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ABSTRACT

This study was borne out of reflection on my own journey of English language learning. My knowledge of English has been built through my ‘lived-experiences’ of academic and social discourses that I encountered as a postgraduate student learning and living, in English, in Australia. I decided I wanted to be able to use my experiences almost as a touchstone for an investigation of the experiences of others like me. In order to do this, this study has been constructed, and is presented, so that the experiences of the researcher - me - run parallel to those of others who are like me.

The study investigates how the knowledge and experiences of English language learning, that Asian students bring with them to Australia, impact academic engagement and second language socialisation. It also examines how the use of explicit instruction in language learning skills and strategies (LLS) influences continued language development, academic engagement and fuller socialisation within the Australian community.

This research is a qualitative case study. The methodology of the study is informed by a number of theoretical perspectives including phenomenology and ethnomethodology as well as by the principles of designed based research. The study also draws on the work of Michael Agar (1994; 2006) to provide a framework for how Asian students adapt to their new environment. Data were collected through in-depth, semi-structured interviews conducted before and after a language learning strategy training program. Data were also gathered through the application and analysis of a strategy checklist and through the use of an online survey.

There were eight principal participants in the study. Their accounts of their experiences provide rich and detailed information about their language learning, about academic discourse socialisation and about socialisation more generally. Survey data suggest that the experiences of the principal participants resonate more broadly within the Asian student population of the university where this study was conducted.

The findings of the study identify areas of difficulty for the participants and evaluate the effectiveness of the strategy program in supporting students to overcome these difficulties. The study reveals that strategy training can be assistive but that other
factors, such as language proficiency and educational experiences both in home country contexts and in Australia, can impact strategy training effectiveness. These other factors are widely reported in the Australian literature (e.g. Betty Leask; Erlenawati Sawir; Helen Benzie; Simone Volet). What is different about this study is that, through the utilisation of a range of theoretical perspectives to inform and enact strategy training and use, a new theoretically cohesive model has been developed that can be assistive in addressing issues associated with both academic discourse socialisation and second language (L2) socialisation more generally. The study also provides recommendations for institutions and advice for students to better support Asian students, like me, who choose to study in Australia.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Setting the scene: Personal perspective

My own experiences of my English language development as an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learner and teacher in Mongolia, and as a postgraduate international student at an Australian university have led me to this study. My first language is Mongolian. I am fluent in Russian and now in English. I learnt Mongolian and Russian within their ‘natural’ social contexts. More specifically, I was socialised into the practices of these language communities which enabled me to participate effectively and appropriately in the social life of the language communities.

With regard to my learning of English, it was a different experience. When I first started learning (in my last year of high school), the only authentic English experience about my learning was an American Peace Corp volunteer who taught us once a week for three months. I did not learn much. At university, I learnt English predominantly from Mongolian English language teachers, English grammar and translating sentences from English and into English, with some opportunities to speak English in speaking classes. I was a successful student (by Mongolian standard that is, as I was good at grammar and translating). In fact, I was so successful that my university hired me as an English language teacher soon after my graduation.

In teaching English to university students, I focused solely on grammar and translation. I had to, as I did not know any different, and the curriculum and examination of the unit stated that that was what I should do. Besides teaching English in university, I worked as a translator in various educational projects with English speaking people. With such access to the English language, I found myself developing good conversational English (at least I thought so), vocabulary, forms, and pragmatics necessary for working in the projects. Further, my professional ambition led me to wanting to study overseas and I decided to prepare for and sit the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) test. I passed it with 7.5.

So I arrived in Australia to do my master’s degree in education. This is when my real adventure with learning English began. For the first time, I had all the opportunities to
learn the language ‘properly’, faster, and better, with all the right ‘ingredients’ in an authentic environment. How very exciting!

Unfortunately, my excitement was short lived. I quickly realised the massive cultural and social differences between Mongolia and Australia. I was forced to face numerous difficulties and challenges in daily life, in university life, and in the routines and practices associated with living and learning. The IELTS 7.5 which made me believe that ‘I am ready to study in Australia and enter into Australian society’ was totally misleading. I was not ready, not even remotely ready. I had passed the entry requirement and yet I could not ‘enter’.

My experience as an international student was challenging and frustrating. When I started going to my classes in Australia, I saw many differences between my way of learning and the ways of learning of my Australian and other Western classmates. I was reserved and quiet. I tended to listen to other students instead of being involved in discussions. It was very hard for me to participate in classroom activities, to be open and to talk. Most of my schooling and part of my university life was spent in the socialist period in Mongolia. I grew up believing in the importance of listening to one who is in charge, and of respecting them without reservation. I was taught not to have an opinion of my own and this has stayed with me. It was frustrating because my classmates’ behaviour was the total opposite of mine. I was forced to admit that I had a problem with both language and culture, or a ‘languaculture’ (Agar, 1994) problem. I wanted to understand why? Why am I who am I and why can’t I learn the way they do?

This is how I chose the area of my master’s dissertation (Tsedendamba, 2006). The study focused on investigating the relationship between language learning strategies and students’ cultural-educational background. The study suggested that participants’ ineffective use of strategies was affected by the residual influence of their previous educational experience and behaviours formed in their Confucian heritage cultures. In addition to this, all participants in my masters research reported that their study and friendship affiliations were with fellow students who shared similar linguistic, cultural and educational backgrounds. This emerged as a limiting factor in terms of participants’ capacity to further develop their English language competency.
But I was different. Unlike, the participants in my master’s research, I was the only Mongolian student on campus. There was no group where I could be ‘safe’. I had no choice but to come out of my comfort zone and engage fully with learning and living in Australia. Through this experience, I came to view language learning as not only about developing linguistic competence but also, and importantly, about understanding and using “language as social practice” (Scarino & Liddicoat, 2009, p. 16). In order to be able to do this, I had to ‘put myself out there’, into the community and develop strategies to support the process (for more information see Chapter 5). Macaro (2006, p. 264) points out that “One thing seems to be increasingly clear and that is that, across learning contexts, those learners who are pro-active in their pursuit of language learning appear to learn best”. This was true in my experience in learning English.

Reflection upon my own journey, knowledge built through my ‘lived experiences’ (van Manen, 1990) in Australia, and reflection on the data from my master’s research have been instrumental in the formulation of my doctoral research. Within the context of my master’s study, it was not possible to fully explore the issues of language learning strategies (LLS) in relation to the nexus between language and culture. I saw my doctoral research as an opportunity to investigate this further.

1.2 Aims of the study

This study aimed to investigate:

- The impact of Asian students’ previous English language learning experiences on the continued development of English language proficiency within the context of Australian tertiary study.

- Language learning strategy use before and after a strategy training program in Australia.

- Socialisation patterns adopted by Asian students within the Australian context and the possible impact of LLS use on these and the continued development of English language proficiency within academe and also more broadly in Australian community life.
1.3 Setting the scene: Research perspective

Research focusing on these areas was felt to be appropriate due to the growing number of second language (L2) students of Asian background studying in Australia. The number of Asian students in pursuit of Australian higher education has been growing for several decades. Australia is one of the biggest providers of international education services in the world. Whilst the Global Financial Crisis and high Australian dollar have impacted the international student population, there continues to be significant numbers of Asian students choosing to study in Australian universities. A report “English Australia survey of major ELICOS [English Language Intensive Courses for Overseas Students] regional markets in 2012” shows that Asia is considered the largest source of enrolments, reporting 65% of total international enrolment. Top source countries include China, South Korea, Japan, Thailand, and Vietnam. Most of the participants in the present study come from these regions.

Associated with the growth in number of Asian students studying in Australia, researchers and educators (e.g. Andrade, 2006; Ballard & Clanchy, 1997; Chalmers & Volet, 1997; Kimmel & Volet, 2011; Saravanamuthu, 2008; Sawir, 2011; Watkins & Biggs, 2001) have conducted numerous studies examining various aspects of these students’ learning and living experiences including learning styles, English language proficiency, academic performance, social interactions, and cultural experiences (see Chapter 2). The literature on L2 students of Asian background presents a contradictory description of the ways they approach their learning. They have been depicted as passive, reproductive and surface or rote learners (Ballard & Clanchy, 1997; Watkins & Biggs, 2001). However, such a view of Asian learners has been increasingly disputed. Chalmers & Volet (1997), for example, challenge the negative descriptions and suggest that L2 students of Asian background use deep and achieving approaches. Volet (1999) argues that Confucian Heritage Students do not rely on a surface learning approach. In fact, Volet (1999, p. 628) points out that “The negative picture of Asian learners in Australian universities contrasts sharply with evidence from university statistics, that when English language proficiency is not an issue, Asian undergraduate students tend to

---

1 L2 is a language learnt after the first language. L2 is learnt in an environment where the language is widely used outside of the classroom. It should be noted here that as Duff (2012) points out language learners might learn more than two languages and the term L2 can be construed as too restrictive with respect to a person’s linguistic repertoire. Therefore, as Duff (2012) suggests the ‘L2’ is used as a cover term in this study.
perform better in their academic study than local students”. Sawir, Marginson, Forbes-Mewett, Nyland, and Ramia (2012) investigated the role of English language proficiency in 200 EFL students’ communicative capacity both inside and outside the education setting (nine Australian universities) using semi-structured interviews. This study found that proficiency enables EFL students to move beyond passivity.

However, low level of English language proficiency remains one of the fundamental issues that negatively impacts L2 students of Asian backgrounds in completing the disciplinary requirements of Australian universities (Robertson, Line, Jones, & Thomas, 2000; Sawir, 2005; Sawir et al. 2012). The present study views LLS as one vehicle for dealing with the challenges encountered across academic and social discourses while promoting greater success in learning the English language. The application of LLS is considered as “an extremely powerful learning tool” (O’Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Manzanares, Kupper & Russo, 1985, p. 43) for learners in their attempt to communicate and learn in target languages. From this view then, flows the notion that learners can be instructed in the use of strategies, and that once trained, learners then become aware of how to approach the learning task, and what learning strategies are best able to achieve desirable outcomes in particular learning situations. This study does not only look at the strategies per se, but also gives attention to L2 socialisation and L2 academic discourse socialisation processes in an attempt to meet the needs of specific learners, especially in terms of the capacity of training to significantly impact language use in Australian academic and social contexts.

L2 socialisation is concerned with how particular linguistic forms are used and interpreted in a local community and how novices are guided by expert members to participate in the routine practices of everyday life (Duff, 2012). Duff points out that this process is mediated by language to enable the novice to become:

more proficient not only in normative target language forms but also in the value, ideologies, identities, stances, affective states, and practices associated with the language and its users in particular communities of practice (2012, p. 4).

In order to enable such an orientation, Schieffelin and Ochs (1986) emphasise facilitating novice learning in social interaction through the use of an ‘expert’ of the culture or knowledgeable member of the community. Little is known about the role of LLS in the processes of L2 socialisation to enhance social interaction between ‘novices’
and ‘experts’. This study intends to shed some light in this direction by helping students to effectively and appropriately interact with target language community members with the help of oral communication strategies.

The basic concept of L2 academic discourse socialisation is similar to that of L2 socialisation. However, the main element of L2 academic discourse socialisation is that it puts emphasis on socialisation into the practices of academic disciplines or content areas in their L2 (Duff, 2007b; Morita, 2004; 2009). Learning, from the perspective of L2 academic discourse socialisation, is viewed by Duff (2007b, p. 01.4) as developing the capability to participate in new discourse communities as a result of social interaction and cognitive experience. It also involves developing one’s voice, identity, and agency in a new language/culture.

Duff (2010) explains that academic discourse, especially English academic discourse is increasingly becoming multicultural and students who come to study using English as the dominant academic discourse are expected to develop proficiency in this area. Studies (e.g. Duff, 2007a,b; Morita, 2004, 2009) show that students from a range of linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and with variable levels of English language proficiency and prior competence in the use of academic discourse face various challenges when they enter new academic institutions. This issue has become extremely salient. However, there is a scarcity of research that focuses particularly on LLS to enhance L2 academic discourse socialisation processes. Once again, this study takes some initial steps in this direction (along with Rochecouste, Oliver, Mulligan & Davies, 2010, see Chapter 2) by suggesting that LLS is one way to respond to the challenges associated with the area.

It is the interest of this study to contribute further to knowledge and understanding in these areas. In investigating these areas, and in determining the structure of this study, the concept of ‘languaculture’ (Agar, 1994) was considered useful.

1.4 Languaculture

The term “languaculture” was coined by Agar (1994) to define the essential tie between language and culture. Agar differentiates between languaculture 1 (LC1) - source languaculture and languaculture 2 (LC2) - target languaculture. Agar states that language users draw on all kinds of things besides grammar and vocabulary such as past
knowledge, local and cultural information, habits and behaviours. Later, Agar (2006, p. 6) defines culture as “translation” in relation to his notion of ‘languaculture’. According to Agar, “Culture is a lens built for LC1 that focuses on problematic meanings in LC2 and the contexts that render them understandable” (p.6). Culture is therefore “an artificial construction built to enable translation between them and us, between source and target” (p. 6). The following model illustrates Agar’s notion of languaculture.

Figure 1.1 Agar's languaculture model

These concepts have been used in framing this study, in defining the research questions and guiding the research process. Within the context of this study, LC1 reflects participants’ existing (home/source) languaculture, particularly in association with their English language learning experiences in their home country contexts. LC2 is the context in which the participants in this study learn and live. Being an effective participant within LC2 is the aspirational target of the study’s participants. Development towards this target involves being socialised into both the academic and social practices and discourses of the LC2. It is suggested that this can be assisted by the effective and appropriate use of LLS.

This study then, is about translation. It is about processes and tools, and the rendering of meaning, as participants engage in L2 learning in the context of this study. It is also about participants’ ability to translate between LC1 and LC2.
1.5 Research questions

In accordance with its aims, this study addresses the following research questions:

- What knowledge and experience do students bring from their LC1 (home/source culture), and how does this impact on continued language development, academic engagement, and on socialisation as they engage with English in an overseas tertiary context? More particularly:
  - What were the participants’ English language learning experiences like in their home country contexts and what LLS did participants use?
  - What LLS are participants using in the Australian educational context to facilitate their academic engagement and socialisation process?
  - How do these impact on participants within Australia with respect to academic engagement, socialisation processes and to continued development of English proficiency?

- How can training in the use of LLS support continued language development, academic engagement, and socialisation within the Australian context? Areas to be explored include:
  - What form should strategy training take, and how should this be determined?
  - The extent to which training in the use of LLS can impact on academic engagement, and socialising within the Australian context (LC2)?
  - How training in the use of LLS can support ‘translation’ into LC2?

Agar’s model has been used to inform the development of these questions. Investigations of these questions are designed to provide valuable insights into participants’ lived-experiences across their LC1 and LC2 and thus make a significant contribution to the body of knowledge associated with the learning and living of Asian students studying in Australian universities.

1.6 Significance of the study

The study has the potential to contribute to the growing body of literature on the experiences of Asian students studying in Australian universities. More specifically, it highlights issues associated with English language use both within the context of university study and within Australian society more broadly. In addition, the findings may also have the potential to make both practical and theoretical contributions to the
area of LLS as the study seeks to accommodate aspects of L2 socialisation and L2 academic discourse socialisation more specifically within the conceptualisation of LLS. As such, this study has the potential to provide insights within the field of LLS.

1.7 Overview of the study

This chapter began with my own story of English language learning. Discussion then moved on to how this informed the research aims and perspective for the study which includes the three key areas of interest: LLS, L2 socialisation, and L2 academic discourse socialisation. The chapter also talks about the concept of ‘languaculture’ which is used to frame this investigation.

Chapter 2 offers a review of relevant literature for the study. This chapter was developed through an ongoing iterative process of synthesising the literature in the fields of LLS, L2 socialisation, and L2 academic discourse socialisation. In reviewing the literature, it is identified that the strategy literature has paid scant attention to strategies to support socialisation and that the language socialisation literature does not address the details of LLS support. It is also identified that more studies are needed to provide explicit illustrations of the types of support new students can be provided with in order to deal with the challenges associated with the socialisation process. Such is the intent of this study.

In Chapter 3, the epistemological stance, theoretical perspectives, methodology, and methods used for the study are presented. The reasons for adopting qualitative approaches and methods to answer the research questions and to achieve the research aims are also presented. A detailed description of the selection procedure for participants as well as data analysis, establishment of trustworthiness, and ethical considerations associated with the study are also included.

Chapter 4 presents an in-depth account of the principal participants’ individual cases including information about their English language learning experiences in their home countries, and learning and living experiences in the Australian context. Through the case studies, participants’ LC1 and LC2 are delineated.
Chapter 5 provides a detailed analysis of the data presented in Chapter 4. This chapter also presents the results of the online survey which aimed to ascertain the extent to which the findings from the principal participants’ cases resonated more broadly within the L2 Asian student population of the case study university. Finally, the chapter identifies the participants’ needs with respect to LLS to support their engagement with LC2 academic and social discourses in order to inform and shape a strategy training program.

Based on participants’ needs, the strategy training program was developed. Chapter 6 presents the systematic development of the strategy training program in three phases: phase 1 – strategy training program development, phase 2 – strategy training program implementation, and phase 3 – strategy training program evaluation and application.

Chapter 7 reports on the analysis of the final semi-structured in-depth interview and participants’ responses with respect to their total experiences. This chapter also discusses the issue of the possible impact of LLS on the participants’ English language proficiency level.

Chapter 8 synthesises the data presented in previous chapters to answer the research questions of this study. This chapter presents a reconceptualised ‘languaculture’ model that is formulated based on the outcome of this study. Following the discussion of the revised model, this chapter presents contributions and limitations of this study, suggestions for future research efforts and recommendations for institutions. Finally this chapter offers some advice for Asian students like me.
CHAPTER 2 A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

As I started Chapter 1 with my own story with respect to the origin of the study, so too I am beginning this chapter with my experiences of undertaking this review. Initially, the thesis had two literature review chapters. This was the result of my initial inability ‘to see the wood for the trees’. Having become so immersed in the field of language learning strategies (LLS), I became ‘bogged down’ and it was difficult to do the required synthesis for a literature review that was directly related to the study. In the process of exploring the fields that are encompassed by this study and their intersections, I have had to consciously pare down the original work in order to distil what was actually important within the study and how the information I encountered guided the research questions.

As a result of this situation, the review has been iterative in nature. It was an ongoing process that both informed and was informed by the study. The iterative process has helped me to relate the literature review to Agar’s model (see Chapter 1, Section 1.3). As can be seen from the model shown in Figure 1.1, there is ‘space’ in the translation arena. In synthesising the literature in the fields of LLS and language socialisation, and having interrogated a significant quantity of data, particular themes pertinent to this study emerged and the positions of LLS and language socialisation in that space in the translation arena have become clearer.

This study focuses on investigating the impact of strategy use across academic and social discourses and on the continued development of English language proficiency. Hence, the key areas of this study focus on LLS, L2 socialisation, and L2 academic discourse socialisation. From this perspective, this chapter presents a review of the literature within these fields and related areas of interest.

2.2 Introducing the concept of LLS

The review of the literature begins with LLS and with a particular focus on a number of central issues which underpin the core concepts of this study. The first consideration is to provide an overview of the history over the last three decades, including how the
elements and aspects within that history relate to this study. The focus of attention will then turn to the issues related to the definition and classification of LLS. This is followed by a review of the literature on variables affecting strategy choice such as proficiency, culture, and learning context. Attention is also given to the ‘teachability’ of LLS.

2.2.1 A potted history of LLS research

LLS research as a field has approximately thirty years of history. The most significant early root to influence LLS research was the work of Vygotsky. Vygotskian ‘cognitive-historical’ work was first written in Russian in 1930 and then published in English translation in the West in the 1970s. In his work, Vygotsky (1978) talks about higher psychological actions including planning, monitoring, and evaluating which are internalised by the learners through social mediation (interaction with ‘experts’) and mediation by a cultural tool (i.e. language or books) until the process is fully self-regulated. This strategy concept informed, and was widely applied in LLS research in its early years.

In the 1950s and 1960s, a behaviourist view that was heavily dependent on stimulus-response reinforcement (Skinner, 1950), quickly became the dominant model in language teaching. Language learning, enacted through this perspective involved a great deal of pattern repetitions to instill proper habits in the learner. This view was overturned because of its focus on the learner as a passive subject. Researchers and educators began acknowledging the fact that learners had been largely neglected in the behaviourist tradition (Danserau, 1978), and the learning aspect of the development of the language process had received little attention (Tarone & Yule, 1989). As Larsen-Freeman (2001, p. 12) points out language education had “underestimated the significance of the learner’s role”.

Building on the concept of learner error, and followed by Chomsky’s (1968) Universal Grammar in which the learner is viewed as a generator of rules, and Krashen’s (1976) theory of L2 acquisition in which he insists that language is acquired through natural communication, a communicative language teaching (CLT) approach was introduced by Hymes (1971). A special focus of the approach was to enhance learners’ communicative competence. This shift gained increasing attention in language education and continues
to be influential. As a result of the adoption of this approach, language education gradually shifted from a teacher-centred to a more student-centred approach. Thus the importance of discovering more about the learner’s contribution in the learning process became a central concern. This was one of the driving forces behind the concept of LLS and has been influential in the emergence of LLS research.

From the early 1970s, awareness grew slowly of the role of strategy use during the process of language development. Researchers also began to attempt to define and classify the strategies (e.g. Naiman, Frohlich & Todesco, 1975; Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1975). At the same time, LLS were investigated in relation to several different variables including language proficiency (Bialystok & Frohlich, 1978), and individual differences (Wong-Fillmore, 1979).

The period between the 1980s and the early 1990s was a time of substantial research in the LLS field. In the 1980s, it became widely recognised that language learning is a cognitive process and that learners consciously and actively participate in their own learning using LLS. The work of Anderson (1983) added an important new dimension to our understanding of learner strategies. In his model of cognitive information-processing, Anderson conceptualised two types of knowledge: declarative and procedural. According to O’Malley & Chamot (1990) strategies begin as declarative knowledge (internalised L2 rules and memorized chunks of language) and can be proceduralised with practice or cognitive and autonomous stages of learning. Ellis (1985) explains that at the cognitive stage, strategy use is still based on declarative knowledge. In contrast, once strategy use has become proceduralised, it is used automatically which means that the student may not be aware of using the strategy (O’Malley & Chamot, 1990). Also, during this period, studies continued to be conducted to investigate the correlation of strategy use with variables such as language proficiency (Bialystok, 1981; Reiss, 1983), and culture (LoCastro, 1994; Politzer & McGroarty, 1985; Surtridge, 1997).

Importantly, in the 1980s it was proposed that learners should be taught LLS to promote more effective learning. Following this trend, researchers (e.g. O’Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Manzares, Russo & Kupper, 1985) began to explore the extent to which strategy instruction enables language learners to become more effective learners. Also, a number of strategy instruction models were developed able to be integrated into the
language curriculum or conducted outside the language classroom (e.g. O’Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990b).

At the end of the 1980s, a group of researchers (Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989) proposed an apprenticeship model in relation to LLS research. The core concept of this model is ‘experts’ model strategies simply by doing their everyday activities and newcomers/novices participate in the activities passively or actively (Brown, Collins & Duguid, 1989). Brown et al. explain that in their attempt to participate and understand the sociocultural situation, newcomers or L2 learners infer or ask the ‘experts’ about how they accomplish their social practices. This element of LLS research has continued to be investigated from a sociocultural perspective by other researchers (e.g. Oxford, 1990b; Scarcella & Oxford, 1992) who have also drawn heavily on the work of Vygotsky (1978).

During the latter years of the 1990s, LLS research declined partly in response to growing criticism around definitional fuzziness (Ellis, 1994), partly because of conflicting categorisation systems (Brown, 1994; Chamot & El-Dinary, 1999; Gu & Johnson, 1996; Schmitt, 1997), and partly because of inconsistent or contradictory results in research studies investigating correlation between strategy use and variables including culture and proficiency (for more discussion on this see Section, 2.3).

At the start of the new century, a number of new studies restrengthened the field. Strategy instruction emerged as a dominant theme in the LLS research (Chamot, 2005; Hassan, Macaro, Mason, Nye, Smith & Vanderplank, 2005; Rubin, Chamot, Harris & Anderson, 2007). Researchers have also further reflected on and refined LLS definitions (Cohen 2011b; Griffiths, 2008; Oxford & Schramm, 2007). Studies have continued to be conducted on variables affecting strategy choice such as proficiency (Takeuchi, Griffiths & Coyle, 2007), culture (Griffiths, 2003a; Woodrow, 2005), and learning context (Gao, 2006; He, 2002; Norton & Toohey, 2001; Takeuchi, 2003).

In terms of LLS theory, as can be seen from above, a large number of studies have been conducted from empirically supported cognitive and sociocultural theories. More recently, Dornyei (2005), a prominent critic of the LLS field (Cohen, 2011b), has suggested looking at LLS use more specifically from an educational psychological perspective. In this regard, Dornyei has dismissed the use of ‘strategy’ and proposed the concept of ‘learner self-regulation’ instead. This is based on his argument that the
process of self-regulation generates strategies as a product. Later, Griffiths (2008) argued that “the self-regulation concept ... does not remove the need for a strategy concept ...” (2008, p. 85). It should be noted here that in spite of his criticism of strategy research Dornyei does support ‘strategy’ at the pedagogical level (Cohen, 2011b). The current study has a significant focus on LLS at the pedagogical level, particularly with respect to the capacity for LLS training to impact language use in the LC2.

Oxford and Schramm (2007) suggest that both sociocultural and psychological perspectives, with focuses on the groups and the individual, are equally important in understanding how language is learnt. Whilst acknowledging the potential compatibility of both theories, Oxford and Schramm offer to consider the importance of self-regulation as an appropriate perspective in strategy research with the aim of understanding strategies in more encompassing and more useful ways. They made such a suggestion on the basis that both psychological and sociocultural perspectives have focused on self-regulation and both can enrich and be enriched by the other.

Therefore, in spite of a resurgence of interest, the theory of LLS remains weak. According to Macaro (2006), the elements that contribute to weaken the theoretical foundation of LLS include problems in definitions, limited consensus on relationship between strategy use to processes and skills, and a lack of certainty with regard to issues related to strategy transfer across tasks, modes and learning contexts. However, in response to the claim that LLS theory is weak, Grenfell and Macaro (2007), Chamot (2009), and Cohen (2011b) assert that LLS is very much alive and well, both theoretically and practically.

Today, more researchers in the field of LLS (Oxford, 2011; Rose, 2012a,b; Weinstein, 2009) are moving in the direction of reconceptualising LLS to be inclusive of self-regulation. However, it is important to note that this work is still in its infancy, and thus should not be regarded as the ‘best’ theoretical approach to be used in relation to strategy use, until further evidence of conceptual usefulness is provided.

After 30 or so years of investigation, the field of LLS remains controversial. This brief historical review of research on LLS identifies key perspectives and trends within the development of this area. As such it provides a preliminary understanding of the field
that is central to the current study. In what follows significant issues within the area will be examined through the literature. These include definitional and classification issues of LLS. Also, the role of culture on the choice of LLS, the impact of LLS on language proficiency, influence of learning context on strategy development, and the teachability of LLS will be considered. Much of the discussion is drawn from Western academic scholarship. In recent years, however, an increasing number of Asian academics have contributed to the field, particularly with respect to understanding the relationship between strategy use and culture, proficiency and learning context (see Section 2.3). This is important as it will give insights into the experiences of Asian students’ strategy use in association with their cultural background, English language proficiency, and learning context. These are the main focuses of this study.

2.2.2 Defining LLS

This section discusses the evolution of LLS definitions. First of all it needs to be noted, as stated previously, that the initial concept of LLS is “fuzzy” (Ellis, 1994, p. 549). The “explosion of activity” (Skehan, 1989, p. 285) in the field of LLS was accompanied by different researchers adapting different definitions. For example, Rubin (1975) following her seminal work, “What the good language learner can teach us”, defined LLS as “the techniques or devices which a learner may use to acquire knowledge” (p. 43). Following Rubin’s broad definition, Weinstein and Mayer (1986, p. 315) defined strategies as “behaviours and thoughts that a learner engages in during learning”. Later Mayer (1988, p. 11) more clearly defined LLS as “behaviours of a learner that are intended to influence how the learner processes information” within the framework of cognitive theory. In contrast, Oxford (1990a, p. 8) defined LLS as “specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations”. From these early definitions, two common characteristics of LLS can be noted. Firstly, LLS are learner generated. Secondly, LLS can be noticeable or observable (behaviour, technique, action) or invisible (thought, process occurring inside the mind).

According to Stern (1992, p. 261), “the concept of learning strategy is dependent on the assumption that learners consciously engage in activities to achieve certain goals and learning strategies can be regarded as broadly conceived intentional directions and
learning techniques.” Later Cohen (1998, p. 4), in his definition of LLS, also emphasised the conscious selection of strategy use by the learner. This shows that an evolution in LLS definitions has occurred over time. Compared with early definitions, these later definitions give emphasis to the level of consciousness of strategy use in order to achieve language learning goals.

Recently from the psychological perspective, Oxford and Schramm (2007, p. 47) defined LLS as being a “specific plan, action, behaviour, step, or technique that individual learners use, with some degree of consciousness, to improve their progress in developing skills in a second language and foreign language”. Once again, this definition emphasises the learner’s intentional choice of strategy use or conscious strategy use which promotes learners to learn successfully and improve language modes. However, Dornyei (2009) is sceptical about the use of ‘consciousness’ in LLS definitions as according to him the word is “a notoriously vague term”.

In 2007 Cohen, in pursuit of definitional refinement of LLS, developed a questionnaire to canvass the views of strategy experts including Chamot, Griffiths, Oxford, Macaro, Nyikos, Rubin, and Vandergrift. Twenty three international scholars met together. The most important finding of the questionnaire in relation to LLS definition was that experts agreed that LLS improve learner performance in language learning and use, and also that strategies make language learning ‘easier, faster, and more enjoyable’.

However, there was a lack of consensus on the word ‘consciousness’ based on the argument that learners could be less conscious or unconscious of their strategy deployment or execution once strategy use becomes proceduralised or automatic. Cohen (2011a) explains that if they were not conscious, or if learners were no longer conscious of employing them, then the actions associated with this behaviour need to be described as processes, not as strategies. Cohen (2011a, p. 7) argues that “the element of consciousness is what distinguishes strategies from those processes that are not strategic” and the element of conscious ‘choice’ is important in strategy use. Consequently, Cohen has defined LLS as “Thoughts and actions, consciously chosen and operationalised by language learners, to assist them in carrying out a multiplicity of tasks from the very onset of learning to the most advanced levels of target-language performance” (2011a, p. 7).
The process of defining LLS remains controversial. However, it is necessary to establish a definition of LLS that is suitable for the purposes of this study. The definition of LLS proposed by Griffiths (2008, p. 87) “activities consciously chosen by learners for the purpose of regulating their own language learning” was felt to be suitable for the purposes of this study. Griffiths proposed this definition by analysing six important features of various definitions suggested and debated by key researchers over the years. Griffiths points out that this definition is broad enough to enable flexibility within the field but also limited in a way that it does not include learner characteristics or other activities that are not LLS. The flexibility factor of this definition allows learners to facilitate not only language learning tasks with the help of strategies and develop language modes, but also any aspect of their learning which could include understanding and capacity to use the various conventions of academic and social discourses, an area of focus in this study. Also, this definition includes the concept of ‘conscious choice’ as the word ‘conscious’ is significant in this study, given that the participants in this study were encouraged to use the strategies consciously, appropriately, and effectively (see Chapter 6, Section 6.5).

2.2.3 LLS classifications

In 30 plus years of history, strategy classification has generally been undertaken for research purposes rather than to support or inform learners’ learning goals or teachers’ instructional goals (Chamot, 2004). This is significant because in this study strategy classification embraces both research and also the practicalities of learning and teaching through strategy training.

In reviewing the literature in this area, it can be identified that there are two common ways of classifying strategies: strategy classification by function and strategy classifications by mode area. Also, strategies have also been classified as surface, achievement, and deep strategies (Ehram & Leaver, 2003; Fan, 2003; Woodrow, 2005), although this classification system is not commonly utilised in the LLS field.

Classification by function namely, metacognitive, cognitive, affective, and/or social strategies is the most common way of classifying strategies. Accordingly, a number of strategy classification systems have been developed (O’Malley & Chamot, 1990;
Oxford, 1990a; Rubin, 1987). Most of these strategy classification systems reflect categorisations of LLS that are relatively the same without any fundamental changes. For that reason, I am not going to compare them, but to mention the classification systems and authors that have dominated the area, particularly those advocated by O’Malley and Chamot, and Oxford².

One of the early attempts to classify strategies by their functions was made by O’Malley et al. (1985). O’Malley et al. identified three sets of LLS: metacognitive, cognitive and socioaffective strategies. Later O’Malley and Chamot (1990) explained the development of these strategies based on information-processing theory, stemming from cognitive theories of general learning processes derived from Anderson’s (1983) work.

Oxford’s classification system is considered one of the most prominent in LLS research. Oxford’s (1990a) classification system divides strategies into two general groups, direct and indirect, and six sub-groups including metacognitive, cognitive, memory, compensation, affective, and social strategies. Sixty two strategies have been illustrated which include every strategy that is referred to in previous studies conducted in the LLS field prior to 1990. Oxford’s classification formed the basis for an instrument she called the ‘Strategy Inventory for Language Learning’ (SILL) which was designed to measure the frequency of strategy use. Although the author points out that “it is only a proposal to be tested through practical classroom use and through research” (Oxford, 1990a, p. 16), the SILL has been used, reported and written about widely (often by Oxford in combination with a range of authors) and translated into 20 languages. Therefore, SILL dominates the literature in the area.

With respect to classification by mode, there are a number of categorisations (Bacon, 1992; Cohen, 2011a; Schmitt, 1997; Fan, 2003). In what follows, I briefly discuss the strategies associated with specific language modes. For example, learners’ listening strategy use has been mainly investigated in relation to a level of success in learner’s performance. Accordingly, O’Malley, Chamor & Kupper (1989) identified that successful language learners appeared to pay attention to chunks of texts rather than individual words using selective attention, elaboration, inferencing, and self-monitoring strategies while listening. Bacon (1992) usefully categorised listening strategies into

² Whilst a comparison is not made in this review, example strategies from both classification systems are included as Appendix 2.1 in this study.
bottom up (text based) and top-down (higher cognitive level). More recently, Griffiths (2003a) added that successful language learners take most out of their opportunities by listening to native speakers and noticing language use in the environment to improve their ability to listen in a target language.

With regard to speaking strategies, Cohen (2011a) identifies learners’ main reasons for using speaking strategies. Generally, learners use speaking strategies when they face problems or breakdown in communication in order to stay clear of encountered problems and so that they can continue speaking in an alternative way (Cohen, 2011a). Cohen (2011a) suggests that commonly used oral communication strategies include overgeneralising grammar rules, topic avoidance or abandonment, message reduction, code switching or compensation strategies, and paraphrasing.

Reading strategy research emerged from English as L1 reading research (e.g. Palincsar & Brown 1984; Pressley 2002) and has become fundamental in informing L2 reading strategy research (e.g. Anderson 1991; Block 1986). Often reading strategies are classified as ‘bottom-up’ (Smith 1978) or ‘top-down’ (Goodman, 1967) strategies. As a bottom-up process, a reader focuses on words and phrases (Smith, 1978) often only interacting with the basic building blocks of sounds and words and focusing on the decoding dimension (Stanovich, 1980). On the other hand, Goodman (1967) explains that a reader who goes through a top-down process reads for the meaning of a text rather than understanding words or phrases and this supports her/his comprehension at a whole text level. Reading, in this sense, is “a dialogue between the reader and the text” (Grabe 1988, p. 56) with reader's background knowledge playing a key role (Tierney & Pearson 1994). Moreover, the emergence of a sociocultural approach to reading has seen Freebody and Luke (2003) propose the four resource model for reading which includes decoding written text, understanding and composing meaningful text, using text functionally, and critically analysing texts. However, reading is a complex process and teaching and learning to read in both L1 and L2 requires attention to the “confluence of a number of theoretical positions and their practical outcomes operating in a sociocultural context” (Winch, Johnson, March, Ljungdahl & Holliday, 2006, p. 2).

Like L2 reading strategy research, L2 writing research has also been informed by English L1 writing research findings (Hayes & Flower, 1983). The work of writing strategy classification remains controversial because researchers still have not arrived at
a unified understanding of the L2 writing process. The main issues of debate include differences (e.g. Bitchener & Basturkmen, 2006; Hinkel, 2004; Lee, 2005) and similarities (e.g. Matsumoto, 1995; Schoonen, van Gelderen, de Glopper, Hulstijn, Simis, Snellings & Stevenson, 2002) between the L1 and the L2 writing process, and the impact of culture on the writing process (e.g. Scollon, 1999). More recently, a shift in writing research has occurred towards a direction termed the ‘post-process’ period (Atkinson, 2003; Leki 2003). This ‘post-process’ encompasses all necessary phases of the writing process including pre-writing, drafting, feedback, and revision. However, the uniqueness of this conception lies in the argument that essential aspects of writing such as accuracy, fluency, clarity, originality, and critical thinking are dependent on the context where the writing occurs.

Research into vocabulary learning strategies has mainly examined vocabulary strategies in relation to strategy identification and classification based on Oxford (1990a) and O’Malley and Chamot’s (1990) work. Schmitt (1997) points out that at the beginning stage learners use vocabulary strategies to learn new words mainly involving mechanical repetition but when they begin to understand the value of the strategies they move away from mechanical repetition to deeper strategies. Following Schmitt’s proposition, Fan (2003) divided vocabulary strategies into a ‘primary category’ (dictionary and guessing strategies) and a ‘remembering category’ (repetition, association, grouping, analysis and known words strategies). According to Fan (2003) the association, grouping, and analysis strategies include deep processing which goes beyond mechanical techniques required in repetition strategies.

While acknowledging the usefulness of all these strategies, Woodrow (2005) points out that there is no one taxonomy of LLS that can be applied to all groups of learners due to the limited empirical research findings in support of each taxonomy and also the scarcity of repeat studies. In addition, Chamot (2004) suggests that modified classification systems can exist for researchers since learners’ learning goals can be expected to vary in response to factors such as the need for interpersonal communication skills, academic study in a L2 at various institutional levels, and passing examinations or course requirements. This, together with the learning context specific to educational institutions in which learners are studying, determines the types of LLS that will be suitable to assist learning (Chamot, 2004). As such, the types of LLS used in
this study were context-specific strategies to assist the participants across their required academic and social discourses.

It is not the intention of this study to assess overall capacity to use a specific type of LLS. This is a qualitative study designed to explore and meet the needs of specific learners who have shifted their learning and living environments from Asia to Australia. The LLS, that are the focus of the strategy training program within this study, were selected through a needs analysis (see Chapter 5). The specific LLS were selected in terms of them being appropriate tools to achieve the expressed needs of participants. This assessment was informed by data from participant interview, my own experience with LLS, my professional experience with learning strategies, and the relevant literature. In saying this, this study did not adopt any specific type of classification system, but rather it has its own modified system which is discussed within Wallace’s (1991) model of reflective practice (see Chapter 6, Section 6.3.1).

2.3 Variables affecting strategy choice

There are a number of different variables identified within the literature that influence a learner’s strategy choice in L2 learning. This section looks at three of these variables considered to be significant in this study - culture, proficiency, and learning context. This is a selective review in that it predominantly focuses on studies that were conducted with adult Asian students in the ESL context.

2.3.1 LLS use and culture

It is a common observation that culture impacts learning strategy use. For example, Griffiths and Parr (2000) point out that students’ ways of learning depend on their cultural backgrounds. Yang (as cited in Oxford, 1996) states that culture includes beliefs, perceptions, and values and these have an impact on the overall learning styles and specific learning strategies used by L2 learners. Surtridge (1997, p. 72) suggests that this is partly because “Different cultural backgrounds and different educational systems foster different strengths and weaknesses in learners”.
Following this trend, the relationship between LLS and culture has been investigated in the LLS field. However, it appears that this area has not been comprehensively examined. It is not easy to find studies that examine strategy use in relation to culture, particularly studies conducted in recent years with a focus on Asian students in tertiary ESL contexts, similar to the ones associated with this study. However, it needs to be noted that work is being undertaken in the Australian context with respect to internationalisation and international students. This promises to be more inclusive of a focus on LLS (Rohecouste, Oliver, Mulligan & Davies, 2010; Whitelaw, Henderson, Jose, Defeng, Cuiming, Wenjie & Qinxi, 2010) (see Section 2.9).

During the “explosion of activity” (Skehan, 1989, p. 285) in the field of LLS in the mid 1980s and 1990s, a number of studies of LLS use in relation to cultural background were conducted. These studies primarily used SILL to investigate what were often small cohorts of Asian language learners studying in university in the USA (Politzer & McCroarty, 1985), in schools in the USA (O’Malley & Chamot, 1990), on Chinese university EFL students (Bedell & Oxford, 1996), and Japanese university EFL students (Mochizuki, 1999). The results of these studies were inconclusive. Some studies yielded findings that rote memorisation strategies were typical of Asian students (Politzer & McCroarty, 1985, O’Malley & Chamot, 1990), while others reported that Asian students’ strategy preference was towards compensation strategies (Bedell & Oxford, 1996; Mochizuki, 1999).

However, in reviewing the literature it was identified that there has been a decline in studies that investigate culture in relation to strategy use since the late 90s. This review suggests three reasons for this. Firstly, this may be due to the perception that it is often considered not “politically correct to generalize” (Pierson, 1996, p. 51), although with respect to this Welikala and Watkins (2008) point out that in order to enhance cultural learning, it is important to ask and listen to experiences rather than stereotyping people. Secondly, this decline may be due to the recent view of strategy use as dynamic and changing across time and context (Gao, 2004; Cohen, 2011b). This is further discussed in Section 2.3.3. Thirdly, this decline may be due to the increasing criticism with respect to SILL as this instrument measures quantity of strategy use, rather than quality, and this causes inaccuracies with respect to individual learners’ strategy use (Tseng, Dornyei & Schmitt, 2006; Woodrow, 2005). It is intended that this study will go some
way to building knowledge in this area from a qualitative rather than measurement perspective.

2.3.2 LLS use and proficiency

Proficiency as a variable has been examined more often than any other variable examined in LLS research. Studies in the area suggest that more proficient learners use a greater number of strategies more effectively than less proficient learners (Green & Oxford, 1995; Lan & Oxford, 2003; Oxford, 1996; Oxford & Ehrman, 1995; Takeuchi, Griffiths & Coyle, 2007). It should be noted however, that much of the research in the area has been conducted using the SILL, and much has been authored by Oxford.

However, contrary to popular belief, the findings of some studies (Nisbet, Tindall & Arroyo, 2005; Woodrow, 2005) yielded different findings. There are a number of reasons for such contradictory results. Firstly, again the types of instruments selected to measure language proficiency are weak (Dornyei, 2005; Woodrow, 2005). Secondly, it was found that strategies other than those included in the SILL may have been used by language learners (Nisbet, Tindall & Arroyo, 2005). Lastly, research in this area has been criticised on the basis that the frequency of strategy use does not measure language learning outcomes (Cohen, 2011a; Gu, 2002).

Many studies that argue more effective use of strategies with more proficient learners measured proficiency through TOEFL (e.g. Green & Oxford, 1995; Nisbet, Tindall & Arroyo, 2005). The fact that proficiency is tested by TOEFL is of itself problematic because TOEFL is not a reliable tool to measure proficiency (Griffiths, 2003b). Griffiths (2003b, p. 37) points out that “real” language is not multi-choice, and

---

3 Language proficiency is a concept that is not easy to define and assess (Griffiths, 2003b). First of all, there is a lack of consistency across different terms used to define proficiency. For example, the concept of proficiency is often related to skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing and elements of language knowledge including pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary and the culture of a language with which people use the language (Lado, 1961). However, it is not easy to determine what constitutes ‘skill’ in language (for example, should skills be differentiated from elements of language knowledge? Is fluency more important than accuracy?) (Brumfit, 1984). Nunan (1988) suggests explaining language proficiency in terms of language performance and linguistic competence. Such inconsistency in defining proficiency complicates the assessment of proficiency. A range of proficiency tests have been developed including TOEFL and IELTS.

4 TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) is one of the widely used tests worldwide to measure English language proficiency of non-native English speakers for academic admission to universities in English speaking countries and placement decisions (Chappelle, Enright & Jamieson, 2008). The main goal of the test is “to meet the needs of college and universities on both undergraduate and graduate levels” (Taylor & Angeli, 2008, p. 27). In other words, the “test tasks would reflect what students would find in academic settings” (Jamieson, Eignor, Grabe & Kunnan, 2008, p. 62).
therefore, it is difficult to be sure that multi-choice questions are really measuring what they are supposed to be measuring”.

In such tests, often “the whole focus is on the test itself” (Sawir, 2005, p. 579). These tests, for example, IELTS\(^5\) often do not of themselves provide a comprehensive preparation for coping with language issues in, for example Australian universities (Sawir, 2005). A lot of international students enter into Australian higher education after passing the entry requirements of TOEFL or IELTS but often they struggle to ‘enter’ just like I did. Carroll (2005) identified that students, although meeting the IELTS entry requirements, still had poor academic English proficiency and poor academic performance.

Hirsh (2007, p. 196) points out that “it is important to indicate that neither the IELTS nor the TOEFL test claims or is designed to predict the subsequent academic performance for tests takers”. However, from a test taker’s point of view, after passing the IELTS, I believed that I was ready to study in an Australian university. Perhaps the advice of Ingram (2005) should be considered. Ingram, one of the original developers of IELTS, argues that what IELTS measures and what it does not measure should be made explicit to test takers from the outset. Ingram (2005, para. 2) suggests that issues associated with IELTS should be solved by universities who are accepting these students by establishing “realistic and appropriate proficiency levels for entry purposes”. However, when universities are competing to attract more international students due to significant economic benefits, this area is left undiscussed. What can be drawn from the literature in this area is that at this stage, tests such as IELTS are a very artificial way of measuring language proficiency and are primarily focused on gate-keeping entrance.

The above discussion shows that measuring language proficiency through the use of tests such as TOEFL and IELTS is contentious. Given this, the claim that more proficient learners use a greater number of strategies more effectively also becomes highly questionable. This study did not want to establish a psychometrically sound

\(^5\) IELTS (International English Language Testing System) is a similar test to that of TOEFL but widely recognised in the Australian higher education context (Taylor, 2007). In the IELTS official website (http://www.ielts.org/researchers/history_of_ielts.aspx), it states that “test tasks were based on an analysis of the ways in which language was used in academic contexts and were intended to reflect the use of language in the ‘real world’”.
instrument to measure language proficiency. This study is interested in the qualitative dimension of the relationship between LLS use and proficiency and to support IELTS ‘graduates’ negotiate the translation arena between LC1 and LC2.

2.3.3 LLS use and learning context

Norton and Toohey (2001) point out that in order to understand good language learning, it is essential to look at social practices as a learning context in which people learn languages. Only a limited number of studies (e.g. Carson & Longhini, 2002; Gao, 2003; Gao, 2006; He, 2002; Takeuchi, 2003) have investigated the relationship between LLS use and learning context from a qualitative perspective. The conclusion arrived at in these studies is strategy use is dynamic and changing because it varies across contexts.

