



Libraries and Learning Services

# University of Auckland Research Repository, ResearchSpace

## Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognize the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

## General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the [Library Thesis Consent Form](#) and [Deposit Licence](#).

# Scholarly Selves:

English Additional Language students' linguistic capital and  
scholarly identities in senior secondary school

Brian Davy-Taefu

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy (Education), The University of Auckland, [2019].

## Abstract

My research explored how new migrant and international students, who have English as an additional language (EAL), used language and pragmatic interaction strategies to negotiate social identities (Jenkins, 2008) in an Aotearoa/New Zealand senior secondary school. I adopted a Bourdieuan approach considering the ways in which students' linguistic, social and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1984) were used in school. These elements of capital, and the relationship they have with EAL students' sense of scholarly investment (Norton-Peirce, 1995) were the foci of my research.

The central question of my research concerned how these particular participating EAL students viewed their various scholarly identities in an academic secondary school environment in relation to existing, socially valued forms of capital. I aimed to gain an understanding of the impacts these existing forms of valued capital had on EAL students' language use in senior secondary school through classroom observations of EAL students' interactions as well as semi-structured interviews and participant journaling. In addition, I sought to interpret how EAL students' concept of their scholarly habitus was continually renegotiated in an English-dominant environment over the course of their final two years of school.

Findings suggest that participants faced conflicting choices. While they had a strong desire to retain their first language (L1), they were immersed in a scholarly environment that places high value on English use. This, coupled with the low use of L1 in academic settings, created a discourse of linguistic hierarchy (May, 2011a) in which English came to be seen as the most valued form of linguistic capital and, relatedly, as a scholastic necessity (May 1994). This served to construct scholarly identities amongst participants, and asserted

the role of English as the pre-eminent (and, at times, only) scholarly language in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Often, but not always, this led EAL students to minimise the role of their L1 in relation to their learning. EAL students adopted various, pragmatic, interactive strategies to adapt to the new English-language-dominant academic field they found themselves in. EAL students often used a *foxhole* strategy in which they would interact in English medium with each other as a way to manage the ever-growing academic and English-orientated language requirements of senior secondary school.

My research made use of the concept of reflexivity to reconceptualise notions of scholarly identities and *scholarly habitus* (Watkins & Noble, 2013). As a result, participants and I were able to see and, on occasions, subvert, existing social norms and related forms of capital, which privileged English in the Aotearoa/New Zealand secondary school setting. This research concludes that teacher promotion of “linguistic safe houses” (Canagarajah, 2004), and a related utilisation of existing foxhole strategies which are shaped around EAL students’ “funds of knowledge” (Moll, Amanti, Neff & Gonzalez, 1992) can enhance scholarly investment (Norton-Peirce, 1995) in both English and L1 amongst EAL students. This, in turn, can have a positive influence on EAL students’ negotiation of scholarly identities based in emergent sentiments of the self as a translingual scholar, rather than just as an English language learner.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge all the people who have helped me in my research journey.

Undertaking PhD research is a significant task and one that is next to impossible without the support of loved ones and colleagues.

I would like to acknowledge my supervisors Professor Stephen May and Professor Richard Pringle. Your patience and sage advice have guided me through this PhD. You have been ever present in helping me through this pathway. I would also like to thank Senior Lecturer Helen Villers. You have been a source of calm through my turbulent PhD process and for this, and your eternal optimism, I am deeply grateful.

I would like to acknowledge my mum, Susan Davy. You and dad (Gordon Davy) put me here. Without you I would not be the man I am today. I love you and I always have dad close to my heart in all the things I do. I only wish he could be here to see the completion of this PhD.

I would like to thank my father-in-law, Taefu Venasio Taefu, and my mother-in-law, Sue Taefu. You have both been so wonderful and supportive. I am truly grateful to call you family. To Tovia Taefu, thank you for always putting a smile on my face even in difficult times.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge and thank the love of my life, Christina Davy-Taefu. We have achieved together so much that I thought would be impossible growing up. You are my light, my source of strength and my best friend. I will love you forever and I will strive every day to be a good husband to you and a good father to our children. Without you I couldn't have finished this. You have been my rock these past years and I will never forget what you have done for me.

## Contents

Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	v
Chapter 1: Introduction .....	1
Outline of the Study.....	1
Secondary schools in Aotearoa/New Zealand .....	4
Context of the research site.....	7
Key Concepts.....	11
<i>Asian</i> as a category .....	11
Model minority .....	13
Culture .....	13
Community of practice .....	14
Why Focus on Identity and Language Use? .....	15
Why Focus on Migrant and International (Foreign Fee-paying) Students?.....	18
Positionality: The Researcher as Prime Research Instrument .....	25
Theoretical Approach: Introducing Bourdieu .....	26
Methodological Approach: Bourdieu’s Theory as Method.....	29
Framework of the Thesis .....	31
Chapter 2: Literature Review .....	33
Introduction .....	33
Scholarly Identities and Scholarly Habitus.....	35
A monological view of scholarly identity .....	44
Multiplicity in scholarly identities .....	46
Bourdieu’s Linguistic Capital and Habitus in the Classroom.....	49
Critiques of Bourdieu .....	52
Applying Bourdieu with EAL students.....	55
Ethnicity as an element of capital.....	60
Rethinking scholarly habitus .....	63
Aotearoa/New Zealand Literature Related to Identity and Language .....	65
Renegotiating scholarly identities.....	69
Chapter 3: Methodology.....	77
Introduction .....	77
Qualitative Research in Educational Settings .....	78

Sources of Data .....	80
Participants .....	80
My Research Paradigm .....	83
Social constructivism.....	83
An interpretive paradigm using reflexivity .....	84
Gaining a thick description .....	85
Effectiveness of an Interpretive Paradigm and Claims to Truth .....	85
Trustworthiness .....	86
Credibility.....	86
Confirmability.....	87
Situated knowledge and representation .....	88
Transferability .....	89
Dependability.....	89
Sustaining reflexivity .....	90
Limitations of an Interpretive Paradigm .....	91
Research in a messy world.....	92
Lowercase c critical .....	94
Applying Bourdieu’s theory as method .....	95
Ensuring dialogic voice.....	97
My Role as the Researcher in this Educational Setting.....	98
Power relations – the researcher–participant relationship.....	99
Reflexive analysis of self as holder of symbolic capital.....	100
Ethical and relational reflexivity .....	102
Sources of Data Collection .....	103
Semi-structured interviews – The active interview: a dialogic method .....	105
Interviewing across cultures .....	105
Interview as a social practice .....	106
Reflexivity in the interview .....	107
Classroom observations – the role of localised practices.....	108
Journaling and the importance of reflexivity.....	110
Institutional data and the role of categories .....	111
Chapter 4: Profiles of Participants .....	113
Profiles of Migrant Student Participants .....	114
Profiles of International Student Participants .....	121
Chapter 5: Findings - The Conditioning of and Investing in English for Academic Purposes.....	128

Introduction .....	128
English in the Aotearoa/New Zealand Education System.....	129
The New Zealand Curriculum.....	129
Other relevant MoE documents .....	130
Manawa High School .....	130
Students’ perceptions of the dominant role of English .....	132
Impact on language use .....	135
Impact on the negotiation of scholarly identities.....	137
Disciplinary Literacies, Decontextualisation and Streaming.....	138
Students’ perceptions of academic trajectories .....	145
Impact on language use .....	149
Impact on the negotiation of scholarly identities.....	151
English in Assessment – NCEA and English-only Assessment.....	153
Students’ perceptions of the dominant role of English in assessment .....	157
Impact on language use .....	160
Impact on the negotiation of scholarly identities.....	161
Discussion.....	163
Chapter 6: Findings - First Language Divestment, Isolation and Access to Communities of Practice	168
Introduction .....	168
First Language Use in School.....	168
Language preference to reduce linguistic isolation .....	169
Disciplinary literacy difficulties .....	170
Negative report comments related to L1 .....	172
Students’ Perceptions – Fear of Loss of their First Language .....	176
No opportunity to use L1 for learning .....	177
Additional burden of first-language disciplinary literacy.....	178
Impacts on Scholarly Identities.....	180
Low expectations linked to English language ability .....	184
Desire to seek out L1 English peers .....	186
Compartmentalisation of Language and Identity – First Language Use at Home .....	187
Student perceptions of compartmentalisation .....	189
Impact on identities .....	192
Discussion.....	195
Chapter 7: Findings – Self-concealment Strategies .....	198
Introduction .....	198

Silence as a Strategy .....	198
Student perceptions of silence as a strategy .....	202
Impact on language use .....	204
Impact on scholarly identity .....	206
Interaction in Linguistic Fox-holes as a Strategy.....	208
Student perception of one-on-one interactions.....	213
Impact on language use .....	215
Impact on the negotiation of scholarly identities.....	218
Covert Clarification as a Strategy.....	221
Gazeless spaces.....	221
Student perceptions of covert clarification .....	223
Impact on language use .....	224
Impact on the negotiation of scholarly identities.....	226
Discussion.....	227
Chapter 8: Findings – Self-reflexivity Strategies .....	229
Introduction .....	229
Strategies to Defuse Pan-ethnic Stereotyping and Challenge Categorisation.....	229
Impact on language use .....	231
Impact on the negotiation of scholarly identities.....	232
Breaking Free of Assigned Trajectories.....	233
Student perceptions of breaking free of assigned trajectories .....	236
Impact on language use .....	239
Impact on the negotiation of scholarly identities.....	240
Strategies to Utilise Translingual Practices and Renegotiate Scholarly Investment.....	245
Students’ investment in their L1.....	247
Impact on language use .....	248
Impact on the negotiation of scholarly identities.....	250
Translingual Practices and Transformative Pedagogy .....	252
Students’ perceptions of translingual practices .....	253
Impact on language use .....	256
Impact on scholarly identity .....	258
Discussion.....	260
Chapter 9: Conclusion .....	265
Limitations .....	276
Recommendations for Future Research .....	277

Appendix 1 – Initial Ssemi-structured Interview Questions .....	279
Appendix 2 – Classroom Observation Schedule .....	281
Appendix 3 – Participant Information Sheet (Board of Trustees) .....	291
Appendix 4 – Consent Form (Board of Trustees).....	297
Appendix 5 – Participant Information Sheet (Parents).....	300
Appendix 6 – Consent Form (Parents) .....	306
Appendix 7 – Participant Information Sheet (Principal) .....	309
Appendix 8 – Consent Form (Principal) .....	315
Appendix 9 – Participant Information Sheet (Student) .....	318
Appendix 10 – Consent Form (Student).....	323
Appendix 11 – Participant Information Sheet (Teacher) .....	326
Appendix 12 – Consent Form (Teacher) .....	331
References .....	334

List of Tables

Table 1. Participants.....	82
Table 2. Data-Collection Summary .....	104

## Chapter 1: Introduction

### Outline of the Study

School is a social space in which a diverse range of students and teachers coalesce. These students are subject to various forms of social and academic judgement. As a teacher of high school economics for over a decade, I have borne witness to the increasing diversity of Aotearoa/New Zealand's student population. According to Statistics New Zealand (2013), the percentage of multilingual speakers has risen from 15.8% of the population in the 2001 census to 18.6% of the population in the 2013 census. This rise in multilingualism is most profound in Auckland with 51.2% of all multilingual speakers located in our largest city. The languages of Aotearoa/New Zealand's student population are numerous. For example, Statistics New Zealand (2013) notes that the total number of Northern Chinese speakers under 30 years (which includes Mandarin speakers) has increased from 12,225 speakers in the 2001 census to 20,424 speakers in the 2013 census. Tagalog speakers under 30 years of age in New Zealand have seen one of the most significant upsurges, rising from 2,607 speakers in the 2001 census to 11,010 in the 2013 census. Languages spoken by people under 30 years classified as *Other* have also seen a rise from 72,483 speakers in 2001 to 92,046 in 2013. The languages that are classified by Statistics New Zealand as *Other* represent a wide diversity of languages – including language communities that may have few interlocutors in their first language (L1) near their current place of residence or in their educational communities. This has implications for the use of students' L1 in their schooling which will be discussed in later chapters.

The diversity of students' L1 backgrounds often differs from the primarily monolingual English-speaking, Anglo-centric, social and linguistic milieu which remains the

dominant language experience of many Pākehā (New Zealand European). This English-language-dominant milieu was also my direct experience of growing up in Aotearoa/New Zealand. I was born and raised on the North Shore of Auckland, a middle to upper middle-class area that was imbued with a potent mix of western neoliberal social and cultural values and the echoes of a long-since secularised protestant work ethic. The community of my youth was primarily Pākehā in identity and individualistic in orientation. It was also unquestionably a predominantly monolingual, English-speaking place. May (2005) notes of this period – in the 1980s and 1990s – that Aotearoa/New Zealand was at that time one of the most linguistically homogeneous countries in the world. English dominated during this time even to the detriment of the indigenous language of Aotearoa/New Zealand (Te Reo Māori), which was largely absent from the classroom and minimised in social life. This relatively homogenous North Shore community has changed significantly over the past 20 years, however. This change has been that much more acute in the greater Auckland areas, which already were more diverse than the North Shore. Auckland, as a whole, has consequently experienced a burgeoning of its Pacifica and Asian populations over the last two decades, in particular.

As a result, the recent languages in Aotearoa/New Zealand report (Royal Society of New Zealand, 2013) has noted that Aotearoa/New Zealand is now a *superdiverse* nation. This is especially true of Auckland as, according to the latest census data, 45.7% of the city's population is now non-European (Statistics New Zealand, 2013). The largest of these non-European groups is the category *Asian*, which comprises 21.4% of the population, followed by *Pacific* peoples at 13.9% and *Māori* at 10.4%. As noted previously, within these overarching categories there are represented a multitude of languages and cultures. The

Auckland of today and the future is thus, and will continue to be, a heterogeneous mix of cultures and languages, increasingly distant from my own earlier experiences.

In short, times have changed, as the young people who now enter the Aotearoa/New Zealand schooling system are from cultures and languages that differ increasingly from the monolingual, English-speaking norm of the past. Often, from an English Additional Language (EAL) background, many of these students face dilemmas around the role their first language (L1) and culture will play in their education. Students that variously come from migrant family backgrounds or are foreign, fee-paying (international) students face an unenviable task of negotiating concepts of self-identity in relation to their L1 and culture in an English-dominant school space. I argue, in this thesis, that the extent to which EAL students feel that they must leave their L1 and culture at the school gate in order to assimilate to an Anglo-normative (Watkins & Noble, 2013) curriculum and school system, has a significant impact on the negotiation of their scholarly identities.

The primary focal point of my research was how one group of migrant and international students negotiated their scholarly identities at one large Auckland secondary school. Hearing the voices of these students and seeking to gain an understanding of their sentiments in relation to these issues helps me, as well as the wider education community, to see the challenges these students face. Engaging in dialogue such as this can help create space for both students and teachers to value and utilise students' existing L1 and culture in classrooms. This, in turn, creates space for translingual (Creese & Blackledge, 2010) identities to be negotiated in which students thrive in both their L1 and culture as well as English and the wider national context of Aotearoa/New Zealand.

Translingualism has been described by Canagarajah (2013a) as the ability of speakers with multiple languages to make use of these languages interchangeably across various contexts for specific purposes. Used in the context of Aotearoa/New Zealand schools, translingualism refers to the fact that students will often operate in a dynamic social milieu in which both their L1 and English are utilised for multiple purposes throughout their daily interactions. Rather than viewing languages as being isolated silos, translingualism recognises the inherently dynamic nature of language use in everyday life. This concept is particularly helpful when considering the dynamic and increasingly multilingual reality of Aotearoa/New Zealand secondary schools.

#### [Secondary schools in Aotearoa/New Zealand](#)

Aotearoa/New Zealand secondary schools tend to follow a standardised progression model which is largely based within a monolingual, English-medium context. Students are expected to attain certain standards of achievement at particular levels in their education careers. This model is most clearly demonstrated in the National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA), which is Aotearoa/New Zealand's qualification framework at senior secondary school. NCEA is assessed at levels 1, 2 and 3 in the last three years of a student's high school education (generally at 15, 16 and 17 years old). At my school site, success in the Achievement Standards (which form the main assessment tool of NCEA) informed streamed placement in more senior classes during the early years of NCEA. In more general terms, NCEA determines access to university. As such, a high degree of academic weight is put onto performance in these standards. Moreover, New Zealand's national curriculum (Ministry of Education [MoE], 2007) states that success in English is central to success over the whole curriculum. Thus, success across the curriculum is often measured and defined as being successful in NCEA assessments through the medium of English.

School is an apparatus that shapes social norms around the importance of various languages. High levels of English ability in this system thus come to be regarded as a form of “socially sanctioned knowledge” (Nieto, 2001, p. 6) and afforded a high degree of capital value. This form of socially sanctioned knowledge tends to be valorised over any linguistic abilities a student may have in their L1 if they speak languages other than English. As Dörnyei (2005) has noted, the promotion of socially sanctioned knowledge, such as the capital value attached to academic levels of English by pedagogical authorities (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1998), can lead to the construction of an *ideal self* around the attributes an English Additional Language (EAL) student would ideally like to possess. The norm of English as the pre-eminent academic language in Aotearoa/New Zealand serves to channel EAL students’ construction of an ideal self around ability and investment (Norton, 1997) in learning English. This process can channel students to articulate capital value (Meadows, 2009) in relation to that which is accepted by the institution rather than any articulation of capital value based on students’ ethnic or linguistic backgrounds. Nash (2003) argued that such attribution of capital value to English and the relative silencing of students’ L1s can, “fundamentally repro[duce] inequalities” (p. 171) via the privileging of English-oriented modes of capital.

A system such as this contributes to the reproduction of the belief of symbolic goods (Bourdieu & Nice, 1980) such as the importance of English for academic success. As Nieto (2001) noted, “students who have not been raised in the ‘culture of power’ (citing Delpit 1988) or have not explicitly learned the rules of the game for academic success lack [the] cultural capital necessary for scholarly experiences” (p. 8). EAL students in Aotearoa/New Zealand secondary schools also do not have equal access to the linguistic rules of the game,

compared with L1 English speakers, in relation to English-oriented pedagogy and assessment.

By way of example, Margret Kitchen (2010), in her study of Korean students in New Zealand secondary schools, noted that teachers with migrant and international students are unlikely to make any changes to their classroom practice. This means that the monolingual norms of the Aoteroa/New Zealand secondary school tend to be maintained and the existing funds of knowledge an EAL student holds in their L1 will tend to be silenced. To add to this dilemma, the reproduction of beliefs based around existing habitus and valued capital serves to reinforce an existing economy of symbolic goods (Bourdieu & Nice, 1980) in which the symbolic value of English is elevated above the symbolic value of other L1s in a kind of linguistic hierarchy (May, 2005). The reproduction of this kind of linguistic hierarchy in Aotearoa/New Zealand schools further negates EAL students' L1 capital. These systems thus expose migrant and international students to what David Gillborn (1992, 1995), citing Apple (1979), has referred to as the hidden curriculum in which students from a linguistic or cultural minority effectively become "second class citizens" (Gillborn, 1992, p. 37). These students are often forced to assume roles which adhere to [majority] norms and only allow for expressions of "plastic ethnicity" (Gillborn, 1995, p. 3) that conform to the majority's notions of how the minorities should behave.

In this thesis I develop the argument that the hidden curriculum of English language validation and attribution of Anglo-normative/Pākehā cultural values impacts on new migrant and international students' negotiation of their scholarly identities. I argue that the power of this English language capital can lead to a negotiation of scholarly identities in school that minimises the role of EAL students' L1 and encourage sentiments which seek to adhere to majority notions of accepted ways of being. In exploring these issues, I made use

of one secondary school site in Auckland, Aotearoa/New Zealand, as a focal point to investigate these issues. It is to the particulars of this research site that I now turn.

#### Context of the research site

Manawa High School (pseudonym) is a large, culturally diverse, urban high school situated in the West of Auckland. At the time of this research, the Ministry of Education operated a school zoning policy. Under this policy, students from those areas that are *in zone* had an automatic right to enrol in that particular school. The in zone areas for Manawa High School encompass affluent harbour suburbs and farming districts on the urban fringe of Auckland. Additionally, Manawa's in zone area includes working-class suburbs and relatively economically deprived suburbs. As a consequence of these vastly diverse in zone areas, Manawa's student population is both economically and culturally diverse.

At the time of this research, the New Zealand Ministry of Education also gave each school a decile rating for funding purposes based on the socio-economic position of the communities in which they serve. The scales ranged from 1-10, decile 10 schools being situated in the highest socio-economic areas and decile 1 schools being situated in the lowest socio-economic areas. The lower the decile rating, the higher the level of Ministry of Education funding that was provided. At the time my research was conducted, from 2016-2017, Manawa High School was decile 4. This is due to the mix of extremely affluent areas and poorer areas all being counted as in zone.

Manawa High School can also be considered a microcosm of Auckland's increasingly culturally and linguistically diverse composition. At the time of my research, the student population consisted of 40.1% Pākehā (New Zealand European), 21.3% Māori, 22.5% Pacifica, 13.6% Asian and 2.4% Other. This diversity was not, however, reflected in the teacher population with 73.5% of teachers of Pākehā origin (including me), 9.1% Māori,

6.8% Pacifica, 8.3% Asian and 2.8% from an ethnic background other than those four categories (Middle Eastern, Latin American or African – MELAA). The relative homogeneity and monolingual nature of the teacher population is important to consider, as Nieto (2001) noted that teachers are often considered to be holders of socially sanctioned knowledge. In this case, socially sanctioned knowledge has been historically based in the preponderance of Pākehā in the New Zealand teaching workforce and the fact that most Pākehā are monolingual speakers of English.

Even so, Manawa High School's charter outlines in its community values statement, that the school:

Acknowledges and supports the multi-cultural and diverse nature of its community. It strives to meet the needs of parents, students, tertiary educators and employers in providing an environment where students will not only achieve academically but who will leave secondary school well-rounded and with good citizen attributes.

These stated values are supported by a vision statement which asserts that the school aims to "Equip students with the attributes to create a sustainable future for themselves [and] provides opportunities to participate and excel in cultural, sporting and performing arts activities". At the time of the research, the school was also part of the Te Kotahitanga programme which promotes "Māori students being able to achieve as Māori". Clearly then, the school is committed to promoting ideals of cultural diversity within an environment of high academic expectations.

These ideals are, however, far more limited when considering linguistic diversity. Māori bilingual classes exist at the junior level and Māori, Samoan, French, German, Japanese and Mandarin are taught as subjects. The majority of classes, however, occur via

an English-language medium with little reference to the student populations' L1. This is particularly true of students from a migrant and/or international background. These students are placed in ESOL withdrawal classes. These are classes in which EAL students are separated from the rest of the student population in order to focus on acquiring English. The school focus is on the rapid acquisition of English for these students in order to facilitate their academic achievement. EAL students will generally attend one period a day in ESOL class (of the five periods in the day). Occasionally, students with minimal English upon entry to school will be required to attend two ESOL classes a day. These classes are not based in year levels as is the case with mainstream classes. Rather ESOL classes are organised according to English language ability. As such, the age range and L1 background can vary widely within a given ESOL class. The unifying factor of these classes is the relative level of English language competence.

Given this unifying factor, ESOL classes have an understandable aim of rapidly expanding EAL student's English language competence. The focus of these classes therefore is largely on the generally technical acquisition of English rather than the development of disciplinary specific communication skills and competencies. In spite of the best efforts of individual ESOL and subject teachers, Manawa High School had no systematic collaboration between ESOL and subject teachers. Therefore, key information ESOL teachers had around language competency remained in the ESOL silo, while key information subject teachers had around disciplinary specific communication remained in the subject silo. Wingate (2015) argued that that ESOL (EAP) classes are often the only explicit literacy support available for EAL student and yet they do little to prepare EAL students for communication in academic disciplines. Manawa High School can be seen as an example of the kind of approach to ESOL classes Wingate identified.

Manawa High School had a relatively large international student population at the time of the research (3.1% of the total student population). The majority of international students were from China, with some from Korea, Japan and Thailand. Most of these students were in the senior school at Years 12 or 13. The school promoted in its international student recruitment material “direct entry into mainstream [English-medium] classes for students with satisfactory English language skills” and “English language support for students who need full-time English assistance [to] help their integration into the mainstream school”. The school thus outlined from the outset in its advertising material the need for English language skills to succeed in the mainstream school. The use of the term *mainstream* in these documents also reinforces the normativity of English-medium instruction in the school.

The school database was a significant tool used in this research. It contained information such as the students’ time in Aotearoa/New Zealand, their residency status, parents’ names and occupations as well as the school reports and NCEA credits records of the student. What was noticeable about this database was its absence of information around significant factors which are pertinent to EAL students. While we have a record of English language ability, we have no record of L1 ability. As such, the potential for students to make use of their high L1 competencies to help other L1 interlocutors or, indeed, other EAL students is lost. We also have no record of the specific educational experiences of EAL students prior to their arrival. For example, while the database gives fairly superficial information like “Thailand” as country of origin and “2 years 6 months” since arrival in Aotearoa/New Zealand. This information does help in knowing the student’s specific educational experiences in their home country, the length of their education, or indeed the language medium in which education was conducted prior arrival in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

There is a need for this information vacuum to be filled with greater collection of data around the specific educational backgrounds and language competencies of EAL learners.

This absence of information places even greater emphasis on teachers, as adaptive experts, to understand the similarities and differences that exist within the EAL student cohort of their classes.

