge in their units of work. In one teacher’s words:

actually have the kids supported with their own culture and identity because from the language maps and the discussion in the focus groups we found that some kids were a little bit confused about their backgrounds and the languages that they spoke and what all of that meant.

Teacher interviews reveal how they worked to build on students’ linguistic and cultural knowledge throughout the units. At EREHWON one teacher reflected on how this became central to her classroom work:

We do a lot of explicit teaching and we try to talk to the kids about English: “Well we need to use this kind of language” or “How has the author used language” and this sort of stuff. And I think that having them talk about their own language helped them, I think before that was really abstract for them. And I think that as the year’s gone on and we’ve kept doing it, and then they’ve done this process where they’ve talked about their own language and language use, it's almost like now they’ve gone “Oh that’s what you're talking about”.
For the teachers at URBAN they saw the development of language transfer. In one teacher’s words:

It has encouraged me to reflect on the change that we’ve made from ESL to EAL, so when we think about English as a second language I tended to think about it as a linear thing, that English was replacing something else and now that we’ve moved to EAL in additional language it seems to represent now that it’s not one after the other, it’s like there’s a capacity for many languages and we don’t have to give up one to take on another. And so I think the whole project is sort of reinforcing that and giving us a basis from which to say that there is a place for many languages not just replacing one with English.

Inclusion of diverse, multimodal texts
Multimodal literacies were a prominent feature highlighted by students in the focus groups and mapping analysis also reveals that within units teachers were looked for and used texts that represented all students’ interests. Texts that included the journey of refugee background students, *Ziba came on a boat* (Liz Lofthouse) among others. At EAMOU and other schools this incorporated texts that included Aboriginal people and places, *My Mob going to the Beach*, (Sylvia Emerton), European, African, and Pacific Island stories. URBAN used a bilingual text, *Mirror* (Jeannie Baker). EREHWON included texts that focussed on place and identity, *Belonging*, (Jeannie Baker); *The fat and juicy place* (Diana Kidd), also exploring Google Earth, online conservations sites, photographs and maps. The units commonly include multimodal texts that reflect and represent the diversity of the Australian population.

A focus on English outcomes
All units worked to address English outcomes, most units looked at outcomes and descriptors related to reading and viewing, speaking and listening, expressing themselves, reflecting on learning, and writing and composing in particular, the prominent focus in these schools being writing information reports. The combination of HSIE and English curriculum approaches extended classroom knowledge about the home languages, people, places and practices. Teachers suggested this simultaneously produced high levels of motivation and engagement for writing that was often absent for many children. Teachers at EREHWON, EAMOU and URBAN suggested many of their students lacked confidence in their own English ability and that the units helped improve their confidence, giving them a confidence to write, by building
on what was known, calling on their own understanding as first step and making connections
to what they were tasked to do in their classrooms. The teachers at EREHWON believed they
had seen great improvement in the students’ writing, and that the impact of their participation
in the project would be carried over into their next writing tasks. They considered that the
students now understood both quality not just quantity in their writing outputs but also came
to understand the process of writing. At URBAN teachers suggested that for some students
the opportunity to use both languages to complete writing tasks helped to make students
produced texts more complex. In reviewing work samples all teachers pointed to an increase
in the complexity and length of writing samples, but gave little specific examples of
improved grammatical skills or elements. All teachers attributed increased proficiency as
realized in work samples to high levels of engagement.

Multimodal assessments
All units incorporated multimodal learning activities (Appendix VI), for example, creating
paper fans and dragons, producing digital self-portraits, using photography and multiple
drawing applications, one or more languages, music and art to create texts. At EAMOU
students shared stories, dances, beliefs and language with each other. At EREHWON and
URBAN, students used video to record themselves. Students in these classes watched
themselves present and considered how the language changed. At EREHWON, students
discussed what words were being used, what other word could be used and they wrote up a
list of alternative words that they could use, and how that would change the nature of the
communication. For one teacher at EREHWON the unit enabled them to focus on Aboriginal
English, as suggested by the teacher:

whether a way of approaching it is saying to the kids, well you know yes there's
Aboriginal English, that’s a dialect, I mean really our kids almost speak their own.
And that their informal language almost is like a separate language and that when they
come to school they have to learn a new language and that’s why it's so hard for them.

For the teachers to have a way to work with the children on shifting language use has been a
crucial breakthrough that is not about them just teaching about the pedagogical relation
through which children and teachers learn but creating a respectful relationship between
children’s everyday worlds and the formal requirements of children.
Student engagement

All teachers suggested that focus groups data and language mapping had given students a renewed sense of self and in one teacher’s words: ‘permission to speak whatever language they needed to speak and then I believe this was hugely beneficial for their learning’. The view that as the classes worked through the unit and discovered new information about other cultures, they began to open up was commonly expressed. As one teacher suggests: ‘they began to talk about and use their life and culture with the class and within their work’. Each time they shared something they loved, teachers commented that their students’ confidence increased. The students then wanted to share more, as this teacher highlights: ‘so that was really powerful once they just started, we couldn’t stop them, even those students who can’t even speak sentences’. In one classroom with large numbers of Samoan students this encouraged the usually quiet group of Samoan students to participate and engage in class activity, sharing more about themselves. Teachers talked of how individual students, those reluctant to participate joined in: ‘I think it was just because everyone was so interested in what they were doing; he wanted to be a part of it’. Another teacher commented on how the unit not only engaged students but helped to support students who struggled to make friends and be accepted by the class: ‘He comes in and I think he just feels comfortable, and now he’s excited to do something that the other kids are doing and they’re interested to share and listen to what he had to say: for this student the change is in his writing outcomes’.

Intercultural understanding

A common theme expressed by teachers throughout this project was the notion that all students were engaged by each other’s cultural and linguistic skills and knowledge. Teachers in EAMOU and URBAN suggest students were consulting with each other in their own language to increase their understanding while continuing to speak English directly to the teacher. They came to appreciate the cultural and linguistic differences of their classmates as a resource for learning. For the teacher at Waratah this was observed as students: ‘teaching each other and they’re all learning the same language and they’re accepting and being respectful because they’ve got a better understanding of each other’s cultural backgrounds’. For one teacher at EREHWON this intercultural understanding was illustrated by the shift in acceptance of one of her students: ‘the change that had occurred in this new class that meant that the children were more accepting of difference’. They were not only more accepting but actually interested in what this student had to say. One teacher suggests that what she had learned was: ‘how engaging anything to do with students’ identity is’, for the Aboriginal
Education Officer at EAMOU the work opened up the other students’ eyes on where their fellow students are from, ‘it’s also given them a better outlook and perspective on their fellow peers and where they’re from, more of an understanding which is what should be happening in our schools’.

Connections and future learning
Teachers suggested that what they had begun in the units overflowed into the playground and into their other KLAs in two classrooms this included students using their native languages in maths which they weren’t doing in maths before. This is further illustrated by the students at EAMOU who when given free choice for a public speech competition chose to talk about themselves, with a focus on their language and cultural background. Teachers commented that these units inspired teachers to consider other topics and units of work that built on the knowledge they had gained about their students within this project. This included for example in one school a unit on family that enabled students and teachers to explore the non-traditional compositions and diversity within families for the students in their classrooms.

Aim 3: Evaluation
Evaluate the impact of the processes of the mapping and pedagogical developments on student learning across the curriculum in complex linguistically and culturally diverse classrooms

In terms of the research question for this project, “How can children’s everyday language practices be mapped onto the curriculum to enhance learning outcomes for all children?”, general learning outcomes are of central importance. Our key data set for general learning outcomes consists of student work samples supplied by the teachers and addressed on PD Day 3. On this day, teachers remarked on:
   a) the engagement engendered in the students by the project
   b) the improved quality of work produced by the students during and after the project
   c) the project as the catalyst for this improvement
   d) students’ attitudinal changes towards their own first language

In each case, teachers asserted strong improvement in attitudes and outcomes in their classes as a result of their work on the project. A selection of these comments are presented below:
a) the engagement engendered in the students by the project

Eamou
(N) has mentioned to me at school that she also felt that the kids have increased engagement…
The students enjoyed looking at the Chinese characters in their name and learning about the Chinese language and how it differs from English. See that’s just another culture that they’re picking up on and they’re learning about it and it shows so much respect for it because they’re enjoying it.

Urban:
Language map … they just started, we couldn’t stop them when they started making the language map and they were bringing all those ideas … these are the students who can’t even speak sentences in English …

b) the improved quality of work produced by the students during and after the project

Erehwon
demonstrates a huge improvement in this student’s writing skills. He’s been a bit of a reluctant writer and somebody who would write maybe a couple of sentences but with poor grammar and sentence structure.

Eamou
there’s a couple of kids in particular in her class that she’s spoken about that she’s very pleased with their progression … She’s had one boy jump 10 levels in reading

Urban
I think that the multi-lingual children from other languages they are also applying the same systems, the same – what do you say – same type of technology as what they’re doing look we talk about … zone of proximal development and all that … We can actually see this happening when they are using the language and connecting it and achieving more than they would

c) the project as the catalyst for this improvement

Erehwon
“A” is Indigenous and he has a huge connection to it, he’s very proud of it so writing this and having the connection with Uluru and the Aboriginal people, he couldn’t get enough of it, he wanted to continue. He came back to school this term and said “Can
we keep doing that?”, like he just wanted to learn, to show his mum, to show his dad, to show everyone in the school, whereas before he would sit there, write his thing all the way to the end, finish, done, not doing anymore… so now he recognises he can do it and it's going throughout everything, not just this project, he’ll now, like reading he’ll have better go at, he’s gone from a level 6 to a level 12…In a really short, like a term, he’s just like, his light is on, he wants to learn now… he’s changed like so much, since last year like he was being suspended, he wasn’t coming to school, he’s there every day ready to go… he doesn’t like being told what to do. But in this project, because he had the choice, you know he couldn’t research himself and he was happy to come and ask me for help, but he had ownership over what he was doing which, yeah just, I was blown away with what he did… he now knows he can do that so he’s going to do that every time, and he won't come and show me until he’s got it like that.

Urban

we started with building simple sentences and then we really built the language, we built the connectives and conjunctions and all…So that they could move to…compound and complex sentences…Simple sentences – to compound and complex sentences…When we were building the complex sentences we did a whole lot of scaffolding and that, that’s where I …used the language maps…directly took them to the language maps so we again had a lesson, two lessons of looking at language map, alright so we have – we have learnt using “and”, “but” and…”because”…”look at the things in the language maps; choose one thing what you would, how has English or your own language helped and use it in make, connecting two sentences. It was really powerful what they came out with this also helps in the numeracy because when we are teaching some things, some concept, they don’t – if I’m testing them, if I’m saying “Okay back now, number before, number after” for them sometimes, especially these new arrivals, they don’t understand. So what I have this thing in my class I ask the similar language speaking students so “Ahmed what do you – how do you say ‘back’ in Arabic? What do you say ‘forward’ in Arabic?” and then Ahmed tells and then I learn myself and I tell them “Is it?” see I have a learnt a few words of that. This – as soon as I speak their language I use that maths word of that English in their numeracy-
I had to use this resource to build in the concept of relationship diversity looking at differences…And how differences … to our friendship, relationship and all … with my activity the whole lesson that I had programmed around – because the concept of relationship really worked well with the mind-map that we did because I found the children were basically talking about the relationship … of the language; what they’re doing with their friends, with their family, at the shops, everything that they related to…Their social skills was already happening within the map
I’m really amazed with the creativity; they have so many ideas inside them it’s just coming and just you know publicly speaking that confidence, it is – they have gained a lot of confidence and as soon as we talk about – we, I have to just say a word language and say “Yes language words, my Farsi”.

d) students’ (and parents’) attitudinal changes towards their own first language

Urban
For them it was only English till now which is valid for them; for them it is now Arabic is valid, it is a language on its own so that’s a really powerful thing for them to do…

Waratah
we have to learn only English. But when they did those language maps whenever we talked about language they started associating language with also their first language. Before it was just English, English, English …Now they learnt to appreciate their native tongue… Acceptance of their own first – of their own selves and their own language – and then the other children then. They’re teaching each other and they’re all learning the same language and they’re accepting and being respectful because …they’ve got a better understanding of each other’s cultural backgrounds.

Outcomes in English specifically: Mapping selected student work samples
In terms of student outcomes in English specifically as a result of the project, in this section we present written work produced by students in the schools and analysed according to specific growth criteria in written English. The contexts of presentation are slightly different for each school and these will be discussed for the relevant school as it comes up. All students whose writing is presented here are LBOTE.

The tools for analysis will be:
1) The Australian 3-6 EALD Progression by Mode: Writing: 3-6 (ACARA, 2011)

2) Models derived from the Crediton project on writing development. Wilkinson et al (1980), in the Crediton project, produced what still remains today a very pertinent study of the long-term writing development of students. In order to gain their picture of writing development over time, the Crediton team set over a hundred students from three schools four written tasks. The students were given the tasks as part of their normal school work over a period of three months and the pieces were assessed in three age groups: ages seven, ten and thirteen. From this sample, the team attempted, in effect, to describe the characteristics of writing at these three age levels. From their analyses of the pieces produced by students in response to the four tasks, four dimensions of growth were derived. Those of most interest here are what they termed Cognitive and Stylistic.

The Cognitive model contained described language development in terms of four major sub-sets of growth: Describing, Interpreting, Generalizing and Speculating. For our purposes here, it is of interest that Describing itself is sub-divided into: Labelling (just using a concept word, eg man), Naming (the specific word, eg John), Partial information (disorganised, unsustained concrete detail), Recording (simple concrete statements about the here and now) and Reporting (some linking between statements in a chronological sequence).

The Stylistic model described language development within seven major criteria for growth: Syntax, Verbal Competence, Organization, Cohesion, Writer's awareness of the reader and Effectiveness. It is within these criteria that levels of growth are labelled and described.

Erehwon samples

Work samples analysed here are from two students and are provided by the teachers. In each case, we have samples of writing from prior to the mapping with its associated unit of work and then from after this unit. Both students are from Stage 2. The analysis is focusing on development as a writer. The written work presented here is seen by the teacher as “typical” for that student at the named time.
Student M

Text from February, 2015:
One upon a lime, Willy was wa

Text from November 2015:
I woke up to go in the pool with my three friends. Then we did a flip in the pool. It was so hot because it was summer. We took really long in the pool splashing and doing tricks. Me and my friends got out of the pool and dried ourselves. Then we went to the movies to see Thor. Then we went back home. There was a fire so we called for help. Then there was a fire engine coming and they put the fire out.

Thus, in February, Student M was able to produce very little written work – and that relying on a catchphrase (‘Once upon a time’).

EALD Progression
In February, Student M shows writing reflecting aspects of the phases, ‘Beginning’ on the EALD Progression. By November, he/she shows aspects of being a ‘Developing’ EALD writer, eg using conjunctions, pronoun referencing, sequencing, subject-verb agreement, appropriate verb tense. This is a highly noteworthy progression in this time.

Crediton
There is not enough text in February to analyse using the Crediton model.

By November, Student M is producing simple, compound and short complex sentences (eg “It was so hot because it was summer; There was a fire so we called for help”). Vocabulary is tied to the concrete and familiar, but demonstrates a great range of verbal competence such as the use of adjectives and causal markers. Sentence structure is a simple linear pattern, but the student has passed well beyond earlier stages of writing in the Crediton model (e.g. unrelated ideas or lack of coherence between parts). Cohesive devices such as temporal, sequential and causal conjunctions are present and correctly used. This narrative pattern, though unelaborated, gives a consistency of focus for the reader. The writing is still close to speech. The text is ‘Describing’ in Crediton terms, but at the ‘highest’ sub-group, ‘Reporting’, i.e. linking statements in a chronological/spatial sequence.
Student P

Text from February 2015:

It I im S han i am 18 and i am at my hose De DO i went to the door and i see a Box i open it in abot 1 sec i get totpct to a weter fall i fine a note and Then i say what is on the note then i end uP in a laB i see a nither Box i open it i see moPes i put the red one on Then I say what on The note Then i Tore into a ninjer Then i meat Tory and Distin Tory Takes the bleu one Disten takes The yellow one Then i new we were Power Rangers.

Text from November 2015:

I drove to the park with no one. I’m lonely and I get bullied. I am playing on the swings. I’m thinking about if I had friends. It was raining. I looked down. Someone threw a match. It landed on bark. A fire has started. I climb on top of the swing pole. I don’t want to jump because I am scared. I call “help!” My house is not far away and mum and dad heard me.

They called the fire men to put out some of the fire. I got out before it covered the ground. They put out the rest of the fire while I rushed home.

EALD Progression

Student P shows strong progression from February to November. The February text is very elementary in a number of ways. It shows inconsistent letter formation, a lack of punctuation, uses grammatical features that are variable and includes run-on sentences and tense inconsistency. There is, however, an understanding of sound-letter relationships. The student is straddling the levels of “Beginning” to “Emerging” on the EALD Progression.

The November text also shows tense inconsistency as the text moves between present and past tense. However, while one would not like to push this too far, this inconsistency works in a filmic way that can be seen as appropriate, as if a camera/voiceover is moving from outer action (past tense) to internal thoughts and feelings and reactions (present tense) and the point of view is shifting. The sequence is simple and the student uses basic punctuation. There is a sense of paragraphing and the work displays some compound and complex sentences (eg They put out the rest of the fire while I rushed home). Time sequencing is appropriate and
subject-verb agreement is accurate. By now, the student is showing many of the marks of a “Developing” writer on the EALD progression.

Crediton
In February, the student uses simple sentences and limited vocabulary. There is, however, a simple chronological or linear pattern. There are some cohesive devices – in particular Then. The writer simply assumes the reader’s awareness of the context (Who are Distin/Disten and Tory? Who are Power Rangers and what is the role of colour in identifying them?). The writing is close to speech. While there is a basic narrative pattern, there is no exploration of the nature of the events or the experience described. The February piece is at the level of “Describing”, sub-group “Recording”: simple concrete statements about the there and then in a list.

The November text retains some of these features: simple sentences, the text is still tied to the concrete and familiar, organization is still simple chronological or linear and writing is still close to speech. However, the piece also uses compound and complex sentences, as we have seen. The range of vocabulary is greater and ideas are much clearer here, with (newly applied) punctuation organizing the narrative. In fact, it is as if the full stop has substituted for cohesive devices in this version. Detail now is related much more clearly for an unknown audience. The piece still sits within Crediton’s “Describing” level, though now of the “Reporting” sub-group: clear linking between statements in a chronological or spatial sequence.

Urban sample
In this sample, we have chosen to comment on the process the writing went through. As a reminder, the Urban classes are reception classes through which LBOTE students pass on their way to a mainstream class once they have reached a certain level of English proficiency.

Student H – Writing from the end of the unit. Students presented a pamphlet on themselves which included individual pages on: My personal profile, Favourite activities and hobbies, Family, Ambitions, Likes and dislikes, Friends.
My personal profile
My name is H.B. I was born in Pakistan. I came from Pakistan seven months ago. My language is Farsi. I can speak two other languages, Urdu and English. I am 10 years old. I went to visit Islamabad, Afghanistan when I was eight years old. (Accompanied by photo of him and a brother and sister?)

Favourite activities and hobbies
My favourite activity is soccer because I am good at playing it. My hobbies are watching television and doing my home work. I also like reading and riding horses. (Accompanied by a photo of a horse)

Family
I have 5 family members: my sister, brother, mum and dad and me. We live together in one house my brother’s name is Sibtain. He is in Holroyd High School. He is in year seven in school. He is 12 years old. My sister is in Urban public school in Kindergarten. She is 6 years old. My mum is a student in navitas centre. She wants to improve her English. (Accompanied by family photo)

Ambitions
Messi is best (handwritten as first sentence). When i grow up i wanna be footballer because I am good at football and I going training with my uncle. Messi is my best soccer player. (Accompanied by a photo of Lionel Messi).

Likes and dislikes
I like mango because it’s healthy. I also like to play and do my homework. (Accompanied by photo of mangoes)

Friends
I have lots of friends in my class in other country and in Australia. My friends are Osman Muhammed Osman, Muhammed Ali and Osman because they don’t put me in trouble. My best friend is osman. Every day Osman plays with me in the park. Osman is from Pakistan too. (Accompanied by a photo of boys climbing a tree)

EALD Progression
After only seven months in Australia, Student H is using features of the “Emerging” and “Developing” phases of the EALD Progression. “Emerging” features include: writing simple
sequenced texts about topics of personal interest; some speech-like sentence structures (“I like…”; “I also like…”); subject-verb agreement and tense consistency; mainly familiar vocabulary, and basic punctuation. On the other hand, “Developing” features include: sentences combined into compound and complex sentences; correct pronoun referencing; accurate subject-verb agreement.

Crediton

BH’s writing falls into the “Describing” level on the Crediton Cognitive model, and within that, mainly into the “Recording” level of simple concrete statements about the here-and-(which may of course, simply be a function of the make-brochure task). Stylistically, the work consists mainly of simple sentences with concrete vocabulary. There is a simple linear pattern to the writing with effective use of cohesive devices, though these are limited in range. In terms of audience awareness, detail in his writing is focussed and easily followed. The writing is close to speech and explanations are coherent, though not elaborated.

Pedagogical steps

How was this piece developed in this class? The process began with the class individually brainstorming onto butcher’s paper appropriate categories for a pamphlet on “Who am I?” These include categories that did not make it a separate categories into the final piece, for example, “What makes you happy/angry/sad?” “What would you never give up?” Written answers to these were transferred onto paper folded into the shape of a brochure/pamphlet, with a penciled draft filled in on each folded section. Teacher corrections are evident here, but largely the work – its spelling, vocabulary etc, is that of the student. The final presentation stage is not largely different from this pencil-written draft. As noted previously, the English piece is accompanied by Arabic hand-written text, even in the final presentation stage of the writing. This may have been an important support for Student H’s final commitment to a finished written piece in English.

We cannot sustain an argument about causality here, though teachers did believe the project was responsible for the outcomes. An important question here is, if the teachers are correct, why this level of change in written English could be evident in such a short space of time?
One answer may be to do with the way the project engendered meta-linguistic awareness in students. The discussion of language in the sense of national/cultural languages carried over into discussion of language use in a more general way and this heightened sense of language and its functions may have carried over into the students’ work on English itself. It certainly cultivated attitudinal change and teachers commented on the project as being instrumental in shifting discussion about languages into improved use of English. As one teacher remarked:

we do a lot of explicit teaching and we try to talk to the kids about, in English, “Well we need to use this kind of language” or “How has the author used language?” and this sort of stuff. And I think that having them talk about their own language almost helped them to, like I think before that was really abstract for them… And I think that as the year’s gone on and we’ve kept doing it, and then they’ve done this process where they’ve talked about their own language and language use, it's almost like now they’ve gone “Oh that’s what you're talking about”.
CASE STUDY: EREHWON PUBLIC SCHOOL

Margaret Somerville

Introduction
Erehwon Public School was built in 1973 on Dharug lands on the western edge of the Mt Druitt District. In 2015, approximately 160 students attended the school with approximately 21% of students identifying as Aboriginal and 42% of students coming from language backgrounds other than English, mainly from Tonga, Samoa and New Zealand. The School is located in a very poor area of western Sydney with high levels of disadvantage. There are disproportionately high numbers of students enrolled in the school who have complex support needs including students diagnosed with autism, mild to moderate intellectual disabilities and a range of challenging emotions and behaviours, often trauma related. The School has an ongoing commitment to implementing programs to enhance the academic achievement of Aboriginal students and educating our wider school community about Aboriginal Australia. It has a long term and substantial program of Aboriginal English and culture offered to all grade levels (K-6) by the Aboriginal Education Officer Ms Sandra Hickey.