Two of these studies (Gao, 2006; He, 2002) are particularly relevant to this study because they depict learners’ evolution of strategy use when they moved from an Asian learning context to ESL learning contexts. Also, these studies are relevant here in the sense that they provide thick and rich descriptions of learners’ strategy use. The current study proposes to also provide rich descriptions of learners and their strategy use. It should be noted here that strategies used by the participants in these two studies were self-initiated. No reference in either of these studies was given in relation to strategy support or training. In contrast, in the current study, besides examining learners’ existing strategy use, support is provided to learners in the form of strategy training.

He (2002) documented the evolution of his own LLS use from his teenage years all the way to being a post-graduate student in Australia. In his LC1 of China, He mostly learnt English following the “Chinese equivalents by copying” (p. 111). Hence, he often used strategies such as coping and memorising. But after his arrival in Australia, his strategy use became diverse in response to the inadequacies in participation in discussions and oral communication. He started using strategies such as watching soap operas on TV, guessing meanings, creating opportunities to talk to his lecturers, and interacting with other students.

Similarly, Gao’s (2006) study identified that the Chinese influence on LLS was weakened after the students started studying in an English university. Through an analysis of 14 Chinese students’ narratives on their LLS use, Gao identified that in
China the students used LLS such as memorising and reviewing mainly to pass official exams and tests. In England, they were motivated to improve their English through active socialisation with English-speakers by making friends with locals, living with local students, and guessing or acquiring meanings of new words in real life interactions. He and Goa’s studies provide excellent examples in support of the claim that LLS use is not static but dynamic and changing.

As aforementioned, the notion of strategy use as both enduring and evolutionary is significant in this study, given that this study looks into the participants’ English language learning experiences together with strategy use both in their home country contexts, and across academic and social contexts after their arrival in Australia. This approach to learner strategy use will “generate highly contextualised understandings about learners’ strategy use in specific contexts” (Gao, 2004, p. 11) where the strategies are being used. In the case of this study, Cambodia, Korea, Japan and Thailand as LC1 and Australia as the LC2.

### 2.4 Strategy instruction

The concept of strategy instruction has been a natural outcome of LLS research. One of the important results of LLS research has been that “learners should be taught not only the language but also directed toward strategies they could use to promote more effective learning” (Rubin, Chamot, Harris & Anderson, 2007, p.141). In general, strategy instruction focuses on raising learner awareness of learning strategies and encourages them to systematically practise, reinforce and monitor their strategy use while working on language tasks to eventually promote effective learner performance (e.g. Chamot, 2005; Oxford, 1996; Cohen, 2011b).

This section presents a review of the literature in the area of strategy instruction. Firstly, it looks at the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) model as its six steps of teaching and learning and its iterative nature are felt to be particularly important in informing the strategy training program of this study. Secondly, explicit or integrated strategy instruction is examined. This helped to determine the type of strategy training to be used in this study. Studies investigating the impact strategy training has on learners have also been considered in this section.
2.4.1 The CALLA model

The CALLA was one of the first strategy training models to be developed and is one of the most widely used. The CALLA model was developed to increase the school achievement of students learning through the medium of an L2 (Chamot & O’Malley, 1994). The distinctive feature of the CALLA model is that it fosters the development of academic language, subject area discourses, and explicit strategy training (Chamot, 2005). The model consists of six steps including, preparation, presentation, practice, evaluation, expansion activities, and assessment. Chamot (2005) points out that the CALLA model is not linear but is iterative in a way that enables learners and teachers to have the possibility of revisiting previous instructional stages when necessary.

The CALLA model is relevant to this study. In particular, the CALLA framework informed scaffolding steps as a teaching approach used to facilitate strategies in the explicit strategy training program of this study (see Chapter 5, Section 5.4.1). Also, the iterative aspect of the CALLA was significant in this study as it parallels the iterative nature of the design-based research methodology which informed the design of the strategy training program of this study (see Chapter 5, Section 5.4).

2.4.2 Explicit or integrated strategy instruction

A distinction is often made between explicit as opposed to integrated strategy instruction. In explicit strategy training, the teacher’s role is to describe, scaffold, and provide examples of effective strategies, organise students to engage with group or class discussions about strategy use, and encourage students to transfer strategies into other learning situations (Cohen, Weaver & Li, 1998). A number of researchers (Anderson, 2002; Chamot 2004, 2005; Cohen, 2003a,b; Cohen, 2011a,b; O’Malley & Chamot, 1990) agree on the effectiveness of explicit strategy instruction. However, Griffiths (2003b) warns that there could be a lack of student motivation to attend a separate training program outside their regular classrooms, as is the usual requirement of an explicit training program.

On the other hand, in integrated strategy instruction, strategies are often woven within the language curriculum, as part of a regular language course. This type of strategy
instruction provides learners with chances to practise LLS with authentic language tasks (Chamot & O’Malley, 1994) However, concern has been expressed about such programs (Gu, 1996; Weinstein & Mayer, 1986), due to the issue of strategy transfer to other tasks or subject areas, as well as the pedagogical impracticality of asking all teachers to teach LLS instead of organising separate training for learners.

Cohen (2003b) suggests that the form of the strategy training should depend upon the students’ needs and the availability of resources including time, money, materials, and teacher trainers. Based on participants’ needs and their time availability (see Chapter 3, Section 3.6), this study employed an intensive explicit strategy training that was conducted outside usual classes over a five day period (for more detailed discussion see Chapter 6).

2.4.3 Studies investigating the impact of LLS intervention on learners

In reviewing the literature, it was identified that early studies that focused on training learners on LLS use mostly were conducted in the ESL context on, for example, school learners (O’Malley et al. 1985), university Russian students (Thompson & Rubin, 1996), and university French and Norwegian students (Cohen, Weaver & Li, 1998). There is a scarcity of LLS intervention studies conducted with Asian tertiary learners in the ESL context. Zhang’s (2008) study within the Singapore context is one of only a few studies conducted in the ESL context in recent years. However, there has been an increase in intervention studies in the EFL context with Asian tertiary level students in recent years (e.g. Cross, 2009; Fan, 2003; Iwai, 2006).

The vast majority of these studies regardless of ESL or EFL contexts are de-contextualised. In other words, these studies mainly focus on determining the relationship between strategy instruction and improvement in language modes, paying little attention to the actual context in which the learning took place and the factors that could have influenced improvement in the use of language modes. Also, these studies have predominantly used pre and post-test methodology, dividing students into control and experimental groups, and comparing the outcomes without accommodating issues related to long-term retention of strategy use.
Also, the value of strategy instruction has not been comprehensively illustrated by the intervention studies. More specifically, in these studies, learner needs were not taken into consideration before the strategy training, the stages within strategy training such as developmental, implementation, and evaluation stages were not demonstrated systematically, and learner application of strategy use was not captured. The intervention program included in this study comprehensively and systematically captures the development, implementation, evaluation and application of the strategy training program in response to participants’ needs from a qualitative perspective. Also, the actual context in which the participants used the strategies has been taken into consideration.

In conclusion, the LLS field remains controversial due to vagueness in definitions, various overlapping classification systems, inconclusive research findings, and a lack of agreement on theories. Moreover, through its history, the LLS field has been dominated by several authors such as Oxford, O’Malley and Chamot. Also, many LLS studies have been conducted from a quantitative perspective and are lacking a qualitative focus. As a result, it has become clear that LLS research needs a more significant focus on qualitative dimensions that take into consideration the learning and living contexts where strategies are being used and the notion of strategy use as enduring and evolutionary to support continued development of the L2. This study attempts to do this. It aims to support participants’ socialisation into Australian academic discourse and also within the broader Australian community through increasing awareness and use of LLS to significantly impact language use in the LC2. Ultimately, the study hopes that participants will be better able to ‘translate’ with the help of LLS. In what follows, literature on language socialisation and academic discourse socialisation is reviewed.

2.5 Introducing the concept of language socialisation

Firstly, it needs to be noted that the strategy literature pays scant attention to strategies to support socialisation and that the language socialisation literature does not address the details of LLS support. In synthesising the literature on language socialisation, especially in the areas of L2 socialisation, this study hopes to add an additional dimension to the LLS field, especially in terms of the capacity of training to significantly impact language use in the LC2.
2.5.1 The background to language socialisation

Language socialisation is the study of how children and other novices are socialised by and through language into the practices of their own and other communities (Bayley & Langman, 2011). Therefore, fundamental to language socialisation is the emphasis on the language and the relationship between ‘novice’ and ‘expert’.

The field of language socialisation has originated from linguistic anthropology (Hymes, 1972) but is also linked to sociology (Bourdieu, 1977), cultural psychology (Rogoff, 1990), and sociolinguistics (Duff & Hornberger, 2008). Accordingly, it has been influenced by a range of theories such as sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978; Ochs, 1986; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006), indexicality (Gumperz, 1982), communities of practice drawing on practice theory (Bourdieu, 1977; Lave & Wenger, 1991), socioconstructivism (Rogoff, 1990), phenomenology (Schutz, 1967) and ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1967). Researchers have also extended their research focus from child primary language acquisition (e.g. Ochs, 1988; Schieffelin, 1990) through to a focus on language socialisation as a lifelong process (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986).

Language socialisation research has been conducted in various settings such as African-American and white working class communities in America (Heath, 1983), indigenous communities (Ochs, 1988; Schieffelin, 1990), urban and diasporic communities in America (e.g. Baquedano-Lopez, 2000), bilingual and multilingual communities (e.g. Li, 2000; Morita, 2004), and institutional environments such as schools (e.g. Duff, 1995) and work places (e.g. Katz, 2000). Within these diverse settings, diverse topics of research have been explored such as communicative style, affective stance, interactional routines, social relationships, social interactions, status differences, and language socialisation through particular linguistic features.

Because of its wide range of perspectives, settings, area of inquiries, and age groups, this review is selective focusing on the area central to this study. This includes ‘novice’ and ‘expert’ relationship, and the stages of the socialisation process that the novice goes through. The review also looks at the studies investigating L2 socialisation.
2.6 L2 socialisation

L2 socialisation occurs when people leave their familiar culture (primarily socialised from childhood) and enter a new cultural environment and join new discourse communities (i.e., institution, workplace) (Lave & Wagner, 1991). Pavlenko and Lantolf (2001, p. 74) describe L2 learners as those “who have both physically and symbolically crossed the border” to live or study in new cultural and linguistic environments. It is noted that learning a L2 consists of processes of learning and acquiring the linguistic conventions and cultural practices of the L2 communities (e.g. McKay, 1993; Pennycook, 1995). During such processes, as previously mentioned the ‘novice’ and ‘expert’ relationship is the key.

2.6.1 ‘Novice’ and ‘expert’ relationship

Duff (2012) explains that an ‘expert’ is someone who is more knowledgeable about and proficient in the language and familiar with the culture whereas the ‘novice’ is someone who is less proficient. Hanks (1996, p. 229) notes that

In order for two or more people to communicate, at whatever level of effectiveness, it is neither sufficient nor necessary that they ‘share’ the same grammar. What they must share, to a variable degree, is the ability to orient themselves verbally, perceptually, and physically to each other and to their social worlds.

In order to enable such orientation, Schieffelin and Ochs (1986) emphasise facilitating novice learning and social interaction by the ‘expert’ of the culture or knowledgeable member of the culture in the ‘zone of proximal development’ (ZPD), a concept introduced by Vygotsky (1978). Bruner (1978) called this concept ‘scaffolding’ which is discussed further in Chapters 3 and 5. Schieffelin and Ochs (1986, p.166) believe that,

Novices are able to carry out particular tasks through ‘guided interactions’; they develop skills in a ‘zone of proximal development’ as they move from guided or collaborative to independent action.

Within this zone, novices socialise into L2 communicative norms, organise, and acquire cultural knowledge through various communicative activities that are culturally situated and widespread in everyday communication (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986).
Researchers explain the stages of the socialisation process that a novice goes through in order to participate in social interactions. At the beginning stage, novices position themselves as peripheral observers (Ohta, 1999), thus their involvement in the social practices with ‘experts’ is limited (Lave & Wenger, 1991). The term peripherality means “an opening, a way of gaining access to sources for understanding through growing involvement” (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 37). Thus novices, although they are not actively being involved in the interactional routines, are as peripheral observers being socialised into target cultural practices and norms (Ohta, 2001). Within the context of this study, ‘periphery’ is the edge of the ‘translation arena’ (see Chapter 1).

However, as exposure to social interactions increase with the help of experts, novices slowly start internalising ways of appropriate participation including communicative norms and nuances, and meanings and purposes implicit within them (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976). Gradually, novices develop the ability to participate in the interactional routines without the help of the expert and deepen their understanding of implicit meanings of social interactional routines (Wersch, 1985) and become legitimate peripheral participants (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Schieffelin and Ochs, (1986) explain that as interactional routines are repetitive in nature, they are gradually proceduralised in learner’s ability to interact which helps them to increase their participation in the interactions, which in return enable them to increase their language performance and develop L2 proficiency.

2.6.2 Studies investigating the L2 socialisation process

Ochs (1999, p. 230) points out that:

… language socialisation research examines how language practices organise the lifespan process of becoming an active, competent participant in one or more communities” that can be “households, neighbourhoods, peer groups, workplaces, professions, religious organisations, recreational gatherings, and other institutions.

In Li’s (2000) study of a Chinese immigrant woman’s language socialisation experience in a workplace, it was revealed that the participant was able to internalise L2 communicative norms and nuances and also to participate in workplace interactional routines such as making direct requests. This progress was achieved with the help of
enough exposure and involvement in the Canadian social practices and was scaffolded by more knowledgeable colleagues.

Duff (2012) notes that experts or agents of socialisation whether they be teachers, peers, relatives, or co-workers need to be willing and have a desire to assist the novices in order to enable their socialising process easier. However, Duff (2002, 2003, 2004) points out that in the L2 socialisation context, some novices may receive a warm welcome and support from their new communities, some may not be accommodated similarly, and may face resistance from the new L2 communities, while others’ goals may not require them to become socialised into the new community for practical, logical, or ideological reasons. Ochs (2002, p. 114) argues:

… there is considerable overlap across speech communities in how language users signal actions and psychological stances but considerable differences in how communities use actions and stances to realize particular activities and identities … commonalities assist novice second language acquirers who venture across geographical and social borders. Alternatively, … cross-cultural differences often thwart the language socialization of novices trying to access second culture … .

For example, in Siegal’s (1994) study of adult Western women learning Japanese in Japan, it was revealed that some of the learners resisted the highly feminised polite forms of language such as high pitch, feminised intonation, lexical conventions, and non-linguistic dispositions such as bowing deeply. These women expressed the notion that such cultural practices conflicted with their own language and gender ideologies because they felt that if they adopt these aspects of a language and culture, it would make them feel subordinate. Another study conducted by Katz (2000) among the staff at a Californian factory found that intercultural misunderstandings existed between two different sociocultural groups including employees and managers because of their different politeness systems and the preference of the employee to stick to their own background social values and identities. Such misunderstanding resulted in a negative perception towards employees as being resistant, uncooperative, and incompetent.

A study conducted by Ranta (2004) among Chinese international students studying at a Canadian university revealed that students who lived and studied in Canada for over six months had only ten minutes exposure to L2 oral interactions outside their normal classroom on a daily basis. This shows that these students had extremely limited L2
socialisation in the host community outside their classrooms and really remained on the periphery of the translation arena shown in Figure 1.1 in Chapter 1.

Norton (2000) points out that as novices interact within target linguacultural contexts, they face challenges to extend their existing identity and constantly attempt to re-define or re-invent their identity, ideologies, as well as socialisation network. Shi (2006) points out that such conflicting processes are usually faced by adult novices because they have already formed more or less proficient linguistic and cultural knowledge, self image, and identity in their primary language socialisation.

Interestingly, researchers (Katz, 2000; Li, 2000; Shi, 2006) note that in the ever-ongoing socialising process, learners/novices tend to conduct self-examination, which helps them to learn, contribute and reshape their participation in socialising interactions. Shi (2006, p. 9) explains that at this stage, “adaptive transformation occurs” and learners:

- expand their repertoire of language resources and social identities,
- become more inclusive, discriminating, and integrating in cross-cultural perspectives,
- develop multiple lenses to view and make sense of their worlds, and as noted by Duff (2012, p. 4)
- they “seek … membership … in the communities in which the language is spoken”

In the current study, participants are positioned as novices in their Australian university and broader Australian community and their Australian peers or members of the Australian community are positioned as experts. This research is about the extent to which the intervention, for example, the strategy training program contributed to or supported participants with socialisation into the LC2. In this sense, the strategy training program serves as a way of facilitating what Shi (2006) calls ‘adaptive transformation’. Also, the strategy training program (or LLS) serves as a tool to help participants move away from the periphery stage or edge of the translation arena into the LC2.

---

6 Norton (2000) used Friedrich’s (1989) concept of ‘linguaculture’. Friedrich (1989, p. 307) describes the concept of ‘linguaculture’ as “a domain of experience that fuses and intermingles the vocabulary, many semantic aspects of grammar and the verbal aspects of culture; both grammar and culture have underlying structure while they are constantly being used and constructed by actual people on the ground”. Friedrich points out that this change in terminology will help to eliminate years of confusion about the concepts of ‘language’ and ‘culture’. Later, Agar (1994) altered Friedrich’s term into ‘languaculture’. On his alteration of the term, Agar (1994, p. 265) says “I modified it to ‘langua’, to bring it in line with the more commonly used ‘language’”, as well as to highlight the inseparability of language and culture. In this study, I have chosen Agar’s concept ‘languaculture’ (see Chapter 1, Section 1.4).
2.7 Introducing the concept of L2 academic discourse socialisation

Academic discourse socialisation is one of the significant areas identified within language socialisation research. However, unlike L2 socialisation which primarily focuses on the socialisation process of novices into the practices of a community, academic discourse socialisation focuses on the socialisation process into academic discourse. Academic discourse consists of forms of oral and written language and communication-genres, registers, graphics, linguistic structures, interactional patterns-that are privileged, expected, cultivated, conventionalised, or ritualised, and therefore, usually evaluated by instructors, institutions, editors, and others in educational and professional contexts (Duff, 2010, p. 175).

According to Duff (2007b) discourse socialisation occurs through processes of apprenticeship and accommodation of newcomers by expert native speakers. Therefore, within the context of L2 academic discourse socialisation experts and their roles are crucial in the processes of apprenticeship. However in this study, the term ‘core member’ in relation to my role in facilitating the strategy training program is used instead of ‘expert’. I position myself using Vickers’s (2007) notion of ‘core member’. This is because although I have traversed the translation arena, I am not an expert native speaker and that therefore the notion of ‘core member’ is more appropriate.

Vickers’s study (2007) clearly illustrates how with support a student can transition from periphery to be a competent member of discipline specific discourse. Vickers’s (2007) study, informed by Leontiev’s activity theory, examined the L2 socialisation process of an advanced student studying science and engineering courses. The student’s transition from peripheral to core member of the engineering course activities was supported by three types of interactional events:

- access to observations of core members interacting,
- scaffolding by core members both in the lab and in the team meetings, and
- opportunities for successful design experiences and for chances to explain design processes (Vickers, 2007, p. 637).

In what follows, the review of the literature looks at a number of studies conducted on L2 academic discourse socialisation processes that can be relevant in informing the current study.
2.7.1 Studies investigating L2 academic discourse socialisation

In reviewing the literature on L2 academic discourse socialisation, it was identified that most of the studies have been conducted outside of Australia, particularly in North American or Canadian contexts. Duff (2010) comments that academic discourse, particularly English academic discourse, has been widely researched from a range of theoretical perspectives. However research on socialisation into academic discourse has received little attention. In other words, Duff (2010) identifies that insufficient research has examined the processes of apprenticeship into the uses of academic discourse as well as the accommodation of newcomers by expert native speakers within academic communities. There are a number of studies, however, that can be used to ‘signpost’ areas to be examined in this study.

Morita’s (2004) study is significant as it suggests that students may well remain on the periphery even though they are positioned within an L2 context. Morita identified issues related to culture, identity, differences in pedagogy, and power relations as impacting ‘translation’. Her study examined the struggle of international first year female Japanese students in a Canadian university as they sought to participate in academic classrooms and in open-ended discussions.

Another study (Duff, 2007a) identified that when students fail to access English speaking support networks due to their cultural and pragmatic differences, they find comfort with other students with the same or similar cultural backgrounds. This was the case of Korean undergraduate exchange students studying in a Canadian university who participated in Duff’s study (2007a). Duff calls it “hybrid/third space” (2010, p. 182) because “in this third space, English was a lingua franca that co-existed with Asian languages, including Korean” (2007a, p. 10). The hybrid or lingua franca is the practised form of the language rather than the academic English required for effective participation in the university context.

In a later study, Morita (2009) examined strategies that one Japanese student employed to help him overcome the challenges associated with language, culture, and gender issues whilst participating in a range of academic practices of a Canadian university. However, the student considered that his biggest problem was language and therefore,
the strategies used were particularly focused on improving language limitations. These strategies were taking ESL/EAP classes, hiring a private tutor, talking one-on-one with his Canadian classmates, and practising English oral communication at home. The student acknowledged the usefulness of the strategies but gave up some of the strategies, for example, ESL/EAP classes because they required additional time and thus interfered with his study period. Also another reason for giving up the ESL/EAP classes was that the student found that the content and the academic skills taught in those classes were different from the requirements of the course he was doing in the university. Whilst the student remained proactive to improve his English proficiency, it was still difficult for him to gain many opportunities to communicate with the ‘experts’ because not all ‘experts’ (e.g. instructors and peers) were keen on assisting him get needed access to the specific practices of the target community that he required. This study shows that L2 academic socialisation process is a challenging process that impacts on student’s participation and development of identity in LC2. It also shows that students can be creative and use various strategies to deal with their challenges.

As the review shows, novices go through stages of socialisation upon entering into a new cultural and knowledge community. Expert/core member facilitation and guidance in novice learning and social interaction is essential in the socialisation process. Research shows that novices often experience a range of challenges due to language, cultural, identity, and ideological differences. As a result, novices can fail to develop the ability to participate in the practices of their target community and therefore remain on the periphery – on the edge of the translation arena. More studies are needed to provide explicit illustrations of the types of support novices/students can be provided with to deal with the challenges associated with the socialisation process. Such is the intent of the current study. The design and implementation of an intervention, inclusive of strategies to support L2 socialisation and L2 academic discourse socialisation, is purposeful and is intended to support novice transition from LC1 to LC2.

Having explored the literature around LLS and language socialisation, it is time to look at studies related to the context in which this current study takes place, namely the Australian tertiary context. A great deal of work is being undertaken in the Australian context with respect to internationalisation and international students, primarily focusing on international students’ learning experiences, adjustment into Australian university learning, and intercultural interactions between international students and
Australian students (e.g. Kimmel & Volet, 2012; Nemoto, 2007; Sawir et al. 2012; Volet, 1999; Volet & Renshaw, 1995; Yoshimitsu, 2007). This review is selective as it refers only to Australian literature and focuses on L2 students of Asian background.

2.8 L2 students of Asian background in the Australian context

Australian tertiary institutions have experienced an influx of international students in recent decades, particularly students from Asian countries (also see Chapter 1, Section 1.3). The learning experiences of these students in the Australian tertiary context are widely documented in the literature (e.g. Biggs, 1996; Chapple, 1998; Curro, 2003; Tran, 2008; Volet & Renshaw, 1995; Volet, 1999; Yoshimitsu, 2007). This section looks at contradictory descriptions of the way L2 students of Asian background approach their learning as reported in the literature, issues associated with English language proficiency and programs developed to increase academic performance and intercultural interaction between international and Australian students. International students’ intercultural interaction with the wider community outside the university context is also considered.

2.8.1 Early studies on Asian learners: Surface approach to learning

Early studies on Asian international students in Australia suggested that Asian learners were rote learners because their learning was surface learning (Brick, 1991; Ballard & Clanchy, 1995). It was suggested that these students demonstrated a surface approach to learning because they predominantly learnt by recalling, reproducing and memorising (Ballard & Clanchy, 1995) with limited student engagement (Biggs, 1979). As a result, these students were unable to fully participate in a learning environment that emphasises cooperative and collaborative learning and that encourages students to communicate, solve problems, think critically, and generate knowledge (McGee-Banks & Banks, 1995). This interpretation of the learning of Asian students was often

---

7 The terms ‘international or foreign’ students have been commonly used across the literature in this area. However, disagreements exist in the literature in relation to the use of the terms. Rochecouste, Oliver, Mulligan and Davies (2010, p. 27) noted that the term ‘international’ was ‘muddy’. A number of different terms were suggested such as transnational and sojourners (Doherty & Singh, 2005; Marginson, 2007). In this review of the literature, I have used ‘L2 students of Asian background’ for ‘Asian international students’ where possible. However, it was not always easy to avoid using the terms ‘international’ because this is commonly used in the literature. I have used the term when talking about the issues related to learning experiences and intercultural interaction in general.
grounded within dimensions of ‘Asian’ culture perceived to relate to power distance and teacher-centred learning environments.

2.8.2 Challenge on early claim: Surface and deep approaches to learning

Other studies (Curro, 2003; Biggs, 2003; Volet & Renshaw, 1995), however, have argued against this simplistic interpretation of learning. This is because mismatches exist in regards to individual differences (Volet, 1999). Chapple (1998) points out the importance of recognising individual differences among students and warns against sweeping generalisations in relation to culture, educational systems and attitudes to study.

Reflecting the above, a number of studies indicate that like their non-Asian counterparts, Asian students use both surface and deep learning approaches. For example, Curro (2003) denied the notion that Asian learners are surface learners and maintains that it is a myth that memorisation equals mechanical rote learning or learning without understanding. Biggs (1996) points out that Asian learners seek to understand, reflect and question knowledge, for later deployment that means they can be deep learners. Research conducted by Wong (2001) on Confucian Heritage Culture students who studied in two Australian universities, revealed that students rejected the ‘memoising and reproducing’ conception of learning.

Moreover, it is identified that Asian learners learn through interactions as opposed to lack of student engagement. For example, Volet and Renshaw’s (1995) research revealed that Confucian Heritage Culture students enjoyed interactions with lecturers in classroom settings and tutorials. In a more recent study (Yoshimitsu, 2007), found that a Japanese student’s increasing interaction with her Australian peers contributed to her participation in the discourse practices of her Australian university. Similarly, Tran’s (2008) study showed that four Chinese ESL students doing their Master’s degree course at an Australian university frequently communicated with their lecturers and this made a significant contribution in their studies (Tran, 2008).

However, whilst these studies document successful transition of international students, a number of other studies (e.g. Bretag, Horrocks & Smith, 2002; Ringer, Volkov & Bridson, 2010; Rosenthal, Russell & Thomson, 2006; Sawir, 2005) reveal that L2
students of Asian background experience a number of challenges whilst studying at Australian universities. These challenges are attributed to differences associated with language, cultural and educational backgrounds.

2.8.3 English proficiency issue: Transitioning into Australian university learning

It should be noted that the low level of English language proficiency of international students is often cited as the fundamental issue that negatively impacts completing the requirements of academic work (Robertson, Line, Jones, & Thomas, 2000; Sawir, 2005; Sawir, Marginson, Forbes-Mewett, Nyland & Ramia, 2012). The most frequently identified language-related learning issues, in Australian research studies, relate to writing and oral communication. For example, in a study (Sawir et al. 2012) on 200 international students 86% of whom were L2 students of Asian background, it was revealed that a number of academic difficulties were triggered by lack of English proficiency. These were associated with discipline specific academic writing tasks, oral presentation, classroom participation, listening comprehension, problems in keeping up with lectures, and teachers who spoke too fast.

2.8.4 English proficiency issue: Forming relationships with Australian students

Also frequently reported within the literature is the difficulty expressed by international students in forming relationships with Australian students. This is attributed to cultural differences and is also related to English language proficiency (Choi, 1997; Nestade & Todd, 2000; Robertson, Line, Jones, & Thomas, 2000; Sawir, Marginson, Deumert, Nyland, & Ramia, 2008; Smart, Volet & Ang, 2000; Volet & Pears, 1994; Volet & Ang, 1998).

Smart, Volet, & Ang, (2000) in their study with eight L2 students of Asian background revealed that none of the students had Australian friends. The students interviewed expressed their interest and high expectation to mix with Australian students, however both Asian and Australian students expressed that the other should initiate the contact. Volet & Pears, (1994) point out that it is not easy for international students to mix, meet and make friends with Australian students, regardless of their interest to do so.
As a result of a lack of intercultural interaction, international students are reported as often facing feelings of isolation from their Australian peers as well as cultural loneliness (Roberston et al. 2000; Sawir et al. 2008). In such situations, these students tend to study and socialise with their own groups from the same or similar cultural background both at university and off-campus (Nesdale & Todd, 2000; Rosenthal, Russell & Thomson, 2007; Volet & Ang, 1998). However, Sawir et al. (2008) recognise that same-culture networks cannot ensure satisfactory engagement with local cultures.

Volet and Renshaw (1995) acknowledge the difficult transfer of international students, and suggest that students need to be well equipped to enhance the necessary skills, such as proficiency in order to “adjust to the overseas ecology” (Volet 1999, p. 636). Volet (1999, p. 628) points out “when English language proficiency is not an issue, Asian undergraduate students tend to perform better in their academic study than the local students”. But when proficiency is an issue problems are magnified. Sawir (2005) agrees with Volet’s viewpoint and suggests that students need to improve English language proficiency, especially oral communication.

2.8.5 Programs to increase academic performance and intercultural interaction

A number of programs have been set up by tertiary institutions to enhance academic performance and to foster intercultural interactions. For example, Quintrell and Westwood (1994) report on a ‘peer-pairing’ or ‘buddy’ program that was developed to establish host university students and international students collaboration with each other to assist the international student to adapt to a new culture. Overall, the program was used successfully and increased intercultural knowledge and interaction between the two groups. However, it was noted that it is important for international students to contribute to the interactive process rather than to position domestic students in the expert role. This claim made by Quintrell and Westwood (1994), however, contradicts with the fundamental concept of L2 socialisation that emphasises facilitating novice learning and social interaction by the ‘expert’ of the culture or knowledgeable member of the culture (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986).

In a similar vein, residential programs provided opportunities for social interaction and friendship formation as well (Todd & Nesdale, 1997; Smart et al. 2000). These programs have resulted in an increased intercultural knowledge and friendship
formation. Volet and Ang (1998) noted that it was best to implement this program at the early stages of transition as at that stage students are most receptive to making new friends. The situation of early intervention programs was summarised by Smart et al. (2000, p. 49):

We have some ideas about programmes in a range of domains that seem to foster increased social interaction. However, in very few cases do we have rigorous evaluations or detailed case studies which could help us establish the underlying principles and dynamics that would be likely to enable design and implementation of more universally applicable initiatives.

More recently, in order to improve interactions between international and Australian students, Leask (2009) suggests developing formal and informal curricular activities which will encourage, foster and facilitate positive and rewarding intercultural interactions amongst students. According to Leask, the formal curriculum activities include the activities organised around content areas, assignments and examinations. On the other hand, by informal curriculum, Leask means a range of extracurricular activities held on campus designed to help students to meet the objectives of the formal curriculum such as organising peer-assisted sessions. Leask proposes a number of suggestions on how to develop these curricula. For example, in order to achieve real engagement between international and Australian students, she suggests designing the curriculum in such a way that its assessment activities, for example, include requirements on demonstrating knowledge in intercultural competencies. Or when designing tasks, instead of asking students simply to work in groups, Leask suggests structuring tasks in such a way that students must meaningfully exchange cultural information. With regard to informal curriculum, Leask acknowledges the difficult nature of planning and organising activities for the informal curriculum. She notes that the most important aspect of such curriculum is to organise activities that will encourage and support the engagement in the interactions of both international and Australian students equally. Although such intervention is likely to impact positively on students’ improvement in interactions, the formal and informal activities suggested by Leask (2009) did not give a clear focus on improving language limitations of international students.
2.8.6 Little attention to enhancing language

In the burgeoning body of literature in this area, there continues to be a paucity of studies focused on enhancing language. Moreover, there are a relatively small number of studies that talk specifically about LLS to assist with academic learning and social interaction. An initial step, however, has been made in this direction by Rochecouste et al. (2010). These authors investigated the relationship between strategies used to improve language proficiency and academic success. Initially, this study set to recruit a potential cohort of approximately 60,000 international students from 59 countries studying in five Australian universities. However, less than two percent of the potential number of international students participated in the questionnaire component of the study and only 12 students were interviewed after the questionnaire. It revealed that students used a range of LLS and academic learning strategies to enhance their learning and living experiences. For example, students used social strategies such as joining study groups and participating in tutorial activities. Or, in order to improve listening skills and develop their understanding of Australian culture, students reported that they listened to news on the radio. Also many of the students reported that social immersion in an Australian environment whether it be at home, at university, at work or in the community is important in order to develop English language proficiency.

The current study with its multiple interviews and strategy training approach aims to give more specific and in-depth information with respect to this area. In what follows, the review of the literature looks at intercultural interactions of L2 students of Asian background with the wider Australian community.

2.8.7 L2 students of Asian background and the wider Australian community

In reviewing the literature, it was identified that investigating international students’ intercultural interaction with the wider community outside the university context is just as important as understanding the interaction between international students and host university students. Marginson, Nyland, Sawir and Forbes-Mewett (2010) point out that capacity to relate to the Australian linguistic and cultural community helps international students promote better self-expression and increased self-confidence. This helps students to carry out everyday tasks (Yang, Noels & Saumure, 2006).
A few Australian studies (Daroesman, Looi & Butler, 2005; Prescott & Hellsten, 2005) that have looked at intercultural interaction between international students and the wider Australian community, have revealed that language proficiency is a central factor in integrating socially with members of the community. This is exemplified in a study by Xu (2012) who documented the successful transition of three Chinese international students with high English proficiency into the Australian linguistic and cultural community. Students made a successful transition by taking up any opportunities to participate in English-mediated activities, by following a problem-solving approach to learning, and by engaging in informal social interactions. These activities were consciously taken up by the students and helped them to construct new ways in relating to and entering into the Australia community.

Rosenthal, Russell and Thomson (2006) also acknowledge the relationship to proficiency in their study. The authors identified that international students who have used English since their childhood experienced less cultural stress and higher connectedness to the discourse community either at work or at home than those who grew up without using English. Students with limited English proficiency had difficulty making a successful transition into the Australian community with their social interactions restricted to their ‘like’ people (Rosenthal, Russell & Thomson, 2006).

Research identifies the importance of on campus support for off campus socialisation of international students. Ross (2008), for example, suggests that universities can create opportunities to help international students with their needs through involving communities into programs of study. Benzie (2010) also suggests that understanding the socialisation aspect of international students off campus is useful in providing opportunities to learn English and other discipline specific knowledge.

The review of the literature on L2 students of Asian background in the Australian context reveals that one of the fundamental problems the Asian learners experience whilst learning in Australian universities is language. There are very few studies focused on enhancing these students’ English language ability. The intention of this study is to focus on enhancing participants’ language use through the use of LLS and also assist them to better engage with LC2 academic and social discourses.
2.9 Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed the literature on LLS, L2 socialisation and L2 academic discourse social. It has also explored the literature on the learning experiences of L2 students of Asian background in the Australian tertiary context. After overcoming my initial inability to ‘to see the wood for the trees’ through an ongoing iterative process, I was able to identify issues and gaps within the literature and also determine how this study can address these practically and theoretically.

The LLS field remains controversial due to vagueness in definitions, various overlapping classification systems, inconclusive research findings, and a lack of agreement on theories. Moreover, through its history, the LLS field has been dominated by several authors such as Oxford, O’Malley and Chamot. Also, many LLS studies have been conducted from a quantitative perspective and are lacking a qualitative focus. As a result, it has become clear that LLS research needs a more significant focus on qualitative dimensions that take into consideration the learning and living contexts where strategies are being used and the notion of strategy use as enduring and evolutionary to support continued development of the L2. This study attempts to do this.

Furthermore, this chapter has identified that most of the strategy intervention studies regardless of ESL and EFL contexts have mainly used pre and post-test methodology paying scant attention to the issues associated with long-term retention of strategy use and the value of strategy instruction. This study comprehensively and systematically captures the development, implementation, evaluation and application stages of the strategy training program and looks at the capacity of training learners to significantly impact language use in the LC2. Also, this study did not adapt any specific type of classification system, but rather it has its own modified system as the focus of this study is to address the specific needs of the principal participants. The strategy determination process is discussed within Wallace’s (1991) model of reflective practice.

In reviewing the literature on L2 socialisation and L2 academic socialisation, this chapter has identified that ‘novice’ and ‘expert’ or ‘core member’ relationships are key in the socialisation process. In these fields, it is argued that ‘expert’ or ‘core member’ facilitation of ‘novice’ into learning and social interaction increases the novice’s ability to interact with members of a target community and to participate in its discourse.
practices. This in return enables novices to increase their language performance and develop L2 proficiency. However, novices often experience a range of challenges due to language, culture, identity, and ideological differences. More studies are needed to provide explicit illustrations of the types of support novices/students can be provided with to deal with the challenges. Such is the intent of the current study. The design and implementation of an intervention, inclusive of strategies to support L2 socialisation and L2 academic discourse socialisation, is purposeful and is intended to support novice transition from LC1 to LC2.

Whilst reviewing the literature on the learning experiences of L2 students of Asian background in the Australian tertiary context, this chapter has identified that these students encounter a number of challenges attributed to differences associated with language, cultural and educational backgrounds. These negatively impacted in completing the requirements of academic work and connecting with their Australian peers and the Australian wider community. The low level of English language proficiency of these students is often cited as the fundamental issue. A number of programs are reported that have endeavoured to increase international students’ academic performance and intercultural interaction. However, there are very few studies focused on enhancing language. In particular, there is a scarcity of studies that talk specifically about LLS to assist with academic learning and social interaction.

The strategy training program of this study, inclusive of strategies to significantly impact on English language proficiency and to support L2 socialisation and L2 academic discourse socialisation, is purposeful and is intended to support novice transition from LC1 to LC2. Ultimately, the study hopes that participants will be better able to ‘translate’ with the help of LLS. This intention calls for conceptualising LLS use in relation to L2 socialisation and L2 academic socialisation as well as incorporating them into a theoretically cohesive model based on Agar’s languaculture model. With this in mind, the next chapter discusses the research project that is the subject of this study.
CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH APPROACH

3.1 Introduction

Throughout the course of the study, I maintained a reflective journal to write about my emerging understanding of research methodologies as well as reflecting on different approaches about generating data. I used reflection as a way to think about myself not as a researcher, but also as a way of remembering and thinking about my own learning in those areas that are the focus here. It became my practice to integrate my readings and my journal as a place for solving problems. In other words, reflective journal writing allowed me to map my growing and changing understanding about the process of doing this study and to record decisions made and justifications for the decisions. Also, by writing down what I observed, what I needed to ask in the next interview, what required clarification, I could keep the focus of the research clear and well organised. Moreover, the reflective journal enabled me to articulate my ideas, thoughts, and doubts about the design and execution of this study. Therefore, the journal was not only for recording my observations of my participants but also it was used to record my own development as a researcher.

This chapter aims to set out the research approach of the study and the steps taken in conducting this research. The interpretive framework used in the design of this research draws on Crotty’s (1998) social research framework. Crotty (1998) frames the research process as being composed of four basic elements: epistemology, theoretical perspective, methodology and methods. Crotty (1998, p. 5) defines the meaning of each element as follows:

- **Epistemology**: the theory of knowledge that defines what kind of knowledge is possible and legitimate.
- **Theoretical perspective**: the philosophical stance informing the methodology and thus providing a context for the process and grounding its logic and criteria.
- **Methodology**: the strategy, plan of action, process or design lying behind the choice and use of particular methods and linking the choice and use of methods to the desired outcomes.
- **Methods**: the techniques or procedures used to gather and analyse data related to the research question or hypothesis.

Crotty’s framework suggests clearly defined elements within the research process. The assumptions embedded in the first element inform each subsequent element. Crotty’s
framework was chosen for this study because these elements provide a structure to understand the research process. The framework provided me with a “sense of stability and direction” (Crotty 1998, p. 2) as I undertook this particular research task.

3.2 The epistemological basis for this study

The epistemological basis of this study lies within the framework of social constructivism. Epistemologically, social constructivism which was pioneered by Vygotsky (1978) and later expanded by other scholars (e.g. Geertz, 1973; Crotty, 1998; Reusser, 2001), situates knowledge as a “human product” that “is socially and culturally constructed” (Geertz, 1973, p. 1). Reusser (2001, p. 2058) sums up learning using the social constructivist perspective in the following way:

Learning and enculturation are not bounded by the individual brain or mind but are intrinsically social endeavors, embedded in a society and reflecting its knowledge, perspectives, and beliefs. People construct their knowledge, not only from direct personal experience, but also from being told by others and by being shaped through social experience and interaction. The basis of personal development and enculturation, thus, is not socially isolated construction of knowledge, but its co-construction of a social and cultural space.

Therefore, from a social constructivist perspective, knowledge construction is not an isolated process, but rather it is constructed by interacting with others in a social context. Robson (2002, p. 27) points out that a researcher’s goal is “to understand the multiple social constructions of meaning and knowledge”. In order to understand participants’ knowledge construction in this study, a number of concepts of social constructivist theory have been most useful. These were the role of social interaction within a social context, the notion of the zone of proximal development, and the primacy of language as a tool for learning.

Social interaction is one of the fundamental principles of social constructivist theory. In this philosophy of learning, learning is a social process where people are engaged with social practices (McMahon, 1997). Vygotsky (1978) argues that with the help of advanced adults or peers, learners develop concepts and ideas that they cannot understand on their own. In other words, learners interact with more knowledgeable members of the group or community in order to obtain or understand new knowledge and learn how that new knowledge may be applied. In this study, the participants’ social
interactions with students, and academics, as well as other individuals and groups beyond the university, were viewed as major influences on their individual development and knowledge construction.

The notion of zone of proximal development (ZPD) (also see Chapter 2, Section 2.6.1) proposed by Vygotsky (1978) is also useful in understanding participants’ knowledge construction. Vygotsky (1978, pp. 88-89) defines ZPD as:

The distance between the actual development level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers.

The ZPD is not a fixed ‘zone’, rather it is context dependent and relates to how the learner interacts with the social activities and makes sense of it. Put simply, the ZPD is the difference between what a learner can do without help and what can be achieved with assistance. In this study, ZPD provides a structure of support points within language learning as an educative process.

Another fundamental aspect of social constructivism is social context. Social constructivism focuses on learning that happens in a social context and on how meanings and understandings develop through social activities and encounters (McMahon, 1997). Within this study, participants’ past and present learning and living contexts formed the social contexts. This involves participants’ ‘school culture’ and ‘home university culture’ associated with English language education, and ‘Australian university culture’ and ‘beyond university culture’.

Moreover, language becomes a critical ‘tool’ (Vygotsky, 1978) that helps learners to mediate social activities such as expressing themselves, explaining, and negotiating in the discussion, for example, of ideas and in writing. It is through speech that learners learn the rich body of knowledge that exists in culture (Vygotsky, 1978). As a result, through such experiences and in a challenging and supported environments, learners gradually become skilled at participating in discussion and other activities (Wertsch, 1991). Therefore, learners need to engage in social interaction within social context to become aware of others’ ideas, to interpret information derived from the interaction or experience, and thus build knowledge and/or incorporate new knowledge. In order to do
all these, the role of language is key because language serves as a tool to mediate that engagement. Social constructivism presents as an appropriate epistemological basis for this study as this study looks at the relationship between participants, and their Australian peers as well as the wider Australian community, and the role of LLS use in this relationship.

3.3 Theoretical perspectives informing the study

Having established in the preceding section the epistemological basis for the study, this section elaborates the theoretical perspectives that were pertinent to the study. In the previous section, I explained that participants’ knowledge construction is developed through their experiences within their home country and Australian contexts. These explanations constitute the lived experiences of participants as they learnt and engaged in the every day practices associated with their academic and social lives. Therefore, as the study draws on a range of areas of inquiry, it is appropriate that a number of theoretical perspectives be used to underpin this research. The study draws on the traditions and methodologies associated with phenomenology and ethnomethodology. Whilst phenomenology and ethnomethodology inform the design and approach of the study neither of these theoretical positions have been adopted ‘holus-bolus’. This study does not adopt a particular type of phenomenology but rather draws on key concepts from them to inform the theoretical perspective of the study.

3.3.1 Phenomenology

Originally phenomenology was conceptualised by Austrian born German philosopher Edmund Husserl (1859-1938). He believed that natural scientific approaches to inquiry did not provide a suitable means to understand the human being, as he believed man could not be reduced to a measurable object (Husserl, 1964). This recognition is particularly significant in qualitative research such as this study because phenomenology focuses on the wholeness of the experience and its meanings and essences rather than measurements (Moustakas, 1994).

Phenomenology is described by Sokolowski (2000, p. 2) as “the study of human experience and the way things present themselves to us in and through such
experience”. In the same context, Schutz and Luckman (1973) and van Manen (1990) refer to this ‘experience’ as the ‘life-world’ of the individual - the world as it is immediately experienced. van Manen (1990, p. 36) states “lived experience is the starting point and the end point of phenomenological research” which strives to gain insight into specific phenomena in order to gain understanding and description of human experience.

There are three formal phenomenological movements (transcendental, existential, and hermeneutic) that represent philosophical assumptions about experiences. Transcendental phenomenology seeks to explore and describe phenomena in association with its structure to give form and meaning to the lived experiences. Existential phenomenology is a version of phenomenology that problematises human existence. But hermeneutic phenomenology focuses on interpreting phenomena from the historical, developmental, and cumulative perspectives.

The present research study does not adopt a particular type of phenomenology but rather draws on key concepts from them to inform the theoretical perspective of the study. One of the concepts used in this study is ‘lived experience’ as it is presented to the consciousness of the individual. Another concept is the notion of reflective consciousness which must be described in order to capture the essential meanings of the experiences. These concepts are relevant in this study in that they provide opportunities to systematically describe ways into the participants’ lived-experiences.

The phenomenological approach endeavours to understand the meaning of lived experience as it is presented to the consciousness of the individual (Moustakas, 1994; Polkinghorne, 1989; van Manen, 1990). van Manen (1990, p. 9) points out that “consciousness is the only access human beings have to the world”. Therefore, using a phenomenological perspective, to understand a particular phenomenon in the life-world is to understand it from the individual, within the context of their life-world. This is achieved through a detailed and comprehensive description of the people under study (Creswell, 2007; Moustakas, 1994). So it is crucial for the researcher to methodologically, carefully and thoroughly capture and describe the research participants’ experiences.
Another important element in Husserl’s phenomenological philosophy that the present study draws on is reflection on the meaning, or ‘essence’, of the experience of consciousness (Husserl, 1964). Van Manen (1990, p. 10) defines essence as that “which makes a thing what it is”. Jennings (1986) explains that essences are not floating around waiting to be actualised as real, but rather are grasped in an act of reflective consciousness. Again the phenomenon has to be described but not explained in order to explore and understand the essences imbedded within the experience (Moustakas, 1994). In other words, in order to understand the ‘essence’ or the meaning of lived experience that has become part of the individual’s consciousness, it is important to capture the essential meanings of the experiences prior to theoretical explanations so that the phenomenon is first extracted in its original situation. Therefore within this study, data collection was designed to enable participants to present the ‘essences’ of their lived experiences. Data analysis, however involved a process of seeking and inscribing social and cultural meanings firmly situated within the social and cultural worlds of the participants. In this study, I have employed a qualitative case study which provided an opportunity to richly and deeply probe the experiences of the participants in order to capture the meanings that their experiences held for them.