This was the economically and culturally diverse, but, linguistically homogeneous pedagogical milieu new migrant and international students entered when they came to Manawa High School. It was within this site of opportunities, restrictions and contradictions that they negotiated their own scholarly identities. The extent to which their L1s and home cultures become a key part of their identities in relation to school was, in no small part, shaped by the school environment itself. The context of this research site is thus a cornerstone to understanding how students negotiate their scholarly identities in school.

### Key Concepts

This section will outline my use of the key concepts which frame my research. The concepts outlined here were used in conjunction with Bourdieu's theoretical concepts to inform my understanding of findings as they emerged during the research. What follows is a description of my own usage of these key terms as well as a critique of these terms.

### *Asian as a category*

The category of *Asian* is a pan-ethnic term which is still used in much of Aotearoa/New Zealand. This use includes Asian as an ethnic category of choice in the national census as well as the presence of this term in defining the ethnicity of students on the database of my research site. Asian as a category fails to recognise the differences inherent in this cohort. Be they linguistic, socio-cultural or religious, one universal category that encompasses

billions of people will always be insufficient to account for such a wide array of difference. The danger of ignoring the differences inherent within the members of a category is that those who are members of a category come to be seen by others and in particular, the majority, as homogeneous. This homogeneity and lack of differentiation of the particulars of each member of the category serves to objectify and 'other' members of the category in its own terms.

Asian students are often Othered by teachers and English L1 students when their ethnic categorisation is coupled with perception of high achievement and hard work. For example, Archer and Francis (2005) looked at teachers' constructions of 'Chinese' pupils in an English L1 class setting. They found that Chinese boys were constructed as 'being naturally good' and 'not laddish' while Chinese girls were constructed as 'passive', 'quiet', 'repressed' and 'hardworking'. In Archer and Francis (2005), we see a homogeneous construction of the Chinese pupil. Although this construction could be seen as attributing positive traits to Chinese pupils, it serves to negate difference as it sees an entire cohort of pupils as an undifferentiated mass. Equally, in Aotearoa/New Zealand, the term Asian serves as a catch-all to encompass the various experiences of a multitude of students. The coupling of achievement with Asian students is also present in Aotearoa/New Zealand. This coupling masks the differences of experiences, skills and desires of an entire cohort of students. It is my aim to critique the term Asian as a category. All of the participants I have selected are categorised as Asian in the school database. However, even within this small selection of participants there is a vast array of experiences, skills and desires.

Asian students are often seen as a model minority in Aotearoa/New Zealand schools who display the traits Archer and Francis (2005) discussed. A coupling of the ethnic category

of Asian and scholarly achievement occurs. This is a coupling which should be challenged and is a significant focus of this research.

### Model minority

As noted in the previous section, Asian students are often constructed as adhering to positive scholarly traits such as being quiet and hardworking. This construction serves to cast Asian students as a model minority. Here the term, model minority, refers to the perception of those in majority relative to the behaviours of the minority. The model is ascribed to all those in the minority and thus an expectation of the majority is cast in which Asian students are diligent, focused and desire success. This model minority view, however, masks the differences within the minority. For example, Pang (1999) noted that migrant students working in their parents' catering business were slightly less likely to achieve their professional goals. In Pang's work, the role of socio-economic status (SES) is clear. The additional burdens of these low-SES students outside of school were hidden from those they interacted with in school. This example is of particular importance when I consider the term model minority as applied to my own research. I have purposefully selected both migrant and international students as they are ostensibly members of this model minority and yet, as we shall see, their experiences, skills and desires are wide ranging. The application of any kind of model minority behaviour to such a diverse cohort is an intellectual dead end.

### Culture

The use of the term, *culture*, in my research seeks to make a distinction between culture and ethnicity. Lee and Zhou (2014) used the concept of frames which are not culturally intrinsic, nor do they cause particular behaviours, but rather these frames make certain patterns of behaviour possible. While ethnicity is seen in my research as a categorical

element, culture instead refers to those frames which make certain patterns of behaviour possible. Archer and Francis (2006) noted the social and educational competition of Chinese migrant families and the tendency to participate in Chinese supplementary schools as a way of retaining Chinese culture and Mandarin. Here the cultural frame of the Chinese diaspora makes certain behaviours possible. This does not mean that this diaspora blindly adheres to a model minority concept imposed on them. Rather they use particular cultural frames to construct certain patterns of behaviour themselves. Lee and Zhou (2014) have noted that social networking, visible role models in the community and the availability of tangible community resources are all ways that a diaspora can make certain behaviours possible. Therefore, the cultural frames which make certain behaviours possible are important to consider in the scope of this research.

#### Community of practice

The term *community of practice* has been used in this research. For the purposes of my research I consider a community of practice to be one in which members are unified in practice with the attainment of a particular goal in mind. The students and teachers in a classroom are a clear example of a community of practice. The students are in a shared environment pursuing a unified goal of learning a particular body of knowledge and achieving NCEA credits.

When a new member of any community of practice enters the community, they tend to begin their membership on the periphery of the community as the shared practices of the community have not yet been acquired by the new member. When an EAL student enters an English-speaking class for the first time they are on the periphery of this community of practice. The onus is often on them to learn the practices of the community to move from

the periphery. In the case of EAL students, they are expected to learn the English-medium practices of the community. Watkins (2018) noted that this integration into the community of practice is how students learn to play the game in the field of education. Ferrare and Apple (2015) saw this as field being realised at the local level. The community of practice that is the classroom reproduces, at a local level, the field of education and its associated habitus. These key Bourdieuan terms will be discussed in more detail in later sections.

Miller (2000) noted that dynamic interactions of instructional contexts, language resources and social identities serve to manifest communities of practice in class. One of the key ways Miller (2000) regarded EAL students as being able to move from the periphery of the community of practice to its centre is through embedded English activities that connect to students' own L1 and background. Miller, whose research was in Australia, saw schools as sites of the convergence of languages. This convergence can help reshape how teachers regard the movement of EAL students away from the community of practice. In my own research, I regard the community of practice as one with a core set of practices which should always be subject to adjustments in practices as the community gains new members. What this means in practice is that an effective community of practice is one in which all members' resources are able to contribute effectively to the overall goal of the community. In order for EAL students to be able to effectively move away from the periphery of the community of practice, they should be able to make use of all their existing linguistic resources and lived experiences.

### [Why Focus on Identity and Language Use?](#)

Identity and language use are interrelated social constructs that serve as framing devices for a student's understanding of their environment. Bonny Norton (2000) defines identity as

being “how a person understands his or her relationship to the world, how that relationship is constructed across time and space, and how the person understands possibilities for the future” (p. 5). In this view, identity comes to be seen as socially and historically constructed (Norton & McKinney, 2011) through an ongoing process of power relations and interactions at various sites. Identity is further conceptualised by Norton and McKinney (2011) as a “non-unitary site of struggle which is subject to change over time” (p. 74). In this view, identity is susceptible to change, influenced by the established social norms of a particular site.

When related to new migrant and international students’ language, this socially constructed concept of identity has been termed by Norton as the *identity approach* to second language acquisition (SLA). An identity approach to SLA seeks to place “into question binary concepts such as a learner being motivated/unmotivated or inhibited/uninhibited” (Norton & McKinney, 2011, p. 73) by attempting to understand the social milieu that acts to construct their ways of being. Every time a student interacts, they are “renegotiating a sense of self in regards to the wider social world” (Norton & McKinney, 2011, p. 73) and as such the language(s) they use, or indeed do not use, come to be a central factor in their ongoing identity negotiation.

The languages that EAL students draw on – most often, English and their L1 in this context – can also be explained by Norton’s related concept of *investment* which links, in turn, to the concept of *capital* (Norton, 1997, 2000; Norton-Pierce, 1995). This relationship between students’ L1 and English has been described as “sometimes ambivalent ... having a complex social history and multiple desires” (Norton-Pierce, 1995, p. 9). Making use of a concept like investment rather than motivation or inhibition thus allows me to account for socially constructed conditions which will inevitably arise in any social setting. The social setting of school is no exception to this. The extent to which the school community affirms

the roles of English and a student's L1 in an academic context will have a significant impact on that student's ongoing identity negotiation around and investment in the role their language(s) must play in their education.

Anderson (1991) coined the term *imagined communities* to refer to a set of ideals around how a group of people imagine themselves to be part of the group. When considering the idea of imagined communities in relation to my research site, it becomes clear that the ideal of success in English is viewed as *the* key to academic success within the school. I argue in this thesis that this leads EAL students to identify themselves as part of a community of scholars only when they feel they hold an acceptable level of proficiency in English. As this occurs, students' L1 comes to be marginalised and identification of their L1 as being part of their scholarly identity diminishes accordingly.

Instead, the community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998) that is the school and the classroom become centred on the dominant role of English. In order to become a part of this community, migrant and international students often felt compelled to focus on the role of English and minimise the role of their L1 in their schooling. This helps these students move from the periphery of the community of practice to its centre. This focus on English as a form of academic capital can lead to a tension between ethnic and academic identities (Nasir & Saxe, 2003), which migrant and international students must manage through an ongoing process of negotiation of their identities.

Gee, Allen, and Clinton (2001) have pointed to the fact that teenagers tend to fashion themselves through the language they use. Stanton Wortham (2008) also noted that students will develop classroom specific identities over time. These classroom-specific identities will clearly be influenced by the way students' fashion themselves through language use in both English and their L1. Since there is a dialogic relationship between a

student's L1 and their ethnic identity (Mu, 2014), I argue that an assertion of the role of a student's L1 would serve to assist EAL students to imagine a wider range of identities over time and place (Norton, 2010) in relation to their school life. This study seeks to shed light on this complex negotiation process amongst one particular group of EAL students at one particular school site.

### Why Focus on Migrant and International (Foreign Fee-paying) Students?

Migrant and international foreign fee-paying students who enter the Aotearoa/New Zealand school system are subject to normative categorisation according to various social, cultural and linguistic traits (Jenkins, 1994, 2008). The ostensibly tolerant majority asserts a discourse about the new members that serves to create a xenophobic normative (Gotsbachner, 2001) view of these members. This normative view of migrant and international students based on such traits as country of origin (Wright, 2011), ethnicity (Webber, 2013), dialect, and comportment in class (Ng, Lee, & Pak, 2007) serves to categorise these students. Such categories are themselves problematic as they do not reflect the different backgrounds, access to resources and the individual trajectories of each of the students who are classified together as a grouping. The categories of migrant and international student mask the differences relative to L1 ability, class background, or levels of personal investment in learning. These categories do, however, act as a useful indicator of some aspects of the students' background and motivations for being in school. For example, most of the international students in my sample came from families with high status positions in their home countries. Be it in engineering or finance, these students' parents generally earned a high salary and the focus of sending their child to Aotearoa/New Zealand was acquire to English over a one-year or two-year period. In contrast, many of the migrant students came from families with lower-paying and lower-status jobs who had

settled in Aotearoa/New Zealand; often these students had significant responsibilities within their family unit to help care for siblings or work in the family business. The backgrounds and particulars of international and migrant students are often vastly different, both across and within these categories. A rationale for the diversity of the sample of EAL students I purposefully selected was an attempt to reflect the variability that exists within these categories. When individuals and their unique trajectories are reduced to general categories, norms around behaviour can be ascribed to particular categories.

Norms of behaviour are ascribed to various EAL students according to these categories. For example, Watkins and Noble (2013) have noted that both Asian and Pacifica students in Australian schools are compared with the supposed Anglo-normative students to varying degrees. Pacifica students tended to have physical attributes which were unfavourably compared to students of European origin. Their size and abilities on the sporting field were often seen as a source of threat, particularly in comparison to the norms of the Anglo majority. In contrast, Asian students' perceived high achievement in the academic field (when compared with Anglo students) was also seen in an unfavourable light – as a threat to the intellectual status of the Anglo-normative majority.

These kinds of unfavourable comparisons with the majoritarian norm can lead to “operational essentialism” (Schneider, 2005, p. 3) in which EAL students, from various linguistic and ethnic backgrounds, are expected to behave in a certain way in order to accommodate the various categories imposed on them by the majority. For example, Cui (2015) has identified that Chinese migrants in Canada are considered a “model minority” (p. 1). In her study, Cui (2015) noted that, particularly in urban metropolitan settings, Chinese “social and academic capital are highly valued” (p. 13). This is because these students often were seen by the majority as displaying traits which were conducive to academic

achievement, such as 'diligence' and 'focus'. However, this model minority view notably did not extend to the use of these Chinese students' existing L1 knowledge in school. In this case, adherence to the normative expectations of the majority tends to yield this model minority a degree of social and academic capital (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1998) in their particular school setting in relation to comportment in class, rather than L1 use.

Identity negotiation occurs in this milieu of socially sanctioned norms. What is not recognised by the normative majority, however, is that these imposed identity constructs serve to ascribe authority (Palmer, 2007; Street, 1994) to some model minority students who adhere to the idealised image of the diligent and focused minority student as defined by the majority. On the other hand, some minority students must achieve authority in the eyes of the majority as they do not, by default, display the requisite modes of performance demanded by the majority. Often students also adhere to these traits in an effort to conform to the expected norms of their own migrant community and, in particular, their parents. These students often encounter identity conflicts (Chen, 2010) across the social space of school as their sense of self conflicts with the established normative majority view of how their identity should manifest.

In addition to misrecognition (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1998) of behavioural and categorical norms (such as the diligent and focused Asian student), the majority may also misrecognise that various migrant and international students have differing cognitive abilities in their L1. This will affect these EAL students' ability to acquire effective academic English.

In this research I have made use of two levels of competence in a language. The first is conversational competence, which is the ability to perform everyday communications. The second is academic language proficiency which is the ability to make use of complex

academic language in the context of a cognitively demanding task such as writing an essay or doing a formal assessment. Conversational competence and academic language proficiency are related to the concept of Cognitive Underlying Proficiency (CUP) (Baker, 2011; Cummins, 2001) which asserts that a high level of language proficiency in one's L1 will serve as a basis for developing proficiency in English.

Too often, schools fail to recognise that the ability of an EAL student to converse in English and adhere to the normative expectations of the majority is not equivalent to the ability to communicate complex ideas in a cognitively demanding English language setting. Equally, the focus of English acquisition tends to ignore the role of L1 and the students' existing academic language proficiency in their L1. This is particularly true of migrant students who have been in the host country for a number of years (Chen, 2010; Mu, 2015), as well as those who were born in the host country but raised in an L1 home environment (Palmer, 2007).

In the Aotearoa/New Zealand context, Kim and Starks (2010) have noted the role of Korean fathers in language maintenance and attrition when the family arrives from Korea. Korean fathers often felt pressure for their children to assimilate rapidly to the language and cultural norms of Aotearoa/New Zealand. In this kind of environment, L1 academic language proficiency can often atrophy over time as English comes to dominate, both in the symbolic power of the wider society and the lived reality of school.

This assimilationist experience for migrant students often contrasts with international students who tend to have a greater degree of academic language proficiency in their L1. This is due to the latter's greater exposure to cognitively demanding terms in L1 rather than exposure in English in their early years. I found in my Master's research that teachers at that research site tended to ascribe the authority of academic capital to

international students (Davy, 2012) who were seen as displaying the cognitive and behavioural abilities to succeed in senior secondary school. Meanwhile, migrant students were often seen as able to speak English but were deemed by teachers to be not sufficiently committed to their education to achieve expected results. In addition, international students often come from wealthy families in their home country and come to Aotearoa/New Zealand for explicitly educational reasons while migrants tend to come from working- and middle-class families who come to Aotearoa/New Zealand for economic reasons. Vollmer (2000) found similar underlying assumptions about EAL learners around behavioural and academic norms. Vollmer, whose study took place in California, USA, particularly noted that assumptions around the ideologically constructed notion of assimilation led teachers to construct an image of a typical EAL learner. These assumptions were further reinforced in the views of teachers by the perceived need and willingness of the students themselves to integrate into the norms of the society they had entered.

Misrecognition of the differing linguistic, social and economic capital of these distinct groups can lead to schools categorising these students as a homogeneous Other (Borrero, Yeh, Cruz, & Suda, 2012; Kubota, 2001) expected to fit into established norms. Those students, often international, who are able to perform according to the school's expected norms are ascribed the authority of scholars.

The term *Generation 1.5* (Bartley, 2010; Benesch, 2008) has been used to describe students who have experienced some schooling in their country of origin as well as some schooling in their new country. These students offer a cogent source of critique of established social norms around the accepted ways of being the minority. They are subject to various normative discourses – by teachers, the wider school and society – which construct them as particular types of learners (Clark & Gieve, 2006), often a type of model

minority learner. This can potentially underestimate the degree of parental acculturation practices (Lee, 2015) and existing middle-class habitus (Chao, 2013) promoted by their family that creates space for them to negotiate transmigrant (or transnational) (Bartley, 2010) identities.

Transmigrants are considered to be those comfortable both in the host countries' and home countries' social and cultural milieus. Opportunities to negotiate transmigrant/transnational identities (Hornberger, 2007; Reynolds & Zontini, 2015) are, however, restricted when migrants attend mainstream schools in which the role of their language and culture is minimised in favour of the English language and cultural norms. Othering can occur in which students' L1 can be seen as not relevant to the pursuit of schooling in Aotearoa/New Zealand. When the core language and cultural traits of EAL students are seen as the Other, this affects the negotiation of their sense of self (Smith, 2013) as EAL students tend to deny the role of their L1 and culture over time in relation to both their educational identities and academic trajectories.

Along with the notion of transmigrant and transnational identities, it is important to consider the notion of translanguaging (Canagarajah, 2013a, 2013b). Translanguaging is the notion that individuals (in my case the EAL students in my research) are able to comfortably make use of multiple languages across contexts and sites. The relationship between translanguaging (comfort across linguistic barriers) and transmigrant/transnational identity (comfort across geographic and cultural barriers) is a crucial aspect of my research. I argue that, when effective links are made between the transnational and translanguaging nature of EAL students, these students will have greater opportunity to regard their scholarly identities as existing in conjunction with their wider lived experience, rather than in opposition to it. Too often, the current reality of EAL students is that their translanguaging is

not recognised in school and this core aspect of their identity is thus cauterised by artificial notions of school-based, monolingual language norms.

Investment in scholarly identities, I argue, can be enhanced when the existing funds of knowledge EAL students can access through their translanguaging are recognised and utilised by teachers. Jain (2014), in a study of EAL classes in an American community college, has recognised the positive implications of teachers acknowledging and validating the translanguaging identities and practices of those in their classroom. I would argue that the positive findings from Jain's work could be extended beyond the EAL classroom and community college context into the multilingual classes of mainstream schools and subjects within which teachers in Aotearoa/New Zealand work.

Challenges to the established norms of Aotearoa/New Zealand schooling which sees scholarly identity as existing in a monolingual, English-only context can be made. This requires a simple, yet elusive, shift in mindset. A shift away from the monolingual mindset (Clyne, 2005) which pervades Aotearoa/New Zealand classrooms and toward a translanguaging mindset which recognises the linguistic realities of Aotearoa/New Zealand's current student population is necessary. Teachers, as pedagogical authorities (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1998), are essential to this shift. Teachers are in a unique interpersonal position, via their pedagogy, to acknowledge and validate the translanguaging voices of the very students facing them on a daily basis.

Such acknowledgement and validation, I argue, would allow the classroom to become a space for the creation of transnational states (Bartlett, 2007) which recognise the social and linguistic identities of both migrant and international students as intrinsically borderless. A dialogue between EAL students and their teachers around translanguaging creates space for the assertion of the role of L1 and culture as central to the renegotiation

of scholarly identities. The process of creating transmigrant/transnational/translingual identities disrupts the monolingual norms of the existing education system and can thus ultimately contribute to the academic advancement of all students.

### Positionality: The Researcher as Prime Research Instrument

Development of a reflexive self-awareness of my own positionality within this social body is critical to this research. As Pennycook (1999) pointed out, a “self-reflexive stance [seeks to] question common assumptions, including [our] own” (p. 239). I am a middle-aged, middle-class, Pākehā male with university qualifications. This most WASPish of backgrounds places me in the Anglo-normative majority. I have reaped all the benefits of a system geared to advancing those who adhere to the norms of the Pākehā majority. My experience is inherently different from my research participants and, as such, renders my research lens opaque. In order to reduce this opacity as a researcher, I must be “aware of the limits of [my] own knowing” (Pennycook, 1999, p. 239) and seek to constantly question my own core understanding of the social realm and the participants I am researching.

One clear way I could work towards this was to adopt a self-reflective stance in my research and “develop a dialogic relationship” (Pennycook, 1999, p. 337) with my participants by putting on display my interpretations of emergent themes in the research and seeking critique and feedback from participants. Participants feeding back their own interpretations of emergent themes allowed me to step outside my previous experiences and reassess my related understandings and assumptions around both my research practice and the emergent research themes and findings.

Donald Schön (1983) uses the *term reflection-in-action* to refer to the process of ongoing reflection via dialogue. In the case of this research, the reflection-in-action occurred through reflexive interviews (Denzin, 2001) and reflective journaling (Clandinin & Connelly,

2000) by both me and my participants. These multiple forums allowed both the participants and me to “interpretively shape” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 102) the construction of emergent themes throughout the research.

Engaging in an interpretivist dialogic process of reflection-in-action between the participants and me created space for a collective form of reflexivity. This form of collective reflexivity follows, in Pierre Bourdieu’s (2004) terms, a kind of “epistemological prudence, making it possible to anticipate the probable chances of error” (p. 91), which occurs whenever I fall back onto my own normative assumptions and understandings of social phenomena. Such a dialogue allowed an “objectivation of my point of view” (Bourdieu, 2004, p. 94) in order to effectively position myself within the research.

#### Theoretical Approach: Introducing Bourdieu

Examining the interconnectedness of language and identity requires a set of theoretical tools. Pierre Bourdieu’s theoretical approach is helpful for me in this sense. Bourdieu identifies himself as a *structuralist-constructivist*. By structuralist he refers to an assertion that “there exists within the social world objective structures independent of the will of agents which are capable of guiding and constraining their practices or their representation” (Bourdieu, 1994, p. 122). By use of constructivist, he refers to the idea that “there is a twofold social genesis, on the one hand a schema of perception thought and action...and on the other hand [a schema] of social structures” (Bourdieu, 1994, p. 122). Each of these approaches to social theory yields useful tools when considering the role of language and identity in education.

Considering first the idea of schemas of thought and action, Bourdieu has coined the term *habitus* to refer to a “system of lasting, transposable dispositions which, integrating past experiences, functions at every moment as a matrix of perceptions, appreciations and

actions” (Bourdieu, 1998, pp. 82-83). In the case of my research, new migrant and international students each develop a specific academic habitus – a unique set of dispositions developed through past experiences that contributes to shaping their perceptions and actions (Harker, 1984) in relation to their schooling. Interpreting the transposable dispositions of participating EAL students helps to unlock how they negotiate their identities and their dispositions toward linking L1 use in school.

Bourdieu also noted that habitus is not static but always subject to change based on new experiences. Most relevant for this study, Bourdieu (1998) stated: “habitus transformed by schooling ... underlies the structuring of all subsequent experiences [and such as] the reception and assimilation of the messages of the culture” (p. 87). Therefore, the ongoing dispositions of a particular student toward their language and identity negotiation may be strongly influenced by the messages and wider normative milieu of the school.

When considering the objective structures capable of guiding and constraining EAL students’ practices or their representation, the notions of *capital* and *symbolic power* are related concepts employed by Bourdieu. Capital here refers to how “institutionalised mechanisms have emerged which tend to fix the value accorded to different products, to allocate products differently and to inculcate a belief in their values” (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 24). By products, Bourdieu is not referring to a narrow economic definition of goods and services. Rather he is referring to social, cultural and linguistic elements. These elements acquire social capital, cultural capital and linguistic capital that, in turn, acquire value through institutionalised mechanisms.

The key institutional mechanism in my study is the role of the school and its ability to affix capital value to the various traits of its students. For example, high-level English

language proficiency will hold a high degree of linguistic capital, while a student's L1 may hold low levels of linguistic capital. The attribution of value to English by the institution may come to transform a student's habitus to becoming less disposed to making use of their L1 in their education. This could facilitate a decoupling of a student's school identity from their L1. Attribution of capital value to the social class (Darvin & Norton, 2014a) and ethnicity (Jenkins, 1994) of these students might also impact on their habitus and, in turn, their identities.

School may be considered one field in which a student's "position and their interrelations are determined by the distribution of different kinds of capital" (Bourdieu, 1991, p. 14). Schools hold access to the cultural capital of qualifications and the potential for academic and vocational advancement. As such, they are significant social spaces in the struggle for symbolic power (Bourdieu, 1977, 1994) which is the ability to attribute value to various forms of capital. Schools exert "pedagogic authority" (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1998, p. 11) as they determine which elements of a student's existing capital may be valued or ignored.

The validation of English over a student's L1 may be seen as an example of what Bourdieu terms *symbolic violence* (Bourdieu, 1991; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1998), in which one element of capital comes to dominate and subjugate another element of capital. Watkins (2008) notes that symbolic violence occurs if certain knowledge and skills are not, or are only minimally, recognised. For example, the absence of L1 from curriculum and pedagogy and an environment which regards a lack of English disciplinary literacies as a cognitive deficit would clearly meet Watkins' definition of symbolic violence. Watkins (2018) recognises the value of English as a social necessity and a skill which allows for capacitation in which individuals are equipped with key capacities for social transformation. I agree with

Watkins that an absence of capacitation in English would also be a form of symbolic violence. When applying the concept of symbolic violence to my own research, I instead focussed on the symbolic violence which lay in under recognition of EAL students L1 and the cultural, arbitrary (Watkins, 2018) role of English and L1 in a linguistic hierarchy. This form of symbolic violence can lead to its own limits on the capacities by which EAL students can engage in social transformation.