In 2013 a small mapping project funded directly by the School was a precursor to the current project (Somerville & D’warte, 2013). It extended the earlier mapping work to the concept of complex multicultural classrooms which include high numbers of students from migrant and refugee backgrounds as well as high numbers of Aboriginal students. They are invariably in low SES areas. The school was keen to continue this work and two Grade 3 classes participated in the Building Linguistic Repertoires project with the two teachers supporting each other and working together as a team while teaching their classes individually.

Focus groups
A total of thirty seven (37) students from the two Year 3 classes participated in the focus group interviews and the following summarises their responses in terms of the specific questions addressed.

1 The Aboriginal English program runs parallel to the language mapping project and its impact is discernible within this project. A separate report addresses the important input of the Aboriginal Education Officers in the schools participating in this project with high Aboriginal enrolments.
Focus group responses

Q: How many of you speak languages other than English? What languages?

A large proportion of the 37 children in these classes nominated that they spoke a language other than English, some of them speaking more than one other language. The following is a summary of the different ethnic languages spoken. The most common languages spoken were Pacific Island languages with eight children speaking Samoan, five speaking Maori or Tongan and four speaking Cook Island language. Two children said they spoke Arabic and only one child nominated each of Chinese, Eritrean, Bosnian, Fijian, Turkish, Dari, Japanese and Spanish.

Five children nominated that they spoke Aboriginal English as a dialect of Standard Australian English (SAE) and one student extended the concept of dialect to include African, Australian, and London versions of standard English.

The students also identified a range of different ways they used language apart from different ethnic languages, with a focus on spoken language:

- Changing your voice: using a loud and strong voice at football, with games, if hurt, angry
- Using a soft voice at school
- Calm voice at school, angry at home
- Speaking English at home because each parent speaks a different language and English is the common language
- Changing the language from English to another language (translation)
- Non-English with family at home, English at school
- Non-English with friends who do not speak English
- A version of non-English, not spoken properly
- Aboriginal English with uncle
- Cook Island with grandparents
- Text language, writing on computer
- Helping sibling with homework
- Skyping
- Reading comics, signs, menus
- Writing shopping lists
- Many students cannot articulate or convey their meaning
Q: How many of you did not speak English when you came to school? What languages did you speak?
Fourteen children responded that they did not speak English when they came to school. Languages spoken included Arabic, Bosnian, Cook Island, Dari, Eritrean, Maori, Samoan, Tongan, Turkish.

Q: How many of you most often speak a language other than English at home with friends and family?
Eighteen children said they speak another language at home and with friends and family.

Q: How many of you translate for family and friends? What do you translate and for whom?
Two students said they translate from Cook Island and Maori, two students said they translate from Dari, and four students said they translate from English to Samoan when visiting Samoa, one student commenting that he would get a hiding if he and his siblings did not speak Samoan in Samoa, so he protects his siblings by translating English into Samoan for them.

The students in these classes also commented on a range of other modes of translation including all students translating technology and web based texts, some translating SMS mobile phone language, some nominating translating computer games language, and others, translating Aboriginal English.

Q: How many of you study another language inside or outside of school? When do you study these languages? What are those languages? How many of you can read/write in those languages?
All students noted that they study Aboriginal English in school. Six students said they learn to read another language and four students that they learn to write another language. Students mentioned learning Arabic at Saturday school and Turkish in after school classes.

Q: Does speaking a language other than English have any benefit or advantage in helping you learn and study English in school? Does it have any disadvantage?
Nine students identified benefits of speaking a language other than English including: “Gives you extra words”, “Helps other people understand, helps you understand” and “Enables you to communicate for yourself and others.” On the other hand, at this early stage of the project,
24 children identified disadvantages of speaking another language including: “Getting words mixed up”, “Not everyone knows the non-English language”, “Not everyone understands”, “It’s confusing”, and “Sometimes you use bad words at school and get into trouble”.

Q: Can you tell what you do with language/s every day outside of school?
Students identified a wide range of everyday language practices outside of school including the following:

- Telling friends who are speaking non-English to speak English so everyone understands
- Talking to people and friends who can speak the non-English language
- Using the Aboriginal English taught in school to talk with Aboriginal friends outside school
- Talking with a Chinese friend on the internet and learning Chinese words with him
- Using background language when on holidays in non-English country
- Watching father use translation function on computer
- Reading books and comics, signs
- Playing computer games, writing emails
- Reading about science
- Recording oneself
- Texting
- Listening to music, songs
- Watching movies
- Using football language
- Reading and writing sub-titles of films

Q: What opportunities do you have in school to talk about what you do with language/s every day outside of school?
Students at this school identified a substantial amount of instances of talking about everyday language practices in school:

- Students learn Aboriginal English at school and this is where they get opportunities to talk about language and use Aboriginal English in the playground with friends
- When in ESL classes
- Reading and writing, using XO’s
Code switching – garden language, sporting language, kitchen language, school language
Talking about the use of computer language
Recounting making a film in Maori with family outside school, using English sub-titles
When fighting, using their non-English language to abuse others who do not understand it

Q: Do you think you should be able to talk about what you do with language every day in school? (Reading, writing, talking and listening, viewing.) If so, why and when? If not, why not?
Five students responded positively to this question with the following statements:
we are learning about each other, where we come from, our feelings. Some people might want to visit where we come from
we have to change if we need to understand English, e.g. on TV
everyone should have a chance to learn a different language

Four students responded negatively, stating that it is:
confusing
I get left out
we should talk English more

Twenty-eight students could not answer this question.

Q: Think again about the reading, writing, listening and viewing you do every day outside of school. Are there connections/matches/relationships/similarities between what you do with language every day in your classroom and during your English classes/English work time?

Students in these classes at Erewhon Public School were more likely to see connections between home and school than the students at Eamou Public School, possibly because of the age difference, or their greater exposure to questions of language. They cited the following connections:
Translation. e.g. English songs for Maori speaking parents
Remembers Aboriginal words and uses them beyond school
“Teachers want to know about Samoa and I speak Samoan”
“I can speak with friends outside of school because of learning Aboriginal English in school”
Reading books at home and in school
With home work
Art and drawing

Summary
The number of students speaking languages other than English as part of their everyday language practices, and the nature of those languages reflects the ‘super diversity’ apparent in global migration patterns. While the most common languages were Pacific Island languages, there was a smattering of other diverse language groups from the Middle East, Europe and Asia. Notably 14 children nominated that they did not speak English when they started school and 18 children said that they speak a language other than English with family and friends. Children in this school also had a relatively sophisticated understanding of dialects and changing registers and codes through their Aboriginal English classes although this tended to remain separate from their in-class learning.

The results of the focus groups were presented in visual form by the researchers to the students in each of the participating classes. The students were highly engaged in this presentation, especially because of the fact that they were part of a university study. This made them feel special and important in the focus on the knowledges and practices of their everyday lives. These presentations were a precursor to the activity of undertaking the language mapping process in which each student made a visual representation on A3 paper using the range of drawing materials provided by the project.

Language maps

Teacher map analysis Class 3A
We've got three groups in my language maps:- one had the student as the focus, one had lots of people, so representing all the people in their families or friends or places they go, and one with no people.
Maps with lots of people
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Figure 1: Maps with lots of people

The typical map I have chosen for this category has lots of people representing families and friends, and the text says “this is my language map fun land”. It looks like a carnival or some sort of fun place that he's been to. There's a Ferris wheel to the side and inside it says, “I speak sarcastically to my friends”. In the middle there's maybe a circus tent or something with people entering. It says, “I speak differently to my baby sister” and on the other side it looks like a rocket or some sort of, I'm not quite sure [and says] “I speak English, I can speak 2 languages, but I only speak it”. I'm not quite sure what it says, with a second language which is South American. So I actually spoke to this student and he only knows a couple of words and he wasn’t even sure which country in South America. But he was very proud to be able to speak that language, and he also identified another person in the class room that could speak Spanish, so they were really happy to speak to each other, even if it was just a few words.

The teacher’s comments on this map revealed that for this teacher the process of choosing and analysing the maps was part of her pedagogical activities with these students as individuals and with the class as a whole. She said that this student is new to her class and that the map gave her a lot of information about him that she could not otherwise have access to. She thought he had chosen a fun place where he had been recently with his family, that he
was very proud of the few Spanish words he knew from his mother’s origin in South America and that he differentiated these from his knowledge of English. She noted that the child had left his previous school because he was not happy there and was initially reluctant to produce a language map. He got very involved once he began, however, and the teacher believed that this was the basis of establishing a relationship with this child.

Student as the focus
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**Figure 2: Student as the focus**

I think in this language map, it's from just an English speaker and she was really struggling to think about how she used language. So we discussed places, so I think she's drawn 2 lots of houses and she's identified that in those places she might speak differently, so she's got Campbelltown so I think maybe mum or someone lives in Campbelltown, Newcastle where Nan lives, and in Sydney. So I'm assuming that would be where she is at school, she's learning Aboriginal English at school. And she said it's a little bit easy and kind of hard to speak Australian, she does have kind of, I wouldn’t say she's delayed in any way she just, her structure of how she speaks is off, and so that’s interesting that she's recognised that it's hard for her. Because she's never verbalised that she kind of just says, you know she's quite confident to speak but it's interesting that she said that it's hard for her. And down the bottom it says, sometimes hard but I get it. So you know that might be helping her with her confidence that she
realised that sometimes she might say things that are not correct, but she gets it, she can still understand people, she can still understand what she needs to do at school, understanding instructions and she can also communicate with other people. So yeah I think it's very interesting and I'm assuming this person over to the right is maybe her, and it just says Newcastle English, maybe even Nan’s English I'm not sure.

In the conversation that followed we asked the teacher why this child had drawn two houses and she explained that it was likely to represent the fact that she lives with her father and her mother lives in another suburb about an hour away. She is an only child and is very close to her father, her mother has mental health issues and she is happy with her father. The teacher says that she is a very confident child because of her sporting prowess where she can compete strongly with all of the boys, but she is not strong academically. The teacher was interested in the fact that she had recognised and expressed all of this in her map, ‘like she's thought about how difficult or how easy something is rather than particularly how she uses language. So it's a different perspective I think’. For the teacher this map again represents a threshold into the world of the child that is not otherwise articulated in the classroom. It provides insight into how her family situation (two houses) is negotiated, and how this is reflected in her particular abilities in sport which is set against her lack of confidence in expressing herself in forms of language like reading and writing.

Maps with no people
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Figure 3: Maps with no people
So this one is from the group that didn’t have any people or any pictures of people in their language maps. This one is quite simple and the student that has written this, this would probably be some of the best work that they've ever done when it comes to writing. He's more likely to just sit and not do anything, but he was really happy to ask for help and he wanted to express himself in this. So he's got English in the centre and then spokes coming off. So he has mentioned that he speaks English to his cousins. He's got his cousins’ names and he speaks English at home which is interesting because he is actually Cook Island. He speaks it at school and English to his mum and brothers, and then over to the side it says, “dad can I please go fishing”. Which is something that I said to him, when would you use the language, and so that’s something that he's recognised that he's using English to ask that question. So yeah I think it shows that he's more connected to his family than at school. But he just hasn’t drawn the pictures, he’s just yeah written their names. I think probably because he doesn’t really use language at school, he's very quiet, he's got expressive and receptive delays, so yeah he doesn’t get much out of school unless you're really pulling it from him.

In keeping with the relational reading that this teacher offers, she explains that she chose this map as typical of this category because ‘it gives you an insight to how he might feel at school, and he's not really comfortable compared to at home’. She notes in her analysis that he itemises six places where he uses language outside of school and school is singular for his language use. She believes that he refers to formal language use only and that he is not comfortable in school. His whole language map is also seen as ‘muted’ compared to the others. The Class 3R teacher adds some further insights into this discussion because his brother is in her class. She notes that ‘he's one of the ones where I don't think the [native] language is taught to the kids, they just want them to be speaking English, maybe with the delays that they’ve all got, mum just wants them to be focussed on English’. She suggests that their current language delays are because they exist in their first language as well. She noted that the brother said ‘mum speaks it to me I don’t know what she's saying’. Both children have expressive and receptive language disorder neither can understand their native language nor instructions in English.
Summary
In all three choices of maps that are typical of their category, this teacher has chosen to analyse in detail those which will extend her knowledge of the children and in particular how language functions for them in their in-school and out of school language practices. The visual and spatial representation of the maps allows the children to communicate in non-verbal means giving this teacher access to valued pedagogical information.

Teacher map analysis: Class 3R

We’ve sorted the class into two distinct groups, one set of maps has very clear connections between the students’ language uses and their different languages and the other group has very separate sections for their different places or languages that they use.

Maps showing connections
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Figure 4: Map Showing Connections

This map is a butterfly and the butterfly has all the different aspects of language she’s put on it – stating the meaning of the butterfly or connected to the body which is her language map. So on one section she’s got that she speaks Turkish in her room, so I
think that’s interesting because it’s quite limited use but she’s very proud of that language. She very much identifies with the fact that she does speak Turkish. Then she has English on another section and she says that she speaks English at the shops and with friends and she particularly states that she has school English, which I think is an interesting sort of sub group in that area. She sees that perhaps as slightly different again than the language that she uses with friends in other places. And then she’s got more areas where she uses her language differently say in her car, at church, at the park, all grouped together in one section and then in the next section she has in the city, in my yard and at the bank. It shows the different places where she uses her language but it is all very much drawn together on this big background of a butterfly sitting on a big flower. And then it’s got these other flowers around it that are also yellow and the fact that she chose that with that pink texta.

In a different approach the 3R teacher chooses this map because it is typical of the category she has created of connections. Everything in this map is integrated into the whole using the schema of a butterfly on a flower to integrate all of the diverse aspects of her language practice. The teacher sees the bright colours and unique schema as illustrative of her confident outgoing personality which means that this child is well able to reflect on and articulate the range of her language practices and present them in a connected way. She is proud of speaking Turkish even though she only knows a few words because the Turkish language is tied to her identity. The teacher notes that this child recognises the different use of English in the classroom compared to her English use with her friends or at the shops. The bright colours are seen as reflecting this child’s ‘bright loud personality’, happy when she has someone listening to her or looking at her work. In this sense the mapping activity is an ideal pedagogical tool for her, reflected in her depiction of a connected world.

Maps showing separations
So the map that we’re looking at as our sample here is one where the student speaks Cook Island and English and he has drawn a character in the centre of his map in which he’s written both of his languages and then he has some distinct lines of connection out on each side but they both refer to his use of Cook Island. One side shows where he uses his language, so that he speaks Cook Island at home and at school and sometimes with his Poppa and then on the other side he says he loves speaking Cook Island with his mum and his cousins and family. So again there are
another two more separate little … he’s drawn, one saying that sometimes he speaks Cook Island at school and on the other side that he speaks Cook Island with a particular student in our class. I think it’s interesting that he hasn’t really talked a lot about how he uses English, he’s very focussed on his use of Cook Island as his first language and he’s used the sort of Pacific Island motif across the bottom that looks to me, identifying sort of his culture.
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**Figure 5: Map showing separations**

Again the teacher chooses this map as representative of the category of maps that showed separations in their everyday language experiences. She noted that the student focussed almost solely on his use of the Cook Island language at home and with his friends at school. The teacher adds that he is a very quiet student with a significant visual impairment. He gets support from a vision support teacher but he hates to be different so the school has to be very subtle about the way that they make adjustments so as not to draw attention to him. On the other hand he is very proud of his Cook Island identity. The map is artistic and symmetrical, a visual characteristic of most Pacific Island children’s work but in discussion it was noted that although the central figure is a person, it is very patterned and possibly disturbing because it is so dismembered. The complexity of identity is possibly evident in this student’s map.
In this map the different languages are sort of separated but they’re joined within the one section of the picture. I think that maybe that actually does reflect the way that she sees her languages that they are quite separate, that it’s all part of her. She speaks – her family are from Afghanistan so that is her first language. She speaks – she’s really quite good with most of her English at school and then she’s also apparently learning Chinese and Japanese, so she’s definitely multi-lingual. I think it’s really interesting how underneath where she’s written the languages she has another section where she says her first language is Afghanistan and she feels good about it. Her second language is English and she feels good about it and then she’s written third language Chinese, Japanese feel bad which probably reflects how she’s judges her level of competency because she likes to be good at things and I’d say if she feels that it’s difficult and she’s not so good at it then she wouldn’t be very happy with that. She does have a lot pressure to be good at everything and she works hard to learn those languages, they do a lot of reading and writing in her first language at home to make sure that she is quite proficient in both languages and then those other additional languages she’s learning as well. Her family also came to Australia because her mum was a journalist in Afghanistan and the children were being threatened so wanted a safe place for them to be able to be educated. She has two daughters and their education is really important to her.
This teacher identified three maps that were described as ‘outliers’ because they could not easily fit into any category. This particular map is conceptualised as a landscape so it presents as very holistic overall even though the languages are separate. The landscape is vivid green and raining, possibly in contrast to her native Turkey. The teacher felt that the vivid map matched the child’s very bright and vivid personality.

Outlier 2
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Figure 7: Outlier 2: a lonely and sad alien

I was really interested in this one knowing the student is actually very quiet and likes to do his own thing with his school work, but sometimes he’s quite disengaged, not just with work but also with people generally. So he’s drawn a big picture of the world for his language map and he has written that he speaks English on one side of the world and the other side of the world he’s written his Mum speaks Cook Island and that sometimes “I don’t know what she’s saying”. So he did tell me that he can’t speak Cook Island and he doesn’t feel that he is competent in that language, although I think other people identify that he is of that culture and language. It’s also very interesting that he has drawn up to the side of the world, he’s sort of drawn some black and some stars like the space and then he’s drawn another – I don’t know if it’s another planet or the moon with an Australian flag on it. Some craters and then on the moon he says there’s a lonely and sad alien who’s smelly and stuck. And there’s also monsters - I think it says hungry. And there’s also another spaceships with some
aliens and some astronauts with their little astronaut suits and the cords coming out from the space station. So it’s very interesting.

In our discussion it was noted that this map is quite extraordinary in its depiction of a globe of the world with the centre with a map of outer space and aliens on the left hand side and words about his alienation from his mother(s) language on the right hand side. The teacher believed that the map was about himself and that it allows him to explore ideas that are simply not accessible to him in language. The teacher reads from this map that the child is disconnected from his inner world. He identifies that he speaks English, but he is disconnected from his Cook Island heritage and his Mother. The teacher goes on to describe the student’s relationship to language work in class and it is clear that this extraordinary visual representation offers a different insight into this child’s difficulties. He has severe expressive receptive language disorder and is a brother to the previous similarly diagnosed child.

Summary
The Class 3R teacher divides the children’s maps into two major categories which are characteristic of the divisions that have been formulated in other projects and by other researchers. The idea of Connections and Separations relates to the extent that some children are able to navigate the multiple places and worlds of their everyday language practice seamlessly and for others there are marked disconnections that are represented spatially in their maps. The most usual of these separations is between the more formal language practices of school classrooms and the informal sites of family and community. They can also be associated with their relationship to the English language and their home language practices as the organising principle.

This teacher has also categorised two maps as outliers, maps that defy categorisation into the two groups she has chosen. Interestingly these two outliers are maps made by students at two extremes of a learning continuum, one a very bright student and the other a student with extreme expressive receptive language disorder. In both cases the students migrated from other countries during their schooling – in one case the home language of Afghani is highly valued and the other the native language of Cook Island is completely discounted possibly leading to the child’s expressive and receptive language disorder. This teacher, in common with the 3A teacher, finds the maps of great pedagogical interest in extending her
understanding of the children’s relationship to language and therefore of great relevance to her ongoing teaching of language skills.

**Children’s map analysis**

The following interviews were conducted during a language mapping session in which I as researcher visited the classes. The teacher and I introduced a process in which the children were each paired with another child to review their language maps and to depict what was similar and different about their language maps in the visual form of a Venn diagram. While the class was engaged in this activity I recorded the following four brief analysis interviews with individual children about their language maps. These very short interviews revealed the richness of the spatio-visual form of language mapping as a threshold to the multimodal engagements of children everyday language practices.

**Azra**

Azra’s unique engagement with her everyday world is made apparent in her map analysis interview. A refugee from Afghanistan she continues to have a love of her native language, but also of English as her second language. She expresses her emotional attachment to the languages themselves as if they are active in shaping her life and her intellect. Chinese and Japanese are also strongly included because of her relationship with the child from whom she learned these languages. Her first word is described as important because that word is Aunty, a word that again evokes a relationship as if the word itself is active in creating this relationship. Her love for her country is lyrically evoked in her descriptions of the flowers in the rainforest, the smell of the rose and the apple blossoms. Finally Azra’s extraordinary aesthetic is apparent in her relationship with the letters that she describes as visual imaginaries in and of themselves. The Y for example is drawn ‘like a Terradactyl from the past’ because ‘I like history’ and she made ‘the M like a little bumpy part on its head, on the top because it's like going to sleep’. Azra’s native language has a written script that is completely different from English and her fascination with the aesthetic is part of this relationship to the way that language makes marks on the page that evoke different forms of imagination. This very short interview is a window onto Azra’s rich multimodal language world where language in all its forms, visual, emotional, emplaced and aesthetic shapes her relationship with her changing worlds.
Jayden
Jayden’s map is unusual in its vibrant geometric blocks of colour that fill all the space on the A3 page. The conversation reveals that this is not only aesthetic but relational as we learn that the colours stand for his relations with his family members, mother, father and brother and in turn their connection to the colours of their favourite football teams. The swimming pool is the only place that features in his language map because he goes there with his cousins and they speak Aboriginal English. The swimming pool is the site of a vivid story about his very embodied experiences there – being hot and cold and getting a feed. He tells us he is ‘three countries’ in terms of his language identities, naming his mother as English, his father as Aboriginal and a third country which is not named, ‘he didn’t tell me yet’. Again his very active and passionate relationship with the tools of his language engagement is evoked in the story of smashing his ipad because it was downloading too slow but the extended conversation about what he does with his ipad opens another whole world of culture and music. All of the bands that he describes listening to on his ipad are African-American rap bands with highly political agendas of black activism. This is the musical world of his family, a very active and social multimodal language practice that is emphasised again when he talks about hiring his family a juke box at the end of his story. Like Azra’s analysis of her map, Jayden’s map functions as a threshold to the rich multimodal world of everyday language practices.