3.3.2 Ethnomethodology

Born out of phenomenology, ethnomethodology extends the phenomenological concern by explaining how an experience is accomplished. Ethnomethodology is an area within sociological inquiry that was developed originally by Harold Garfinkel (1967). Garfinkel conceptualised this tradition when he noticed that mainstream sociology failed to recognise the ways people create reality and produce their own world (Kendall, 2010). During the process of conceptualisation, many ideas, definitions, and interpretations were proposed within this philosophical tradition that have been hotly contested and debated in the ensuing years.

There are several core nomenclatures used in ethnomethodological studies such as indexicality, reflexivity, accountability and the notion of member. ‘Indexicality’ and ‘reflexivity’ are two outcomes derived from the relationship between social interaction and everyday reality for ethnomethodological inquiry (Heritage, 1984). Actions are indexical in that they rely on context for meaning – they are indexed for their location. Actions are reflexive in that while the meaning of an account is provided or constructed
by its context, that context is itself shaped and constructed by the account (Heritage, 1984). Accountability is associated with liability or explicable liability of social members’ actions (ten Have, 2004).

This study, however, draws on two key elements within ethnomethodology which are specifically relevant to this research. These elements are a ‘notion of member’, and an ‘ethnomethodological experiment’.

The common question asked in ethnomethodology is “How do people make sense of their everyday activities so as to behave in socially acceptable ways?” (Patton, 2002, p. 110). This study is primarily concerned with the ‘notion of member’ (Garfinkel, 1967). In ethnomethodological studies, the notion of member does not only refer to a member “who breathes and who thinks” (Coulon, 1995, p. 27) but broadly it refers to a member who possesses social competence appropriate in a given social context and exhibits commonsense knowledge recognised and accepted to the community (Coulon, 1995). Heritage (1984, p. 4) explains it this way:

The term refers to the study of a particular subject matter: the body of common-sense knowledge and the range of procedures and considerations by means of which the ordinary members of society make sense of, and find their way about in, and act on the circumstances in which they find themselves.

Garfinkel (1967) maintains that participants within a particular setting know what they can and cannot do and according to him, this knowledge is commonsense knowledge. Kendall (2010) related this notion to people’s background expectancies – that is, “their shared interpretations of objects and events as well as their resulting actions” (Kendall, 2010, p. 132). In other words, within ethnomethodological tradition, interaction is based on assumptions of shared expectancies (Kendall, 2010). For example, when people are having conversations, generally they take turns to speak and this is common sense. But if one of them talked for an hour without giving others a chance to speak, they would be surprised based on their background expectancies (Kendall, 2010). Within this line, Francis and Hester (2004) propose a notion of language-in-use arguing that language is an essential element in social life at everyday level. Garfinkel made it quite clear that understanding language is not according to a set of rules of grammar, but rather “understanding language is understanding actions - utterances - which are constructively interpreted in relation to contexts” (Heritage, 1984, p. 139). So within the ‘notion of member’, concepts such as commonsense knowledge or background expectancies, and
language-in-use are central elements. The concept ‘notion of member’ is particularly relevant to this study as it looks at participants’ socialisation processes into academic and social life as participants transition from LC1 to LC2. The study examines how participants apprentice themselves into L2 academic discourses as well as more general socialisation into the LC2. During the apprenticing process, participants will engage with the discursive practices of LC2 with the help of LLS which ultimately will enable them to move away from the fringes of the translation arena to the core of the LC2.

Also, ethnomethodologists employ ‘ethnomethodological experiments’ in order to find out “what a complete stranger would have to learn to become a routinely functioning member of a group, a program, or a culture” (Patton, 2002, p. 111). In other words, the researcher can conduct an intervention with the hope of changing ordinary practice (Patton, 2002). In this research study, a strategy training program was developed and delivered to the participants to assist them to develop or expand their LLS use in order to support continued language development, their language socialisation and to help them to become self-directed autonomous learners within their learning and living contexts. Ethnomethodologically, the program can be described as a way of supporting participants to become routinely functioning members within their university as well as beyond it within Australian culture. In other words, the intervention that is offered to the participants can be interpreted ethnomethodologically as an ‘experiment’ that I am reporting on.

Both phenomenology and ethnomethodology are widely debated and contested theoretical traditions. For the purposes of this study, however both traditions offer concepts that contribute to theory to underpin this study. The elements described above, drawn from phenomenology and ethnomethodology are conceptually useful for the study as they provide a powerful way of understanding and explaining the phenomenon of participants’ learning and living experiences within everyday academic and social contexts.

3.4 Methodology

This section discusses the methodological aspects of the study. It is very important to match the research methodology with the purposes of the study to ensure that the
findings are understandable, useful, and credible (Patton, 2002). This research study aimed to develop and describe a comprehensive understanding about participants’ English language strategy use both in the contexts of LC1 and LC2. In order to achieve this, qualitative research was chosen as a suitable approach for this study.

There are two key aspects within the methodology for this study. Firstly, the study was framed as a qualitative case study. Secondly, the strategy training intervention/program of the study was informed by principles associated with design-based research methodology. In this section, an account is given of the selection of a case study. I also discuss the characteristics of design-based research and what principles of this methodology were used to inform the strategy training program and how these methodological choices facilitated my inquiries.

3.4.1 Qualitative research

Qualitative research is generally concerned with the unfolding of social processes. It is inductive, and it is concerned with meaning as seen by the participants (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). Berg (2009, p. 8) points out that:

> Qualitative research properly seeks answers to questions by examining various social settings and the individuals who inhabit these settings.

The role of a qualitative researcher is to examine the inhabitants’ arrangements of themselves and their environments and to understand the meanings the individuals give to their experiences and surroundings (Berg, 2009). Denzin and Lincoln (2005, p. 3) express the role of a qualitative researcher in their evolving definition in this way:

> ...qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them.

Hence, qualitative research allows researchers to develop an understanding of others and to find out the ways people give meaning to their every day lives. Creswell (2007) emphasises the importance of understanding the meaning first hand from the participants but not the researchers’ interpretation of the experiences or the meaning given by the writer in the literature.
Qualitative research also allows researchers to construct a complex holistic view of the subjects under study which may involve reporting different perspectives, finding out the multiple factors in a situation, and identifying the bigger picture that emerges (Creswell, 2007). Creswell points out that, the researchers are tied not by “tight cause-and-effect relationships among factors” (2007, p. 39) but rather by exploring the complex correlations of elements in different circumstances or detailed understanding of the issue. As the present study was concerned with developing detailed understandings about the participants’ experiences, a qualitative approach was an appropriate fit for this research.

### 3.4.2 Case study

In seeking to understand what participants’ experiences were really like for them, a case study was adopted. The concept of case study comes from qualitative investigations that help researchers to understand how things happened, or how a number of elements work together to form a situation in the context of the real world (Merriam, 1998).

The literature in the field shows that different case writers define case study differently. For example, Merriam (1998, p. 19) states that “a case study design is employed to gain an in-depth understanding of the situation and meaning for those involved” providing insights into the complexities of particular cases. Merriam (1998) points out that case study is interested in process rather than outcomes. For Yin (2009, p. 18) “A case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident.” Yin (2009) explains that such studies help researchers to keep holistic characteristics of real-life experiences while bringing out details from the viewpoint of the participants. Thomas (2011, p. 3) simply states that “The case study method is a kind of research that concentrates on one thing, looking at it in detail, not seeking to generalise from it. When you do a case study, you are interested in that thing in itself, as a whole.”

Thus it can be seen that when researchers talk about case study research, they define and explain it in various ways with some overlapping commonalities. Gerring (2007) acknowledges that the source of this confusion derives from the existence of a large number of synonyms (i.e., case control, case history, case method within-case, and so
forth). Merriam, 1998 points out that this is related to various researchers regarding case study research as equivalent to fieldwork, naturalistic inquiry exploratory research, and participant observation. Burns (2000) suggests that this confusion exists because it is viewed as a ‘portmanteau’ term and thus definition of case study remain loose.

However, in terms of alignment with the purpose of this study, a definition of Helen Simons (2009, p. 21) is appropriate. Simons describes case study as follows:

Case study is an in-depth exploration from multiple perspectives of the complexity and uniqueness of a particular project, policy, institution, programme or system in a ‘real-life’ context. It is research-based, inclusive of different methods and is evidence-led. The primary purpose is to generate in-depth understanding of a specific topic (as in a thesis), programme, policy, institution or system to generate knowledge and/or inform policy development, professional practice and civil or community action.

This definition creates a clear picture of what case study is in respect of this study. Such a definition is sympathetic to the study’s constructivist framework. This definition also encompasses the notion of case study having the potential to inform “policy development, professional practice” (Simons, 2009, p. 21) which means that it suits the future intention of the present research to inform program design and planning for internationalisation within tertiary institutions.

**Type of case study selected for this study**

This qualitative case study is a single-case study comprising multiple cases. The larger case or a single case of the study focuses on experiences of L2 students of Asian background studying in Australia. The subunits or multiple cases include 8 L2 students of Asian background studying at an Australian university. The main advantage of this type of case study is that it serves as a suitable tool for keeping a clear research focus as opposed to a single-case study without multiples cases (Yin, 2009). This is because the nature of a single case study may shift during the course of the study without the researcher knowing it as it is mostly conducted at an abstract level (Yin, 2009). In other words, embedded design or multiple cases keep a research focus clear without allowing unsuspected shifts to occur during the course of the research. Qualitative case study methodology enabled me as a researcher to develop an understanding of the complexities of participants’ learning and living experiences that evolved in their home country and Australian contexts.
However, potential limitations to the study need to be mentioned. One disadvantage of a case study that is frequently mentioned in the academic literature, is its consequent limitations of not being able to be transferred to other research contexts. The issue of transferability and generalisability of this study is discussed in Sections 3.8.2.

3.4.3 Design-based research methodology

In this study, along with case study, elements of a design-based research methodology have been used to inform and shape the strategy training program. The strategy training program aimed to support participants in improving their English language proficiency through developing their capacity to use LLS, to promote more effective academic learning and assist with their language socialisation. In this section, firstly I discuss design-based methodology in general and then why elements of this methodological approach have been chosen for this study.

Design-based research as a methodological approach was developed from the work of Ann Brown (1992) and Allan Collins (1992). They argued that education theory needed to be tested and shaped in sustained authentic practice as this was the best context to determine if the research was able to improve teaching and learning (Brown, 1992; Collins, 1992).

Generally, in design-based research, the researcher addresses complex practical issues experienced in local educational settings, identifies current student capabilities and needs, designs an intervention in iterative cycles and carries out the intervention with students. According to Design-Based Research Collective (2003) design-based research can develop different kinds of knowledge that include better theoretical understanding of the learning process addressed by an intervention. Therefore, design-based research is pragmatic as well as theoretical in orientation and is based on a specific design for intervention.

Barab and Squire (2004) note that the researcher usually conducts the research on learning in authentic contexts and designs the intervention. They emphasise that the researcher’s role is not to simply prove that the particular ‘experiment’ worked but to go beyond that level and come up with “evidence-based claims about learning” (Barab & Squire, 2004, p. 2) that apply theoretical knowledge of the field (p. 6). The value of the
theory should be measured in its ability to make changes in the local context and remain useful within the local context as well as in other similar contexts (Barab & Squire, 2004).

Cobb, Confrey, diSessa, Lehrer and Schauble (2003) articulate some key elements of design-based research:

- research produces and furthers theories on learning and teaching,
- it is interventionist in nature,
- it takes place in authentic contexts, and
- it is iterative in design.

Outcomes from previously conducted designs/sessions provide an explanatory framework which is the focus of the next cycle (Cobb et al. 2003). Gravemeijir & Cobb (2006) point out that an important aspect of design-based research is the iterative cyclic process of designing and re-designing teaching tasks and other parts of the instruction.

Design-based research methodology was considered appropriate for this study because it is:

- pragmatic as it addresses practical issues within learning and teaching environments
- interactive as it encourages collaboration between participants and researchers and
- flexible as changes are anticipated, and
- it is integrative as it uses different methods that can document and connect processes to outcomes (Wang & Hannafin, 2005)

Within this study, most of these elements were used to inform and shape the strategy training program. However, the ‘iterative cycle’ was not implemented with this particular cohort. In order to organise the intervention through a cyclic process, you need to have enough time in hand. The given timeframe of my PhD course and also participants’ limited timeframe impacted on the capacity of the intervention to be iterative. However, I have been able to articulate changes and additions for a next iteration based data from this study. This is elaborated in Chapter 8.
3.5 Data collection methods

Qualitative research methods such as interviews (Gay & Airasian, 2000; Patton, 2002), observations (Merriam, 1998; Nunan, 1992), think-aloud protocols (Gass & Mackey, 2000), and diaries (Halbach, 2000) are powerful in their provision of an in-depth and detailed description and understanding of particular phenomena from the participants’ perspectives (Merriam, 1998). In this section, firstly, methods such as these, together with a number of additional methods, are discussed together with their strengths and weaknesses and the reasons for their suitability or otherwise with respect to this study. Secondly, the processes associated with data collection are described in Section 3.5.1.

**Interview**

In general, interviews are used to discover, explore, and understand human feelings, interests, experiences, attitudes, and problems (Gay & Airasian, 2000), and are commonly used methods in qualitative studies. There are different types of interviews used in research such as single, multiple, structured, unstructured, and semi-structured interviews. The interview types used in this study were multiple semi-structured individual in-depth interviews. In this study, two individual in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted with principal participants, one at the beginning of the research and the second at the end of the strategy training program (for more detailed discussion, see Section 3.5.1, Chapter 4 and 7).

Gay and Airasian (2000) suggest that multiple interviews are used to gain in-depth data. More specifically, multiple interviews offer a broader scope of data and perspectives whilst single interview may not provide the detail needed. Semi-structured interview has been chosen in this study because it offers flexibility and allows the researcher to come up with new questions whenever the interviewees raise interesting topics (Flick, 1999). During this type of interview, interviewees are able to interrupt, repeat, clarify or even change the subject (Schurich, 1997). These advantages can be provided through predetermined questions or an interview guide, where questions are intentionally open-ended and provide a general framework for the interview (Kvale, 1996; Patton, 2002). Also during the interviewing process, the researcher retains the freedom to be able to make changes to the predetermined questions. This depends on the real interviewing
context by probing into interviewees’ responses to collect in-depth data about their experiences (Gay & Airasian, 2000).

However, the limitations of interviews need to be addressed. Gay and Airasian (2000) state that the idea of interviewing might appear to be easy. However, the process of interviewing can be complex. Nisbett and Wilson (1977) point out that participants may have difficulty in recalling events which may have taken place some time prior to the interview. But Assor and Connell’s (1992) review of research done since 1984, on self-reporting of personal efficacy and competence, concluded that for older children and adolescents, the method yields trustworthy data. However, the aforementioned limitation is not considered a major concern in this study as participants of the present study were university students. In-depth individual semi-structured interviews were a powerful data collection method and provided a great opportunity for the development of a better understanding of principal participants’ experiences.

**Online survey**

Online survey was used in this study to ascertain the extent to which the findings from the in-depth case studies of principal participants resonated more broadly within the L2 student community of Asian background of the case study university. In general, a survey is the most widely used research method (Walter, 2010) in which respondents answer the same set of questions (de Vaus, 1995). Traditional methods of surveys include paper-and-pencil based survey, telephone interviewing, self-administered mail questionnaire, and face to face interviewing (Sue & Ritter, 2007).

Online survey is a relatively new dimension for conducting survey research and has emerged since the rapid growth of the Internet has created an opportunity for almost everyone to access a computer network. More and more researchers are now using computer-based data collection methods such as electronic mail and online survey (Jansen, Corley & Jansen, 2007) in order to examine different types of issues, from various perspectives and respondents (Walter, 2010). Also, through online survey large amounts of data can be collected in a short time and the process can be cost effective (Czaja & Blair, 2005).
While a survey will always generate some data, Walter (2010) warns that it is possible that a survey may provide data that is misleading or of limited value. Therefore, an effective survey requires substantial planning and the sequential use of specific skills across all its major phases (Walter, 2010). Czaja and Blair (2005) propose five sequential steps that are used in the development, implementation, and completion of effective surveys:

- Draft planning
- Testing before data collection
- Actual planning and data collection
- Data analysis, and
- Final report.

The online survey was suitable in this study because of its ability to collect large amount of data in a short time. The development of the survey used in this study was based on these five stages (see Section 3.5.1).

**Strategy training**

The strategy training program itself was one of the principal data collection methods used in the study. It was considered suitable in this study because it is an effective way of increasing students’ awareness of LLS. Research on LLS instruction has been focused on identifying the usefulness and effectiveness of strategy instruction. An assumption that is fundamental to strategy instruction is that learners will be able to take an active role in their language learning process, if they know 'how', 'when' and 'why' to use LLS, and metacognitively engage with their learning by evaluating and monitoring (Cohen, 2011a). This concept is central to this study.

As previously mentioned in the literature review (see Chapter 2, Section 2.4.2) there are two types of strategy instruction: explicit and integrated. Explicit instruction focuses on developing awareness of existing and new strategies. A teacher’s role is to model strategic thinking, provide practice opportunities and evaluation of strategy use (Chamot, 2005). Integrated instruction is carried out concurrently with the language course. Researchers (Chamot, 2004, 2005; Chamot, Barnhardt, El-Dinary & Robbins, 1999; Cohen, 2003b, 2011a; O’Malley & Chamot, 1990) suggest that explicit instruction is more productive and effective than simply asking or suggesting to learners that they use strategies (integrated strategy instruction). Nevertheless, less agreement is
found as to whether strategies should be taught explicitly outside the language classroom or concurrently within the language classroom (Chamot, 2005). The strategy training program included in this study was an explicit intensive training program conducted outside the language classroom. For more detailed discussion see Chapter 6.

**Observation**

Another data collection method used in this study was participant observation. Nunan (1992) states that observations are useful for obtaining and understanding learners’ strategy use in classroom environments.

Two types of observations exist: participant observation and non-participant observation. Participant observation provides a means for researchers to be close to the group members being studied and not to disturb the natural flow of activity in the group itself (Merriam, 1998). Spradley (1980) indicates that there are two key elements of being a participant observer. The first is to engage with the activities as a member of the community. The second is to observe the activities, people and physical aspects of the situation from a participant perspective. On the other hand, non-participant observation does not involve interaction or involvement with activities or people studied. In other words, the participants or the people involved in the research do not know the observer because there is no interaction or communication between them. This study used participant observation in the sense that I was present in the strategy training sessions as a facilitator and the participants were informed that they would be observed.

This method of data collection has its limitations. Taylor-Powell and Steele (1996) point out that an observer’s presence often makes people behave differently. However, these problems can be reduced over time. Cohan & Manion (1989) and Wragg (2001) claim that after some time, participants will return to normal behaviour when they get used to the researcher’s presence. In this study, my presence in the classroom did not make the participants uncomfortable as they had had extensive contact with me prior to the strategy training program (see Section 3.6 of this Chapter) and they were all very willing volunteers for the program. Observation was non-intrusive and therefore the aforementioned limitation associated with the method of data collection was not of concern in this study. Observations were undertaken while the participants were working in pairs or on group tasks.
Deciding what to observe is an important starting point in the observational data collection process. Merriam (1998) points out that the choice of what to observe is determined by many factors and depends primarily on the conceptual framework of the study, the problem examined and the question of interest. Since observation as a data gathering method is very subjective, what to observe has to be selective (Merriam, 1998). I was interested to observe participants’:

- level of interaction and interest
- level of cooperation, and
- use of strategies to complete tasks.

**Strategy checklist**

A strategy checklist has been used in this study to collect follow up data after the completion of the strategy training sessions. A checklist is a type of informational tool used to help to ensure consistency in carrying out a task or to check progress of a task in order to see those areas still requiring work. A strategy checklist is one of the recommended methods to evaluate and monitor the effectiveness of strategy trainings (e.g. Chamot & Rubin, 1994; Rubin, Chamot, Harris, & Anderson, 2007) and it has been successfully used in LLS research (e.g. Flaitz, Feyten, Fox & Muckerjee, 1995; Halbach, 2000; Vandergrift, 1999). Flaits et al. (1995) distributed a checklist to students in experimental groups upon the completion of metacognitive awareness raising training. The study results show some empirical evidence that students who received this training performed significantly better than their control group peers. Vandergrift (1999) suggests that teachers should develop performance checklists to assist students consciously pay attention to metacognitive strategies pre and post task completion. Vandergrift points out that such strategies can help learners to prepare themselves for a specific task, and evaluate their performance afterwards. Wenden (1987) states that a checklist is an important tool that assists learners self-evaluate their oral production and their use of self-evaluation as a learning strategy.

In order to develop a checklist for this study, I produced a compilation of all the strategies that were explained, modelled, and practised throughout the strategy training sessions. I then converted these strategies into a strategy checklist addressing participants’ perceived use and usefulness of the strategies and disseminated it to the participants on weekly basis. The objective of the strategy checklist was to refresh and
reinforce participants’ awareness of the strategies and also to determine whether they were using the strategies and were finding them useful. The checklist enabled a process for evaluating and monitoring students’ strategy use.

**Data collection methods that were not used in this study**

**Think-aloud protocols**

As mentioned at the outset of this chapter, the use of think-aloud protocols is a widely employed method in research on learning strategies and cognitive processes. Gass & Mackey (2000) assert that think-aloud protocols can be a powerful method to produce rich ‘live’ data about the learner’s cognitive and metacognitive processes that otherwise might not be accessible.

In order to carry out think-aloud protocols, there are three questions that need to be considered. Firstly, there is a question of language with respect to think-aloud elicitation. Learners can report their thoughts in their L1 or L2 (L3 etc). However, in the ESL/EFL context, traditionally researchers have often asked learners to think-aloud in English (their L2) as translations from various languages into English are time-consuming and costly (Cohen & Macaro, 2007).

Secondly, although thinking aloud seems to offer almost direct access to learner’s thought processes, its validity and reliability have been called into question by some researchers. For example, Seliger (1983) claims that we cannot be sure that the respondents are verbalising truthfully their thoughts and the act of verbalising one’s thoughts during a task may influence and change the performance of a task. Indeed Ericsson and Simon (1980) point out that respondents are most likely to ‘pad out’ their verbalisation by guesswork when they are forced to do so with respect to processes which they do not normally pay attention to.

Thirdly, in order to successfully conduct think-aloud protocols, the process of thinking aloud needs to be introduced and participants trained in its use, because people do not normally do the two actions (i.e. write and verbalize their thoughts) at the same time (Ericsson & Simon, 1987). Patton (2002) states that training is necessary for
participants to get them used to verbalising what are usually only internal dialogues with themselves.

Although almost routinely used in strategy training research, I decided not to use think-aloud protocols with this study for these reasons. Firstly, the method was unsuitable when participants’ English language proficiency level was taken into consideration. In other words, the participants were L2 students of Asian background whose English language proficiency did not permit them to freely and spontaneously articulate their thinking process. Secondly, my previous experience of using think aloud protocols for my Master’s degree pilot case study research showed that the participants had difficulty with the thinking aloud process despite the fact that they were provided with the training in the area (Tsedendamba, 2006). For participants, the task of working on a language activity and at the same time verbalising their thoughts in English about the activity and what was happening was too hard and would have been an unreliable source of data. Finally, participants’ time availability limited opportunities for training as well.

**Diaries**

Like think-aloud protocols, diary is frequently used as a data collection method in research on strategy use (Halbach, 2000). Diary is an introspective tool (Nunan, 1992) in which learners reflect on the processes that go on inside their minds and they open up fields that are normally not accessible to researchers in other ways (Halbach, 2000). However, diary was not considered as a feasible method for data collection in this study.

Many researchers (e.g. Bailey, 1990; Halbach, 2000; Matsumoto, 1996) have used diaries to study individual learning processes and experiences. The study results show that keeping a dairy and analysis assisted students to raise awareness of their own L2 learning. Oxford, Lavine, Felkins, Hollaway and Saleh (1996) emphasise that keeping a language learning diary helps learners become more aware of their strategies at any given time and across a long period.

Although this method has its strengths in collecting data about students’ reflections on their own learning, its application imposes extra time-consuming responsibility on those
involved. Given that the participants in this study were all busy students, I was concerned that the requirements to keep a learning diary would discourage them from continuing participation in this study. In addition, many of these students’ experiences had been within academic traditions where the value of self-reflection was not acknowledged and that, because of this, it would have been difficult to utilise the process within the study. Therefore, this method of data collection was not considered feasible.

However, I kept a reflective journal myself over the course of the study in order to track the research progress. Keeping a reflective journal is a strategy that is a commonly used technique in qualitative research (Etherington, 2004; Ortlipp, 2008). There is a scarcity of literature on the use of reflective journal and how it is used during the research process (Ortlipp, 2008).

3.5.1 Data collection procedures

The detailed procedures associated with the data collection are described below in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Data collection procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection procedures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1: Initial individual semi-structured in-depth interviews</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My reflective journal throughout the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1: Initial individual semi-structured in-depth interview and development of participants’ profiles/cases within their home country and Australian contexts before the strategy training program to identify their LC1 and place within LC2. Initial profile development is part of stage 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2: Online survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3: Strategy training program including observations and strategy checklist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4: Second round individual semi-structured in-depth interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stage 1: Initial individual semi-structured in-depth interviews**

The first interviews were conducted at the beginning of the study. All interviews were conducted on campus. During the interviews, only the participant and I as an
interviewer were present. The average length of the interview sessions was 30 minutes, with a range from 25 minutes to 45 minutes.

The interview questions were formulated against the aims of the research questions of the study. Most questions were open-ended (see Appendix 3.2) allowing participants to respond personally and as fully as able. Ten participants were interviewed following necessary ethical requirements (see Appendix 3.1 and Section 3.9) and the same set of questions was used in each interview. Before the interview, I had a casual chat for warm-up and also reassurance with respect to participant rights. This was also a starting point. I also briefly explained what kind of questions they would be asked. These questions were focused on obtaining information about participants’ English language learning experiences both at home and in Australian contexts, their experiences with LLS use, academic learning, and socialisation in Australia. The interview was structured into four topics (see Table 3.2)

Table 3.2 Initial in-depth semi-structured interview guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview topics</th>
<th>Question guides</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic 1: Brief self-introduction</td>
<td>Name, age and country, Life at home, Educational background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 2: Home country English language education</td>
<td>English language education at home, Length of time studying English, LLS use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 3: English in Australia</td>
<td>Length of stay in Australia, Educational experience in Australia, English language learning in Australia, LLS use, LLS development in EAP classes (those who attended EAP classes), Knowledge learnt about Australian culture and community in EAP classes (those who attended EAP classes), Friendship and socialisation pattern and its impact on English language proficiency, Thoughts about English language improvement in Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic 4: Life in Australia</td>
<td>Overall feeling about life in Australia, Types of free time activities, Friends and activities, People they talk to often, Any difficulties in living in Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the interview, I asked probing and prompting questions in order to encourage participants to tell more. I used repeating the interviewee’s words, simple interpretation,
and additional open-ended questions in order to prompt or tease out their accounts. This is shown in the following extracts:

Interviewer: *As you said before, there was no discussion in your Japanese classrooms. Do you think this has affected your current way of participating in discussions?* (Interview with Akio, 5.5.2008).

Interviewer: *So you did write essays often before you came here?* (Interview with Akio, 5.5.2008).

Interviewer: *Tell me about your EFL classes. What were they like?* (Interview with Maly, 19.5.2008)

The fact that participants felt at ease to talk freely and honestly, enabled the very personal nature of some of the discussions which took place during the interviews to be facilitated. For example, some discussions included criticism of the participants’ previous educational system, learning experiences both in their home country and in the Australian university, and personal and potential weaknesses. LeCompe and Preissle (1993, p. 179) point out that a relaxed conversational style is “most likely to elicit the trust, confidence and ease among respondents necessary for yielding elaborate, subtle, and valid data”.

The recordings were transcribed verbatim. The interview data provided a very rich picture of individual experiences and this was a good starting point to further investigate the participants’ lived experiences. The transcripts were read to identify common and different themes raised by the participants and these were used as headings for the individual profiles.

At this stage, I started writing preliminary case studies/profiles of each participant. All comments from participants were used verbatim. I did not correct their grammar or sentence structures. Individual case studies presented in the form of profiles were composed for each participant. Each case consisted of two main parts:

- Learning and living before the strategy training program
  - Learners within their home country context: Reflecting on LC1 experiences
  - Learners within the Australian context: Engagement with LC2 practices

During the process of data analyses and case study composition, initial themes in the data were identified. The common themes were identified and used to frame the survey questions. The cases/profiles are presented in Chapter 4.
Stage 2: Online survey

The development of the online survey followed the five general stages common in the development and completion of surveys. In this section, I present the first three stages. The last two stages include data analysis and the development of the final report and these are discussed separately (see Section 3.7 and Chapter 5, Section 5.5). The survey was used to gather data on the extent to which the findings from the 10 principal case studies resonated more broadly within the Asian international student community of the case study university. The intention was to utilise an additional mechanism of data collection in this study.

Preliminary planning

At the preliminary stage, three things needed to be determined: survey questions, survey timing, and survey participants. The questions for the survey were formulated around the common themes identified in 10 cases after the initial in-depth interview. The questions were designed to gather data using multiple choice and also open-ended questions (see Appendix 3.3). While I was developing the questions, I wanted to make the respondents’ task as easy as possible to encourage and maximise responses (Czaja & Blair, 2005). As for the actual online survey timing, it was estimated that 10 minutes would be enough time for participants to complete the survey. With regard to the survey participants, see Section 3.6.

Pretesting

Before making the survey available online, the survey instrument was pre-tested. Pretesting can be done formally or informally (Czaja & Balir, 2005). I used an informal pretesting method. I asked two fellow postgraduate students to try out the survey. They did not encounter any difficulties and it didn’t take them more than 10 minutes to complete the survey. The pretesting identified that there was a possible definitional issue with regard to LLS that needed to be addressed before the survey was made available. This was attended to before dissemination. In addition, respondents were

---

8 It should be noted here that two of the 10 participants discontinued their involvement in the study after the initial in-depth interview. However, I still used the valuable data collected from them in the study. For more detailed information see Section 3.6.
reminded that there were no right or wrong answers. All that was required was their honest response.

**Final planning and data collection**

The survey was available online for four months. Submission of the survey constituted consent.

**Stage 3: Strategy training program**

Stage 3 of data collection was associated with the strategy training program and involved observation and the use of the strategy checklist.

**Observations**

Observations took place during the strategy training program sessions. Before the beginning of each session, I informed participants that I would be observing them during task performance.

During the observation, I focused on the level of interaction and interest, level of support required, body language, and strategies that were used to complete tasks. I recorded my observations systematically in my reflective journal whilst observing. An example of my observation notes is shown in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3 Journal entry No. 3 - an example of observation note

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module: 3 Oral communication strategies</th>
<th>Reflective notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Descriptive notes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1: Pairs: Dara and Annan; Chika and Maly. After reflecting and discussing the questions, participants start telling each other their thoughts and ideas. Annan starts first, then Chika and Maly. Dara remains quiet until I ask him if he wants to share his ideas. Dara sits crossing his arms and does not maintain eye contact with others.</td>
<td>I wonder why Dara did not volunteer his ideas like others. Dara seems distant from others, judging by his body language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3: After brainstorming the strategies, Annan again starts talking about his experience first. Then Maly volunteers followed by Chika. Maly speaks longer than others and she asks a question from Annan about his experience. I again ask Dara to share his experience if there is any. He smiles and after 30 seconds or so starts sharing his experience.</td>
<td>I wonder why Dara never volunteers. Why he speaks only after he is asked to. I’ll ask him later. Maly seems an active speaker. She participated in the tasks more actively than others. She used ‘ask question’ strategy when she wanted to find out more information about Annan’s experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My observational data were used to inform the conduct of the second interview. For example, in Table 3.3, I wrote “Maly seems an active speaker. She participated in the tasks more actively than others. She used the ‘ask questions’ strategy when she wanted to find out more information about Annan’s experience”. In the second interview, I wanted to clarify why she chose to attend tutorial participation training sessions because based on what I observed she was active and spoke more than others.

**Strategy checklist**

The use of a strategy checklist is a well recommended method to evaluate the effectiveness of strategy training (Chamot & Rubin, 1994; Cohen, Weaver & Li, 1998; Rubin et al. 2007). In this study, participants were given a strategy checklist (see Appendix 6.2) to use for a period of eight weeks in order to track and evaluate the progress of their strategy use. They were asked to fill in the checklist once a week (usually at the end of the week in their own time) by writing examples of their strategy use – when and how? and also by placing a check mark in the boxes “Yes, it was useful” or “No, it wasn’t useful”. The strategy checklist was collected at the end of each week personally.

**Stage 4: Second round semi-structured in-depth individual interviews**

The development of the interview guide was informed by data analysis of previous interviews, the strategy training program, strategy checklists, the observations, and the reflective journal. The same procedures were followed as in the initial interview. The participants were interviewed using the same set of questions as well as case-specific questions (Appendix 3.4) that had emerged through the data analysis process. See Table 3.4 for the interview guide.

Table 3.4 Second semi-structured in-depth individual interview guide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions about strategy use</th>
<th>§ for communication strategy use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§ for tutorial participation strategy use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§ for writing strategy use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§ for reading strategy use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§ for listening strategy use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§ for vocabulary use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions about</td>
<td>§ the value of strategy use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§ meaning of using strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§ future strategy use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§ changes occurred in social aspects of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>§ changes occurred in learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the interview participants’ accounts of their experiences were teased out to provide a fuller picture. Also, when I wanted to clarify strategy use in the checklist, I read out some interview extracts before I asked my questions in order to make the retrieval of information easy. For example:

**Interviewer:** When I was analysing your week eight strategy checklist, I encountered only one Western name Paul. You [Dara] wrote: yes, when my friend introduce his friend, Mr Paul to me [Dara said to Mr Paul] What a beautiful day! Not too hot, not too cold.

**Interviewer continued:** It is good to see you used conversation starting statements to communicate with Paul but was he the only native-English speaking person you have spoken to during these eight weeks, apart from your supervisor?

Participants were also invited to comment on any aspects of their answers not covered by the interview questions. I always encouraged participants to talk about whatever they considered relevant or important, irrespective of what I thought.

Sometimes I came across situations where participants seemed to be giving differing, even contradictory opinions on certain issues. For example: In the first interview,

**Annan said:** “[In English for Academic Purposes (EAP) classes], she taught us [LLS] you should look the material, she taught many strategy ... she recommended TV channel, she just said we keep trying.”

In the second round interview, I quoted his answer given in the first interview and asked him if he still thought he was introduced to LLS use in the EAP classes,

**Annan answered** “Mmm, I am not sure. Could be. ... but it is better to follow your strategy. ... your strategy make me feel like open mind to communicate with others. Strategy checklist was a good way to remind about strategy. ... we have to remind every day”.

This indicates that Annan had a heightened awareness of LLS. Based on the interview transcriptions, I continued writing case studies/profiles of each participant. This time the profiles were called:

- Learning and living after the strategy training program
  - The impact of oral communication strategies on the L2 socialisation process
  - The impact of strategies on the L2 academic discourse socialisation process
3.6 Selection of participants

A small group of students as principal participants in the study were selected using purposeful sampling. Purposeful sampling is a commonly used technique in qualitative research. The logic of purposeful sampling is in choosing “information-rich cases” for in-depth study (Patton, 2002, p. 46). Patton (2002) advises researchers to select information-rich cases from which issues central to the purposes of the research can be learned. Purposeful sampling enables the building of information-rich cases which lead to the development of in-depth understanding.

In the selection of participants for this study, potential participants needed to meet three criteria:

- They must be from Asian counties.
- They must have studied English in their home countries but they needed to improve their English language proficiency.
- They must be studying at tertiary level in Australia.

These criteria were proposed to ensure that the potential participants possessed shared perspectives and experiences that were related to the present research topic. The following is a description of how the participants were recruited.

Approval from the University’s Human Research Ethics Committee was obtained prior to the commencement of the recruitment process (see Appendix 3.1). The research project was originally conceptualised around selecting a cohort of 10 students from a pre-university admission intensive EAP program. In preparation for the selection process, I observed seven sessions (July – December, 2007) of four groups of EAP classes (32 students in total). The purposes of observing the classes were to:

- let students get to know me and be comfortable with me
- observe how the program supported students in using and learning LLS
- observe their English language level and
- recruit volunteer students to participate in the study.

After observing the classes, I targeted 23 students who met the selection criteria. I invited via email all potential volunteers to participate in the study. The response rate to the email was poor. Only four students (one from Cambodia, one from Korea and two from Thailand) responded to the email and agreed to participate in the research.
Given the time parameters around the study, an alternative method was adopted to recruit additional participants. I contacted a staff member from the Teaching and Learning Centre of the university to assist with the recruitment process. As a result, five Japanese and one Cambodian exchange student agreed to participate in the study. I chatted with the students informally about the nature of my research project and asked them if they could participate in the study. I did not expect them to answer me straight away. I sent out the same invitation email to them, after our conversation. All the students I met in person expressed their willingness to participate in the study. The recruitment process for the 10 principal participants took a period of six months in total. It would have been desirable to have a cohort where experiences and purposes were less disparate (a cohort of 10 students from the EAP classes), however due to the lack of interest from students to voluntarily participate in the research, I had no choice but to find an alternative method to involve more students. Also, participants were from a range of disciplines including arts, business, information technology, economics, engineering, and environmental science. Most of the participants were in their early twenties, except two students in their early forties who were doing their Doctoral degrees. The length of time they had lived in Australia by the time they participated in this study varied with an average of six months.

Moreover, two of the ten participants discontinued their involvement in the study during the data collection process. One participant from Thailand (Yada) withdrew from the study after the initial in-depth interview due to the fact that she failed one of her units and had no time for anything else but focusing on her study. The other student Chika from Japan withdrew from the study half way through the strategy training program. She never explained why she stopped participating in the study. The remaining eight participants participated in the study until the end.

The withdrawal of the two participants did not affect the process of the study. Patton (2002) states that qualitative inquiry typically focuses in-depth on relatively small samples. Smith & Dunworth (2003, pp. 603-604) also point out that in qualitative research “an attempt is usually made to understand a small number of participants’ lived experience or views of the world rather than trying to test a preconceived hypothesis on a large sample”. Therefore, it was considered that eight participants were a sufficient number for this qualitative case study given that the focus of this study was to develop an in-depth understanding of their individual experiences.
Survey participants were selected from a particular pool of possibilities. Survey participants were recruited using a database from the Student Learning Centre of the University and also through personal contacts. The Centre assisted in advertising the survey and identifying the participants. An email containing the nature of the research, assurance regarding anonymity, confidentiality, and the link to the survey with an information letter as an attachment was sent out to 58 students. A total of 44 students completed the survey.

3.7 Data analysis

Data analysis in qualitative research is about making sense of huge amounts of data collected, about reducing the data, identifying significant patterns and constructing the essence of what the data reveal (Patton, 2002). This section discusses the processes associated with the analysis of the data obtained from interviews, the strategy training program, observations, and the online survey. In this study, the data were analysed using two approaches:

- Case analysis
- Cross case analysis/thematic case analysis

Case analysis requires writing a case study for each person interviewed (Patton, 2002). Yin (2009) emphasises that firstly, each of the cases must be described in detail and themes that emerged from the cases must be delineated. Researchers need to review, code, and recode the themes systematically in order to identify the themes (Miles & Huberman, 1994) and categorise them. Themes then need to be analysed across the cases. Cross-case analysis is used to analyse different or similar perspectives to common questions (Patton, 2002).

The main method of data analysis involved reading, rereading, coding the data, and also comparing the individual cases until the common or different themes emerged. The coding process was based on Miles and Huberman's (1994) typical sequence of qualitative analysis. All interview data were transcribed. The transcripts were carefully read to identify meaningful segments. The passages or sentences which exemplified the same concepts were colour coded. These codes were further examined for overlaps or repetitions. The codes which represented identical concepts were then merged into one theme. The coding process was used at all stages of data analysis (except stage two)
further clarifying the emergent themes. The passages and sentences which exemplified different concepts were also hand coded.

Within the qualitative research process, the data collection and analysis phases are in many ways intertwined and it is therefore difficult to draw a strict line between the two phases (Sarantakos, 1993). The data analysis process in this study was undertaken at different stages of data collection. In the following sections, the data analysis is discussed with reference to five stages: the first stage dealt with the data collected from the initial in-depth interview; the second stage was concerned with the online survey analysis; the third stage was concerned with the data of the strategy training program; the forth stage included the data analysis of the in-depth interview that was conducted after the strategy training program; the fifth stage or the last stage carried out comprehensive analysis on the data generated from the four data collection methods. The first three stages were concerned with case analysis while the last two stages focused on cross-case analysis.

**Five stages of data analysis**

Initial analysis of the initial in-depth interview data was conducted upon the completion of the transcriptions. After this, I started developing individual cases/profiles. The profiles were organised according to the interview guides (see Section 3.5.1). Based on the individual cases, needs analysis was conducted and the participants problems with their learning and social experiences prior to participating in the research project were identified (see Chapter 5). Consequently, in order to meet participants’ needs and help to solve their problems, types of LLS were selected to be introduced and taught in the strategy training program (see Chapter 6, Section 6.3.1).

The second stage covers the data analysis of the survey data. The survey website itself is a comprehensive user friendly tool that analysed the survey data. The results of the analysed survey data were compared with the results of the case analysis in order to ascertain the extent to which the case analysis results resonated more broadly within the Asian international student community of the university.

The third stage involved analysing data generated from the strategy training program. The data analysis performed at this stage focused mainly on observation conducted
during the strategy training program and the strategy checklist that was carried out by the participants after the training for a period of eight weeks. The data analysis of the strategy checklist revealed which types of strategies the participants used the most and which ones they did not make use of and why. The analysis of observation data also revealed some types of strategies that participants used while executing pair and group tasks during the training. This helped to fully describe the types of strategies that the participants reported using.

The fourth stage of data analysis focused on the second round individual in-depth interview that was conducted after the completion of the strategy training. The data analysis process at this stage was focused exclusively on finding out the participants’ learning and living experiences after being involved in the strategy training program. Also at this stage, the individual cases/profiles were enriched and further developed. These are presented in Chapter 7.

On completion of the data collection, the data from all four rounds were drawn together for further analysis. At this final stage, cross case analysis was used in order to “build abstractions across cases” (Merriam, 1998, p. 195) and to seek explanations (Miles & Huberman, 1994), and to reveal different perspectives of the central phenomena (Patton, 2002). This was performed by comparing and cross-checking the consistency of data (Patton, 2002). In other words, the information of what a particular participant said about the same thing at different stages of the data collecting process and what different participants said about the same issue was compared and cross-checked for consistency. The patterns of overall experience with strategy use and themes that emerged from this analysis are discussed in Chapter 8 by answering the research questions.

3.8 Establishment of trustworthiness

Qualitative research, which of its nature does not attempt to conform to the scientific standards of reliability, validity, or generalisibility, must still display the rigorous critical standards demanded of all credible research (Silverman, 2001). A number of frameworks have been developed to evaluate the rigor or assess the trustworthiness of qualitative data. The framework developed by Guba (1981) has won considerable
favour and forms the basis of establishing the trustworthiness of this study. Guba proposes four criteria that can be used in pursuit of a trustworthy study:

- credibility (internal validity);
- transferability (external validity/generalisability);
- dependability (reliability);
- confirmability (objectivity).

The establishment of trustworthiness was built into this study, from the initial design of the research through to drawing the conclusions. Table 3.5 summarises the measures of trustworthiness adopted for this study. An elaboration of these measures is included after the table.

Table 3.5 Provisions to ensure trustworthiness for this study based on Guba’s (1981) criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality criterion</th>
<th>Provisions used in this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>• Well recognised methods were used and data generated were carefully analysed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reflective journal over the course of the study was maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Thick description was provided using participants’ own words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Member acceptance was established to eliminate power difference and build trust so that data distortion was avoided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Member checking was conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferability and generalizability</td>
<td>• Detailed description of phenomenon was provided to allow comparison to be made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Survey was used to ‘test’ findings more broadly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependability</td>
<td>• Widely accepted approaches were used in the study that were aligned to the aim and purposes of the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensured credibility and trustworthiness to allow the study to be replicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmability</td>
<td>• Findings emerged from data and measures were taken to avoid bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Limitations of the study’s methods and their potential benefits were recognised</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8.1 Credibility

Credibility of the research study is a vital factor in establishing trustworthiness (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The aim of credibility is to evaluate if findings of the research represent a “credible” conceptually oriented interpretation of the initial or original data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 296). Patton (2002) points out that the overall credibility of the findings depends on the consistency of data from different sources and the richness of the information gathered.
In this study, the five stages of data collection were carefully defined and there were corresponding stages of analysis. This process, together with the use of the ongoing reflective journal generated rich data and produced a thick description of the participants’ experiences that incorporated their own words.

Moreover, in order to establish and strengthen participants trust in me, I informed the participants that I was an international student who could claim equivalent experience and similar concerns. This way, ‘member acceptance’ (Woods, 1996) was established and participants did not feel any power differences (Kouritzin, 2000) between me and them.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) assert that trust, together with improved mutual understanding, maintains the avoidance of any distortions creeping into the data or the findings. However, Edge and Richards (1998) claim that data distortion may occur because respondents may say what they think the researcher wishes to hear. In other words what the respondents say may not be the ‘truth’. However, if ethical procedures are followed regarding confidentiality, if participants are volunteers and if the power differential is minimised, there is little motivation for participants to purposefully lie (Kouritzin, 2000). In this study, appropriate ethical procedures were followed and all the participants were volunteers.

The final provision used in this study to ensure credibility was ‘member check’. Lincoln and Guba (1985) point out that member check is a good strategy to maximise the credibility of the findings. Member check is the process whereby the data are reviewed by the participants (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In this study, the complete interview transcripts of the two interviews, together with the copies of their profiles were returned to the participants to check for accuracy. Participants were encouraged to comment on and make additions and changes to the transcripts and profiles. All participants approved the accuracy of the information. Only one participant (Yada) asked for some changes and these were made.

An interesting outcome of this process was a number of participants (Yada, Mariko and Sung Hi) commenting on the quality of their English language usage. They were unhappy with their spoken English performance during the interviews. Thus, this
member check process not only improved the clarity of the data collected, but also highlighted for participants issues associated with the quality of their language use.

3.8.2 Transferability or generalisability

To allow transferability, firstly, Merriam’s viewpoint on external validity is considered. Merriam (1998, p. 207) states that external validity “is concerned with the extent to which the findings of one study can be applied to other situations”. In qualitative research, since the findings are unique to, for example, a case study, it is impossible to demonstrate that the findings are applicable to wider populations. However, Stake (1988) and Denscombe (1998), while acknowledging the uniqueness of each case, point out that the possibility of transferability should not be immediately rejected as one case study is also an example within a wider population. In 1985, Lincoln and Guba presented a similar argument and suggested that researchers have to ensure that all necessary information about the phenomenon and the context is provided to enable readers to make such a transfer. In this study, the issue of transferability is discussed within the context of generalisability.