Clearly Bourdieu's potent theoretical tools such as habitus, capital, field, symbolic power and symbolic violence will be useful in examining the impact of education in Aotearoa/New Zealand on the relationship between migrant and international students' language and identities at my school site. These tools will be examined in more detail and applied to my research site in subsequent chapters.

#### Methodological Approach: Bourdieu's Theory as Method

In my methodology chapter, I will explain how I made use of Bourdieu's social-constructionist methodological approach as the basis of the research framework. I will explore my adoption of an interpretivist paradigm through Bourdieu's concepts of habitus, field and capital in his theory of method. I will explain how these concepts provide a framework to gain meaning from interpretation of a messy research world (Law, 2007) in which participants often differ wildly in their trajectories.

Central to my interpretations will be engaging in an ongoing dialogic and reflexive relationship with participants. In so doing, my research placed participant voice at the centre of the sorting, selection and interpretation process by engaging in an iterative dialogue around data and findings. My participants are 14 EAL students from Year 12 (eight migrant students and six international students) from one mid-decile high school in

Auckland. These students were part of the research for the last two years of their high school (Years 12 and 13). I engaged in a “purposeful selection” (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2013, p. 230) of participants based on categorical elements from the school’s data base. My rationale for this selection was to explore the variation of experiences and identities that exists in such ubiquitous categories as *Asian*, *migrant* and *international student*.

In the selection of my sources of data, I sought to make effective use of Bourdieu’s theory as method tools by “simultaneously analysing the experience of social agents and the objective structures which make this experience possible” (Bourdieu, 1988, p. 782, cited in Reay, 2004, p. 439). The experience of social agents was sourced through semi-structured interviews with participants, as well as classroom observations and reflexive journaling by the students involved in the research over a two-year period. Objective structures were analysed via data collected from the school’s data base, as well as teachers’ school reports on student progress. This dual approach allows a consideration of both pedagogic authority and those exposed to the symbolic violence inherent in that authority.

I show how Geertz’s (1973) concept of *thick description* is a useful concept for my research. My data draw on the meanings of participants’ interpretations through an ongoing dialogic and reflexive practice. Thick description takes research from a descriptive to an interpretive paradigm. My methodology chapter goes on to explore the effectiveness of an interpretive paradigm and its claim to truth. I will explain how I established trustworthiness by actively engaging in practices such as “prolonged engagement in the field; persistent observation ... [and] member checking” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). I was also aware, when using an interpretivist paradigm, of the need to situate knowledge and representation. Using Gergen and Gergen’s (2007) definition of situated knowledge, I seek to “place

(knowledge) within particular contexts of use/value” while also being aware that “local conventions [are not] universal truths” (p. 474).

My methodology chapter goes on to outline the limitations of an interpretive paradigm such as the reliance on the dialogue that manifests between participants and myself. The inductive dialogic nature of my research was guided by participants’ interactions and social practices. This has great strengths but I also recognise its limitations and these will be explored in more detail in the methodology chapter.

In the final part of the methodology chapter, I will analyse the power relationship inherent in the researcher–participant relationship. I will seek to explore an understanding of the ways this relationship can be made more equal. I will then engage in a reflexive analysis of my own role as a researcher and teacher in this educational setting. I explain how sustained reflexivity is required during each stage of conducting, analysing, interpreting and reporting to ensure a consistent awareness of these power relationships. Overall, my methodology chapter highlights the links between the established literature around EAL students’ L1 and identity in school and the situated material practices of the 14 participants in my specific research site over a two-year period (which will be analysed in the findings chapters).

### [Framework of the Thesis](#)

This introductory chapter has provided the necessary context for my research. It has outlined the Aotearoa/New Zealand educational system and highlighted the focus on Auckland and the specific school research site. I have provided an initial understanding of the concepts of language and identities which are a central focus of this research. This chapter concluded with an exploration of the theoretical underpinning of my research,

drawing primarily on Bourdieu's work, and critiques of his theoretical approach. Chapter 2 will explain in more depth the relevant literature behind language acquisition and identities negotiation with specific reference to the Aotearoa/New Zealand school context. The manner in which this context impacts on new migrant and international students' identities and language use in school will be analysed in depth with reference to relevant literature. Chapter 3 explores the methodological lens used, how data have been analysed and the limitations of these data. Chapter 4 will provide a more detailed description of the individual EAL student participants and shed light on their personal background and journeys. Chapters 5-8 will analyse the major findings from these EAL students according to the themes of language and identities. I will engage in discussions at the end of the findings chapters as to how contemporary educators can make use of these findings. Chapter 9 will provide some concluding remarks on how linguistically and culturally diverse schools might more effectively activate links between L1 and identities in school.

## Chapter 2: Literature Review

### Introduction

Through this review of literature, I will adopt a Bourdieuan social-constructivist perspective. This perspective has been adopted around arguments about the role, in the mainstream Aotearoa/New Zealand education system, of English Additional Language (EAL) students' first language (L1), and its important implications in the shaping of these students' emerging scholarly identities.

Traditionally, Aotearoa/New Zealand secondary schools, much like the rest of the Anglo-sphere (countries in which English is the dominant language of civic and social engagement, e.g., Australia, Canada, the USA and the UK), have embraced a largely English-only focused curriculum and related assessment methods. As I will show, this approach is indicative of what Clyne (2005) terms the *monolingual mindset*. I will explore this monolingual mindset, through a Bourdieuan theoretical lens, making use of Bourdieu's key concept of *symbolic goods* (Bourdieu & Nice, 1980), in which various elements of capital acquire a symbolic value and are able to assert symbolic power (Bourdieu, 1991) over other elements of less valued capital. In practical terms, the valued element of capital in my research is the English language and the socio-cultural norms associated with English use in Aotearoa/New Zealand schooling. These language norms are subject to collective misrecognition (Bourdieu & Nice, 1980), both by the majority (L1 English language students and teachers) and, via a process of internalisation, EAL students as well. Consequently, the less valued capital element is EAL students' L1, which is not recognised as a valued element of capital in Aotearoa/New Zealand secondary schools. The monolingual mindset assumes that English, and only English, should be the medium of academic achievement.

I will review scholars who assert that the global power of English (Pennycook, 1999) can be countered by promoting *investment* (Norton-Pierce, 1995) in the previously undervalued linguistic and cultural capital of EAL students. I will follow the line of thought that views the classroom as a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991), which benefits from the positive presentation of L1 (Bartlett, 2007). In such a community of practice, EAL students' existing funds of knowledge (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992) can be drawn on for the benefit of all members of the community, English L1 students included.

In this research, I will be exploring EAL students' interactions in school, their involvement in class and their own perceptions of academic success. In so doing, I will make use of Liddicoat and Scarrino's (2013) concept of multiple lived communities, which are the lived reality for the EAL students participating in my research. Central to my research, then, is exploring how engaging in these multiple lived communities influences the EAL students' ongoing negotiation of their school identities (Le Court, 2012). From this, I will explore how concepts such as translanguaging (Garcia & Wei, 2014), in which both L1 and English are used in a dynamic way, might be used in the classroom. Such classrooms can, in so doing, become transnational spaces (Hornberger, 2007) and promote the development of EAL students' transnational identities (Darvin & Norton, 2014b). Development of such identities can also help minimise the social distance (Corson, 1998) often felt by EAL students as they negotiate their way between multiple lived communities in relation to school life.

With these goals in mind, in the remainder of this review of literature I will explore how scholarly identities come to be negotiated and performed by individuals. I will analyse how habitus and capital influences identity negotiation, with a particular focus on EAL students in the field of school. Examples will be drawn with respect to how teachers, students and the wider educational community can reflexively renegotiate ideas of capital

value and habitus. Such a renegotiation can free up EAL students to reconsider the value of their own capital and how it might impact upon their scholarly habitus (Watkins & Noble, 2013). All these elements can then aid in the renegotiation of the scholarly identities of EAL students, shifting away from the monolingual mindset and towards a translingual reality. In the final part of the chapter, I will explore literature that considers the pedagogical implications of the preceding analysis.

### Scholarly Identities and Scholarly Habitus

Given the pre-eminence of English as a valued cultural artefact in many Aotearoa/New Zealand schools, the role of a student's own L1 and culture may be silenced in relation to the more highly valued artefact of English. The uncritical acceptance of English language norms can pathologise EAL students. For example, Wigglesworth, Simpson, and Loakes (2011) found EAL students' lack of English is often perceived as a cognitive deficit. Further, Shohamy (2006) found the prestige of English can lead to a standardisation of EAL students' positioning. This might lead to the problematisation of English language acquisition and the gaze of EAL pedagogy (Moore, 2005) applied to these students. Pennycook (1999) has identified this process as an example of the "global power of English" (p. 333), a power which sees the "exclusion of alternative forms of literacy and a dislocation of the Other from academic discourse" (Le Court, 2012, p. 133). This can cause the loss of affiliation of L1 with scholarly identities. This, in turn, can lead to a looping effect of categorisation (Hacking, 1999) in which the EAL student disregards their own L1 in relation to schooling.

In contrast, when a student from an EAL background identifies their L1 and culture with academic success they will have a higher degree of investment (Norton-Peirce, 1995) in the relationship between their L1 and their education. Recognising this relationship can help

enhance chances of success in school (Krappmann, 2006; Llamas & Watt, 2009) for EAL students. Investment (Norton-Pierce, 1995) in language and culture helps to inform social identities (Wortham, 2006, 2008) of EAL students. For example, May (2011a) notes that majority languages are afforded “instrumental value” and are seen as assets in the quest for social access and mobility. Minority languages, meanwhile, are afforded only “sentimental value” (p. 160) and regarded as not holding the same worth in social access and mobility. Bourdieu and Nice (1980) used the term *symbolic goods* to refer to this phenomenon, where group members are afforded certain implicit privileges of membership due to their holding various forms of capital. These forms of capital include linguistic, social and cultural capital.

Establishing how constructions of EAL students’ habitus and scholarly identities are formed within the capital allocating social institution of the school is core to my research. Norton (1997, 2000, 2010) pioneered the notion of investment in education as being linked to membership of an imagined community, such as belonging to the school community. Norton’s work focused on adult EAL students although her concepts can be equally applied to high-school-level EAL students.

Those EAL students who regard themselves as members of this imagined community will have higher degrees of investment in academic success in the imagined community of school. For example, Hasan (1999) noted that the production and reproduction of official language in schools (such as English in the case of Aotearoa/New Zealand) tended to disempower minority students as social agents in their own education. In a contrasting example, Bartlett (2007) identified, in her study of a Latino student in a US high school, that the school’s local mode of sanctioning bilingual students in a positive light served to inform their identity as successful bilingual students. This allowed the EAL students to make

connections and feel invested in this imagined community of scholars as their existing funds of knowledge held value in this community. In both cases, the imagined community and investment by the student(s) are intimately linked in a spiral of dispositions, interpretations and actions that shapes scholarly identity.

According to Le Court (2012), “identities are often acted upon as if they were authentic and unified within cultural categories” (p. 19) rather than subject to negotiation across discursive sites and ever subject to change. Castells’ (2010) work on identity across spaces recognised that identity and the networks created in social space are intertwined social processes. Recognising this context of identity construction and reconstruction across spaces helps reinforce that students are members of multiple lived communities (Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013), of which school is only one. From these multiple lived communities comes ample opportunity for renegotiation of identities across time and social space.

Seeley (2014) sees the “multiple fragmented nature of identity [in the] social world as a system of overlapping and relational networks, institutions, and disciplines” (p. 33) and emphasises the need for a comprehensive analysis of the discourses that manifest in relation to these students across the school space. This view asserts the need for the narrative voice of the students themselves to emerge in any research that examines students’ identities. My research methodologies have sought to place the voice of participating EAL students at the forefront of findings (see Chapters 5-8).

Darvin and Norton (2014b) make use of the concept of *transnational identities* (Israel, Block, Bauserman, & Kinnucan-Welsch, 2006) to expand on Norton’s idea of investment. Transnational identities signal learners’ socially and historically constructed relationship to language, along with the desire to maintain links with their L1. Darvin and Norton (2014b) state that, if “migrant learners maintain multi-stranded connections with

their countries of origin and settlement, they engage with the world with transnational identities that negotiate a complex network of values, ideologies, and cultures [based around] fluid, multidimensional identities” (p. 57). In this view, which I share, the maintenance of language and culture are essential for EAL students to become “fully invested in their transnational identities” (p. 57) and to help shape positively scholarly identities and educational processes.

Representation in the school space of EAL students is thus framed by concepts of “social distance or closeness [which] constrains behaviour and helps change the meaning and value of a person’s presentation of self” (Corson, 1998, p. 17). EAL students often seek to adhere to the cultural and linguistic norms of the majority and acquire symbolically powerful forms of capital. The discursive, dialogic and ever-changing nature of social identities (Jenkins, 2008, 2014) and scholarly identities must, therefore, be recognised.

I have adopted a sociocultural perspective in my consideration of the relationship between social norms and identity formation. Sociocultural perspectives frame EAL students’ scholarly identities as being formed in relation to those around them at the school site. For example, Dixon and Durriheim (2000) adopt this perspective to assert that the *place-identity* frame of reference is constructed around the local nature of subjectivities. We are formed and informed by subjectivities of those around us and the symbolic power attributed to various forms of capital.

In an Aotearoa/New Zealand study, for example, Franken and McCormish (2003) have identified how a discourse of low expectations based on EAL learners’ backgrounds had a significant detrimental effect on their subsequent educational outcomes. As these students are immersed in an environment of low expectations, the capital they do hold is negated by those with pedagogic authority (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1998). The net result is

the severing of these learners from the idea that they can develop scholarly identities and succeed academically. Pavlenko and Blackledge (2004) note identities are ever subject to fragmentation and the negotiation of new identities. In the case of my research, these negotiations inform the scholarly identities of EAL students in relation to both English and their L1 over a period of two years (2016-2017).

Students' language and culture inform their sense of self in academic environments that often privilege the place of English within pedagogy and assessment. The Vygotskian idea that "semiotic mediation of cultural artefacts [such as language] are central to humans' abilities to modulate their thoughts and actions" (Bartlett, 2007, p. 217) is crucial to understanding how these students come to idealise their own scholarly identities and investment in school.

Kalantzis and Cope (1999) recognised that "people are simultaneously the members of multiple lifeworld's [sic] so their identities have multiple layers" (p. 270). Along similar lines, Harklau (2000) argues "identities embody a myriad of meanings, depending on contextual factors" (p. 40). Harklau (2000) went on to note that, within the context of schools, "educators are more able than their students to impose their perceptions and viewpoints as common sense" (p. 40). For example, Rubie-Davies, Hattie, and Hamilton (2006) identified the high expectations of teachers of primary school students from Asian and Pacifica backgrounds due to the perceived strict home environments within which they are raised. Thus, representational notions of categorical norms established by teachers serve to inform and reconceptualise student identities. As a consequence, with reference to my research, EAL participants have "actively create[d] their own identities and subjectivities within conditions that are not of their own making" (Gewirtz & Cribb, 2009, p. 98) amidst

normative discourses (Barkhuizen, 2010) such as the preeminent role of English and its scholastic necessity in the Aotearoa/New Zealand high school space.

The context of the place in which social interactions occur is also important to analyse in relation to EAL students' categorisation and social identity formation. Nieto (2010) has noted potential "discontinuities experienced by students whose cultures and/or languages differ substantially from the [English-language] mainstream might interfere with [their] learning" (p. 150). The difference in the social space of school life and the private space of home life may lead to "rejection of one's own language family and community" (Lankshear, Gee, Knobel, & Searle 2008, p. 38) in favour of socially validated ways of being and forms of capital which adhere to normative discourses of academic success and associated English language use.

Hornberger (2007) has suggested that a way to undermine this home–school dichotomy for EAL students is through the manifestation of transnational spaces as spaces in which these students may develop new identities in these new contexts. This conceptualisation of transnational spaces in school allows for the new migrant (or in Hornberger's terms, the transmigrant) and international student to navigate local practices. The notion of translanguaging (Garcia, 2007; Garcia & Wei, 2014) complements Hornberger's ideas by also allowing the student to negotiate school life based in both their L1 and culture as well as English and the majority culture.

With this in mind, my study examined how participating EAL students can subvert existing socially validated concepts of capital around language and culture by reflexively exploring how capital attribution impacted upon their negotiation of scholarly identities. Furthermore, I sought to gain an understanding of how participants utilise their own funds of knowledge as part of their emergent identities as scholars. I develop the argument that

making use of EAL students' existing cultural and linguistic resources through a process of culturally responsive pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 2006) creates space for EAL students to negotiate scholarly identities on their own terms. Investment in the educational community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) can be enhanced among EAL students when teachers accord a role to students' L1 (Littlewood, 2014) as an intrinsic element of their education.

Traditional Anglo-normative discourses have increasingly come to be challenged by educators and researchers alike via the assertion of EAL students' funds of knowledge. For example, in the Aotearoa/New Zealand context, Fletcher, Parkhill, Fa'afoi, Taleni, and O'Reagan (2008) found that "explicit and continued acknowledgement of the value of [the students'] language and culture" (p. 4) will reinforce students' scholarly identities and assumptions about their language and their education. This acknowledgement and attribution of value help mitigate the traditional monolingual mind-set (Clyne, 2005) dominant in Aotearoa/New Zealand educational settings.

Fossilised assumptions about language, culture and acceptable ways of being in school can come to inform and essentialise notions of language use by EAL students. These notions of language inform the social space of education creating, as Cummins (2009) put it, "normalised assumptions [which are] often implicit and unarticulated" (p. 261). These normalised assumptions, according to Cummins (2009), include that literacy refers only to reading and writing in the dominant language and that "first language linguistic abilities that bilingual students bring to school have little instructional relevance [and] linguistically diverse parents, whose English may be quite limited, do not have the language skills to contribute to their children's literacy development" (p. 262). Language, much like culture, within the prism of these normalised assumptions comes to be viewed as reified and timeless, an edifice of standardised and accepted forms of speaking and writing.

As Kalantzis and Cope (1999) noted, however, “the reality of language is not simply the reproduction of regularised patterns and conventions. It is also a matter of intertextuality, hybridity and language as the basis of cultural change” (p. 271). Language is not ethereal but *corporeal*; language comes to inform notions of ourselves as social beings and our identities as scholars.

The denial or diminution of EAL students’ L1 can have significant impacts upon their construction of self. Public practitioners such as teachers must be attendant to their own concept of language in public practice as well as the wider social norms which manifest through and about language. As Franken, May, and McCormish (2007) noted in an Aotearoa/New Zealand study on EAL provision, teachers must be aware of issues around EAL students and how the use of L1 can support their learning.

Evidence of the dynamic, socially embedded, nature of language has been shown in much recent sociolinguistic research. These dynamics occur in the social field, such as manifestations of dialects and language patterns according to place. They come to shape performances by EAL students in the school space around acceptable ways of being. For example, Pavlenko and Jarvis (2002) identified bidirectional transfer in English influencing US-Russian students’ Russian as well as their Russian influencing their English. This shows the dynamic and socially constructed nature of language manifest in speech patterns. Pavlenko and Jarvis’s (2002) work is one example which indicates performance as bilingual students can be implicitly linked to acceptable ways of being in school. This view challenges the deficit notions around L1 use characteristic of the monolingual mind-set (Clyne, 2005) of a great many other school sites. Mu (2014) has also identified a link between first language proficiency and an individual’s sense of ethnic identity as being moderately positively correlated. Similarly, ethnic identity has been found by Borrero and Yeh (2011) to have a

positive association with students' interest in learning and a sense of collective self-esteem amongst ethnic groups. These studies all point to the need for my research to be attentive to sociolinguistic and sociocultural processes as they manifest in my research site. I aimed to provide EAL student participants a platform to voice their views and to gain a reflexive awareness of how these processes impact upon their negotiation of identity as scholars.

Urry (2003) asserts the need for a "complexity turn in social sciences" (p. 1), as multiple identities and representations of EAL students occur across a range of social networks and "discursive formations [which] are present and at work within assemblages of power" (Zingsheim, 2011, p. 26). In order to establish how identity and habitus are formed and re-formed, I must first consider how the institutional allocation of capital acts upon the negotiation of EAL students' scholarly identities.

Overall, then, cultural artefacts such as language and embodied ways of being are essential to identity work. I argue, following the themes of the literature referred to, that the denial of such artefacts in the crucial social space of school can have a detrimental effect on EAL students' emerging scholarly identities. They may come to regard themselves as not embodying traits, particularly around language use, that adhere to normalised scholarly habitus. These manifestations of identities will occur across a range of "social networks helping to structure social actions" (Seeley, 2014, p. 27) and serve as a platform for the performance of the EAL students in accepted roles. The "discursive construction of national sameness [along with the] discursive construction of difference" (De Cillia, Reisigl, & Wodak, 1999, p. 149) can lead to the subjective application of difference being manifest in social practice. Students' language and culture are often categorised as holding a peripheral place in their education. They are to be gazed upon as an artefact, whose knowledge is not relevant to the academic work of the so-called mainstream (English-medium) Aotearoa/New

Zealand school context. This stands in contrast to EAL students being enabled to use their language and culture volitionally as a tool to enhance their education.

#### A monological view of scholarly identity

The extent to which the passive, categorised agent emerges in EAL students' negotiation of identities will, in no small part, be impacted upon by pedagogical practice. Since "education systems are crucial for the reproduction of monolingual norms" (Schneider, 2005, p. 1), understanding the capital attribution of EAL students' L1 and home culture is of great importance. Harklau (2000) provides a helpful definition of representation as "the images archetypes, or even stereotypes of identity with which students are labelled that serve to stabilise and homogenise images of identity" (p. 37). When homogenised images of EAL students' identity prevail, these students are categorised as holding particular traits that are implicitly linked to their identities.

EAL students' identities in the school space are thus framed by concepts of "social distance or closeness" (Corson, 1998, p. 17) to other members of the community of practice. Habitualised discourse dynamics (Gotsbachner, 2001), which construct these norms, might have a discriminatory impact upon those students "who are either unable or unwilling to fit the monoglot standard" (Blackledge, 2002, p. 670). That is to say, those EAL students who are either unwilling or unable to display particular forms of capital will be subject to symbolic violence by those who do hold socially sanctioned capital.

These dynamics allow those members of the social body who hold valued capital i.e., the social, linguistic, cultural, L1 English-speaking majority, to "hold minority 'cultures' responsible for their members' failure to succeed" (Gaudio & Bialostok, 2006) while "acknowledg[ing] difference only in contexts in which it favours [the majority]" (Foster, 2009, p. 685). Seeley (2014) noted, "identities must develop stories to explain themselves

and explain their position in the overall social world” (p. 38). My research sought to interpret how EAL students developed stories and identities to account for their position in the field of school.

Ellis (1993) has noted there is often a distinction between natural and educational settings. These distinctions often lead to challenges in adapting to unfamiliar social norms (Barnard, 2009) particularly when the linguistic and cultural norms of each setting differ. For example, Tse (2000) found that American students of Asian descent who still had links to their heritage language showed little or no interest in developing their identities based on their ethnic background. These students might have adapted to a learning environment that silences the role of a heritage language and culture and thus come to reject the development of their own identities in school based around these traits. Yamaguchi’s (2005) findings echoed those of Tse’s. In Yamaguchi’s case study of generation 1.5 Japanese students in America, these students had a negative view of their past in Japan and positive views of their current life in the USA. These students retained identities as Japanese but framed their identities through the prism of an English-dominant society and school. Through this prism their present American lives tended to be elevated while their past, Japanese, lives tended to be silenced. The impact of the desire to assert anglicised names by Asian students in western countries has been noted by Thompson (2006) as another example of the desire of these students to silence aspects of their identities in order to become normalised by the majority in their scholarly identity.

These spaces can affect identity negotiation, as Miller (2004) has noted, if “you sound alike within discourse you aren’t seen as different” (p. 310). Students who have similar dialects and speech patterns as their peers are not subject to Othering. Those students that are not native, by contrast, are often labelled as having *broken English*

(Lindemann, 2005) and categorised as the Other. This Othering is based on the subtleties of how speech patterns can affect self-image as the speaker projects a self-image (Riley, 2006) in light of the perceived assessment of those hearing their dialect and choice of language. By implication, Othering limits the terms upon which identities are negotiated. Language use, or the silencing thereof, thus has a clear effect on how EAL students cultivate a sense of self as scholars.

#### Multiplicity in scholarly identities

The view that identities are “multiple [and] fragmented [in the] social world as a system of overlapping and relational networks, institutions, and disciplines” (Seeley, 2014, p. 33) contrasts with the view of a monological scholarly identity which adheres to archetypal norms. The notion of multiple and fragmented identities leads me to question the homogenised and stabilised view of identity often imposed on EAL students. In contrast, for the purpose of this research, I regard identities as relational and multimodal. The relational nature of identities is important when considered in light of categories and representation. My research sought to question uniform assumptions often held by educators about the identities of EAL students. I sought to challenge these essentialised views by providing EAL students with voice to express how they regard their scholarly identities. The subtleties of these students’ voices and views drew out the heterogeneity of how they negotiate their various scholarly identities, in contrast to the homogenising ways in which they were usually positioned by others.