Luapo
The beginning of the conversation with Luapo is marked by loss, the death of his mother, aunties and uncles. It is not appropriate in the context of this brief classroom interview to discuss this further so we turn to the most significant feature of his language map, an elaborate drawing of a playstation. The playstation is again an opening to another world of games and imagination and Luapo names four games, his favourite being the Assassin. He is most explicit and forthcoming in talking about this game which develops a sense of common identify, ‘a club’ distinguished by wearing particular clothes and in which they ‘fight and solve mysteries’. This interview again emphasises the multimodal nature of everyday language practice and the children’s engagement through digital media with other worlds of imagination through which they enact their cultural lives. The digital as media is not the point in any of these interviews because, like Luapo, it is what they access rather than the medium itself that tells us about their language worlds.
Manual
This relatively long interview with Manual about his language map tells of his navigation between two very different worlds, the world of El Salvador from which he and his family have recently migrated and the world of Erehwon where they live their new life. He describes the very unusual main feature of his map, the open mouth of his dentist, a child’s view shaped by his experience of a mouth, no doubt his own as well as that of the dentist. He indicates this is an imaginary mouth because he is half vampire with blood drops from his teeth. He is ‘half vampire’: ‘a lizard tongue’ and ‘vampire teeth’. While Manual tells us that he will draw the head if he gets another paper, his A3 sheet is completely filled with the image of a mouth, the very body parts that shape our oral language. The reason for this powerful and in some ways violent image is left unexplained as Manual moves between the world of his family in Erehwon where he assists his mother and father to learn English and their regular return to El Salvador for Christmas where lollies are cheap and you can ‘get a whole bag for 95 cents’. The places and people of his everyday life are vividly evoked from his first exposure to English in the ‘wizards’ to his current relations with friend, neighbours and his dog. The map analysis interview with Manual suggests that language for him is complex, at times painful, and serves to mediate the different worlds and countries where he and his family have lived their lives.

Summary
The short analysis interviews with the children about their language maps offered entirely different and unexpected insights into their language maps compared with the teacher and researcher analysis. For the children, talking about their maps opens up sometimes extraordinary and sometimes strange worlds of multimodal language practice where the body, and their senses come to the fore as they are shaped by the many relations, media and modes of their language engagement.

Unit of work and work samples
The participating teachers from Grade 3 at Erehwon Public School chose a unit of work from the HSIE syllabus called Significant Environments linked with their English curriculum (see Appendix III). Significant environments is about the geography of the places and the way people interact with these environments and covers two themes: Patterns of place and location, which describes places in the local area and other parts of Australia and explains
their significance; and, Relationships with places, which describes people’s interactions with environments and identifies responsible ways of interacting with environments.

- geographical terminology, e.g. north/south/east/west, Equator, Tropic of Cancer, Tropic of Capricorn, North/South Pole
- significant natural, heritage and built features in the local area, New South Wales and Australia, and their uses
- the location of major cities, rivers and mountains in New South Wales and the capital cities in Australia
- local and other Australian communities
- environmental changes
- groups associated with places and features, including Aboriginal people
- management and care of features, sites, places and environments.

The unit of work involved the study of several texts including *Belonging* and *Window* by Jeannie Baker, *The fat and juicy place* by Diana Kidd, *My place* by Nadia Wheatley, and many digital texts and activities from The World Facebook to Google Maps, Picture Australia and local environmental activist sites such as Keeping Australia Beautiful, Tidy Towns, Coastcare, Landcare, Bushcare and Rivercare.

The following is taken from the transcript of the teachers’ discussion about how they chose and adapted the unit of work to link into the mapping project.

**Class 3A Teacher discussion**

We developed our unit together so for the two classes we did the same sort of thing and we linked together our HSIE with our English. So the topic that we did for HSIE was about significant environments and it started off looking at places in Australia but we extended that to actually have the kids supported with their own culture and identity because from the language maps and the discussion in the focus groups we found that some kids were a little bit confused about their backgrounds and the languages that they spoke and what all of that meant. So we felt that it was probably worthwhile to actually explore with the kids more about their identity and their background.
We also linked that in with our English when we actually looked at characterisation in the books that we did. We looked at characters and about people and describing people and got them to think about themselves as well. And then the work that the students did from that we talked about some significant environments in Australia as per the examples and linked it to Aboriginal culture for the places that we did and then the students had the task of researching and writing an information report about a significant place to them and they had a choice about what that was and it was quite interesting to see the difference between some of the students [who] were really keen to choose a place from their own cultural background and some of the others had no interest in doing that at all. Some of them chose some random location that they thought was interesting. Some of them researched places in Australia that we had talked about that they found really interesting and they explored those things more.

**Work sample analysis**

The first work sample chosen for analysis was a piece of written text by Luapo. The teacher read the work sample and then commented on what this meant in terms of the project and its outputs.

**Work sample 1**

“Samoa is a kind of place where people go and spend their vacation, kind of a small island and S… is a large beach. It's on the side of Samoa and it's where people go and have fun. They can enjoy the beach and warm sand. Samoa is a special place because it's my favourite island in the world, I like swimming there, you can do anything you want like games or picnics”.

The reason that I have chosen this piece is because it demonstrates a huge improvement in this student’s writing skills. He’s been a bit of a reluctant writer and somebody who would write maybe a couple of sentences but with poor grammar and sentence structure. So this is obvious, this has been edited but as you can tell there's still some errors in it because it truly is his own work. And he did put a lot of effort into writing that and he, you know with a bit of feedback would go back and try and organise his information a little bit better.
The teacher went on to comment during the discussion on how the piece was expanded and the extent of editing that was carried out by the student, something that he had previously not done at all. She identified that this was ‘because it was something that meant something to him’. For this teacher it was a matter of talking with the students individually about their writing rather than just telling them what the correct version should be. Many students did not have a sense of what a sentence is so she would ask such questions as: ‘Is that a sentence, is that correct?’ ‘Does that make sense’ or ‘Does it follow’. She used an overall planning outline and referred the students back to the questions: ‘Which question have you answered here, well maybe this information needs to go together in this’, as a way to talk to the students about how to organise their writing.

In terms of curriculum outcomes the teacher commented that he’s been able to produce a text that is an information report, which is what we were aiming for. It's certain, he’s made progress in the outcomes but he probably still would be. He’s not using paragraphs yet - so there's still some skills that he needs to work on to sort of be at stage level - but he’s certainly achieved a lot more outcomes through this process than he had before he started it.

In relation to the process of mapping everyday language activities the teacher reiterated that while the students were initially very keen to talk about their everyday language practices, they were also not sure, particularly some of the students with an Islander background. They were not too sure about which languages they spoke or how they used their language. The combination of the HSIE and English curriculum approaches extended their knowledge about their origins and their native languages, simultaneously producing high levels of motivation and engagement for writing that was normally absent for these children.

Work sample 2
When asked to choose a sample of student work where a major change could be seen the 3A teacher chose a sample from ‘a boy who was brought into my class from another classroom’.

“The Great Barrier Reef is one of Australia’s most remarkable, natural gifts. The Great Barrier Reef is blessed with the breathtaking beauty. The Great Barrier Reef is the world’s largest coral reef. The Great Barrier Reef is located on the North East of
Queensland. The reason it's important is because of all the creatures and all the coral. The reason it is interesting is because of all the coral and fish, they are so recognisable because of their colours.

When he came to me I opened up his book and he had nothing in it from a term, and I spoke to his teacher and he just would refuse to do work, and this is the work I got from him after a day. So just as something different, I don’t really think he was, I mean he didn’t do the language maps and he doesn’t know much about the project, and he came in as we were doing this so I don’t think he was as connected to his location that he’s chosen, but just having the choice I think was something that he enjoyed. He doesn’t like being told what to do but when I showed this to his other teacher she was like, she nearly had to pick her jaw up from the floor! It was just a huge change from him. And I don’t know really where that came from, if it was the choice or maybe changing classroom.

The teacher went on to relate the improvement in this student’s work to the quality of the whole class and their engagement because of the project, ‘I think it was just because everyone was so interested in what they were doing; he wanted to be a part of it’. In addition to this, she explained that ‘he’s come from a class where people were just shunning him, like they had; they didn’t want anything to do with him. He’s just a little bit different and they are not accepting at all of him’. When he came into her class she felt that the nature of the work the students had done in the mapping of everyday language practices meant that the class as a whole had learned to accept difference, ‘He’s come in and I think he just feels comfortable, and now he’s excited to do something that the other kids are doing and they're interested to share and listen to what he had to say’. For this student the change in his writing outcomes was part of a whole cultural change not only from his previous class but the change that had occurred in this new class that meant that the children were more accepting of difference. They were not only more accepting but actually interested in what this student had to say.

Class 3R Teacher discussion

The 3R teacher followed the same process and read out the student work then commented on why it was chosen and what it illustrates in relation to curriculum outcomes and the mapping project.
Work sample 1

“Uluru is a big red sandstone rock; it is located at Darwin in the middle of the central Australian desert. Uluru is important to the aborigines because they love the rock; it is a big hard rock to the people because they have had the rock for 600 million years”.

The teacher commented that she chose this example because it was such a huge improvement from what this student had done previously. She said that this student had always wanted to write but his goal was to get to the end of the page and the whole page would be filled with letters and no words at all. In this piece she explained that he is using sentences with capital letters and full stops. She saw this as a massive change from where she started with this student. The teacher explained that this student ‘is Indigenous and he has a huge connection to it, he’s very proud of it so writing this and having the connection with Uluru and the Aboriginal people, he couldn’t get enough of it, he wanted to continue. He came back to school this term and said ‘Can we keep doing that’. She observed that he was very motivated to learn, that he wanted to show his mother and father and everyone in the school what he had achieved. Previously he would fill the page with meaningless letters then just refuse to do anything more.

For this teacher it was a very significant breakthrough for a student diagnosed as ADHD with significant family issues who was normally a highly disruptive influence in the class even when accompanied by his Integration Aide. The student himself recognised his successful learning outcomes that extend to other areas as well, ‘so now he recognises he can do it and it's going throughout everything, not just this project, he’ll now, like reading he’ll have a better go at, he’s gone from a level 6 to a level 12’. These changes happened during the one term in which the class covered this unit of work, ‘a really short [time], like a term, he’s just like, his light is on, he wants to learn now’. The change in his relationship to school and to learning is evident in contrast to the previous year when ‘he was being suspended, he wasn’t coming to school, he’s there every day ready to go, it's crazy the difference. And people are noticing’.

Work sample 3

When asked to choose a sample of student work that illustrated a major change the 3R teacher chose another work sample from a reluctant writer who showed great improvement. ‘Different, maybe Manual, so okay maybe Manual’s - Manual by Manual. So he did want to
do something about somewhere in New Zealand but he didn’t really have a concept of places there. He’s got a strong sense of that identity and he does have some words in Maori, I'm not sure how well he speaks it, but he certainly does strongly identify with that culture. So we looked at places in New Zealand and it appealed to both of us that he could do Manual by Manual’.

I suppose the reason that I think it's a little bit different is that he’s a potentially capable student who doesn’t generally produce what you expect he could produce. He does have some significant problems with comprehension, particularly with reading comprehension and his writing is generally really, really poor. He’s reluctant to write and anything that he produces rarely matches what I would expect he should be capable of, given some of his other skills. So what he’s done here is, I mean this is, would be the best piece of writing that he’s done this year. But it was a real struggle for him. And I had to really prompt him through every step of thinking about “Well what can you do in that place?” “I don’t know”. “Well how could we find that out?” And really, really step him through all of that stuff. So he’s really pleased with what he did in the end and as you can tell, as you can see on there I actually sent him down to the Assistant Principal to show off his work to try and really build some confidence with writing.

We do a lot of explicit teaching and we try to talk to the kids about, in English “Well we need to use this kind of language” or “How has the author used language” and this sort of stuff. And I think that having them talk about their own language helped them to, like I think before that was really abstract for them. And I think that as the year’s gone on and we’ve kept doing it, and then they’ve done this process where they’ve talked about their own language and language use, it's almost like now they’ve gone “Oh that’s what you're talking about”.

Summary

For the Grade 3 teachers the work samples showed that the students now recognise the connection between their experience of the world, what they want to write, and how to write. They gave the example of students understanding the difference between the sorts of words that you use to describe the setting and how you would use the language to create a feeling. They understand much better how language works because of their meta understanding of
language, a language that has become their own. They have a better understanding of what the teachers mean when they ask ‘How are we using language?’ or ‘How is the author using language and what does that mean?’ The students had never thought about this before and the process has been a pedagogical one that has taken place over time and a series of activities and applied lessons. At the beginning of the process language was very literal, they understood the concept of language as meaning only the ethnic language that you speak. Now they understand language in a whole different way. This has led to a change in what they expect from themselves and how they work on their writing until they achieve that goal. Extending this work the teachers developed activities for the students to observe their oral language practice and understand its relationship to standard English. For the teachers to have a way to work with the children on the delicate balance between supporting their spoken language, but changing their written language, has been a crucial breakthrough. The language maps have served to bridge these worlds for these teachers and the children in their classes.

Evaluation

For the teachers from Erehwon School the language mapping project had many benefits and positive outcomes both in terms of their own development and that of the children.

It's just such a luxury to have time to sit back and actually think about these things. And when you came and did the groups to have the luxury to actually sit back and listen to the children speaking without having in our mind think, what we're assessing or what we're trying to teach then at that time. But just to do that observation and to get information from the kids and get to know them better and then the time to actually sit down and look at these [work samples] and say, well what does that mean and what does that tell you about this child, it's really interesting. It's something we don’t usually do, like we’re not usually looking at their language but in that one aspect of understanding how language can be used in different ways they do well because look at this, that would be one of the few things that a lot of the children are actually achieving at their expected level because we've done this.

There were many other aspects of the language mapping project that the teachers discussed in their consideration of the meaning and impact of the children’s participation in the language mapping project. An extended conversation began with how much the children loved the box
of assorted coloured pencils, textas, crayons and lead pencils that the project provided to these resource poor schools. The treasure chest of drawing materials operated as a material sign in the classroom of their connection to the university and a different world of experience and aspiration.

When considering the question of whether the language mapping project made any difference to the children in their classes the Grade 3/4 teachers responded that

they're just more accepting of each other now, in my class. They just, they recognise that they're all different but they're still the same. We've done activities like that and there's been no change. Like I've done social skills and all those types of things, and for a day they’ll be great and then the next day it's gone. Whereas I think learning that it is okay to be different from the language maps and that they’ve all got something to give.

The teachers agreed that

there's a lot of our children that they aren’t pen to paper children in any case, they're very visual and this is giving them that opportunity to be able to put pen to paper even though, and they don’t like to write big sentences because of that, they like to say what they need to say. This was a breakthrough for these kids.

The teachers believed that because they have seen such great improvement in the students’ writing that the impact of their participation in the project would be carried over into their next writing tasks. They considered that the students now understood both quality not just quantity in their writing outputs and understand the process of writing.

Starting this term we’re doing like settings of a story and looking at the sort of vocabulary that you might use to describe a setting. And we looked at it in our text and then we together built an example of, just like two or three sentences and I said to them “That’s all I want you to do, I don’t want a whole story, I just want 2 or 3 sentences but I want them to be really good”.

They described the language maps as ‘opening the door for what we were going to talk about’.
Conclusion

The case study has followed the process of Erehwon Public School’s engagement in a project designed for the purpose of ‘Building on children’s linguistic repertoires to enrich English learning’. The project followed four main stages, focus groups with the children, mapping of children’s everyday language practices, designing units of work and collecting student work samples in response to those unit of work.

The focus groups identified the numbers of children speaking different languages and dialects of standard English and the many other language activities that children engage in within their everyday language practices. While the most common languages were Pacific Island languages, there was a smattering of other diverse language groups from the Middle East, Europe and Asia. Notably 14 children nominated that they did not speak English when they started school and 18 children said that they speak a language other than English with family and friends. Children in this school had a relatively sophisticated understanding of dialect and the nature of changing registers and codes through their Aboriginal English classes, although this tended to remain separate to their in class learning.

The teachers grouped the maps into categories determined by their reading of the visual and spatial organisation of the maps. Once they had grouped the maps into categories they selected individual maps as typical of their groups. The 3A teacher chose maps for detailed analysis that revealed the pedagogical potential of the categories, those children whose maps revealed new and relevant information about their learning worlds. For this teacher the visual and spatial representation of the maps allowed the children to communicate in non-verbal means giving her access to valued pedagogical information from a process which is pedagogical in and of itself.

The Class 3R teacher divided the children’s maps into two major categories of Connection and Separation which are characteristic of the divisions that have been formulated in other projects and by other researchers. These two major categories led to a further two maps being characterised as ‘Outliers’, maps that cannot be categorised into these groups. This teacher, in common with the 3A teacher, found the maps of great pedagogical interest in extending her understanding of the children’s relationship to language and therefore of great relevance to her ongoing teaching of language skills.
The short analysis interviews with the children about their language maps offered entirely different and unexpected insights into their language maps compared with the teacher and researcher analysis. For the children talking about their maps opened up sometimes extraordinary and sometimes strange worlds of multimodal language practice where the body, and their senses come to the fore as they are shaped by the many relations, media and modes of their language engagement.

For both of the Grade 3 teachers the work samples showed that the students now recognised the connection between their experience of the world, what they want to write, and how to write. They gave the example of students understanding the difference between the sorts of words that you use to describe the setting and how you would use the language to create a feeling. They understand much better how language works because of their meta understanding of language, a language that has become their own.

They have a better understanding of what the teachers mean when they ask ‘How are we using language?’ or ‘How is the author using language and what does that mean?’ The students had never considered language in this way before pedagogical process has been evident over time and the series of activities and lessons. At the beginning of the process the student understanding of the concept of language was very literal, they understood language as meaning only spoken ethnic language. Their new understanding of language has led to a change in what they expect from themselves and how they work on their writing until they achieve that goal.
CASE STUDY: EAMOU PUBLIC SCHOOL

Margaret Somerville

Introduction

Eamou Public School is located on Darug lands in outer western Sydney, approximately 52 kilometres west of Sydney CBD. It caters for K-6 children and has an enrolment of 274 students - 43% from a Language Background Other than English (mainly Pacific Island backgrounds) and 19% Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander (ATSI) background. The School receives Resource Allocation Model (RAM) funding and National Partnerships Low SES funding (NP). These funds have been used by the school to offer a number of innovative arts-based programs to support Pacific Islander and Aboriginal children and literacy and numeracy programs for all children with specific learning needs.

A Grade 2 and a Grade 4 class participated in the language mapping project with the Grade 2 class complemented by the activities of a second Grade 2 class in a team teaching arrangement. The teachers of the Grade 2 and Grade 4 classes participated in the three full day collaborative research activities at different stages of the project. The children took part in focus groups, language mapping, and specifically designed units of work that produced samples of student work for analysis. The following discussion and analysis of data generated in this project follows the processes and outcomes of these research activities.

Focus groups

Q: How many of you did not speak English when you came to school? What languages did you speak?

The purpose of the focus groups was to raise students’ awareness of the range of different language practices they used in their everyday lives and to elicit conversations about this in the classroom. Students participated vigorously in these discussions and were highly engaged in these and the subsequent language mapping activities. They talked about the different ethnic languages and dialects they used in their everyday lives and the different places of these language practices such as at home, at the shops and in restaurants. They also discussed the range of different language practices within the English language which required them to
switch register on a frequent basis such as computer specific language, SMS text language and specialised sporting language.

A total of 37 students participated in the focus group interviews and their responses are summarised below:

Q: How many of you speak languages others than English? What languages?

Twelve children speak Samoan, four children speak Tongan, two children speak Hawaiian and one child each reported that they speak Aboriginal English, Chinese, Fijian, Maltese, Alibi, Portuguese and Sign language. Two students reported that they speak Pig Latin dialect, some students identified sporting languages. Some of the younger children had difficulty articulating their language use in response to the question.

Three children identified that they spoke Samoan only when they started school.

Q: How many of you most often speak a language other than English at home with friends and family?

Four children said they speak Samoan at home and with friends and family.

Q: How many of you translate for family and friends? What do you translate and for whom?

Seven students said they translate from Samoan to English, and one each from Fijian and Tongan to English.

Q: How many of you study another language inside or outside of school? When do you study these languages? What are those languages? How many of you can read/write in those languages?

- Read: 2, Write: 4
- 1 Portuguese and 1 Tongan from family
- 1 Tongan from the “Bible Book”
- 2 Hawaiian from family
- 1 Maltese from Dad
- 2 learn Samoan in church
- 2 learn Chinese from a book
- 1 learns Korean from YouTube
- 1 studies sign language
- 1 tries to make up his own language for himself and his siblings
Q: Does speaking a language other than English have any benefit or advantage in helping you learn and study English in school? Does it have any disadvantage?
Many of the younger students had difficulty answering this question but in the overall focus groups tow students felt it was not hard to speak languages other than English, and three students identified disadvantages including ‘not everyone understands’ and ‘it’s confusing’.

Q: Can you tell what you do with language/s every day outside of school?
- Talking to people and friends who can speak the non-English language
- ‘I know how to say I hate you’ in Korean
- Teaching each other to speak non-English language

Q: What opportunities do you have IN SCHOOL to talk about what you do with language/s every day outside of school?
- Reading and writing, using XO’s to translate
- Can talk with teachers and friends about language
- Reading books from library and talking about them

Q: Do you think you should be able to talk about what you do with language every day in school? (Reading, writing, talking and listening, viewing.) If so, why and when? If not, why not?
Four children said Yes, and that it was important for people to know their language. Twelve children said No and identified the following reasons:
- ‘I just talk to my Samoan friends’
- ‘They might be saying something mean and other people can’t understand them’
- ‘They might keep saying it and then you would get annoyed’
- Non-inclusive
Many of the younger students could not answer this question.

Q: Think again about the reading, writing, listening and viewing you do every day outside of school. Are there connections/matches/relationships/similarities between what you do with language every day in your classroom and during your English classes/English work time?
All of the students in the Eamou focus groups responded that there was no connection between their everyday out of school language practices and their English classes.

Summary
The students in Grade 2 in this study (aged around seven years), were interviewed individually by the teacher because of their lack of maturity in relation to their ability to
participate in focus groups and respond to the questions. Fifteen of Grade 2 students were interviewed individually and 22 Grade 3/4 in focus groups. The results were collated and presented to the students as a whole.

In common with the other participating classes, the students at this school spoke a number of different ethnic languages and dialects. They also demonstrated other associated metalinguage skills such as translation, code switching and multimodal literacies in their everyday language practices. In both grades the students were highly engaged in the topic and generated rich conversations about how they use language in their everyday lives. Bringing these conversations into the classroom was the beginning of awareness of the potential for everyday language practices in their in-school learning and in particular their learning of English.