Generalisation means generalising the findings of a study beyond the boundaries of the group studied, for example to the whole population (Patton, 2002). In a case study, however, “there may or may not be an ultimate interest in the generalisable … the search is for understanding of the particular case, in its idiosyncrasy, in its complexity” (Stake, 1988, p. 256). Throughout the processes of undertaking this study, my main priority was to describe the complexity of the participants’ experiences and optimise my understanding and interpretation of their cases. Therefore, this investigation into the participants’ experiences provided conceptually dense, rich descriptions and assisted me to capture “the complexity of reality” and to “make convincing sense of it” (Strauss, 1987, p. 10).

Following the discussion on transferability, in terms of generalising the findings of this study, the concepts of ‘fuzzy generalisation’, introduced by Bassey (1999, p. 52) or “naturalistic generalisation” by Stake (1988, p. 260) which allows for the flexibility of interpretation by the reader was the position on which I drew. Indeed, according to Denscombe (1998), the reader of the qualitative case study has ‘some responsibility’ in interpreting findings. Denscombe (1998, p. 37) points out:
The reader of the findings will use the information to make some assessment of how far the findings have implication across the board for all others of the type, or how far they are restricted to just the case study example. The reader, though, must be provided with the necessary information on which to make an informed judgement on this matter.

Therefore, this study leaves generalisation of this study to the reader’s judgement and interpretation. In other words, study results could be used to help identify other cases to which the results may be generalisable.

However, whilst generalisibility to wider population was not the intention, the survey results did indicate that the findings from the eight principal cases resonated more broadly within the international L2 students of Asian background studying at the university (see Chapter 5, Section 5.5).

3.8.3 Dependability

In order to establish dependability, a qualitative case methodology was selected to meet the aims of this study and to produce a thick description of individual cases. Multiple sources of data collection and multiple stages of data analysis were used to generate rich data and ensure consistency. Also, the richness of the data was enhanced because I presented the participants’ experiences through their own words without altering any word or proofreading their grammar. The readers of this report are therefore, provided with sufficient details of the participants’ experiences to have an in-depth understanding of it. Whilst this is beyond this study, the level of detail within the study may provide for the possibility for replication or for a similar study to be conducted.

3.8.4 Confirmability

Miles and Huberman (1994) consider that an important factor for confirmability is the extent to which the researcher recognises the limitations of the study’s methods and their potential effects. In this study, I have explained the reasons for favouring particular methods over others. I have also acknowledged and discussed possible limitations such as sample size and composition.
3.9 Ethical considerations

The issue of ethics in research is extremely important. In qualitative research, researchers have to ensure the rights, privacy and welfare of the participants (Berg, 2009; Miles & Huberman 1994; Stake, 2005). The study was conducted with the approval of the University Human Research Ethics Committee, Permit Number 2008/103.

3.10 Conclusion

This chapter provides a detailed description of the research approach used in this qualitative case study. This approach is scaffolded by Crotty’s (1998) social research framework. Within this framework, the theoretical concepts used in social research have been utilised to inform this study. Data collection and analysis methods have then been chosen to compliment the overall theoretical approach. As such, this research is underpinned by a sound theoretical and methodological framework. It is situated at the nexus of theory and practice.

In the next chapter, the profiles of the principal participants will be presented. These profiles are organised to reflect on experiences within their home country and Australian contexts before the strategy training program.
CHAPTER 4: LEARNING AND LIVING BEFORE THE STRATEGY TRAINING PROGRAM

4.1 Introduction

I begin this chapter by thinking back on my own lived experiences associated with English language learning in my LC1 and also when I first arrived here in Australia – my LC2. In some ways it all seems a very long time ago now but in others, the memories and frustrations are still quite vivid. I cannot help wondering what it would have been like if someone had wanted to interview me about my learning and living experiences? How would I have responded? Would I have been comfortable? Would I have seen the experience as one designed to help support me as I recall my LC1 and tried to negotiate the LC2? Putting myself in my participants’ shoes now forces me to again engage with, and reflect on these experiences. After all, my participants are like I was.

I cannot help wondering how I would have responded to the questions I was about to pose to my participants. I had come from a rigid and grammar oriented language learning context where there had been little focus on developing spoken English. Before I came to Australia I had worked for five years both teaching English and using English for work purposes and yet I still could not converse fluently. The halting English of my participants confronted me as a salutary reminder of what it had been like for me.

I also remember my first experience of meeting with staff and other postgraduate students. It was at a breakfast and it was overwhelming. A sea of new faces and a cacophony of voices. I had not been prepared for this. My learning and living experiences in my LC1 had not provided me with the knowledge that I needed to be comfortable with this experience. Second language socialisation was revealed to have been an aspect of my own English language learning that was missing. Life in my LC2 was to be full of challenges and frustrations. I knew, however, that I had to be proactive in my pursuit of learning language not only for academic purposes but also to be part of the L2 community. I immersed myself in the social aspects of the English language by ‘putting myself out there’ into the community. Through this experience I came to realise the importance of learning through English, not about English. But what of the participants in my study – how do their experiences resonate with mine?
This chapter seeks to capture principal participants’ lived experiences associated with their LC1 and LC2 though the use of in-depth individual interviews. As explained in Chapter 3 one of the theoretical perspectives informing this study is phenomenology. Phenomenology strives to gain insight into lived experiences in order to build a description of human experience and develop a deeper understanding of how people construct meaning (van Manen, 1990; Moustakas, 1994). Therefore by constructing individual participant profiles based on what they report as their lived-experiences, this chapter aims to develop an in-depth understanding of participants and English in their LC1 and LC2 before the strategy training program.

4.2 The profiles

Participants’ profiles are presented in two parts:

- Learners within their home country context: Reflecting on LC1 experiences
- Learners within the Australian context: Engagement with LC2 practices

The profiles are presented alphabetically according to participants’ home country names (Cambodia -2, Japan -5, Korea-1, and Thailand-2). Table 4.1 presents brief background information on the participants at the time they participated in the study.

Table 4.1 Brief summary of participants' background information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Participants’ experiences in the LC2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dara</strong> was a Cambodian PhD student. He had been learning English for 14 years and had been in Australia for 7 months. He passed the EAP program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maly</strong> was a Japanese exchange student (originally from Cambodia) studying in an Economics and Business course. She had been learning English for 9 years and had been in Australia for 3 months. Maly passed TOEFL for entrance to the university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ai</strong> was a Japanese exchange student studying Asian Studies. She had been learning English for about 6 years and had been in Australia for 3 months. Ai passed TOEFL for entrance to the university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Akio</strong> was a Japanese exchange student studying Asian and Indigenous Culture. He had been learning English for 9 years and had been in Australia for 3 months. Akio passed TOEFL for entrance into the university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chika</strong> was a Japanese exchange student studying Asian Studies. She had been learning English for 11 years and had been in Australia for 3 months. Chika passed TOEFL for entrance into the university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mariko</strong> was a Japanese student studying in a Masters course in Environmental Management. She had been learning English for approximately 10 years and had been in Australia for 6 months. She attended the EAP program on her arrival at the university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nori</strong> was a Japanese exchange student. She had been learning English for about 12 years and had been in Australia for 3 months. Nori passed TOEFL for entrance into the university.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The extent of the translation arena between LC1 and LC2

The profiles are constructed on the basis of the transcribed initial in-depth interviews as well as participants’ written communications. All are quoted exactly as expressed by the participants. Indeed, in developing my understanding of participants’ experiences, I found it to be of crucial importance to present the data as expressed by participants themselves without altering any lexis, grammar, or syntax in any way. This helps to convey the authentic voices of the participants, and gives a real sense of their experiences and an appreciation of their level of English language proficiency.

4.3 Learners within their home country context: Reflecting on LC1 experiences

This section includes information about participants’ English language education in schools, university, and their perceptions of LLS within their home country contexts. The participants’ own words are also used as headings to highlight the main themes of their experiences.

Dara: I didn’t study English in school ..., university

Dara was a 40 year old post-graduate student from Cambodia. Dara finished his undergraduate and Master’s degree in Bulgaria and worked in the field of agricultural land research management before he came to study in Australia. Dara had been in Australia for seven months. He was doing a PhD course in Environmental Science. Before he enrolled in his course, he had to attend English for Academic Purposes (EAP) classes as he did not pass the IELTS university entrance requirement. He had been learning English for about 14 years.

Dara started learning English at the age of 28 after he completed his Masters course in Bulgaria. Dara did not learn English consistently. Constrained by his employment, he
was only able to learn English on and off in private language schools. He said “I studied English for six months and stopped for few years and start again because I have to work some other place”. As a result of this, Dara’s English was as he put it “I speak little bit speaking, grammar”. Dara was not able to describe how his teachers used to teach English or how he learnt grammar or developed some spoken English. He struggled to recall his inconsistent English learning experiences as they were a long time ago.

However, prior to his arrival in Australia to study in a PhD course, Dara went to study in Cambodia full-time in a private English course for a year with native English speaking teachers from Australia and England. He enjoyed learning English. He said “We studied writing, speaking, listening. I enjoyed learning”. Again, Dara did not go into details of how he was taught or learnt English in this private school besides adding “I did a lot of IELTS preparations”. However, he did not gain entry into the Australian university straight away because he had not achieved the required score.

Apart from studying English in the classroom, Dara used to read English newspaper articles, and listen to English news. When asked if he used any other language learning strategies to improve his English, he claimed “I haven’t heard about language learning strategies … not formal program for strategy”. It was interesting to see that he focused on the news. This suggests that his experience with English language learning was very limited in terms of exposure to text types. Limited experience with different text types is also likely to have impacted his L2 socialisation.

Dara’s answers to my questions were always very brief. I found myself often having to probe or prompt with little success in retrieving detailed information. He would think for some time before he replied with mostly grammatically incorrect short answers. It seemed that learning English on and off for 13 years and having an intensive focus on English for IELTS impacted negatively, especially with respect to his English oral communication. He appeared to have had little opportunity to develop “functional efficiency” (Tikunoff, 1985, p. 4) in the English language.
Maly: In Cambodia … we mainly focus on the grammar

Maly was a 20 year old student originally from Cambodia. She was awarded a scholarship from the Cambodian government to study in a Japanese university. Her involvement in this study was as an exchange student from the Japanese university. Maly had studied in Australia for 3 months by the time she was first interviewed. She was enrolled in an Economics and Business course. To gain entry into the exchange program she passed the TOEFL test with a score of 520.

Maly had been learning English since middle school from the age of 11. She studied English for 6 years in school in Cambodia and two years in university in Japan. When she was asked to talk about her English language education in Cambodia, she described it as follows:

*The system was not that good because the teachers were all Cambodian and they have Cambodian accent. Students follow the teachers and we have bad pronunciations. I was bad on speaking and writing as well. Only the grammar. In Cambodia, we only follow textbook and we can’t improve the way we think. And because, in Cambodia I didn’t have much chance to speak and listening.*

Maly’s English language education was grammar oriented and it lacked interaction opportunities. According to Maly, her rigid, highly structured, and text-book based education did not provide her with opportunities to develop creative thinking skills and she clearly was dissatisfied with her Cambodian English language teachers. As a result of her learning experiences, Maly’s English proficiency was limited.

Maly continued comparing her English language education in Cambodia with her experience with English learning at her Japanese university. She said that it was “good because most of my teachers were native speakers. I think they teach better than the way teachers taught in Cambodia … because they ask us to … sing and to learn to write by our own not just follow textbooks”. Maly enjoyed learning English through what she considered to be fun and creative approaches. She also enjoyed talking to her native English speaking teachers. However, her time speaking English was very limited. She said “only teacher I could talk English rest of the time in Japanese”.

Not all her experiences with native-speaker teachers were positive. Maly was disappointed with the teacher who constantly corrected her mistakes. She stated “...
teacher try to correct me because I try to speak teacher all the time”. Because of her teacher’s constant correction of her mistakes, Maly developed a “fear of making mistakes” which gradually discouraged her from talking to the teacher. She said “so I couldn’t talk much”.

At the end of the interview when I asked if she had heard of or used any LLS, she said “... the writing I could improve because we write in English. When I email to Cambodia I use English because computer doesn’t have Cambodian. Even we make lots of mistakes just write”. This suggests that Maly was able to identify at least one element of her own strategy use but that overall she had only a limited understanding of LLS.

**Ai: Lots of memorisation**

Ai was a 21 year old exchange student from Japan. In her host university, she was studying to be a Japanese language teacher. Ai had been studying English since her junior high school years. Ai had studied in Australia for three months by the time she was interviewed. She was a third year student studying Asian Studies. Like Maly, Ai also had to pass the TOEFL exam to be able to study in the Australian university.

Ai was taught English by both non-native and native English speaking teachers. When she was asked to talk about her English language learning, she said;

*In high school before I entered university, it is only for reading for writing not to communicate just grammar test something like that. Lots of memorisation. We have to learn many many vocabulary. Tests like just translate just Japanese meaning. Teachers used grammar translation method, I think. I didn’t find that useful. Even I learn for 6 years I couldn’t speak English at all after I finish high school. I don’t know why teachers never focused on speaking. I am not sure. I don’t have much opportunity to speak English in Japan.*

Like Maly, Ai’s English language education was focused on grammar and exams. Ai was quite critical of such learning as she did not gain much benefit out of this experience and felt frustrated with the fact that she could not communicate orally in English after six years of learning the language. Being an Education student, Ai was aware of the method her teachers used to teach English and she questioned their overemphasis on grammar and their very limited attention to speaking.

When Ai continued learning English at university, she had native English speaking teachers which meant she had an opportunity to actually speak English. Her teachers
organised English classes as Ai explained “just for fun actually... like playing games”. This fun way of learning English gave Ai motivation to learn English “became I wanted to motivation ... in that point I think that is useful”. She further explained “she [English language teacher] regarded the most important thing is communicate. I didn’t have grammar translation lesson in university. Not like study study study”. Ai concluded that her English improved “because she didn’t use grammar translation method, also she was native teacher and we talked a lot and it was fun”. The fun way of learning English was motivating and provided some support with respect to developing communicative proficiency.

At the end of the conversation when I asked Ai about her strategy use, she replied “I didn’t hear about language learning strategy”. But she mentioned again that in her attempt to improve her English she used to try to speak with her native English speaking teachers.

**Akio: I just learn grammar, writing**

Akio was a 20 year old exchange student from Japan. Akio was studying English Literature and Culture in a Japanese university before he came to Australia. Akio had been in Australia for three months. He was studying Asian and Indigenous Culture at the time the study took place. Like other Japanese exchange students involved in this study, Akio achieved the TOEFL score level required by the Australian university.

Akio had been learning English for nine years. He first learnt English in school, an experience he recalled as “I just learn grammar, writing. I wrote just short sentences”. Apart from learning grammar and writing short sentences in his English classrooms in school, Akio had to “listening what teacher talking and write answer short questions sometimes short test. Also I didn’t discuss some kind of topic. And I didn’t talk with other students in English. I couldn’t have conversation. Akio’s English language education reflected a grammar oriented rote learning system. His recollection of his English learning in his Japanese school resembles Maly’s learning experience in her Cambodian school. In fact, interview data suggest that there is a clear similarity between Japanese and Cambodian English language education in schools. Both Maly and Akio were critical of these experiences.
Further, Akio talked about his English learning in university. He said “in university, I wrote essays about literature in English and about European culture. So in university I always write essays”. Akio knew that this way of learning English was not sufficient for him to become competent in English. He said “I don’t think it is enough”. His comments suggest that there was a lack of emphasis on English as a medium of communication within social interactive contexts. His feelings of dissatisfaction were further expressed when he pointed out:

*I have to do is listening what teacher said. We don’t have to express our opinion, just listening so we don’t have to do discussion so I can’t get any other views from other students. I have just one view about the topic. I have to listen for one and half an hour each unit [in university in Japan].*

Hence, again interaction was not encouraged and the classes were about listening, writing, and absorbing what the teachers imparted and this was the required knowledge for students to pass required tests. However, Akio remembered his native English speaking teacher in his first year at university who taught spoken English. Although the experience of learning spoken English was brief, he recalled that “conversation was very effective”.

Having learnt English for approximately nine years with both native and non-native English language teachers, interview data suggest that Akio’s English language proficiency remained limited. When I asked about Akio’s knowledge or use of LLS, he said “... back home I always practise writing, try to remember words”.

**Chika: A lot of students feel shy to speak up**

Chika was a 20 year old third year exchange student from Tokyo. When Chika was in Japan, she was studying Economics and Management in university. Chika had been in Australia for three months and was studying Asian Studies when this study took place. Chika passed the TOEFL exam with a score of 530.

Chika had extensive experience of learning English having studied it for 11 years. Firstly, Chika started learning English in a private English school with Japanese teachers for two years as “my [her] parents forced me [her] to study English”. However, she found the learning enjoyable because “it wasn’t serious learning like at school but pure fun”. As in Ai’s situation, the fun way of learning English gave Chika motivation “it made me interested in English” to continue learning English.
Chika continued learning English in junior high school but compared to her previous experience, she found it “pretty bad”. She described it as follows:

It is no fun. Homeworks. The teacher’s Japanese. We had native speakers. They didn’t teach us they are just to speak English. We did a lot of grammar. It is mainly grammar. We were focusing on sentences. We didn’t do a lot of writing and reading just always grammar and sometimes listening and we play games.

Chika’s English learning sounds similar to Maly, Akio and Ai’s – heavy emphasis on grammar and some speaking classes with native English speaking teachers. Chika found her junior high school English learning experience neither interesting nor beneficial. When she enrolled in high school, Chika went to England for 6 months to continue learning English. When she came back, she enrolled in a private school and this experience of hers she found to be very productive. She said:

In high school it was a bit different. They had a lot of native speaking teachers. My English language learning in high school was good intensive learning. Because we had intensive classes after school with native speakers for about half an hour 3 times a week.

I observed during our interview that Chika’s fluency in oral communication compared with the other participants in this study, was relatively good and her pronunciation was clearer.

Another phase of Chika’s English learning continued in university with classes only once a week which she found “not enough”. Here Chika described her Japanese university classroom in comparison with her Australian classroom. She said:

The lecture style is different in Japan because the teacher talks talks and talks we just make notes. It is not interactive. A lot of students feel shy to speak up. We don’t have tutorial in university. It is all the classes like lecture. We have something similar like tutorial it is called seminar. In that class we have it is more interactive. We have lot of group work. I don’t think it is focused on critical thinking or focused on academic learning.

Chika’s English language learning in university was not as productive and interesting as her previous learning experiences. Chika points out that the significant barrier for Japanese students to be interactive is because of their shyness and this hinders them in participating in group work. With regards to LLS, like other participants she said she did not hear about them and had limited experience in using them.
Mariko: We are not good at speaking

Mariko was a 23 year old student from Japan. She was doing her Masters degree course in Environmental Management at the time she was interviewed. Mariko had lived in Australia for 6 months by the time this study took place. In order to enter the Australian university, Mariko had to complete an EAP program.

Mariko had been learning English since junior high school for approximately 10 years. This is what Mariko had to say when she was asked to talk about her English language education in Japan:

... we are focused on the grammar and like reading and writing we are not good at speaking. Once a week, we have the opportunity to meet native English person in conversation class but it is not good. I think it is not much time to speak most of time we met Japanese teacher. I write the sentences just sentences. It is a systematic very systematic. We use just materials, teachers explain and we do homework and something like that. We don’t say opinions.

Again Mariko’s English language education presents a system with an overemphasis on grammar learning with no encouragement for students to express their opinions. Mariko had difficulty developing sufficient English language knowledge and she did not seem to gain much benefit from her speaking classes taught by the native English speaker.

Mariko continued learning English in university, however only for a year once a week. She did not feel this was enough for her to sufficiently develop competence in the English language. Being frustrated with her English language education, Mariko decided to take up private conversation classes, an experience she described as very “beneficial” – “Private class, like conversation with three students. It was beneficial”. I asked if she used any LLS to better learn English and she replied “I don’t hear LLS”. However, she added “I make a rule in using English everyday in Japan. I like the movie. I used to watch the movie with subtitles and it is very practice for me for my listening”.

Nori: I never spoke English in Japan

Nori was also an exchange student from Japan. She had studied business in a Japanese university for two years before she arrived in Australia to study. Nori had been learning English for approximately 12 years and had been in Australia for three months by the time she was first interviewed. Nori also passed TOEFL to enter the Australian
university. Australia was not new to Nori as she had come here on holidays once before with her family when she was seven years old.

In Japan, Nori studied English in school and then university. She described her English language education in school as “very bad”. She continued:

*Teachers are Japanese and they speak in Japanese. They teach grammar. No speaking. We had some native speaking teachers and they taught speaking and listening. I never spoke English in Japan - no one to talk to.*

Nori’s account of her English learning experience was the same as other participants’. Also, like other participants, she expressed her disappointment with the English language education system that she felt taught her nothing but grammar.

Nori’s university English learning was similar to her school experience. However she found her writing classes, which focused on developing essay writing and critical thinking, useful as it contributed to her study in university in Australia. She said “in university, I took writing class and that one helped me to study here. They taught critical thinking, essay writing”.

With regard to LLS, Nori said she never knowingly used any specific LLS, however, as she was keen to improve her English, she said she used to listen to English music, and read English novels and magazines.

**Sung Hi: … grammar in school, grammar in university**

Sung Hi is from Korea. Sung Hi had a degree in Communication Engineering from a Korean university. After completing her undergraduate degree, she taught mathematics in a school for a year in Korea. Sung Hi studied in EAP classes prior to her university enrolment. After successfully completing the course, she was exempted from the first year and she enrolled in a second year engineering course. By the time she was interviewed, she had lived in Australia for nine months.

Sung Hi had been studying English for 10 years, an experience she described as “… grammar in school, grammar in university … not speaking English no listening”. Sung Hi gave me some examples to illustrate her point:

*In high school in classroom, we have book and there is part of reading and grammar and speaking and listening. But we just brief study like listening and
speaking because it is hard to teach. It is hard to teach because our teachers are not good at speaking because they were Koreans. So they usually focus on teaching grammar and reading. Teacher taught us reading. First they ask us to memorise word, vocabulary. And usually they ask us to memorise every sentence if it is possible. And fix the grammar.

According to Sung Hi, the main reason for why her teachers emphasised teaching reading and grammar but not speaking was because “we have test to go to university and it is really really important to high school students that test consist of reading, listening, and grammar. Listening is little part of the test. Usually it is reading and grammar. So we just focus on reading and grammar to get high mark.” This shows that the main priority of Sung Hi’s English language education was to write and absorb in order to reproduce in exams. The operation of this system suggests that Sung Hi was expected to learn the required knowledge to get the ‘correct’ answer for exams.

Sung Hi did not study English to the same extent as mathematics and physics. She said “I am an engineer student even in Korea. I didn’t study English that much because I just study like mathematics and physics not English. I attended and I got good marks because it is like just grammar not speaking”. Her given area of study may have been another reason for such a grammar oriented English language education system. However, Sung Hi assured me that this was common for all Koreans who were learning English. She said “that is why Korean has problem to speak English”.

Based on Sung Hi’s recollection of her experience with learning English, both at school and university, Sung Hi sounded frustrated. She was frustrated because “… after I graduate high school, after I graduate university, I have to study speaking English, otherwise I can’t get job”. She went to study in a private English course because “there is native speaker”.

It seemed that there was a significant gap between the requirements of her English language education in school and university and what employers required in terms of English language skills. Sung Hi’s recollection of her English language education portrays an exam oriented system that focused on reproductive rote learning. Her employer, however, required a good command of spoken English. Her school and university English education did not give her this capacity. When I asked about her understanding of LLS, Sung Hi replied she never used LLS.
Annan: ...*study English for long time but they can’t speak*

Annan was a Thai student in his early 40s. Annan was a university lecturer for almost 10 years before he came to Australia. Annan was studying for his Doctorate in Information Technology. Annan attended EAP classes to be able to do his degree in an Australian university. Annan’s first visit to Australia had been eight years ago for a six month period to study English. This was his second time here and at the time the interview took place he had been here for eight months.

Annan had been learning English for approximately 13 years. He revealed his English language learning experience in Thailand to have been very frustrating. He described “we study a lot of English but we cannot use that.” Annan explained further:

> In Thailand, educational system we in my generation in the primary school in grade 5 to first study English until graduate from the high school. And after that I went to university. At the first year at university I didn’t study English class. Anyway, we had to read textbook from unit.

> We start learning English from grammar so that is why when study English for long time but they can’t speak because we just focus on grammar on the sentence. So because in the class we not much conversation we just try to study the words and study the sentence proper sentence something like that.

Again, Annan’s experience with learning English in his home country reveals obvious similarities to other participants’ experiences mentioned above – heavily focused on grammar learning.

When Annan was in his fourth year of university, his desire to improve his English motivated him to enrol in a private English course with native English speaking teachers. On the one hand, he found this experience helpful as he had a chance to speak English, but on the other, he was disappointed with the limited time he had speaking with his teachers “two three hours in one week” and lack of English speaking environment to practise his speaking “after class we speak Thai anyway”.

Annan’s English classes did not stop there. He took up TOEFL classes in order to be able to gain entry to university in Australia. He did not reveal his score but it was not sufficient for him to enrol to his Doctorate in Information Technology course straight away. He only commented “I will learn a lot of word but not so good conversation”. After learning English for 13 years, Annan’s account of his experiences of English
language learning both in public and private institutions, was that it limited his capacity to develop a sufficient level of English language proficiency to support his postgraduate study. At the end of our interview, I asked Annan if he used any LLS, he answered:

*I know maybe somebody told me just we have to practise, have to reading from newspaper, try to speak English something like that.*

He added “If you keep trying to use that try to improve that that is basic things”.

**Yada: I study English more than 10 year but I cannot use**

Yada was a Thai student who was studying for a Masters degree in Arts. Yada had been in Australia twice before to study general English. She completed a 10 month EAP course prior to her enrolment in the Masters in Human Resources.

Yada was another Thai student who studied English for more than 10 years. Besides learning English, she taught the language for one year in a high school in Thailand. Yada’s account of her English language education in Thailand resembled that of Annan’s. She stated:

*In Thailand we focus on English grammar. When I was young I have to remember vocabulary. I was sitting in English classes, copy on the board.*

She went on to give me an example to illustrate her point “if the teacher wrote about “I am hungry” I have to learn what is the subject, auxiliary verb, the main verb something like that. Actually at that time I just copy I really don’t understand”.

This example clearly shows that learning English for Yada was to try to absorb without necessarily understanding what she was learning. This approach to learning left Yada totally frustrated and somewhat angry. She expressed “Although, I study English more than 10 year, but I cannot use because I didn’t practise”. Yada continued “Language is the one of the skills you have to use not just remember”, a point Annan made earlier.

Another contribution to her frustration was “I always study in my language. Nothing improve”. It appears that for Yada learning English through the Thai language seemed unproductive with the result that even after 10 years her language was limited.
Furthermore, this is what she had to say about her English exams “Exam is just multiple choice and reading the answer just come from the topic the teacher gave. We don’t have to analyse”. She added:

*When I studying in the university it is quite easy because I think I just learn about a conversation. But when I was doing exam, exam is little bit difficult. I don’t understand why the teacher taught is easy but the exam is very difficult.*

For reasons unknown to Yada, the contents of her exam papers seemed to contradict what she learnt in classes. Yada’s account of her exam experience is similar to that of Sung Hi’s, the Korean participant.

Yada also talked about her English language teaching experience. She said:

*M My teaching experience, I followed my colleague’s lesson plan. I just the same. I just want them [students] to understand some of the conversation of daily life.*

Despite a number of disappointments with her English language education, it seemed Yada did try to challenge the traditional way of teaching English and tried to teach conversational English to her students.

Like Annan, she studied elementary and intermediate level English in a private English course to be able to gain entry into a Masters course in university in Australia. Her English language proficiency level was not sufficient to provide her with access to the university. When I asked her if she used any LLS, she mentioned “rereading”, a strategy which she used when she was studying in the private classes.

### 4.4 Learners within the Australian context: Engagement with LC2 practices

This section includes information about participants’ learning and living experiences in Australia and attempts to reveal their existing relationship with the LC2 prior to strategy training. It is divided into two parts: challenges in university learning and challenges outside university. Again participants’ own words are used as the headings of the profiles to highlight the main themes of their experiences.
4.4.1 Challenges in university learning

**Dara: Little help from teacher … I just do lab work**

Our discussion of Dara’s learning and living experiences in Australia began with him talking about his EAP classes. Dara commented: “We have to how to write essay also writing it academic style also some skill”. I asked Dara if he could elaborate on the academic writing and ‘some skills’ that he mentioned but he was not sure how to answer that question.

I was most interested in what he learnt about Australian culture during his program and if he came across any information about ways of life in Australia. He said:

> About Australian culture, yeah English class normally we have all 6 student we can learnt something from with other. We learn about different cultures. I didn’t learn much about Australian culture.

Although Dara claimed that he learnt about Australian culture in his EAP classes, his discussion really focussed on learning about the different cultures of his classmates. Australian culture seemed not to be actively addressed in the EAP classes. Cultural awareness came from interactions with other international students.

I was also interested to know if he was introduced or practised any LLS in his EAP classes. He reiterated the emphasis on writing essays. However, he added “to improve my English, I after class I have a free time, I enjoy listen, watch TV” a strategy that he used to use while he was learning English in his home country.

Overall Dara felt “comfortable learning and living in Australia”. However, Dara found a few issues that were problematic and hindered him from talking to or socialising with Australian people in the university context. When Dara first embarked on his journey in his PhD course, he found it “very challenging … because everything single have to do independently. Little help from teacher, we have to our own initiative, idea” in comparison to his Cambodian research degree in which “they [students] have more assistance from teacher”. Dara continued “Here [in Australia], I have to go and ask. We [him and his supervisor] meet almost every week. But they don’t give more details and we have to find it out myself. I just do lab work”. He said he spent most of his time in the laboratory doing his experiments. Dara sounded disheartened when he found that he
could not expect step by step assistance from his supervisor but had to work on his own independently. Tikunoff (1985) explains that dependent students learn when they are provided with frequent clarification, monitoring and feedback concerning task completion. If this is not provided, their inability to work independently causes them to give up or get off-task easily when working at a complex level (Tikunoff, 1985). While Dara was not entirely unable to work independently as he continued working in his laboratory on his own, overall, he presented as a dependent and an isolated student who would have preferred more frequent help from his supervisor. Dara expressed his interest in learning some oral communication strategies to help him to communicate better.

**Maly: … in Japan we don’t have the tutorial**

Maly faced a number of issues in her academic learning. The problem was “… the system here [Australia] is completely different from Japan”. Maly compared her learning experience in Japan with the experience she was exposed to at the Australian university. Overall Maly was satisfied with the Australian university system but she revealed some issues with her study in the new learning environment. She reported tutorials and writing essays as being difficult because she had no prior knowledge of these academic activities that are commonly practised in Australian universities. She said:

*It is very hard for me because in Japan we don’t have the tutorial. We have only lecture. We don’t have to work hard in class. But just maybe one or 2 months before the exam maybe try to study hard and then. But here we have to work step by step. We have to submit assignment every week and I feel that it is very hard. I didn’t get used to it. Like essay I don’t know how to write essay. In Japan it is different. When we submit assignment or report and then get it and they don’t give the feedback. We don’t get the paper back so we don’t know whether we do it correct or incorrect. We just get the mark. I can feel the system here is very good. I can get the feedback I can improve myself.*

Maly’s insufficient knowledge about academic conventions and practices is understandable because first, no real attention or feedback was given with respect to academic conventions in English in her Japanese university. Second, she had no understanding of ‘tutorial’. In addition to her difficulties with tutorials and writing, she revealed that reading was also an issue due to the specialised vocabulary in the text. Maly said *“I cannot really understand the context because of new words”*. In Asian culture we are not required to read a lot. She continued “I also think my English is a
problem”. It is interesting that, Maly related her reading shortcoming to her Asian culture, a point not made by any other participant.

I asked Maly if she tried to do anything to improve her learning and her English proficiency. She named a number of strategies such as trying to speak freely without fear of making mistakes, watching English TV shows, and emailing her friends in Cambodia. Maly sounded driven and motivated to further improve her English as she saw the English language as an important element in her future career. She said:

*It is important for me to continue develop my English because I want to work with the foreigners. I think if I can English fluently, I can improve my career well. It is really important. After university I want to continue to Master so it is very important. I need English.*

At the end of our interview, Maly revealed that she was interested in learning some useful LLS to better participate in tutorials, read effectively, and increase her vocabulary.

**Ai: Tutorial is very hard for me ... essay is difficult**

Ai revealed some difficulties she was facing in her study. These were tutorial participation, writing essays and reading. She said:

*Tutorial is very hard for me. All of them are native speaker ... they talk so fast and sometimes I couldn’t catch it. And like sometimes I didn’t say anything in tutorial I feel disappointed. I feel struggling and disappointed ... I want to say but I can’t speak it well because of my English. I can’t express myself in English so sometimes I feel pressure.*

Ai attributes her disappointment and unwillingness to participate in tutorials to her English language competence. She struggles and feels disappointed because she gets lost during discussions and lacks understanding. Her English native-speaking peers’ active participation puts implicit pressure upon her and she feels self-pressure. She also experiences pressure when she cannot express herself in English. It appears that Ai’s English language proficiency was a barrier which prevented her from effective learning and interaction in university activities. Furthermore, Ai found “*essay is difficult*”. She compared her essay writing experience in her Japanese university with her current experience. She continued:

*Back in Japan, teachers didn’t teach much essay. Not that much focused on academic essay. In Japanese university, I wrote essays but structure is little bit different. Like in English essays, you wrote introduction, body and conclusion.*
Of course Japanese essay has the structure. But I think English essay is more strict about that structure. Japanese is not that strict.

Like Maly, Ai did not have prior knowledge about writing academic essays using the expected conventions in the Australian context. Ai also expressed her concern about having difficulties in understanding her unit readers. She believed that if she understood her readings well, it would have been easy for her to find and select sources for the essay topic and produce good essays.

When I asked her if she was doing anything to help her, she reported using strategies such as asking questions for clarification, trying to speak English frequently, and listening to the English language. Unlike other participants, Ai had some knowledge of LLS. She said:

*I heard about it in my English studies course here. Social strategies I thought it was very effective. Interaction with other classmates. Lots of classes in Australia have discussion and even lecturer and students have argue. There is many interaction.*

At the end of the interview, it was revealed that Ai wanted to learn some effective LLS to better participate in tutorials, to learn how to read effectively, and to improve her writing.

**Akio: It is difficult to ... express my opinion**

Overall, Akio was happy about his life in Australia. He felt more relaxed than he was in Japan. He said “Maybe the land is huge comparing to Japan. The nature beautiful beach. Very relaxing”. However, he expressed some concerns with regard to his academic learning, especially participation in discussions. He said:

*It is difficult to discuss with others about one topic, express my opinion. Because first my vocabulary not good so if I had some opinion, I can’t say that in English and sometimes I have no opinions about the topic because topic I never think such topic. So first I have to think what is the topic. So before express my opinion, I have to think and sometimes I can’t say anything in the discussion.*

Akio manifests lack of confidence with his English including limited vocabulary, that inhibits him in terms of participating in discussions. Interview data suggest that Akio’s previous educational experiences did not prepare him for how to express opinions and participate in discussions. He continued: “... I have to get used to discussion but in Japan I didn’t do any discussion”. This is a concern he expressed when he was talking.
about his Japanese educational experience that “I have to do is listening what teacher said. We don’t have to express our opinion”. Moreover, Akio added “Maybe sometimes I have bad opinion. So I have to say something and I need to be brave I am little shy. So for me it is difficult to be brave”. So for Akio, his struggle to participate in discussion was a combination of his limited English language proficiency and limitations imposed through academic practices and expectations from his LC1. For example, Akio struggled with the importance of rehearsal and practice as opposed to spontaneity and the need to agree and not express disagreement. He expressed his desire to learn some helpful strategies to better participate in tutorials, read effectively and to increase his vocabulary.

Chika: It is not easy for me to flow into the discussion because I am not used to it

Overall, Chika enjoyed her life here in Australia. She found life in Australia to be easy and laid back compared with Tokyo. Chika finds the Australian educational system different from Japan. One of the main differences Chika mentioned was the notion of a tutorial. She said:

_Educational experience here is totally different from Japan. We have tutorials. I have to do the reading before tutorials so that I can participate. Attendance is not enough so you have to participate in tutorial. Because of my English I have not done my reading. I find the reading difficult._

She finds tutorials difficult because firstly, she had never experienced tutorials in her Japanese classes and secondly, her lack of English language proficiency limited her capacity to read for tutorials and then participate in discussion. She said:

_It is not easy for me to flow into the discussion because I am not used to it. I can’t really express myself. I wish my English was better as well._

Like Akio’s experience with tutorials, Chika also realised that her not making an appropriate contribution to class, and not communicating her ideas to the class effectively in tutorials, was a combination of her inadequate English together with the cultural influence that came from her Japanese education. She was keen to receive any help that would enable her to better participate in tutorials and read effectively. Moreover, she wanted “to improve speaking listening reading also. My writing is not very good but ok”.
When I asked if she was using any technique or strategies to improve her English, she replied that she was trying to make more friends and speak in English with them, listen to music, watch TV, and ask for help. The data reveal that Chika expressed her need to improve her tutorial participation, reading, oral communication, listening, and writing.

**Mariko: ... I want to ask, I cannot express very well**

Another Japanese student expressed a similar concern with regard to her inability with self-expression. Mariko found her life in Australia stressful due to her struggle with requirements associated with her academic study.

Mariko entered the Australian university after she had completed EAP classes. I was interested to know what she learnt about Australian community life and culture in her EAP classes and if she was instructed in any LLS. She said “I was taught LLS”. When she was asked to describe what type of LLS she learnt and how she used them, she said:

> If I use more English, express English the teacher, I could improve my English speaking, I was the worst student to speak English.

Also, Mariko said that she learnt about Australian culture in EAP classes including “science and computer ...”. She continued “I don’t think so I can use those information everyday life here”. It appears that both LLS and Australian culture and community life were not addressed in her EAP classes in a way that she could make use of the information. Her understandings seemed very vague and she did not see relevance with respect to her situation.

We discussed Mariko’s university studies further. Mariko mentioned the difficulties she had been encountering as an international student. She said:

> It is very difficult. It is very tough in assignment. The first time, I am not sure about the question. What the teacher want us to do. Next I have to use English it is very difficult. If I am in the class, the Australian ask questions to the professor. I don’t understand and I want to ask, I cannot express very well.

Mariko’s academic study experience is very similar to the other participants: limited English language proficiency, inability to understand classroom interaction, inability to understand her lecturers, and lack of ability to express herself. Mariko’s relative reticence had as its consequence not being recognised as a competent participant, and she was unable to develop her own sense of membership of class groups. Mariko even
mentioned how these problems affected her state of well being. She said “I am very worry about assignment it very difficult. Sometime I worried a little bit depression”. I asked Mariko if she was doing anything to help herself to tackle these problems, she answered she was trying to use “more English … just reading and speaking” and speak English with her Asian friends. At the end of our interview, Mariko was most interested in learning some listening strategies, which according to her, would help her to improve her understanding of her lecturers’ instructions, classroom interactions, and possibly enable her to participate in discussions.

**Nori: Tutorials are difficult. I never speak**

As mentioned earlier, Nori liked living in Australia and found her life fun. However, most of the time she studies and this keeps her busy. She said “I study a lot. A lot of assignments and very busy. It is very challenging”. Nori particularly found tutorials challenging because “it is very fast” and “You ask a question very slowly and people don’t understand”. Hence, she finds “Tutorials are difficult. I never speak”. Nori sounded frustrated because the task of participating in tutorials was an extremely daunting experience for her and she felt discouraged when she realised that her classmates were not able to understand her non-standard English and thus she was not receiving any feedback on her ideas. Her perceived reasons for this challenge included her limited comprehension, fast-paced class discussions, and her limited English speaking abilities. Consequently, Nori decided to never speak in tutorials. I was interested to know if she tried to do something differently to participate in tutorials. She answered “If I didn’t understand something I ask my [Asian] friends or just leave it”. She also mentioned listening to music and reading as ways to improve her English. At the end of our interview, Nori said that she needed help to participate in tutorials and also how to effectively read her unit texts.

**Sung Hi: As an Asian, I feel shy to ask when I have some problem**

First Sung Hi and I talked about Sung Hi’s experience with EAP classes. She said:

*In EAP classes, we just learn how to write report. Just learn how to study how to learn university course, like we learn how to write report. How to hold presentation like that ... it help a lot in my university study.*
When I was interested if she was taught LLS, Sung Hi replied “I don’t think I heard some strategy for English”. I was also interested to know if she learnt anything about Australian culture and lifestyle to which she replied:

*Australian culture – we have kind of, I can’t remember the specific day but like in Melbourne they have like horse race. That is really popular. Most of Australian bet money. That is it.*

These comments suggest that ‘culture’ was represented in EAP course as isolated facts about ‘cultural events’. The issues around interaction and socialisation appear not to have been addressed. We continued talking about Sung Hi’s university study. Overall, Sung Hi was satisfied with the Australian university’s education system. Her satisfaction derived from being able to effectively review a topic or a subject. She said:

*Actually I really like Australian education. Especially, university education because they have a lot of lecture. At the same time they have laboratory and tutorial so I can review a week’s lessons again, again and again.*

Sung Hi compared the host university’s education with the Korean education system. She pointed out that in her culture competition for excellence was the target of learning. She said:

*In Korea, I usually got depressed to get high mark. I have to compete with my classmate. Here I don’t have yeah to because if we study very well or how can I say if we get some good purpose of learning engineering we can get all HD. In Korea no only 2 of them get HD. They are so compete with each other to get HD. You know what I mean? So it is quite easy to study. We can help each other [students]. So my life is easy than in Korea.*

Moreover, Sung Hi claimed that she “understand [s] my lecturer … speak formal English” and “because I read before I get to lecture. I prepare myself. So I can understand easily”. However, Sung Hi experienced difficulties understanding informal spoken English during her laboratory work and tutorials which hindered her accomplishing tasks at hand. She said:

*... in lab or tutorial ... they speak like informal English I cannot understand. So it is quite hard because I don’t want to miss any of their words, even a single word. So and if I miss their single word, I can’t do that. So he says understand? So show me. I can’t because I couldn’t understand.*

Sung Hi reported that she felt that this issue was also associated with her being Asian and that this had its ‘drawbacks’ that were related to her personality as well as to language. She expressed:
As an Asian, I feel shy to ask when I have some problem so and I wonder what if they think I am stupid because that kind of problem is related to language problem. So it is like a language problem – a lot of them that cases.

It appears that Sung Hi’s inability to understand informal registers caused a significant obstacle to her learning. Overall Sung Hi seemed a capable student but her language barrier was limiting her comprehension of informal talk and discussion in the classroom. Due to this problem she did not want to ask questions fearing she might ‘lose face’. Sung Hi continued talking about her behaviour in comparison with her Australian classmates, describing them as ‘aggressive’. She said:

*I found that Australian student they usually they usually ask like everything when they feel they have problem. Even that is so small. But to me if it is small I think I can handle that. I am alone in the class, as an Asian as a female student so I feel shy. And we are not aggressive people like Western people.*

Barnard (2009) notes that Korean students have clear perceptions about the nature of learning and teaching which include ways by which knowledge is constructed. In Sung Hi’s case, the social and cultural attitudes implanted through Sung Hi’s schooling did not support her active oral engagement in the classroom including asking questions. Therefore, when she saw her Australian classmates asking questions regardless of whether the question was significant or not, she perceived them as ‘aggressive’. This suggests that Sung Hi had a lack of familiarity with informal register commonly used by Australian people. Barnard notes that Western students tend to be assertive and upfront with their questions and inputs into classroom discussion. Barnard explains that such misunderstanding or perception is caused by “cultural distance” (Barnard, 2009, p. 5).

For Sung Hi, the classroom was a place where she constantly negotiated her competence, including her language abilities, membership in her new academic community, and also multiple and sometimes conflicting identities (i.e., being a confident student who finds it easier to study in Australia than in Korea versus shy female Asian student). At the end of our interview, Sung Hi was most interested to learn some LLS that would help her to improve her oral interaction.

Annan: *... many international students and Australian student quite separate*

Annan’s enrolment in his Doctorate was conditional on him undertaking an EAP program to improve his IELTS score. He found the EAP program “is very good for me.”
I think this course is the best. I write essay at the same time reading, we have to speak”. Therefore, he believed with the help of the EAP program “My English is improve”.

When he was asked what he learnt in the EAP classes about Australian culture, everyday life, and customs, he said:

Some topics we have conversation is about Aboriginal when we heard from the news sorry day something like that. Lecturer just told me a story what happened in the past. Include in class maybe I can’t remember.

Adriana Diaz (2010) uses the phrase “understanding culture in interaction” (p. 173) and emphasises the importance of the development of language learners as intercultural speakers in language programs at university level in Australia. This concept was not a part of Annan’s EAP experiences. Again, like Sung Hi, Annan talked of learning about facts and events of Australian history. Annan’s account suggests that these were learnt in isolation from language. There is little evidence of EAP classes addressing interactions, informal register, and other aspects of language use relevant to participation and socialisation in the LC2.

I was also interested to know if he was taught any LLS to which he replied “She taught many strategy like watch TV, keep trying. After the class, we just do our way anyway”. It does not appear that LLS were systematically taught in the program, rather there were some ‘suggestions’ made as to how students might improve their English which Annan ignored.

We moved on to talking about Annan’s university study experience. Annan started “My experience is not so good.” His “not so good” experience was first, related to his writing “My weakness is writing”. He also experienced difficulties with group discussion. He explained:

When we form group, I talk with the Australian students talk with the international student and when we try to do the same topic what happen after that ... we just split with Australian students. If 3 people in the group 2 international student speak maybe the same culture ... international student have to pay more attention with our topic. But Australian people just ready.

Annan identifies dilemmas international students confront while engaging in collaborative tasks. First, they are expected to progress with learning tasks at the same rate as their Australian peers with little support in terms of negotiating content and the
demands of specific tasks. Second, capacity to complete tasks speedily was impacted by English language proficiency. Therefore, as Annan said, while the international students were still working on the given task, the Australian students had already finished and were ready for the next task.

Further, Annan pointed out that “In the class ... many international students and Australian student quite separate”. He believed the reason for this was “... maybe they don’t use to talk to foreigner because sometimes the language is the barrier”. His comments suggest a divide between international and Australian students in class. However, Annan emphasised that his major drawback was academic writing. When I asked if he was doing anything specific in order to deal with his learning difficulties he said “I am not doing any specific activities to improve my English. Just do homework is a lot of thing to do”. At the end of our interview, Annan expressed his interest in learning writing strategies to improve his academic writing.