There are various case studies from research which contrast these examples of the silencing of elements of language and culture in EAL students’ negotiation of scholarly identities. These studies have highlighted the effect of EAL students utilising elements of their L1 and home culture, as well as English and the host culture, in the negotiation of their

scholarly identities. Dialect and accent are important aspects of how EAL students use language (Gee et al., 2001) to negotiate identities in an Anglo-normative environment. For example, Rampton's (1996) study of interethnic interactions within multi-ethnic schools in England revealed that students of "Asian descent put on strong Indian English accents when addressing Anglo teachers and adults" (p. 159) in order to promote negotiation of identities which make use of existing elements of their linguistic capital. The crucial aspect of this is that the negotiated and contextualised nature of language and identity serves to place in doubt traditional pedagogical notions of standardised English language being fossilised as the normative means of academic advancement.

Wortham (2008) argued that students might adapt to the learning environment over time and develop complex but robust identities in particular social groups. I have sought in my research to explore Wortham's argument around the extent to which scholarly identities of EAL students have developed over time by selecting participants who have had a range of time in Aotearoa/New Zealand schools. The aim here was to gain an understanding of the extent to which elements of EAL students' scholarly identities might shift or become more robust with more exposure to the Aotearoa/New Zealand education system.

Language users construct their own language use relevant to context. The denial or mitigation of the role of L1 in the school space restricts the terms upon which EAL students negotiate their scholarly identities. These restrictions stifle the development of their L1 in relation to their schooling. This process becomes more robust over time and restricts EAL students' linguistic options in the school environment.

Reay and William's (1999) research focused on the role of assessment in educational communities of practice. It noted that the way these educational communities of practice

develop will be shaped strongly by the power relations that manifest in these spaces. The power of classification acts in a capillary fashion through discourse and comes to discipline EAL students' way of thinking. Reay and William (1999) further noted in their study, that these power relations have a significant impact on higher educational choices by ethnic minorities. Clearly, then, negotiation of identities based in language and cultural elements are context- and place-dependent.

Nieto (2001) has found that "students' identification with and maintenance of their native culture and language can have a positive influence on learning [and therefore] the role of the teacher as cultural accommodator and mediator is fundamental to promoting students' learning" (pp. 154-155). This can be achieved when EAL students' existing funds of knowledge are seen to have capital value and are promoted in context-specific norms and everyday interactions within the school's community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Teachers might make use of students' existing "funds of knowledge that can form the basis for an education that addresses broader social, academic and intellectual issues than simply learning the basic rudimentary skills" (Moll & Gonzalez, 1994, p. 441). These funds of knowledge provide opportunities for alternative models of pedagogy that contrast with the monolingual, one-size-fits-all norm. In this dynamic view of pedagogy, "diversity becomes a positive resource for access rather than a cultural deficit to be remedied by affirmation of difference alone" (Kalantzis & Cope, 1999, p. 251) within the school space.

There is a key gap in literature around the effects of these various normative assumptions in relation to EAL students' identity negotiation and language use in a common social space of senior secondary school. The role of L1 as an element of valued linguistic capital, and its influence on scholarly habitus, is clearly important to understanding how EAL students learn a set of dispositions upon which they negotiate scholarly identities. My

research seeks to address this gap by creating a dialogue with EAL students to understand how their own learned set of dispositions, developed in the monolingual, English-speaking school context of Aotearoa/New Zealand, has influenced how they regard their own L1 over time as an element of capital (or not) in their ongoing education.

### [Bourdieu's Linguistic Capital and Habitus in the Classroom](#)

Schools are traditional modes of transmitting socially sanctioned norms and habits (Shilling, 2008) through the valorisation of norms and habits that attribute symbolic power to the capital of the majority. They implement, through the curriculum and pedagogy, the socially sanctioned knowledge (Nieto, 2010) and monolingual norms (Schneider, 2005) required of the nation-state (May, 2008). In the case of Aotearoa/New Zealand, these monolingual norms come to privilege the notion of English as being the language which is required for academic success and the language which signifies scholarly identity.

Rodriquez (1982) identified the chasm of the private home language of students and the formal academic language of school. This chasm arises out of a regular silencing in the school space concerning "who can speak and what/what not can be spoken" (Fine, 1991, p. 33). L1 comes to be regarded, through this process, as only for use within the family while English comes to be regarded as the language of academic advancement. In particular, there is value attached to English in Aotearoa/New Zealand schools as the dominant language of social communication and economic advancement. EAL students are tasked with acting out a kind of "public performance" (Lukes, 2005, p. 23), as they shape their language use in an effort to curry favour with those who assert categorical norms and hold pedagogical authority: namely, teachers and assessors.

Social, cultural and linguistic capital (Bourdieu, 1984) are important concepts when considering my research site. In Pierre Bourdieu's multi-faceted conception of capital,

cultural capital can be defined as learned competence in the ways of doing things within a particular culture. The particular nature of capital is important to note here. Archer and Francis (2006) asserted that capital is context-specific and does not hold value across time and space. The value of capital is attributed in specific fields and that value might not hold across fields. My own concept of capital is informed by this view and that the learned competencies associated with capital are subject to reproduction and change (Harker, 1984; Harker & May, 1993) across time and space. The attribution of value of learned competencies are institutionalised through educational qualifications (Bourdieu, 1985) such as NCEA in the Aotearoa/New Zealand school system. As such, the pedagogical authority of the teacher has a significant role in the attribution of value of these competencies in the specific field of the classroom.

Habitus is a key concept which has links to capital. Habitus, according to Bourdieu (1984), is a learned set of dispositions that arises in specific fields that attribute value to various elements of capital. Habitus becomes more ingrained via repeated practices over time which are unconscious and implicit. Specifically, when applied to this research, the notion of scholarly habitus can be defined as dispositions acquired over time as a result of repeated practices that incline a student towards scholarly endeavour (Watkins & Noble, 2013) in a particular field. Habitus can be seen as an adaptive system that may be reframed and subject to reinterpretation according to the conditions of field and the capital valuation that is attributed in that field. Habitus therefore helps establish “schemas of perception” (Watkins & Noble, 2013, p. 95) related to various fields.

Fitzpatrick and May (2015) have noted that field is itself a “product of historical politics and relations of power” (p. 106). In my case, this product is the field of the school site in which my research took place. This school site is one in which I was both a researcher

and a teacher. As a consequence, my positionality in the academic hierarchy as a participant in these very relations of power (Fitzpatrick & May, 2015) are important to consider when I make use of the theoretical tools of capital, habitus and field.

Habitus is informed by “deep codes [which] are mostly unconscious and emanate from common traditions” (Yair, 2009, p. 5) that are historically situated in specific fields. I am just as subject to these deep codes as any other individual in a particular field. Deep codes, in turn, “lead to constituting narratives in culture” (Yair, 2009, p. 143) and “[lead] to institutions establishing a logic of practice” (Bourdieu, 1990c, p. 12). It is of critical importance that I, as a researcher, am constantly reflexive around my own positionality, as well as aware of the inherent power I hold in the institutional logic of practice within the school site.

Truth, under this conception of habitus, “involves struggles in every field” (Bourdieu, 1990c, p. 32). This points to the “generative nature of habitus” (Watkins & Noble, 2013, p. 140) in which generative is meant to describe “a set of unconscious and inventive strategies [which] come into play when conditions are encountered that are identical or analogous to those which created the habitus in the first place” (Scahill, 1993, p. 302). These strategies among established members of a learning community are employed because they share the same habitus. Bourdieu’s perception of the social world thus rests upon the belief that all social relations, including linguistic exchanges, are symbolic interactions (Bourdieu, 1991) premised upon relationships of symbolic power. According to Bourdieu (1984), schools act as though all students have equal access to all forms of capital when, in many cases, they do not.

Making use of Bourdieu’s concepts of capital, habitus, and field allowed me to recognise the dynamic, interrelated nature of social interaction and self-identification.

Capital is ever-changing and the role of various arbiters of capital such as teachers is essential. Under this dynamic view of Bourdieu's concepts, the linguistic capital of EAL students could be asserted more value by pedagogical authorities. In this process teachers could use their pedagogical authority to communicate forms of powerful knowledge rather than the knowledge of the powerful (Nash & Lauder, 2010). My research made use of Bourdieu's concepts coupled with dialogic analysis of data and reflexive practices. Scholarly habitus, when reflected upon in a dialogic manner, becomes more conscious, explicit and subject to change. This is exactly the approach I took with the framing of scholarly habitus in relation to L1 capital as it manifests in the field of Aotearoa/New Zealand classrooms.

#### Critiques of Bourdieu

Before exploring the implications of a Bourdieuan analysis more specifically for EAL students, it is worth addressing briefly a regular critique of Bourdieu – his supposedly over-deterministic view of social structures which limit individual agency. Giroux (1981) critiques Bourdieu's view of habitus, for example, by asserting that it "smothers the possibility for social change and is reduced to a mode of management ideology" (p. 9). In Giroux's view, the structural imposition of habitus does not allow for the individual's consciousness to break free of the social structure and to allow them to live a non-conditioned life.

Hargreaves (1982) echoes a similar critique of Bourdieu's structural determinism, noting that "cultural determinism within which the agents of cultural practices ... are properties of the system" (p. 14) which, in turn, is controlled by those in power, allowing little room for human agency.

Bourdieu's theoretical construct can be conceived as one of domination and subordination. Calhoun (1993) noted that, in this system, power is always used and "differential[ly] distribut[ed]" (p. 64) to powerful elites that hold deterministic will over the

attribution of capital value. According to Shilling (2004), Bourdieu's system "can't account for those which break free from trajectories assigned to them" (p. 474) by acts of resistance and the assertion of individual agency. Homi Bhabha (1994) has argued instead for the idea of hybrid identities which recognise moments of categorical in-betweenness and reject categorical absolutism. This view allows for a process of social change such that the discursive self is not always "reducible to [and] determined by something else" (Collins, 1993). While Bourdieu's structural ideas do offer clear insight into social worlds, I was ever alert to avoid fundamentalist interpretations of his ideas that place all weight on social structure. These interpretations can deny the potential of human agency and social change.

The next major critique highlights the over-use, or misuse, of Bourdieu's theoretical tools. Any theory should be a guide to illuminate research and bring a degree of clarity to findings. Research should not be made to fit theoretical constructs. Diane Reay (2004) argued that there is a "contemporary fashion of overlaying research analyses with Bourdieu's concepts rather than making the concepts work in the context of the data and the research settings" (p. 431). Research conducted in this way does not draw out the analytical subtleties of a particular site or set of participants. Rather, this sort of research seeks to fit real social phenomena into a preconceived set of ideas. As such, theoretical tools need to be consistently wrestled with by researchers (Grossberg, 1996) so that we guard against retroactively imposing concepts upon the social world.

I must also consider that Bourdieu's theoretical tools are interrelated and not ignore any one aspect of his theory. Ward, Bochner, and Furnham (2010) have asserted that "raids to capture discrete concepts may violate the integrity of the conceptual schema" (p. 158). Given this, I was aware when applying Bourdieu's theoretical construct to my analysis, of

the inherent interrelatedness of habitus, field and capital and their impacts on the identity formation of students.

I argue that it is not helpful to simply abandon Bourdieu's theories as structurally over-deterministic, as denying individual agency, when researching identity and language. Adams (2006) provides a cogent argument for a hybridisation of these two extremes of social theory. Adams (2006) asserts "the importance of post-reflexive choice" (p. 511) when considering structural elements such as habitus, field and capital. This creates room for agents to question deterministic social conditioning and assert their own vision of habitus and attribution of value to elements of their capital.

On balance, I argue that Bourdieu's social theory has more analytical benefits than shortcomings. This is particularly true in relation to the kind of research I conducted. His theory of habitus provides powerful insights into how conditioning of dispositions can have effects on the individual. His notion of habitus is backed by a theory of capital that asserts the role of the symbolic power of language and culture which those who are symbolically powerful may wield in a given field.

I must, however, not be absolutist about Bourdieu's theories and recognise the validity of his critics. I must be aware of avoiding over-determinism and denial of agency as well as avoiding reverse engineering my findings to snugly fit the theory. Conducting this research with an awareness of agents' post-reflexive choice and an understanding that the habitus of participants is ever changing helped provide a more nuanced approach. The complex nature of new migrant and international students' relationships between their languages and identities in school required nuance and a reflexive awareness of phenomena such that these students' voices would be effectively heard in my research.

## Applying Bourdieu with EAL students

Bearing these important caveats in mind, I continue to apply a Bourdieuan analysis in order to show that the misrecognition of equitable access to capital can cause inequitable outcomes for EAL students. The framing of these students as holding, or not holding, socially valued forms of capital has been termed as the framing of a kind of symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1985). In the case of education in Aotearoa/New Zealand, symbolic capital is asserted by schools as being held by those who are able to perform effectively in a monolingual (English-speaking) environment. Gewirtz and Cribb (2009) have noted that this leads to institutional norms which manifest in “conforming notions of the ‘ideal pupil’ [who] can accrue symbolic capital” (p. 95) in the field of school. This can manifest particular dispositions in learners (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1998) that, in turn, generate accepted notions of a scholarly habitus.

When applied to the broad field of education, this requires a renegotiation of socially established ideas of scholarly habitus in the school space. Specifically related to schools, the recognition and misrecognition of capital may lead to “embodied competence – a competence which may include the ability to reproduce specific textual forms, to cite particular culturally valued texts or to maintain normalised relationships with other students and those in positions of authority” (Carrington & Luke, 1997, p. 107). In the case of my study, this relates to how EAL students articulate embodied competencies in classroom interactions within one Aotearoa/New Zealand secondary school site. I sought to interpret the extent to which these EAL students are exposed to an Anglo-normative hidden curriculum (Gillborn, 1992) and how they respond to these dominant realities. Capital, in this case, inherently takes into account the notion of “embodied capital [as] the individual is trained in a set of knowledges, practices and dispositions of the bodily habitus. That is, he or

she learns to embody the traits and practices of particular kinds of [socially valued] literate human subjects” (Carrington & Luke, 1997, p. 105).

In the area of language use, the phenomenon of the reproduction of institutional norms is also clear to see. For example, Heller’s (1996) study of schools in Ontario, Canada, identified ideas of legitimate language use that would valorise English and tend to Other the students’ L1. Those that do not hold the appropriate linguistic and or cultural capital might be subject to symbolic violence in which students’ L1 or culture are discounted as being not useful or appropriate to education in an English-speaking academic environment. Under this framing, capital becomes an embodied phenomenon (Bourdieu, 1985) that holds a value in a field.

Fields have been defined by Bourdieu (1991) as “semi-autonomous, structured social spaces characterised by discourse and social activity” (p. 215). These fields can produce a “logic of practice in which models are handled in a practical pre-reflexive state” (Bourdieu, 1990c, p. 65). Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) note that the politics of field are inscribed on the individuals who participate in that field.

Attribution of elements of capital are therefore inherently related to the historical politics of a field. As a consequence, specific fields may experience a degree of congruity or separation when distinctions in fields occur according to the attribution of capital. For example, in the school/home fields, “contradiction between specific interest of the family as body and collective class interests” (Bourdieu, 1990c, p. 45) may arise within the discipline of education. This may lead to a disjunction of the home/school fields around concepts of the acceptable forms of habitus and attribution of capital value that apply to each field. In particular, with a view to my own research, the English language has high capital value in

the field of the Aotearoa/New Zealand education system. This can lead to a linguistic disjunction for EAL students across fields.

The idea of field as a social space in which symbolic exchanges occur is crucially interrelated to capital and the manifestation of habitus (Bourdieu, 1985). Pink (2011) has noted that a kind of performance in social spaces occurs in relation to others and is derived from the notion of emplacement in which the field of social exchange helps determine embodied dispositions. These dispositions are derived from the holding or otherwise of symbolic capital and come to form a habitus. The specific fields in which these forms of capital and symbolic power manifest are, therefore, key to understanding the construction of capital in social realms.

In the specific context of schools, and the classroom, the choices made by students (Ball, Davies, David, & Reay, 2000), that are the result of these dispositions, are dialogically framed by the nature of the social environment. Given the interrelated nature of field and habitus, teachers should engage in the dynamic context that is specific to the intersections (Asher, 2007) of their students' language and culture in an effort to mitigate the misrecognition of capital.

Ideals of the correct ways of being that manifest a habitus lead to social actors negotiating identities shaped by these ideals. In the case of school, EAL students attempt to link their scholarly identities to the ideals of a scholarly habitus. Often this process discounts the role of their own L1 and culture in their education in an attempt to adhere to the monolingual norms of the school field.

Crucially for Bourdieu and Nice (1980), those who hold capital engage in "collective misrecognition" (p. 267) of the fact that they are holders of capital. In the case of my study, those students (and indeed teachers) with English as a first language collectively

misrecognise the fact that they are the holders of these key forms of symbolic capital. For example, Barkhuizen, Knoch, and Starks (2006) noted that Aotearoa/New Zealand Pākehā students asserted conservative views with regard to multilingualism compared with the views of Māori, Pacifica and Asian students. It may be said here that the Pākehā students' collective misrecognition of the fact that they hold the symbolically valued linguistic capital of English led, in turn, to them negating other forms of linguistic capital. This misrecognition leads to notions of "fake meritocracy [in which] those with advantage don't recognise their advantages" (Yair, 2009, p. 118). As Bourdieu argued, habitus "held in common by the members of dominant groups permeates education, the law, and media" (cited in Blackledge, 2002, p. 70) and can affect the way individuals perform across social fields.

The cultural capital of students who are not from the dominant group is silenced or minimised in relation to the dominant, normative language and culture. In the case of EAL students, they are often placed in a "passive role [that] induces a form of learned helplessness" (Cummins, 1986, p. 27) in this cohort of learners. This can lead EAL students to further negotiate identities of the self-existing outside of acceptable educational norms, particularly in relation to their own L1 in their education.

These monolingual school norms can, however, be effectively challenged. Jaffe (2003), for example, has argued for the collective and collaborative production of text by bilingual students. In the Jaffe (2003) study of Corsican/French bilinguals it was found that the collaborative production of texts tended to raise the perceived value of Corsican amongst both students and teachers. In this case, the school created space for the recognition of a scholarly habitus that encompassed students' performance in Corsican as it held symbolic capital in that particular field. This served to mitigate the collective misrecognition of the dominant role of French in these Corsican students' education.

In the case of Aotearoa/New Zealand schools, collective misrecognition manifests when English is valorised over other languages. EAL students' performance in English is seen as crucial to success and other forms of linguistic capital are discounted in favour of the social norm of English as the language of the academy. This could be seen as a modern iteration of English in the discourses of colonialism (Pennycook, 1999), as the dominant way of being is constructed subjectively as being objectively rarefied truth. When applied to pedagogy, this may lead to socially sanctioned knowledge (Nieto, 2010) and transmission pedagogy (Cummins, 1986) framed by a monolingual mind-set (Clyne, 2005) which promotes English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) withdrawal classes and English-only teaching and assessment methods – both prominent in Aotearoa/New Zealand schools.

ESOL withdrawal classes have the aim of rapidly enhancing EAL students' English language skills such that these students might more effectively integrate into monolingual mainstream classes. ESOL classes have an intensive focus on the vocabulary and grammar features of English. Students are divided into ESOL classes according to the level of English they hold when they enter the Aotearoa/New Zealand school system. As a consequence, EAL students are placed in ESOL classes which have a range of students from different year levels, studying different subjects outside of the ESOL class, at different qualification levels. In this environment, it is difficult for the ESOL teacher to focus on the subject-specific disciplinary literacies an individual student might require for their other subjects.

While ESOL classes are well meaning in their goal of enhancing EAL students' English abilities, they often have the unintended consequence of socially and linguistically isolating EAL students (Franken, May, & McComish, 2005). In addition, students' existing L1 knowledge is, at best underutilised and, at worst, totally ignored in these classes as the focus is on the acquisition of English.

The sublimation and silencing of EAL students' L1 permeates through much of the wider school's academic contexts. This is particularly true of the silencing of EAL students' L1 (Miller, 2004) during high-stakes assessment (Garcia & Pearson, 1994) at senior secondary school. In addition, Coxhead, Stevens, and Tinkle (2010) found, in their study of the corpus of four science textbooks published for Aotearoa/New Zealand schools, that these textbooks contain many high-level, often unknown words for EAL learners comparatively new to English.

Specifically for my study, the EAL students were in senior secondary school and sitting NCEA national assessments which are taught and assessed in an English-only environment. Educators, acting in what they believe to be a pragmatic way, may have a "positive self-presentation [in which] his or her own group or country is essentially tolerant towards minorities or immigrants" (Van Dijk, 1993, p. 250). However, they might be simultaneously using classroom practices that propagate socially sanctioned norms such as the dominant role of English in Aotearoa/New Zealand schools.

#### Ethnicity as an element of capital

Another key component in the construction of capital which may be subject to symbolic violence is ethnicity. Ethnicity has been defined by Watkins and Noble (2013) as a "social construction based on the perception of shared qualities borne out of the interaction between self-identification and identification by others" (p. 5). This conception of ethnicity as manifest in educational norms may lead to "deep-seated and unchanging cultural pathologies" (Watkins & Noble, 2013, p. 7). A key aim of my study is to expose the cultural pathologies around ethnicity, and language, which have been internalised by EAL students who have been exposed to these forms of symbolic violence. Gotsbachner's (2001) concept

of xenophobic normativity is helpful here when considering how a majority culture talks about minorities. Often this xenophobic normativity comes in subtle forms that emerge under the radar of established social norms such as the framing of foreigners as posing an economic threat to the majority population's jobs or as a social threat to the existing (majority ethnic) culture. In the case of ethnicity, Foster (2009) identified the "race talk" of majority white college students in one US college in which the acknowledgement of racial differences only occurred in situations that were perceived to favour the white students. Other situations that potentially disempowered ethnic minority students were noticeable by the silence of white students' race talk (Foster, 2009).

Van Dijk (1992) identified the issue of what he termed *elite racism*, in which elites would frame discourse as a positive self-presentation that would impose a negative discourse on migrants. Van Dijk (1992) recognised that the positioning of new migrants that came from languages and cultures "other than the dominant metropolitan" (p. 197) language and culture were labelled as "disadvantaged". He notes that national and local education policies were developed which aimed to remedy this disadvantage. The ESOL withdrawal classes discussed earlier are a good example of this in the Aotearoa/New Zealand context. The stated policy aim of Manawa High School to achieve rapid integration of new migrant students, as long as they have sufficient English language skills to achieve in a mainstream setting, can be seen as yet another example of (re)positioning *disadvantaged* EAL students.

Watkins and Noble (2013) noted that the construction of a scholarly habitus around certain embodied capacities may lead to "different capacitated bodies' produc[ing] a disposition to learn". Watkins and Noble (2013) conducted a study in Australia on the relationship between EAL students' learned set of dispositions, which form their scholarly

habitus, and the attribution of elements of capital by pedagogical authorities in school and wider social discourse. One of the key findings of this study was that “students from ‘Asian’ backgrounds are often seen as having a cultural advantage, while others, such as Pacifica students, are perceived as culturally prone to under achieving” (Watkins & Noble, 2013, p. 1).

My research has been informed by this finding and has sought to problematise the assumptions and misconceptions (Harper & De Jong, 2004) of the uniformity of the categories of EAL students from various ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. My particular focus is on EAL students who all are categorised ethnically as Asian. These are the kinds of students often portrayed as being successful, based on certain imagined cultural advantages. I aimed as part of the study to expose distinctions held by the EAL students themselves around distinguishing factors like country of origin, family background and length of time in New Zealand. These subtler distinctions impact on concepts like language use in relation to those students’ scholarly habitus and negotiation of scholarly identities. Overall, then, my research is informed by various concepts related to the socio-cultural experiences of students in the school space.

Within the social space of schools, social identities become linked to imagined communities (Norton-Pierce, 1995). In these imagined communities different participants within the community come to negotiate diverse understandings of how the community should be constructed. This then forms within the milieu of normative discourses and develops a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Less experienced members of a community (such as EAL students) come to participate in these communities in ways which are familiar to existing members of these communities (i.e., existing teachers and English L1 students).

These EAL students seek to perform the role of the ideal English learner as they seek to move away from the periphery of the existing community of practice and towards its centre. Bourdieu (1984) calls this the *illusion of unanimity of representation* which can create “archetypal images of learner identity, offer(ing) a means of understanding how seemingly self-evident and unchanging identities emerge in a particular social context” (Harklau, 2000, p. 35). When “teachers themselves adopt particular ethnicised schemas of perception of students and their parents which participate in the distribution of academic outcomes” (Watkins & Noble, 2013, p. 33), a scholarly habitus around certain elements of capital, such as language and ethnicity, is established. This will serve to normalise and pathologise various students according to socially constructed categories. Thus, the credentialing function (Martin-Jones & Heller, 1996) of education masks real sources of inequality.

#### Rethinking scholarly habitus

If students in the field of education are able to reflexively renegotiate their forms of capital and habitus according to more dynamic, less essentialised ideas, habitus may no longer be imposed from above but may also be negotiated from below.

Bartley (2010) identified the fluid, non-essentialised nature of migrant patterns and social relations. Bartley asserted that a nuanced view of dispositions to learning and the role of language was highlighted by students in new academic environments. These non-essentialised views of migrants (and international students) and their patterns of migration highlight how EAL students can be academically comfortable in both languages and cultures as transmigrants who can exist in transnational spaces (Hornberger, 2007). These spaces, in turn, may imbue a transnational identity (Darvin & Norton, 2014b) amongst EAL students.