The results of the focus groups were presented in visual form to the students in each of the participating classes and the students were equally engaged in this presentation, even more so in the fact that they were part of a university study. This made them feel special and important in the focus on the knowledges and practices of their everyday lives. It was evident that their everyday language and cultural practices did not normally enter the classroom, even in the context of a school with many different cultural programs.

**Language maps**

The following is a summary of the teacher analysis that resulted from this process.

**Teacher map analysis: Class 2**

My class is a Year 2 class of 15 students with a large percentage of Pacific Islander students and one student from Ghana who speaks Twi. It's a very small class, there's only 15 students in the class, so I think that's limited the amount of maps that are in each bundle. I’ve grouped my class in the vast majority of students who have their language or culture in the centre and all the different places that they use that emanating from around it or the people with whom they use their language. I have two outliers.
The overwhelming majority of students have a typical map with their language or their culture in the centre with arrows coming out from that, that depict where or with whom they speak different languages. The one that I'm looking at in particular has a very colourful centre with the child's culture in the middle and in lead pencil around the outside she's drawn all the people whom she interacts with. There are also some pictures of those people they're, they're all very cheerful, it's very heavily centred on that she speaks Samoan in most places. She's drawn a happy face and a sad face at the top, this particular student talks a lot about being homesick and how she misses Samoa. So I think that might be representative of her mixed feelings about where she is. She has, where she's written that she speaks Samoa with her family that there are 8 people drawn and she's actually drawn the number, the numerals for 1 to 8.
Outlier 1: Child in the centre

Figure 9: Child in the centre: outlier

The second map that I've chosen is different from the typical because it has the child in the centre, this particular child suffers with autism and he's drawn a cloud around himself with arrows with a lot of different countries on those arrows. He has Australia, Samoa, Tonga, he also has the people that he interacts with, his parents, his cousins, friends, family, sport, it's different from the other bundle because he sees himself as the centre rather than the culture as the centre. He has some pictures on the outside which are a little hard to distinguish, they are actually meant to be people, he's just drawn them as a head with legs and one of them is himself, the other are some of his friends from school and he's grouped them by their cultures. So he has one cloud with his friends who are Australian, one cloud with his friends who are Pacific Islander and another cloud with himself on it. And across the top he's drawn flags from all the countries where he has interactions with people from that country.
Outlier 2: No people in map

Figure 10: No people in map: outlier

The final map is a student with very low literacy levels and significant learning difficulties. His map is the outlier because he doesn't have any people at all on his map, he doesn't have anything that would indicate a particular place. At the centre of his map is a depiction of the world with some continents floating there and then jutting out from, from the world in a very distorted perspective is very large overbearing looking buildings with closed doors and there are no windows, there's no writing at all on this picture, there are no depictions of any people on this picture. It's a very isolated and dominant looking drawing that only primarily uses red and blue with a tiny bit of green. I think possibly depicts his feeling of isolation and some of the difficulties that he’s having with communication because of the learning difficulties that he has. His depiction of the world isn't round, it's more of a triangular shape, there's some large red spots on the continent, I'm not entirely sure what those are meant to depict. I think possibly depicts his feeling of isolation and some of the difficulties that he’s having with communication because of the learning difficulties that he has.
Outlier 3: Family and language compartmentalised

This one is a female student with Aboriginal background who has herself and her family compartmentalised on one side showing the different ethnic and language backgrounds that they have and on the other side of her map the places where she uses language. This student doesn't herself identify as having Aboriginal background but has siblings that identify as Torres Strait Islander, and a father with Aboriginal background. I'm not certain however, if that's her biological father or just the father figure in the household. Her map is different because rather than having something at the centre, she's drawn it in a linear way with herself at the top and other things underneath it. It's very colourful and the people look very cheerful and she's drawn lines that connect the different people and flags that depict where they're from. To the right is a cloud that has all the places that she uses language: she has a computer; she's written that she was born in Australia; she speaks English; her language interactions with her father involve Aboriginal English; a remote control to depict the television; and a book.

For the Grade 2 teacher the large majority of the maps have a common spatial arrangement with the language in the centre and spokes leading out to all of the places and people where
and with whom language is spoken. While these maps are characterised by language as social and interactive they also include images of computers as the site where forms of written language occur as well as multimodal and digital literacies. It seems that this teacher knows the children in her class well and reads their maps in terms of what she knows about them. It is likely that the outliers in this group confirm her knowledge of these children and may contribute to her insights into the pedagogical work that follows.

**Teacher map analysis Class 4N**

I’m about to speak about my Year 4 class of 25 students with a large population of Samoan background. I have bundled my maps into three separate groupings with one outlier; the first lot were bundled purely based on all having flags depicted in their language maps. The second bundle was based on having their language or their first language in the centre and all the things that are connected to that. The third bundle there was only two and they had a heart around their first language and the outlier was picked purely because his – he’s an English speaking student with an Aboriginal background but his language that he had in the centre was Pig Latin.

Category 1: Maps that feature flags as language identity markers

![Figure 12: Category 1: Maps that feature flags as language identity markers](image)
An example of this category is a map that shows a patterned red cloud shape in the middle with Samoa on it but all around this could shape are flags and similar symbols of national identity. The whole page is richly filled with colour and pattern, especially the signature Samoan patterns which are even labelled as such. The flags include all of the flags of the Pacific Island nations with the addition of the Aboriginal flag, an appropriate addition to the Indigenous peoples of the Pacific. Apart from these symbols of national identity other forms of language identified in this map include English, music, computer language, and sport language. Places are also named including home, school and church, and countries including New Zealand and Australia.

The overall impression of this map is a rather fragmented multidimensional understanding of a richly coloured world of pattern and identity in which home and school are diametrically opposed on diagonally opposite corners of the A3 page. There is no possibility of connection within the space of this map.

Category 2: Language in centre, spokes outwards to people and places

![Figure 13: Language in the centre, spokes outwards to people and places](image)

This map is structured spatially around a central rectangular box labelled English/Samoan with arrows of connection to many small vignettes of the places and nature of this child’s everyday language practices. The fact that English and Samoa are written as a single word with a slash suggests that there is little separation in this child’s bilingual ethnic language use.
The many intricate drawings are labelled and further reveal aspects of this child’s integrated experience of a world in which ‘Language is fun’. Church, sport, school, computers/technology, friends and home are all depicted as sites of animated language practice. Tiny examples are given of baby talk (googoo gaagaa) and computer/technology language (oxox, lol, asap, @) and tiny people are drawn in a world that is imagined in all its colour and animation. It is truly a representation of multiple language practices in an integrated world.

![Heart shape centred around first language](image)

Figure 14: Heart shape centred around first language

This map is one of the two maps that feature a heart shape in the centre drawn around their first language. The heart shape that structures the centre of this map is highly coloured and patterned in the style of Samoan work. It not only includes the name ‘Samoa’ but also English and NPS (the initials of the school) as well as the bright patterns. Around the heart shape are the names of family members, Dad, Mum, three siblings and ‘ME’ and underneath the heart shape the words Samoa Home Land with another heart shape coloured in bands of red, yellow and green. Along the bottom of the map a row of grass springs forth bright red flowers and butterfly symbols dot the background. Home and school are positioned at the top of each side of the page with home interestingly connected by a short red line to the heart shape. Nothing is connected to School which sits out in the corner alone.
A reading of this map suggests that this is a happy child for whom language is about relationships with family, friends and her native land. School is not yet connected to this happy relational world.

![Image of a map with the words 'Pig Latin' in the center, connected by large arrows to different domains of language practice.](image)

Figure 15: Pig Latin: outlier

This map was identified by the teacher as an Outlier because it is drawn by an Aboriginal students and features the words ‘Pig Latin’ in the centre. The circle surrounding the words Pig Latin is connected by five large arrows to different domains of language practice. At the top centre is talking with different talking to friends: next I talk different at home to my mum and dad; third, I speak Pig Latin to my football mates; and the fourth appears to be a drawing of himself on the football field and the fifth again about playing football with five small figures labelled by name. Clearly for this child football is the dominant language in his everyday world. He conjures up Pig Latin as a form of private code language that defies all of the conventional understandings of language diversity. The map is strong and confident with heavy black and blue colours. The figures are similarly dark texta outlines but they all have smiley faces. The only two places depicted in the map are a drawing of ‘home’ next to the statement about ‘talking different to mum and dad’ and the drawing of the green football field. School does not figure at all in this child’s language map.

This teacher’s reading of the maps reveals a process orientation where the reading forms part of her ongoing pedagogical work with the children and her growing engagement with their ethnic identities in particular. As an Aboriginal teacher she is interested in the way that the
Aboriginal student’s map which she has selected as an outlier focuses on ‘Pig Latin’ as the named language in the centre of the map.

**Children’s map analysis**

The following interviews were conducted during a language mapping session in which I as researcher visited the Grade 2 classes. The teacher and I introduced a process in which the children were each paired with another child to review their language maps and to depict what was similar and different about their language maps in the visual form of a Venn diagram. While the class was engaged in this activity I recorded the following four brief analysis interviews with individual children about their language maps. These very short interviews revealed the richness of the spatio-visual form of language mapping as a threshold to the multimodal engagements of children’s everyday language practices.

**Brett**

In this interview/map analysis Brett moves between the multiple languages and knowledges of sport, music, finance, and his iTunes digital literacy in a way that mirrors the seamless navigation of his everyday life. He is good at football and his mother gives him money for each try he scores. With this money he buys iTunes card to download his favourite music. The band that he mentions, Justice Crew, is described as an ‘all male Australian’ pop music band formed in 2009 and pictured in 2012 as a group of seven who are as multicultural in ethnic origin as the children in Brett’s school with three anglo and four non-anglo members. One of the characteristics of this interview, as with the others, is its brevity and intensity, fitting a very large amount of information by moving between the map and the stories that it opens up about his everyday language practices.

**Tamati**

Tamati is a reluctant interviewee chosen by the teacher, not sure why. He is shy rather than resistant but the interesting thing about this interview is that he also spontaneously mentions downloading music on his ipad using iTunes and Sound Cloud. He is very particular about the process of downloading the music, ‘You go onto search and you spell the song you like and then you press the one that you like’ and the music he cites is a hymn, ‘Let us be’, also very particular to his ethnic background and the cultural practices of his Samoan community.

**Malikah**
Malikah begins this interview/map analysis by talking about the time difference between Ghana and Australia, something that she understands and negotiates through her access to Ghanaian television on the internet. She accesses Ghanaian music, films, television and photos on both a computer and an ipad, but this is equally mixed up with her daily life of birthday celebrations, losing teeth and accessing popular culture in the form of Shopkins, a world and language of its own. Woven amongst these multimodal language practices is her learning of Ghanaian as an ethnic language and part of her cultural heritage.

Leilani
Leilani was born in Samoa and Samoan is her native language. Like the other Samoan child who was interviewed about their language map, Leilani is reserved about her language practices but through the process of this project has been able to use her native language in other areas such as mathematics. Her teacher reporting that she now figures out her maths in Samoan and then translates it into English. Her language map shows a drawing of a Samoan house and enables Leilani to recall the sensory experience of walking on rocks without shoes and the protection of the matting floors in a Samoan house. She has also drawn beautiful images of girls in elaborate miniature dresses, the Samoan dresses that they wear to church, the main location of their collective Samoan cultural practices. Like all of the other children, Leilani deploys a range of digital media to take photos, play music and games.

Summary
The short analysis interviews with the children about their language maps offered entirely different and unexpected results compared with the teacher and researcher analysis. Each of the symbols on the maps functioned as a threshold to a world of language and cultural activities that the children could enter and expand upon. The visual mode of the language maps enabled the children to express something that may not have been previously aware of nor present in their school learning. The maps provided a bridge between their everyday language worlds and the ways that they operated within the school. Some of the children, particularly those with Samoan ethnic backgrounds, could better express themselves in visual modes than the verbal ones offered in the interviews but the bridge to in school learning remained important as in the case of Leilani who began to do her maths in Samoan and then translate into Maths/English languages. The most unexpected aspect of the children’s map analysis was the fact that every child from this Grade 2 class who was interviewed mentioned their use of digital media as part of their everyday language practices. The digital media itself
was not the important aspect of their use however, but the cultural and linguistic meanings of the activities they accessed.

**Unit of work and work samples from Class 2S**

Class 2S adapted a Unit of work from the English syllabus called The Journey (see VIII). The key concepts identified in this unit included Creativity and Culture. Creativity was defined as ‘The dynamic process of using language to conceptualise, interpret and synthesise ideas in order to develop a 'product'. Culture was identified as ‘The social practices and ways of thinking of a particular or heritage group, including shared beliefs, values, knowledge, customs, lifestyle and artefacts’. In this unit of work the concept of Journeys is explored through a range of spoken, print and digital texts about family, cultural history and cultural tales. These included oral history, picture books, visual texts, and songs and presentations by guest speakers about particular journeys. Students can begin to express their point of view about different aspects of the topic such as interesting methods of travel and unusual or memorable experiences. The mentor text *My Mob Going To The Beach*, portrays an idyllic view of childhood when a simple trip to the beach can offer high adventure.

The unit of work names three key print texts, *My Mob Going To The Beach* by Sylvia Emerton (Indigenous Australian); *My Place* by Nadia Wheatley and Donna Rawlins. (Various); and *Lizzie Nonsense* by Jan Ormerod (European Australian). Three digital texts are included: *O Le Talo Sione* by Lino Nelisi (Pacific Island); *Handa’s Surprise* and *Handa’s Hen* by Eileen Browne (African).

The ways that the unit of work was adapted to relate to the language mapping project expanding the children’s print and multimodal literacies is evident in the many work samples the teacher presented for analysis. (Work samples 1-5 can be found in Appendix V.)

**Work sample 1: Pacific Island mask**

The children in Class 2S made Pacific Island Tiki Masks and discussed Pacific Island symbolism, the imagery that is seen frequently in the culture of the children in this class. They looked at pictures of carved totems and some of the Pacific Island children offered language words associated with these totems and symbols. The teacher said the children were very patient in the making of the masks and all of the class were highly engaged in the activity.
Work sample 2: Student painting based on Aboriginal artist work
Bronwyn Bancroft is a contemporary Aboriginal artist from Gumbaynggirr country and the children discussed the imagery of water in this painting and the connectedness in the pattern and about different things being connected with each other. All of the students than made a copy of Bronwyn Bancroft’s water painting in order to further explore Aboriginal visual symbols.

Work sample 3: Persuasive text
This example of persuasive writing was accomplished by Shaun who has Tongan background. He speaks in English beautifully with one of the best vocabularies in the class but it doesn't always carry over to his writing. The teacher was pleased with that sample because he'd written quite a large volume of work and, and it all made sense. For the teacher the important development was that the students had the confidence that what they put down will be accepted. They had frequent discussions in class about the differences between Samoan grammar, for example, with the children telling her they are ‘Samoa’ not ‘Samoan’. So instead of stopping something coming out because it might be in Samoan or it might not be right, they became more relaxed about putting down their thoughts and then editing the writing later, leading to more output. She believed the mapping project was a starting point for this development in their writing because they learned a lot about different language practices and how they related to their writing of English.

Work sample 4: Recount of excursion
As part of their unit of work on The Journey, the students went on an excursion to a historic village at Rouse Hill where they journeyed back in time to spend a day in school in 1889. They had to march and they'd talked to them about marching and then we all stood around the flag which was outside and said, ‘God Save the Queen’ and then they went inside the classroom and the teacher called out, because they were all given a fake name was indicative of that period, some names and there was, none of the students there. He said, “Oh that's very fortunate for you guys because they were going to get the cane,” and showed them the cane and it was a really good day.

They did a lot of language work on the board when they returned to school in preparation for their writing. This child writes expressively and perceptively, figuring out in their child’s mind, for example, why the children in 1889 might have sung God Save the Queen (because
she did not feel safe). The teacher chose this example because she considered his Samoan culture so far removed from a monarchy and figured in his churchgoing culture that they needed to pray for the Queen to keep her safe.

Work sample 5: Mathematics language
The students explored the language of maths using the model of the Venn diagrams that they had been introduced to in the language project. The concept of probability was a difficult one for the children to understand and they used the Venn diagram to represent diagrammatically whether something was impossible, possible or probable. It took the students 2 weeks to be able to understand the concept.

Summary
The teacher also presented a whole class example of the speeches they wrote for the whole school public speaking competition. They were given free range of topic and almost all of the children wrote about where they are from. This further emphasised for the teacher how important who they are and where they come from is important in their learning. She said she would definitely do the project again and will continue to look for cultural connections in the work that she plans for them. She would really like to do a unit of work on family because the western concept of family, the Indigenous and the Pacific Islander concept of family are quite different and it would be good to do a unit of work around that.

Class 4N: Unit of work
In common with all of the teachers in the study, the Class 4N teacher adapted a Unit of work that was already in existence. The Unit of work is called Exploring Visual Literacy through Culture (see Appendix IV) and was written to interrelate with an integrated unit about cultures and their beliefs. While this unit explored different cultures and experiences, the primary focus was literacy, particularly visual literacy, comprehension and writing. Included in the rationale for the unit is the idea that new technologies are largely accountable for the fact that young children are increasingly encountering multimodal forms of texts, or texts that are made up of more than one symbol and sign system (Kress, 2003). Visual literacy is understood as the ability to decode, interpret, create, question, challenge and evaluate texts that communicate with visual images as well as, or rather than, words. Visual literacy is also understood as including the ability to construct and create visual texts for a range of purposes and audiences. The visual literacy and cultural focus of this unit of work was well suited to
connect with the children’s mapping of their everyday language practices. The unit was operationalized through the exploration of four key texts: Ziba Came On A Boat by Liz Lofthouse, Whoever You Are by Mem Fox, Mirror by Jeannie Baker and The Little Refugee by Anh Do and Suzanne Do and was conducted through Term 3.

Class 4N work sample analysis
The teacher produced eight work samples for our analysis including four examples of student writing and 4 examples of student art work in keeping with the visual literacy focus of the unit. In the following sections four of these eight work samples are presented and discussed, two examples of the writing and two examples of the visual literacy art work.

Work sample 1: Published diary
Two of the writing examples were of hand written diary entries and two were of published work, all four completed in response to the children’s reading of the text Ziba came on a boat. Ziba is the story of a young girl who had to leave a war torn country with her family on a fishing boat to start a new life in another country. She was sad to leave her country and thought often about her father who would stay behind, but in the end her mother was feeling hopeful because they were going to the new country.

Work sample 1 was chosen because the teacher considered it well written with rich complex language, good paragraph structure and punctuation and a complex narrative. The narrative fits well with the story of Ziba leaving her home country but translates it into the student’s own life experience, including her difficulties with her ‘mother tongue’ and of living within a Jehovah Witness culture. This student has presented a child’s response to her situation to complement the adult imagined child story of Ziba.

Work sample 2: Draft story
In this work sample which is written in draft form written as a personal diary entry, the student has translated the literal story of Ziba into a first person narrative. The exercise involves an in-depth comprehension of the story and then the ability for the student to imagine themselves into the story and construct a first person narrative. The first person narrative encompasses all of the detail of the story, organised into three different paragraphs according to the structure of the original story. This begins with the sadness of leaving one’s
country of birth, turns to remembering all of the good things that made home in this place while on the journey, and finally the anticipation of life in a new country.

Work sample 3: Japanese fans
The students produced Japanese fans and paper dragons as part of the visual literacy unit that linked the HSIE and literacy curriculum. As well as making artworks, these learning activities involved a group learning pedagogy in which each student produced an individual art work as a collective activity, assisting each other to achieve the learning outcomes. The students used the letters in their name to create their Japanese name. The teacher reported that the students loved learning about their Japanese name and getting the teacher to pronounce their name in Japanese which would’ve been fun because Nicole wouldn’t have been able to do it.

This example demonstrates the multimodal nature of this learning activity involving design, construction, use of colour and form and writing symbols. The fan is also an interesting plurilingual example of the joining of two different cultural traditions combining the traditional symbolism of Pacific Island cultures in the patterning on the left, the use of the symbolic Japanese cherry blossom in the centre, and the Japanese symbol of the land of the rising sun on the right.

Work sample 4: Chinese paper dragons
While studying China as part of the integrated literacy and HSIE unit, students created an artwork on the Chinese Dragon. They used a painting technique and strips of paper and string to create their dragon. The artworks were labelled with the student’s name written in Chinese. The students took care in creating this art work after learning about Chinese culture. They enjoyed looking at the Chinese characters in their name and learning about the Chinese language and how it differs from English. Learning about the processes of representation in another culture was important in developing respect for cultural difference more broadly.

Work sample 5: Samoan singing
The teacher also shared an audio file of Samoan children who offered to share their Samoan singing. They sang ‘Happy birthday’ in English and Samoan and two hymns in Samoan, highlighting the significance of church as the children had already portrayed in their language mapping. The teacher’s assessment of this response was that the children had previously felt too shy and reserved to use their language in the context of the classroom and the work in
language mapping had bridged the gap between their out of school and in school language practices. This was important in their sense of themselves and learners, in reinforcing their multiple language skills and in their understanding and acceptance of cultural difference.

Summary
The Class 4N teacher noted the high levels of engagement and the multimodal competencies developed in the students during this integrated unit of work that involved the English and HSIE curriculum. The activities included hands on making, writing, language in multiple language scripts and multiple media, developing head, hand and eye co-ordination. The collaboration through team work was also noted as a significant pedagogy through which students learned to work collectively across the multiple language and cultural differences in the class.

EVALUATION
The Class 2S teacher summarised the value of the mapping activity as knowing exactly what all their backgrounds of the students were because she had children in her class who she assumed were from an English speaking background who were not. When writing her unit of work she could include very specific details of an African student’s cultural and linguistic identity. From the mapping activity she could then find things from exactly where they were from and that significantly increased their engagement. Most of them had reported to me the teacher originally that their parents had said that when they’re at school they need to speak English and she believed that they had felt that they would get in trouble if they spoke their native language in the classroom. Opening that up through the focus groups and language mapping gave them permission to speak whatever they needed to speak and she believed that hugely beneficial for their learning.