**Yada: I want to express is difficult for me**

First, Yada and I talked about her EAP program and what she thought of it. Yada found her EAP classes easier than her Master’s study. This was because her level of English was comparable to her EAP classmates who were all international students with limited English. She said:

\[\text{My English was enough for EAP classes. In EAP class, although sometime it is difficult for me to explain but they can understand. We can use the easy vocabulary to explain. EAP helped my writing I think some of reading. I think when I study in EAP class my English is better than I study in Master degree. I just feel like that.}\]

Thus Yada’s English language knowledge which was sufficient enough to cope with EAP tasks became insufficient within the context and requirements of university postgraduate academic practices. Also, in the EAP classes Yada’s classmates were ‘like’ people but in the broader university context the majority of her classmates were native English speakers. This increased the challenge. However, on a brighter note, Yada believed her English improved in EAP classes, specially her writing and reading.

When she was asked whether she learnt anything about Australian lifestyle and culture in EAP classes, she said:
I think just some. I don’t remember because we have only Australian who is the teacher and my classmates are international students.

As with the experiences of other participants, it appears that Australian culture, lifestyle and other aspects of interaction within the LC2 were not addressed in her EAP classes. I also asked if LLS were taught in the EAP classes to which she replied no.

Yada expressed some concerns with regard to her Master’s course. She said “I don’t know what will happen because master degree is not easy for me”. Yada reported a number of difficulties that she had been encountering while doing her Master’s course. She said:

Doing Master in Australia has many problem. Discuss in workshop in the class assignment. I think it is my limited English is problem. When I have to discuss with my friend some experiences I want to express is difficult for me because I have limited vocabulary. I am little shy and shy something wrong.

... sometimes, I don’t have a confidence that maybe I am wrong that I read what I understand maybe wrong. So I don’t speak it up because maybe just small group I can just tell.

Yada’s comments suggest a need to be ‘right’ and anxiety about being ‘wrong’. The legitimacy of having different views seems to be outside of her LC1 experiences and is not natural for her.

Yada continued to share her experiences. She talked about two incidents that occurred while completing group assignments which involved a mix of international and domestic students. She said:

I have bad experience two times of group work. Last trimester, we have to do group work on marketing management. At that time we have three Thai students and one Australian. After one week, the Australian said he has no time to do the group work, so he quit our group only three people in the group and this trimester the same. Four people and one left. But in this time a Malaysian, Singapore and Thai. I think because some Australian doesn’t want to do group work with international student. I think they might get the lower mark than they could get. He said he has no time to come to the class, but I saw him every week.

Yada points out two important issues here. First, Yada felt that the Australians believed that they would be disadvantaged in terms of marks. Second, the comments identify issues with respect to task design and group accountability and demonstrates a lack of awareness with respect to principles and practices associated with collaborative teaching and learning.
I asked Yada if she used any special techniques or strategies to enhance her English proficiency or cope with her challenges, she replied “I don’t do any specific thing to improve my English. I don’t have time I have plenty of assignments”. At the end of the interview, Yada expressed her interest in learning strategies to support tutorial and discussion participation as well as reading.

Yada’s concerns echoed those of other participants. The limited language competency that hindered Yada in participating in group assignments and comprehending reading materials were reported by all 10 participants. Overall participants were struggling to achieve the learning requirements of their Australian university. As a result they were left at times feeling confused, frustrated, isolated, and lost.

4.4.2 Challenges outside university

Dara: My time to talk to other people is not enough

Besides claiming he had little help from his supervisor and was spending most of his time in the university in the laboratory, Dara also expressed his concern about his limited encounters with other people both on and off campus with whom he could have a conversation. He said: “In uni I have very little time to interact with other children [students]”. According to Dara, the only other time he had conversations on campus, apart from with his supervisor, was with his “… friends, I have one friend from Bangladesh we came here to for PhD the same supervisor. Normally lunch time we catch up and another from my country my housemate”.

Dara mentioned an Australian friend who he hardly ever met because they lived far from each other. It appears that the only native English speaker Dara communicates with on a more or less regular basis is his supervisor and these discussions are mainly about his PhD work. Dara is living in an English speaking country and yet he does not speak English. He repeatedly emphasised this factor, as if to justify his limited oral communication skill in English. He said:

Outside university, actually I live with Cambodian we normally speak our language. This is disadvantage my English. My time to talk to other people is not enough. My English since I came here, my speaking not much improve.
Indeed, Dara had extremely limited opportunities to speak English. Dara acknowledged the importance of having Australian friends. He said: “It is important to have Australian friend that we can talk I also want to have other close friends talk freely”. Dara had a genuine desire to make some local friends with whom he could communicate on a regular basis.

Dara also hoped that his “… writing and listening maybe improve”. Dara was optimistic that his reading and writing of English would improve over time. He said “I think my English will improve from time to time by reading book or writing something from my research and living in English environment”. He was also hopeful that his oral communication would get better “because we learn English here, we live here English environment because speaking watching TV”.

At the time of this study, however Dara was very much at a distance from a real community of English speakers. Therefore, his L2 socialisation experience was almost non-existent. As can be seen from Dara’s account, one could easily count the number of his Australian conversation partners. Dara was, however, interested in learning some oral communication strategies.

**Maly: I hang out normally with Asian**

In spite of her short period of time in Australia, Maly felt that her English had improved because of the English speaking environment. She said “Here people speak English and I feel that my English improve a lot. Actually I don’t really feel but my friends told me that”. When she was asked to talk about her friends and life in Australia, she replied:

*I don’t have many Aussie friends. I hang out normally with Asian. My friends are from Indonesia, Filipino, Malaysia, a lot of Singapore, Hong Kong, Japan. I speak with them in English.*

Maly was happy with the fact that she got to meet people from different cultures and became friends with them. But Maly did not sound happy about living with her aunty and not being able to speak English. She said “The problem is I talk in Cambodian with her”.

I asked her if she had any Australian friends, she said “I don’t spend time with Australian people. I just have class with them. And talk before the class and after the
Maly wanted “to meet more [Australian] people to talk to them”. This shows that like Dara, Maly had limited encounters with Australian people and was not able to fully immerse herself into the community and Australian society. However, she was optimistic that her English would improve even further as she had seven more months left to study and live in Australia. At the end of the interview, Maly revealed that she was interested in learning strategies that would help her to improve her oral communication.

**Ai: I have much opportunity to speak English**

Ai enjoyed her life in Australia. She also found Australians to be relaxed and open people. She said she liked Australia very much and she was interested in teaching Japanese in Australia in the future.

Ai had been studying in Australia for three months when the first interview was conducted. During this period, she made some Australian friends. She said

> My housemates it is Australian, Singaporean, Bangladeshi. I speak with them in English. My study buddy is an Australian and my classmates. I see my Australian friends every day. Sometimes I go out with them. When I go out with my classmates, I go to their house and flat in the village, go shopping.

Compared with Dara and Maly, Ai speaks English with Australians on a regular basis. Consequently, Ai believes that her English has improved since her arrival in Australia. She said: “My English improved a little because I am in the environment. I have much opportunity to speak English. Sometimes I couldn’t understand the conversation. I ask them”. This reveals that Ai is utilising her opportunity to immerse herself in Australian language and culture – LC2. Importantly, she also has friends who can support her when help is needed. Therefore, Ai did not express an interest in participating in an oral communication strategy development program because she was happy with her socialisation experiences in Australia.

**Akio: I always try to talk with someone**

Akio sounded happy living in Australia because he had a great opportunity to improve his oral English. He said “Speaking is very important for me. I always try to talk with someone”. He made some Australian born friends who were interested in learning Japanese and they teach each other their languages. He said:
... some friends studying Japanese. They are from Danish, Australia, Singapore yeah. Most of them was born in Australia. My English is improving. My pronunciation is very bad so sometimes they give me advice so I can correct my pronunciation. They tell me we should use this word and they always help me.

Akio was very happy about the fact that he made native English speaker friends who were willing to help him to improve his English. Besides, Akio also has a close Australian friend who is learning Japanese.

He is studying Japanese and I am studying English. First we talk each other in English and we talk each other in Japanese. So if I couldn’t find the word I can ask him so I can improve my [English] everyday.

It was an advantage for Akio to find a friend who wanted to learn his language. This provided him with a very good opportunity to form a close friendship with his Australian friend or friends and at the same time practise his English on a daily basis. Akio also added “Recently usually [spends time with] Australian friend” and “I go clubbing, drinking, sometimes go to Kings park watch scenery, watch movies”. Akio not only practises his spoken English with his friend but also socialises with him. He is engaging more broadly with the LC2. Moreover, it appears that Akio used LLS such as making local friends to exchange language knowledge, asking for help, listening to advice on his mistakes and correcting them, and spending much time with his local friends by speaking English and socialising. Like Ai, Akio did not express an interest in learning oral communication strategies.

Chika: I hang out with my friends they are all Asians ... most of them born here

Chika and I started talking about her social life in Australia and who her friends were. She said:

I hang out with my friends. They are all Asians and I have to speak English with them because most of them are born here or went to school here, they are almost like local.

Besides this, Chika also communicates with Australian students in student village who are interested in learning Japanese. However, she said she did not have much time to speak English with them.

When asked if she thought she made any improvement in her English, she replied “I think it is improving. I can learn from them casual English”. However, she added:
… my English is not good I can’t follow their conversation so I can’t keep. When I can’t follow the conversation I ask them to repeat or slow down but I don’t ask them all the time.

Chika was willing to learn oral communication strategies. However, she discontinued her participation in the research after being involved in the first interview and half of the strategy training program. I tried to contact her many times to find out why she disappeared so suddenly but never received any reply.

**Mariko: My friends are Japanese**

Compared with Ai, Akio and Chika (other Japanese participants), Mariko’s social life and friendship affiliation mainly revolved around her Japanese friends. I wanted to know why she specifically mentioned speaking English with her Asian friends. She said “I live with Asian students. To improve my English … I use English”. It appeared that she only speaks English with her housemates and spends her free time with her Japanese friends “I go to Fremantle, go shopping with my Japanese friends” speaking Japanese.

Mariko never mentioned communicating with Australians nor did she express her interest in socialising with them. Like Dara, Mariko’s social life only revolved around her co-nationals or other Asian students. This way she had very limited opportunity to enhance her cultural understanding, broaden her vision and enrich her learning and living experience. I was hoping Mariko might want to learn some useful oral communication strategies to increase her opportunities to speak with Australians and improve her oral communication. However, she did not express an interest in doing this. It appeared that Mariko was comfortable socialising and spending time with her co-nationals and other students from Asian countries. Perhaps, for Mariko, the process of ‘translation’ between LC1 and LC2 is easier and less ‘threatening’ for her when ‘hanging around’ with her Japanese friends and other Asian students. It is more likely, however, that she was not interested in this process. For her, English was pragmatic—only for study purposes.

**Nori: It is very difficult to make friends with Australian girls**

Nori mentioned earlier that she was reluctant to talk in tutorials. However, with regard to talking to people outside university, Nori was not reluctant. She said “I am confident. I speak up and if I don’t understand something I say “pardon” or “could you speak
slowly”. Further, she said she practiced her speaking with her friends/flatmates from Malaysia, Korea and Denmark. Nori continued talking about her friends. She said she had Japanese and Australian friends with whom she liked going shopping. However, Nori made the following remark:

It is very difficult to make friends with Australian girls. Guys are easy. I don’t know. Australian girls don’t speak up.

Overall, Nori sounded happy with her social life and was hopeful that her English would improve over time “My English is not very improving. But will be better”. Hence, she did not express any interest in participating in oral communication strategy sessions.

**Sung Hi: ... as an engineer student, I don’t have much opportunity to speak**

Besides having difficulties in her university learning, another area that Sung Hi struggled with, that arose from being the only female student in the class, was in making friends. First, “as an engineer student, I have no female friends. It is hard to involve. Most of them like 100% male students”. And second, “as an engineer student, I don’t have much opportunity to speak and to write report, because I usually deal with mathematics. Just reading book and solving problem”. However, Sung Hi did have an Australian friend with whom she hangs out. She said:

I have friend. He is Australian student and he is like 19 years old. We have same unit. We have to attend this semester. So I usually hang out with him.

I asked her what type of activities she liked to do with her friend when they were hanging out and how much English she spoke outside university, she replied:

I don’t have much free time because I am working. But if I have free time I just I meet my friends - Korean friends. Sometimes I need Korean friends to talk. We go to some restaurant and have nice meal.

It appears that Sung Hi socialises with her Australian friend mainly on campus as they were classmates and spends her free time outside university with her Korean friends speaking Korean. Sung Hi added:

I am living with Singapore housemates so maybe I talk to them in English - in poor English with each other and maybe my professor and other classmates.
It is ironic that Sung Hi felt unable to make more Australian friends and speak more English due to her study pattern and working hours as she said “I cannot feel any improvement with my English. But it might be because I keep speaking English with him [Australian friend]”. However, she added “It is not easy to keep speaking with Australian people. They are different and little aggressive” a similar point she made earlier with regards to her classmates assertive and expressive behaviours during class discussion. I asked her if she did anything else or used any strategies to improve her English, she said “yes, I love watching TV, especially I download a lot like “Hero” and “Lost”. At the end of our interview Sung Hi expressed that she was interested in learning some oral communication strategies to improve her English oral communication.

**Annan: It is important to mix with Australian people and culture but we don’t know how to do that**

I asked Annan to talk about his social life outside university. I was particularly interested if he had any Australian friends, how much English he used, and what type of social activities he undertook. Annan replied:

I do have the local friend ... When I arrive here first time, I have people helped me to get house. We are friend already. My boss in the restaurant is Australian. So we meet every day so we can speak.

However, most of the time, he spends with his family and speaks Thai “I hang out and spend most of my time with my family because come back home anyway we still speak Thai”. It appears that in social situations, Annan’s encounter with Australian people is limited only to his friend(s) who helped him to settle in and his boss at work. Annan never mentioned socialising with this friend (s). However, Annan acknowledged the importance of mixing with Australian people and culture “It is important to mix with Australian people and culture” but he admitted that he did not know how to do that. He said “In school [university] friend it is very hard as well. I don’t know how to make friend with them.” Annan continued:

Australian culture is different if I compare with Thai culture. I don’t know they [Australians] want to talk to me or not something like that.

Thus existing cultural differences prevented Annan from making friends. At the end of the interview, Annan revealed that he wanted to learn some effective strategies to enhance his oral communication.
Yada: I spend most of my time with Thai friend

I asked Yada to talk about her social life in Australia including activities she did during her free time with her friends. Yada said:

I spend most of my time with Thai friend. I speak in Thai with Thai friends. Outside university, I use English just a little bit. Just when I go to shopping, I go to the library cause I spent most of my time in the library. Speaking English only in the class is not enough for me.

Yada added “I have some local Australian friends [classmates] I spend 10 percent in the class. I go to my class and talk to them”. Overall, Yada’s life outside university resembles other participants’ socialisation patterns. They all seem to choose to live with their co-nationals or students from a similar cultural background. Such living arrangements limit opportunities to talk to, socialise with, and learn about the Australian way of life which ultimately could provide them with the skills and habits necessary for participating more fully within Australian community life. I asked her if she tried to do anything to meet more Australian people and talk to them, she again said “I have no free time”. Yada did not express an interest in learning strategies to increase her opportunities to communicate with Australians and increase her oral communication.

Like Chika, Yada withdrew from the study right after this interview. She stated that the reason for this was she failed one of her units and had no time for anything else but focusing on her study. Yada’s diligent hard working study regime which did not permit her to do virtually anything else but study had not paid off. I suggested to her that by participating in the training program, she might be able to learn some useful strategies to help her with her problems in her studies. She insisted however that she had no free time.

4.5 Conclusion

Through this chapter we have been able to get to know the principal participants associated with this study. We have been able to hear their voices and learn of their lived experiences within the LC1 and also the LC2. Importantly, we are also now aware of the limitations associated with their English language use, not only in terms of what they have reported but also because we can ‘see’ how they speak. This insight provides
a further dimension with respect to understanding participants’ living and learning in English.

Prior to arrival in Australia all participants had learnt English on average for ten years, mainly through grammar oriented teaching with little focus on interactive communicative learning. Nonetheless the Japanese exchange students passed the English language requirements of the case study university and the other participants attended EAP programs. All participants had been accepted to study in undergraduate and postgraduate degree courses in an Australian university.

Interview data suggest however, that whilst passing the tests and the EAP program, participants still did not have sufficient English language proficiency and awareness of academic conventions to operate easily and effectively at a tertiary level. In addition, participants’ experiences outside university indicate that differences in language and culture sometimes created tensions and contributed to participants’ challenges in becoming involved in the L2 community more broadly. The challenges clearly presented considerable obstacles to participants’ attempts to enter and to increase involvement in the L2 academic and social discourse practices of the LC2.

The next chapter provides a detailed analysis of the data presented in this chapter and identifies participants’ needs in order to inform and shape the strategy training program.
CHAPTER 5: INTERPRETING THE DATA AND PLANNING FOR THE STRATEGY TRAINING PROGRAM

5.1 Introduction

In view of my comments at the beginning of Chapter 4, I now believe it is commonplace for students like me, for whom English is not their first language, to confront issues associated with operating effectively in English, on arrival in a new LC2 environment. If I think back to when I first arrived to study in Australia, I can now recognise myself (in respect of Agar’s languaculture model) as being on the fringes of the translation arena. Although at that time I did not have a true appreciation of my circumstances, what I did realise was that I needed to figure out how best to move forward in my new environment. It became very clear to me, very early on, that I needed to do this as I was the only Mongolian student on campus and I did not wish to remain isolated and alone. In Agar’s terms, I wanted to move away from the fringes and ‘enter’ the translation arena.

Finding a way to move into the translation arena was not easy. There was no obvious pathway and no signposts immediately recognisable. Over time, however, I discovered two critical elements that collectively marked the way forward. The first of these was the realisation of the need to come out of my comfort zone. Without doing this I was destined to remain on the fringes. The second was my discovery of a tool kit that comprised clearly articulated and documented strategies to support the learning of additional languages. These strategies (LLS) were new to me. They intrigued me. And as I learnt about them, and how to use them, they provided me with the means to traverse the translation arena.

As I reflect back, I realise now that it wasn’t that I hadn’t ever used strategies to learn language before, it was that the strategies needed to negotiate this LC2, with its specific academic and social demands, were different. It was also about these newly discovered strategies being explicit rather than being part of a sub-conscious, routinised process that was embedded within the culture of learning that I had come from. I could now identify strategies appropriate for my new circumstances. I had the right tool kit to support my translation into the LC2.
The question confronting me now is can my experiences and knowledge of LLS support the participants in my study? Can LLS be as powerful for them as they have been for me in respect of learning and living in Australia?

In the previous chapter, the voices of this study’s participants were heard through the profiles developed from their first interviews. We heard about their learning and living and the extent to which they were able to identify with the tools that proved so important for me. In this chapter, patterns from these interviews will be reported in response to an analysis of the data. Also in this chapter, the experiences of the principal participants will be compared with the experiences of the students who undertook the online survey. This is done in order to build a broader picture of the learning and living experiences of Asian L2 students at the case study university. Importantly, this chapter also aims to identify principal participants’ needs in order to inform and shape the strategy training program.

5.2 Patterns of participants’ English language learning in the LC1

Although participants came from a number of different Asian countries, all reported influential experiences suggestive of education systems in which students listen and teachers talk. A number of common patterns and key concepts in participants’ English language educational experiences in their LC1 have emerged from the data. Table 5.1 presents these common patterns and the key concepts.

Table 5.1 Patterns of participants’ English language learning in their home country contexts

All participants reported being schooled through a:
- scholastic and didactic approach (Sawir, 2005) with
- predominantly non-native English language teachers that
- paid minimal attention to interactive learning and ‘the culture connection’ with and through language.

As a result, participants who learnt English on average for 10 years continued to have limited English language proficiency. For participants:
- writing meant writing words on paper as evidence of grammatical knowledge at sentence and lexical level but not to reflect evidence of the composing process and
- reading meant mastery of vocabulary, structure and pronunciation when reading aloud but never was about focusing on depth of reading or ‘critical reading’. They were
- not encouraged to discuss and provide opinions in the classroom and they
- never had enough exposure to English oral communication. English was learnt
- in isolation from its social and cultural contexts, and hence participants
- lacked knowledge about appropriate use of language according to context, purpose and audience and had
As can be seen from the Table 5.1 for participants, writing was never about demonstrating the use of language meaningfully or being part of a meaning making process but rather it was a medium through which grammatical knowledge could be demonstrated and evaluated for its own sake. In terms of reading, the emphasis was on mastery of vocabulary, structure and pronunciation rather than on depth of reading or ‘critical reading’. Ross (1992) points out that in many Asian countries’ EFL education, writing and reading have never been emphasised as discourse skills and this was the case in the participants’ situation. The teaching process for teaching English was also geared closely to examination requirements an approach described by Wong, (1996, p. 89) as “bird-cage teaching”.

Most of the participants, especially the Japanese participants, reported that they attended English speaking classes that were taught by native English speakers in schools and universities. Although they had some exposure to native speakers, these people or assistant English teachers were not necessarily qualified teachers, their role was simply to be real native speakers, and the work they undertook was not recognised within the scholastic didactic paradigm of transmission and testing. Also and importantly, speaking was not examined so it was not valued within these contexts. Ruegg (2009) states that assistant English teachers often lacked adequate teaching qualifications and that they did not have sufficient expertise to control and facilitate a class of 30-40 students. In addition, research suggests that Japanese English learners do not take communicative English programs and native English teachers seriously (Whitsed & Wright, 2011) and Japanese universities prevent native English teachers from integrating into and participating in activities beyond their teaching (Whitsed & Volet, 2011). Therefore, the issue related to Japanese participants’ limited English language proficiency is complex and involves a number of different aspects associated with English language teaching and learning.

Another finding that emerged from the profiles was that English was being taught by non-native English language teachers with limited capacity to speak English themselves. Participants were primarily required to listen to their teachers who predominantly used their first language as the vehicle for the teaching of English. This finding was also evident in my Master’s research study (Tsedendamba, 2006) that
investigated 5 L2 students of Asian background studying at an Australian university. Sawir (2005) points out that EFL pedagogies in many Asian countries adapt a scholastic, didactic approach that focuses on grammar and correct usage with little attention to oral communication. According to Sawir one of the main reasons for this is that English is taught by teachers who themselves were educated using a scholastic and didactic approach to language. Sawir explains that these teachers normally feel most comfortable reproducing the same approach with their own students. In other words, participants were taught the English language by non-native English language teachers in isolation from its social and cultural contexts. Such teachers only saw and taught English that was appropriate to their and their students’ immediate circumstances. They were not ‘in the business’ of teaching for real communication in English speaking communities. Therefore participants’ English language education did not prepare them to use the language conventions that are necessary to communicate effectively using a range of text types and discourse patterns with speakers of the English language. Hence, within the English classrooms of Asia there was very minimal attention paid to communicative interactive learning or developing a cultural connection with the English language.

Further, during the time participants learnt English, they were positioned in their respective education system as passive learners. Participant data suggest that they were almost never encouraged to discuss and they did not know how to provide their opinions spontaneously. This has been explained as a result of the strong influence from Confucianism and Buddhism in Korean, Japanese and Thai societies (Bao, 2001; Han, 2003; Sato, 1994). In particular, Confucian principles have significantly influenced these societies’ educational philosophy, formation of mind, values, behaviours, rules, and ways of communicating. For example, Sato (1994) points out that in Japanese classrooms teachers talk believing that their explanation is all that is necessary and students listen without asking any questions. Therefore interaction during lessons is not encouraged. This was evident in all participants’ English language learning classroom experiences. Sato (1994, p. 250) further points out that “Japanese highly value implicit communication modes” and this reflects the way Japanese communicate in classrooms. Like the Japanese, the Korean way of communication is often indirect and nonverbal including hiding anger and sorrow, and less expression of feelings either happy or sad (Han, 2003). This pattern of communication and interaction appears to be similar in Thai education contexts because Thai Buddhism and Confucian norms both
complement each other (Bao, 2001). Therefore, the essence of Thai education hinges on these traditional values including respect for teachers (Bao, 2001). As a result of this tradition, the scholastic and didactic teaching approach to English language education has almost no focus on interactive learning. This impacted participants’ way of learning the English language. Data from the first interviews show that after high school graduation and completion of university English language programs, participants had very limited English language proficiency and almost no knowledge of language being social and communicative. As a result of this situation, and as evidenced through the interview process, participants were unable to express themselves fluently in English. They used broken English.

As the profiles indicate participants also had little understanding of the concept of LLS as we know them within Western discourses and reported only limited capacity to use them either consciously or unconsciously. Therefore participants’ experiences when learning the English language in the LC1 of their home countries contrast with the pedagogies and approaches commonly used in the Australian context.

5.3 Patterns of participants’ L2 academic discourse socialisation in the LC2

The participant profiles presented in Chapter 4 show that they faced a number of challenges with respect to L2 academic discourse socialisation due to a variety of factors. These challenges are shown in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2 Challenges associated with participants’ L2 academic discourse socialisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited English language competency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge of academic conventions associated with:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o expressing opinions and participating actively in tutorials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o conceptualising and writing specific academic text types</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o reading critically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English that was good enough in EAP but not good enough in the ‘real’ university context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of familiarity with informal register in academic contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of exposure to ways of socialisation and working with Australian students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis suggests that language competence and inefficiency in language use were significant barriers for all participants in their study in the Australian university that was the site for this study. The profiles also suggest that such challenging aspects of
participants’ learning was to a considerable extent affected by cultural factors. Significant amongst these factors was that participants were trying to engage with the L2 academic discourses using LLS that were effective in the LC1 for learning as it was constructed in their home societies but that were of limited assistance in the LC2. Strategies derived from the LC1 context proved to be ‘inappropriate tools’ for the LC2. Examples to emerge from the interviews that informed profile development included ‘if you work more, you will get better’ and ‘feeling of worry or undecidedness between right or wrong’.

These could be explained in relation to Confucian principles as they have impacted educational practices. In other words, ‘working hard and displaying persistence’ is one of the virtues in Confucianism (Hodge, 2000). Participant attempts to use the ‘strategy’ was not enough within the Australian context where there is more focus on the outcome of the hard work. ‘Work hard’ in Confucian contexts places value on group achievement and social harmony (Rarick, 2007). This works better within groups who believe in group-achievement rather than individual-achievement. Thus participants’ use of this ‘strategy’ was of limited assistance in the LC2 with its different culture and values.

In addition, participants’ feeling of ‘worry’ or undecidedness between ‘right or wrong’ can also be interpreted as a reflection of Confucian ideology. More specifically, participants were unsure whether they understood the discussions and reading materials correctly. They also doubted whether the things they said or wanted to say during tutorials were correct or incorrect. These behaviours and thoughts are suggestive of an educational ideology where a function of education is to enforce making the distinction between right and wrong (Han, 2003). Therefore, the residual ‘strategies’ from the LC1 together with the limited English language proficiency or ‘LC1 toolkit’ continued to impact on participants’ university learning in the LC2 context.

Another important finding that emerged from the data analysis and the construction of the profiles was that the involvement of Australian peers in participants’ university learning was lacking. The profiles also suggest that there was an obvious divide between Australian students and students from other countries such as the participants. This exacerbated the difficulties associated with interaction in tutorials and group work.
A significant pattern that emerged through the data analysis was related to EAP classes. Participant recollection of EAP classes suggests that Australian culture was represented primarily through isolated facts about ‘cultural events’. The issues and practices associated with day to day events and Australian lifestyle, ways of socialisation, and informal register appear not have been addressed. In other words, the languaculture of this new environment or “understanding culture in interaction” (Diaz, 2010, p. 173) was only tangentially explored.

A point made by participant Yada is quite significant to further understand participants’ experience with the EAP. Yada’s English language was adequate while attending EAP in terms of proficiency but inadequate for attending her Master’s classes. She was shocked by this realisation. Yada’s account shows that the level of English language used in the EAP classes was not compatible with the level required at university.

Issues associated with participants’ EAP experiences suggest that the generic content of the EAP program with no attention to text types for specific programs or differentiation between undergraduate and postgraduate studies was inadequate to support language use in the LC2. Also, as discussed in Chapter 4, Yada failed one of her units and felt that she had no time for anything else but focusing on her study. However, Yada’s diligent hard working study regime that was constructed and considered effective in her Thai learning context had not paid off. This again shows that Yada’s ‘LC1 toolkit’ was not adequate in the L2 context. Unfortunately, Yada did not see the benefit in strategies as I espoused them. She did not appreciate the need for a different toolkit to support her learning and living.

The participants’ profiles demonstrate that in the LC1 they experienced a very different academic culture from that of their Australian university. Hence, they faced difficulties in adapting to the requirements of their new institution and learning together with Australian students. Based on the findings associated with their L2 academic discourse socialisation in the LC2, participants were positioned as ‘peripheral observers’ (Ohta, 1999) or spectators on the fringes of the translation arena.
5.4 Patterns of participants’ L2 socialisation in the LC2

The profiles presented in Chapter 4 also reveal that participants faced a number of challenges associated with L2 socialisation beyond the university environment. The notion of transition was confronting and difficult for participants. The challenges they faced are shown in Table 5.3.

Table 5.3 Challenges associated with participants' L2 socialisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges associated with L2 socialisation beyond the university context. These included:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• lack of proficiency and inefficiency in their English language use proving to be a major obstacle in mixing with members of the Australian community and engaging in societal practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• limited opportunities to mix with the broader community in order to develop their oral communication skills and little motivation to do so (with the exception of Ai and Akio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• socialisation within familiar cultural and language groups not helping participants’ to come out of their comfort zone—with the result that friendship affiliation was mainly with their co-nationals and students from similar LC1 backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• little capacity to develop an awareness or understanding of social interactions, interactional routines, and community practices without support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 shows that participants appeared to be isolated from the host community. Because of the feeling of isolation from the Australian community, participants tended to socialise within familiar cultural and language groups, either speaking English where it would not be scrutinized, or using their own language. Their friendship affiliations were mainly with their co-nationals and students from a similar culture. Several Australian studies (e.g. Daroesman, Looi & Butler, 2005; Prescott & Hellsten, 2005) that have looked at intercultural interaction between international students and the wider Australian community, have revealed that language proficiency is a central factor in integrating socially with members of the community. Rosenthal, Russell and Thomson (2006) point out that students with limited English proficiency have difficulty making a successful transition into the Australian community with their social interactions restricted to their ‘like’ people. Sawir et al. (2008) recognise that same-culture networks cannot ensure satisfactory engagement with local cultures.

However, the profiles presented in Chapter 4 show that some of the participants self-segregated by choice. For example, interview data revealed that Mariko never mentioned communicating with Australians nor did she express any interest in socialising with them. Also, Yada said “I have no free time” when was asked if she
wanted to meet Australian people and talk to them. In these participants’ cases, it appears that they were happy socialising with ‘like’ people.

Additionally, the analysis of participants’ socialisation experience reveals some of the complexities of cultural difference. There were different aspects of culture that participants attempted to make sense of, including as Sung Hi expressed “It is not easy to keep speaking with Australian people. They are different and little aggressive”. Also as Annan pointed out “It is important to mix with Australian people and culture but we don’t know how to do that.” Like academic norms and conventions, the social interactional norms and routines were not made explicit to participants and they were not easy to access. Participants had to work it out by themselves.

In learning and living in English, all participants faced multifaceted challenges. Analysis of the interview data reveals that the participants’ academic and social lives were both filled with paradoxes. They favoured interactive learning and teaching approaches but they were reluctant to participate and interact. They liked the fact that they were learning and living in Australia. However, the majority were isolated from Australian culture and preferred to socialise with co-nationals or other students from similar cultural backgrounds. In particular, limited English language proficiency was a significant challenge that had a considerable impact on participants’ socialisation and participation both academically and socially. Participants’ accounts of their LC1 and LC2 experiences before their engagement in the strategy training program suggest that the translation arena was extensive and was a place where they were principally spectators on the fringes.

5.5 Reporting the outcome of the online survey

The interview process enabled me to build a comprehensive picture of the main participants. However as a researcher, I was very conscious of the fact that I had developed an in-depth understanding with respect to a small number of participants. It was important to ‘test’ my findings and the patterns that emerged from the profiles within the broader Asian L2 student community of the university. Therefore, I conducted an online survey to build a broader picture of the learning and living experiences of this group of students studying at the Australian university that was the site for this research.
Survey questions addressed the same areas that were the focus of the first individual interviews including questions about students’ English language learning experiences both in their home country and in the Australian context as well as the types of LLS they used. Results from the survey data were compared with the findings presented in this chapter to ascertain the extent to which the findings from the interviews with the principal participants resonated more broadly within the L2 students of Asian background in the university community. A total of 44 participants completed the survey.

The participants who completed the survey were from Hong Kong, Malaysia, Nepal, Cambodia, Thailand, Indonesia, Japan, Singapore, Brunei, China, and Korea. It was identified that on average the participants had studied and lived in Australian for 2.5 years but studied English on average for 15 years. Most of the students passed either IELTS, TOEFL or an EAP program before they were accepted to study at the university. Table 5.4 presents findings that emerged from the online survey.

Table 5.4 Findings that emerged from the online survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English language learning in the home country context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 97.6% of the participants reported that their English language education was focused on grammar and reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 66.7% said that they did not learn to write academic essays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 80.5% claimed that they were not taught LLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 47.6% believed that their English language proficiency was very limited with only 11.9% replying ‘very good’ before they came to study in Australia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences in EAP program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 12 out of 44 participants attended an EAP program before enrolling into university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 76.5% of the students reported that they were not taught about LLS in their EAP program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 70.6% said that they were not taught about Australian culture (29.4% who responded ‘yes’ gave examples such as history, slang, dialect and accent, holidays, values, and family life)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic learning experience in an Australian university</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 32.4% wished that they knew some useful tutorial strategies to help them to participate better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 29.7% claimed that their English language proficiency was not good enough to participate actively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 59% reported that it was easier for them to work through their unit readings when they were familiar with the topic and 30.8% wished to know some useful reading strategies to read effectively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social life in Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 53.7% of the students reported that they spent most of their time in Australia with people from the same country speaking their own language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 43.9% reported that they spent their time with people with a similar or the same culture speaking either English (lingua franca) or their own language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Only 7.3% said they spend time with Australian people speaking English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement in English language proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 61% of the students believed that their English had improved since they came to Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Factors such as speaking English (65.8%), and reading and watching TV (50%) influenced their English language improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings that emerged from the responses of the 44 survey participants support the findings from the principal participants. 97.6% of the participants reported that their English language education in their home country contexts was focused on grammar and reading. This confirms that grammar oriented English language teaching and learning is common practice not only in the countries from where the principal participants come but also in other Asian countries. In addition, the fact that 80.5% of the 44 participants reported that they were not taught LLS shows that this concept was not a significant element in English language teaching and learning practices of these countries. What this shows is that the concept of LLS is essentially a Western concept and because Western pedagogical approaches such as Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) are not used in serious academic study in Asia, participants were not familiar with the concept of LLS. Further, the findings from the survey participants also confirm that the area of LLS was not addressed in the EAP program.

Other findings that emerged from the online survey also support the findings from the principal participants with respect to their academic and social lives in the Australian context. Both principal and survey participants reported that they encountered difficulties in engaging with L2 academic discourses due to the limited English language proficiency. They also reported spending most of their time in Australia with people from the same and a similar country speaking their own language or/and unscrutanised English. Only 7.3% reported that they spent time with Australian people interacting in English. This suggests that the wider Asian student population at the case study university experienced difficulties across academic and social discourses that were similar to those of the principal participants. Interestingly, 61% of the students believed that their English had improved since they came to Australia by speaking English (65.8%), and reading and watching TV (50%). This finding needs further exploration and is beyond the scope of the present study.

5.6 The needs analysis

Interview data and survey responses were used to inform a needs analysis undertaken to shape the strategy training program. These data identified that prior to the strategy training program participants were positioned as peripheral observers on the fringes of the translation arena due to the challenges participants faced whilst trying to engage with L2 academic and social discourses. Data showed that participants were highly
critical about their English learning experiences in the LC1 and were eager to learn LLS assistive of them in the LC2 context. More specifically, data identified that participants wanted to learn a number of specific LLS to facilitate their L2 socialisation and L2 academic discourse socialisation processes. The majority of participants wanted to learn how to better communicate in English both with their Australian peers and the wider Australian community, thus improving their conversational skills and oral interaction. They also wanted to learn effective LLS to participate more actively in tutorials, to read and listen effectively, to improve their academic writing, and to expand their vocabulary. Table 5.5 presents an overview of participants’ specific needs with respect to LLS.

Table 5.5 Using data for the design of the strategy intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants who want to learn oral communication strategies to facilitate L2 socialisation beyond university context</th>
<th>Participants who want to learn strategies that will facilitate L2 academic discourse socialisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dara Maly Chika Sung Hi Annan Yada</td>
<td>Maly Ai Akio Chika Nori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to better communicate in English both with their Australian peers and the wider community, thus improving their conversational skills and oral interaction</td>
<td>to better participate in tutorials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maly Ai Akio Chika Nori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to learn how to read effectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ai Chika Annan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to improve writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maly Akio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to increase vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mariko –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to learn how to listen effectively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on these needs, I developed the strategy training program. The strategy training program is a crucial element of this study. Its capacity to impact the translation process is the central focus of this study. Detailed discussion of the strategy training is the focus of Chapter 6.
5.7 Conclusion

This chapter provides analysis of the data presented in Chapter 4. It began by identifying patterns of participants’ English language learning experiences in their home country contexts. This analysis identifies that in their LC1 context, participants’ went through an education system characterized by a scholastic didactic paradigm of transmission and testing where participants were positioned as passive learners. This chapter also identifies patterns of participants’ engagement with L2 academic and social discourses in the LC2. Through the analysis it becomes clear that participants made use of an LC1 toolkit that included residual LLS or tools that were not necessarily appropriate within the LC2. This, together with the inefficient use of English resulted in a number of challenges for participants with respect to engaging with academic and social discourses in Australia. These findings were similar to the findings that emerged from the online participants’ experiences in the LC1 and LC2. Collectively these findings informed the needs analysis that has informed the strategy training program which will now be discussed.
CHAPTER 6: STRATEGY TRAINING: TOOLS WITHIN THE TRANSLATION ARENA

6.1 Introduction

I now intend to elaborate on my experiences with LLS. Unlike participants in this study I did not receive any explicit strategy training. I first officially heard about the concept of LLS when I was attending one of my classes and I thought this was an excellent thing to use to improve my inefficient and clumsy use of the English language. LLS intrigued me. I started thinking about using LLS in my every day interactions and learning. One of the most significant incidents with LLS that greatly impacted on my ability to interact fluently was during my first holiday in Australia with L1 speakers of English whom I befriended during my holiday. I will talk about this event in detail in this chapter. During this experience, I realised the importance of consciously using LLS. I also realised that the conscious use of LLS alone is not enough. My experiences showed that conscious strategy use has to be both appropriate and effective. By ‘appropriate use of LLS’, I mean LLS that fit the context and ‘effective use of LLS’ means accomplishing the purpose of using LLS and achieving the desired outcome.

My understanding of the concept of LLS, and experiences with it, were further advanced through my professional practice when I was designing curriculum for refugee students seeking to study in Australian universities. I also talk about this in this chapter. Dealing with LLS on a professional level meant that I looked deeply into many different needs that these students had. Developing teaching and learning materials specific to these needs was a very rewarding and fulfilling experience. My experiences with LLS, together with a process of reflection on my strategy use, has helped me develop a greater understanding of not only LLS but also has helped me realise that LLS are languaculture bound. I also talk about this in this chapter.

In order to help participants in this study to better engage with the practices of L2 academic and social discourses in the LC2, their expressed difficulties were used to enable me to determine the types of strategies that were needed. My experiences and knowledge of LLS were complimentary in this process. In this chapter I use Wallace’s (1991) reflective practice model to help me organise my somewhat messy personal data associated with my engagement with, and use of LLS, as well as identifying strategies
thought useful for participants to learn, practice and deploy in the strategy training program.

Overall this chapter seeks to explicitly and systematically present the development, implementation and evaluation phases of the strategy training program. As discussed previously (see Chapter 3, Section 3.4.3), this was informed by principles associated with design-based research methodology (DBRM). The chapter is organised into three main sections: Phase one – strategy training program development; Phase two – strategy training program implementation and; Phase 3 – strategy training program application and evaluation. The chapter begins with the aims of the strategy training program.

6.2 Aims of the strategy training program

Traditionally strategy training has focused on language learning rather than the more specific fields of L2 socialisation and L2 academic discourse socialisation (see Chapter 1, Section 1.3). The main goal of strategy training has been to provide learners with the tools to become aware of what helps them in the overall process of learning the L2 more effectively (Cohen, 2003b).

The strategy training program developed in this study, however, has been designed to support participants’ engagement with, and utilisation of, academic discourses and also with language socialisation into the broader community through increasing awareness and use of LLS. By addressing these aspects of learning in the strategy training program, this study intends to add an additional dimension to the LLS field. Ultimately, it was expected that participants would be better able to ‘translate’ with the help of these strategies. In this context, the LLS are viewed as tools within the translation arena.

The strategy training program aimed to:

- increase awareness of LLS
- help participants to engage with, and increase their participation in L2 academic discourse socialisation
- help participants to apprentice themselves in the broader Australian community and operate efficiently within the LC2, and
- improve overall English language proficiency

It should be noted here that the strategy training program was tailored to meet the specific needs of each of the principal participants.
6.3 Phase one: Strategy training program development

An important principle in design-based research methodology (DBRM) is to identify students’ needs and develop an intervention based on those expressed needs (see Chapter 3, Section 3.4.3). Phase one of the strategy training program reports on the developmental phase of the strategy training program in response to the participants’ needs identified through the initial interview process (see Chapter 4 & 5). In this sense, the intervention can be considered to be pragmatic because it addressed practical issues within participants’ learning and living environments, one of the important elements in the DBRM. This phase of the study consisted of two parts: strategy determination and module development. The strategy determination section addresses LLS selected to be taught, modelled, scaffolded, and practised in the strategy training program sessions. The module development proceeded after the selection.

6.3.1 Strategy determination

Rubin et al. (2007, p. 153) point out that “there is no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ strategy but rather one that works for the particular learner for the particular task and goal”. As such, this process was all about finding appropriate LLS as tools to assist and achieve the expressed needs of study participants as they engaged with the LC2. It should be noted here that this study did not adapt any specific type of classification system, but rather it has its own modified system which is discussed within Wallace’s (1991) model of reflective practice.

The LLS selection process was informed by Wallace’s (1991) model of reflective practice in association with participants’ experiences with learning English and with LLS, together with my own experience with LLS. Wallace’s model of reflective practice focuses on teachers becoming reflective practitioners in order to find better ways of meeting their students’ needs. Wallace’s model consists of two types of knowledge: experiential knowledge and received knowledge. Experiential knowledge is the knowledge that arises out of our own practices, described by Schon (1983) as ‘knowing-in-action’ or “out of our own experiences in life” (Wallace, 1991, p. 13). But received knowledge is knowledge that we gain through education and professional development that consists of “facts, data and theories, often related to some kind of research” (Wallace, 1991, p. 12). Wallace’s (1991, p. 15) ideas encapsulate my own
experience with LLS as a reflective practitioner in terms of my experiential and received knowledge. This is shown in Figure 6.1.

Figure 6.1 A model of my reflective practice adapted from Wallace (1991)

As shown in Figure 6.1, the depth in my understanding of LLS, particularly oral communication strategies, developed through a cyclic process of practice and reflection during my own socialisation process as a language learner and new participant within the LC2. The socialisation process that I engaged with during my first holiday in Australia, provided me with real opportunities to develop what Cummins (2008) would term as basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) that are context-embedded and which support the development of “conversational fluency in a language” (Cummins, 2008, p. 71). During this socialisation process, I realised that I used oral communication strategies such as presenting myself as an approachable person by initiating conversations or asking people’s names and giving my name back. I quickly made English and Australian friends who helped me to improve my English through real life contexts. Whilst I was not systematically aware of the theoretical aspect of my practice, through the reflective practice process, I discovered that my newly made friends were what Duff calls ‘experts’ of the LC2. I was a ‘newcomer’ (Duff, 2012) in the LC2. Within the ethnomethodological tradition, I was apprenticing myself into the discursive practices of the LC2 with the help of the ‘experts’. I was developing the ‘notion of member’ – one who exhibits commonsense knowledge recognised and accepted in the community (Coulon, 1995) (see Chapter 3, Section 3.3.2). Oral communication strategies assisted me with the apprenticing process. My experience with the strategies suggested that they are useful tools in engaging with the L2 socialisation process and this has helped me realise that LLS are languaculture bound. They were something that
participants in this study would need and this was born out in their own accounts of their experiences.

In response to their expressed needs and my experiential knowledge, 16 oral communication strategies were selected for the strategy training program to assist participants with the L2 socialisation process (see Table 6.1).

Table 6.1 Oral communication strategies to engage with the L2 socialisation process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral communication strategies to engage with the L2 socialisation process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• When someone smiles at me I smile back and say ‘Hi’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I ask people’s names and give my name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I make eye contact with a person I am talking to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I walk through the mall and just say hello to people as I walk past them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I will speak two sentences in each event or meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I work on alternative strategies to reach the original goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I use substitutions i.e., words, phrases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I change topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I ask for help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I ask questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I take a risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I am not afraid to make mistakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To fill the awkward moments in the conversation, I use ‘Jump Starters’ by asking questions such as Did you happen to watch…?; Have any of you seen the film …?; Have you heard on the news yesterday that …?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Remember people’s names and repeat the name back in my greeting ‘Nice to meet you, Tom’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I use conversation starting statements i.e., What a beautiful day!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I verbally let others know that I am following along, actively listening by showing my interest in hearing more, clarifying, arguing, seeking specifics etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I hoped that the types of strategies that helped me would help the participants to engage with the social practices of their host community.

Whilst selecting the strategies, I was aware that for participants, it would not be automatically ‘comfortable’ to use the strategies listed in Table 6.1. Because of this, I did not force these strategies onto participants. Rather, I provided them with options of strategies to use according to their needs. Rubin et al. (2007) warn that teachers should not force students to use one strategy or another as their learning styles and approaches differ and they might prefer certain types of strategies that they like to use.