Elements of both the home and host culture and language come to be positively utilised in identity and academic work. Kalantzis and Cope (1999) have noted that such students have the opportunity to construct multiple lifeworlds which might have a positive impact on identity construction and academic outcomes. Such opportunities include encouraging a transcultural perspective on language education (Canagarajah, 2013a, 2013b).

Challenges to the habitus of the individual may occur in a variety of ways. Banks (1995) noted that transformative teaching methods may come to question racialised discourses. Methods such as student participation in personal, social and civic action as well as interactive teaching have been identified by Banks (1995) as ways of renegotiating habitus and forming less essentialised views of the role of language and culture in mainstream educational contexts. In the area of literacy development, D'Warte (2014) noted that teachers may use the linguistic repertoires of EAL students in multiple languages to construct literacy activities. These activities would serve to disrupt the established idea of English as the sole language of education and serve to renegotiate the scholarly habitus and their scholarly identities and which integrated EAL students' L1 into the teaching and learning process. I thus sought, in my research, to encourage participating EAL students to renegotiate their own scholarly habitus via a reflexive awareness of the role of their L1 and culture in their education.

Reimagining the relationship between language and identities in education can lead to Othering being disrupted. For example, Epstein and Kheimets (2000) identified the Mofet schools in Israel as an example of where Israeli Russian-speaking teachers helped monolingual Russian-speaking students. This allowed the establishment of alternative fields and habitus which serve to reconceptualise and undermine the established normative framework of the majority Hebrew-speaking population.

## Aotearoa/New Zealand Literature Related to Identity and Language

Research specifically related to the Aotearoa/New Zealand context echoes the findings of the international literature on the (re)positioning of EAL students. For example, Bartley (2010) has identified that “there is a significant population of children who grow up embedded in social networks characterised by transnational family structures” (p. 389) in Aotearoa/New Zealand. These students have a stronger degree of affiliation with their L1 as well as English when negotiating their scholarly identities. As a consequence, negotiation of identities and the narration of the self (Hornberger, 2007) occur for these students, across geographic and temporal spaces such as the home, school and wider community. For other EAL students in Aotearoa/New Zealand, a bifurcation of home life and host country life is characteristic of their experiences. For example, Kitchen (2010) identified that Korean new migrant students in Aotearoa/New Zealand classrooms experienced a breakdown of cultural connections, such as the role of Korean language and culture in their education. This constrained options for the negotiation of identities amongst these students.

The role of community diasporas has also been explored in research from Aotearoa/New Zealand, particularly with reference to Pacifica communities. For example, Siope (2011) highlighted the central role of church and community (and values; Violeti, 2006) for Pacifica new migrant students in Aotearoa/New Zealand, acting in concert with family ambitions to live the migrant dream. Toloa, McNaughton, and Lai (2009) found that the use of Samoan language in home and community might be made more productive use of in school to assist academic participation and achievement. Further, in the Aotearoa/New Zealand context, Siteine and Samu (2011) identified the superficial and limited representations of Pacifica peoples in Aotearoa/New Zealand school journals, which are common reading texts in primary and junior secondary school. This representation helped

contribute to a patterned way of thinking about this ethnic group around surface features of the culture, such as food and dance, rather than a more in-depth representation of the various cultures, languages and social relations of Pacifica peoples.

That said, there is a key gap in the literature regarding how various Asian diasporic communities in Aotearoa/New Zealand respond to issues such as literary representation and L1 use for academic purposes. In my study, I sought to raise these issues of representation and language use with participating EAL students from an Asian categorical background. I will explore in the findings chapters how students were aware of culturally based stereotypes, as well as their conflicted views in relation to their L1 use for scholarship. Through discussing emergent themes with this cohort of Asian EAL students, I wanted to see if they came to view their own identities as fluid (Hitlin, Brown, & Elder, 2006) and subject to change over time. This would help question, from the ground up, textual and social perceptions of particular ethnicities as an ossified cultural artefact to be determined and categorised by those in the academic hierarchy.

All of the studies explored earlier, both in Aotearoa/New Zealand and internationally, clearly demonstrate the need for enhanced understanding of the relationship between EAL students' L1, their identities and their schooling. The extent to which they themselves regard these relationships in an English-dominated school environment has important implications for the negotiation of scholarly identities. Ward et al. (2001), for example, have found that teachers are unlikely to make changes to classroom context and learning tasks when they have international and migrant students in class. Pedagogy such as this, as well as assessment (Reay & William, 1999), can induce fear and anxiety in EAL students as they come to believe that their relative performance against English L1 students in an English-dominant environment reveals something intrinsic about

themselves. This would serve to cauterise the negotiation of scholarly identities in relation to L1 and culture.

This silencing of EAL students' language and culture can, however, be reversed and subject to renegotiation via developing a reflexive awareness of the silencing. As Benesch (2008) has noted of various generation 1.5 students, these students can come to assert a view in which they regard themselves as *particular* rather than *visible* minorities. These students attempt to assert their own demographic, linguistic and academic particularities in school rather than accepting institutional and pedagogical labels of being a visible homogeneous grouping. Fletcher et al. (2008) identified perceptions by teachers of the need to provide multiple supports for Asian students in Aotearoa/New Zealand for reading in English. In Fletcher et al.'s study, the view of a homogeneous Asian student emerges in teachers' perceptions. This is a view which I explicitly seek to critique in my study.

McNaughton (2011), in a further Aotearoa/New Zealand study, has identified the need for teachers to become adaptive experts in their pedagogy in order to support adequately the diverse needs of their students. These supports, McNaughton contends, should include the active use of the existing linguistic and cultural funds of knowledge that these students have. This would allow space for new opportunities to re-negotiate scholarly identities. This approach to pedagogy is also validated by research outside Aotearoa/New Zealand such as that by Saville-Troike (1984) who found "children who achieved best in content areas as measured by tests in English, were those who had the opportunity to discuss the concepts they were learning in their native language with other children or adults" (p. 216). This allows EAL students space to make use of existing funds of knowledge and to develop a more nuanced, heterogeneous view of scholarly identities. As noted earlier, Hornberger's (2007) conceptualisation of transnational spaces also allows for EAL

students to navigate “local practices and identities profoundly rooted in processes of globalization, constantly shift[ing] and develop[ing] across time and space” (p. 325).

Just as the notions of culture and language require a rejection of fossilisation, so too does the concept of place. Miller, Kostogriz, and Gearon (2009) and Kostogriz (2009) each affirm Hornberger’s view of the role of transnational spaces by exploring the notion of transculturation as a central aspect of the pedagogical process as the majority comes to acknowledge the ways of the Other. Place for EAL students, when considering transculturation, takes on a radically different conceptualisation from that of traditional notions of place as space in stasis. In relation to the wider Aotearoa/New Zealand education system, this would mean developing a pedagogy that actively rejects deficit ideas around EAL students’ L1 and culture and promotes them as the inherent funds of knowledge that they are. For example, in a Swedish study, King and Ganuza (2005) noted that a transmigrant identity was developed in Chilean new migrant students to Sweden which helped strengthen their identity in both cultural settings. In the Aotearoa/New Zealand context, Bartley (2010) has helpfully linked these concepts to the experience of transmigrant youth in New Zealand. He identified the concept of settlement as a “complicating factor given the fluid nature of contemporary migration patterns” (p. 390). My study seeks to further analyse how migration patterns and length of time in New Zealand schools complicate the terms upon which scholarly identities are negotiated amongst EAL students.

A translingual student engages in fluid conceptualisations of place and how language and culture may manifest in these places which, in turn, either enable or restrict subjectivities (Pink, 2011). My research explores how the fluidity of place experienced by these EAL students at various stages of their lives has influenced subjectivities around

language use and shaped their negotiation of scholarly identities. De Cillia et al. (1999) noted that the “discursive construction(s) of national sameness [along with] discursive construction of difference” (p. 149) can lead to the expression of difference being manifest in social practice. My research recognises that “positioning, whereby selves are located in conversations can be interactive in which what one person says positions another [or] reflexive positioning in which one positions oneself” (Davies & Harré, 1990, p. 48). As such, the researcher needs to be reflexively aware of established norms in order to comprehend how students locate themselves within a particular site. A process of reflection by all participants in the social realm of schooling may allow these students to become more “visible in their daily lives” (Benesch, 2008, p. 294). This can, in turn, create space for the renegotiation of scholarly identities around less categorically uniform and more nuanced aspects of EAL students’ real lived experiences.

#### Renegotiating scholarly identities

Providing EAL students with opportunities to connect the linguistic and cultural background of their families, as well as literate practices of their previous educational experiences, with the practices of the new school, can reconceptualise scholarly identities. This will be shaped around existing funds of knowledge (Moll et al., 1992) within a newly negotiated community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). For example, Pang and Macdonald (2015) note of Chinese students in Australia that these students construct identities over transnational boundaries but this construction is often not recognised by Australian educators. Jia, Gottardo, Koh, Chen, and Pasquarella (2014) have identified that the level of acculturation experienced by Chinese immigrants is a strong predictor of English literacy skills. While Fung, Wilkinson, and Moore (2003) noted that L1 assisted learning of English texts by

Chinese students helped develop cognitive and metacognitive strategies in both their L1 and English.

Morgan (1997) has noted that identities emerge for EAL students in meaning-making activities. These activities include the use of rich texts (Gibbons, 2009) in which academic content is highly scaffolded via context-embedded tasks (Cummins, 1981). My research considered the extent to which EAL students are afforded opportunities in class to engage in these kinds of activities and make use of existing funds of knowledge, such as their L1, while engaged in these activities.

Providing learners space to negotiate and develop their own scholarly identities creates further space for “effective learning [which is] relevant to the individual rather than institutionally imposed” (Kalantzis & Cope, 1999, p. 255). For example, Zhang and Cowie (2004) noted that Chinese students in Aotearoa/New Zealand physics classes enjoyed the positive social environment established by their teachers but were concerned and wary of what they perceived as time wasting. Here we see students’ own expectations of what constitutes a scholarly habitus challenged by social norms in the school. Clearly, these students had a conception of what the class should be like that contrasted with the actual experiences of an Aotearoa/New Zealand style of pedagogy.

This kind of negotiation of scholarly identities is premised on the promotion of “student empowerment as both a mediated construct influencing academic performance and as an outcome variable itself” (Cummins, 2001, p. 179). Educators need to be challenged to recognise a new concept of pedagogy which “does not separate learning and social positioning [within a] curriculum [which] affords opportunities for social identification, and social positioning as social actors develop models of self/knowledge” (Bartlett, 2007, p. 218). The reflexive awareness engaged in during my research, by both

participants and myself as the researcher, provided opportunities to problematise the positioning of EAL students in their learning environments.

An important implication for renegotiating scholarly identities is the extension of reflexive awareness practice across the teaching profession. When teachers recognise that “the selection and definition of school knowledge is legitimated by recourse to a version of rationality in fact, a political process of labelling and exclusion” (Gillborn, 1995, p. 3), they may begin an iterative process with their students that allows for contestation and reconsideration of legitimised school knowledge such as how a scholarly habitus is conceived and normalised in scholarly identities.

Higham, Brindley, and Van de Pol (2014) have called for dialogic secondary education along these lines which reverses the non-participation in imagined communities (Norton, 2014) that is often the experience of many EAL students. In practice, this would involve teachers hearing and reflexively acting upon the voices of EAL students such that they become active participants in the classroom community practice based upon their existing funds of knowledge. Carrington and Luke (1997) have, in turn, recognised the need for the “recognition of the student’s capital as such by those who are in a position to monitor and govern the exchange of capital” (p. 106). Specifically, in the field of education, these governors of exchanges of capital come in the form of teachers, parents, policy makers, researchers and, indeed, the students themselves. Schools are the most direct social institutions that embody the state and are “the arbiter of the rate of exchange between the semi-autonomous forms of capital over which people struggle in the various fields that together comprise the social field” (Pileggi & Patton, 2003, p. 320). Part of the reason for my research is thus to bring the struggle for recognition of non-legitimised forms of knowledge

(such as EAL students' L1s and cultural backgrounds) to the forefront of consciousness in the social fields of education and educational research.

There are multiple literacies taught and learned in community and school fields (New London Group, 1996). However, EAL students in Aotearoa/New Zealand continue to be normalised/pathologised in relation (only) to literacy acquisition in English. According to Watkins and Noble (2013), in their Australian based research, "school practices help produce the attributes of learners [and, in turn] these attributes are embodied as dispositions towards learning" (p. 1). Understanding the links between school practices and the dispositions of EAL students in terms of the negotiation of their scholarly identities is crucial to my research. Exploring if this link leads to established notions of scholarly habitus being "patterned in terms of ethnicity and broader sociocultural background" (Watkins & Noble, 2013 p. 2) is a core focus of my findings.

What is required in the school space is negotiation of identities based upon EAL students' existing dispositions, as these students "develop durable, classroom-specific identities [which] emerge across events" (Wortham, 2008, p. 294). Rather than objectively reified, social identities should be constituted as "multiple, a site of struggle, and changing over time" (Norton-Pierce, 1995, p. 14). A reflexive awareness of how identities are negotiated will help this change occur. What is required is a reconceptualisation of notions of identities and, in particular, learners' identities such that we may better connect the various discursive spaces and the ways of being within which EAL students are enmeshed.

Appeals to constructions of culture, language and place as reified and objective identities within the education system may lead to "pedagogy and curriculum becom[ing] cosmetically relevant rather than genuinely transformative" (Grimmett, MacKinnon, Erickson, & Riecken, 1990, p. 23) as teachers continue to engage in "a one size fits all form

of transmission pedagogy that promotes normative linguistic and cultural markers of success” (p. 23). Teachers must instead be sensitive to EAL students’ understanding of the rules of participation (White, 2011) in class and that non-participation is not a sign of academic apathy but an effort to maintain elements of their own identities in the face of an onslaught of new social norms. When teachers gain an understanding of how EAL learners construct knowledge (Villegas & Lucas, 2002) and affirm views of the diverse backgrounds of learners, they will go some way towards connecting the social spaces of home and school language and culture in a meaningful way.

Regarding culture, language and place as fluid entities operating in a nexus of normalised “institutional constraints require educators to make individual and collective choices in how they negotiate identities with students and communities” (Cummins, 2009, p. 262). This would include pedagogy with an intercultural orientation (Cummins, 1989) that is attentive to students’ existing funds of knowledge. Further to this, educators face choices around “how they interact with and engage students and activate their prior knowledge by involving parents and their home language and culture in their children’s education” (Cummins, 2009, p. 262). Making these choices would lead to greater investment in scholarly identities by EAL students, which are framed by both English and L1 use.

When values and assumptions around institutional norms are foregrounded, EAL students can gain an opportunity to glimpse elements of their own complex identities as well as how they are classified across spaces. Students may come to understand how institutional norms influence their ordering of relevant and irrelevant knowledge, such as the roles of their L1 and English. This newly formed understanding can go some way towards challenging norms and constructing EAL students’ own funds of knowledge as intrinsic to the terms upon which they negotiate their scholarly identities. This

reconceptualisation of what constitutes capital may then inform a new *reflexively aware* scholarly habitus which reasserts the value of EAL students' existing language abilities in relation to school and their scholarly identities. Engagement with the funds of knowledge of the communities from which EAL students come may help break the silence that surrounds EAL students' L1 in mainstream schooling. Strauss and Smedley (2009) have noted that the process by which refugee students are made welcome into Aotearoa/New Zealand schools has been constrained by the availability of resources and translators. Educators must work to develop a community of such resources and translators so that existing funds of knowledge may be more effectively utilised. For example, the high level of Samoan language use in homes and communities (Toloa et al., 2009) of Aotearoa/New Zealand's Samoan-speaking students should be made more productive use of in the classroom context. This is particularly true of these students' L1, as their language has strong links with their ethnic identity (Mu, 2014). To extend the good work done in relation to Māori and Pacifica students' ethnic identities in Aotearoa/New Zealand, my research explored links between language, ethnicity and identity for EAL students from the Asian ethnic category in more detail. I sought to drill down into the wide range of countries, backgrounds and experiences that make up this pan-ethnic category.

Webber (2013) states that "culturally responsive pedagogy is dependent, in part, on teachers getting to know their students at a deeper level, by teachers not being afraid to raise gritty questions about how their students relate to their own ethnicities and those of others" (p. 67). It requires a rejection of normalised representations of language and culture and how these manifest to construct identities. My research sought to interpret the accepted ways of being around language and culture in senior secondary school.

Gee (1999b) showed that “literacy practices are fully shaped by economic, political, and cultural contexts as well as social interactions” (cited in Bartlett, 2007, p. 216). For EAL students, the implication here is that “bilingual literacies and their educational trajectories are shaped by social relations and identity formation” (Bartlett, 2007, p. 216). The influence on practice will lie in the emergent understanding for teachers and the school of the effect on students who are regarded as not holding particular valued forms of capital, such as the linguistic capital inherent in English fluency within wider Aotearoa/New Zealand society.

The particular embodied capacity of language, then, represents a form of “embodied capital that enables or disables educational participation [that has] to be placed alongside other forms of educational capital” (Watkins & Noble, 2013, p. 62). As such, I was concerned when undertaking this research to give voice to students’ own views of their language and identity. In doing this, I aimed to expose more enabling opportunities in our schools for learning based less on the pre-eminent role English in pedagogy and assessment and more on the existing funds of knowledge of all students, including those traditionally silenced in normative, English-medium classrooms.

If educators are able to make real long-term connections with EAL students’ homes and communities they may go some way towards “redefining institutional goals so that the schools transform society by empowering minority students rather than reflect society by disabling them” (Cummins, 2001, p. 191). This form of pedagogy in its application would acknowledge that “education [and] curriculum is a dialogue between student discourses and the culture of schooling” (Kalantzis & Cope, 1999, p. 262). The need arises for educators to “examine non-school literacy practices to find connections between local literacies and the dominant, academic literacies” (Morrell, 2002). These practices will subvert the artificial

separation of students' literate practices and dominant literacies promoted in public schools (New London Group, 1996).

Reconceptualisations of pedagogy, such as those outlined above, would go some way towards encouraging renegotiation of scholarly identities. This renegotiation of scholarly identities can then more adequately reflect the realities of today's translingual and transnational EAL student population in Aotearoa/New Zealand schools.

## Chapter 3: Methodology

### Introduction

This methodology chapter will explore my adoption of an interpretivist paradigm toward the material practices of EAL students' schooling. I will explain how, through this paradigm, Bourdieu's social-constructionist methodological approach has been used. Such an approach asserts that the dialogic negotiation of meaning should be central to data collection, analysis, and interpretation. My research has, at its core, student voice. As such, the dialogue EAL participants engaged in during data collection and the reflexivity of ideas therein help inform my findings around the central research question of this thesis:

What are EAL students' own perception of their linguistic capital (both L1 and English) in relation to their schooling and their own scholarly identities?

In order to seek answers to this question, I used Bourdieu's (1973) methodological concept of *praxeological knowledge*. Such knowledge considers that analysis is not of the *stuff* but what the *stuff means* (Mitchell, 2007). The meaning of the stuff in my research is the perceptions of the EAL students. How we get to an understanding of what the stuff means depends on my choice of methods. As such, the active interview (Gubrium & Holstein, 2012) was adopted in an effort to replace the authorial voice of the researcher with the co-constructed knowledge that comes from student voice and the dialogic interpretation of that voice. The implication of this and other sources of dialogically focused data collection will be discussed further later.

I will also explore my role as a researcher and my engagement with reflexivity throughout the course of this research. I will examine, in particular, how my own symbolic power is contended with in the messy world of the research. Finally, I will demonstrate how

and why all the above elements are particularly methodologically well suited to the conduct of this research. I will focus on the concept of understanding the situated knowledge of the local practices in the field I research. For now, though, this chapter will begin with an overview of qualitative research and how it relates to educational settings.

### Qualitative Research in Educational Settings

*Qualitative research* is a highly contested term. The term encompasses research drawn from a range of paradigms. These paradigms are used to analyse data which have been collected through various methods. Data analysis may involve an array of interpretations depending on what paradigm the researcher chooses to work with. Selection of a research paradigm is therefore important as it crucially serves, in turn, to shape my research aims.

Although qualitative research is a contested term, Denzin and Lincoln (2005) have offered an in-depth definition that helps me shape an understanding of my chosen research paradigm, forms of data collection, and analytical methods. Denzin and Lincoln (2005) stated, “qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world” (p. 3). Here, Denzin and Lincoln take a critical stance towards qualitative research. Knowledge is not the end goal but is rather a transformation of the existing conditions of a group or society. My own research goes some way towards advancing this view as my research explicitly aims to make a difference in the material and linguistic practices of EAL students in a school setting.

Denzin and Lincoln’s (2005) definition is significant when considering the context of educational research. Their attention to the situated nature of qualitative research alerts me to the importance of the place and context of the study. My research takes place at one

school site. This site serves as the locus of my observation. The interpretation of material practices will be framed by my understanding, and the participants' understanding, of the site within which we are situated.

Denzin and Lincoln's (2005) statement about practice transforming the world is also important for me as an educational researcher. We often research in spaces where young people are having highly formative experiences. Our research, by its very nature, impacts on these experiences. My research is no exception to this. I must be aware of my role and engage in a constant process of reflexivity around the impacts I am having. Educational researchers work in a field that "is inherently political and shaped by multiple ethical and political positions" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 7). I must be empathic to these positions and seek to maintain my ethical and epistemological integrity throughout the research.

In their general definition, Denzin and Lincoln (2005) went on to state "qualitative research involves an interpretive naturalistic approach to the world" (p. 3). I seek to interpret a natural world that is often complex and contradictory. In order to make meaning from messy worlds (Law, 2007); as a qualitative researcher, I need to develop an "intimate relationship between [me] and what is studied" and understand "the situational constraints that shape inquiry" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 10). Interpretation will be shaped by the "socially constructed nature of reality" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 10) that manifests in the researcher-participant relationship.

Denzin and Lincoln's definition of qualitative research has helped shape my own understanding of the research paradigm I used in my own study, along with the related means of data collection and interpretation I employed. The next section will outline my own research paradigm in light of Denzin and Lincoln's call for qualitative research that is a

situated activity, interpreting material practices, and seeking to make visible and transform the world.

### Sources of Data

In selecting my sources of data, I sought to make effective use of Bourdieu's theory as method tools by "simultaneously analysing the experience of social agents and the objective structures which make this experience possible" (Bourdieu, 1988, p. 782, cited in Reay, 2004, p. 439). The experience of social agents was sourced through semi-structured interviews with participants, reflexive journaling by the participating EAL students, and classroom observations, over the two years of research. Insight into the objective structures of the school site were sourced from institutional data, such as school policy documents, the school's database of students, and students' school reports.

This wide range of data allowed "a means of viewing structure as occurring within small-scale interactions and activity within large-scale settings" (Reay, 2004 p. 439).

### Participants

I engaged in "purposeful selection" (Cohen et al., 2013, p. 230) of participants based on the following criteria:

1. Each participant was categorised as either a permanent resident or an international student in the school database.
2. Each participant's ethnicity was categorised as 'Asian' in the school database.
3. Each participant had some previous educational experience in a country other than Aotearoa/New Zealand.
4. Each participant was an EAL student.

5. Each participant was in Year 12 and sitting NCEA level 2 in 2016, when the research started (most students in Year 12 are over 16 in Aotearoa/New Zealand schools).
6. Each participant had no instructional relationship with the researcher. That is to say I was not currently, nor had I been previously, their teacher.

This purposeful sampling sought maximum variation within the criteria set out above. I was careful to purposefully select a wide range of students on the basis of country of origin, time in Aotearoa/New Zealand and residential status (see Table 1). This maximum variation, purposeful sampling was an effort “to achieve representativeness of the activities, behaviours, events, settings and individuals involved and catch the breadth and heterogeneity of the population under investigation” (Cohen et al., 2013, p. 230). The maximum variability also reflected the super-diverse nature of classrooms in Aotearoa/New Zealand. I sought to explore the variation of experiences and identities that exists in such ubiquitous categories as *Asian*, *migrant* and *international student*. In particular, an exploration of the similarities and differences around how members of these categories view of their own L1 in school was key to emergent findings.

With the support of the school principal and advice from the school’s international dean, I invited 14 students (eight migrant students and six international students) to participate in the research. A total of 13 of these students were involved throughout the two years of the study and participated fully in interviews, journaling and classroom observations. One international student (Shane, a pseudonym as are the names given in table 1) returned to China at the end of year 12 and so only participated in interviews, journaling and classroom observations for the first year. Below is a summary table of participants. Chapter 4 will be devoted to a more in-depth profile of participants. This is to

account more fully for the particulars of each participant, which inevitably go well beyond any categorical placement.

*Table 1. Participants*

Pseudonym	Age at the start of research	Gender	Residential status	Country of Origin	Time in Aotearoa/New Zealand at start of research
Daniel	17	Male	International Student	China	1 year
Leon	16	Male	International Student	China (Hong Kong)	3 years
Miyu	17	Female	International Student	Japan	1 year
Seong	16	Female	International Student	Korea	4 years
Shane*	17	Male	International Student	China	6 weeks
Udom	17	Male	International Student	Thailand	3 years
Elaine	16	Female	Migrant Student (Refugee background)	Myanmar/Burma	3 years
Harry	16	Male	Migrant Student	Cambodia	11 years
Jejomar	16	Male	Migrant Student	Philippines	5 years
Jung Min	16	Female	Migrant Student	Korea	8 years
Kanda	16	Female	Migrant Student	Thailand	4 years
Kathy	16	Female	Migrant Student	Philippines	6 years
Kidlat	16	Male	Migrant Student	Philippines	4 years
Padayao	16	Female	Migrant Student	Philippines	10 years

\*Shane participated in the study for the first year (Year 12) and then returned to China. All other participants were in the study for two years (Years 12 and 13).