I have a year 2 class and we did a unit of work with the theme journey. I was a little stressed out putting it together because I felt like I was trying to please a lot of different people. I had things I wanted to incorporate from there. There were things from my supervisor said that I needed to incorporate. We were also doing some speaking and listening of work at our school and so the person who’s running that had certain requirements so it took me a little while to get my head around how I was going to bring it all together. So we had a mentor text which was *My Mob Going to the Beach* because we do have quite a significant indigenous population at our school
that’s why I chose an indigenous text. We did quite a lot of background work on that text. We also had to incorporate our HISE topic into that so that was How we used to live. We talked a lot about indigenous culture and the cultures that they come from and we had a lot of discussion comparing how some cultures have changed significantly in the last 100-200 years whereas some – the Samoan children particularly – the way their parents live in Samoa has not changed drastically over a long period of time. The thing that I noticed mostly is that I grossly underestimated how involved the students would be. We looked at texts that were in Samoan and in Aboriginal English. We looked at some Tongan things and a story from Portugal because I have a Portuguese background student and also an African story because I have an African student in my class. I very much underestimated how much their engagement would increase when they felt like I had taken note of their background and where they come from and made an effort to include everybody. They were very interested in each other’s things and I’ve noticed outside of this literacy unit that they’re speaking to each other – consulting with each other in their own language to increase their understanding but they’re speaking to me always in English.

The very first time that I spoke about this there were quite a few heads down and Malikah in particular – she is the only student in my class who is African. I can tell that she feels different because she’s the only African child where I have lots of Samoans and several Aboriginal students and so they all sort of identify with each other. I think she feels a little out on her own but she brought in food from Ghana and we looked at a book from Africa and it was very self esteem building for her and the children said to me one day that in the playground she had been telling them words in her language and they had been telling her the Samoan words for the same thing. So what we started in the literacy unit overflowed into the playground and into our other KLAs using their other languages in maths which they weren’t doing in maths before, and very very much more engaged than they were before we looked at this.

For most of my children I feel that English is their more proficient language and Samoan – except for Leilani they are all born here. They speak Samoan well but not as well as English but Leilani was born in Samoa and has spent more time in school in Samoa than Australia. I observe her quite regularly now when we do maths sitting and working out in Samoan and then either writing or answering me orally in English and
it’s improved her ability and speed at working things out in maths drastically and her English is coming along as well and if she doesn’t understand something she will consult in Samoan with the other children and they are quiet about it but it’s been very helpful for her.

The teacher believed that improved learning happens when the children speak about their identities, it gives them self-esteem and confidence which in turn gives them the power to empower themselves to go for things in life. ‘Set your goals little and go for it.’ The children have a limited vocabulary and the focus has been on just trying to expand their English vocabulary but if it was done in the abstract they would not have responded nearly as well because it they do not own it. The key it is the engagement, having the students engaged and on task and the learning happens because they are so engaged and so interested.

M: ‘I’m covering for Nicole today because Nicole has sorry business to attend so bear with me. I have worked with Nicole’s class too – they’re our bush tucker mob. They’re doing exploring visual literacy so I am winging okay guys – be patient please. Visual literacy through culture so she’s got four books and I would say they are taking their visual literacy from these books.

Overview for Nicole – Nicole’s year 4 class completed a unit with explored visual literacy through culture. The unit focussed on the text *Zeeba Came On A Boat* by Liz Lofthouse, *Whoever You Are* by Mem Fox, *Mirror* by Genie Baker and the *Little Refugee* by Ahn and Susanne Do.

The unit looked at different cultures, experiences and refugees. The year 4s human society and it’s also environment unit also linked in with culture and experiences. The unit focussed on countries in Asia which included China, Japan, Thailand and North and South Korea. Students learnt about similarities and differences of Asian and Australian cultures by comparing customs, practices, food, lifestyle, landscape, politics, celebrations and beliefs, creating and performing arts explored Asian inspired art works to also link in with the HSIE and English units. Students created art works and a Chinese dragon; Japanese fans; cherry blossom trees; paper cranes and lanterns. Students were also encouraged to share their customs and experiences specific to their culture throughout these units. Students should share a story, dances, beliefs and languages with the class. For example, Venn diagrams in pairs – students created
Venn diagrams on their language maps to discuss and record the differences and similarities between them. This activity gave students the opportunity to get to know a student in their class that may not regularly interact with outside the classroom. Students shared their culture, customs, language and beliefs with other and discussed the differences and similarities between them. The activity gave students the opportunity to share the things they love and are proud of in a creative way.

When students were stuck with ideas I would assist them with suggestions for them to include – one particular student from a Samoan background said she wasn’t allowed to draw her flag. We both found this one weird okay. Because she is not allowed her national flag. Well to me, I don’t know about you guys but I find that extremely odd but there is a [story?] to that too.
CASE STUDY: URBAN PUBLIC SCHOOL

Jacqueline D’warte

INTRODUCTION

This large primary school is located in Sydney’s south western suburbs. The city was listed as the most diverse Local Government Area in NSW in 2011, with 54.2% of the residents from language backgrounds other than English. The school serves a diverse community, evident in the cultural backgrounds of students who attend the school. More than 600 students are enrolled and 99% of the students are from language backgrounds other than English. Over 35 different languages are spoken. The largest cultural groups are from Turkey, Afghanistan, Lebanon, Iraq, Somalia, the Pacific Islands and China. A significant number of families have refugee status resulting in many students in their past not receiving formal schooling for extended periods. The school has played a significant role in the community for more than 125 years. The school promotes cultural similarities and differences in a nurturing environment and has extensive community language programs, with classes in Turkish, Arabic, Chinese and Farsi that are closely aligned to classroom programs. Bilingual support aides are also employed in most classrooms.

In this school, the project involved 39 students and three teachers in two reception classes. Teachers comprised an EAL/D mentor support teacher and two reception class teachers. Classes comprised students in Stage 1 at grades 1-2 and Stage 2-3 at grades 3 through 6. Reception classes are created to offer a consistent approach to the transitioning of students from new arrival classes to mainstream. Students in these classes were new arrivals to Australia and classified as English as an Additional Language/Dialect Learners. These students required targeted and systematic learning support. The Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA, 2014) has developed an EAL/D learning progression from Foundation to Year 10. This includes broad descriptions of the characteristics of learner groups at each of four phases of English language learning. EAL/D students of any age may be in any of the language learning phases from Beginning English through to Consolidating English (ACARA, 2013, p. 2). Students across these two classes
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were identified most often as in the Beginning or Emergent phase of English, while one or more students were in the Developing phase. Students were assessed and transitioned into mainstream classes twice a year. Students were most often exited and transitioned into mainstream classes at the Consolidating English phase. What follows is a discussion and analysis of data generated in this project at this school, and the subsequent processes and outcomes of these research activities.

In the first meeting, a researcher and teachers explained the project to students; this preliminary introduction generated much excitement. Students were very interested in talking about the researcher’s work of teaching teachers, and many questions ensued. Students in the Stage 2 and 3 classes were keen to know if the people learning to be teachers sat on the floor in classrooms as they did in their own. One student, who had some experience of university, explained the configuration of a lecture theatre which had all students baffled yet intrigued. Students were excited to know that their work would be shared with other schools and people learning to be teachers and they were equally excited to be involved with the university. Researcher and teachers told students that they would be doing classroom work that involved them in talking about language and the ways they used language/s everyday inside and outside of school, and as a first step they would be asked to talk about the ways they used language in small groups.

FOCUS GROUPS

The purpose of focus groups was to raise students’ and teachers’ awareness of students’ language practices. Focusing on the ways these young people used language everyday to read, write, talk, listen and view in different places with different people provided a foundation for further classroom discussion that enabled an explicit focus on language at the context, text and word level.

Following the initial classroom visits, discussions with teachers and school executive resulted in a request to further involve Community Language Teachers in this project; to engage them in reinforcing the work done in this project within their language classes. The involvement of community language teachers and parent volunteers was brokered by teachers and the school researcher. Field notes from the first meeting revealed participants sharing their knowledge and expertise about the wider community’s linguistic and cultural practices. These
participants were excited to see how students’ practices and experiences would be acknowledged and facilitated for learning, most particularly they were interested in the possibility of this project elucidating the relationship between first language and English language learning. In community language classes, teachers and students worked through a variety of K-6 curriculum content using their first language. It is important to acknowledge that in this school, participating students were mostly newly arrived students who were beginning English language learners; it was decided that where possible focus groups would be conducted in students’ first language with community language teachers and parent volunteers. In this way, students would call on their full linguistic repertoire and the language they were most fluent in to share their experiences, this also enabled the linguistic capacity of the school community to be recognized and the knowledge and expertise of the language teachers and parent volunteers to acknowledged.

Focus groups were conducted by six Community Language Teachers and two parent volunteers in first language with groups of between 4-7 students. This data were audio taped and then transcribed into English for project analysis. The project funded one day’s release for all participants to undertake this translation work. The project funded one day’s release for all participants to undertake this translation work. Participants were given the focus group questions (see below), which were modified with input from participants (to ensure clarity and age and language appropriateness). Interview data were audio recorded in nine focus groups in Arabic, Dari, English, Mandarin, Turkish, Urdu and English. Students actively participated, talking about the languages they spoke and those they were learning, either formally or informally. They also shared the multimodal language and literacy practices they engaged in (i.e., how and when, and with whom, and in what languages they were reading, writing, talking, listening, and viewing). They reflected on language learning and talked about the relationship between language use at home and school and the possible language connections between these two spaces. The following summarises student responses.

Q: How many of you speak languages other than English? What languages? Nineteen languages and dialects were spoken by the 39 students.

Q: How many of you did not speak English when you came to school? What languages did you speak? Thirteen students said they did not speak English on entering school, some remained silent.
Teachers revealed that 30 students did not speak English when they came to school and spoke one of the five languages used during the interview.

Q: How many of you most often speak a language other than English at home with friends and family?

Twenty-seven students responded ‘Yes’ to this question

Q: How many of you translate for family and friends? What do you translate and for whom?

Thirty-three students translate languages for family and friends; grandparents; teachers. They translate at home, for mum in class, in the playground and other social situations. One student translates English from the computer to parents in Urdu.

- Arabic: 18
- Chinese: 4
- Farsi: 3
- Hazaragi: 1
- Turkish/Turkmen: 4
- Urdu: 6

Q: How many of you study another language inside or outside of school? When do you study these languages? What are those languages? How many of you can read/write in those languages?

Students, 37 out of 39, said they are studying another language inside or outside of school. All students learn informally from family and friends.

Arabic:

- Many, 18/22, study Arabic in community languages at school, three remained silent
- Six can read and write in Arabic, 10 are learning to read and write
- Three learnt Arabic overseas
- Six attend Arabic Saturday school
Chinese:
- Five out of five Chinese students are learning Chinese at school
- Chinese student is getting bi-lingual tutoring outside school
- Two Chinese students can write Chinese; three can read Chinese

Farsi:
- Five out of five study Farsi in school
- Two out of five read and write Farsi

Turkish:
- Two out of two study Turkish in school; one studies Turkmen

Urdu:
- Six out of seven study Urdu at school
- Students who speak Urdu are learning Arabic from religious tutors - for reading the Quran
- One out of seven can read and write Urdu

Q: Does speaking a language other than English have any benefit or advantage in helping you learn and study English in school? Does it have any disadvantages?
Don’t know: 2 students, No: 1 student, Silent: 7 students

- Yes, benefits: 12
- Fourteen Arabic students agreed different languages help win class and in the playground
- The Arabic language helps us to express our feelings and needs with our parents
- Helps translation; at the market, swimming pool, anywhere
- Helps reading, communicating
- Helps with numbers
- Helps improve vocabulary and alphabets
- Translating from Farsi into English – using books helps
- The dictionary on the computer helps
- Watching English movies with Farsi sub-titles help
- When students don’t understand English, parents explain in Urdu
- One student said Chinese helps English and maths
Q: Can you tell what you do with language/s every day outside of school?

- Talking about language use with friends and teachers at school, family at home, grandparents
- Using different languages in the classroom, community gatherings, in the playground, with visitors
- Playing computer games, using computers
- At tutoring
- Watching TV and movies in English and non-English and using sub-titles
- Shopping
- Writing letters
- Going to the park and speaking with friends

Q: What opportunities do you have IN SCHOOL to talk about what you do with language/s every day outside of school?

- Use of English for English questions, Arabic for Arabic questions
- Use of different languages at school in the classroom and playground to talk about what students do
- All five Chinese students speak English at school and use English to talk about what they do with language
- The four Farsi speaking students have opportunities in Farsi Community language classes to talk about what they do with language
- The two Turkish speakers speak non-English with family, friends and teachers
- The seven Urdu speakers use English and Urdu at religious celebrations and at school

Q: Do you think you should be able to talk about what you do with language every day in school?

Eleven students responded ‘Yes’ to this question

- It helps to talk and write about language
- It is important to learn language
- Twenty-eight students could not answer this question
Q: Think again about the reading, writing, listening and viewing you do every day outside of school. Are there connections/matches/relationships/similarities between what you do with language every day in your classroom and during your English classes/English work time? Also numeracy and other curriculum lessons?

- I speak Arabic about myself, English about friends. Some time I mix up languages
- Some time I have to use formal Arabic with parents, slang Arabic and English with friends
- Five Arabic students said there are connections with films, on the computer and in community language classes
- One Chinese student said he wants to speak English more, that it is important to do this
- One Farsi speaker says reading a book at home in English helps with learning at school
- One Farsi student agreed there are connections but cannot explain them
- With some things there are similarities between home and school, with other things, no connections
- Yes – links with drama and films; use of the same words in different places
- One student said he saw no connections
- Most students did not understand this question or were silent

Summary

The purpose of focus groups was to reveal practices and generate rich discussion about the relationship between everyday language practices and experiences and school learning, particularly English learning. All focus group data were collated and presented to students in small groups. Classroom observations, field notes and accompanying audio data revealed that students were excited to participate and were keen to talk about themselves and their language use.

Data revealed that students regularly engaged in translation and language brokering practices both inside and outside of school. Learners were language brokering and translating for family and others in a range of places with a variety of multimodal texts. These students
translated most often for their mothers, this finding concurs with much of the work on young people as translators and/or language brokers, highlighting how mothers often rely on their children to do the work of translating for the family. These data also reveal that students were most often translating in their own classrooms, this finding is a feature of the transition classrooms, where students are encouraged to support each other in making meaning, as they developed their English competencies and completed their across curriculum work in English. In these classrooms the animated sharing of translation / language brokering practices generated much discussion. One student shared her experiences shopping with her Mother and Grandmother and several students shared their experiences of translating over the phone. A long discussion ensued with the three to six students who shared their experiences of translating calls from phone companies, several students commented on the difficulty of these conversations, describing them as; ‘confusing’ and ‘hard to understand’: They want to tell you about new phones and how to pay less, it’s hard to understand and hard to tell my Mum’. Teachers extended this engagement by having students continue to talk with a partner about their translation experiences. These discussions revealed regular use of online environments for communicating with family members in home countries around the world. Additionally, these young people watched movies and television serials in home languages, often recommended by family and people in other places.

The focus group data from this school revealed wide ranging language skills sets, and offered evidence that these young people were regularly afforded opportunities to listen to and use their home languages for authentic communicative purposes in their everyday worlds however, these practices were rarely shared or used in service of developing curriculum or learning sequences in these classrooms.

LANGUAGE MAPS
In both classes mapping took place at the conclusion of the class discussions described above. Students were tasked with: ‘Thinking about how you use language everyday, who you communicate with, in what language or languages, what kind of language you use, when and in what places’. They used the large paper, crayons and colours to show the ways they use language by making a language map, a picture that could be organized in any way. As many students in 1/2S were very beginning language speakers, this required additional support and scaffolding and modelling by teachers. One teacher engaged students in the making of her
language map she drew and talked through how she would represent her everyday language use.

Mapping Analysis
Teachers were involved in analysing all students’ maps during professional learning day 2. Unfortunately the two classroom teachers were ill on this day and were unable to attend University, consequently analysis was done at the school site on a subsequent day. The children’s language maps were displayed on tables with one for each class. The first part of the activity was for the researcher to take all teachers through the process of reviewing the language maps. In this part of the process teachers made general comments about their impressions of the language maps. They noted anything that stood out for them and any commonalities or differences between class maps. Pertinent here was teachers’ observations about their students’ ability to complete this task, as expressed by the two teachers:

I am so amazed by what they did, all students, those that are not speaking English to those that are now reading and writing in English or other languages, they were able to represent their languages and the ways they used, it tells me about their literacy and their developing language between home and school” ; I am so surprised by the detail, colour, drawings of people and places, I wasn’t sure my young students would be able to do this at all” the knowledge that they are bringing in and we have completely ignored that, I haven’t tapped into it at all, at young age year one and two I had never imagined that I would, we would get so much out of that.

In the second part of the process, the idea of clustering, or categorising the maps was introduced considering how the maps could be grouped or categorised to communicate the main ways that the children depicted the nature and places of their everyday language practices. The researcher worked with the teachers from each school and supported the teachers to lead the analysis for their class. The individual teachers grouped the maps from their class, identified any maps that did not fit and chose a typical map from each of the groups to analyse in greater detail. The following is a summary of the teacher analysis that resulted from this process.
Teacher map analysis Class 1/2S.

In class ½ S students who are newly arrived are still developing their first language and English, I think the most significant part is the influence of family in their home language that it was apparent in all the language maps. As my students are year 1 and year 2 I think year 2 students had a bit more representation of school probably because of their experience – more experience in school especially with their community language teachers and of course their friends who have the same language strengths, they have had friendship over the two years, but family – whole family things … which they do with family like in the community. Like for example going to shops, going to the park, but it is family oriented. There was a lot of modelling and scaffolding which is happening in class. I know my apprehension was whether they would be able to put it in the language map. I know they had a lot of things including the data that give us the information after that scaffolding and after that modelling of the language map. They did get what they’re supposed to do giving us the information. It is very interesting to see all the information, which has come up. I have identified three categories and two outliers.

1. Language centred mostly in in family – limited connections to school
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Figure 16: Language centred mostly in in family
That was of major significance in their language maps. This is really interesting. So obviously she has represented a lot of community things here, mostly things which she is doing with family. So its family oriented community activities knowing the background of this girl they have recently come to Australia. She loves reading books? Yes she loves reading. She talks quite often with the – they’re from Nepal and they were affected by the earthquake – she told me she quite often talks to her grandparents on the telephone yes. Temple – yes they go to temple. So looking at all these shops, park, mum and dad, mum and father – she is the only child so her centre of existence is her mum and dad and mum, dad, TV, friends, going to the zoo. This is very interesting – park – this is a park again. She … putting school and friends in a separate box. That is so interesting. I think what she is saying for her language her native language, family and community place are fairly significant – yes but from that she is bringing it back to the school. I think for her I think school is a place where she is – basically bringing all these experiences and she is using these experiences to develop her English because she is expressing herself more. She loves talking about all her experiences where she goes and all and she loves talking English. But someone isn’t it funny how it’s sort of separate? I mean she has got all these arrows to community but school is away from all of these things. Because I think school is playing a very significant part in her personality and making her feel and secure also – absolutely yes and she is developing that confidence, because with this child initially I don’t know if I’m allowed to say that but this child initially she was put in a mainstream classroom thinking that she has some English language but she just couldn’t settle in the mainstream. She couldn’t survive and no she couldn’t – she refused to come to school and she was scared and insecure. When she came to my class then she was shifted to my class just for a few days just to see if she could settle down and it took us a while to make her because she had already all of those insecurities being in two different classes for her. School became something like something in the sense that she doesn’t want to get connected with and parents were worried, but staying in my class it’s obviously as a teacher my main aim was to develop that security in her and to make her feel safe which she developed and within next week parents came and said that she loves coming to school now and she
is the one telling them and they are so relieved that it is, but what I’m saying is that she needed that time – so exactly. She wasn’t secure about the language and everything. And she is not ready to go to mainstream. She was in the mainstream class she had an English speaking teacher. And when she was brought into this class because I was the one bring her to this class I could speak in Hindi to her and she understands that, and then I came and introduced her to the new teacher and said she also speaks in Hindi she immediately had that connection. So I don’t know if that played any part but I think it did have something.

2. Language centred on family & community activity (L1) Translation:

Some inclusion to school

![Figure 17: Language centred on family and community activity](image)

These two are also mostly community based which his really interesting. It is really detailed. Talking – seeing – that’s interesting talking. Books, mosque – this is the second year of M in my class and I can that language developing now and he’s getting more confidence. Park, he shares all these experiences in school – he does in the class talk to school, shops, swimming that’s interesting, swimming yes and soccer so when he was making this map he was telling me that these are the places. So who was he talking in Arabic with when he goes – obviously soccer with his parents yes, and also he does take the role as a translator because mum knows English but very limited English, but now that M has gained more acquisition of his second language he helps
mum sometimes when she has to talk in the swimming pool. He’s got the doctor here. Doctor, so he helps mum sometimes with that yeah he does. It’s really interesting.

Q: Why do you think they’ve got these boxes around everything? That’s interesting isn’t it – when they’re boxing things?

Hmm it’s really interesting yeah. Over here he’s got playground and that playground is in school because I know that he means, so he’s telling that he uses language in school in the playground and he’s got school in a big box so there is a big influence of school there. What’s …; beach so he’s bringing all the experiences which he – in the community, family oriented and that is helping him. Friend Mrs S yeah. Because he speaks … with me sometimes. That’s really interesting – heavily community based but it is basically family. He has written mosque. He probably done it two or three times but look at this even that one looks like mosque. So that shows there’s a big influence of religious mosque there isn’t it? The colour here is incredible. So that’s all to community.

3. Language (L1 situated in the family only)

![Diagram](image)

Figure 18: Language (L1 situated in the family only)

Then I’ve got family again shops but it is mostly family. See over here so school has got this part into it – just this part but most of it is friends, dad, mum, shops – experiences she has in shops with – and she does play a role of a translator with mum. Yeah telephone so she is ringing home – back home overseas. And they are all able to represent this which is really interesting. And this is she reads books in her first language. So she’s got the arrows
coming out I suppose in some ways as well rather than the divisions I guess – the sort of boxed out things as some kind of movement around it seems from what she is representing. It is understandable that we have family as such an important thing because … that most of their experiences are out of [school]. They are at the stage of developing friendships so they haven’t had that much experience; much time having that friend you know what I mean – really bonding with the friends so they are just willing to start developing but family plays a very major part there. Now these ones I have got family. So there is telephone, calling overseas is a big part in their life. Leaders at home so they do go to whatever their Arabic … read that; TV yes; Arabic books; so it’s mainly Arabic – so there is no connection with the school here – see look at that. It’s not connected is it to anything. I mean all these lines. Interesting that school is sort of outside. The rest are all kind of connected and I think what’s interesting about this mapping too is it’s the sort of notion about the placement on a page. I mean they’ve got this whole page and then how are they representing how language is working for them I suppose in different places and spaces’.

R: Very interesting – it’s one of these interesting things that’s coming out of this methodology I think is the way that they’re positioning things.

The teacher identified two outliers, identified as the Relationship to Farsi (includes where student uses Farsi) and Demarcation between home and school, a separation of languages.

Figure 19: Two outliers: Relationship to Farsi & home/school demarcation
Teacher map analysis: Class 3/6: Categorised into 5 groups

The following transcript details the teacher’s analysis. The class is a 3/6 with students who are newly arrived from many different places and wide ranging English language levels.