Further data from participants’ initial interviews (see Chapter 4) indicated that participants also experienced a range of challenges in association with L2 academic discourse socialisation. In response to their need to better participate in the practices of LC2 academic discourse, and again informed by my received knowledge, a total of 6 vocabulary, 5 listening, 16 reading, 11 writing, and 4 tutorial participation strategies
was selected to be used in the strategy training program. Table 6.2 shows these strategies. As can be seen from Tables 6.1 and 6.2, the terminology used to phrase the strategies was easy to understand and thus was accessible for participants. This is in accord with Cohen et al. (1998) who highlight the need to avoid confusion with respect to strategy type that may arise out of limited language proficiency.
Table 6.2 LLS to enhance L2 academic socialisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary and listening strategies</th>
<th>Reading, writing and tutorial participation strategies</th>
<th>Tutorial participation and listening strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocabulary strategies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reading strategies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Metacognitive tutorial participation and listening strategies</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - I learn the meaning of a word from the context | - Highlight interesting points | - Planning (before the tutorial/discussion)  
| - I guess the meaning of a word from its structure | - Circle unknown words and look them up later | I need to check whether I have understood the tutor’s instruction for the discussion, if not develop an immediate action plan in order to find out i.e., asking a question from the tutor or a group member or I will speak one sentence in each tutorial/discussion or I will try to talk to my classmates before the tutorial to relax myself during the tutorial  
| - The more I read the more new words I acquire and understand | - Write summaries of each reading | - Monitoring the flow of the conversation (during the discussion)  
| - I keep a pocket notebook and write down new found words | - Note-taking of key points | In a discussion/tutorial, I need to be aware of the progress of interaction in terms of pace, turn-taking and the exchange of information  
| - I use the new found words when communicating | - Annotate the readings | - Monitoring comprehension (during the discussion)  
| - I learn 5 new words a day and use them when communicating | - Discuss interpretation of the reading with a friend | I need to check or correct my understanding  
| **Listening strategies** | - Develop graphic outline and predicting the content | - Monitoring how clearly you have been understood (during the discussion)  
| - I try to predict the content of the conversation/listening text | - Use a mind-map to see how a reading relates to other readings | I need to be aware of listeners’ reactions – listeners’ comprehension of what I said; their responses including both verbal and physical e.g. nodding.  
| - I pay attention to what I am listening to | - Make meaning from context clues | - Self-evaluation (after the discussion/tutorial)  
| - I notice new words, expressions, and pronunciation etc | - Take notes of key words and expressions | I need to reflect on my involvement in the tutorial – write down both my active and inactive involvement in the tutorial; when I was active; when I wasn’t; what I understood; what I need to change in my next discussion/tutorial  
| - I take notes of key words and expressions | - Listen for specific details such as numbers or examples |  |
| - I listen for specific details such as numbers or examples | **Reading, writing and tutorial participation strategies** |  |
| **Writing strategies** | **Metacognitive reading strategies** |  |
| - Rough draft - an attempt to get ideas down on paper | - Am I asking questions about the reading contents? |  |
| - Redrafting - rethinking ideas on the basis of literature review | - Am I critically reflecting on my reading? |  |
| - Redrafting - reshaping ideas to express them more precisely | - Am I reading in-depth? |  |
| - Redrafting - adding additional information | - Am I reading on surface level? |  |
| - Editing – spelling, punctuation and grammar | - Am I developing both ‘deep’ and ‘surface’ reading styles? |  |
| **Metacognitive writing strategies** | **Writing strategies** |  |
| - Do you check, whether the main argument is clearly established? | - Do you order your argument in a logical sequence? |  |
| - Do you use formal English? | - Do you reference the evidence correctly? |  |
| - Does your argument convince the reader? | - Does your writing show evidence of critical thinking |  |
| **Tutorial participation strategies** | **Tutorial participation strategies** |  |
| - Make a bid to participate in the discussion | - Planning (before the tutorial/discussion)  
| - Comment on an aspect of the reading | I need to check whether I have understood the tutor’s instruction for the discussion, if not develop an immediate action plan in order to find out i.e., asking a question from the tutor or a group member or I will speak one sentence in each tutorial/discussion or I will try to talk to my classmates before the tutorial to relax myself during the tutorial  
| - Disagree with a fellow student’s point of view | - Monitoring the flow of the conversation (during the discussion)  
| - Respond to what the tutor has said | In a discussion/tutorial, I need to be aware of the progress of interaction in terms of pace, turn-taking and the exchange of information |  
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As accounts of participants’ engagement with the processes of L2 academic discourse socialisation before the strategy training program (see Chapter 4) revealed, many experienced a number of challenges with respect to, for example, expressing opinions, participating actively in tutorials, writing with specific criteria, and reading critically. In order to assist participants with their challenges, the LLS shown in Table 6.2 were targeted for the strategy training program.

With respect to vocabulary and listening strategies, my own experience as a Master’s student, together with the experiences reported by the participants highlighted these as areas of need. Participants required strategies to help them comprehend and recall listening input so that they could engage more effectively in academic activities that demanded listening and oral interaction. In order to enable this, students, as suggested by Schmitt (1997), need to use their learning and seek opportunities to use the vocabulary they learn. Both listening and vocabulary strategies were suggested to be used in combination with the oral communication and reading strategies.

Reading, writing and tutorial participation strategy choice was also informed by my experience, particularly my professional practice as a curriculum designer. My work designing curriculum for refugee students seeking to study in Australian universities revealed many of the same issues that were evident within the profiles of the participants in this study. It was, therefore, necessary to include a range of strategies across the areas of reading, writing and tutorial participation. The reading strategies included in the strategy training program ranged from skimming strategies for general meaning through to metacognitive strategies for critical reading. The writing strategies focused on a series of drafting and metacognitive strategies expressed in question forms which were informed by a conception called ‘post-process’ (Atkinson, 2003; Leki, 2003) (see Chapter 2, Section 2.2.3). The four tutorial participation strategies were selected based on common concerns expressed by participants.

Data from participant interviews demonstrated that reflection was generally not part of their experience. In order to nurture the process of reflection and integrate it into participants’ repertoire of strategies, a selection of five metacognitive strategies for tutorial participation and listening were also included. These were drawn from the work of Oxford (1990a). It was important to include metacognitive strategies in the strategy training program because these strategies provided participants with an opportunity to
learn to reflect on their strategy performance (Oxford 1990a) and their strategy use development process (Rubin et al. 2007). As such, the strategy training program itself placed an important emphasis on participant reflection as a strategy to support English language proficiency development. Having selected the LLS to be introduced in the strategy training program, I proceeded to develop the instructional modules.

### 6.3.2 Module development

Accordingly, six modules were developed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Module 1: Strategies to improve oral communication</td>
<td>To assist with the L2 socialisation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 2: Strategies to learn vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 3: Strategies to improve listening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 4: Strategies to improve writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 5: Strategies to improve reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 6: Strategies to better participate in tutorials</td>
<td>To assist with the L2 academic discourse socialisation process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Module 1 aimed to help participants to apprentice themselves into the LC2, particularly in terms of interactions and socialisation beyond the university context. Modules 2 and 3 were designed to assist participants to engage both with L2 socialisation and L2 academic discourse socialisation processes. Module 4, 5 and 6 aimed to provide participants with strategies to assist them to engage with, and increase their participation in the L2 academic discourse socialisation process. The module outlines are presented in Table 6.3 and are followed by a general discussion of the development process.
### Table 6.3 Module outlines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module 1: Strategies to improve oral communication</th>
<th>Module 2: Strategies to learn vocabulary</th>
<th>Module 3: Strategies to improve listening</th>
<th>Module 4: Strategies to improve writing</th>
<th>Module 5: Strategies to improve reading</th>
<th>Module 6: Strategies to better participate in tutorials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 1: Where do I start?</strong>&lt;br&gt;Objectives:</td>
<td><strong>Session 1: Vocabulary strategies</strong>&lt;br&gt;Objectives:</td>
<td><strong>Session 1: Listening strategies</strong>&lt;br&gt;Objectives:</td>
<td><strong>Session 1: Translating information from reading to writing</strong>&lt;br&gt;Objectives:</td>
<td><strong>Session 1: Predicting the content</strong>&lt;br&gt;Objectives:</td>
<td><strong>Session 1: Purpose of the tutorials and role of the tutor</strong>&lt;br&gt;Objectives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reflection on past oral communication experiences&lt;br&gt;• Developing an understanding about living in a different culture&lt;br&gt;• Will have a repertoire of strategies to initiate a conversation and keep it going – a positive step towards making friends</td>
<td>• Will have a repertoire of vocabulary strategies that will improve your vocabulary acquisition, comprehension and oral communication</td>
<td>• Reflection on listening experiences&lt;br&gt;• Learn effective listening strategies</td>
<td>• Learn how to translate information from reading to writing&lt;br&gt;• Develop writing strategies</td>
<td>• Learn to make predictions about the text’s likely content using graphic outline strategy</td>
<td>• Develop an understanding of the role of the tutor, purpose of tutorials, and what you can gain from them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 2: It’s all in the asking and listening.</strong>&lt;br&gt;Objectives:</td>
<td><strong>Session 2: Metacognitive strategies for listening</strong>&lt;br&gt;Objective:</td>
<td><strong>Session 2: Skimming and scanning</strong>&lt;br&gt;Objectives:</td>
<td><strong>Session 3: Making meaning</strong>&lt;br&gt;Objectives:</td>
<td><strong>Session 2: Making meaning</strong>&lt;br&gt;Objectives:</td>
<td><strong>Session 2: Tutorial participation: preparation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Objectives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue to learn how to keep the conversation going&lt;br&gt;• Learn how to get your conversation partner talking&lt;br&gt;• Appreciate that listening is not just hearing but it should be a visual, verbal, and interactive process</td>
<td>• Develop metacognitive listening strategies</td>
<td>• Learn how to get a general idea of a text and specific information using skimming and scanning strategies</td>
<td>• Develop strategies to help you to make meaningful guesses and deal with unknown words without overusing a dictionary</td>
<td>• Understand the value of doing your reading before coming to the tutorial</td>
<td>• Understand the value of doing your reading before coming to the tutorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Session 3: Making meaning</strong>&lt;br&gt;Objectives:</td>
<td><strong>Session 3: Active participation in tutorials/discussions and developing confidence</strong>&lt;br&gt;Objectives:</td>
<td><strong>Session 3: Active participation in tutorials/discussions and developing confidence</strong>&lt;br&gt;Objectives:</td>
<td><strong>Session 4: Becoming a strategic reader</strong>&lt;br&gt;Objectives:</td>
<td><strong>Session 4: Becoming a strategic reader</strong>&lt;br&gt;Objectives:</td>
<td><strong>Session 4: Becoming a strategic reader</strong>&lt;br&gt;Objectives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reflection on own reading experiences&lt;br&gt;• Asking questions about your readings and learning</td>
<td>• Develop active participation in tutorials/discussions and developing confidence</td>
<td>• Develop active participation in tutorials/discussions and developing confidence</td>
<td>• Reflection on own reading experiences&lt;br&gt;• Asking questions about your readings and learning</td>
<td>• Reflection on own reading experiences&lt;br&gt;• Asking questions about your readings and learning</td>
<td>• Reflection on own reading experiences&lt;br&gt;• Asking questions about your readings and learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Module development was based on the idea of providing participants with a series of sequential strategies in order to support further cumulative development of strategies. In other words, I avoided providing participants with inconsequential unrelated strategies that they might easily forget or not find useful. For example in Module 1: strategies to improve oral communication moves from strategies ‘to initiate conversation’ to ‘keep the conversation going’. Also, Module 1 includes strategies on ‘how to get your conversation partner talking’ and ‘how to handle awkward moments that occur during conversations’ as well as strategies ‘to listen to your conversation partner’. This approach allowed me to plan tasks that encouraged participants to develop confidence in the use of these strategies and then use them sequentially or in combination.

With this in mind I had a definite idea of the ‘flow’ or sequence of sessions included in each module. For example Module 1 consists of 2 sessions: Where do I start?, and It’s all in the asking and listening. Taking the first session and using it to build the second, I attempted to direct participants to develop an understanding of the process of strategy use. The careful structuring of the sequence of sessions provided the framework to introduce strategies then to consolidate strategy use through a series of carefully designed tasks.

Tasks and texts used in the modules were selected and developed according to the participants’ English language proficiency level as determined by the initial interview (see Chapter 4). Oxford, Cho, Leung, and Kim (2004) suggest that texts and tasks should be developed according to the students’ proficiency level. Chamot et al. (1999, p. 99) warn:

If the task is too easy, students will not need strategies to succeed; they may therefore see strategies as a waste of time. However, if the task is too difficult students may not be able to succeed even when they do use appropriate strategies.

Once all modules were developed a delivery timetable was delineated for module presentation and provided to the principal participants. See Appendix 6.1 for an example session.
6.4 Phase two: Strategy training program implementation

The strategy training program was conducted over a period of five days. The discussion of this phase consists of two parts: scaffolding as a teaching approach, and observation of, and experiences within the strategy training program. Following DBRM principles, throughout the implementation phase, the intervention had an interactive focus as it encouraged collaboration between participants and the researcher. Participants selectively attended the strategy training sessions according to their needs, meaning that the types of strategies the participants engaged with varied from module to module.

6.4.1 Scaffolding as a teaching approach

There is no empirical evidence to determine a single best method for conducting strategy training (Cohen, 2003b). There is, however, a sequence of four steps common to most major strategy instruction models (Chamot et al. 1999; Chamot, 2005; Cohen, 2011a; Grenfell & Harris, 1999; Oxford, 1990b). The steps are:

- Initial modelling of the strategy by the teacher with direct explanation of the strategy’s use in order to raise awareness of the strategies
- Guided practice while students are working on an activity
- Independent practice with the strategy providing students with opportunities to move towards autonomous use of strategies
- Suggestions for the transferability of the strategies to new, similar tasks

Scaffolding as a teaching approach includes all the elements common to the major strategy instruction models mentioned above. Researchers (Bransford, Brown & Cocking, 2000) explain that during the scaffolding process an expert models an activity, provides learners with advice and examples, guides and prompts students in practice gradually removing support until finally no support at all is needed. Rubin et al. (2007) state that in strategy based instructions, modeling is generally achieved through ‘thinking-aloud’ while working on a learning task. Thus, nurturing activities of an expert (in the context of this study a ‘core member’) are regarded as crucial to facilitating students through different stages of learning to use strategies and as an essential part of scaffolding for learning.
Figure 6.2 shows the scaffolding steps used to facilitate strategies in the strategy training program. The scaffolding steps were informed by the CALLA framework (Chamot & O’Malley, 1994) (for a discussion of CALLA see Chapter 2, Section 2.4.1).

Figure 6.2 Scaffolding steps informed by the CALLA framework

As shown in Figure 6.2, the strategy training program involved a ‘teacher-led’ approach during its preliminary stages. The reason for this was that it was important to ensure participants had a clear understanding of how to use strategies. They were provided with examples of strategy use that it was hoped they could relate to. Also, they received appropriate support when they needed it, and they had opportunities to reflect on, and discuss their strategy use. Therefore, in the beginning stage, the participants’ role was primarily to listen but also participate by sharing examples of their strategy use. Their participation in the activities gradually increased, by attempting, internalising, understanding, and using strategies. At this point, the training framework shifted into a participant-led orientation. During the teacher-led part of the session, I took the roles of an instructor and a facilitator. During the participant-led part of the session, my roles changed into an observer and a coach, as I needed to gradually remove my support and allow students to work independently.
6.4.2 Observation of and experiences within the strategy training program

‘Reflection’ and ‘discussion’ were a focus within each module as these processes underpinned the strategy training program and it was important for participants to be able to understand and use these processes. In other words, a critical element of ‘discussion’ was on ‘reflection’. Whenever possible, participants were engaged in a discussion about their experiences with the modelled strategies. Dealing with the strategies in such a way, promoted explicit awareness of the strategies the participants were learning or may be already using.

During task executions, when I observed or felt participants needed direction to appropriately use a certain strategy, I provided additional help or hints or clarification to individuals or to the groups concerned. However, I did not want to give the impression that I was over-correcting them. The main intention of my intervention during task execution was to guide and encourage participants to maintain using strategies as the development of participants’ competence in using and understanding strategies was the learning priority. Thus, it was important to minimise participants’ frustration with the process by providing just enough support.

Participants were also encouraged to learn to transfer strategies to new tasks whether they be reading or speaking tasks, that they encountered in similar contexts in their classrooms, assignments, and in informal situations outside classrooms. LLS research shows that transfer of strategies to new tasks does not happen automatically (e.g. O’Malley & Chamot, 1990) but explicit training and the development of metacognitive awareness promotes strategy transfer (Rubin et al. 2007).

Whilst participants were engaging with the strategies, a number of key observations were made. It became evident throughout the training that participants’ prior knowledge of the targeted strategies was on a surface level. For example, when I introduced general reading strategies such as ‘highlight interesting points’ or ‘note taking of key points’, they all reported that they often used these strategies. However, when I asked them what and why they highlight and how they took notes, a lack of understanding of effective use of these strategies was evident. In other words, participants were not able to provide a reasoned account of what they did and why.
I also observed that during a task involving critical reflection (for example, metacognitive reading strategy use) some participants were reading the text again and again without making any notes. Others were attempting to be critically reflective and wrote one or two sentences. However, the sentences that they wrote were not critical in nature but a paraphrase of sentences in the given text. It was evident that participants were struggling to critically read the texts. Such observed responses necessitated further guided practice. In such circumstances, I felt that participants might be nearing frustration point and, therefore, needed more help with using metacognitive reading strategies.

However, I also observed that as their involvement gradually increased, participants were eager to learn to use strategies. A sense of accomplishment was shown by some participants who began to complete tasks faster than others and then tried to help other participants with strategy use.

Overall, participants actively participated in their learning, engaging in different tasks and they were eager to improve their strategy use. Participants usually rose to the challenges and gleaned the main message about how to learn with the help of strategies. Participants reported that they felt comfortable using the strategies. They seemed to enjoy the training and found it useful. However, some said: “too much thinking” with regard to metacognitive strategies (Maly) or replied to questions related to usefulness of strategies with just nodding (Ai). I did not ascribe a specific level of importance to specific strategies. Instead, the participants were encouraged to develop their own repertoire of strategy knowledge by identifying which strategies worked for them and suited their own learning needs.

6.5 Phase three: Strategy training program evaluation and application

The most convincing evidence of success or failure (or anything in between) of the strategy training program was participants’ engagement with a strategy’s use after the strategy training program. This is discussed here. This section reports on the participants’ use of strategies post the training period, through the use of a strategy checklist. An analysis of the data collected from the strategy training checklist is also presented in this section. The use of a strategy checklist is advocated to evaluate the
effectiveness of strategy training (Chamot & Rubin, 1994; Cohen et al. 1998; Rubin et al. 2007). In this study, participants were given a strategy checklist (see Appendix 6.2) to use for a period of eight weeks. This was done in order to track and evaluate the progress of their strategy use and also to help participants consolidate their strategy use. Participants were asked to fill in the checklist once a week (usually at the end of the week in their own time) by writing examples of their strategy use (when and how?) and also by placing a check mark in the boxes “Yes, it was useful” or “No, it wasn’t useful”. The strategy checklist was personally collected at the end of each week. At the beginning of each week the participants were reminded by email to try to use the strategies consciously, appropriately and frequently to support continued improvement in their academic learning, social participation in the LC2, and overall development in their language proficiency. Participants were informed that support would be provided via email or through face-to-face meetings, should they require assistance in strategy use. The strategy checklist reflected the strategy areas identified in the training program. Within this context, the strategy training program was integrative as it used different methods to document processes. This is another important element of the DBRM.

6.5.1 Oral communication strategy use

Oral communication strategies help students to maintain meaningful interaction and solve communication problems in order to reach the desired communication goal and improve their oral communication competence (Faerch & Kasper, 1983). In this study, it was hoped that with the help of oral communication strategy use participants would enhance their L2 socialisation and engage more fully in the LC2. It was intended that participants use the strategies to facilitate their authentic conversational interaction with people from the host community.

Initially, six participants expressed their interest in developing their oral communication strategies. However, two of them withdrew from the study (see Chapter 3, Section 3.6). Therefore, the strategy checklist analysis was conducted on the remaining four participants’ strategy use. Table 6.4 presents the participants’ use of oral communication strategies and shows both commonalities and differences in their strategy application. The most commonly or consistently used strategies are highlighted.
Table 6.4 Dara, Sung Hi, Annan and Maly’s use of oral communication strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral communication strategies</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies to initiate</td>
<td>When someone smiles at me I smile back and say ‘Hi’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversation</td>
<td>I ask people’s names and give my name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I make eye contact with a person I am talking to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remember people’s names and repeat the name back in my greeting ‘Nice to meet you, Tom’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I walk through the mall and just say hello to people as I walk past them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I will speak two sentences in each event or meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies to engage in extended</td>
<td>I work on an alternative strategy to reach the original goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversation</td>
<td>I use substitutions e.g. words, phrases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I change topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I ask for help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I ask questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I take a risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am not afraid to make mistakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To fill the awkward moments in the conversation, I use ‘Jump Starters’ by asking such questions as Did you happen to watch the Thursday “So you think you can dance”?; Have any of you seen the film .... ?; Have you heard on the news yesterday that .... ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I use conversation starting statements i.e., What a beautiful day!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I verbally let others know that I am following along, actively listening by showing my interest in hearing more, clarifying, arguing, seeking specifics etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis revealed that the participants commonly applied 11 out of 16 oral communication strategies with varying degrees of effectiveness. Below, I discuss the impact of commonly used strategies on participants’ L2 socialisation process. More specifically, the discussion is focused on identifying the extent to which these strategies were useful in supporting participants to feel comfortable with engaging in initiating and extending conversations with L1 speakers of English.

The greeting strategies are very simple but very important in establishing rapport. In general, the greeting strategies helped participants to build interpersonal relationships. The strategies were applied in both on-and-off campus conversational exchanges with L1 speakers of English. Participants used these strategies in situations such as talking to strangers at the bus stop, at the train station, in the shopping mall, to bus drivers, to classmates in class or outside class, students in the library, and to neighbours. All participants endeavoured to use these strategies. However, Dara’s use was different. Dara used the strategies predominantly with his fellow postgraduate students that he shared an office with and with whom he also shared a similar cultural background (Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, and Nepal). Unlike other participants, Dara did not challenge himself to come out of his comfort zone and talk to L1 speakers of English.
Dara’s use of strategies to help initiate conversation beyond his immediate circle of acquaintances was limited.

A number of significant strategy use incidents were identified through the analysis of strategies that helped or did not help participants to engage in extended conversations. ‘I change topic’ was one of the most commonly and effectively used strategies. Participants reported that when they attempted to maintain conversations by changing topics, they often managed to lengthen the conversation time. For example, Dara chose to change topic by using TV programs that people commonly watched or knew about. Sung Hi used this strategy by asking questions about holidays. Participants found this strategy very useful. However, Maly was not sure about the usefulness of the strategy. The reason for this was, when she tried to continue with the conversation, she felt that her conversation partner seemed disinterested in talking to her. Therefore, she felt discouraged and found the strategy not useful.

A combination of ‘I ask for help’ and ‘I ask questions’ strategies also enabled participants to engage in longer conversations with L1 speakers of English. In particular, these strategies enabled Sung Hi and Annan to move from being reluctant to ask for help to being comfortable with actively seeking assistance by asking questions. They reported asking for help from classmates (L1 speakers of English), friends (L2 speakers of English) and tutors. Although participants reported using these strategies to good effect, data indicate that they were often used on campus rather than off campus. Further, Dara’s account of the use of these two strategies revealed that the only L1 speaker of English he mentioned in his strategy checklist was his supervisor. Looking at the questions he asked (for example “when my friend talking about his research”, “How is the situation in your country now?”, “How many seasons are there in your country?”), it became clear that Dara did not even attempt to use the strategies with L1 speakers of English.

This was further evident in Dara’s use of a subsequent strategy ‘I use conversation starting statements i.e., What a beautiful day!’. Dara’s checklist examples “Can you tell me about Ramadan?” or “What makes you impressed when you arrived Perth?” reinforce that he was not making any attempt to converse with L1 speakers of English. Instead, he was using the strategies while talking to his friends and fellow postgraduate students from a similar background. On the other hand, Sung Hi used the strategy both
to initiate and maintain conversations and expressed that she progressively felt more confident about talking to her Australian classmates.

Maly, reported that she felt rejection whilst attempting to seek help and ask questions from her Australian classmates. Because of this, Maly gave up asking for help from her Australian classmates, instead she decided to “only ask my close friends ... [and] tutor”. Therefore, in the initial weeks of strategy checklist use, Maly reported the strategies as not being useful every time she perceived rejection from people she talked to or asked questions from. This suggests that Maly expected instant success without recognising the complexities associated with social interactions in the LC2. However, in the later weeks, Maly was prepared to have another go at building relationships with her Australian classmates. Maly reported that she took a risk and tried to ask questions from her Australian classmates again using a combination of ‘I ask questions’ and ‘I take a risk’ strategies. She said “they try to help” and reported that the strategies were useful.

Participants’ strategy checklist analysis reveals that participants used the oral communication strategies consciously and consistently in combination with one another. Also, it has become clear that comfort and context were key elements in strategy use. Dara never challenged himself to come out of his comfort zone and talk to L1 speakers of English. Maly did not find strategies useful when she felt an unwelcoming reception from her conversation interlocutors. Also, overwhelmingly, these strategies were used ‘on-campus’ and in academic contexts. There was a little evidence of ‘beyond campus’ conversation.

6.5.2 Vocabulary strategy use

Vocabulary learning strategies are tools to learn words and word meanings. It should be noted here that participants reported the need to learn the specialised vocabulary of their discipline area. This is a critical aspect of academic discourse. Participants were encouraged to seek opportunities to use their learning in order to make vocabulary available for use as is suggested by Schmitt (1997). It was hoped that such learning facilitated by the vocabulary learning strategies, would promote vocabulary growth and in so doing help participants communicate at a more sophisticated level.
Maly and Akio were provided with six types of vocabulary strategies. It was suggested that these strategies be used in combination with other strategies such as reading and oral communication strategies. Table 6.5 presents Maly and Akio’s vocabulary strategy use.

Table 6.5 Maly and Akio’s vocabulary strategy use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary strategies (reading)</th>
<th>Maly</th>
<th>Akio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I learn the meaning of a word from the context</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I guess the meaning of a word from its structure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The more I read the more new words I acquire and understand</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary strategies (oral)</th>
<th>Maly</th>
<th>Akio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I keep a pocket notebook and write down new found words</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the new found words when communicating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learn 5 new words a day and use them when communicating</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the help of vocabulary strategies to be used in combination with reading strategies, Maly reported that she noticed improvement in her reading comprehension. Maly also reported that she noticed that the more she read the better her ability to understand became. She not only read her study related materials but also engaged in other reading to learn new words and “increase general knowledge”. This suggests that awareness and use of vocabulary strategies helped to improve Maly’s reading comprehension. However, Maly did not use the vocabulary strategies in combination with oral communication strategies. This is reflective of her experience with oral communication strategies discussed above.

Unlike Maly, Akio attempted to use all vocabulary strategies. As a result, Akio noticed growth in his vocabulary. He stated “I can use them [words and expressions] ... in my essay etc. It’s good way to develop my vocabulary”. Also, data suggest that Akio effectively used the strategies and made positive changes in his oral communication. For example, Akio kept a pocket notebook (provided to him during the strategy training session) and wrote down new found vocabulary. He also used the new vocabulary in his everyday communication. He said “I had a conversation practice with my friend. I learn some expression and practise pronunciation”. Akio practised words and expressions not only to remember them but he was also evaluating his use of the words “… whenever I learnt new words, I need to practise then I can check I could use the words”. Further, Akio reported “I started conversation practice with my friend. I can make my
“conversation sound more natural” and noticed significant improvement in his oral communication. This shows that Akio’s consistent and conscious use of the vocabulary strategies positively impacted his learning and oral communication.

6.5.3 Listening strategy use

Listening strategies help students to comprehend and recall listening input that enables them to interact in oral communication. The following listening strategies were provided to Mariko during the strategy training. Table 6.6 summarises Mariko’s listening strategy use.

Table 6.6 Mariko's listening strategy use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metacognitive strategies</th>
<th>Cognitive strategies</th>
<th>Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mariko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning (before the tutorial/discussion)</strong></td>
<td>I try to predict the content of the conversation/listening text</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I need to check whether I have understood the tutor’s instruction for the discussion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>if not develop an immediate action plan in order to find out i.e., asking a question from the tutor or a group member</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring flow of conversation (during the discussion)</strong></td>
<td>I pay attention to what I am listening to</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In a discussion/tutorial, I need to be aware of the progress of interaction in terms of pace, turn-taking and exchange of information</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring comprehension (during the discussion)</strong></td>
<td>I notice new words, expressions, and pronunciation etc</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I need to check or correct my understanding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring how clearly you have been understood (during the discussion)</strong></td>
<td>I take notes of key words and expressions</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I need to be aware of listeners’ reactions – listeners’ comprehension of what I said; their responses including both verbal and physical like nodding</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-evaluation (after the discussion/tutorial)</strong></td>
<td>I listen for specific details i.e., supporting details or examples</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I need to reflect on my involvement in the tutorial – write down both my active and inactive involvement in the tutorial: when I was active; when I wasn’t; what I understood; what I need to change in my next discussion/tutorial</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the table, Mariko’s strategy checklist analysis revealed that she used cognitive strategies rather than metacognitive strategies. The data analysis revealed that Mariko used the metacognitive strategies inconsistently and ineffectively. She reported that she “… couldn’t exploit it much”. She stated that she was not fully confident in whether she understood the classroom discussions correctly at all times. Therefore, she “mostly listened to other people’s speaking” and wrote down questions.
to ask her lecturer after the class. The data suggest that she did not have adequate language competency to be able to use metacognitive strategies consistently and effectively.

On the other hand, the awareness and use of cognitive strategies assisted Mariko to stay focused and better understand what she was listening to. For example, while listening she tried to pay careful attention, and notice new words, expressions and pronunciation of the words. She wrote them down using dot points “I used dot points for understandable”. Mariko also reported that “case studies ... or evidence ... were very useful for me to understand”. However, when she did not understand some words, she could not continue concentrating on the listening. She stated “Sometimes, some words have not been got ... I stopped listening”. This, together with her account of metacognitive strategy use, indicate that the task of participating in the discussion and listening to lectures was too sophisticated for the level of Mariko’s English language proficiency. As Chamot et al. (1999, p. 99) point out “… if the task is too difficult students may not be able to succeed even when they do use appropriate strategies”. And this was the case for Mariko.

6.5.4 Writing strategy use

Writing is a complex and recursive process as planning, composing, and revising stages often overlap. The writing strategies included in the strategy training consisted of a series of drafting and redrafting strategies, and metacognitive strategies.

The following writing strategies were introduced to Ai and Annan during writing strategy training sessions. Based on the understanding that participants execute different types of written work such as essays, reports, papers and projects, the following strategies were thought to be flexible enough to apply to these types of academic writing. Table 6.7 summarises Ai and Annan’s use of writing strategies.
Table 6.7 Ai and Annan’s use of writing strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing strategies</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ai</td>
<td>Annan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series of drafting strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rough draft - an attempt to get ideas down on paper</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redrafting - rethinking ideas on the basis of literature review</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redrafting - reshaping ideas to express them more precisely</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redrafting - adding additional information</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing – spelling, punctuation and grammar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you check, whether the main argument clearly established?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you order your argument in a logical sequence?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you use formal English?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you reference the evidences correctly?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your argument convince the reader?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your writing show evidence of critical thinking?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ai and Annan’s eight week strategy checklist analysis revealed Ai used few writing strategies compared with Annan. Ai reported the reason for this to be that she did not have a lot of written assignments to do during the eight week period. Ai reported that the strategies that she used were effective and useful. While Ai was using the drafting strategies to write her essays, she “... first ... wrote down many ideas on a piece of paper”. Gradually as she progressed through the essay, she “gave ... more details by using different pieces of paper for each idea”. This reveals that Ai learnt about drafting and redrafting strategies and began to use these in her assignments. With regard to metacognitive strategies use, Ai did not use them. Instead, she “asked [her] Australian friend to check or correct my essay after I did it myself”.

In contrast, Annan used all writing strategies consistently and effectively. During the period of eight weeks, Annan had to write a conference paper, a journal paper, and an essay. The drafting strategies increased Annan’s awareness of the fact that writing is an iterative process and planning ahead is vital. For example, Annan stated that he wrote “questions before writing about what I want to know”, “read information from many papers before I add some information”, and tried “to make complex sentences to reduce to one sentence”. Moreover, Annan’s metacognitive strategy checklist analysis showed that he consistently checked the establishment of the main arguments and convinced readers by “emphasis[ing] the problems and present[ing] results of experiment”. Also, Annan showed evidence of his critical thinking by reviewing “many research papers to find out techniques about web personalisation”, and “make my comments” or “give opinion about the topic”. Annan reported that the use of writing strategies had a
significant impact on his ability to write using the text-types that were essential in his area of study.

### 6.5.5 Reading strategy use

As students progress through university, they are asked to read increasingly complex texts in their content areas. The ability to understand and use the information in the text is important to students’ overall academic success. In order to help participants to read their unit readers and related texts, 16 reading strategies were suggested in the strategy training program. Table 6.8 summarises participants’ reading strategy use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading strategies</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlight interesting points</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circle unknown words and look them up later</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write summaries of each reading</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note-taking of key points</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annotate the readings</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss interpretation of the reading with a friend</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop graphic outline and predicting the content</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use mind-map to see how a reading relates to other readings</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make meaning from context clues</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skim reading to get general idea</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scan reading to get specific information</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am I asking questions about the reading contents?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am I critically reflecting on my reading?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am I reading in-depth?</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am I reading on surface level?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am I developing both ‘deep’ and ‘surface’ reading styles?</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The strategy checklist analysis revealed that participants commonly applied eight cognitive strategies and only one metacognitive strategy. Overall participants found the cognitive strategies useful and effective because “It’s good for preparation for tutes” and “important to write essays”, “don’t have to read again” (Nori), “helped understanding” (Ai), and “… not to forget the sentences I checked” (Akio). Amongst the cognitive strategies participants preferred to use skim and scan reading strategies. This was because they did not want to spend long periods of time reading texts “… too long”. Their accounts of using reading strategies suggest that there was pressure for participants to get through the readings and the skimming and scanning strategies were easier for them to use. As Maly said “Usually ... tend to use this strategy because I have
to finish reading quickly”. Data suggest that the extensive reading requirements of the case study university caused participants to develop a preference for only skim and scan reading.

This together with a lack of appreciation for the need to use metacognition or critical thinking is suggestive of participants’ background educational experiences in learning. This is reflective of what Chika said about her learning at university in Japan. Chika said “I don’t think it is focused on critical thinking or focused on academic learning” (see Chapter 4, Section 4.3). Critical thinking had not been part of participants’ experience. As a result, the metacognitive strategies that would be useful in deep engagement with readings and developing critical thinking were least used.

**6.5.6 Tutorial participation strategy use**

Tutorial participation or joining in discussions is an important part of university learning in the Australian context. In order to assist participants to participate in tutorials successfully, a number of metacognitive and cognitive strategies were introduced to them. Table 6.9 summarises participants’ use of tutorial participation strategies.
Table 6.9 Maly, Ai, Akio and Nori’s use of tutorial participation strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tutorial participation strategies</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning (before the tutorial/discussion)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need to check whether I have understood the tutor’s instruction for the discussion, if not develop an immediate action plan in order to find out i.e., asking a question from the tutor or a group member</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will speak one sentence in each tutorial/discussion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will try to talk to my classmates to relax myself during tutorial</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring flow of conversation (during the discussion)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a discussion/tutorial, I need to be aware of the progress of interaction in terms of pace, turn-taking and exchange of information</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring comprehension (during the discussion)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need to check or correct my understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring how clearly you have been understood (during the discussion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need to be aware of listeners’ reactions – listeners’ comprehension of what I said; their responses including both verbal and physical like nodding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation (after the discussion/ tutorial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need to reflect on my involvement in the tutorial – write down both my active and inactive involvement in the tutorial: when I was active; when I wasn’t; what I understood; what I need to change in my next discussion/tutorial</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make a bid to participate in the discussion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment on an aspect of the reading</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree with a fellow student’s point of view</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respond to what tutor has said</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the summary shows, participants’ strategy use varied from strategy to strategy and there is not a single strategy that was commonly used by all of them. Also, as can been seen from the table, there is not a single highlighted section here. This indicates that tutorial participation strategy use was the most ineffectively and inconsistently used strategy area from the strategy training program. This is what participants had to say about their experiences with the metacognitive strategies:

“I easily got lost.” (Maly)

“lack of my opinion ... and ... this strategy [monitoring strategies] always make me depressed because my understanding is sometimes wrong! But it is useful.” (Akio)

“I can’t understand what they are saying. Because teacher talks really fast and I have no idea what she is saying so I can’t see what is going on. … I don’t talk.” (Nori)

Inconsistent strategy use and associated comments suggest that the task of participating in tutorial discussions was too difficult for their level of English language proficiency.
This confirms Chamot et al. (1999) finding that students may fail to execute learning tasks even if they are provided with appropriate strategies.

In addition, a sense of intimidation, together with the thought of loosing face, seem to have made it difficult to even attempt to use the strategies. For example, Nori said “I am afraid that most of the students are Australian students are native speakers so if I ask the question they are gonna be like Oh laughing so …… I don’t use the strategy”. Another factor that is reported as having hindered the use of metacognitive tutorial participation strategies was the feeling of marginalisation. For example, Maly reported “I guess all of the above is unable to be practised because I feel that people do not show their interest in listen to me or I can’t really express what I want to talk”.

A further factor identified was that participants’ failure to use the strategies was related to their lack of preparedness for tutorials. For example, Akio reported “I have to understand our reading deeply or I can’t follow discussion”. Akio also said that “if I want to ask question to someone, I have no idea what to ask. All I can do is listening to discussion”. This suggests difficulty in making meaning from the texts and, because of this, the right questions cannot be asked. It also suggests Akio’s lack of knowledge of academic conventions used in the Australian university contexts. Based on these results, it was identified that the strategy training program in this area had very limited effect for these students.

On the other hand, Ai and Akio made some positive changes with the help of one particular planning strategy - ‘I will try to talk to my classmates to relax myself during tutorial’. Through the use of this strategy, Ai and Akio began to feel more connected with classmates:

“… if I can talk to my classmate about other than that unit like about weekend or something, it is easier to participate discussion.” (Ai)

“… tried to have a short conversation with my classmate before our tutorial. It was good for preparing for tute” and “I talked with a classmate whom I’d never talked before. It was good warm up and I could relax during the class.” (Akio)

Besides this positive outcome, data clearly show that this area of the strategy training had limited effect for participants. As stated in Chapter 3, Section, 3.4.3, the time frame of my PhD program and also participants’ limited timeframe impacted on the capacity of the intervention to be iterative. The next iteration would need to consider
incorporating affective strategies such as ‘identifying one’s anxiety level’, ‘talking about feelings’ and ‘positive self-talk’ so that learners are better prepared to deal with negative or perceived negative attitudes. Affective strategies, according to Oxford (1990a) help students regulate emotions and attitudes and this would be emphasised in the next iteration. Another important aspect that may need to be considered in the next iteration is the issue around limited English language proficiency that impacted participants’ poor metacognitive strategy use. This needs to be approached systematically. Based on the findings of this study, there is no easy solution to deal with this issue because it involves participants’ background English language proficiency developed in the LC1, experiences with the EAP course, and tests such as IELTS and TOEFL. Instead of suggesting a specific solution to address this issue in the next iteration, this study suggests some recommendations with respect to the use of tests such as IELTS and TOEFL to be considered by universities and EAP program providers.

6.6 Conclusion

This chapter described the development of the strategy training program. It also detailed the strategy use patterns of the principal participants involved in this research study. Data show that participants’ strategy use in some areas was consistent and useful. In other areas, however, this was not the case. This was particularly evident with respect to the use of metacognitive strategies. The analysis of the participants’ LLS use reveals that the strategy training program had a positive impact on some participants such as Sung Hi, Annan, Akio, and Ai. However, participants such as Dara, Maly, Mariko, and Nori drew little benefit from the strategy training program due to underlying factors such as feelings of rejection, limited engagement with L2 practices, lack of understanding of the significance of critical reading, and poor English language proficiency.

It would, however be over-optimistic to believe that after five days of strategy training and eight week’s use of the strategy checklist, participants would be operating successfully across LC2 academic and social discourses. Developing competence in strategy use is a gradual process and during this process strategies need to be used consistently, consciously, and appropriately.
Given the nature of this study and its theoretical underpinnings it was important to develop an understanding of how the participants felt the strategy training program impacted their learning and living in Australia. In order to do this, a second interview was conducted after the strategy training program. Findings of this interview are discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 7: LEARNING AND LIVING AFTER THE STRATEGY TRAINING PROGRAM

7.1 Introduction

In the previous discussion of my own development I noted that with the help of conscious and appropriate use of LLS my English language proficiency improved. My experiences showed that once I overcame inefficient or clumsy use of language, the cultural and social differences seemed much less significant for me in terms of successful, or at least comfortably operating in the Australian context. I believe with the help of LLS or the ‘right tools’ for the LC2 context, I was able to move away from the fringes of the translation arena and felt comfortable with the discourses of the LC2. However, it was not as easy as it may sound. Again, I cannot help but think what would it would have been like had I been provided with explicit strategy training like the participants in this study? I think my ability to translate into the LC2 would have been much shorter, easier and more enjoyable. The reason why I am saying this is because most of the time, I had to do the figuring out myself with regard to strategy use and its impact on L2 socialisation processes. If I transition my experiences into participants’ experiences as recounted to me in the second interview, I would agree with what some of the participants had to say about the use of LLS. I would agree that LLS are “… very useful” as Maly put it and are “… not stressful or uncomfortable” as Sung Hi described them. I also believe that with the help of consistent and appropriate use of LLS, students can achieve better results as explained by Annan and this relieves some of the stress associated with workload, as Ai pointed out. However, I have to wait and see what all participants reveal about the use of LLS.

Accounts of participants’ strategy use revealed that their use of LLS was both effective and ineffective due to a number of factors that impacted on their capacity to translate into LC2 academic and social discourses.

This chapter seeks to build a comprehensive understanding of the principal participants’ total experiences with strategy use and the strategy training program. This chapter is organised into two sections: the impact of oral communication strategies on L2 socialisation, and the impact of strategies on L2 academic discourse socialisation. In
presenting participants’ overall experiences with LLS participants’ own words are used as the sub-headings to highlight the main themes of their experiences.

7.2 The impact of oral communication strategies on the L2 socialisation process

This section focuses on accounts of participants overall experiences with the oral communication strategy use and its impact on the L2 socialisation process. It also reveals participants’ perception with respect to improvement in oral communication and English language proficiency.

**Dara: These are good strategies and I suggest to my kids**

The main findings that emerged from Dara’s strategy checklist analysis was that Dara consciously and effectively used the strategies, but was unable to do so beyond his immediate study environment. He did not challenge himself to interact with L1 speakers of English. Instead he confined his interaction to his fellow postgraduate students and family. Data show that the only L1 speaker of English Dara had lengthy conversations with was his supervisor and these were mainly about his research.

During the interview after the strategy training program, when I asked Dara about his overall impression of the LLS, he said “It is a good idea. It is important for me but not all important. If we can use all the strategy maybe useful”. Dara continued:

Strategies you gave me to want to talk with my family and some people we rarely talk. And when together we don’t have what to talk. But now I know strategy and talk like change the topic.

Dara’s use of English beyond university was for simple transactions in places like shopping centres and streets. He felt however, buoyed by his supervisor’s comments “My supervisor say you now speak better English. She said before I didn’t talk too much with you, now I want to say thing to you and to talk to you”.

Also during the interview, I noticed changes in Dara’s way of speaking. In contrast with his first interview, Dara was smiling, making eye contact while talking, and willing to continue talking. At the commencement of the study, Dara would answer my questions with one or two words and I often had to prompt. Dara came to believe that with the help of the oral communication strategies an improvement in his English language proficiency had occurred. Dara even wanted his children to learn the strategies. He said
“these are good strategies and I suggest to my kids”. However, due to his limited social encounters with L1 speakers of English, Dara’s L2 socialisation was limited. He remained on the fringes of the translation arena.

**Maly: [strategy usefulness]… depend if those people eager to talk to me or not**

In the previous chapter, it was noted that Maly also used the strategies consciously and consistently. However, at times she was not sure about the usefulness of certain strategies particularly when she felt that her conversational interlocutors were not interested in talking with her.

When I asked Maly to talk about her overall impression of using the strategies and if the strategies were useful, she replied “it depend if those people eager to talk to me or not... outside tutorials to people I have the courage to do that and find anything [to talk about]. Some people just ignore and walk away. So it depends”. This indicates that Maly was still unsure about the usefulness of the strategies when she perceived an unfavourable reaction from her conversational partner. She did, however, remain positive “I can learn from my mistakes. Sometimes we can make joke on our own mistakes so it is fun”.

With regard to social oral interactions with her classmates, Maly said “I have some Australian friends who are really nice and I talk to them even in tutorials and outside tutorials but other no. It is sometimes hard”. Maly believed that her English oral communication had improved. She said “it is better than before”.

When asked if she would continue using the strategies, she replied she would. However, she had a hesitant, provisional tone in her answer. It seemed that Maly still had a lingering feeling of intimidation when it came to talking to L1 English speakers. Fear of rejection was a factor that negatively influenced her in apprenticing herself into the LC2.
Sung Hi: Strategies not stressful or uncomfortable

Sung Hi reported her experiences with oral communication as a success. She noticed a dramatic change in her oral communication from the time she started using the strategies. With the help of these strategies, Sung Hi realised the importance of initiating the greetings and how much difference a simple greeting could make to a conversation. She said:

*I have some problem to memorise people’s name. Usually whenever I call people just like ‘Hey girls, guys’ but now I am trying to memorise their name and to use their names like ‘Hi Nick’ etc. It was really good.*

*I think actually to a Korean to Asian so like when we start talking usually Australians like Hi, How are you? How is it going? These kind of words. To me this is weird because we see everything so we know everything about that about each other, why we ask like How are you? How is it going? but I felt that this is the point of how to start our communication. So that strategy was really helpful to start communication.*

This shows that Sung Hi was able to clearly identify different text type conventions in the LC1 and LC2. Further, with the help of the strategies, Sung Hi challenged herself to come out of her comfort zone and talk to people and ask questions without worrying about making mistakes. She said:

*... whenever I have small problems I usually not to ask right, but at the moment I ask even though that is small. I wanna show that I am here. ...I tried not to be shy or not to panic. I don’t feel shy with my mistakes anymore. I asked people to explain again rather than to be panic.*

Sung Hi continued:

*Whenever I tried to use it [strategy], I think they have or they feel something different from me because I tried to talk more. More than before and I tried to be not to be shy.*

The reaction from her conversation partners indicates that she managed to present herself as an approachable and easy to talk to person. Sung Hi even asked her friends to join her in a Korean meal in a restaurant and was also invited to a party “*I was invited to party. It was good time to learn their culture*”. Data show that Sung Hi’s level of confidence and ability to interact with L1 speakers had increased.

In addition, she pointed out that she felt that the oral communication strategies should be addressed in EAP programs. She said:
... in EAP we study like how to write report how to prepare presentation, I mean what is grammar and how to read. We know a lot because we have got test in our own country that we know all of that. But it is kind of hard to start speaking with Australian. We didn’t know for example, how are you that strategy to start communication. That was very helpful.

Finally, Sung Hi said:

*Strategies not stressful or uncomfortable. If I face that kind of situation I think oh what if I use that strategy or what about I use this strategy something like that. Give me some idea to how to talk with my friends in the class. That is really powerful.*

Sung Hi stated that she would continue using the strategies. Sung Hi also believed that her oral English had improved since she started using the strategies. Unlike Dara and Maly, Sung Hi’s account of her use of the oral communication strategies reveals that they motivated her and helped her to begin to apprentice herself into the LC2. This significantly increased her chances of moving away from the fringes of the LC2 translation arena.