Table 1 allows room for only very general characteristics of participants. As noted, for a more in-depth biography of participants, see Chapter 4.

## My Research Paradigm

The research paradigm I have chosen to work with in this research is drawn from social constructivism. I use social constructivism through a Bourdieuan methodological framework, incorporating critical/interpretive and reflexive methods of analysis. In the following sub-sections, I will elucidate how these ideas cohere to inform my own research paradigm.

### Social constructivism

My research is centrally concerned with “interpreting the material practices” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 3) of EAL students at one senior secondary school and how these practices are situated in a specific context to inform identity and language use. Upon consideration, I feel that the best way to interpret these material practices and make the world students inhabit visible to both readers and me is to use a social constructivist paradigm.

Social constructivism asserts an epistemology in which “knowledge of the world and self finds its origins in human relationships” (Gergen & Gergen, 2007, p. 462). For my research, knowledge of students’ concepts around identities and language will arise from an iterative dialogue of interpretations and reflections between participants and me around these issues. Claims to objective truth in a social constructivist paradigm are rejected as “no one arrangement of words is necessarily more objective or accurate in its depiction of the world than any other” (Gergen & Gergen, 2007, p. 464).

The strength of a social constructivist approach lies in its ability to construct knowledge from social practices. It allows for an ongoing dialogic negotiation of meaning. I would, however, critique the social constructionist paradigm for its assertion of Vygotsky’s (1978) idea that everything within the mind reflects the surrounding social sphere (Gergen & Gergen, 2007, p. 465). Wholesale acceptance of such a view negates human agency and

reduces “independent thought processes” (Gergen & Gergen, 2007, p. 465) to a product fashioned within the structure of a particular setting.

#### An interpretive paradigm using reflexivity

As Law’s (2007) notion of messy research suggests, we are not bound by set trajectories and have the capacity to engage in a dialogic transformation of our practices. I would, therefore, assert that my social constructivist paradigm should also be informed by ideas of interpretation and reflexivity. Social constructivism at its core does have “the capacity to reduce orders of oppression, broaden the dialogues of human interchange ... and to incite the collaborative creation of more viable futures” (Gergen & Gergen, 2007, p. 465). As such, it provides a powerful epistemic basis on which this research is founded. I argue, however, that an interpretivist paradigm is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the epistemic rigor I seek. The very nature of subjective interpretations by both participants and me requires an “incorporate[ion] of reflexiv[ity]” (Sommer Harrits, 2011, p. 156) to enhance the interpretive method. Bourdieu (1973) argues that praxeological knowledge, which focuses on an interpretivist analysis of themes as they emerge in the research, can bridge the objectivist–subjectivist divide. Sommer Harrits (2011) notes that this is achieved by moving from the analysis of “structures and regularities” that is characteristic of a normative paradigm to “analysing principles of production of these regularities inherent in practice” (p. 156). By utilising reflexivity in my research, I aim to subvert the pitfalls of phenomenological subjectivity and simultaneously acknowledge the “limitations of objective knowledge” (Sommer Harrits, 2011, p. 157) while maintaining epistemic rigour in exploring the world of human experience.

## Gaining a thick description

Geertz's (1973) concept of a *thick description* is useful for my research. Cohen et al. (2013) note that a thick description approach to research lends itself to "interpretation of events rather than relying on the researcher's own inferences" (p. 466). A thick description takes research from a merely descriptive to an interpretive paradigm.

Thick description is used in this research by the very nature of its methods and conceptual framework. The social construction of knowledge relies on participant interpretation. Bourdieu's concepts of habitus, field and capital in his theory of practice, outlined below, provide a framework to gain meaning from interpretation. The participants and I were consistently engaged in reflexivity through dialogue and interpretation. These tools focus "not on the 'stuff' itself, but on what the 'stuff' means" (Mitchell, 2007, p. 60) to participants.

My research placed participant voice at the centre of the sorting, selection and interpretation process by engaging in an iterative dialogue around data and findings. This led to the refinement of interpretation and a thicker sense of what *stuff* means. In this paradigm, the authorial voice (Mitchell, 2007) of the researcher is replaced by the co-constructed voice of participants and researcher.

## Effectiveness of an Interpretive Paradigm and Claims to Truth

Adopting a critical social constructivist paradigm and making use of interpretive methods has led me to question more positivist ideas of claims to truth. Denzin and Lincoln (2005) have identified a "triple crisis of representation, legitimation and praxis that confronts qualitative researchers in the human disciplines" (p. 19). If we assert a position in which lived experience is constructed in text and social interactions, we face a crisis of representation as objective claims to truth are called into question. Legitimation of the

researcher's findings are also problematic when we cannot objectively claim truth. Denzin and Lincoln (2005) note that the legitimation crisis "involves a serious rethinking" of more traditional qualitative judgements of effectiveness such as "validity, generalizability and reliability" (p. 19). Finally, if we cannot claim an objective material truth in the world how can we engage in praxis to make changes to the material world?

The following sub-sections will seek ways to address this triple crisis from the critical social constructivist paradigm that has been used in my methodological approach. Rather than asserting objective claims to truth, I will seek instead to judge the effectiveness of my interpretive methods against the criterion of trustworthiness. These criteria, in turn, include the notions of credibility, confirmability, transferability and dependability. I will outline how these criteria are underpinned by a sustained process of reflexivity. I will then outline how issues of situated knowledge and participant representation have been addressed in this research.

#### Trustworthiness

Lincoln and Guba (1985) have argued that the criterion of trustworthiness can replace the more traditional qualitative judgements of validity and reliability. This criterion can be broken down into the notions of credibility, confirmability, transferability and dependability (Cohen et al., 2013, p. 210). In this research, I aimed to achieve trustworthiness through a rigorous process of member checking and interpretations co-constructed with participants (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Details of how I aimed to achieve credibility, confirmability, transferability and dependability will now follow.

#### Credibility

Lincoln and Guba (1985) include "prolonged engagement in the field; persistent observation ... [and] member checking" (Cohen et al., 2013, p. 185) as some of the means of gaining

credibility in research. I have had prolonged engagement in the field of study. I have been a teacher at this school for over a decade and conducted data collection for my research over a two-year period (2016-2017). In those two years, I have engaged in observations of students in various classes and they were involved in regular reflexive journaling. My interviews served a double purpose of data collection and member checking of my interpretations of data made from previous interviews, journaling and classroom observations. I sought to engage in an iterative, dialogic interpretation of data in which participants' co-constructed knowledge in a process-orientated format (Talmy, 2010). In this process of interpretation, participants were able to enhance the credibility of interpretations through consistent member checking of emergent themes during interviews.

#### Confirmability

Confirmability can be enhanced, according to Lincoln and Guba (1985), by techniques such as “multiple devices for recording ... a flexible observation schedule in order to minimize biases [and] using low inference terminology and descriptions” (cited in Cohen et al., 2013, p. 187). I have sought to use multiple devices for recording, such as a flexible observation schedule (see Appendix 2), in conjunction with audio recording of classroom interactions.

In addition, I have collected data in participants' journaling and semi-structured interviews (see Appendix 1 for the schedule of initial interview questions). When relaying my initial interpretations to participants, I have sought to use low-inference terminology and descriptions so participants can engage fully in a co-construction of interpretation. Gee (1999a) stated that the agreement is important and “more convincing the more native speakers of the social languages in the data and members of the Discourses implicated in the data agree that the analysis reflects how such social languages actually function in such settings” (p. 95). So, for my research a key means of confirmability was seeing if my

interpretations agreed with how participants see their social language functioning in the field.

Given the multi-ethnic backgrounds of my participants it was of particular importance that my confirmability took account of cross-cultural considerations. Matsumoto and Yoo (2006) note that research in cross-cultural settings often makes the flawed assumption that:

Countries are the same as cultures ... individual behaviour is the same as group behaviour ... there is a single or main culture in a culture and ... attributing the causes of differences found between cultures to cultural sources rather than to other factors. (cited in Cohen et al., 2013 p. 190)

In order to counter these flawed assumptions, I sought confirmability from participants about my interpretations of their backgrounds and how these have influenced them. The biographical vignettes set out in Chapter 4 were drawn from the participants' own descriptions of their backgrounds and member-checked with them for confirmability. I do not seek to assert that these participants' interpretations are representative of their culture, rather that they are situated in the participants' own particular experiences.

#### [Situated knowledge and representation](#)

Gergen and Gergen (2007) note that situated knowledge is important when a social constructivist stance is adopted in research. According to Gergen and Gergen (2007), situated knowledge "does not invalidate knowledge claims so much as place them within particular contexts of use/value ... descriptions and explanations can be [trustworthy] so long as one does not mistake local conventions for universal truth" (p. 470). As noted earlier, my research does not seek to assert a claim of universal truth. I have attempted to provide clear description and explanation of context and participants.

Distributed representation (Gergen & Gergen, 2007) has been used in this context through the establishment and maintenance of an equitable dialogic relationship between participants and myself. Situated knowledge is more effectively conveyed when “participants were given a broader space in which to tell their own stories” (Gergen & Gergen, 2007, p. 472) and form co-constructed interpretations of data. When writing up this thesis, I have sought to be reflexively aware of how I represent participants in light of their contribution to the research and the interpretation of findings.

### Transferability

Lincoln and Guba (1985) use the notion of transferability in place of the “external validity [criterion] in qualitative research of generalisability” (Cohen et al., 2013, p. 186) when assessing effectiveness in more naturalistic research such as this current study. Clear and detailed presentation of my findings, setting and participants is required for others to be able to effectively assess the extent to which my research is transferable to different situations, settings and groups. Gee (1999a) suggested that the notion of “coverage” is useful here. He asserted “the more [findings] can be applied to related sources of data” (p. 95) the more transferable a research project becomes.

Central to my research has been gaining a thick description of data through my co-constructed interpretations of participants. This iterative process has allowed room for the *what* and the *how* of social language, situated meaning and cultural models to be explored. The depth of interpretation here creates room for other researchers to assess whether these interpretations are applicable to their own research settings.

### Dependability

Dependability is the final criterion of trustworthiness. Cohen et al. (2013) have noted that when “data are analysed at different levels ... [and] the writing engages the reader and is

replete with unexpected insights, whilst maintaining believability and accuracy” (p. 226), dependability can be gained. When writing is seen to be authentic (Guba & Lincoln, 1989) to readers, the dependability of interpretation is enhanced.

Much like the measures set out in the credibility section, I have sought dependability through measures such as “member checks ... prolonged engagement in the field ... persistent observations in the field [and] reflexive journals” (Cohen et al., 2013, p. 202, citing Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Of particular importance to dependability is the process of sustained researcher reflexivity. When I write, I need to be consistently aware of my own bias and investment. I have actively sought to check these biases through a sustained process of critical reflexivity.

#### Sustaining reflexivity

I am part of the research field I am writing about. As such, I bring my own “culture, norms, values to bear in conducting, analysing, interpreting and reporting [this] research” (Cohen et al., 2013, p. 575). Therefore, a sustained reflexivity is required during each stage of conducting, analysing, interpreting and reporting on the research.

My research was a constructed interpretation based around my own biases and investment. Although I have sought to co-construct interpretations of data, analysis and findings in an iterative dialogic process with participants, the ultimate task of writing this thesis lay with me. Reflexive awareness of my role and social position, as well as member checking, have been essential in helping me effectively interpret and report findings.

Given my cross-cultural research context, it has been crucial to address directly the “ethical reflexivity that recognises the inherent risk of ‘symbolic violence’” (Block, Warr, Gibbs, & Riggs, 2013, p. 84) in the participant–researcher relationship. I have taken measures during the research which seek to increase equity in the relationship and reduce

the risk of symbolic violence. As Block et al. (2013) note, measures such as these can “simultaneously address practical, ethical and methodological challenges, [and] can produce research which is more transparent” (p. 84), as the situated knowledge of participants plays a key role in analysing and interpreting data.

These sub-sections on the effectiveness of interpretive methods will conclude with a brief discussion of the importance of situated knowledge and representation in my research.

### Limitations of an Interpretive Paradigm

A central limitation of this interpretive method is the reliance on the dialogue between participants and me. As Finlay (2012) notes, “the fact that participants present what they want to be known about themselves in interviews and that the resulting narratives arise from a co-created dialogue between participant and researcher” (p. 321) leaves potential interpretation in a fragile position. Finlay (2012) advocates that a “reflexive account of these situational variables can be invaluable” in a process she has termed “contextual-discursive reflexivity” (p. 321).

I am using a wide range of data sources including interviews, classroom recordings and observation notes, journaling and institutional documents. Given this, another clear limitation exists around the “selecting and ordering” of data which “might involve some personal bias” (Cohen et al., 2013, p. 540). This limits my research in the sense that it is imbued with subjectivity. As noted in previous sections, I have sought to address this subjectivity through a sustained process of reflexivity.

Giddens’ (1976) critique that interpretive methods involve a “double hermeneutic process by which the researcher interprets the data from participants who have already interpreted their world, and then relates them to the audience in his/her own words”

(Cohen et al., 2013, p. 540) also places limitations on the salience of my interpretive methods. Cohen et al. (2013) advise that, to address this double hermeneutic problem, “reporting and analysis should strive to catch the different definitions of the situation from the different participants, and to combine etic and emic analysis” (p. 540). My research has sought to achieve this balance by an iterative process of etic analysis of institutional documents and emic interpretive strategies.

Canagarajah (1995) advises caution when writing research reports. Often a “passive syntax and impersonal tone, together with the inductive structure, serve to maintain the pretence of objectivity, detachment, and neutrality, suppressing the agency of the researcher” (p. 323). This can lead to “profound implications for the representation of the knower/researcher in the report ... [and] ... hides the manner in which the subjectivity of the researchers ... shapes the research activity and findings” (p. 324). I have sought to address this potential limitation by situating myself clearly in the research as an active, meaning-making subject.

Reflexivity has been a significant tool in this research to address both positivist and postmodernist critiques of my interpretivist method and its framing through a social constructivist approach. While my research paradigm has clear limitations, I have sought to minimise these by seeking credibility, confirmability, transferability and dependability at every stage of this research from data collection to analysis to reporting.

#### Research in a messy world

John Law (2007), in his work as a healthcare researcher around patient trajectories, has raised an important consideration for all qualitative researchers. We live in a messy world that is often not conducive to neat and clean theorising. Law noticed (2007) “trajectories offered by one interviewee didn't plug into trajectories suggested by another... it started to

dawn on [Law and colleagues] that the object [they] were studying might be a shape-shifting reality” (pp. 5-6). In this messy world, Law found theories of “trajectories of ‘typical patients’” (p. 5) became problematic.

As a qualitative researcher in another social field, I feel I must acknowledge the likelihood of ambiguity in my research. The social world of school is inherently messy and the statements of one participant may be incongruous with the statements of another. Indeed, one participant may express contradictory views over the course of one interview ... or one sentence. Law (2007) asserted: "as we seek to know the world not everything can be brought to presence. However, much we want to be comprehensive, to know something fully, to document or to represent it, we will fail” (p. 9). I do not reject this as a kind of empiricist’s nightmare, rather, I seek to embrace the ephemeral nature of research in the messy world. If participants are to be epistemically present, it behoves me to acknowledge the complicated and, often contradictory, world which they describe. Engaging in reflexivity (Reinharz, 1997) and discursively constructing voice based on the contingencies of the particular situation (Talmy, 2010) will open up space for both participants and me to engage in a dialogic social construction of both the what and the how.

Acknowledging the messy world seeks to negate the Othering (Law, 2007) that occurs when certain knowledge is excluded from findings. The invisible work (Law, 2007) of participants is rendered visible when we acknowledge the mess. Messy research also acknowledges the crucial idea “that practice is productive” (Law, 2007, p. 10). The notions of habitus (Bourdieu, 1984) and dialogic open-endedness (Bakhtin, 1986) assert the productive practices of social interaction that influence our ongoing dispositions and utterances. These ideas are central to the research paradigm I seek to utilise.

I have outlined above the benefits of using an interpretive paradigm while engaged in a rigorous process of reflexivity. I have also sought to acknowledge the messy nature of social research in a situated context. I will now make use of these concepts to assert why a social constructivist lens is appropriate for my research and why this lens is compatible with the use of interpretive and reflexive tools.

#### Lowercase c critical

Along with social constructivism, my research paradigm is informed by Street's (2002, 2003) concept of a *lowercase c* critical perspective. In Bloome (2013), Street's distinction between *uppercase C* critical and *lowercase c* critical is that:

Critical perspectives [with an uppercase "C"] ... is an a priori foregrounding of power relations [while] critical perspectives [with a lowercase "c"] ... acknowledge and describe such relations without necessarily prioritising them. (p. 19)

I seek to acknowledge and describe the power relations to which EAL students are subject in the classroom and wider school environment. My account, however, seeks to affirm the notion that EAL students often diverge from the trajectories those in power would assign them. The means of achieving this acknowledgement will be by prioritising the voice and social practices of the participants themselves, rather than focusing on the structural rigidities of the institution they are taught in and the power relations inherent in that institution.

As a teacher at the research site, I take an emic (Bloome, 2013) perspective in my critical social constructivist stance. This insider's view informed my data collection and methodical approach, which will be outlined in later sections. For now though, I will explore

how a critical social constructivist paradigm can be applied using Bourdieu's concept of *theory as method*.

#### Applying Bourdieu's theory as method

Bourdieu's idea of theory as method (Grenfell & James, 2004, p. 516) has been utilised in my research to provide a framing tool for my critical social constructivist paradigm. This provides "a set of thinking tools visible through the results they yield" (Wacquant & Bourdieu, 1989, p. 50). The inductive dialogic nature of my research was guided by participants' interactions and social practices and fits well with Bourdieu's focus on a relational approach. As Grenfell and James (2004) assert, "a relational approach to educational questions [emphasises] the mutual interdependence of social constraint and individual agency" (p. 514). The relational approach of Bourdieu acknowledges the strengths of social constructivism but is not bound by the social constraints of a particular setting. Equally, Bourdieu's approach allows for a critical perspective which accounts for human agency within a wider social setting.

Bourdieu's concept of field is used to describe a setting in which social practices manifest. Grenfell and James (2004) recognise that, for Bourdieu, "capital ... is ... both product and process within a field [and] the prevailing configurations of [symbolic capital] shape social practice" (p. 510). Field is a helpful concept in my research as "it is by definition dynamic and ever-changing" (Grenfell & James, 2004, p. 511). The concept of field suits my research paradigm as it rejects the structural rigidity of conventional social constructivism and allows for a more generative, and critical, view of settings and practices. Using field helped account for why deterministic trajectories assigned to students cannot account for their own material (often divergent) practices. Field allowed me to take a critical eye on the

forms of symbolic capital that are valued in school while also creating a space for transformations within the school by a reflexive reimagining of valued symbolic capital.

Habitus is another tool that I employed through Bourdieu's theory as method. Habitus is defined by Bourdieu (1984) as "a system of practice-generating schemes which expresses systematically the necessity and freedom inherent in [a] class condition and the difference constituting that condition" (p. 172, cited in Howson & Inglis, 2001, p. 309). These practice-generating schemes can be used as a methodological tool which "connects an account of social structural and power relations with a phenomenological account of corporeal being and doing" (Howson & Inglis, 2001, p. 310). Field (structure) and practice (agency) are no longer binary dualities in this conceptualisation.

Bourdieu (1985) himself states that it is through the workings of habitus that practice is linked with capital and field. The social constructivist tendency towards determinism based upon setting is reconciled as Bourdieu (1990a) stated "habitus becomes active in relation to a field, and the same habitus can lead to very different practices and stances depending on the state of the field" (p. 116, cited in Reay, 2004, p. 432). Habitus therefore cannot be conceived as one particular normalised set of dispositions. Rather, it "differs to the extent that the details of individuals' social trajectories diverge from one another" (Bourdieu, 1990b, p. 46, cited in Reay, 2004, p. 434). The concept of habitus thus helped me account for the diverse range of experiences and social trajectories of my participants that occur in a messy world (Law, 2007).

The concepts of habitus and field also provide space for a critical approach in my research which can transform practice. Howson and Inglis (2001) noted:

Habitus allows an overcoming of the chasm between structure and action by showing that the socialised body is not merely acted on by society but is itself possessed of a set of structuring capacities, to change social conditions. (p. 310)

The very act of research itself creates a new field in which participants engage in social practice. As Reay (2004) noted, “when habitus encounters a field with which it is not familiar, the resulting disjunctions can generate change and transformation” (p. 436). In this process, both the participants and I gained opportunities to reflexively consider existing understandings of the school field and the symbolic capital valued in that field.

Bourdieu’s powerful concepts of field, capital and habitus can, however, only be effectively employed in a research environment that ensures the voice of participants is heard in a dialogically constructed environment. In my research, I have aimed to place participants at the centre of the locus of power (Bishop, 2005). It is to the issues of participant voice and power relations that I now turn.

#### Ensuring dialogic voice

Voice, according to Gubrium and Holstein (2002), “references the subject position that is taken for granted behind speech” (p. 22). My research sought to recognise the “possession of alternative voices and varied subject positions and shifting subjectivities in relation to topics under consideration” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2002, p. 22) that participants expressed. Further, my research paradigm and methodological approach aimed to “empower [participants’] voice as equal partner in conversation” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2002, p. 16); voice that co-constructs meaning and is situationally contingent (Talmy, 2010). I aimed to engage in a dialogic, open-ended (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 72) research process. Through this, I hoped to gain insight into the contextual meaning of participants’ utterances (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 92) as they manifest in social practices. Charmaz and Mitchell (1997) stated:

Voice varies along three main dimensions 1. The freshness of the inquiry 2. The relationships that researchers craft with their informants 3. The place of the studies phenomenon in larger systems of meaning and practice. (p. 209)

When considering these dimensions, I am alerted to Bishop's (2005) call for research that benefits participants, represents participants, and has accountability to participants. The most effective way I could facilitate this was by engaging in a dialogue with participants that was led by their concerns and which created space for their shifting subjectivities. I sought to build a relationship with participants to enable them to express these concerns and subjectivities. I sought to engage in data analysis that was reflexive and consistently seeking participant interpretation of findings on an iterative basis throughout the research. I sought to represent wider phenomena impacting upon participants fairly and relate how these phenomena are interpreted by them. I sought to be accountable and transparent throughout the research process and had foremost in mind the interests of my participants. A carefully cultivated ongoing relationship based on reciprocity (Noddings, 2003, p. 69) helped co-construct findings with participants' voice at their core.

Central to the task of ensuring the dialogic (Bakhtin, 2010; Wells, 1999) voice of participants is present in my research and its findings is understanding my role as a researcher situated in a particular educational setting. This setting presents dilemmas around power relations and calls for a reflexive analysis of myself as a holder of symbolic capital. It is to these issues I now turn.

### [My Role as the Researcher in this Educational Setting](#)

In this section, it is my intention to engage in an analysis of the power relationship inherent in the researcher-participant relationship. I will seek to explore an understanding of the ways this relationship can be made more equal. I will then engage in a reflexive analysis of

my own role as a researcher in this particular educational setting. Reinharz (1997) noted, “understanding the self in fieldwork releases us from an epistemological tension between unreflexive positivism on the one hand, and naval gazing on the other” (p. 18). While holding this epistemological tension in mind, I sought an understanding of myself as a holder of symbolic capital in the research setting as both a teacher and researcher in this space.

#### Power relations – the researcher–participant relationship

The relationship between researcher and participant can often be highly inequitable. This is particularly the case in educational research when research participants are children. Cohen et al. (2013) have noted that, in a research situation, “children may well feel powerless and insecure” (p. 176). In order to reduce this sense of powerlessness I took active steps to include participants in the co-construction of knowledge. The critical social constructivist paradigm that I set out in previous sections takes explicit steps to include participants as co-creators of knowledge.

Hart (1992, cited in Cohen et al., 2013, p. 176) has offered the model of a ladder of participation when researchers work with child participants. The researcher should position their research at the top of the ladder where a participating child is consulted and informed about research and, better still, the child acts as initiator in the research and engages in shared decisions with adults. I have sought to position my own research at the top of the ladder of participation by engaging in a process of consultation and information about the aims of the research. I have encouraged my participants to engage in feedback and share in the co-construction of findings.

Methods such as ongoing in-depth interviews and reflexive journaling have “enabl(ed) self-disclosure” (Swain, Heyman, & Gillman, 1998, p. 26), on the part of both

participants and myself. Cohen et al. (2013) have noted that creating a space in which participants feel able to “recount their subjective experiences and feelings ... gives them a ‘voice’, where otherwise they would either not be heard or listened to” (p. 435). I have also endeavoured, in these interactions, to recount my own experience and feelings to show fellow feeling with participants and build our relationship. These measures helped create a safe place for participants to engage as co-constructors of knowledge.

#### [Reflexive analysis of self as holder of symbolic capital](#)

Being reflexive provided me with a way “of demonstrating [my] historical and geographic situatedness, and [my] personal investments in the research (along with the) various biases [I] bring to the work” (Gergen & Gergen, 2007, p. 470). As Bourdieu (1984) noted, “we have vital stakes in our scientific productions” (p. 49) and it is incumbent upon me as a researcher, adopting a Bourdieuan position, to be reflexive and clear about those vital stakes. What follows is an account of my own historical and geographical situatedness, personal investment and the biases I inevitably bring to this research.