Well I think, oh it's quite creative, the creativity is there, I can see the children have all represented their points of view using symbols and notations and diagrams and illustrations, so you can see that. A lot of children have used their own language to write, and plus you can see a lot of English being used as well. So you can see that they using the notion of school and home and shop and what they do outside, is all represented in here, yeah some of them have the countries they come from, they have highlighted that part, how they have come, they have highlighted the aeroplane and things like that. I can see, now this child had only started a week or two weeks before we did this, and although there's no clear spelling he was out there trying to put them down. I have identified 5 categories and one outlier.

1. Home & School Division

![Language Map]

Figure 20: Home and school division

This is first category the home and school, and they're mostly divided, dividing home and school? In their home language and the schooling, so all the academic learning plus the informal everyday language learning. So this child has represented himself and has used his name which is A.... And he has put in a symbol for music; obviously he’s using both English and Arabic to listen to the music at home. He has ...

(Background noise) public school and he has said “At the school I talk in English and
I help classmate ... my friends”. “At home I talk in Arabic” and put the images of couple of stick figures which I'm imaging are his siblings. This picture seems to have a clear division: Because it's saying that I learn English at school and translate for my friends at school, and then it says “Solely I talk Arabic at home”, and I ... “this is me” and “I'm ... because I talk Arabic with my siblings at home”

2. Showcasing high level literacy
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Figure 21: Showcasing high level literacy: developing bilingualism.

In this category literacy is at a prominent stage, so for them both languages have the same level of status and showcases their high level literacy in both languages. So in this map this child has tried to write it in English plus ... them visually, and she has said, in a range of places she uses English. So we can see in the map, we use our own language to talk to each other, in Chinese, and she has ... English on one side on the right, left corner. This child’s mum is in China, so she ... uses a computer to communicate to mum in China. She's the one who has been helping translate for the family, grandma doesn’t speak, mum doesn’t speak at all, and so what I have thought is she’s come to a stage when she’s able to translate for them. We can see even though
she put it in, the Chinese is in the same category as the English, but ... but that’s more ... in English. But language map she has written the word language as a title in Chinese, in English ... language. This showed me her developing bilingualism.

3. Language situated in the Community (L1/L2)

Figure 22: Language situated in the Community (L1/L2)

In this category language is part of the community, used in the community, and this student has highlighted how they use it at swimming pool, at the Pizza Hut, obviously at school but language is situated at home in each particular place within the community. I see this student feels perhaps that language is home language and they are unable to use the language of the classroom yet which is English. They identify the love of their language grouped together in community places.
4. Prominent Home Language Use (L1)

Figure 23: Prominent Home Language Use (L1)

In this category literacy is prominent in home language. In this map there are images of home or building. In the first one is just image of home, in the second one is it home … lounge room because we've got a sofa, coffee table in … (Background noise) and watching TV. This map is interesting isn't it because it's sort of an aerial view, like they’ve drawn from the perspective of above, for this student language is situated in the home and it is Arabic. This student is not speaking in school very much and this is reflected in his map and the other maps in this group.

5. Language situated in the family (Using 3 languages)

Figure 24: Language situated in the family (Using 3 languages)
In this category we can see the use of language and they can see both languages, both languages as a prominent language for home and with their family. So in … case he has tried to put English … (Language words) in number places, this either could be because I put the name … (Language words) on the blackboard for him … then …, or he’s literally using those languages at home. In this typical map students insert feelings like ‘I love my family’- ‘My family, mum, dad, I speak … sometimes I speak … I love people’. In this map it includes gardening and it’s interesting how they can pick out those things, you know those different things. I remember someone in class saying, talking about cooking and gardening and all of those, dancing, all this language, amazing.

Summary
The teachers’ analyses and reflection on language mapping suggest that this process made students’ repertoires visible, revealing to both students and teachers what students knew and could do with language in their everyday worlds. For these teachers this work also bought the multiple register dimensions and multimodal practices of language and literacy into sharp focus. Mapping offered students a way to represent their everyday worlds in a complex and in written language free form. The three teachers in this school were bilingual. This may have added to their awareness of language transfer; however, teachers clearly identified the mapping process and corresponding lessons as key in illuminating language transfer for themselves and their students. Mapping also enabled them to reflect on their students’ competence in one or more languages. These observations are highlighted in the discussion of each map and the teachers’ final transcripts below:

T1: I really haven’t talked about the various ways students are using the language and especially when I did it myself it was a big eye opener for me as well because a lot of things I do without realising, without using language in so many ways and opening that up with the students all … was that it’s a rich thing they’re bringing in and we are not tapping into that at all. I would love to tap into that and see how that can help them with the language acquisition and helping them in developing further.

T2: Because that was like a … of knowledge that they are bringing in and we have completely ignored that, haven’t tapped into it at all and also the notion that at that
young age year one and two I had never imagined that I would, we would get so much out of that.

T3 As a … I knew that … first language and what they bring in class but you are right M that I think that has really opened for us that we really need to give it more emphasis because for us as teachers and looking at our outcomes we are always into acquisition of their second language, but we know that the first, they bring a rich understanding, in their first language, I think we need to work more recognising that and also letting them, making them feel confident and making them realise and understand that their first language is equally important as second language, so that is a really big thing yes, and as you said I really never imagine with my kids that they would come up with such a lot of information like that.

T1. They have said a whole lot of information, the importance of bilingualism and the understanding that they are … what they know … the message they are giving to us is as important and we putting all our emphasis on English then they know their own language and they [are] only getting half of their understanding in English. So if we can lose the notion of bilinguals to upskill them in their … how good would that be, but that’s a skill as teachers we need to develop as well how to do … language.

The maps shown above reveal students’ awareness of the multimodal nature of language. Singing, dancing, listening to music, cooking and gardening are featured in their expression of linguistic practice, understandings and practices that were further explored in their units of work. In these maps languages were clearly marked and situated in a variety of places. These maps were further analysed by students and used to create Venn diagrams with partners, to share with parents and to further expand their knowledge of themselves and their interests. This knowledge and information first realized in maps was put to work in the subsequent unit of work that asked students in years 1-2 to think about the ways they used language in different places and with different people, with a focus on the various ways they communicated and used this language to persuade. In years 3-6 these were used to stimulate the idea of always valuing and celebrating what it means to be different as a way to build relationships, the focus of the teacher designed 3-6 unit of work.
UNITS OF WORK AND WORK SAMPLES
Teachers in both 1-2 and 3-6 with the support of the EAL/D mentor teacher designed units of work that built on the knowledge and understandings generated from the activities and data detailed above. In both classrooms these teachers used this work as a foundation for their subsequent units, not only revisiting and using the data, but building on an extending it in unit focussed lessons and activities. In the transcript below the teacher one teacher talks about how this work helped generate the content in her unit.

So I find it to be very useful, connected. And it’s connected …. So when I have to start my unit of work, as I said, I had to – get my … students excited to do … to convince. So there it was – and I was thinking, “What am I going to do with that …,” so I looked at those … maps, So I started with, “How can you convince me that you are using this language, that there is a lot of connection?”.

For years 1-2 the unit linked with their English syllabus. The theme ‘To Convince’, identified the key concepts as discussion of the various ways students communicate with different people and how language changes in different situations. In this unit outcomes were drawn from the literacy curriculum and matched to ESL scales. These included:

- English integrating English ES1 & S1 Content descriptors
- Speaking & Listening
- Reading & Viewing and Writing & Representing
- Grammar, Punctuation and Vocabulary
- Thinking imaginatively and creatively
- Expressing themselves
- Reflecting on Learning

In this unit, the teacher engaged students in writing generated from what students had detailed in their classroom discussion of compiled focus group data. Focus group data were presented to students using interactive whiteboards comprised of graphs and figures (see further explanation below); this was coupled with students language maps and associated activities (also detailed below). The focus was writing sentences that served to convince or persuade, included here was attention to the use of connectives. Students began by writing sentences that detailed their use of multiple languages at home and school. After reading
three persuasive texts, students responded by writing sentences generated from these book themes, that persuaded or convinced the reader to their point of view. This was coupled with guided, support and scaffolding in the form of brainstorming, deconstruction, joint construction and independent construction of persuasive texts. Students also focussed on key vocabulary, such as persuasive words and phrases. Students were tasked with convincing a boy to use a particular colour for drawing (the days the crayon quit). Students returned to language maps for a culminating activity that required them to choose one practice or activity, device from their language map and write a letter to their parents to convince/persuade them of the importance of their chosen task or activity.

Work samples 1-2: Whole class sentences

The teacher chose student sentences for analysis and the following transcript offers teacher analysis of these work samples.

So then we started with simple sentences. “I speak … at home”. So that was the basic point and they’re looking at their language maps and making simple sentences. So when we were looking at our persuasive text, we were looking at conjunctions, and point of view, we again looked at the language maps; we started with connecting those. So we are meeting the outcomes moving from simple sentences to complex
sentences. I had students, who were able to use two complex sentences and we began with just one sentence coming from the map “At home I speak in x”; “I like speaking x”. So this is where they’re expressing themselves. So this is a whole lot of work to get to a point of view. Because when it started they didn’t have a point of view, they’re not used to having a point of view. So they started having, “Yes, I like x”, it was, “No, I only like English”, validating as I said before. Do you remember that NAPLAN test, where the kids had persuasive writing one where the kids had to say why they wanted to change and it caused so much controversy, because there were so many children who were affected by this – they couldn’t write, yeah because they think that they’re not allowed to do things like this to break rules. Yeah, very culturally biased they should not have their own opinion. They have to follow whatever is generally the norm. My students attempted to write two sentences, always trying, she’s the girl who, you remember, in the holidays made her own language map. And first day back she showed me, she showed her dad, her mum, her sister. And she has an older brother in high school, and the brother said “What is this? Why have you’ve done this? What it this?” And she explained to all of them what that meant. So that really – she was really very affected by a language map, and she loved it, yeah. Yeah. You can see her sentence: “Pharsi helps me learn English because I help mum understand the meaning of English words”. When she came, when she joined the school, and I asked her, “Do you speak x?” - because I always ask my children, “Do you speak your language? How much do you speak?” It is for me to know how much their language proficiency. And she was told by her dad to tell the teacher that she just speaks English at home, that she does not speak. So that I think that she just knows English. And she said, “No, I speak English. Just speak English”, but when we did the language map that was the first time she thought “my language is important”. She’s is on level 17 now in reading. She can read and write in her first language, I think that’s the reason that her improvement is so fast. She has just gone past other students who had joined before her – much before her. They had the learning the process of writing, that there is a planning process, and then there is editing, and then there is publishing, making them learn in a structured way. They had lots of thoughts in their mind, but then writing, we worked into it. So they had now transferred this, starting with the language map, because in that language map they were expressing their point of view, they could identify themselves, in the sense that now they know that there is validity to their language. And they know that they
also have feelings, they also have views. Whatever we are doing within class reading a story or any big book reading they’re doing …, they just have that connection. Yes, “Oh yes, I remember x,” and they remember other friends’ languages, the sentences show we built on that.

The participating teacher from Grade 3-6 at Urban Public School choose a unit of work linked with their English syllabus (see Appendix VII). The key concept: Building relationships included a focus on Literacy, Critical and Creative Thinking and Personal and Social Capability, combined with an EAL/D across modes focus. Students were scaffolded towards producing information texts and the culminating task required students to write information reports. These reports took the form of individual profiles produced as pamphlets.

In designing this unit this teacher also began with the project curriculum, this included the focus group follow up as described above and mapping and accompanying activities and discussion. These preceding activities provided the foundation for the rest of the work of this unit. Although the stage 3 across school focus was ‘Building relationships’, this curriculum was tied quite closely to the importance of always valuing and celebrating what it means to be different as a way to build relationships. Difference was key focus of the texts read in the unit: *Luke’s Way of Looking* (Nadia Wheatley) and *Mirror* (Jeannie Baker), a multilingual text. During one lesson the classroom teacher and a student teacher who was an Arabic speaker, read the text in tandem. This reading lesson engaged students in keen listening and comparison of the two boys in this story, one who lived in a Western English speaking country and another in a Middle Eastern Arabic speaking country. During this task one student, an Arabic speaker, was silently reading along and sometimes interjecting as the student teacher read the Arabic text. The student teacher invited the student to be the reader, remarking to the student ‘your Arabic is beautiful; you can read this much better than me. Why don’t you read this?’. The student did this with great proficiency and this opportunity informed her teacher, who had been unaware that the student was such a fluent reader of Arabic. In the units of work and generated work this teacher encouraged students to use English and their home language where possible.
The culminating task and work samples discussed by the teacher in the transcript below are personal profile pamphlets. This directly relates to multimodal practices and data generated from this project.

So in this context I have the children write their country of birth, their names, information about themselves, information about the family, information about the friends, their likes, their dislikes. Anything … about their personal profile, who they are, because all their influences makes them who they are. So that was the kind of what I was getting at. And then comparing with the peer, and then looking at the influences – the peer’s influences. And so together then they will see their similarities between them and what the differences between them.

Q: So what do you notice about this work sample in particular, about the student and their links to the outcomes or abilities? Does it tell you anything that you can think about that links directly to outcomes, or directly to the mapping activities, or any of the things that you’ve done? So what is the work sample?

Yes there is their personal profile; the idea was to build in their language. As I said interactions in English, but I have told them, explained to them, they need to use their whole language. They are articulating about themselves, they are articulating about their friendships and things like that, which is really the curriculum context, which is building relationship, but not only the concept and theme that they are doing but also it builds on from the language maps that they did. Because they’re talking about language there and how they use it, and this is sort of building on to that about the language and talking about how their identity is also language. Well the level of the written work shows he is making simple sentences at the moment, but this is clear sentence structures and most of the kids are not doing those clear sentence structures. This is independent work, and this child is making use of verbs, they’re using descriptions, so there’s grammar happening, making sentences with a clear subject, adding conjunctions, so there’s some compound sentences happening, but it’s limited. He is using spelling, most of the sight words, correctly. I’m thinking, is that to move from pictorial to that sort of more written language it’s really about risk taking a lot of risk taking and confidence. I meet children all the time who apologise for not knowing the word in English, like somehow it’s something they have to be ashamed of or apologetic about. But by going through the process of the language map and then the Venn diagrams, it’s almost like saying, “There’s no need to apologise, you
"just know it in a different place.” And that level of confidence allows children to have that space to risk take, and to produce that more extended language.

Summary
In school research continues to offer evidence of meaningful and lasting learning being fostered when academic experiences build on students’ existing ‘funds of knowledge’, most especially the linguistic and cultural knowledge students bring from home (Gonzalez et al., 2005). The units and work started with students’ experiences and supported them to recognise the connection between their everyday language worlds and the connections to talking, listening, reading and writing in their classrooms. They could see how students’ language skills and understandings had developed, how they could engage students in reflecting on their everyday worlds to generate authentic curriculum that would support and scaffold their English reading and writing. They could see students develop a keen understanding of register, by calling on their first language knowledge. They felt that the work generated from the units and initial curriculum engaged students and made them aware of the need to call on students’ first language.

Discussion
While many scholars argue that Australian society fails to recognize bilingual and or multilingual skills as valuable assets that can be taken up in school to facilitate learning, in this project we sought to create a space for the assets of students in complex multicultural classrooms to be first elucidated and used to inform teachers and the students themselves, and in turn inform teaching and learning in these classrooms.

Representative comments below, taken from focus group interviews, reveal a nuanced understanding of the use of two languages and the interdependence and apparent facility in using both languages. These comments reflect what Giddens (1984) describes as ‘discursive consciousness’, defined as reflections on language use and practice that are verbalised or considered intellectual. While this may be attributed to the central role of the community language programme and the influence of the community language teachers in this school environment, observation and accompanying data reveal that this discursive consciousness was being facilitated and continued to develop in this project. Additionally, the structure of the transition classes offered a small class focus that facilitated access to bilingual resources
and offered opportunities for scaffolded support from teachers and peers, who often spoke common home languages.

- Sometimes I mix up languages
- Learning English is easier than learning Chinese
- Language helps me think
- Arabic helps us to express our feelings and needs with our parents
- English is important
- I speak my language with my friends
- Arabic words help when a teacher uses it to explain English words when I don’t understand
- I have to help my friends talk my language
- Learning Arabic helps with writing
- Chinese maths helps me to learn English
- I have to use formal Arabic with my parents
- Arabic helps with numbers
- Learning my language helps me to understand English meanings better
- If I know how to talk my language I can tell someone to help me

In this school context, where multilingualism was recognized and enhanced through community language programs, collected data continued to inform both students and teachers. In some cases, students and teachers were unaware of the multiple languages spoken and the practices and experiences students engaged in their everyday worlds. In this school, data revealed that while teachers were aware of parents’ home languages they were mostly unaware that a number of students frequently spoke multiple languages at home. This new knowledge continued to inform their understandings of some students, as illustrated by the Year 3-6 teacher’s comment below:

I knew he had travelled across many countries to get here but I was unaware that he could speak 3 languages Urdu, Dari and Arabic. I can see now why he is such a resource for others, and why his English is developing so quickly.

Data revealed these learners were language brokering and translating for family and others in a range of places with a variety of texts, they were code-switching and shifting registers with various degrees of flexibility across multiple platforms. These initial focus groups offered an opportunity for teachers and students to not only discuss their practices but also to identify linkages between and across languages and practices. Recent work on plurilingualism (Moore & Gajo, 2009) suggests that languages can be used separately or together for different purposes in different places and spaces with different people and that these myriad communicative ways may result in plurilingual repertoires, where languages are rarely equal
or speakers entirely fluent in their languages. Focus group data, and the ongoing exploration and elaboration of this preliminary data set, coupled with the accompanying work revealed that students in these classrooms possessed plurilingual repertoires. Plurilingual practices involved speaking, but for most students, this was combined with reading, writing and viewing in one or more languages. Language brokering and translating for family and others was a common practice; it occurred in a range of places with a variety of texts, it involved the switching of codes and shifting of registers across multiple platforms with varying degrees of proficiency.

Mapping offered an opportunity for students to consider what they did everyday and make connections to their school practices through the prism of language. In these maps languages were clearly marked and situated in a variety of places. In pairs, students compared their maps and created a Venn diagram that showcased similarities and differences between practices, this activity generated much discussion and excitement across classrooms. In the transcript below a teacher reflects on the Venn diagram activity:

Our second thing was doing the VENN diagrams, that was interesting too because we – there we didn’t look at the similar language group of students, we did mix of … groups so it was like they’re speaking the different language but now it was about they’re looking at their language map studying their language map. So they worked together, they sat together so what are the commonalities between their language map. Some of the kids had words written in their language map but some of them had just pictures a few images, yeah. They were not able to write about it, but they could connect words with the pictures, which was really powerful.

Students’ visual and spatial organisation, and the reading of these dimensions, has clear implication for the ways we view language, literacy and learning. How do we build on students’ sophisticated notions and the scripted and embodied cultural and linguistic practices of their everyday worlds in service of learning? This question motivated teachers’ development of lessons and units of work. For teachers in these classrooms, maps made students’ repertoires visible; they realized that students’ repertoires were not acknowledged in their classrooms, and for them these maps told them how important this was. One teacher suggests: ‘the message they are giving to us is as important and we putting all our emphasis on English then they know their own language and they’re only getting half of their
understanding in English’. The maps and corresponding analysis added to teachers’ awareness of language transfer, enabling them to reflect on their students’ competence in one or more languages and use this to support their learning of English. Teachers used the maps, regularly asking students to review them. They provided not only the basis for units of work but generated sentences about their practices in years 1-2, and offered a stimulus for creating personal profiles in years 3-6.

In-school research continues to offer evidence of meaningful and lasting learning being fostered when academic experiences build on students’ existing ‘funds of knowledge’, most especially the linguistic and cultural knowledge students bring from home (Gonzalez et al., 2005). While sometimes the connections are hard to see as the units develop, what is clear is that the units of work and work samples from this school, offer evidence of how teachers and students built on funds of knowledge for development of English. Data suggests that for teachers in this school, the units of work helped them and their students to make links between languages and helped to facilitate a pride in students’ home languages, and they could use this in service of English.

EVALUATION
While most teachers were restricted in the development of units because of pre-existing demands that required them to use predesigned unit of work, address supervisor and stage level demands, and stage levels themes and foci, all teachers managed to successfully incorporate the focus group data into their units. For most teachers the focus groups and mapping became a central part of their units, this pedagogical work provided the foundation for their developing units of work. Restrictions on teachers' ability to generate their own curriculum content is an area that needs further attention, teachers expressed frustration at the lack of autonomy. While they welcomed produced units that offered them an often innovative and creative blueprint for meeting curriculum outcomes, content and particular themes, they suggested a need for more autonomy to build on and or modify these units or create new units that would in their mind more closely meet the needs of their students and the teaching and learning sequences they wanted to include.

Data and analysis revealed that teachers continued to build on the initial work and use it as a central tenet in the writing tasks assigned to students. All assessments were linked to across-stage English outcomes, with a focus on the completion of predesigned text types, reports,
persuasive texts, and narratives, and the inclusion of relevant grammatical and structural features. All teachers suggested some improvement in the complexity of students written tasks; most often this was attributed to students’ engagement and increasing self-confidence generated from the initial work and the focus on their everyday language and cultural practice and the sharing of that in their classrooms. Teachers saw this as authentic curriculum that called on student knowledge as well as their own growing knowledge of their students. Language awareness was central here; all teachers alluded to students growing knowledge of how language worked and the connections to students and everyday worlds. In this way the texts they had students produce offered more resonance and real application.

The development of units of work and assessment tasks linked to outcomes that build on the work discussed here requires further research and development. These units of work and work samples helped offer a recognition of the value of plurilingual competence for teachers and students, a space for a shared repertoire, where expertise shifts across context and overtime, increasing student engagement offered a re-imagining of pedagogies cultivating flexibility and versatility while promoting competence confidence and belonging.
CASE STUDY: WARATAH PUBLIC SCHOOL

Wayne Sawyer

INTRODUCTION
Waratah PS is a large (24 classes) primary school located in Sydney’s outer western suburbs. The school is in the Blacktown Local Government Area. Based on the most recent published census data (2011 or 2012), at the end of 2014, this LGA had 42.4% of its population born overseas, with 37% of its population speaking a language other than English at home. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people constitute 2.7% of the total population of the LGA. 52.5% of the population over 15 years of age had post-school qualifications, with the biggest proportion (12.8%) having a Bachelor’s degree. The average wage income was $49,761. In 2014, student enrolment at the school was 468 students. The school population figures could be said to run against the key trends of the LGA. Aboriginal students comprise 16.3% of student enrolments with 47% of students from a language background other than English. Two EAL/D teachers are employed five days per week to support newly arrived students and those who have limited exposure to English. The school receives Norta Norta Targeted Aboriginal Funding, which funds Aboriginal tutors to work with teachers to enhance Aboriginal student engagement and improve aspects of student academic achievement. The school has is a full-time AEO and is a focus school under the current Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education action plan (ATSIEAP). The school supports an Aboriginal staff member to be an Aboriginal support teacher K-2. This position includes working alongside the AEO with Aboriginal families and community groups to create and foster positive home-school partnerships. There is an Aboriginal Education learning hub directed by the AEO. The school provides programs for students gifted in dance, art, technology, gymnastics, debating and performance and caters for children with a mild or moderate intellectual disability from Kindergarten to Year 6.