**Annan: I got used to improve myself to make conversation to others**

The strategy checklist analysis revealed that the oral communication strategies also helped Annan to make a significant change in his approach to talking to people. This is what Annan had to say:

*I think strategy is important and maybe more than that. I compare between before and after, I think, I follow your strategy make me feel like open mind to communicate with others. Try to make connections with others. First in the past, I just waiting somebody to say something first then I respond for them but now I think I got used to improve myself to make conversation to others. That is why very impressive.*

Annan sounded highly motivated about the positive change. He wanted to maintain using the strategies in the hope of building friendships with his conversation partners. He said:

*... if I keep to do that, for example, with somebody the same ones so after that the same person have like co-relationships and very very happy to talk with me something like that. If you want to improve English ... better try to keep relationship with others.*

Annan attributed his success with oral communication strategies to the strategy checklist that he had to use for a period of eight weeks. Annan pointed out that the strategy checklist was important to ensure a consistent use of the strategies. He said:
If somebody like you have a checklist for everyone to do every day, we have to remind every day. I think it is very useful but if it one time and then just do our ways. Maybe just come back to normal. It depends on people some people just not doing things. Just do one time after that don’t want to do anymore. It is good idea strategy to guideline somebody how to improve doing this thing. Strategy checklist was a good way to remind about strategy.

When asked if he would continue using the strategies, Annan said “I will still use it”. Oral communication strategies helped Annan to be able to present himself as an open and approachable person. Although he had yet to establish friendships with his conversation partners, he believed that it was possible if he maintained the use of strategies. Therefore, like Sung Hi, Annan increased his potential to further engage with the LC2 through the help of oral communication strategies.

7.3 The impact of strategies on the L2 academic discourse socialisation process

This section focuses on accounts of participants’ overall experiences with writing, tutorial participation, reading, vocabulary, and listening strategies, and how the use of strategies in these areas helped them to socialise into the L2 academic discourse of the host university. It also reveals participants’ perception of their improvement in English language proficiency as a result of using the strategies.

Writing strategies

Annan: It is better to follow your strategies better outcome ... results

Annan was one of the two participants who attended the writing strategy session. Annan considered his experience with writing strategies to be successful. He believed that as a result of using strategies he produced better quality writing “the quality of writing always stand out first”. He reported receiving better marks “It is better to follow your strategies better outcome ... results”. He added:

But the result and mark from the writing is depend on topics. Some topics I did really well because I have more content, wrote more reference and maybe I get used to the topic. And some topics are very hard or new for me but stand out after writing is ok. They [strategies] remind me to think about what I should do and follow that one.
Overall, writing strategies guided and organised Annan’s writing process which partially helped him to produce a better quality of written texts. The quality of his writing was also partly dependent on whether he was familiar with the content or not. Annan reported successfully incorporating the writing strategies into his language repertoire. In addition, this could have been related to his personal educational history. In other words, Annan had been a university lecturer for about 10 years at home in Thailand and he was doing his Doctorate in Information Technology by the time he attended the strategy training. More specifically, Annan was a more experienced writer than Ai who was in her early 20’s and studying in an undergraduate degree course. It is likely that Annan’s personal educational history may have positively influenced his successful incorporation of writing strategies.

**Ai: ... [strategies] make my assignments less stressful**

Ai’s experience with writing strategies was also positive and in her opinion effective. She compared her experiences before and after the strategy training. She said:

> When I tried to write essay I try to finish the whole essay. It is a very big goal. Actually it is not effective. I try to write from the beginning and in the order: Introduction, body and conclusion.

> ... in this strategy, I need to split in part and I can write for each section. It was useful for me. ... it is make my assignments less stressful.

Chapter 6 revealed that Ai had little opportunity to use these strategies extensively because she had few written assignments over the period of strategy checklist use. Regardless, of this data show that for Ai writing strategies helped her to organise and draft her assignments better and this relieved her of some of the stress associated with her workload.

**Tutorial participation strategies**

**Maly: I can’t participate for the tutorial**

The interview conducted after the strategy training program confirmed that Maly was still struggling to participate in tutorials. She felt intimidated by her Australian classmates. She continued to lack understanding of the flow of the discussion because of its fast pace, also because of her fear of making mistakes. She said:
... first time I went to tutorial ten minutes before time, I saw girls my classmates, my tutorial mates in a class they talking wasn’t looking at the doorway I comed. She saw me ... I wanted to talk to them I can’t because she was busy.

I often feel uncomfortable in tutorial with other native speakers because they speak very fast and I got lost. I just don’t understand what they are talking about. Even at first time the tutor introduced the topic and then when the discussion going on I got lost. I just don’t know what they are talking about. I can’t say the point and what they are talking about. So I can’t participate.

Sometimes even I try to do all the readings and read it completely many time and when I come to tutorial what they are talking was different from what I know – different ideas. So ... I always afraid if I talk different what they are talking about like topics or ... I just weird. I feel fierce of making mistakes in front of them.

Maly also blamed her lack of organisational skill and poor time-management for not being able to participate in tutorials “I can’t participate for the tutorial. I go and I got lost. That is because of the unorganised because I am always busy, for example, doing assignments, exams or writing essays”. However, Maly remained positive. She reported that her confidence with English had improved since she participated in the study “If you keep thinking something negative you think it is negative even though it is positive. And for the level of confidence with my English, I think it has increased”.

Ai: ... atmosphere was changing and it became easier to talk to them in the tutorial

Ai also reflected on the tutorial participation strategies she used. She said:

At first I didn’t think they understood me. I tried to talk to them before tutorial and after tutorial to make friends to be friends. And the atmosphere was changing and it became easier to talk to them in the tutorial. Sometimes they help if my English is still poor. Sometimes they explain the tutor what I am saying.

Ai added “I realised if I can talk to my classmates about other than that unit like about weekend or something it will be easier to participate in discussion”. Ai emphasised how important it was to establish a comfortable relationship between her and her Australian classmates by having an informal chat before and after tutorials. In other words informal social interaction with her classmates made her feel at ease during tutorials and this in turn helped her to attempt to speak up in tutorials ‘I will try to talk to my classmates to relax myself during tutorial’. However, she admitted that she was still struggling to participate in discussions.
With regard to her ineffective metacognitive tutorial participation strategies use discussed in Chapter 6, Section 6.5.6, Ai said “I tried to concentrate on listening and the flow of discussion ... but not all the time. It helped me understand a lot thing”. Ai admitted that she “should have used it [metacognitive strategies] much more”. However, Ai believed that the strategies that she used helped “make study easier”.

**Akio: Last year [before the strategy training] I didn’t know how. So this semester, I got checklist so I can know how I can participate in tutorial**

Akio talked about his experiences with tutorial participation and reading strategies use and how many differences he noticed in his learning after using the strategies. This is what he had to say:

Last year [before the strategy training] I didn’t know how. So this semester I got checklist so I can know how I can participate in tutorial. I had no idea what should I do to participate discussion but this semester I got some ideas from checklist so to be more familiar with tutorial I have to use those checklist.

Like Ai, Akio pointed out the importance of establishing a comfortable relationship with his classmates. To achieve this, the strategy ‘I will try to talk to my classmates to relax myself during tutorial’ was used. He said:

... it makes me easier to say something discussion because when I don’t know my classmates I was very nervous to say something about my opinion. But before the tutorial if I talk to them I can understand what’s they are like so I realise that they are very nice. So I can say anything.

Akio’s comment emphasises the importance of promoting social and informal interaction between Australian students and students from different cultural backgrounds like himself. It also emphasises why it is essential for students, no matter where they are from, to feel comfortable around each other. In Akio’s case, creating a comfortable atmosphere helped him to feel at ease and say things during discussions. Moreover, Akio believed that his level of tutorial participation increased and his English improved after the strategy training. He pointed out:

I could be able to ask some questions to my classmates. And then if the topic is what I know I can participate in the conversation and then when I speak English my feeling is more relaxed and I thought my English has improved.
Nori: ... it is really bad but I almost give up [using strategies]

Nori’s experience with tutorial participation strategies was not successful. Nori named three reasons for why she was not able to use the strategies. Her reasoning was similar to that of Maly and Mariko. Firstly, discussion in her tutorials was extremely fast paced and she got lost in the middle of it. Secondly, she was not able to prepare well enough for tutorials because she was busy with her assignments. And thirdly, she felt that her classmates might laugh at her mistakes and she feared losing face. This is what she had to say:

*I can’t understand what they are saying. Because teacher talks really fast and I have no idea what she is saying so I can’t see what is going on. Yeah so I thought it is a bit hard for me to actually to participate.*

*I think that is because my other reason is I can’t prepare enough because of other assignments. I think that is the reason I didn’t have basic knowledge of this.*

*I am afraid that most of the students are native speakers so if I ask something they like laughing ... It is more easier for me to ask tutor so I ask my tutor like every week.*

I asked Nori if she tried to use the strategies to solve the problems. She answered “I almost give up. Yeah it is really bad but I almost give up”. I asked her if she meant she gave up on using the strategies, she said “I really think about it”, meaning she indeed did stop trying to use the strategies to improve the situation. I was interested to know what she thought would help her most to be able to improve her tutorial participation. She said “I need encouraged to say something”.

Unfortunately, Nori did not make use of the tutorial participation strategies and did not make any improvement in her level of tutorial participation. She needed much more by way of encouragement to express herself, to voice her opinion, and to know that nobody would react negatively to what she had to say.
**Reading strategies**

**Maly: I found the strategy was very useful**

With regard to reading strategy use, Maly claimed that the strategies significantly helped her to manage her reading materials. She said:

*I find that before I tried to read everything and then but I finish everything just went out of my mind. I can’t get anything. I didn’t want to read. But when I use the strategies, especially the ‘developing graphic outline to predict the content’, I can get the main points and I can understand. And I can read more because if I try to read everything I feel like it is very boring but if I read only one time and analyse it later on I don’t need to read the whole text. I found the strategy was very useful.*

Maly preferred to skim and scan read rather than deep read “*... just do the scanning and skimming, I can get the points of the text*”. Maly even mentioned that her classmates commented on the fact that she came to class prepared for tutorials. She said “*I was very happy when I annotate them and when I went to the tutorial, my classmates like oh you tried to the reading. I was just using the strategies and didn’t do anything*”. I asked Maly if she would use the deep reading strategies, she said “*I like surface reading than deep reading style*”.

**Ai: I always wish ... I could have use ... deep reading strategy but I couldn’t do that much**

This is what Ai had to say with regard to her experiences with reading strategies:

*In this semester, I was taking agriculture and everyday life and that unit reader was really huge and I was struggling and struggling to read many readings and confusing the reading was not well organised ... many point in everywhere so confused. When I read that unit reader strategy was very useful.*

I was most interested in Ai’s point of view about her preference to use cognitive over deep reading strategies. Ai replied “*... it [cognitive strategies] is easy to use*”. She continued:

*The deep reading style takes more time I was struggling to my unit and always need to finish reading faster and only I could use surface reading. I always wish to I could have use include my deep reading strategy but I couldn’t do that much.*

Whilst it was desirable for Ai to use metacognitive strategies, she was at least able to develop a repertoire of cognitive strategies that assisted her to manage reading long texts.
Akio: [Deep reading strategies] the best one if I can ... use. I need to develop this

Unlike other participants, Akio realised the significance of metacognitive engagement with his readings in order to actively participate in tutorials. This is what he had to say:

This active participation really depends on the reading and the topic. I finished my all readings. I already knew what is the topic what is the question so I was thinking maybe I can say anything about the topic but in the tutorial the questions were more deeply about reading then so I don’t know the details so I couldn’t understand anything.

And also I am not before I came here I am not familiar with tutorial, discussion so before [in Japan] I just finish reading then tutor asks some basic information about reading. So they don’t ask questions deep related to reading so it was easy to answer the question. But here [in Australia] we have to think ourself very deeply more critical but so maybe I think that is the reason. If I use deep strategy, maybe I could understand more.

I asked Akio what was the difference between using surface reading and deep reading.

He replied:

Surface and deep that is not the same. When I use surface strategy, I just check some easy information. I can understand the whole picture. [When he used deep reading strategies], I got too much information and I was confused. The best one if I can ... use [deep reading strategies]. I need to develop this.

This shows that Akio did not make use of deep reading strategies. However, Akio realised that critical thinking or using a critical approach to reading texts was an important skill in university learning that he needed to develop.

Nori: I can read it more quickly

Nori’s reading strategy use was not consistent. She used the strategies mostly to “not to read them again” and “make it [reading] easier”. During our interview after the strategy training, it was revealed that she was still focusing on finishing her readings fast. She said “…I have got a lot of things to do. By doing this, I tried to make the time short”. I asked her if she noticed any improvement in her academic reading, she replied;

I can read it more quickly and then I can leave the not necessary part and then it is more easier to understand. And yeah like writing [concept] map it is more easier. I can related to other readings.

Whilst it was desirable to use both cognitive and metacognitive strategies in combination, it was good to know that she believed her reading had improved with the
help of the reading strategies that she chose to use. Nori said that she would continue using the strategies.

Overall, interview data analysis revealed that all four participants who participated in reading strategy training read on surface level using only cognitive reading strategies.

**Vocabulary strategies**

**Maly: I try to look at the context of the words**

The last strategy training sessions that Maly participated in were associated with vocabulary strategy training. Maly believed that the vocabulary strategies helped her to increase her vocabulary and she came to realise the importance of learning vocabulary with the support of strategies. She said:

*I think it helped me a lot. Even though I don’t know the vocabulary, I can ask them oh what does it mean? Now I try to look at the context of the words rather than check the words and try to remember.*

I asked Maly to express what she really thought about using strategies and if she thought incorporating them was important in coping with challenges. Maly said:

*Before I don’t know strategy, I try to like ask people lots of idea whether how to learn language and I get the idea. But it is not right and not organised that this point is reading strategy and that point is speaking strategy something like that. But after that I studied the strategy, ok this is for reading and a b c and it appears in my mind that I can use a lot of strategies. Sort of organises the way I learn.*

Therefore, Maly believed that the strategies made her learning easier and more organised. Maly was optimistic about using the strategies in the future “*try to use it to improve my confidence*”.

**Akio: I think my vocabulary has increased**

Akio sounded very positive about the improvement in his vocabulary knowledge. He compared his vocabulary knowledge before and after the strategy training together with the difference he noticed in his oral communication. He said:

*It is increasing. I think my conversation became more natural because last semester my vocabulary were very poor then my expression is very strange. My friend told me sometimes, Japanese people are too formal so not natural for them. I could learn some informal language and more expression. So I think my vocabulary has increased.*
Akio sought opportunities to use vocabulary in its context. The main benefit for Akio was that it helped him to have a free flowing conversation because he learnt how the words and expressions were used in informal communicative contexts. Akio added:

“... with your checklist it was more developed, like expression in the tutorial, short presentation, then I can use some expression, vocabulary, reading”.

At the end of the interview, Akio stated that he would continue using the strategies because “I want to continue studying English or language so will do reading maybe I have to do some discussion with people so ... I can use these strategies”.

**Listening strategies**

Mariko: *This approach is very systematic ... it helped me to what I concentrate what I try to listen next time*

Mariko only participated in listening strategy training. Overall, Mariko was happy about using the listening strategies. She said:

*I didn’t not gain the listening strategy at language school so you tell me this strategy. This approach is very systematic... it helped me to what I concentrate what I try to listen next time ... how we develop listening skills. ... I pick up the most important sentence or most important meaning.*

However, her struggle with speaking in front of her Australian classmates still persisted (see Chapter 6, Section 6.5.3). She was not able to express herself in class. Even when she did express herself, like Maly and Nori, she felt intimidated by what she perceived to be her classmates’ reaction. She added:

*SOMES I worried about the reaction of the native [Australian] people because it is very recognisable their appearance: body language, appearance, facial expression - whether they understand my expression or not so sometime worried about it.*

Unfortunately this situation led Mariko to give up speaking “Actually sometimes gave up my expression quite”. It is ironic that Mariko felt so intimidated by her classmates that instead of trying to challenge herself, she decided to stop expressing herself altogether. However, she did not totally give up using strategies. She continued evaluating her actions and circumstances, and continued planning her next action. She said:
I usually evaluate myself because sometimes I could not participate in the discussion or my expression is not understandable for other people so after that I evaluate it to improve my English what I have to do next time. I think that way.

When she was asked if the listening strategies made any difference in her listening ability, she answered:

*Yes, definitely because this cycle is very improving develop myself and my listening skill. If I have more tutorials or discussion time in the school I think I can improve my capability of discussion.*

7.4 Conclusion

Overall analysis of the transcriptions of the interviews after the strategy training program confirmed the main findings that emerged from the strategy checklist analysis. However, the interview analysis identified a number of additional aspects that support the contention that (in general) participants benefited from the strategy training program. Participants’ positive comments show that the strategies often served as answers or at least partial solutions to challenging situations. Interview data also suggest that the strategy checklist helped participants to organise and maintain their strategy use. Through such processes, participants learnt not only which types of strategies to use, but also how to use them appropriately. This suggests that learners’ strategic competence can be developed through raising awareness, conscious use of strategies, and the supervision of strategy use. Data also reveal that strategies made study easier and more organised for a number of the participants. Participants’ comments also suggest that strategy use led to better language performance and that this, in turn, increased motivation. Based on participants’ self-perceived observations, they noticed improvement in their English language proficiency and they remained positive about continuing to use the strategies. In the next chapter these areas will be elaborated further and the research questions will be answered.
8.1 Introduction

I begin this chapter by talking about my experiences in relation to the two research questions of this study. The first research question aimed to find out the types of knowledge and experiences participants brought from their home culture (LC1) and how these impacted their academic and social practices as they engaged with English in an Australian tertiary context (LC2). Secondly, the study aimed to investigate the possible impact of a strategy training program on L2 academic discourse socialisation, L2 socialisation and continued development of English language proficiency.

As I said before, my home educational experience was similar to that of the participants in this study. My teachers were Mongolian English language teachers who predominantly taught me English grammar. I used to memorise grammatical functions, words, and conversations a lot. It was a very artificial mechanical experience. There was no context for what I was learning. I was not happy with the way I was being taught and with how I was learning the language. In thinking back, I found that in my English learning process I used some strategies reported in the literature (e.g. Oxford, 1990a). I used cognitive strategies such as repeating, translating, memorising and paraphrasing and I also used some of these strategies together with social strategies such as speaking to myself in front of the mirror to practise what I had learnt in the classroom (self-talk), trying to speak with any foreigner I saw on the streets of Ulaanbaatar (cooperating with proficient users), and listening to English songs and trying to understand them. So I think I can say that I started using LLS a long time ago but I was just not consciously aware of the fact that I was using them and the role they could play in learning a language and improving language use. As discussion on definitions of LLS (see Chapter 2, Section 2.2.2) reveals, conscious use of LLS is what helps learners achieve their language learning goals (e.g. Cohen, 2011a; Griffiths, 2008). Therefore, my early experience with LLS shows that a lack of conscious awareness of using LLS could have been a significant factor that impacted on my inability to learn English effectively. My English was not good enough. Yet I passed the IELTS test with a score of 7.5 the first time I did it.
After I started my life in Australia, I faced quite a few challenges due to differences in educational and cultural experiences (see Chapter 1, Section, 1.1). However the key for me in overcoming these challenges was to use LLS consciously, effectively and appropriately. Such use of LLS enabled me to facilitate not only language learning tasks and develop language modes as described by Cohen (2011a), but also any aspect of learning including understanding and capacity to use the various conventions of academic and social discourses. For example, as a learner, I used to get overwhelmed with the amount of reading I had to do. However, with the help of a ‘patterned note-taking strategy’ (Norton, 1981) simply known as a ‘mind-map’ (Norton, 1981), I learnt to read faster but effectively. This is a very simple reading strategy yet it is an effective one if used appropriately. This strategy remains one of my favorite strategies to use when I engage in academic reading. Also, I used to get frustrated with the fact that I could understand everything people were talking about in social settings yet I could not converse with them easily. I started off presenting myself as an approachable person using strategies such as ‘when someone smiles at me I smile back and say ‘Hi’ or ‘I ask people’s names and give my name’. Again these are very simple strategies yet highly effective ones because people like to talk to people who are approachable. These experiences enabled me to expand my repertoire of language resources as described by Schieffelin and Ochs (1986) as well as become included in the Australian way of life. I think now I can say that I have traversed the translation arena because I have developed an ability to translate between LC1 and LC2.

This allowed me for this study to position myself as a ‘core-member’ (Vickers, 2007). As a core member, I could establish a role that enabled me to provide the expert role, particularly in facilitating the strategy training program. The notions of ‘expert’ or ‘core member’ facilitation in novice learning are essential elements in the L2 socialisation literature (see Chapter 2, Section 2.6 and 2.7), as is made clear in this study. My role as a ‘core member’ was important because I am personally well aware of the use of LLS, how they can be used and why it is important to develop competence in using LLS to engage with LC2 practices. For example, during the strategy training sessions, I used to suggest to participants things like “get yourself out there and talk to people”, “you need to present yourself as an approachable person and the oral communication strategies will help you to do that”, or “try to get to know your classmates – this will help you say things in tutorial discussions”. These suggestions I made to the participants are core elements of L2 socialisation as reported in the literature (Duff, 2012; Li, 2000; Ochs,
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1999) and discussed in Chapter 2 of this study. However it should be noted here that there is a very little reflection of this area in the LLS strategy training literature. Also, during my facilitation of strategies, I would always use examples of my own use of LLS and explain how this helped me to achieve what I wanted to achieve. By doing this from a position of someone who had experienced similar challenges as the participants, I thought they would be able to relate to my experiences and truly understand that LLS is a powerful tool to help them successfully learn and live in the LC2 context. I believe by positioning myself as a ‘core member’, I supported participants in their quest to learn to translate into the LC2 with the help of LLS. But the important task now is to find out how effective the strategy training program was for participants and whether it helped them to learn to translate into the LC2? This is the final research sub-question of this study.

Before answering the research questions, this chapter provides a review of the research process with a particular focus on establishing the specific contributions of each chapter to the various facets of the study. Following this, I intend to address the research questions systematically based on the key findings that have emerged from the data analyses. This will lead to presenting a revised languaculture model following Agar’s (1994; 2006) languaculture model that was presented in Chapter 1 and that has permeated this study. This revised model will illuminate the answer to the final question of this study.

8.2 Review of the research process

I started each chapter with my own story with respect to how my own learning and living experiences across two cultures interface with the purposes and content of each chapter of this study. In this way this dissertation presents two stories – my own and that of the participants involved in this study. Chapter 1 outlined the aims of the study, research perspective, research questions and the significance of the study. Agar’s (1994; 2006) ‘languaculture’ model was identified as being important to the study as it has provided the theoretical perspective that frames this research.

Through an ongoing iterative process of synthesising the literature in the fields of LLS, L2 socialisation, and L2 academic discourse socialisation, Chapter 2 was developed. In the process of exploring the fields, particular themes pertinent to this study emerged.
Also, in reviewing the literature in the field of LLS, it became clear that the strategy literature paid scant attention to strategies to support socialisation and that the language socialisation literature does not address the details of LLS support. It became clear that more studies were needed to provide explicit illustrations of the types of support novices/students can be provided with to deal with the challenges associated with academic and social discourses within a new LC2. Such was the intent of this study.

Chapter 3 aimed to set out the research approach of the study and the steps taken in investigating the lived-experiences of participants involved in this study. Also, with the help of my reflective journal used throughout the course of the study, I was able to map my growing and changing understanding about the process of doing this study.

Chapter 4 presents the profiles of the participants who I got to know through my initial contacts and the first interviews. I was able to hear their voices and learn about their lived experiences within the LC1 and also the LC2. Importantly, I became aware of the limitations associated with their English language use, not only in terms of what they reported but also because I could ‘see’ how they spoke. This insight provided a further dimension with respect to understanding participants’ learning and living in English. This required an explicit ‘unpacking’ of participants’ experiences both in the contexts of LC1 and LC2.

Chapter 5 analysed and interpreted the data presented in Chapter 4 and identified the principal participants’ needs in order to shape and design the strategy training program. This chapter identified that participants tended to use their LC1 toolkit inclusive of residual LLS that were often inappropriate or ineffective in their LC2. This caused a number of challenges for participants. In terms of Agar’s (1994; 2006) model they were positioned on the fringe of the translation arena. Online survey findings were also presented in this chapter. These supported the findings associated with the principal participants’ LC1 experiences and also academic and social life in the Australian context. In order to help principal participants to better engage with the practices of L2 academic and social discourses in the LC2, their expressed difficulties enabled me to determine the types of strategies that were needed. My experiences and knowledge of LLS were complimentary in this process.
Based on the participants’ needs that were recorded in Chapter 5, the strategy training program was developed within the framework of a design-based research methodology. This was discussed in Chapter 6. The strategy training program was designed to support participants as they ‘translated’ into the LC2. Details of the program were recounted in this chapter. Accounts of participants’ strategy use revealed individual differences in their responses to strategy training.

To obtain a comprehensive understanding of the participants’ LLS use, another individual in-depth semi-structured interview was conducted after the strategy training program. The analysis of data from these interviews was presented in Chapter 7. Interview analysis confirmed the main findings that were discussed in Chapter 6. However, the interview also included an opportunity for participants to self-critique their own English language proficiency.

Chapter 8 or this chapter aims to answer the research questions of this study. Findings from this study have enabled the development of a reconceptualised languaculture model based on Agar’s original languaculture model. This final chapter also includes the limitations of this research and directions for future research efforts. A number of recommendations relevant to the tertiary study context of Australia are also included. Finally, I offer advice on learning and living in Australia for Asian students who are like me.

**8.3 Addressing the research questions**

Two broad questions underpinned this study. Firstly, this study aimed to find out the types of knowledge and experiences participants brought from their home/source culture (LC1) and how these impacted their use of academic and social practices as they engaged with English in an Australian tertiary context (LC2). Secondly, the study aimed to investigate the possible impact of a strategy training program on L2 academic discourse socialisation, L2 socialisation and the continued development of English language proficiency. In other words, this study aimed to investigate the impact of strategy training to support ‘translation’ into the participants’ LC2.
8.4 Research question one

Research question one involved three areas and these will be addressed in the following three sections.

8.4.1 Participants’ English language learning and types of LLS used in home country contexts

Accounts regarding participants’ LC1 indicated that although they came from different countries, they shared similar experiences. The type of English language education they experienced was focused on the acquisition of grammatical and morphological forms. This included writing sentences as evidence of grammatical knowledge, reading texts with the purpose of learning vocabulary, practising pronunciation, and sitting exams that tested grammar knowledge. Participants’ English language education was never about developing knowledge about language conventions necessary in order to communicate effectively using a range of text-types and discourse patterns with speakers of the English language. Within the English classrooms of their LC1, participants were mainly required to listen to their teachers who predominantly used their first language, and not English, as the vehicle for the teaching of English. Participants were almost never encouraged to discuss, provide their opinions, or do group problem solving activities. This resulted in participants’ inability to express themselves in English.

From the social constructivist perspective, participants’ learning of the English language was not meaningful because their experiences did not encourage them to take an active role in constructing knowledge. In other words, participants’ English language learning did not occur in a meaningful social and cultural context. It could not mirror aspects of the reality of the L2. Rather it was learnt/taught as code, not social practice (Scarino & Liddicoat, 2009) and in a foreign environment.

However, participants intensively prepared for exams like TOEFL and IELTS in order to be admitted to Australian universities’ mainstream education. According to the participants, the intensive preparations for such exams did not provide them with opportunities to develop “functional efficiency” (Tikunoff, 1985, p. 4) in the English language, especially with respect to oral communication. As Annan commented “I will learn a lot of word but not so good conversation”.
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As a result, participants’ English language learning experiences in their home country (LC1) contexts indicate that after learning the English language on average for 10 years, participants’ English language proficiency remained limited. Participants also identified that they had little understanding of the concept of LLS as it pertains to this study and reported only limited capacity to use them. The strategies they used were those that helped them pass tests and exams, not engage in real communications or reading and writing academic discourses.

8.4.2 LLS participants used to facilitate their academic engagement and socialisation process in the Australian context

By the time participants took part in this project, they had studied at an Australian university from 3 to 9 months. Through the analysis of the data from the first interview, it was identified that participants still had very limited understanding of the concept of LLS. Participants who attended the EAP program reported hearing their teachers suggesting that they use a number of strategies (for example, “… watch TV, keep trying” (Annan). There was, however, no evidence of explicit attention to strategy use in EAP. Participants’ accounts revealed that the actual concept of LLS, ways of using LLS, and benefits of LLS were not made explicit to them. As identified in Chapter 5, Section 5.2, participants continued using LC1 strategies or an LC1 ‘toolkit’ that was not suited to their changed circumstances. According to Griffiths and Parr (2000) students’ ways of learning depends on their cultural background and this was evidenced in this study (see Chapter 5, Section 5.3). More specifically, culture has an impact on the overall learning styles and specific learning strategies used by L2 learners (Yang as cited in Oxford, 1996). As such, strategies that participants used were derived from the LC1 context and this proved to be an ‘inappropriate toolkit’ for the LC2. As a consequence, they reported a range of challenges experienced both in and out of university. Data suggest that these challenges were also linked to participants’ limited English language proficiency.

8.4.3 Impact of LC1 on academic engagement, socialisation processes and continued development of English proficiency within Australia

Data show that participants’ limited understanding of the concept of LLS, and their limited English language proficiency impacted negatively on engagement with Australian academic discourses. Academic discourses involve a range of text-types that
are inclusive of more than reading and writing and these were not part of the participants’ repertoire.

In addition, participants’ interactions with Australian students within the university context were very limited. This finding mirrors the research cited in the review of the literature included in Chapter 2 of this dissertation (e.g. Robertson et al. 2000; Sawir et al. 2008; Smart et al. 2000). From the social constructivist perspective, knowledgeable member or ‘expert’ involvement, is an important element in the ZPD (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986; Vygotsky, 1978). This was largely missing in participants’ university learning. Rather, participants were in the position of ‘peripheral observers’ (Ohta, 1999) struggling to find ways to interact with Australian students. From both a constructivist and ethnomethodological perspective, member or expert involvement is considered important (Garfinkel, 1967; Vygotsky, 1978) and yet with respect to their pre-strategy training experiences participants had little experience of this.

The impact of these issues on the socialisation process outside the university was no different. For the majority of participants, the language limitations made it difficult for them to gain opportunities to mix with locals and develop their oral communication skills. This finding again resembles the findings of research studies discussed in the review of the literature (e.g. Daroesman, Looi & Butler, 2005; Prescott & Hellsten, 2005). The researchers of these studies have identified that language proficiency is a central factor in integrating socially with members of the Australian community (see Chapter 2, Section 2.8.7).

Participants of this current study tended to stay and socialise within familiar cultural and language groups either speaking unscrutinised English as lingua franca (ELF) or their own language. This finding supports the research literature (Nesdale & Todd, 2000; Rosenthal, Russell & Thomson, 2007; Volet & Ang, 1998). Data from this study show that participants’ friendship affiliations were mainly with co-nationals and students from a similar cultural background. Duff calls it “hybrid/third space” (2012, p. 182) because “in this third space, English was a lingua franca that co-existed with Asian languages” (2010, p. 10). Limited attempts were made by participants to socialise and interact with the broader LC2 community. ‘Translation’ (Agar, 2006) was difficult and
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9 English as lingua franca is a way of referring to communication in English between speakers who have different first languages (Jenkins, 2007).
confronting. Participants appeared to be isolated from the host community and they did not know what to do in order to diminish that isolation. Consequently, participants had limited exposure to community practices and interactional routines that may have enabled them to better understand the social interactions of the LC2. Therefore, before the strategy training program, for participants the translation arena was extensive and was a place where they were principally spectators on the fringe.

8.5 Research question two

Research question two involved three areas, particularly focusing on the strategy training program as an intervention. These areas will be explored in the following four sections.

8.5.1 Determining the form of the strategy training program

Elements of a design-based research methodology were used to inform and shape the overall design of the strategy training program for a number of reasons. Data from the participants, together with consideration of time constrains for me and them, determined that the strategy training program take the form of an intensive training program conducted outside usual classes.

In addition, a strategy checklist as a tool to evaluate the application of participants’ strategy use after the strategy training program was selected. A detailed response to this question is provided in Chapter 6.

8.5.2 Impact of the strategy training program in the use of LLS on academic engagement, socialising within the Australian context and continued language development (LC2)

The most convincing evidence of success or failure (or anything in between) of the strategy training program was participants’ engagement with LLS use after the strategy training. The discussion of this is as follows.
8.5.2.1 Impact of LLS use on academic engagement within the Australian context

A number of findings with respect to the impact of LLS use on academic engagement have emerged from this study. A significant finding is that participants used cognitive strategies more often and more effectively than metacognitive strategies to engage with L2 academic discourses. The reasons for this are discussed below.

Strategies that students found useful

The accounts of participants vocabulary strategy use revealed that their many encounters with words, by hearing and using them, increased participants’ vocabulary. This was particularly true for Akio and Maly who stated that the use of vocabulary strategies enabled them to read texts more quickly. This finding can be explained using Nagy, Anderson, and Herman’s (1987) explanation of learning new words. Nagy et al (1987) explain that on the first encounter with a new word, a student stores in memory some information about how the word fits into what she/he is reading. They further explain that this information is reinforced each time students see, hear or use the word. With each new encounter, students pick up more information about the word from its various contexts. As a result, the students gradually acquire ‘ownership’ of the word (Nagy et al, 1987). In this study, the strategy checklist provided an opportunity for participants to apply the principles articulated by Nagy and his colleagues. Therefore, as Akio and Maly were able to display the ‘ownership’ of the words, as described by Fan (2003), they were also able to demonstrate the use of vocabulary strategies beyond mechanical repetition.

Other strategies that participants found useful were skim and scan reading strategies. Participants claimed that these strategies increased their reading comprehension (Akio and Ai) and helped them to identify relevant segments in the texts and use them for their tutorials and essays (Nori and Akio). However, data show that the main focus of using skim and scan reading strategies was in order to finish the reading of texts quickly. Accounts of all four participants’ strategy use revealed that by reading the texts quickly, participants felt able to keep pace with reading requirements. Data show, however, that they were only able to develop superficial or literal understanding. Participants failed to incorporate metacognitive strategies into their reading. This demonstrated that the use of skim and scan reading strategies alone, without critical engagement or an
“interrogating practice” (Freeboy & Luke, 2003 p. 53) with a focus on interacting with and questioning the text, limited participants’ ability to become effective readers in the Australian academic context.

Cognitive listening strategies such as ‘I listen to specific details i.e., supporting details or examples’ and ‘I try to predict the context of the conversation/listening text’ were also found to be useful. These strategies helped Mariko to focus on larger segments of texts and this, in turn, helped her to better comprehend texts. This account echoes O’Maley et al’s (1989) finding that effective listeners are likely to listen for larger chunks of text. Therefore, Mariko had the potential to become an effective listener. However again, as with other participants, Mariko’s inability to use metacognitive strategies (see below) in combination with these cognitive listening strategies impacted her ability to be a truly effective listener. It should be noted here that interestingly, Mariko was the only participant who expressed her interest in learning listening strategies. Findings from the study suggest that other participants did not see the need for listening strategies because they did not appreciate the role that listening strategies can play in developing other areas of learning critical within academic contexts. Tutorial participation was one such area. This was a domain difficult for all the principal participants and it may be that strategy training in listening could have been assistive here.

Within this study, only one tutorial participation strategy ‘I will try to talk to my classmates to relax myself during tutorial’ was useful for participants. Akio and Ai reported using this strategy to feel relaxed during tutorials and help them to connect with the classmates they spoke with. Although this was the only tutorial participation strategy that participants used from the pool of 11 strategies taught, it was powerful enough to make a difference in Akio and Ai’s experiences with tutorial participation. The accounts of Akio and Ai’s strategy use showed that feeling comfortable and relaxed around their classmates had a positive impact on their tutorial participation. As Akio said “… if I can talk to my classmate about other than that unit like about weekend or something, it is easier to participate discussion”. This is supportive of comments made by Wood, Bruner and Ross (1976) that as exposure to social interactions increase with the help of experts, learners’ ability to participate in the interactions increase as well. This, in turn, enables learners to increase their language performance and develop L2 proficiency (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986) and this was the case for Akio and Ai.
Strategies that students did not use

Participants did not use metacognitive strategies related to reading, listening and tutorial participation. Data indicate that the quantity of reading material that participants felt they had to ‘get through’ impacted their ability to even try to use metacognitive strategies such as ‘Am I asking questions about the reading contents?’ ‘Am I critically reflecting on my reading?’ and ‘Am I reading in-depth?’ Instead students felt that they needed to finish reading the texts as soon as possible without spending too much time. Participants’ lack of appreciation of the importance of metacognitive reading strategies shows that they were not yet able to become truly critical and effective readers.

Another area of metacognitive strategies that students failed to access was metacognitive listening strategies. Mariko failed to use planning, monitoring and self-evaluation strategies to listen effectively. Data reveal that Mariko’s inability to use these metacognitive strategies was related to her limited English language proficiency. When she did not understand some words, she could not continue concentrating on the listening. Listening to lectures and following the flow of the discussions were activities that were just too difficult for Mariko. According to Oxford (1990a), the conscious use of metacognitive strategies helps learners get back their focus when they lose it and this Mariko could not do. Therefore Mariko remained limited in her capacity to listen effectively. O’Malley et al. (1989) found that skilled listeners use metacognitive strategies to redirect their attention back to the comprehension breakdown, whereas less skilled listeners give up and stop listening. Mariko’s listening strategy use in the present study confirmed this.

However, the most ineffectively used metacognitive strategies were – planning, monitoring and self-evaluation tutorial participation metacognitive strategies. Participants (Ai, Akio, Maly and Nori) could not use these strategies because they could not understand what was going on in the tutorials due to their limited English language proficiency. They also felt discomfort and perceived a lack of acceptance by their Australian peers. Because of these issues they felt frustrated and had a strong sense of marginalisation during tutorials. They believed that these circumstances hindered them in participating in tutorials and worked against them being able to use the strategies. This finding is in line with Oxford’s (1994) finding that learners with negative attitudes
and beliefs often exhibit poor strategy use or lack of ability to orchestrate the use of strategies.

Data suggest another explanation for their poor use of tutorial participation metacognitive strategies. The fact that participants found it difficult to ‘jump’ into a discussion, and interject in open-ended and free-flowing discussions is related to their previous pedagogical orientation and experiences. These were structured and dependent on the teacher who rarely encouraged them to participate in discussions (Chapter 4, Section 4.2.1). Therefore, the significant differences in pedagogical styles between Australia and their home countries’ education also contributed to participants’ poor use of tutorial participation strategies. These reasons resulted in participants avoiding participation in tutorials all together.

Overall, besides participants’ limited English language proficiency that negatively influenced their use of metacognitive strategies, data show that there was a lack of appreciation of the need for critical thinking as participants engaged in the academic discourses of the LC2. They did not, and could not, use the metacognitive strategies to good effect at all.

8.5.2.2 Impact of LLS use on socialising within the Australian context

Four of the eight principal participants were exposed to oral communication strategies through the strategy training program. It should be noted here that only half of the participants chose to engage with these types of strategies. This was because two participants felt they did not need to learn about oral communication strategies as they had Australian friends. The other two participants did not feel they needed to engage with the LC2 community or make Australian friends.

After the strategy training program, as seen in the accounts of the four participants’ strategy use, they readily recognised the usefulness of oral communication strategies. Overall, it was found that participants used the oral communication strategies consciously and consistently. Participants used strategies to start conversations, keep conversations going, and to maintain interactions with their conversation partners. In addition, they used strategies in tailored combinations. Oxford (1994) identifies that well tailored combinations of strategies often have more impact than single strategies.
Such strategy use on the part of participants was encouraging from the point of view that participants were “not mere sponges” (Chamot, 1987, p. 82), but were capable of contributing in their own learning process (Larsen-Freeman, 2001).

The context in which they chose to use them is, however, significant. Two of the four participants (Sung Hi and Annan) successfully used the oral communication strategies by creating opportunities to engage with native English speakers. This means that the opportunities that the students created for themselves to communicate with LC2 English speakers provided an appropriate context to use the LLS effectively.

However, the findings that emerged from the other two participants’ accounts of their strategy use were different. This was because they did not create opportunities to talk to LC2 English speakers and thus did not use the LLS in their most appropriate context. These findings reveal that isolation from the host community and feelings of rejection by conversation partners can result in ineffective or limited strategy use. Dara used the oral communication strategies mostly with his fellow PhD students who were from the same or similar cultures. This insulated him from language ‘experts’ and limited his opportunities to apprentice himself through L2 socialisation processes. This finding shows that physical location in the LC2, with mere exposure to LC2 practices, do not of themselves, provide an appropriate and adequate context for LLS use. The appropriate context for LLS use is one that enables interaction with LC2 community members. As Gao (2006) identifies, making friends with locals, living with local students, and guessing or acquiring meanings of new words in real life interactions are excellent contexts for learners to use LLS and improve English. As can be seen in Dara’s case, he used the LLS consciously and effectively however only with his ‘like’ people. Dara failed to use the strategies appropriately in real life with LC2 community members beyond the university context. This finding clearly demonstrates that context is critical for supporting appropriate LLS use and that this is significant for successful translation into the LC2. In this sense, this study adds to the existing literature on LLS use by further emphasising the importance of learning context.

With respect to Maly, her perceived rejection by her conversation partners prevented her from using the strategies effectively. What this highlights is that conscious strategy use can be impacted negatively by other factors in the environment. This finding, emerging from Maly’s account, suggests that she needed help in managing her feelings
so as to remain relaxed and positive as she engaged in oral interaction. According to Naiman, Frohlich, Stern and Todesco (1978), it is important to come to terms with the affective demands of learning a new language. Krashen (1981) is another researcher who stresses the importance of what he calls the “Affective Filter”, which he believes, under unfavourable conditions, can block language acquisition. Oxford (1990a; 1999) also emphasises promoting affective strategies. Within the time constrains of this study (see Chapter 3, Section 3.6), significant attention to this area within the strategy training program was not able to be achieved.

Data suggest that overall the notion of translation was too hard and confronting for Dara and Maly and this hindered them with respect to social involvement with English speakers. Therefore, they remained relatively isolated within the LC2. As MacIntyre and Doucette (2010, p. 162) state “the L2 learner’s decision to initiate conversation has been linked to the notion of crossing the Rubicon, an irrevocable decision that can lead to success or failure”. This was the case for Dara and Maly.

8.5.2.3 Impact of LLS use on continued language development

Evidence with respect to this research question comes essentially from self-report of the participants. In their second interviews participants asserted that they believed that their language had developed through the use of LLS. But there is little evidence to corroborate this. Participants felt positive about the impact of LLS on language development but the voices of the participants themselves, reported verbatim in this study, do little to support such an assertion.

However, these accounts raise questions regarding the degree to which such improvement in English occurs when a student is not participating in tutorials or if a student understands ‘a lot’ only by monitoring the flow of discussion. Based on what participants have had to say about their proficiency level, it is overly simplistic to suggest an uncomplicated linear association between learners’ self-perceptions associated with their proficiency improvement and strategy use. Due to the time constraints of this study, it was difficult to see the long-term impact of LLS use on participants’ English language proficiency. This needs to be considered in future research.
8.5.3 Impact of strategy training in the use of LLS to support ‘translation’ into the LC2

In order to articulate and illuminate how strategy training in the use of LLS impacted on supporting participant ‘translation’ into the LC2, this dissertation presents a revised languaculture model. Data from the study have enabled a refinement of Agar’s (1994; 2006) languaculture model to better accommodate how training in the use of LLS can support translation. In what follows, this reconceptualisation is presented and discussed with respect to the general questions of this study.

8.6 Reconceptualising Agar’s languaculture model

A number of changes to Agar’s languaculture model have been made in response to the findings that have emerged around the key concepts used in this study. The refined model (Figure 8.1) presents a visual representation of how the emergent factors fit together. It should be noted however, that any diagrammatic representation of factors within processes can be open to either simplistic or too rigid an interpretation. Processes are dynamic and thus the model presented should be viewed as articulating key elements or factors that can operate and impact differently in diverse contexts.

Figure 8.1 A reconceptualisation of Agar's languaculture model
8.6.1 Explaining the ‘refined languaculture model’

As explained in Chapter 1, Agar differentiates between languaculture 1 (LC1) - source languaculture and languaculture 2 (LC2) - target languaculture. Agar states that language users draw on all kinds of things besides grammar and vocabulary such as past knowledge, local and cultural information, habits and behaviours. Later, Agar (2006, p. 6) defines culture as “translation” in relation to his notion of ‘languaculture’. According to Agar, “Culture is a lens built for LC1 that focuses on problematic meanings in LC2 and the contexts that render them understandable” (p. 6). Culture is therefore “an artificial construction built to enable translation between them and us, between source and target” (p. 6). These concepts or Agar’s notion of ‘languaculture’ serve as the basis for the development of this new model.

This study was about translation. This study was concerned with the ‘kinds of things’ that Agar refers to but it was particularly focused on processes associated with learning about and using LLS to support academic discourse socialisation and L2 socialisation as aspects of translation. The use of the term ‘translation arena’ was extrapolated from Agar’s notion of translation and this enables more clarity around Agar’s notion of ‘translation’. In this study, the ‘translation arena’ is a place or scene where forces contend, events unfold, and there is activity, debate and conflict. These activities and factors are used to explain the revised languaculture model together with the findings of this study because the findings illuminate additional key elements within ‘translation’.

**Forces contend**

Within the context of this study and the reconceptualised model, ‘forces contend’ encapsulates such things as experiences and artifacts of the LC1 associated with participants’ English language learning experiences and the use of LLS in their home country contexts. Also included here are experiences of, and expectations associated with LC2 before the strategy training program. The findings of this study reveal that in the LC1 participants experienced a very different academic culture to that of their Australian university. In their LC1 context, participants experienced an education system that did not encourage them to take an active role in constructing knowledge but instead was characterised by a scholastic, didactic approach of transmission and testing, with minimum attention to interactive learning. Participants’ LC1 English language education did not prepare them to use the language conventions necessary for effective communication using a range of text types and discourse patterns with speakers of the
English language. Participants did not know how to provide their opinions spontaneously and had little understanding of the concept of LLS as we know them within Western discourses. Overall, participant data indicate that they were positioned in their home education systems as essentially passive learners.

As such, when participants commenced their studies in an Australian university, both their English language proficiency and preparedness for learning and living in Australia were extremely limited. They were trying to engage with the L2 academic discourses using strategies and approaches derived from the LC1 context such as working hard and interpreting information as being either right or wrong (see Chapter 5, Section 5.3). These approaches were of limited assistance in the LC2. In addition, participants were isolated from the host community and their social interactions were restricted for the most part, to their ‘like’ people. Thus forces associated with their LC1 learning and living experiences contended with LC2 expectations and experiences.

In addition, this study identified that limited English language proficiency was a significant challenge that had a considerable impact on participants’ socialisation and participation both academically and socially. These contending forces meant that at the beginning of the study, for participants, the translation arena was a place where they were principally ‘spectators’ on the fringes. This study sought to investigate the provision of support to draw participants away from the fringes towards the LC2. Data from the study have identified significant elements within this process as being ‘experts’ and/or ‘core members’ and LLS as tools. Within the reconceptualised model, these are, therefore, located within the translation arena as mechanisms to support the translation process.