I was born and raised in Auckland, the only child of two loving parents. I am Pākehā (a European New Zealander), male, English is my first language and I have thrived in an educational environment that places a high value on English proficiency. I hold Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees from one of the top universities in the country. I have been a secondary school teacher of economics for over a decade and I am currently head of subject at my school. I am the husband of a beautiful Samoan woman and we are the proud owners of two houses on the North Shore of Auckland (no mean feat for millennials in the Auckland housing market). It is clear that I hold a large amount of economic and symbolic capital. I have benefited from my education, employment and social position in a society that values the elements of capital I hold.

Things, however, were not always so privileged. Growing up, both of my parents suffered ill health and both were on invalid benefits for all of my childhood. My father suffered a serious stroke when I was 13 and was unable to care for himself from that time until he passed away when I was 28. I was his main caregiver. Although I am Pākehā, male and now middle class, I know what it feels like to be cast as the Other: the poor kid. Growing up in 1980s and 1990s Aotearoa/New Zealand in an environment of neoliberal fundamentalism, I was exposed very early on to the power of labelling: beneficiary; bludger; shirker. I saw the pain this labelling caused my parents and I was not exempt from its effects in the school yard. These formative experiences have fuelled in me an intense desire for social justice. It is why I became a teacher and it is why I have since become a researcher.

I have a deep sense of investment in this research. Manawa High School is my school. I do not mean this in the possessive sense. Manawa is the school where I started my teaching career. It is my first school. It is my only school. I feel an abiding attachment to the school and to its students. I want to do right by them and provide them with the same care my own teachers provided me throughout my schooling. The reason for this research is that, as an economics teacher, I have a vast array of EAL students in my class, perhaps a higher percentage than most subjects. Initially, I was simply concerned with the question: How do I teach these kids better? This simple question has led me on an academic journey, the culmination of which you are reading now.

Do I have biases? Yes! We all do. My own biases, however, come from my personal experiences as a son, husband and teacher. I want my future children to be bilingual Samoan and English speakers. I want them to have all the opportunities Aotearoa/New Zealand, at its best, can offer. I want them to be proud of who they are. It is the socially just position to want the same thing for all children as you do for your own. I want my research

participants to retain and use their L1 just as readily as English. I want them to feel a part of Aotearoa/New Zealand society and I want them to be proud of who they are. This research project is one small way I can work towards fulfilling that ambition.

This personal vignette provides some insights into my situatedness, personal investment and biases. It is, however not sufficient enough to “incorporate the complex splits and shifts in the subject positions of the researcher, characterised by a mixture of divided interests and values influencing the research process” (Canagarajah, 1995, p. 325). Simply engaging in “I dropping” (Raymond, 1993) in a few paragraphs of a methodology section cannot be considered a “sustained and rigorous exploration of the ways [my] subjectivity influences the research process” (Canagarajah, 1995, p. 325). In order to account for these subjectivities, I sought to make reflexivity an intrinsic part of the research process itself. I sought to engage in ethical reflexivity when acknowledging my power relations with participants. I sought to engage in relational reflexivity while co-constructing knowledge with participants. This was done in a constant feedback loop, never assuming that the reflexivity box has been ticked, rather consistently revising issues in a non-linear fashion. I will now explore these various modes of reflexivity and how they were applied in my research.

#### Ethical and relational reflexivity

Block et al. (2013) have argued that “ethical reflexivity is ... essential when researchers and research participants have disparate lifeworlds” (p. 71). While I feel I do have my participants’ interests at heart, I must acknowledge that I come from a different linguistic and cultural lifeworld. I have in previous sections alluded to the inequitable power relations in the researcher–participant relationship and sought ways to minimise this inequity. To avoid the symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 1996) which might be inflicted on participants in the

research process, I must acknowledge participants' disparate experiences and seek to co-construct findings on an iterative, dialogic and relational basis.

Relational reflexivity, according to Finlay (2012), "put(s) the intersubjective and relational dimensions between interviewer and interviewee under the microscope" (p. 325). It is my responsibility to acknowledge and maintain the personal connections I have with participants. We each inhabit the same social space for the purposes of the research but also for the purposes of the participants' education and my employment as a teacher. We have common ground but we also must acknowledge and discuss our intersubjective differences. I have aimed, in all my conversations, to be open about myself with participants in order to build the relationship and help participants feel safe in sharing their stories. We often see each other around school, and I am greeted with a warm smile or friendly hello. We engage in conversation and have developed a strong bond over the two years of research.

This ongoing reflexivity occurred in a "non-linear" (Lash, 2003, p. 50) way. This was an open system that was ever subject to "disequilibrium and change ... produced internally to the system through feedback loops" (Lash, 2003, p. 50). Ongoing reflexivity was required to meet the ethical and relational dimensions set out above. It was also required to be consistent with Bourdieu's concepts of habitus and field that "by definition [are] dynamic and ever-changing" (Grenfell & James, 2004, p. 511). It is to the applications of these issues I now turn as I seek to further clarify my research approach.

### Sources of Data Collection

Sources of data were collected over the two-year period in which the research was carried out (refer to Table 2 for a data-collection summary below).

*Table 2. Data-Collection Summary*

	Number per participant	Timing of data collection	Location	Average length
Interviews	16 (2 per term for two years)	Start and End of each school term	Researchers classroom	20 minutes
Classroom observations	16 (2 per term for two years)	On-going throughout school year	Participants classes	25 minutes
Journaling data	20-30 (varied between participant)	Ongoing throughout school year	Researchers classroom	200-300 words per entry

This longer time period allowed me to develop a deeper researcher–participant relationship. The time period was important to elicit meaningful responses which reflected participants’ actual points of view. The danger of a researcher–participant relationship is that participants may simply say what they believe the researcher wants to hear. This danger is present in my own research due to the inherent power relations discussed in earlier sections. A longer time period of data collection allowed more meaningful dialogic relationships to emerge (Pennycook, 1999) as participants and I constantly engaged in feedback loops over the two years of data collection. Dialogic approaches were key to data collection and analysis. This research made use of strategies such as reflection in action (Schön, 1983), reflexive interviews (Denzin, 2001) and reflexive journaling (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) over this two-year period. Each of these strategies considers interpretively the how and what of data (Talmy, 2010) through a dialogic process. With each feedback loop created, the quality of data collected continued to improve. Dialogue which actively sought input, feedback and critique on an iterative basis from participants was essential to

my research. The following sections provide more detail around the specific application of these feedback loops as applied to each data source.

#### Semi-structured interviews – The active interview: a dialogic method

The concept of an active interview sees “activating interviews as sites for production of meaning, constitutive role of social interaction” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2002, p. 14). This contrasts with the view of interview participants as “passive subjects” (Gubrium & Holstein, 2002, p. 13) from which the research draws knowledge like liquid from a vessel.

Epistemologically, the view of the active interview matches well with my social-constructivist research paradigm. As Warren (2002) noted when “interview participants are viewed as meaning makers ... qualitative interview tends to be more constructivist” (p. 83). In addition, the interpretivist approach to this research aligned well with an active interview method of data collection that sees production of meaning occurring in speech events (Mishler, 1986) such as the interview.

The active interview allows the *whats* and *hows* (Gubrium & Holstein, 2002) of social experience to emerge through dialogue. Talmy (2010) argues “analysing not only the what’s, or the product of the interview, but also the how’s, or the process involved in the co-construction of meaning, has significant implications for the analysis of interview data” (p. 28). It allows participants and researcher to discuss not only stuff but also what stuff means (Mitchell, 2007), enabling a thick description to unfold through an interpretative and critical process.

#### Interviewing across cultures

Given that I conducted interviews across cultures in a language I speak as a first language, but participants speak as a second language, I need to be particularly aware of issues that arise in cross-cultural interviewing (Kitchen, 2013). I have sought, through the process of

active interviewing and the research in general, to ensure that participants are fully informed about the process and that participants “share the same understanding of the meanings of the questions they are ... answering” (Crookes, Davis, & Goldstein, 1995, p. 589), as a potential for misunderstanding exists in this context.

I have sought to facilitate empowerment in interviewing. Mishler (1986) notes that interviews have the tendency to separate respondents from their everyday lives. This process leads to a decontextualisation (cited in Heyl, 2001, p. 376) of responses. In order to overcome this problem, Mishler (1986) argues that power in the interview relationship should be shared. In my interviews, I explicitly sought to share power around issues such as representation, legitimacy and accountability (Bishop, 2005) by engaging participants to co-construct interpretations of findings through an ongoing dialogic process of semi-structured interviews over time.

#### [Interview as a social practice](#)

These ongoing interviews were approached with a “social practice orientation” (Talmy, 2010, p. 25). In this approach, each interview cycle (at the beginning and end of each of years one and two – see Appendix 1 for cycle 1 interview questions) was seen as an ongoing process in which meaning was co-constructed between participants and me. As Bucholtz and Hall (2004) argued, “social practice analysis examines the co-construction of identity and distinction” (cited in Talmy, 2010, p. 26) as themes emerged and were discussed and reflected upon over the two years my research was conducted.

Kvale’s (1996) metaphor of the research interviewer as a traveller is helpful when thinking about social practice interviewing. Here the research interviewer is seen as being “on a journey” in which the “route may be planned ahead of time but will lead to unexpected twists and turns as interviewer-travellers ... adjust their paths according to what

those met along the way choose to share” (Kvale, 1996, p. 4, cited in Heyl, 2001, p. 372). In this concept of an ongoing journey of social practice interviewing, “both the traveller and those met are changed by those relationships involving meaningful dialogue” (Heyl, 2001, p. 372). Interpretations arise not from the interviewer (traveller), but rather, interpretation arises in the process (journey) and dialogue with those encountered throughout the process. The traveller metaphor can be seen as exemplary of an active interview/social practice approach. It can be contrasted with the mining metaphor characteristic of the participants as passive vessels of answers (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995) approach. The journey metaphor creates space for co-constructed interpretation and transformation of future social practice.

#### Reflexivity in the interview

A central aspect in a successful interview journey is an ongoing process of reflexivity. Bourdieu has recognised that “interviews are a source of symbolic violence” (Slembrouck, 2004, p. 108). In order to counter the potential for symbolic violence, I sought to reduce the inequalities in the researcher–participant relationship, as discussed above. A redistribution of researcher power is not enough, though. I was constantly guarding against misinterpretation and misrepresentation of participants’ utterances throughout the research. I achieved this through reflexivity and constant dialogue with participants.

Fine's (1994) notion of working the hyphens is helpful here. She urges researchers to “develop awareness of the complex interplay of self and other during interviews ... We would increasingly recognise the depth of our kinship with those whom we study” (cited in Heyl, 2001, p. 377) through reflexivity. In this process, I gained a greater awareness of how participants and I interacted in interviews and together we were able to reflect upon what this means for the research and emergent findings.

Therefore, reflexivity occurs before, during, and after each interview. Bourdieu (1996) has called reflexivity that takes place during the interview “reflex reflexivity” (p. 18). Reflex reflexivity is important in the struggle to address the potential for symbolic violence in the moment of the interview. I sought to be attuned to participants’ utterances and the way they utilised words to convey situated meaning. Interviewing must, therefore, be active, equitable and a social practice that co-constructs voice in an open-ended dialogue.

#### Classroom observations – the role of localised practices

Another key source of data used to shed light on the experiences of social agents was classroom observations. These observations helped reveal the localised practices of participants situated in a very specific field. The strength of observation according to Simpson and Tuson (2003) is that it is:

A highly flexible form of data collection that can enable the researcher to have access to interactions in a social context and to yield systematic records of these in many forms and contexts, to complement other kinds of data. (p. 17 cited in Cohen et al., 2013, p. 457)

In my research, observations were conducted in an “open ended and inductive” (Cohen et al., 2013, p. 456) manner. This kind of observation aligned well with my research paradigm set out in earlier sections. Observation is also important to provide context to “habitus expressed through durable ways `of standing, speaking, walking, and thereby of feeling and thinking’” (Bourdieu, 1990c, p. 70 cited in Reay, 2004, p. 432). It also aligns well to my use of Bourdieu’s approach of theory as method.

During classroom observations, I adopted an observer-as-participant (Gold, 1958) position. Cohen et al. (2013) note that, in this position the researcher is “not a member of the group but may participate ... peripherally in the group’s activities” (p. 457). As a

researcher who is also a teacher in the school, students were aware of who I was and would often acknowledge my presence in class and initiate conversation with me. In these instances, I was happy to engage with the group as “Mr Davy.” For the most part, however, I endeavoured to make my “role as researcher ... clear and overt [and be] as unobtrusive as possible” (Cohen et al., 2013, p. 457) during class time. This was in an effort to respect the fact that the teacher had granted me access to their classroom and I sought to provide as little disruption as possible to their planned lessons.

Reflexivity is also required during the observation process, given my interpretation of events was “inevitably selective” (Cohen et al., 2013, p. 459). I engaged in a process of reflection after each observation by thinking about what I had written and how I had interpreted classroom events. Davies and Harré (1990) contend that “one’s beliefs about the sorts of persons ... who are engaged in a conversation are central to how one understands what has been said ... [and] ... the force of any utterance” (p. 58). Reflexivity before, after, and during classroom observations helped me consider my interpretations of participants’ interactions and how this influenced my interpretation of events that I fed back to participants.

The field notes I took were taken on a flexibly orientated observation schedule (see Appendix 2) which reminded me to focus on “critical events” (Wragg, 1994). For my observations, I considered critical events any time a participant interacted with a peer or the teacher. Who initiated interactions, what was the nature of them and what the participant did after the interaction were all salient factors in my consideration of critical events. In addition, factors such as the amount of “class wide teacher talk” (Cohen et al., 2013, p. 456), as well as a sketch of the class showing the physical position of the student in relation to

peers and any teacher or student movement that took place during the class, were also considered.

My field notes format also allowed space for me to take notes on my perceptions around participants' feelings about a particular critical event or the class in general; to focus on understanding the feelings of the student reveals my stance relating to how I identify with participants. By focusing on interactions and participants' feelings about these interactions, I am "prioritising and framing certain topics and thus writing more fully about those events" (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 2001, p. 12) with a sympathetic eye to the emotions my participants might be experiencing in a high-pressured setting.

All of my field notes have been supplemented with an audio recording of the participating students' interactions in class. After the observation, I transcribed any utterances the student made and any of those peers or teachers interacting with the student. This allowed me to get a more in-depth picture of critical events which formed the locus of my interpretation of the classroom observations.

#### [Journaling and the importance of reflexivity](#)

The final source of data I utilised to shed light on the experience of social agents was participants' journaling. Participants engaged in this journaling process constantly over the two-year period. I gave them a login and password to a private online journaling account where they could make journal entries as frequently or infrequently as they chose. I encouraged students to make use of their journal accounts on a regular basis and most would make an entry every week. This became a key source of information around participants' "beliefs and feelings" (Pavlenko, 2007, p. 165) over the course of two years which I could use to check against my own interpretations in field notes of classroom observations.

Journaling provided students an opportunity to engage in reflexivity about their school week and about the issues we discussed during interviews. The journaling also helped me address the issue of “ethical reflexivity” by “promoting autonomy and capacity of research participants and enhanc[ing] the potential for outcomes to be rigorous and useful” (Block et al., 2013, p. 69). The journal entries allowed me to check my own interpretations from classroom observations, and indeed interviews. In doing this, I adopted a “continuous process of critical scrutiny and interpretation” (Guillemin & Gillam, 2004, p. 275) regarding how I was positioning students in my field notes and analysis of interviews.

#### [Institutional data and the role of categories](#)

One way of investigating the objective structures of the school site was by looking at school policy documents, the school’s database relating to participants and school reports written by teachers, at the end of each term, about participants. Grenfell and James (1998) noted that, “if habitus brings into focus the subjective end of the equation, field focuses on the objective” (p. 15). Investigating these objective structures was part of my process of theory as method in gaining an understanding of the field in which participants were situated.

The analysis of these structures included how “educational tracking” categorised participants and also the “textual silences” (Rogers, 2011, p. 239) that existed in policy documents, database information and school reports. The absence of text (such as information or comment about a student’s first language) proved just as revealing as what was included in these texts when considering issues around language and identities in relation to schooling.

In this section, I have described the participants in my research and outlined the sources of data I have collected. I have aimed to provide a rationale for why I collected this data based around the relationship between the experience of social agents and the

objective structures which make this experience possible. I have noted that reflexivity was an intrinsic part of every stage of data collection and I have demonstrated the ways I engaged in constant reflexivity. A key element in understanding and constructing a reflective awareness of the data is understanding the participants who dialogically produce the data. The next chapter will be devoted to a more in-depth exploration of the EAL participants as specific individuals.

## Chapter 4: Profiles of Participants

Participants' are experts on their own condition. The material conditions and experiences of the EAL students in my research varied greatly. I engaged in purposeful sampling to find participants who represented a variability of time in Aotearoa/New Zealand schooling, exposure to English, exposure to various normative discourses (Barkhuizen, 2010, 2011) and desired academic trajectories. In purposefully sampling for a variety of EAL students, I sought to question unreflexive assumptions about norms applied to these students, such as the model minority archetype. This archetype often sees the majority construct those minority EAL students as displaying socially affective traits seen as conducive to academic achievement, such as *diligence* and *focus* (see Chapter 1, pp. 12-13).

My research, overall, sought to show students as particular selves (Benesch, 2008) who negotiate identities based on a variety of backgrounds and experiences. These particular selves would continue to negotiate and renegotiate their identities over the two years of the research (2016-2017). These brief profiles of participants are aimed at exploring the depth and variety of experiences, fears and dreams that make the EAL students who participated in this study complex and contradictory individuals. These profiles are but the start of showing this complexity, as Chapters 5-8 seek to explore findings which emerged in dialogue and are based on salient themes relevant to the students themselves. These profiles will also start to show the variety and complexity of the linguistic settings and relationships in which EAL students use their L1s and/or English. All names used are pseudonyms.

## Profiles of Migrant Student Participants

The shared characteristic of the migrant student cohort (eight students) was that, at some stage in their lives, they have been uprooted from their country of origin and travelled with their family to a new, strange country. This new country is populated by people and by institutions who do not communicate in the language of their birth. The reasons for the parents' decision to come to Aotearoa/New Zealand are varied. They may have sought economic advancement or to escape political persecution. The experience of a discontinuity of educational settings for all EAL students in my research is, however, uniform. The differences in time, space and circumstance will be explored in this chapter, but the fundamental shared characteristic is a fracturing of educational trajectories along various linguistic, culture and interpersonal fault lines. These brief profiles will now explore the shared and varied experiences and ambitions of the migrant student cohort.

### *Jejomar*

Jejomar is an example of a student who experienced this discontinuity of educational settings just prior to the start of high school. His automotive mechanic father and bindery assistant mother moved with him and his siblings from the Philippines when he was 11 years old. For Jejomar, unfortunately, this discontinuity has had negative impacts on his subsequent negotiation of a scholarly identity in Aotearoa/New Zealand schools. In particular, he has experienced limited opportunities to negotiate a scholar identity in relation to his L1. Internal school records note a "language barrier between home and school." Jejomar articulates that he feels this barrier has negative consequences for his education. He stated in an early interview that he sees himself as "not that smart." He further stated that, in terms of language use at home, "my mum and dad speak Tagalog at home but my [younger] brothers and sisters speak English to me." While at school he speaks

English with his Filipino friends because “they don’t speak Tagalog.” The fracturing of Jejomar’s education and differences between home and school language uses have had particular negative consequences in relation to his streamed class placements. He was typically placed in lower stream 02 and 03 classes and the net result was a low accumulation of NCEA credits by the end of the research period. His total credits, which are often referred to as a normative marker of academic success, were not sufficient for NCEA level 3 or to meet University Entrance Literacy criteria.

#### *Jung Min*

Like Jejomar, Jung Min experienced the fracturing of her educational settings. For her though, the circumstances and consequences differed markedly. She, like Jejomar, came to Aotearoa/New Zealand with her family due to her panel beater father seeking employment. Unlike Jejomar, she came from Korea and at a slightly earlier age (eight years old). The major difference, however, lay in her scholarly identity and achievement via NCEA. She was in an advanced stream classes during the two years of research and by the end of the research had easily gained NCEA level 3 and University Entrance Literacy credits.

Jung Min intends to go to dental school at the University of Otago in the years following high school and credited her ambitions to the fact that her “aunties are nurses ... have kind of encouraged me into it ... like maybe it’s because they are my family so I kind of get more stuff from them.” For Jung Min, family and peer support networks helped her overcome the potential pitfalls of educational, cultural and linguistic discontinuities. Jung Min was able to display the use of symbolically valued capital through the use of academic English in school. She had developed a disposition to learning conducive to Aotearoa/New Zealand’s education field. She showed the traits of the model minority, but she did so on her own terms, often rejecting notions that she was seen to be a model minority.

### *Harry*

Harry is similar to Jung Min in many ways. He has been in Aotearoa/New Zealand the longest of any participant (11 years) and experienced only one year of primary school in Cambodia. As such, he had only distant memories of his Cambodian experiences and often showed in interviews and classroom interactions that he is very comfortable with Aotearoa/New Zealand schooling and his peer group. Harry, however, seems to actively reject the image of a model minority, not only in his words but also his deeds. Our wide-ranging conversations included topics such as his experiences with, and the consequences of, marijuana use, his love of gaming and cars, as well as the more mundane world of his school life. Far from the shy and retiring model minority student, Harry asserts his particular self through his out-of-school life. He is aware of the pressures that are often on EAL students in terms of parental expectations, noting “like I can see why some people commit suicide like the pressure from their parents ... like that’s why so many people are depressed cause of the pressure.” He feels that his “parents [are] relaxed in the sense of school and that it’s your fault if you don’t pass if you study and you pass then that’s good ... congratulations things like that but for other people it depends on their parents.” Harry and Jung Min have been in Aotearoa/New Zealand longer than almost all the cohort. They have, however, acculturated differently based on different exposures to norms and experiences. These differing experiences have led Harry to negotiate a scholarly identity along different trajectories from Jung Min.

### *Kanda*

Kanda is an example of an EAL student who felt the pressures of expectations that Harry spoke of. This pressure largely came from herself. She felt that she must work harder than *normal* English L1 students in order to achieve. Coupled with this, she had many

responsibilities at her parents' family-owned Thai restaurant. As with many migrant families, Kanda's family had exhaustive work commitments, "work 6 days a week every day except Tuesday." Kanda like many migrant students speaks her L1 (Thai) to her parents but the rest of her wider social interactions are in English, aside from the occasional Skype call back to friends in Thailand. With these economic and linguistic pressures, Kanda stated, "I try to manage time with school work but, I don't know, I think work place is the only outside place I go most often apart from school." Kanda set high expectations of herself to live up to the model minority image of the diligent worker. She aimed to "live the migrant dream" and saw this as being achieved by working hard at school and achieving according to established assessment norms.

#### *Elaine*

Elaine represents the smallest language group of any of the participating students. She is an indigenous Karen speaker who was born in Myanmar/Burma. Her parents were forced to flee with her when she was young over the border to Thailand. She spent most of her youth in "the camp," as she calls it. Her family moved to Aotearoa/New Zealand under the refugee resettlement programme when she was 13 years old. Elaine attributes her parents' primary reason for coming to Aotearoa/New Zealand as "we moved here because my mum wanted us to have a better education." For all the trauma of forced dislocation and resettlement, Elaine's mother (who is herself a teacher aide) still wished her children to live the migrant dream and get a better education.

Like many of the other migrants she found it difficult to share and/or seek help with her school work from her parents. Even though Elaine's mum is a teacher aide, Elaine thought that due to the complexity of academic English "she can't really help me with my school work." In addition to the experience of not being able to seek out parental help,

Elaine also had the impediment of her L1 having very few interlocutors in Aotearoa/New Zealand and, relatedly, practically no academic resources in Karen that would be helpful for her to contextualise content.

### *Kathy*

Kathy's family disjuncture was far less violent than Elaine's but did have the same result of isolating her L1 (Tagalog) as just being spoken in limited settings with English dominating most forums. In addition, Kathy attended private school in the Philippines that was an English-medium school. As such, English already had a high degree of symbolic value for Kathy in her education even before coming to Aotearoa/New Zealand. During the period of research, Kathy and her family "[went] back this year... after seven years." Over those preceding seven years in Aotearoa/New Zealand, Kathy's negotiation of her scholarly identity had been reinforced as existing in an English-medium form.

While Kathy retains her L1, speaking it with her parents and engaging in "pretty much a mix" of English and Tagalog with her sister and some Filipino friends, her academic world is firmly entrenched in English. Kathy was able to become successful in this English-medium academic world by the standards of attainment of qualifications. By the end of the research period she had both NCEA Level 3 and had met University Entrance (English) Literacy credit requirements. She hoped to study at university to become a primary school teacher.

### *Kidlat*

In contrast to Kathy, Kidlat, in his own words, "didn't really like learn[ing] the Filipino language [Tagalog] ... I understand it but I can't speak it myself." With his parents, he "speak[s] English cause I cannot speak their language." Kidlat's siblings speak English to each other and the only time he heard Tagalog was when his parents were speaking to each

other. I asked Kidlat about his view of this potential for linguistic tension between home and wider life. This exchange exemplifies Kidlat's views of his L1 and English:

Brian: Do you think there is a tension between living in the English-speaking world and then at home your parents are speaking a different language.