At Waratah, the project initially involved 28 students, one teacher and two AEOs and a Grade 5/6 composite class. The original teacher, who became the school’s RFF teacher, was unable to continue with the project after Phase 1, which was soon after the mapping, was done. Some aspects of the project were then delivered by the AEO.
STUDENT FOCUS GROUPS

Student focus groups for the 28 students were conducted in April 2015. There were six student focus groups in all and each was recorded and transcribed. Data reported here are the product of student self-reporting and they are reported by individual question.

Q: How many of you speak a language/s other than English? What language/s?

Five students reported speaking Spanish, and three each of Aboriginal English, Tongan and Arabic. All other languages reported were reported by one student each, viz: Dinka, French, Fijian, German, Indonesian, Maori, Telugu and a Creole. At least six students understood the notion of dialects, with one referring to Scottish English, one making a general reference to Aboriginal dialects and others referring to Pig Latin as a dialect of English.

Q: How many of you did not speak English when you came to school? What languages did you speak?

Only one student reported that they spoke Telugu only when they started school.

Q: How many of you most often speak a language other than English at home with friends and family?

Fourteen reported children speaking a language other than English at home and with friends and family.

Q: How many of you translate for family and friends? What do you translate and for whom?

Thirteen students reported translating from other language to English. The languages were: Spanish (4), Maori (2), Tongan (2), Indonesian, Dinka, Telugu, Samoan and Aboriginal English (1 each)

Q: How many of you study another language inside or outside of school? When do you study these languages? What are those languages? How many of you can read/write in those languages?
Q: Does speaking a language other than English have any benefit or advantage in helping you learn and study English in school? Does it have any disadvantage?

Twelve students saw mainly benefits and eight mainly disadvantages. Others found this difficult to answer. The advantages, which students saw in speaking a language other than English, were largely around enabling a wider network of communication, including communicating for others, such as translating. Not all students understood the question fully. Most of the “disadvantage” responses saw the question in terms of time being taken away (in school) from learning English (“All the time you are learning a different language you could be learning English”) or in terms of another language replacing English in their usage (“not everyone understands” “not everyone knows the non-English language”; “other people get angry when they do not understand”; “it’s confusing”).

Can you tell what you do with language/s every day outside of school?

- Talking about language use with friends and teachers at school, family at home
- Speaking to friends in other languages, including using the Aboriginal English taught in school by the AEO to talk with Aboriginal friends and family outside school
- Talking about language at sport and at dancing
- Talking with friends more generally
- Watching movies, some in non-English and using sub-titles
- Using iPod app (that speaks in Japanese then aunt translates back to English)
- Reading
- When drawing and painting
- Playing computer games, writing emails
- Texting, using emoticons
- Listening to music, songs
- Speaking on the phone
- Skyping
- Playing and watching sport
- When dancing
- Writing letters, stories, poems
- Translating for family and friends
- Doing homework

Two students reported thinking in other languages (Spanish, Fijian) and each are translating for themselves all the time.

This list shows that students had a broad sense of their everyday language use and of the practices which constitute language use outside of school.

Q: What opportunities do you have IN SCHOOL to talk about what you do with language/s every day outside of school?

Little was forthcoming on this other than from students who were learning Aboriginal English at school and therefore having opportunities to talk about language as well as using Aboriginal English in the playground with friends.

Q: Do you think you should be able to talk about what you do with language every day in school? (Reading, writing, talking and listening, viewing.) If so, why and when? If not, why not?

Four students answered “Yes” to this question, five “No” and nineteen had no response. The four who agreed tied this into knowledge about other cultures (“More people will know about our language and heritage”; “We are learning about each other. You can understand people.”) Of the five students who disagreed, this was largely again in terms of confusion or the time taken from English.
Q: Think again about the reading, writing, listening and viewing you do every day outside of school. Are there connections/matches/relationships/similarities between what you do with language every day in your classroom and during your English classes/English work time?

Four students saw no connection. Of those who did, answers were:

- Homework and sport being discussed at home
- Aboriginal painting being done both in and out of school
- Writing at home and in school
- Reading library books then telling everyone at home about them
- Telling parents what is learnt at school

Summary

There were 17 different languages reported in the class other than English (see graph below). The broad group had a good sense of the contextual aspects of language. This included both shifting from one national language to another national language (such as when shopping or using different languages at home from school, or even using English as a lingua franca at home when parents have different language backgrounds from each other). This contextual knowledge also included shifts between dialects and registers in any national language (eg differentiating appropriate language between teachers and friends or between family and non-family, or in contexts such as sport or the language of texting). Explicit connections between students’ everyday language and cultural practices and classroom work and discussion did not appear to be strong and this is consistent with reports from Dr D’warte on students’ responses to questions about home-school language connections:

What connections can you see between home and school? Now, I can you tell in my data set I always ask this question. Almost every child says nothing. There’s no relationship between home and school. Teachers - that’s nice to hear, isn’t it? Thank you very much. But that’s their perception of what’s actually happening (Transcript PD Day 3).

Data from focus groups at Waratah produced the following graph of language experience in the relevant cohort:
LANGUAGE MAPS

As described earlier in this report, professional learning days were held for teachers and AEOs. The following is an extract from the teacher and AEO analyses and that of the AEO that resulted from these processes.

Teacher map analysis (recorded extract) - Waratah

As you’ve seen on a couple of other schools, we have those (national) maps that are really prominent. But that could be related to something that we did in Term 1, where we actually looked at culture and I displayed all their flags and everything in the room. So we do have a world map, and they were able to plot where they were from. So we’d already talked about culture and where they were from. So I think a lot of that came through their maps, just what we’d done previously. And they could identify then that their heritage was mum or dad, or grandparents came from these places, and then we’re seeing 3 or 4 (national) maps on a language map. Again, some of mine did put themselves as the centre, or they put their language as the centre, or their culture…. a lot of people have put the child in the middle, and some have put the language in the middle, and then a lot of flags…. there’s some that are very, got very clear connections and others that just have bits of information.

AEO map analysis (recorded extract) - Waratah

With our (Waratah) children, and there’s more written words, there are pictures in a lot of them, but there are more written words as we got into the older groups. They’re all the same…the language is all the same, they’re talking about their identity, they’re talking about their pride, their family, and their friends.

A third level of discussion of maps was between the researchers. Though the maps chosen for discussion below are chosen based on the individual categorisations of the teacher, the AEO etc, the actual analysis given here is based on the aggregation of these various combinations of analysing teams and is influenced by the work of Albers on visual discourse analysis. This analysis is based on a belief that visual texts reveal ‘traces of identity in images’, in particular that ‘visual texts can provide information about the text maker regarding her/his interests, beliefs and values’ (Albers: 86-87). Albers goes on to argue that ‘systematic analysis of
visual texts led to significant insights into the intentionality behind the production and interpretation of visual texts’ (Albers: 87).

The Waratah teacher categorised the maps from her class as falling into 4 groups, viz:

- Family tree
- Kids in the centre
- Geometric (design)
- Culture
- Those that made no connection to a (national) language.

![Family tree map](image)

**Figure 26: Family tree**

This map was regarded as a typical example of the category Family tree. It could also be categorised as Kids in the centre, but what stands out about this map is the child’s sense that language is relational. Language is used to reach out and to create and/or cement relationships. Key relationships shown are of both family and friends. The key people are also seen in terms of their cultural connections, as represented by the Aboriginal, Torres Strait Islander and Australian flags. The centre circle (see below) reveals the child’s background as both Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. Other connections made here are to friends who presumably have travelled by sea and to his/her sporting interests. The trail around this map is painstaking. It characterises and relates key figures in the child’s life by name, by nationality and relationship to him/herself. The network of relations to each other as well as to him/herself is carefully tracked. The centre circle labelled ‘Me’ is constructed as a profile: cultural background, physical description, personality (‘nice’), interests and
‘favourites’, name (?) and school address. Colours of objects are of equal intensity. The placement of subjects, their size and this aspect of colouring position subjects as of equal value. The child’s profile is seen here as the centre of this large network of nations and languages.

Figure 27: Kids in the centre

Figure 28: Geometric
Figure 29: Culture, see Figure 31: ‘Solid Aboriginality’

The Aboriginal Education Officers categorised one of the maps from this class as falling into the category of ‘Solid Aboriginality’:

Figure 30: Did not make a connection to a language

She nominated this map as ‘typical’ of the Solid Aboriginality group, the teacher having characterised it as ‘typical’ of Culture. Aboriginal cultural icons abound here: the rainbow
serpent, the Aboriginal flag, the figure of the goanna, as well as plants. The dominant figures are the serpents, both in number and in the way they frame the central rectangle. They have an echo in the lizard of the central rectangle. Plant motifs are also repeated. There are lists of key figures in his/her life: Mum, Dad are listed but alongside other key figures in or about the square boxes in the top corners of the central rectangle. The ‘Mum’ group and the ‘Dad’ group are positioned equally and the hearts of course indicate the closeness of the parent-child relationship here. The names in black and red may or may not be relatives (as understood in either a Western sense or an Aboriginal sense) or friends, but are obviously key people in the child’s life. Koori and English are named. The former may be a reference to language or an equivalent grouping to ‘Australian’. ‘Aboriginal culture’ is also highlighted. Art also obviously plays a role in this child’s life as the Eastern edge of the map shows. The written text mainly names people, though it also highlights for this student the significance of culture, language and nationality. It is tempting to argue that the word ‘Koori’ denotes both language and culture, and to that extent, corresponds both to ‘English’ and ‘Australian’. This is another map that strongly connects language to identity. Identity this time is familial, cultural and national. The map itself suggests the student’s knowledge of, and immersion in, his/her Aboriginal culture.

The UWS team of researchers categorised the maps in terms of spatial relationships. Categories were:

Centre circle with lines to images
Block composition
Dispersed images

‘Typical’ maps in these groups are discussed below:
Map 68 (Centre circle with lines…)
Map 54 (Block composition)
Map 61 (Dispersed images)
Figure 32: Centre circle with lines to images

Centre circle with lines… may suggest nothing more than naming a geometric design. It is meant to pick up the notion of connection, and in that sense contrasts with the other named groups. Map 68 typifies this group. All subjects radiate from the central dominant figure, whom we presume is the child. Interestingly, he/she is drawn while all the other figures are referred to only in written text, with the exception of the Australian flag, though a variety of colour is used of equal intensity. The colour of the central figure contrasts with the Australian flag. Each line traces to a subject, in a cloud-like diagram. These are usually family with some associated aspect of their history, eg where they were born. Other characters are simply named and float between the clouds. Connection seems to dominate here. The child associates language not with its functions or spatial contexts, but with those with whom he/she uses language – the dominant figures in his/her ‘language life’.

In some respects, Map 54 is similar. It too names significant figures – Mum, Dad, Melody. Some are associated with specific languages (‘Dad’s side speaks English and Tongan’; ‘Melody speaks half and half’) but again we mostly get small descriptions or aspects of history (‘Melody Blacktown hospital’; Mum’s side dark blue eyes’). Melody- presumably sister- is prominent The whole thing is colourful and displays strict geometric design. The Australian and Tongan flags are reasonably prominent. What contrasts with Map 68 are two key aspects: the relative absence of the student who made the drawing and the ways in which the characters exist in separate boxes. The piece displays significant figures in the child’s
language life, but they represent more of a ‘list’ than a set of connections. The relationship of language to identity here is about the family and the nation.

Figure 33: Block composition

Figure 34: Dispersed images

Map 61 is very dynamic, giving it its characterisation as ‘dispersed’. There is neither the linking to a central figure of Map 68, nor the ‘democratic’ division of Map 54, where characters are in largely equal-sized boxes with carefully straight lines lining the figures up in a very tightly organized way. Subjects here are related within various groupings (e.g., flags, the child’s own profile) but between groupings is dispersal. The dominant figures are the flags of
Italy, The Philippines and Australia. These represent ‘the things I can speak’ (though the Italian flag may be representing ‘Pig-Latin’). The connected circles at the bottom of the drawing each represent a particular interest of the child, and the disconnected circles at the top of the figure and underneath the flags list aspects of his/her personality. Family, with the figure of a heart attached, sit in a balloon to the far right of the picture, but not coloured. The other children in the family are not named other than by their relationship to the student (‘bro’, ‘sis’) The brown figure at the extreme left we can presume, we think, to be the student. There are dispersed names at the left of the picture. The repetition of ‘Filo’ on the drawing perhaps suggests that Filipino is the dominant language spoken (at home?) by the student. The flag of the Philippines is also the central one of the three flags. The most intense colours are given to the flags and the very stylised heading of the piece. There is a kind of framing in the composition made by the students’ personality trait balloons at the top, his/her interests balloons at the bottom and the flags in the centre, and perhaps the drawing at the left and the family’ balloon on the right. However, the occurrence of bottom-end balloons closer to the flags, the seeming randomness of where people’s names and the word ‘Filo’ occur differentiate this map from the more careful composition of the other two. This map seems to present Filipino as the language to which the child is most attached and family (and friends?) seem to be the significant figures in language work. As with Map 54, the relationship of language to identity here is about the family and the nation.

CONCLUSION
The case study at Waratah largely followed the process at other schools, though the class teacher moving RFF duties meant that some of the work was shortened. Student focus groups with students and language mapping were the central exercises here.

There were 17 different languages other than English reported in the class. The largest reported group was Spanish. Aboriginal English was the next most reported, along with a number of Pacific Islander languages (Maori, Samoan, Tongan). There were smaller numbers of European languages other than Spanish, viz French and German. As a class group, the students had a broad conception of their everyday language use and of the practices which constitute language use outside of school. Across the class there was a very good sense of the contextual aspects of language. Explicit connections between students’ everyday language and cultural practices and classroom work and discussion did not appear to be strong.
In terms of language mapping, the teacher based her categories partly on spatial arrangement and partly on stand-out relationships (Kids in the centre, Geometric design, Culture, Family tree, and those with no language connection). In the ‘typical’ maps chosen for analysis, the key issue for students, revealed using a visual literacy analysis, were mostly connected to the relationality of language. Networks of relations with family and friends; the significance of culture, language and nationality; dominant figures in students’ language lives, and thus the close connections these students made between language and identity – these seem to be the key themes of the maps chosen as ‘typical’ of their particular categories.
CONCLUDING REMARKS

The findings for the project are contained in the Executive Summary of this report so the concluding remarks are focussed on the culminating exhibition and presentation by the participating students. The exhibition took place at Western Sydney University and the visit to the University was first suggested by the students themselves. For all of them being part of a university project, especially one that took an interest in their everyday worlds was important, perhaps even life changing. Many of these students in very poor schools did not know where the university campus was located although only a short drive away. As the idea developed and they realised that their own work was going to be exhibited, and that they would personally present about their work in the project to the other participants, it became even more exciting.

The event took place in the Playhouse exhibition space and auditorium. All of the maps that had been selected as typical in the different layers of analysis were printed onto A3 canvas mounted on a frame so that they presented as art pieces. The total maps produced by each class were compiled into a collage and printed on vinyl and displayed on the walls. Two large monitors presented a rolling digital display of all maps. Approximately 180 students attended with their teachers and some principals. The students had an opportunity to view the maps before and after the presentations. Each class presented different versions of their work to the excited audience of participants and teachers. The culminating performance by Erehwon Public School from the poorest of poor communities presented the most moving performance of a song in Samoan accompanied by hand and body movements. The Principal from this school was moved to tears at this achievement.

Many of the children, as they left the university said that they would like to return, imagining future worlds and lives that may have not been imaginable before. As their teachers strongly reminded us, their participation in the project not only recognised them in their individual identities, cultures and languages, but gave them a purpose to their learning beyond the school and the classroom.
FUTURE DIRECTIONS

In this section we consider possibilities for future research and application of findings. It is important to consider in this exploration of future directions that despite considerable knowledge of the rich repertoires of students’ linguistic practice, and the knowledge that these practices are a resource for literacies in English and for enhanced educational practice, students’ everyday language and literacy experiences and learning are commonly not reflected in schools (Pacheco & Gutiérrez 2009; Lorimer Leonard, 2013).

**Knowing students and how they learn**

*Further research that identifies how building these relationships with students explicitly increased teachers’ knowledge about students and the ways students’ learn is needed.*

In this project we found that students’ maps offered a common language enabling students to communicate with their teachers and with all of their peers. Evidence from this study reveals how the mapping offered a bridge that enabled students and their teachers to cross significant barriers of communication in order to activate learning for the classroom community. In this study, highly engaged teachers were able to support students to produce maps that showed clear connections across all the domains of language practice. Building on this knowledge further research would consider what teachers explicitly learned about their students as a result of the mapping and associated work. Identifying how this knowledge influenced teacher learning, and subsequently teaching in these classrooms would be invaluable.

**Further explorations of the multimodal nature of students’ language practices**

*Further research is needed into pedagogical approaches that will enable students to navigate the different places and modes of their language practice and how students’ multimodal practices can be explicitly linked to learning.*

In this project we developed a new theoretical framework of complex multicultural classrooms, classrooms that include both significant numbers of Aboriginal students and culturally and linguistically diverse students. This new framing highlighted the importance of facilitating opportunities for all students to create visual representations of their multimodal language practices and experiences. These experiences and practices were embodied and more extensive and complex than we had envisaged as this project began. In interviews and subsequent lessons, almost all of the children mentioned their use of digital media as part of
their everyday language practices, this area warrants future exploration, prompting us to ask further questions about the cultural and linguistic meanings of these activities.

**Language and identity**

*Further research is indicated to understand the relationship between language, identity and learning for all students and what possibilities this offers for the development of intercultural understanding within classrooms.*

In this study we saw a shared understanding of the importance of language and identity between the Aboriginal Education Officers and the bilingual teachers in particular. For all teachers the potential and value of students’ first languages was foregrounded. The focus on place and literacy had a significant impact on English language performance, increasing students’ confident in their learning. This link between language and identity is often taken for granted, the findings from this study highlight the need to explore this link more closely and in so doing, consider further possibilities for supporting an increasing awareness and acceptance of difference as was showcased in these classrooms.

**Measurable outcomes**

*Further research that includes longitudinal measurable data that shows growth in learning is required.*

Teachers at EREHWON, EAMOU and URBAN suggested many of their students lacked confidence in their own English ability and that participation in this project helped improve their confidence. Others noted an improvement in the students’ writing, carried over to other writing tasks. While teachers pointed to an increase in the complexity and length of writing samples, examples of improved grammatical skills or elements was limited and requires further exploration. The importance of teachers’ observations of increased proficiency as realized in work samples cannot be underestimated but measurement data sets across the research are required to offer hard evidence for increased learning.

**Linguistic transfer**

*Building on this work, research that further develops and refines research and pedagogical methods that support students and teachers in making explicit links between students’ home language and English is required.*

Recent research continues to offer a rethinking of the ways young people communicate, and this new knowledge compels educators to consider new ways to build on young peoples’
evolving language and literacy experiences, skills and understandings. Many students in this study were bilingual, Garcia (2009) and others define bilingual individuals as those that have communicative skills, oral and/or written with various degrees proficiency in two or more languages. Young people who are bilingual learners are not a homogenous group they also differ in socio-cultural and socio-economic background. This definition of bilingualism also includes those young people who are first language speakers of Aboriginal English (AE), a non-standard dialect that differs from standard Australian English in morphology, syntax and semantics (Halen, 2010; Eades, 2013).

**Next Steps**

In order to progress the collaborative development of teacher capacity in this area an online Professional Learning package is required to specify details of the mapping and analysis processes and the link to units of work and the generation and evaluation of work samples. In this way the findings of this project can be extended to all teachers who are interested in extending this important work.
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## APPENDIX 1: Project Plan and Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone 1</th>
<th>Project Establishment</th>
<th>Dates Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1.1</td>
<td>Meeting of Steering Committee to refine project plan</td>
<td>September 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1.2</td>
<td>Obtain ethics clearances from UWS, submit proposal to Department of Education and communities for approval via its State Education Research Application Process (SERAP)</td>
<td>September – November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1.3</td>
<td>Identify potential sites and present research project to school staff</td>
<td>October 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1.4</td>
<td>Finalise participating schools and conduct full school professional learning session with all staff</td>
<td>November-December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1.5</td>
<td>Report on Milestone 1 to Steering Committee</td>
<td>December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestone 2</td>
<td>Map everyday language practices</td>
<td>January to June 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Task 2.1    | Conduct professional learning with participating teachers and education workers to develop their research skills in methods of mapping students’ everyday language practices | Events:  
  • Teachers Professional Development Day, (PD) 1, May 11, 2015  
  • Aboriginal Education Officers (AEO’s) PD1, May 4, 2015 |
| Task 2.2    | Conduct student Focus Group Interviews and fortnightly in-school classroom observations and support for teachers’ and students’ ongoing mapping of language practices. | Events:  
  Focus Group Interviews:  
   • N – March 16, 2015  
   • W – March 18, 2015  
   • A – April 21-24  
   • C – April 27, 2015  
   • H – May 20, 2015  
  Delivery of mapping resources and support to teachers, April |
| Task 2.3 | Conduct teacher, AEO and class discussions about the meaning of student maps and to develop lesson plans and units based on map analysis and student language use | May - June 2015 – school visits Events:  
- Teachers PD2, May 29, 2015  
- AEO’s PD2, July 20, 2015 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 2.4</td>
<td>Researchers to copy, compile and make language maps available via Dropbox to school participants</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Task 2.5 | Report on Milestone 2 to Steering Committee | Events:  
- Steering Committee Meeting 2, March 27, 2015  
- Steering Committee Meeting 3, July 2015 |
<p>| Milestone 3 | Developing pedagogies based on mapping | July – September 2015 |
| Task 3.1 | Conduct Teachers PD day 3 to collaboratively analyse language maps, plan exhibition of student maps and project evaluation | October 16, 2015 |
| Task 3.2 | Teachers apply pedagogies in lesson plans developed from language map analysis | July – September, 2015 |
| Task 3.3 | Researchers visit classrooms fortnightly for observations and support of students and teachers | July – September, 2015 |
| Task 3.4 | Researchers copy and compile data about the implementation of pedagogies and make available in Dropbox for collective analysis | September 2015 |
| Task 3.5 | Report on Milestone 3 to Steering Committee | September 2015 |
| Milestone 4 | Project dissemination and evaluation | October – December 2015 |
| Task 4.1 | Researchers compile formal data for learning outcomes | October 2015 |
| Task 4.2 | Conduct Teachers PD4 to analyse learning | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 4.3</td>
<td>Develop materials for dissemination and evaluation</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4.4</td>
<td>Conduct final Steering Committee meeting to evaluate project</td>
<td>November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4.5</td>
<td>Prepare final project report</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II: Teachers’ professional development days programs

Building on Children’s Linguistic Repertoires to Enrich English Learning
A partnership between NSW Department of Education and Communities and
the University of Western Sydney
Professional Development Day 1 - Agenda

**Date:** Wednesday March 11 2015  
**Venue:** Northern Room, Hawkesbury Campus

9.00 - 9.30: Arrival, registration and welcome

**Session 1  9.30 - 11.15**

- **Exploring Linguistic Repertoires**  
  What do we know about multimodal language learning and associated practices?
  