**Events unfold**

The events that have unfolded in this study embrace participant experiences pre, during, and post the strategy training program. It was expected that participants would be better able to translate with the help of LLS. It was also expected that scaffolded learning across the ZPD would be an essential process in participants learning to be able to use LLS effectively and appropriately. Hence, the identification of the ZPD as a place for linkage within the reconceptualised model.
**Activity**

In terms of activity, data from the study identify that strategy training of itself is not enough to facilitate translation. Other activities were essential. Contact and exchange with expert language users and/or core members has emerged as being critical with respect to modeling language use, providing access to the LC2, nurturing and scaffolding. In this study, experts were the participants’ Australian classmates and members of the wider Australian community. Participants were encouraged and supported to communicate with these English language experts. Not all participants, however, accessed the experts and the findings of the study illustrate the negative impact this had on translation. Data suggest that my role as a core member to facilitate training and scaffold learning, as well as being able to empathise and share experiences, was assistive with the translation process. The activities of the participants themselves however were critical.

Their initial engagement with LLS training and their subsequent use of LLS supported by the strategy checklist was significant. Data from the study suggest that the relationship between participants and experts and/or core member is key in their ability to successfully translate into the LC2. This finding supports the work of Schieffelin and Ochs (1986) who argue that expert facilitation or guidance in the ZPD is essential in socialisation processes because through ‘guided or collaborative interactions’, novices socialise into L2 norms, organise, and acquire cultural knowledge that is culturally situated and widespread in its use in everyday communication. Within the reconceptualised languaculture model, this is recognised and aligned with LLS tools. The recognition of this alignment is a significant outcome of this study.

**Debate and conflict**

The findings of this study identify that the process of translation between LC1 and LC2 is not easy. Accounts of participants’ experiences with the use of LLS reveal internal and external debate and conflict. Participants debated within themselves with respect to what their difficulties in using LLS were and how they could ‘move’ into the LC2.

Debate and conflict were also part of the external environment and activities within the translation arena, and these were problematic for participants to differing degrees. Most found the expectations around debate, argument and conflict with respect to academic
activities, particularly tutorials, to be confronting. For example, before the strategy training program, Sung Hi said

*I found that Australian students they usually ask like everything when they feel they have problem. Even that is so small. But to me if it is small I think I can handle it. I am alone in the class, as an Asian as a female student so I feel shy. And we are not aggressive people like Western people.*

Here Sung Hi perceived her Australian classmates’ asking questions regardless of whether the question was significant or not as “aggressive”. This example demonstrates conflict or a clash between LC1 values and understandings and those of the LC2. As reported by Barnard (2009) being upfront and assertive and asking questions was difficult for participants such as those in this study. Sung Hi’s comments after the training program illustrate, however, that within the translation arena training and the use of LLS can have an impact:

*… at the moment I ask even though that is small. I wanna show that I am here. I don’t feel shy with my mistakes anymore. I asked people to explain again rather than to be panic.*

Therefore, this study shows that the use of LLS has mitigated the influence of the behavior or actions of Australian students on Sung Hi.

Also, context has emerged as being critical for supporting appropriate LLS use and this is significant for successful translation into the LC2. However, for some participants using LLS in the broader Australian context was not an easy thing to do. As discussed in Section 8.5.2.2, for example, Dara did not challenge himself to come out his comfort and talk to Australian people. Instead he isolated himself from the host community and this negatively impacted on his ability to appropriately use LLS.

As a result of such debates and conflicts experienced by the participants, this study identifies that the process of translation into the LC2 is not easy. This brings us to the answer to the final research question ‘How can training in the use of LLS support ‘translation’ into the LC2?’

### 8.6.2 Addressing the final research question

As evidenced from the previous discussion, the answer to this question is not straightforward because participants attempted to translate differently whilst dealing with the complexities within the translation arena. The findings indicate that strategy
training and use can have a positive impact on participants’ learning and living experiences and that they can support the translation process into LC2 academic and social discourses. The findings show that LLS can help in the move away from the fringes of the translation arena. This was the case for Akio, Annan, Sung Hi, and Ai. In this regard, this study does reveal a number of critical factors with respect to how training in the use of LLS can support translation. These are:

- Context appropriate strategy use
- Use of expert or core members to model and also scaffold and support LLS use as tools
- Use of tools independently facilitated through a strategy checklist

Context is critical for supporting appropriate LLS use. The appropriate context for LLS use is one that enables interaction with LC2 members. Training for context appropriate strategy use so that learners are able to interact with experts is identified from this study as being significant. Data from this study show that the relationship between learners such as the participants, and experts, is key with respect to the ability to successfully negotiate academic and social discourses and translate into the LC2. For example, Annan made a significant change in his approach to talking to Australians with the help of oral communication strategies. Annan said:

\[\text{First in the past, I just waiting somebody to say something first then I respond for them but now I think I got used to improve myself to make conversation to others. That is why [strategies] very impressive. ... If you want to improve English ... better try to keep relationship with others [English speakers].}\]

In this sense, this study adds to the literature by linking the notion of context appropriate LLS use and expert facilitation with strategy training. As can be seen throughout this dissertation, LLS literature talks about the relationship between LLS use and context. L2 socialisation literature deals with novice learning through expert facilitation. Therefore, by training for context appropriate strategy use so that learners are able to interact with experts, this study adds to our understanding of effective strategy training and also to the academic literature associated with this area.

Moreover, core member support is also shown through this study to be critical in effective LLS use. In the context of this study, my role as a core member was important in scaffolding and supporting participants’ LLS use. As Annan said “\text{If somebody like you have a checklist for everyone to do every day ... I think it is very useful’’}. This is significant because as a core member I could truly relate to what participants experienced during socialisation processes but I also had the competence to model,
scaffold and support LLS use. This was due to my experiences with LLS as a learner, as a teaching professional and also as a researcher. Again by linking the notion of core member in scaffolding and supporting participants’ LLS use with strategy training, this study adds an additional dimension to the strategy training literature.

However, findings from the study that indicate unsuccessful strategy use, particularly from data from Dara, Maly Mariko and Nori, who remained as ‘spectators’ on the fringes of the translation arena serve to highlight the complexity of the translation process. This study identifies that strategy training will only be able to support in the metacognitive use of language if the participants have adequate language proficiency. Data show that learning to use metacognitive strategies was too difficult for the participants’ level of English language proficiency. This was evident in participants’ comments “I easily got lost” (Maly), “this strategy [monitoring strategies] always make me depressed because my understanding is sometimes wrong!” (Akio) or “I can’t understand what they [Australian students] saying. … teacher talks really fast and I have no idea what she is saying... I don't talk” (Nori). Therefore, training in the use of metacognitive strategies had limited effect for participants in supporting translation into the LC2. This study suggests that if the language level of participants is limited then success with training will also be limited.

8.7 Contributions of this study

This study makes practical and theoretical contributions to a number of areas. In practical terms, this study contributes to learning and teaching practices with respect to using strategy training, particularly in EAP programs. From a theoretical perspective, this study contributes to LLS research methodology by integrating phenomenology and ethnomethodology to systematically capture and unpack participants’ lived-experiences. Also, this study makes contributions to the LLS research body by building knowledge in the use of LLS from a qualitative rather than measurement perspective. In addition, the double narrative approach used in this study can be considered as a contribution to the field as this approach has enabled the highlighting of the complexities of my language experiences alongside those of the principal participants’ in this study.
A significant theoretical contribution of this study is the reconceptualised languaculture model and the development of a better understanding of the role of LLS in the processes of L2 socialisation. These contributions are explored in the following sections.

8.7.1 Contributions to strategy training programs

The findings of this study reveal the importance of involving participants in the choice of areas for strategy training rather than just ‘lumping’ them into a generic EAP program. In other words, this study identifies the importance of developing strategy training programs based on learners’ specific needs. Giving students a say through interview and needs analysis is demonstrated in this study as an essential element to ensure that participants’ specific needs are targeted and addressed. Also, this study identifies that supporting scaffolded learning and explicit teaching to help learners to better translate into the LC2 academic and social practices is an effective way to increase awareness and use of LLS.

Equally important as the development of strategy training specific to students’ needs, is the use of a strategy checklist after the completion of the strategy training program. A checklist is a tool that helps learners to track, evaluate, continue and consolidate their strategy use in order to identify those areas still requiring work. The methodology of this study has taken the strategy checklist beyond the strategy training and out of the classroom into the LC2. It has elongated the intervention of the training program making it more capable of bringing about long term change in language use. Whilst the literature (e.g. Cohen, Weaver & Li, 1998; Rubin, Chamot, Harris, & Anderson, 2007) supports the use of checklists, discussion is predominantly within the context of pre/post test methodology rather than over an extended period of real world use (e.g. Chamot & Rubin, 1994; Hasan, Macaro, Mason, Bye Smith & Vanderplank, 2005). Findings from the study suggest that more frequent use of this type of tool has the capacity to be effective for learners to support and evaluate their strategy use for an extended period rather than just as a testing mechanism before and after a formal training intervention.

In addition, this study highlights the importance of extending the role of ‘teacher’ (particularly teacher of English/academic skills) to be inclusive of explicit attention to factors and experiences associated with L2 socialisation, not just language. This study
has established that the role of experts or core members is important in participants’ ability to use LLS. Increasing awareness of the role of teachers as experts and core members will add weight to the benefits of strategy training programs.

These practical contributions to learning and teaching, particularly with respect to the use of strategy training programs are incorporated in the reconceptualised model and offer specific areas that deserve to be considered in the development of future strategy training programs. The use of this model enables both teachers and learners included in strategy training to better account for, and balance factors within the complexity of translation.

8.7.2 Contributions to theoretical orientations in LLS research

The integration of phenomenology and ethnomethodology as theoretical perspectives within the research methodology of this study also contributes to knowledge in the LLS field. Phenomenology and ethnomethodology are not theoretical perspectives commonly employed in the area of LLS research. In this study, phenomenology offered an opportunity to richly and deeply probe the lived-experiences of the participants in order to capture how participants made meaning from within their LC1 and then the LC2, and also the changing nature of LLS use in both languacultures. Ethnomethodologically, the strategy training program served as a way of supporting participants to operate within the LC2 with the help of LLS. By integrating these two perspectives within the study design, this dissertation has established their usefulness in making sense the use of LLS across different contexts - home country contexts and across academic and social contexts within a LC2. More specifically, the elements drawn from both traditions have been conceptually useful, as they have provided a way of understanding and explaining the phenomenon of participants’ learning and living experiences within everyday academic and social contexts.

Another contribution that this study makes to LLS research is that this study adds to the limited body of research on LLS that is qualitative and that provides rich descriptions of participant experience. As identified in the review of the literature, LLS studies have been predominantly conducted from a quantitative perspective and have lacked a qualitative focus (see Chapter 2, Section 2.3 and 2.4). This study has gone some way to
building knowledge in the use of LLS from a qualitative rather than measurement perspective.

The double narrative approach (my story recorded through reflective journaling and the stories of participants) that I have taken to write this dissertation also makes a contribution to the field. By deliberatively and purposefully recounting my rich language experience from the perspective of a learner, teaching professional and researcher alongside that of the principal participants in this study, I have been able to use narrative inquiry (Smith, 2007) to highlight the complexity of the experiences explored in this study.

Also from a theoretical perspective, a significant contribution of this study lies in that it has connected the two theoretical orientations of LLS and L2 socialisation. Previously these have, for the most part, been conceptualised, theorised and operationalised discreetly in LLS and L2 socialisation studies. Out of this study emerges a theoretically more cohesive model (based on Agar’s notion of languaculture) that incorporates concepts of L2 socialisation together with the LLS concept. In this light, and also in light of the findings, this study contributes to the development of a better understanding of the role of LLS in the processes of apprenticing L2 students of Asian backgrounds, such as participants in this study, into the academic and social discourses of the LC2. In other words, this new model provides a clearer articulation of forces, factors and processes that impact the learning and living experiences of such students within the LC2. The study itself illuminates how these forces, factors and processes interrelate and interact to influence success in the translation process.

8.8 Limitations of the study

This study has a number of limitations. One limitation of this study stems from the time constraints of both participants and the researcher. This meant that the design-based research element of the study could not be operationalised in an iterative way. Consequently, within this study there was no chance to develop and implement the next iteration of the strategy training program. The findings of this study suggest however that the next iteration would need to incorporate affective strategies such as ‘identifying one’s anxiety level’, ‘talking about feelings’ and ‘positive self-talk’ so that learners are better prepared to deal with negative or perceived negative attitudes. Such strategies
have the capacity to help learners to manage destructive feelings and focus on accomplishing academic and social language tasks. The next iteration of the strategy training program would also benefit from the inclusion of additional intensive work in the area of metacognitive strategy use.

Another limitation of this study relates to the reliance on self-report to determine the impact of LLS use on the continued development of English language proficiency. Based on their perceptions, in their interviews, participants stated that their English language proficiency had improved through the use of LLS. However, these accounts raise questions regarding the degree to which such improvement in English occurs when findings of the study reveal that participants struggled to use metacognitive strategies due to their limited English language proficiency. Therefore, the use of self-report as a way of assessing participants’ proficiency level after the strategy training program was not a sufficiently precise tool to enable a clear picture of the impact of the strategy training program on participants’ language use and proficiency. However, in this study it is acknowledged that five days of intensive strategy training and eight weeks of evaluating strategy application is a very short time frame for significant changes in language proficiency to occur.

Also, as initially planned, this research project was conceptualised around selecting a single cohort of participants from a pre-university admission intensive EAP program. However, due to a lack of response from potential volunteers wanting to participate in the study, I was forced to use an alternative way of recruiting additional participants from the case study university. As a result, this study came to include participants from a range of disciplines in both undergraduate and postgraduate degree courses. I was concerned that this situation was not ideal. Also, the length of time participants had lived in Australia by the time they participated in this study varied greatly and I was concerned that this would impact or compromise findings. Initially this presented as a possible limitation of the study. However, data suggest that the significant commonalities in participant experiences both in the LC1 and LC2 demonstrate that this was not a limitation. In fact, this shows that there were core issues and difficulties that impacted Asian learners irrespective of level of study or length of stay.
8.9 Suggestions for future research

In the previous section it was noted that this study could not be operationalised in an iterative way. More studies need to be conceptualised and enacted to be iterative in order to enhance opportunities for a positive outcome for learners as well as to provide for improved program design. In addition, as mentioned previously, in future research, strategy training programs would benefit from the inclusion of affective strategies in their design. Data from this study identify the need for considering including affective strategies in the first cycle of the program so that learners are well aware early on of the importance of coming to terms with the affective demands of learning a new language (Naiman, Frohlich, Stern & Todesco (1978). Affective strategies will assist learners in identifying the factors that can negatively influence strategy use.

Future research also needs to use more precise tools to measure students’ language proficiency level instead of solely depending on self-report. Self-report may be used as a base for understanding learners’ English language proficiency from their point of view. However, this study identifies that this tool does not have the capacity to clearly determine the relationship between the impact of a strategy training program and providing an accurate measure of language proficiency. It needs to be stated however, the measuring proficiency is notoriously both complex and contested within the area of applied linguistics.

Additional studies also need to be conducted to ‘test’ the utility of the revised languaculture model with respect to supporting students’ L2 socialisation processes across academic and social discourses through the use of LLS. Application of the revised model with similar participants and contexts and also with different participants and in a diversity of contexts (such as schools or workplaces) would provide additional opportunities to investigate the utility of the model as well as the trustworthiness of the findings of this study.

8.10 Recommendations for institutions

Based on the findings of this study, several recommendations for institutions are made. It is recommended that tertiary institutions in Australia review entrance requirements such as IELTS and TOEFL in order to identify the extent to which they are valid
indicators of competence to enable Asian L2 students to effectively engage with all aspects of Australian curriculum. This is important. The review of the literature identifies that TOEFL is not a reliable tool to measure proficiency (Griffiths, 2003b) and IELTS does not of itself provide a comprehensive preparation for coping with language issues in, for example, Australian universities (Sawir, 2005). These findings are confirmed in the present study.

If after review, IELTS and instruments like IELTS are retained, it is recommended that required entrance scores be reviewed. Data from this study indicate that current scores are not a good indicator of student success. Determinations need to be made as to what scores are really required to enable L2 students of Asian background to operate effectively in the Australian tertiary environment. As can be seen from the data of this study, participants struggled on a daily basis to navigate their ways through the academic and social practices of the LC2, even though they met the entrance requirements of the case study university. It is useful to cite Ingram’s (2005) comments with respect to the issues associated with IELTS. Ingram, a co-developer of IELTS, suggests that issues associated with the testing system should be solved by universities who are accepting students, and that this should be done by establishing “realistic and appropriate proficiency levels for entry purposes” (2005, para. 2). As to what this might comprise Ingram makes no further comment.

Also, consideration needs to be given within Australian tertiary institutions as to how to best support students. The roles and activities of learning and teaching centres within universities deserve to be reviewed. It is recommended that as part of this review process, learning and teaching centres examine mechanisms that can be put in place. This is to be done not only to support Asian L2 students, but also to support academics so that they can better identify with the needs and lived-experiences of their students, as well as appreciate that they have a role in being the ‘experts’ or ‘core members’ in supporting the translation process. Evidence from studies such as Whitelaw et al. (2010) indicate that whilst some work in this area is happening in Australia, more needs to be done.

In addition, EAP program providers who aim to develop academic English language and research skills necessary for successful university learning are encouraged to review their programs. This study advocates the need for review particularly of generic EAP
programs. It recommends that consideration be given to making more widespread use of specific, tailored programs that better accommodate the diversity of academic discourses addressed within institutions. As discussed previously, Yada’s experience of EAP was one where the level of English language required in generic EAP classes was not compatible with the level required for study in a Masters program. Morita (2009) reports similar findings with respect to content and academic skills taught in EAP classes in a Canadian university.

Also, this study suggests including additional intercultural perspectives in EAP programs. The provision of factual, stereotypical information about Australian culture is shown by this study to be inadequate with respect to L2 socialisation. More attention is needed with respect to the Australian way of life, cultural norms and routines of interaction so as to support the development of an intercultural perspective and effective L2 socialisation into the LC2.

It is recognised that these recommendations will have financial implications for EAP providers. However, these need to be measured against the obligation to provide quality, effective programs. Also, as shown by this study, including strategy training programs that address both academic and L2 socialisation aspects in EAP programs has the potential to be of benefit to students.

8.11 Advice for students like me

I started this dissertation with my own story so it is only fitting that I use my story to bring this dissertation to a close. In light of the findings of this study and my own experiences as student, teacher, a core member, and now as a researcher, I have some advice to share with students from Asia who are wanting to study in an Australian university context. My advice will provide some practical steps that prospective students can take to support ‘translation’ and enhance their learning and living experiences within the Australian context.

First, I would like to suggest to L2 students of Asian background that they find out more about TOEFL or IELTS (or whatever the ‘gate keeping’ mechanism is) that will allow them entry to their Australian university of choice. I want students like me to understand that the tests that they do to meet university entrance requirements neither
prepare them, nor provide an accurate measurement of their capacity to cope with the
discursive academic practices of Australian universities. I now know that neither the
IELTS nor the TOEFL test is designed to predict the subsequent academic performance
of tests takers (Hirsh, 2007, p. 196). I know this from my own experience and now also
from my research. I remember being back in Mongolia and preparing for the IELTS
listening test. I practised multiple choice questions, matching or sentence completion
tasks by listening to a number of different monologues and conversations. I was good at
these tests. It was only later after commencing my sojourn in Australia, that I realised
that these particular tests were not indicative of what was required in listening to
discipline specific lectures or discussions of academic texts - academic practices
common in Australian universities. My realisation is in line with what Griffiths (2003b)
identifies with regard to the reliability of such tests. Griffiths (2003b, p. 37) points out
that “real” language is not multi-choice, and therefore, it is difficult to be sure that
multi-choice questions are really measuring what they are supposed to be measuring.
What I experienced in my IELTS test was nowhere near reflective of what I had to do in
an Australian university. I cannot help but think that tests such as IELTS are a very
artificial and inaccurate way of measuring language proficiency and granting access to
LC2. I urge students like me to understand the issues around such tests and be well
informed about the real requirements of Australian universities.

My advice to students like me is that preparation for the test is not enough. Prospective
students from Asia need to seek out opportunities to interact in English – face-to-face,
online, it does not matter. What matters is that real oral interaction (not contrived or
rehearsed unnatural interactions), and real English language deployment become a
significant part of pre-departure preparation either at an institutional or individual level.

On this note, I want to remind Asian students like me that they came from cultures
where language is learnt as code and is rarely acknowledged as social practice (Scarino
& Liddicoat, 2009, p.16). Knowing sixteen different English language tenses will not
help to engage in debate or critically analyse academic texts. Students from Asia need to
remember that the social aspect of learning a language deserves to be considered, and
engaged with, even if it is beyond the formal experiences and expectations of learning
English within the LC1.
And then after students arrive in Australia, I strongly encourage them to seek out opportunities to interact with English first language speakers – with ‘experts’ (Duff, 2012) and also with ‘core members’ (Vickers, 2007). I urge students like me to get as much exposure to Australian (LC2) social practices as possible. I credit my broader exposure to English with much of my development in really being able to use the English language. This has been emphasised as important by many researchers in the literature (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Li, 2000; Ohta, 2001; Wersch, 1985). I believe that my involvement in social activities had a positive impact on my ability to learn academically. I started feeling confident with my English and comfortable studying with a diverse group of students in one classroom. Reading academic texts started making a lot more sense and writing academic essays became easier as I continued the process of socialising into the LC2 academic and social discourses of Australia. Volet (1999, p. 628) states that “when English language is not an issue, Asian undergraduate students tend to perform better in their academic study …”, this proved to be true in my experience. However, it took me a long time and a lot of exposure to, and use of English, for it not to be an issue.

I am always mindful of not forgetting the challenges I faced as a student when I embarked on my journey after arrival in Australia. The stages of my development as an L2 student involved some difficult periods where I was frustrated and challenged. The challenging situations made me seek ways of learning the English language better. For me it was a toolkit comprising LLS that helped significantly in this regard. I want to suggest to other Asian students that they too use such a toolkit.

I particularly recommend that students from Asia, like me, use simple oral communication strategies to get them started on arrival in Australia. However, it is important to understand that, as is demonstrated through this study, the use of oral communication strategies will only be successful when learners are willing to step out of their ‘comfort zone’ to listen to, and to talk to speakers of the English language. Sometimes it happens that conversation partners do not show much interest in talking to the ‘foreigner’. Students may feel disappointment or rejection as was seen through the experiences of some of the principal participants in this study. However, I encourage future students to see these feelings as natural and normal and not to allow such feelings to hinder them in the learning process. As Peloghities (2006, p. 48) puts it, students need to have an “ability to cope with the unexpected”. Initial use of oral communication
strategies will support the development of more complex strategies and this will help students to compensate in dealing with their language problems (Bialystok, 1990).

It must be remembered, however, that the level of English that students need in order to participate in academic practices is much more demanding and complex. Reading academic texts critically and writing highly structured critical essays may seem alien for L2 students like me. Also, students need to understand that a certain level of academic uncertainty is natural. I want Asian students to be aware of this and I urge them to use LLS to support their use of academic practices of the LC2.

It concerns me that many students from Asia are unaware of LLS that are appropriate for the context of learning and living in Australia. I therefore encourage students to seek out opportunities to participate in strategy training programs where they will have access to these. By participating in such programs, students can learn how to approach a learning task and know what strategies are best able to support them in achieving a desired outcome. I also recommend the use of a strategy checklist to keep students on track and check progress as they translate into the LC2. This study shows that using LLS as tools has the potential to clarify uncertainties and support successful engagement with respect to learning and living within the LC2 context.

This then brings me to the final words of this study. Throughout this dissertation I have shared the particularities of my lived experiences as a Mongolian student learning and living in Australia. My engagement with the English language, and the obstacles I have had to surmount as part of my translation experience, have brought me to this point and enabled me to reflect on my journey. I hope that my experience of traversing the translation arena, and of helping others to do the same, as recorded in this research, will be of benefit to academics and students alike, and that this study can make a contribution to both scholarship and practice.
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Example strategies as itemised in SILL, adapted from Oxford (1990b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Representative strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
<td>I plan my schedule so I will have enough time to study English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies</td>
<td>I have clear goals for improving my English skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think about my progress in learning English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>I practise the sounds of English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies</td>
<td>I start conversations in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I read for pleasure in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>I practise English with other students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies</td>
<td>I ask questions in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I try to learn about the culture of English speakers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>I use rhymes to remember new English words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies</td>
<td>I use flashcards to remember new English words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I review English lessons often.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>To understand unfamiliar English words, I make guesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies</td>
<td>I read English without looking up every new word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I make up new words if I do not know the right ones in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>I try to relax whenever I feel afraid of using English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies</td>
<td>I give myself a reward or treat when I do well in English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I write down my feelings in a language learning diary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example strategies adapted from O’Malley and Chamot (1990).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Representative strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metacognitive</td>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies</td>
<td>Self-monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>Repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies</td>
<td>Note taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and affective</td>
<td>Questioning for clarification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strategies</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-talk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Information Letter

We invite you to participate in a research study looking at the effects of language learning strategies on the continued development of English language proficiency. This study is for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the School of Education at Murdoch University. My supervisors are Dr Lindy Norris and Prof Simone Volet.

Nature and Purpose of the Study
The aims of this study are to investigate:

- The impact of Asian students’ previous cultural-educational experiences on the continued development of English language proficiency within the context of Australian tertiary study.
- Language learning strategy use pre and post commencement of study in Australia.
- Socialisation patterns adopted by Asian students within the Australian context and the possible impact of these on strategy use and the continued development of English language proficiency within academe and also more broadly in Australian community life.

What the Study will Involve
If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete the following tasks:

- An interview at the beginning of the study that asks you about your English language learning experiences in your home and host countries.
- Involvement in a strategy training program that will develop your strategy use in i.e., speaking, listening, reading, writing and viewing in English.
- Observation during the strategy training program
- Second in-depth interview at the end of the research to ask about your overall experiences.
- Consultation and feedback from you in order to confirm the findings
- Interviews will be audio recorded. This will ensure the correct accounts of interview data.

Voluntary Participation and Withdrawal from the Study
Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may withdraw at any time without discrimination or prejudice. All information is treated as confidential and no names or other details that might identify you will be used in any publication arising from the research. If you withdraw, all information you have provided will be destroyed.

If you consent to take part in this research study, it is important that you understand the purpose of the study and the procedures you will be asked to undergo. Please make sure that you ask any questions you may have, and that all your questions have been answered to your satisfaction before you agree to participate.

Benefits of the Study
While there is no guarantee that you will personally benefit, as a result of your involvement, you will have a better understanding of and ability to use language learning strategies to support your academic work, and your engagement with Australian community life in general.

If you are willing to consent to participation in this study, please complete the Consent Form. If you have any questions about this project please feel free to contact either myself, Nara Tsedendamba on mbl. 0433281661 or my supervisor, Dr Lindy Norris, on ph. 9360 2849. My supervisor and I are happy to discuss with you any concerns you may have on how this study has been conducted. If you wish to talk to an independent person about your concerns you can contact Murdoch University’s Human Research Ethics Committee on 9360 6677 or email ethics@murdoch.edu.au

You will receive ongoing feedback during the study and after its completion you will receive a summary of the findings.

This study has been approved by the Murdoch University Human Research Ethics Committee (Approval No. 2008/103)
Consent Form

Title of study: Learning and Living in English

1. I am over 18 years of age and agree voluntarily to take part in this study.

2. I have read the Information Sheet provided and been given a full explanation of the purpose of this study, of the procedures involved and of what is expected of me. The researcher has answered all my questions and has explained the possible problems that may arise as a result of my participation in this study.

3. I understand I am free to withdraw from the study at any time without needing to give any reason.

4. I understand I will not be identified in any publication arising out of this study.

5. I understand that my name and identity will be stored separately from all transcripts, and these are accessible only to the investigators. All data provided by me will be analysed anonymously using code numbers.

6. I understand that all information provided by me is treated as confidential and will not be released by the researcher to a third party unless required to do so by law.

7. I am happy to be audio and video recorded as part of this research. I understand that I do not have to answer particular questions if I do not want to and that I can withdraw at any time without consequences to myself.

Signature of Participant: ____________________________ Date:

............./........../........
(Name)

Signature of Investigator: ____________________________ Date:

............./........../........
(Name)

Supervisor’s Signature: ____________________________ Date:

............./........../........
(Name)
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Questions for the initial semi-structured in-depth interview

1. Home country experiences

- Tell me about yourself. Where are you from? Can you tell me a little bit about your family and about your life before coming to Australia?
- Can you tell me about your educational experiences at home?
- How did you learn English? What were EFL classes like? What did you do in them? What did you do to improve your English? What types of language learning strategies did you use?

2. English in Australia

- How long have you been in Australia?
- Can you tell me about your educational experiences here?
- What do you do to improve your English?
- Who do you hang out with here in Australia? What impact does this have on the continued development of your English language proficiency?
- Have you been taught language learning strategies explicitly in English for Academic Purposes (EAP) classes?
- What did you learn about Australia within EAP classes?
- Has this helped you feel comfortable here?
- Do you think your English has improved since you came to Australia?

3. Life in Australia

- How do you feel about your life in Australia?
- What do you do in your free time?
- Who are your friends?
- Who do you talk to?
- Do you experience any difficulties in your learning and living experiences?
Appendix 3.3

Online survey on English language learning experience

If you are a student from an Asian country and English is your second language, I would like to request your participation in this survey. The survey form contains questions about your English language learning experiences both in your home country and in the Australian context including some questions about how you learn English or the types of language learning strategies that you use. This survey will take approximately 10 minutes. Please remember: There is no right or wrong answer. Your honest responses will be most appreciated. You can circle more than one answer. Confidentiality: All your responses and personal details will be kept confidential. Note: English for academic purposes (EAP) is a course designed for students for whom English is a second language and who want to enter university education after the completion of this course.

PART A: General questions
1. Which country are you from?

2. How many years have you been studying in Australia?

3. How long have you been learning English in total?

4. What type of English language test did you pass in order to study in Australia ie., IELTS, TOEFL and what was your score?

5. Did you attend English for academic purposes (EAP) classes prior to university enrolment?

PART B: English language learning within the home country context
1. Was your English language learning experience within your home country context focused on
   a. developing speaking skills
   b. rote learning
   c. writing English sentences
   d. grammar and reading

2. Did you learn to write academic essays when you were learning English at home?
   a. Yes
   b. No

   If yes, how were you taught this and how did you structure your essays?

3. What do you understand the term ‘language learning strategies’ to mean?

   Please provide your understanding and some examples of language learning strategies:
4. Were you explicitly taught language learning strategies while you were learning English at home?
   a. Yes
   b. No

If yes, what strategies were you taught?

5. With respect to speaking English before coming to Australia, how would you rate yourself?
   a. Very good
   b. Good
   c. Every day English
   d. Very limited

PART C: English language learning within the Australian context

1. If you attended EAP classes, were you taught about Australian culture?
   a. Yes
   b. No

If yes, what sorts of things were you taught?

2. If you attended EAP classes, were you taught about language learning strategies and how to use them?
   a. Yes
   b. No

If yes, what strategies were you taught?

3. What language learning strategies do you use?

   Please provide some examples of language learning strategies:

4. Who are your friends that you spend most of your time with here in Australia?
   a. People from my country
   b. People with a similar culture
   c. Australian people
   d. All of them equally
5. If you spend most of your time with people from your own country or from a similar culture, do you speak with them in
   c. English               c. Both but mostly own language
   d. Own language          d. Both but mostly English

6. Where or how have you improved your English the most?
   a. In tutorials/classes   c. From classmates
   b. From friends           d. Doing other activities ie., watching TV or reading

7. If you have tutorials, how do you feel about your participation in tutorials?
   a. It is easy for me to participate because ...........................................
   b. It is somewhat easy for me when I have spoken to my classmates before the tutorials
   c. My English language ability is not good enough to participate actively
   d. Can’t participate because students speak too fast for me
   e. I don’t understand what students and tutors are saying and I get lost in the middle
   f. I wish I knew some useful tutorial participation strategies to help me to participate better

8. How do you find working through your unit readings?
   a. Easy because I know some good reading strategies
   b. It is somewhat easy when I am familiar with the topic
   c. Difficult because I don’t understand most of what I read
   d. I get confused easily and I don’t feel confident if my understanding is right or wrong
   e. I wish I knew some useful reading strategies to help me do my readings effectively

9. Overall, do you think your English has improved since you came to Australia?
   a. Yes             c. I am happy with how my English has been improving
   b. No              d. Still limited

10. What is the main factor/s that influences your English language improvement?
    a. I socialise with Australians most of the time
    b. I read and watch Australian TV a lot
    c. I always speak English
    d. I use certain strategies to improve my English such as ...........................................

Thank you for your time!
Appendix 3.4

Questions for the second round semi-structured in-depth interview

These are indicative questions. It is expected that more specific questions will arise depending on how the sessions unfold.

Indicative questions for speaking strategy use:

- How/why did you interpret his/her point that way?
- What did you do to participate in the discussion?
- Did the strategies help you to execute the tasks?

Indicative questions for tutorial participation strategy use:

- What strategies did you use to participate in the tutorial participation?
- Why did you like to use … strategies over other strategies?
- Did you notice any changes in your tutorial participation after you have used the strategies?

Indicative questions for writing strategy use:

- How did you construct the plan for your essay?
- How often did you read your essay?
- Did the strategies help you to execute the tasks?

Indicative questions for reading strategy use:

- How did you read the passage?
- What reading strategies did you use?
- Why was it helpful or why not?

Indicative questions for listening strategy use:

- What didn't you understand?
- Can you identify why you didn’t understand?
- Did you need any help?
- How did you figure that out?
- Did they help you to execute the tasks?

General questions:

- Were you able to get the idea of using language learning strategies and how did they assist you in learning?
- What does using language learning strategies mean to you?
- Is this going to assist you for your future learning? How?
- Talk about any changes that have taken place in your life and your learning as a result of being involved in this study. For example:
  - Has the strategy training changed how you go about doing assignments/writing essays?
  - Is your involvement in classes/tutorials different now?
  - Do you now consciously try to improve your English? How/Why?
  - What about other aspects of your life? Are there differences here? Do you have contact with members of the Australian community? How/Why?
Appendix 6.1 – Example session

MODULE 1 - SESSION 1: WHERE DO I START?

In this session, you will:

- Reflect on past oral communication experiences
- Develop an understanding about living in a different culture
- Build a repertoire of strategies to initiate a conversation and keep it going – a positive step towards making friends

Did you know?

Almost everyone feels confused and nervous when they leave their own familiar culture to live in a new different culture. When you live in a new culture, you are bound to face a lot of changes. One of them is changing friends. In other words, you leave your old friends in your culture and make new friends in your new culture.

Making new friends in a different country is not easy because people from other cultures whom you hang out with or go to the same university with may have grown up with values and beliefs that differ from yours. Because of these differences, the things they talk about, the ways they express themselves, and the importance of various ideas may be very different from what you are used to.

Don’t panic! Try to understand your target culture – don’t close yourself up because you are different but instead be open-minded. Remember! If you make yourself unapproachable, no one will approach or talk to you.


TASK 1: Reflect on and discuss the following questions with your partner for 3 minutes. You will be asked to share your thoughts and ideas with the rest of the students.

- Have you experienced any conversation breakdowns since you arrived in Australia? If yes, how did you handle it?
- Have you tried to make Australian friends? How?
TASK 2: Read the following points. Do you agree with the points? Please add some more points.

There are lots of possibilities around you to make friends and improve your English:

- You are in the real English environment
- You are surrounded by many English speaking people
- Everywhere you go (library, lectures, tutorials, students village, shops, bus station, train station etc) you hear and speak English
- You often read English books and watch Australian TV
- You often write in English

TASK 3: Here are some strategies to initiate a conversation. Highlight the ones that you use and share your experiences with your partners. Practise the strategies with your partner.

- When someone smiles at me I smile back and say ‘Hi’ (approachable person)
- I make eye contact with a person I am going to ask a question of or talk to (approachable person). Smile!

  Remember! These two simple acts are the beginning of establishing rapport because you have shown an interest in the other person.

If you have never used these strategies, try the following: Practise the last 2 strategies with your partner. Share your experience with the rest of the students.

- Walk through the mall and just say hello to ten people as you pass them. Keep practising until it feels natural.
- This week I will come to my class (event or meeting) 5 or 10 minutes earlier to warm up my voice eg., ‘Hi, how are you?’ etc
- First week, I will speak one sentence in each tutorial (event or meeting)
- Second week, I will speak two sentences in each tutorial etc (as you see, you can use these strategies in conversations as well)

Of course, you have to stay and talk, not just offer a passing hello.

- Ask people’s names and give my name (approachable person)
- I remember people’s names and repeat the name back in my greeting ‘Nice to meet you, Tom’
- I use the name in the conversation

  Remember! If you’ve forgotten the name better ask ‘Excuse me, I am not sure I got your name’ or ‘I am sorry. I’ve forgotten your name. Please remind me’

  When you take the time to learn another person’s name, you are expressing a sincere interest in that individual that will be warmly received.
TASK 4: Brainstorm some of the strategies to keep the conversation going. Share your strategies with your partner and tell each other your experiences with using the strategies.

Don’t sit back and wait for another person/student to start a conversation

Keeping the conversation going

Here are some more conversation starting statements: Have you used them? Highlight or underline the ones that you have used.

- What a beautiful day. What is your favourite season of the year?
- What a beautiful dress. Where did you get it?
- I was truly touched by that movie. How did you like it? Why?
- This is delicious food. What is your favourite food? Why?
- What a great event/meeting/celebration. Did you find it useful/enjoyable/exciting?
- I was absent from the last week’s tutorial. Could you please tell me what I missed?
- I am so frustrated with lots of new things that I have to adjust to. Have you experienced anything like this before?
- Your lawn always looks so green. What is your secret?
- We’ve been studying together for months now. I’d like to get to know you better. Tell me about some of your outside interests?
- You did pretty well in your presentation. How did you prepare for that?
- I heard that Australians are all into outdoor activities. What is your favourite outdoor activity?

You must be thinking now but how do I keep the conversation going when my English is so limited? There are always good strategies that you can use in your oral communications. Highlight or underline the ones that you have used or use!

- achievement strategies - work on alternative strategy to reach the original goal
- changing the topic
- asking for help
- asking questions
- don’t be afraid to make mistakes
- using substitutions i.e., words, phrases
- taking a risk
- using ‘Jump starters’
- I verbally let others know that I am following
Appendix 6.2

STRATEGY CHECKLIST (ORAL COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES)

It should be noted that participants were given bigger spaces to write their examples of strategy use in the checklist. In this appendix, I have minimised the spaces for ease of perusal.

Please, try to make use of the strategies in your academic learning and social life. Try to use the strategies consciously, appropriately and frequently. Improvement in your language proficiency, academic learning and social life will not happen overnight. It is a gradual process and hopefully the use of these strategies will be assistive.

The following Strategy Checklist will help you and me to see your progress in your strategy use. Please reflect on your strategy use and fill in this form once a week (at the end of the week in your own time) and I will collect this sheet from you once a week until the last week of October. Please write examples of your strategy use – when and how? and place a check mark in the boxes “Yes, it was useful” or “No, it wasn’t useful”. Thank you very much for your time 😊

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies for developing oral communication</th>
<th>Yes, I use it.</th>
<th>Yes, it was useful</th>
<th>No, it wasn’t useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Write examples – when and how did you use the strategy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When someone smiles at me I smile back and say ‘Hi’ (approachable person)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask people’s names and give my name (approachable person)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make eye contact with a person I am talking to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remember people’s names and repeat the name back in my greeting ‘Nice to meet you, Tom’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I walk through the mall and just say hello to people as I walk past them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will speak two sentences in each event or meeting etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work on an alternative strategy to reach the original goal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use substitutions i.e., words, phrases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I change topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask for help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ask questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take a risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not afraid to make mistakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To fill the awkward moments in the conversation, I use ‘Jump Starters’ by asking such questions as ‘Have any of you seen the film …?; Have you heard on the news yesterday that …?’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use conversation starting statements eg What a beautiful day. What is your favourite season of the year?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I verbally let others know that I am following along, actively listening by showing my interest in hearing more, clarifying, arguing, seeking specifics etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRATEGY CHECKLIST (WRITING STRATEGIES)

Please, try to make use of the strategies in your academic learning. Try to use the strategies consciously, appropriately and frequently. Improvement in your language proficiency, academic learning and social life will not happen overnight. It is a gradual process.

The following Strategy Checklist will help you and me to see your progress in your strategy use. Please reflect on your strategy use and fill in this form once a week (at the end of the week in your own time) and I will collect this sheet from you once a week until the last week of October. Please write examples of your strategy use – when and how? and place a check mark in the boxes “Yes, it was useful” or “No, it wasn’t useful”. Thank you very much for your time 😊

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing strategies</th>
<th>Yes, I use it.</th>
<th>Yes, it was useful</th>
<th>No, it wasn’t useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Write examples – when and how did you use the strategy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rough draft - an attempt to get ideas down on paper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redrafting - rethinking ideas on the basis of literature review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redrafting - reshaping ideas to express them more precisely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redrafting - adding additional information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing – spelling, punctuation and grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you check, whether the main argument is clearly established?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you order your argument in a logical sequence?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you use formal English?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you reference the evidences correctly?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your argument convince the reader?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your writing show evidence of critical thinking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please try to make use of the strategies in your academic learning. Try to use the strategies consciously, appropriately and frequently. Improvement in your language proficiency, academic learning and social life will not happen overnight. It is a gradual process.

The following Strategy Checklist will help you and me to see your progress in your strategy use. Please reflect on your strategy use and fill in this form once a week (at the end of the week in your own time) and I will collect this sheet from you once a week until the last week of October. Please write examples of your strategy use – when and how? and place a check mark in the boxes “Yes, it was useful” or “No, it wasn’t useful”. Thank you very much for your time 😊

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tutorial participation strategies</th>
<th>Yes, I use it</th>
<th>Yes, it was helpful</th>
<th>No, it wasn’t useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write examples – when and how did you use the strategy?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning (before the tutorial/discussion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I need to check whether I have understood the tutor’s instruction for the discussion, if not develop an immediate action plan in order to find out i.e., asking a question from the tutor or a group member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I will speak 1 sentence in each tutorial or discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I will try to talk to my classmates to relax myself during tutorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring flow of conversation (during the discussion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- In a tutorial, I need to be aware of the progress of interaction in terms of pace, turn-taking and exchange of information (speaker order)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring comprehension (during the discussion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I need to check or correct my understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring how clearly you have been understood (during the discussion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I need to be aware of listeners’ reactions – listeners’ comprehension of what I said; their responses including both verbal and physical like nodding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluation (after the tutorial/discussion)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I need to reflect on my involvement in the tutorial – write down both my active and inactive involvement in the tutorial: when I was active; when I wasn’t; what I need to change in my next discussion/tutorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Make a bid to participate in the discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Comment on an aspect of the readings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Disagree with a fellow students’ point of view</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Respond to what tutor has said</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRATEGY CHECKLIST (READING STRATEGIES)

Please, try to make use of the strategies in your academic learning. Try to use the strategies consciously, appropriately, and frequently. Improvement in your language proficiency, academic learning and social life will not happen overnight. It is a gradual process.

The following Strategy Checklist will help you and me to see your progress in your strategy use. Please reflect on your strategy use and fill in this form once a week (at the end of the week in your own time) and I will collect this sheet from you once a week until the last week of October. Please write examples of your strategy use – when and how? and place a check mark in the boxes “Yes, it was useful” or “No, it wasn’t useful”. Thank you very much for your time ☺

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading strategies</th>
<th>Yes, I use it</th>
<th>Yes, it was helpful</th>
<th>No, it wasn’t useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highlight interesting points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circle unknown words and look them up later</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write summaries of each reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note-taking of key points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annotate the readings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss interpretation of the reading with a friend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop graphic outline and predicting the content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use mind-map to see how a reading relates to other readings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making meaning from contextual clues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skim reading to get general idea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scan reading to get specific information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am I asking questions about the readings content?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am I critically reflecting on my reading?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am I reading in depth?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am I reading at surface level?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am I developing both ‘deep’ and ‘surface’ reading styles?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRATEGY CHECKLIST (VOCABULARY STRATEGIES)

Please, try to make use of the strategies in your academic learning and social life. Try to use the strategies consciously, appropriately, and frequently. Improvement in your language proficiency, academic learning and social life will not happen overnight. It is a gradual process.

The following Strategy Checklist will help you and me to see your progress in your strategy use. Please reflect on your strategy use and fill in this form once a week (at the end of the week in your own time) and I will collect this sheet from you once a week until the last week of October. Please write examples of your strategy use – when and how? and place a check mark in the boxes “Yes, it was useful” or “No, it wasn’t useful”. Thank you very much for your time 😊

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vocabulary strategies</th>
<th>Yes, I use it.</th>
<th>Yes, it was useful.</th>
<th>No, it wasn’t useful.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I learn the meaning of a word from the context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I guess the meaning of a word from its structure - guessing the meaning of a word from its structure i.e., compound words – <em>matchmaker, bookkeeper</em>; words that contain a familiar stem to which an affix, prefix or suffix has been added – <em>microscope, tasteless</em> etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The more I read the more new words I acquire and understand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I keep a pocket notebook and write down new found words</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the new found words when communicating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to learn 5 new words a day and use them when communicating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STRATEGY CHECKLIST (LISTENING STRATEGIES)

Please, try to make use of the strategies in your academic learning and social life. Try to use the strategies consciously, appropriately, and frequently. Improvement in your language proficiency, academic learning and social life will not happen overnight. It is a gradual process.

The following Strategy Checklist will help you and me to see your progress in your strategy use. Please reflect on your strategy use and fill in this form once a week (at the end of the week in your own time) and I will collect this sheet from you once a week until the last week of October. Please write examples of your strategy use – when and how? and place a check mark in the boxes “Yes, it was useful” or “No, it wasn’t useful”. Thank you very much for your time 😊

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listening strategies</th>
<th>Yes, I use it.</th>
<th>Yes, it was useful.</th>
<th>No, it wasn’t useful.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Write examples – when and how did you use the strategies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning</strong> (before the discussion) - I need to check whether I have understood the tutor’s instruction for the discussion, if not develop an immediate action plan in order to find out i.e., asking a question from the tutor or a group member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring flow of conversation</strong> (during the discussion) - In a discussion, I need to be aware of the progress of interaction in terms of pace, turn-taking and exchange of information (speaker order)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring comprehension</strong> (during the discussion) - I need to check or correct my understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring how clearly I have been understood</strong> (during the discussion) - I need to be aware of listeners’ reactions – listeners’ comprehension of what I said; their responses including both verbal and physical like nodding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-evaluation</strong> (after the tutorial/discussion) - I need to reflect on my understanding of what was said in the discussion and my involvement in the discussion – write down both my active and inactive involvement in the discussion: when I was active; when I wasn’t; what I understood; what I didn’t understand; what I need to change in my next discussion/tutorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to predict the content of the listening text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I pay attention to what I am listening to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I notice new words, expression and pronunciation etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take notes of keywords and expressions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I listen for specific details i.e., supporting details or examples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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