  Project Review:
  
  - Erewon Project: UWS/DEC 2014 – Margaret Somerville

- **Organisation and protocols, consent forms**
- **Creating language maps with teachers**

Morning Tea  11.15 – 11.45

**Session 2  11.45 – 1.00**

- **Research Methodology: Teachers as Researchers**
  
  - Introduction to processes and procedures
  - Group analysis of language maps
  - Linking research to curriculum

Lunch  1.00 - 1.45

**Session 3  1.45 – 2.30**

- **Project Team Planning**
  
  - Reflecting on our local context
  - Scope and sequence for students’ language mapping
  - Discussion of Focus Groups
  - Calendar – future project dates. Please bring school calendars/diaries to assist with scheduling of project dates
**Professional Development Day 2 - Agenda**

**Date:** Friday May 29 2015  
**Venue:** Poolside Room Hawkesbury campus

9.30 – 10.00: Arrival, registration and welcome.

Morning Tea

Parking vouchers are available from Caroline Hatton

**Session 1  10.00 – 1.00**

- **Exploring Linguistic Repertoires:**
  - Discussion of Implications of Student Focus Group data (20 mins)
  - Group analysis of students’ language maps (2.5 hours)

**Lunch  1 - 1.30**

**Session 2  1.30 – 3.00**

- **Lesson Planning**
  - Planning lessons to apply language understandings in classroom
  - Calendar – future project dates. Please bring school calendars/diaries to assist with scheduling of project dates

**Teachers are asked to bring on the day:**

- Project audio recorders for recording during day
- Individual A3 size language maps from all their students. Could students’ names be on the back of these maps, with a symbol to indicate if the student is from Aboriginal background
- Any reflection notes made by teachers during the course of the project so

**Development Day 3 – Agenda Date:** Friday October 16th, 2015

**Venue:** L2.G.30, (new room – Northside Room ) Hawkesbury Campus

9.00 - 9.30: Arrival, registration and welcome

**Session 1  9.30 – 10.00 (Jacqui)**

- **Exploring Linguistic Repertoires: Preliminary Data Presentation**
  What do we know about multimodal language learning and associated practices of our students?
Reviewing data: First round coding
  - Languages/dialects spoken
  - Using languages differently with different people
  - Translation practices (context/with whom)
  - Out of school language learning
  - Advantages/Disadvantages of speaking a language other than English
  - Practices outside of school
  - Opportunities to talk in school
  - Connections between home and school language

  - Session 2 10.00 – 11.00
    - Research Methodology: Teachers as Researchers (Wayne)
    - (Teachers bring a hard copy of individual units)
      Linking research to curriculum: presentation and analysis of units of work.
      Each teacher discusses her unit considering the following questions:
      - What precipitated the unit development (stage requirement, curriculum resources, initial mapping, KLA focus)
      - How was the mapping activity explicitly linked to the activities/sequences in this unit of work? What would be missing from the unit if you had not done the mapping activity?
      - What did you notice about yourself, your students and the work produced as you proceeded?
      - What impact (short/long term) has this project had on your students learning, interest, experiences?

Morning Tea 11.00 – 11.15

Session 3 11.15 – 12.30 (Margaret Jacqui Wayne and Lin)
  - Research Methodology: Teachers as Researchers
  - Teachers bring 6 samples of students work (e.g., writing/sentences, brochures, video of students talking/listening, drawing) that reflect a range of abilities.
    Linking research to curriculum: presentation and analysis of student work samples
    Teachers:
    - Why did you choose this work sample? What are its particular characteristics in terms of curriculum outcomes?
    - What does it reveal about the relationship between mapping everyday language practices and its application in the unit of work?
Focus Group Summaries

Lunch 12.30 - 1.00

Session 4 1.00-2.00 (Margaret)

❖ Research Methodology: Teachers as Researchers continued
❖ Teachers bring 6 samples of students work (e.g., writing/sentences, brochures, video of students talking/listening, drawing) that reflect a range of abilities.

Linking research to curriculum: presentation and analysis of student work samples

Teachers:

  o Please consider any change in your perception of students’ abilities and/or engagement (for e.g., attendance, participation, completion of challenging work) as a result of the mapping you have done.
  o Please consider any change in your perception of students’ attitudes and/or identities in relation to language use/ language learning.

Session 4 2.00 – 2.30 (Margaret)

❖ Exhibition and future planning

  o Checking maps against coding
  o School and class presentations
  o Travel and organisation for exhibition

  o Where to next?
Significant environments

Significant environments is about the geography of the places and the way people interact with these environments.

HSIE Syllabus references:

ENS2.5 Patterns of place and location
Describes places in the local area and other parts of Australia and explains their significance

ENS2.6 Relationships with places
Describes people’s interactions with environments and identifies responsible ways of interacting with environments

Students will learn about:

• geographical terminology, e.g. north/south/east/west, Equator, Tropic of Cancer, Tropic of Capricorn, North/South Pole
• significant natural, heritage and built features in the local area, New South Wales and Australia, and their uses
• the location of major cities, rivers and mountains in New South Wales and the capital cities in Australia
• local and other Australian communities
• environmental changes
• groups associated with places and features, including Aboriginal people
• management and care of features, sites, places and environments.
**Focus**

This unit was written to interrelate with an integrated unit written about cultures and their beliefs. This unit will look at different cultures and experiences however the primary focus will be the literacy, particularly visual literacy, comprehension and writing.

**Rationale**

The ability to decode, interpret, create, question, challenge and evaluate texts that communicate with visual images as well as, or rather than, words. Visually literate people can read the intended meaning in a visual text such as an advertisement or a film shot, interpret the purpose and intended meaning, and evaluate the form, structure and features of the text. They can also use images in a creative and appropriate way to express meaning. (English K-10 Syllabus, 2012)

New technologies are largely accountable for the fact that young children are increasingly encountering multimodal forms of texts, or texts that are made up of more than one symbol and sign system. (Kress, 2003)

In today’s world, children need to learn how to critically make sense of visual texts that surround them, some of which are immensely sophisticated. There are visual texts for a range of purposes, such as to entertain, to persuade and to describe; children need to learn what visual texts are for. Furthermore, they need to learn how to construct and create visual texts themselves, for a range of purposes and audiences.

As teachers it is crucial that students are given opportunities to experience visual texts and use skills to explore and critically think about them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes &amp; Content</th>
<th>Reading &amp; Viewing</th>
<th>Writing &amp; Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses an increasing range of skills, strategies and knowledge to fluently read, view and comprehend a range of texts on increasingly challenging topics in different media and technologies EN2-4A</td>
<td>Respond to, read and view texts</td>
<td>Respond to and compose texts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies and compares different kinds of texts when reading and viewing and shows an understanding of purpose, audience and subject matter EN2-8B</td>
<td>o Use strategies to confirm predictions about author intent in imaginative, informative and persuasive texts</td>
<td>o Plan, compose and review imaginative and persuasive texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Recognise how aspects of personal perspective influence responses to texts</td>
<td>o Discuss aspects of planning prior to writing, eg knowledge of topic, specific vocabulary and language features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Recognise cohesive links in texts, eg pronouns that refer back to particular people or things, and understand how they contribute to meaning</td>
<td>o Plan and organise ideas using headings, graphic organisers, questions and mind maps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Connect information by observing text connectives</td>
<td>o Create imaginative texts based on characters, settings and events from students’ own and other cultures using visual features, for example perspective, distance and angle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Interpret text by discussing the differences between literal and inferred meanings</td>
<td>o Reread and edit texts for meaning, appropriate structure, grammatical choices and punctuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Justify interpretations of a text, including responses to characters, information and ideas</td>
<td>Develop and apply contextual knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand and apply knowledge of language forms and features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar, Punctuation &amp; Vocabulary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Develop and apply contextual knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Uses effective and accurate sentence structure, grammatical features, punctuation conventions and vocabulary relevant to the type of text when responding to and Thinking Imaginatively, Creatively & Interpretively | o understand that effective organisation of ideas in imaginative, informative and persuasive texts enhances meaning  
| o understand that choice of vocabulary impacts on the effectiveness of texts |  |
| Understand and apply knowledge of language forms and features | o understand that the meaning of sentences can be enriched through the use of noun groups/phrases and verb groups/phrases and prepositional phrases (ACELA1493)  
| o identify and use grammatical features, eg pronouns, conjunctions and connectives, to accurately link ideas and information |  
| o understand that verbs represent different processes (doing, thinking, saying, and relating) and that these processes are anchored in time through tense (ACELA1482) |  
| o experiment with punctuation to engage the reader and achieve purpose |  
| o investigate how quoted (direct) and reported (indirect) speech work in different types of text (ACELA1494) |  |
| Respond to and compose texts |  |
| o compose a range of effective imaginative, informative and persuasive texts using language appropriate to purpose and audience |  
| o use grammatical features to create complex sentences when composing texts |  |
| Understand and apply knowledge of language forms and features | o make connections between students’ own experiences and those of characters and events represented in texts |  |
APPENDIX V: Eamou Grade 2 work samples

Work sample 1: Pacific Island mask

Work sample 2: Student painting based on Aboriginal artist work
Work sample 3: Persuasive text

Dear Mr. Pan,

I was trying to learn that you had banned excursion, and why would you had banned band excursion? Any way we all love excursion, it is very fun and exciting. That's why we should go on a excursion. We love it! Love it! We urge you to reconsider banning excursions.

As teachers, we can choose excursions which are meaningful to students and improve our test scores and increase our motivation to learn. If we continue to go on these excursions, we will truly achieve our school's motto: “ Honour and Knowledge.”

Work sample 4: Recount of excursion

On the 12th August 2015, an historical excited year 7 from Momena Day We to see how children lived in 1821. Then we learned about manners and flag. Then we said and save. The queen because she felt not safer and we learned about how to animals be safe for we did spelling odd drew some china animals. If you don't do your ti...
Work sample 5: Mathematics language
My life in New Zealand

My name is Bronwyn and I am a 10 year old girl. I have two older sisters. Their names are Lakena and Syrene. I also have two younger brothers and their names are Samuel and Mj. I have two bigger people I try to imitate. They are my parents. They have personal names too. Dad's name is Togatalima and mum's name is Tamaril. At home, I am encouraged to speak in my mother's tongue which is Samoan. But most of the time I struggle doing so. Before living in Australia, I, along with my family resided in the land of the Kiwis, NZ. I lived in West Auckland, 38 Archibald Rd, Kelston.

I was born in Samoa but I only lived there for 4 months. We travelled to New Zealand and we lived there for about 7 ½ years. As one of Jehovah's Witnesses, I attended meetings twice a week. My school was opposite my house so it took me about 30 seconds to 1 minute to walk there. It was called Kelston Primary. I loved my school. Every year, we as a family went to a theme park called Rainbows End for free. We went on heaps of different rides. The scariest ride we went on was the Fear Fall! It was 59.4 meters in height. We were lifted up in the air and then as soon as we heard three clicks, we dropped almost to our death! The pit of my stomach was over my head. This was all possible because of my dad's employment.

My Grandpa's birthdate is December 19th 1937, I'm not allowed to celebrate anything but my dad is not a Witness. We had to do an item for his birthday so we did 2. Me and my 2 sisters were doing it. They were hula dances; my favourite one was the fast one. We then had dinner, one of the foods were fish. We also had dessert, my favourite part! We had vanilla and chocolate ice cream, also delicious mud cake. I felt really angry and sad when I had to leave because most of my dad

Work sample 1: Published diary
Thursday 20th August 2015

Dear diary,
I left my home on Thursday 20th August 2015 because I was a worker. I had to go on a soggy old fishing boat with my family and other workers. We and my mum were really sad when we left our home.

When I was on the boat I was thinking about the stuff I missed. I really missed when I was helping my aunty do the food going to the market. I got water in clay pots and when my dad tells me poems and stories, I was really sad because I missed my home very much.

My mum was very excited about our new country. She was getting her hopes up. I was excited too. I thought about people coming and welcoming me to our new country. I was looking forward to playing, laughing, dancing and studying again and go school.

\[20/8/2015\]
Work sample 3: Japanese fans

Work sample 4: Chinese paper dragons
Overview - # This program is part of Linguistic Repertoires Project undertaken in conjunction with University of Western Sydney. The project aims to incorporate students’ range of home language repertoires, dialects and communicative styles, socio-cultural background knowledge and understanding as well as personal experiences into learning to support students’ acquisition of English language skills as an additional language. It allows students to gain an appreciation for their exiting skills in order to extend their sense of independence and self- worth for academic learning and development within an Intensive English Language classroom. The program is embedded within a Stage two literacy program with a focus on building relationship. The literature focus for the term is “Luke’s Way of Looking.”

Luke’s Way of Looking is an insightful book as it highlights a prevalent theme in society today. The underlying theme of the book, reminds the reader of the importance to always value and celebrate what it means to be different. This was conveyed effectively with the author’s use of language. Nadia Wheatley finely structured the language in a way that the words of each page build the story at the right pace, keeping the reader intrigued as to what Luke was going to experience next. Whether you can relate to how Luke is feeling, or you broaden your perspectives on different ways of looking, all should read this book.

Nadia Wheatley & Matt Ottley
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective A</th>
<th>Objective B</th>
<th>Objective C</th>
<th>Objective D</th>
<th>Objective E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communicate through speaking, listening, reading, writing, viewing and representing.</td>
<td>Use language to shape and make meaning according to purpose, audience and context.</td>
<td>Think in ways that are imaginative, creative, interpretive and critical.</td>
<td>Express themselves and their relationships with others and their world.</td>
<td>Learn and reflect on their learning through their study of English.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Speaking and Listening 1
EN2-1A Communicates in a range of informal and formal contexts by adopting a range of roles in group, classroom, school and community contexts.
- Develop & apply contextual knowledge
- Understand & apply knowledge of language forms and features.
- Respond to & compose texts

### Writing & Representing 1
EN2-2A Plans, composes and reviews a range of texts that are more demanding in terms of topic,

### Speaking and Listening 2
EN2-6B Identifies the effect of purpose and audience on spoken texts, distinguishes between different forms of English and identifies organisational patterns and features.
- Develop & apply contextual knowledge
- Understand & apply knowledge of language forms and features
- Respond to & compose texts

### Writing & Representing 2
EN2-7B Identifies and uses language forms and features in their own writing appropriate to a range of purposes, audiences and contexts

### Thinking Imaginatively & Creatively
EN2-10C Thinks imaginatively, creatively and interpretively about information, ideas and texts when responding to and composing texts.
- Engage personally with texts
- Develop and apply contextual knowledge
- Understand and apply knowledge of language forms and features
- Respond to and compose texts

### Expressing Themselves
EN2-11D Responds to and composes a range of texts that express viewpoints of the world similar to and different from their own
- Engage personally with texts
- Develop and apply contextual knowledge
- Understand and apply knowledge of language forms and features
- Respond to and compose texts

### Reflecting on Learning
EN2-12E Recognises and uses an increasing range of strategies to reflect on their own and others' learning.
- Develop and apply contextual knowledge
- Understand and apply knowledge of language forms and features
- Respond to and compose texts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience and Language</th>
<th>H'writing &amp; Digital Technologies</th>
<th>Reading &amp; Viewing 1</th>
<th>Reading &amp; Viewing 2</th>
<th>Grammar, Punctuation &amp; Vocab</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Develop &amp; apply contextual knowledge</td>
<td>• Develop &amp; apply contextual knowledge</td>
<td>• Develop &amp; apply contextual knowledge</td>
<td>• Develop &amp; apply contextual knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understand &amp; apply knowledge of language forms and features</td>
<td>• Understand &amp; apply knowledge of language forms and features</td>
<td>• Understand &amp; apply knowledge of language forms and features</td>
<td>• Understand &amp; apply knowledge of language forms and features</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Respond to &amp; compose texts</td>
<td>• Respond to &amp; compose texts</td>
<td>• Respond to, read &amp; view texts</td>
<td>• Respond to, read &amp; view texts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EN2-3A** Uses effective handwriting and publishes texts using digital technologies
- Develop & apply contextual knowledge
- Understand & apply knowledge of language forms and features
- Respond to & compose texts

**EN2-4A** Uses an increasing range of skills, strategies and knowledge to fluently read, view and comprehend a range of texts on increasingly challenging topics in different media and technologies
- Develop & apply contextual knowledge

**EN2-8B** Identifies and compares different kinds of texts when reading and viewing and shows an understanding of purpose, audience and subject matter
- Develop & apply contextual knowledge
- Understand & apply knowledge of language forms and features
- Respond to, read & view texts

**EN2-9B** Uses effective and accurate sentence structure, grammatical features, punctuation conventions and vocabulary relevant to the type of text when responding to and composing texts
- Develop & apply contextual knowledge
- Understand & apply knowledge of language forms and features
- Respond to, read & view texts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>knowledge</th>
<th>Develop &amp; apply contextual knowledge</th>
<th>Understand &amp; apply knowledge of language forms and features</th>
<th>Understanding &amp; apply knowledge of vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Understand &amp; apply knowledge of language forms and features</td>
<td>• Develop &amp; apply contextual knowledge</td>
<td>• Understand &amp; apply knowledge of language forms and features</td>
<td>• Understanding &amp; apply knowledge of vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop and apply graphological, phonological, syntactic &amp; semantic knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Respond to, read &amp; view texts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spelling**

EN2-5A Uses a range of strategies, including knowledge of letter-sound correspondences and common letter patterns, to spell familiar and some unfamiliar words.

• Develop & apply contextual knowledge
• Understand & apply knowledge of language forms and features
• Respond to & compose texts
### Key Concepts

**Creativity:** The dynamic process of using language to conceptualise, interpret and synthesise ideas in order to develop a 'product'.

**Culture:** The social practices and ways of thinking of a particular or heritage group, including shared beliefs, values, knowledge, customs, lifestyle and artefacts.

### Focus / Summary

The concept of *Journeys* is explored through a range of spoken, print and digital texts about family, cultural history and cultural tales. These including oral history, picture books, visual texts, songs and presentations by guest speakers about particular journeys. Students can begin to express their point of view about different aspects of the topic such as interesting methods of travel and unusual or memorable experiences. The mentor text *My Mob Going to the Beach*, portrays an idyllic view of childhood when a simple trip to the beach can offer high adventure.

While teaching this unit, explicit teaching of reading will occur concurrently and reading groups will operate.

### English Syllabus Objectives:

A: EN1-1A communicates with a range of people in informal and guided activities demonstrating interaction skills and considers how own communication is adjusted in different situations

EN1-2A plans, composes and reviews a small range of simple texts for a variety of purposes on familiar topics for known readers and viewers

EN1-3A composes texts using letters of consistent size and slope and uses digital technologies

EN1-4A draws on an increasing range of skills and strategies to fluently read, view and comprehend a range of texts on less familiar topics in different media and technologies

EN1-5A uses a variety of strategies, including knowledge of sight words and letter–sound correspondences, to spell familiar words
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B: EN1-6B</th>
<th>recognises a range of purposes and audiences for spoken language and recognises organisational patterns and features of predictable spoken texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EN1-7B</td>
<td>identifies how language use in their own writing differs according to their purpose, audience and subject matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN1-8B</td>
<td>recognises that there are different kinds of texts when reading and viewing and shows an awareness of purpose, audience and subject matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN1-9B</td>
<td>uses basic grammatical features, punctuation conventions and vocabulary appropriate to the type of text when responding to and composing texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: EN1-10C</td>
<td>thinks imaginatively and creatively about familiar topics, ideas and texts when responding to and composing texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D: EN1-11D</td>
<td>thinks imaginatively and creatively about familiar topics, ideas and texts when responding to and composing texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN1-11D</td>
<td>responds to and composes a range of texts about familiar aspects of the world and their own experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: EN1-12E</td>
<td>identifies and discusses aspects of their own and others’ learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT1-1</td>
<td>communicates an understanding of change and continuity in family life using appropriate historical terms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT1-4</td>
<td>demonstrates skills of historical inquiry and communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Literacy Continuum Critical Aspects:**

**Reading Texts**
- Understands text features such as illustrations, diagrams, tables, maps and graphs to enhance meaning.
- Automatically integrates a range of information, e.g. meaning, grammar and letter/sound relationships to read in a phrased and fluent way.
- Knows that literary, factual and screen texts need to be ‘read’ in differing ways.
Aspects of writing

- Responds to punctuation and adjusts expression to enhance meaning when reading aloud.
- Plans texts by making notes, drawing diagrams, planning sequence of events or information
- States purpose and intended audience before creating texts.
- Spells words with regular spelling patterns correctly and makes plausible attempts at words with irregular spelling patterns.
- Applies spelling generalisations when writing.
- Uses contraction apostrophes and capitals for proper nouns as well as other simple punctuation.
- Writes short, connected and sequences texts to narrate events of convey information.
- Includes different types of verbs using appropriate tense and demonstrates subject-verb agreement.
- Uses a computer to produce texts with graphics.

Aspects of Speaking

- Expresses a point of view about a text/topic and listens to and accommodates the viewpoint of others.
- Plans and delivers oral presentations on familiar topics for audiences beyond the immediate classroom, e.g. report or message to another class.
- Automatically adjusts speech to suit different audiences, purposes and situations.
- Demonstrates attentive listening and viewing for extended periods of time.
- Stays on task and participates effectively in longer class and group discussions.

Assessment/Evidence

| Task 1: Questioning of guest speakers. |
| Task 2: Writing to be completed based on the story they were told by a family member or caregiver. |
| Task 3: Written recount of their excursion |
| Task 4: Letter writing - Post card |
| Task 5: Persuasive writing - letter to the Principal |
| Task 6: Persuasive writing – it is better to live in the past/present |
Students will also be assessed on their technology skills when they publish their writing as part of the technology program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Texts:</th>
<th>Written</th>
<th>Visual</th>
<th>Multimodal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written texts involve planning, composition, editing and publishing in print or digital forms.</td>
<td>A visual text is a text in which the image plays a major role in the audiences’ response. Variety of picture stimulus depicting journeys.</td>
<td>Multimodal is defined in the Australian Curriculum as the strategic use of ‘two or more communication modes’ to make meaning, for example image, gesture, music, spoken language, and written language.</td>
<td>O le talo sione by Lino elisi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>