Kidlat: What do you mean?

Brian: Like do you feel that you would like to have the language that you would like to communicate with them or are you just happy in English as well.

Kidlat: I mean they speak English as well.

Brian: So, you feel it's not really a major deal.

Kidlat: Nah.

Kidlat's responses here showed a relatively *laissez faire* attitude in relation to his L1 and its use or absence in his life. Kidlat was academically successful in the English-medium environment, achieving the necessary qualifications for entrance into university. He was, however, the clearest example of the potential for L1 disuse and loss in an English-dominant society and its effects of negotiation of scholarly identity.

#### *Padayao*

A complexity of factors associated with identities are inherent for all adolescents. Often linguistic factors come to the fore when participating EAL students are faced with this new schooling environment. Much like all teenagers, however, participants in my research also faced complexities in relation to emergent sexuality, family religions and cultural norms and the differences of Aotearoa/New Zealand social norms with those of their family life.

Padayao is a good example of this complex confluence of factors which impacted on her negotiation of identities. Padayao openly stated to me "I'm bi" and "a tomboy." This orientation was all the more complicated for Padayao as her father is an evangelical

Christian preacher. Padayao, in this moving monologue, articulates her complex relationship with her identities and family expectations:

They are like totally against you know gay rights and things. I'm ok with it. I myself am actually Bi, they actually don't like the idea I'm bi, they are against sex before marriage. I've broken that rule too; I've broken quite a few rules my parents wouldn't like ... I've cut my hair short ... I'm meant to have long hair. I'm not meant to be dating till a certain age, then my grandma told them [my parents], we are in New Zealand we are not in the Philippines and she's free to do what she likes, she's 18 now.

Here Padayao articulated the tensions and complexities she experienced in relation to her negotiation of identities. Her grandma felt that, because the family is in Aotearoa/New Zealand, the social pressures her parents placed on Padayao are not now relevant.

In spite of the restrictions imposed by her parents, Padayao's independence shone through when she asserted "I've told my parents I'm free to do what I like. Thank you, I will listen but it doesn't mean I will do all those things. I'm not going to rebel. I don't like that sort of thing but if I want to do something you can't exactly stop me; it's my choice not their choice." With this independent spirit, Padayao is a prime example of the assertion of a particular self.

Padayao was academically successful according to the norms of Aotearoa/New Zealand qualifications. She, however, experienced multiple and contradictory influences on the negotiation of her identities. All of us experience these but, for Padayao, as with other EAL students, these influences and contradictions are all the more stark and confronting when considering the linguistic and social milieu of Aotearoa/New Zealand.

All of the migrant EAL students profiled in this section have experienced educational fragmentation at some stage in the lives. This fragmentation led them to be taught in a language that differed from that of their country of origin and home life. These universals, however, mask the particularities of each participant. This section has sought to begin to show the variability within this particular migrant participant cohort. In the next section, I will profile the international students involved in this study and outline the variability which existed in that cohort.

### Profiles of International Student Participants

The international student cohort (six students) shared some characteristics with the migrant student cohort. They were also uprooted from their country and travelled to a linguistic and social landscape that differed from their home country. They experienced a dislocation of educational settings, just like migrant students, and also struggled with multiple competing influences impacting upon their negotiation of identities.

These international students did, however, have some specific differences in their experiences as compared with the migrant student cohort. International students are often in a homestay environment in which the language of communication is English. They come to Aotearoa/New Zealand for a more limited time with the explicit goal of learning the socially and economically valuable language of English.

International students often arrive in Aotearoa/New Zealand during senior high school. As such, the educational schism experienced by all participants often comes closer to the time of formal English only NCEA assessment for the international student participants. The pressures to acquire English rapidly, in particular, for academic purposes were all the more acute for participating international students. What follows are the brief initial profiles of the international students. The aim of these, as with the migrant student

profiles, is to explore the participants as particular selves, with their own unique backgrounds and experiences. I hope by doing this to draw into question universalised notions of categorial norms attributed to international EAL students.

### *Miyu*

Miyu came from Japan for the last two years of high school. She was a good example of the unique pressures faced by international students. In addition to going from a Japanese language education system to an English language system, Miyu has left her family behind. She relied on local social networks of homestay hosts and fellow EAL peers such as Kanda and Seong (whom she is close friends with) for support.

Miyu summarised the pressure she feels when she spoke of the conversation with her parents about whether or not to come and study in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Miyu stated, “at first my parents say you shouldn’t go and I say ‘I’m going to go by myself’ and [they] say ‘ok but you have to be responsible.’” Miyu felt she had to adopt a degree of self-reliance and responsibility. This ethos extended to her school life as she quickly sought to acquire the English-medium disciplinary literacies of her chosen subjects. This drive was so effective that she felt, after only two years in Aotearoa/New Zealand, that her academic English was already much greater than her academic Japanese.

### *Seong*

Although the experiences of international students and migrant students differ in often-significant ways, there are also important similarities between the two cohorts. Seong was an example of a student who, like many other migrant and international students, had parents who had highly demanding professions that required long hours away from home. This is demonstrated for Seong in this exchange:

Seong: He's usually in another city like the company is in many different cities and he comes home on weekends.

Brian: So, growing up, would it be mum or dad that would help with school work, would you have tutors or would you do it by yourself?

Seong: By myself.

In this environment, Seong had already learned a set of dispositions which relate to study being an individualistic task that requires personal focus. This set of dispositions was easily translated into an Aotearoa/New Zealand school environment still very much focused on the myth of individualistic meritocracy.

Capital, around language was, however, another matter. Seong herself recognised that her prime struggle in Aotearoa/New Zealand schooling was not the elements of acculturation to individualised classroom norms. Rather, it was the English language itself. Like Kanda, who was in the migrant student cohort, Seong saw any success she had in NCEA as a result of struggle which she endured above and beyond that which English L1 students experience.

### *Leon*

Another similarity across the international student migrant student classification divide was students who actively sought to break with the image of the model minority. Leon, as with Harry in the migrant student cohort, sought to distinguish himself in various ways as different from the image of the model minority Asian student. An interesting distinction raised by Leon in our interviews was that he was from Hong Kong and did not regard himself as Chinese. Like Harry, Leon was afforded a relative degree of parental freedom and recognised that this was not the norm for Asian parents. Leon notes "my parents give me a

lot of freedom ... they say don't do drugs but you can do whatever you want ... cause it's your life." He recognised this as uncommon among Asian students' parents, noting of another EAL student "she told me her parents where really tough on her like her parents even pick her own subjects ... she doesn't have choice." Leon likened his own family environment to being more "like how kiwi people tend to raise their children. I think it's not how they do it in Asia, maybe some people [do] but some people don't."

Leon's homestay situation was different from other participating international students in that his hosts were friends of his parents from Hong Kong and also L1 Cantonese speakers. Leon, however, still preferred to speak English with them. This limited, even when he had the opportunity, his use of his L1 in both a basic conversational and academic sense. Leon stated: "yes I speak Cantonese with them but they can speak real well English cause they come from Hong Kong and English is one of the official languages of Hong Kong because they are born in the British economy." When I asked about the potential for them to help him with his school work in his L1, he responded, "I don't want them to help 'cause they are kind of annoying." In this statement he rejected a potential opportunity for his L1 to be used in a scholarly context.

Leon identified strongly with English as the language of his education and found much common ground with the social and cultural elements of Aotearoa/New Zealand life. This was to the detriment of his L1 and his associations with his culture, particularly in relation to his schooling.

#### *Daniel*

Unlike Leon, Daniel was very proud to identify with his Chinese culture. He stated: "well I'm proud of my culture but I cannot make other people proud of their culture." He went on to state, "I love Chinese history and Chinese culture and I wrote like a story book of them."

Daniel was an example of a student who has a high degree of value attributed to his own linguistic and cultural capital. This attribution of value at times conflicted with the differing values attributed by school. Daniel recognised this and he was open to critiquing the Aotearoa/New Zealand education system during our interviews. He considered Aotearoa/New Zealand education to be too slow and not going into sufficient detail on a particular topic or problem.

Daniel is an example of large cohort of students from Shanghai that make up the majority of Manawa's international student population. Manawa gets many EAL students from Shanghai due to their relationship with a feeder school, although, as it happens, Daniel came under a separate programme via the United States of America. Like many international students, Daniel's parents have high-status jobs in their home countries. Daniel notes: "oh my Dad is a headmaster for a high school in Shanghai and mum is an engineer for a German company, she does something to do with the iPhone." Clearly, students like Daniel come with a differing set of capital to those students who come from less socio-economically fortunate families. This is an important aspect when considering other elements of capital in the subsequent findings' chapters.

Even with all the attendant capital advantages of high socio-economic parents and a love and deep knowledge of his L1 and culture, Daniel also felt, like many other participants, that English was subverting his L1. This exchange demonstrates his concerns:

Daniel: School words?

Brian: Like the specific vocabulary like...

David: Ooo yeah its [Chinese] losing yeah but I really want to get it back you know like when I'm at home I sometimes read a Chinese old book like history and language.

Guarding against linguistic atrophy is an ever-present task for EAL students in an English-language-dominant environment. This was the case for even the most L1-centric students, such as Daniel.

### *Udom*

Udom was another international student who comes from an economically privileged family. He stated: “my dad is running his own business which is about fertilizer and farming stuff ... it’s successful ... his factory I would say [has] about 100 workers.” Udom felt a clear need to acquire English to help with the family business. He further stated, “I think I want to do like with my dad deal with like other countries that are shipping with Thailand so I can sell my product, my fertiliser, to them.” The power of English as an element of economic capital on embodied cultural capital comes to the fore here. Udom felt pressure to contribute to the family business and he saw acquiring English as a key way to help his dad here. Udom articulated the pressure he felt in this exchange:

Brian: Do you feel a lot of pressure from your parents to go to university?

Udom: Yeah like a little bit ... it’s really hard you know cause my sister just graduated and on that day my mum was like you know look at your sister ... obviously my parents want me to go to uni. Even my dad like really wanted me to go to a Master degree and I’m like oh my god I’m mean like for me ... I don’t know.

Here Udom sought to balance a desire to live up to parental expectations with his own concept of his academic pathways and scholarly identity. This is a drama that is played out in households across the world between adolescents and their parents. For Udom, however, like his international student counterparts, this drama occurs across national borders and time zones as well.

## *Shane*

Shane was the most potent example of why I undertook this research in the first place. He came from Shanghai at the start of my research period. He had the most limited English of my research participants and experienced clear disengagement in class. Shane stated: “I think it’s hard with the English language. I can’t understand when the teacher is speaking. My English is so least so I can’t understand the words.” Shane was unable to acquire conversational competence and had little of the linguistic capital valued by teachers and L1 English-speaking peers. This caused social and linguistic isolation which, in turn, led to academic disengagement, and eventually Shane returned to Shanghai after six months.

When I think of Shane I wonder if we, as a school and society, did right by him? We are supposed to be a people who believe in a fair deal. Did Shane get a fair deal when his parents paid the school via an agent large tuition fees in exchange for six months of isolation and disengagement? We as a profession can do better for students like Shane.

My research, and the findings that will follow in the next chapters, seeks to go some way to informing dialogue about how we can better serve students like Shane and, indeed, all the EAL participants in this research. The complexity and variability of these participating students will be considered at all times during the following analysis of findings.

## Chapter 5: Findings - The Conditioning of and Investing in English for Academic Purposes

### Introduction

In this chapter, I will argue that the dominant role of English in the Aotearoa/New Zealand education system permeates policy documents and school practices as the medium of instruction. The normative discourse of English as a prestige language, I will argue, filters through to EAL students' perceptions, language use, and scholarly identity. This discourse imbues a learned set of dispositions which links a student's scholarly habitus to English as the only valued form of linguistic capital. Such a normative discourse shapes wider impressions of the benefits of English. I will support my argument with analysis of the *New Zealand Curriculum* (NZC), along with other relevant Ministry of Education (MoE) documents, school policy documents and promotional material. In addition, the statements of participating EAL students and examples from their classroom interactions will help elucidate the effects of this normative discourse on the negotiation of their identities.

As Watkins and Noble (2013) have pointed out, Anglo-normative education systems, in which English plays a dominant role, are a key aspect in the generative nature of habitus for EAL students. In the case of my research, participating EAL students were in classes that had the curriculum delivered exclusively in English. I found that the English language norms of these classes came to generate a learned set of dispositions in students that asserted the symbolic capital of English language ability as essential to scholarly success and intrinsic to their negotiation of scholarly identities.

In an Anglo-normative education system, a linguistic hierarchy can be established and reinforced when social actors afford an instrumental value to majority languages and

only a sentimental value to minority languages (May, 2011a). In the case of my research, many participants came to afford English an instrumental value of being *the* language of academic advancement, while their L1 was afforded a sentimental value as a symbol of family and home life.

The final part of this chapter will focus on how the dominant role of English comes to permeate the classroom and affects EAL students' negotiation of their classroom-specific scholarly identities. The reason for this movement from macro policy concepts to micro classroom interactions and interpretations of these interactions is that the classroom is the key social space in which EAL students negotiate their scholarly identities, and this space is inevitably informed by macro level normative discourses.

Using Bourdieu (1991), I argue that a logic of practice locates itself around what are socially valued forms of symbolic capital. In the case of my research, the dominant role of English creates a logic of practice in which the knowledge and use of English holds a high degree of symbolic capital. This symbolic capital impacts on students' scholarly habitus and their negotiation of scholarly identities. As capital, field and habitus are interrelated, it is important to gain a detailed understanding of these students' experiences in class.

## [English in the Aotearoa/New Zealand Education System](#)

### [The New Zealand Curriculum](#)

The dominant role of English as a prestige language is asserted at multiple levels of the Aotearoa/New Zealand education system and beyond. At the apex of this system lies the NZC, produced by the MoE (2007). This policy document informs the policies and practices of Aotearoa/New Zealand schools. As such, an awareness of how the role of English is

framed in this document is important when we consider how schools frame the role of English and, in turn, how students perceive the role of English in class.

The NZC asserts that “success in English is fundamental to success across the curriculum” (MoE, 2007, p. 18). This statement places the dominant role of English language use at the centre of the achievement of educational success. The statement is reflective of norms that encourage, in Hasan’s (1999) terms, the production and reproduction of official languages in school. Existing at the apex of Aotearoa/New Zealand’s education system, the NZC permeates all aspects of schooling from school-wide policy to classroom interactions. Placing English as the centrepiece to educational success in the NZC thus encourages the production and reproduction of the dominant role of English in the Aotearoa/New Zealand education system.

#### [Other relevant MoE documents](#)

Another crucial MoE document for my research is the “Dimensions of Effective Literacy Practice” (MoE, 2003). This document promotes, as one of its effective literacy practices, making use of the knowledge of the learner. The document also promotes collaborative spaces as another dimension of effective literacy practice. These dimensions create space for the use of L1 as this will utilise the knowledge of the learner and provide learners with collaborative spaces in which they can use their L1 in linguistic safe houses. This creates a contrast from the interpretation that can be derived from the NZC in which pedagogy is viewed as occurring in a mainly monolingual environment.

#### [Manawa High School](#)

The norms of the dominant role of English asserted in the NZC is reproduced in Manawa High School’s own recruitment material for international students. The material promotes

“direct entry into mainstream [English-medium] classes ... for students with satisfactory English language skills”. The material also asserts that, for those international students requiring “English language assistance,” the school will provide “qualified and experienced teachers [who will] work with these students in small groups and help their integration into the mainstream school.” These statements assert the dominant role of English, as international students are afforded opportunity to enter mainstream classes as long as they have satisfactory English language skills with which to integrate. When international students are seen to not hold satisfactory English language skills, priority is given to upskilling students to a satisfactory level such that they can “intergrat(e) into mainstream school.” This advertising material clearly echoes the NZC’s linking of success in English as being fundamental to success across the curriculum. Meanwhile, the advertising material remains relatively silent on matters related to the knowledge of the learner (such as their L1) that are raised in the dimensions of effective literacy practice (MoE, 2003). Manawa High School can also be seen to manifest a discourse of English as a branded global commodity (Chun, 2016), as the statements in their recruitment materials utilise the idea of the global power of English (Pennycook, 1999) which will also be central to a student’s success in the mainstream of Manawa High School and the rigours of NCEA.

The conditioning of the dominant role of English further manifests in the statements of EAL students participating in my research with regard to their teachers. For example, Elaine (Year 13) stated in a journal entry: “my teacher always tells us how important English is for us, since we live in this country where everyone here speaks English.” A teacher’s comments in Elaine’s school report reinforces this norm by stating “she is to be congratulated for the overall progress she has made since arriving here 4 years ago, with almost no English.” Here a positive framing, by the teacher, of Elaine’s acquisition of English

serves to construct Elaine as a diligent model minority seeking to adhere to the field-specific language norms of school. For Elaine, the message of the dominant role of English has permeated into the teacher's statements and she is praised in her school report for the progress she has made in her English ability. The message of the dominant role of English is clearly reinforced by policy and permeates through to classroom levels. This reinforcement has a significant impact on EAL students' perceptions of English.

#### Students' perceptions of the dominant role of English

Participating EAL students clearly recognised the dominant role of English in Aotearoa/New Zealand schools. Participants often identified English language ability as the primary difficulty for them when entering Aotearoa/New Zealand schooling. For example, Harry, who migrated with his family from Cambodia, noted that when he first entered school in Aotearoa/New Zealand at the age of six, "the language barrier is a big thing for me because when I came here, I didn't know any English. I had a lot of trouble trying to tell the teacher my name and trying to write in English [were] a lot of issues as well." Jung Min echoed these sentiments, stating that, when she entered an Aotearoa/New Zealand school at the age of eight, "speaking English all the time, that was the hardest thing for me when I got here and seeing like different people cause in Korea it's just ... Koreans." Harry and Jung Min both went through this difficult communicative adaptation earlier in their lives. However, both participants still have clear memories of the difficulty adjusting to the dominance of English in the Aotearoa/New Zealand school context.

For a more recent arrival, like Jejomar, the memories of adjustment are all the more acute. He asserted in his initial Year 12 interview that "New Zealand school is different; the language is hard. English is quite hard." The primary difference for Jejomar was the dominance and difficulty of English. Jejomar, in contrast to Harry and Jung Min, has had

much less time to adjust to the difficulty of the English-dominant environment of Aotearoa/New Zealand schooling.

Nieto (2010) identified that discontinuities experienced by students whose culture and language are different from the mainstream may interfere with learning. The EAL students participating in my research recognised the discontinuities and interference with their own learning they experienced as they integrated into an English-dominant education system. EAL students often stated that they felt additional pressures due to these discontinuities which English L1 students did not encounter. For example, Kanda noted in a journal entry, “I have so much more work than a normal student.” For Kanda, a normal student was one who has existing English language competencies and who did not experience the discontinuities characteristic of her move from Thailand to Aotearoa/New Zealand. Kanda goes on to explain in a further journal entry:

I don't know about other immigrants but I believe that because I struggle so much as being an [immigrant] in New Zealand it keeps me going and striving for something better. I struggle with everything, even everyday activities, for so long that I have to learn to live like this.

For Kanda, the immigrant experience involves struggle and striving for something better. Intrinsic in her moving statement is that “learn[ing] to live like this” involves working harder than the normal student to integrate into the norms of school such that she may strive for something better. As noted earlier, central to the norms of Manawa High School is the dominant role of English. Therefore, for Kanda, central to “learning to live like this” is gaining English.

Kathy more explicitly links the dominance of English to effective integration in Aotearoa/New Zealand schooling when she states:

In my opinion English is kind of like what everybody speaks so I think it's important to learn ... cause English will really help you ... like it's the best way to communicate with people cause everyone speaks English everyone knows English ... yeah so, I think it's good to like have that knowledge.

Kathy goes on to link English language use to success in her Year 13 studies when she states in a journal entry "all of my subjects this year have something to do with English". For Kathy, the dominance of English is recognised in both a social integrative sense and a scholarly successful sense.

International students such as Daniel, from China, and Udom, from Thailand, extended the concept of the dominance of English to outside the education field and into broader economic considerations. Indeed, these students' coming to Aotearoa/New Zealand was primarily motivated by the desire to acquire English. This is due to its dominance in economic spheres and the perception of the value of English in their home countries. For example, Daniel asserted that the view of English in China was that it is "the most ... useful language in the world"; when asked why he thought this, he stated, "because America is the best country in the world now." Udom stated that "the main reason that I came here is just to improve my English." When I asked him to explain this reasoning in a bit more detail, he stated that his parents "want me to learn English cause my dad, he got a business but he cannot speak English well, so every time he deals with foreign traders from America or other countries he would need someone to ... translate for him." For Daniel and Udom the perception of the need to acquire English in order to integrate into the Anglo-normative education system is augmented by wider considerations around the value English has in their home countries for business and employment.

Both migrant and international EAL students recognised the dominant role of English in the Aotearoa/New Zealand educational system. For many of the students, this dominance extends beyond the classroom walls and across national borders. The recognition of the dominant role of English by participants impacted their investment in language use and the negotiation of their scholarly identities. This section will now conclude with an analysis of these impacts, both on EAL students' language use and the negotiation of their scholarly identities.

#### Impact on language use

Participating EAL students perceived that English as a prestige language impacted on their language use in relation to their schooling. For example, Kanda asserted in her initial Year 12 interview:

Firstly, when I moved here I really struggled with my English cause like back in Thailand I usually study a lot of grammar but in here they start writing essays and a lot of what I haven't covered in English class [in Thailand] but my English isn't up to what they expect me to be so I have to study more and more at home by myself.

Here Kanda perceives her English language is not up to what "they" (the teachers and school) expects it to be. She perceives the solution to this to be more individual study of English at home to achieve success in the language and thereby success at school. This is a clear example of what Harklau (2000) identified as educators being able to impose a viewpoint of what is common sense. In this case, teachers have imposed a common-sense viewpoint that success in English equates to success at school. Kanda has sought to increase her chances of success at school by increasing the practice of English in her study alone at home.

May's (2011a) notion of linguistic hierarchy is important to consider here. As English comes to be afforded instrumental value in school by the EAL learners themselves, what happens to the perceived role of their L1? When asked about the potential existence of a linguistic hierarchy, participants pointed to English existing at the top of the hierarchy. For example, Miyu stated "I think English is higher ... 'cause I actually didn't like English that much when I was in Japan but when I came here like lots of other people not even Kiwis speak English and if I don't speak English I can't talk." Here Miyu states that she did not hold English in high regard when she was in Japan. However, this changed when she came to Aotearoa/New Zealand and experienced the dominance of English. Jung Min similarly noted, "I find English better," as compared with her Korean L1. In the case of both Miyu and Jung Min, English language dominance resulted in the language being viewed as the pinnacle of a linguistic hierarchy. For Miyu and Jung Min, English serves the instrumental purpose of both conversational effectiveness and scholarly success. These perceptions tend to relegate their L1 to the perceived sentimental realms of home and family life, as English comes to dominate schooling.

A high level of value was placed, by participating EAL students, on the linguistic capital of English in the field of school. Meanwhile, the capital of their L1 tended to be minimised, as a view of L1 holding academic capital was absent from this field. May (2011b) has pointed out that there is often misrecognition of the dominant role of language in education. In the case of my research, this misrecognition contributes to a common-sense view constructed around the dominance of English as intrinsic to school success. This common-sense viewpoint is conveyed through pedagogy and acquired through a learned set of dispositions by EAL students who shape their negotiation of scholarly identities around the notion that English is the (sole) language of their education.

## Impact on the negotiation of scholarly identities

Identity is a socially and historically constructed phenomenon (Norton & McKinney, 2011) which arises through a process of negotiation in a social space. Habitus is a “system of transposable dispositions” (Bourdieu, 1998, pp. 82-83) which are not static but subject to change. These transposable dispositions in a particular field serve to create a “logic of practice” (Bourdieu, 1990c) which shapes how value is placed on particular elements of capital. Therefore, understanding the system of transposable dispositions that manifests in a student’s scholarly habitus in the field of school leads to an understanding of how capital is valued with regard to the student’s own scholarly identity.

In my research, I found a set of learned dispositions which manifests as a scholarly habitus within EAL student participants that placed value on the symbolic capital of English language use in the field of the Manawa High School. This set of learned dispositions manifests in scholarly identities of many participants, in which English was regarded as the only “legitimate language” (Heller, 1996) to be used in their education. Within a field of social practice with little opportunity for L1 use, classroom practices came to establish relations of linguistic domination (Blackledge, 2002) in which English played the dominant role.

My research contributes to the view that policy makers and teachers have the power to establish what forms of capital are to be valued in school. Further, this comes to influence EAL students’ investment in these particular forms of capital. Many of these students viewed education as a driving force for self-improvement. Watkins and Noble (2013) noted that students will self-discipline their own identities around valued capital attributes. The EAL students participating in my research similarly self-disciplined their scholarly identities around the capital value of English as the language of their education.

## Disciplinary Literacies, Decontextualisation and Streaming

In this section, I will argue that the demands of disciplinary literacy (Moje, 2007) at senior secondary school lead to the reinforcing of the dominance of English in EAL students' academic trajectories. I will argue that the dominance of English-based disciplinary literacies served to reinforce the use of English as the language of education and further align participating EAL students' scholarly identities with the symbolically valued linguistic capital of English.

I have found in my research that participating EAL students recognised that the dominant role of English in their education became more acute as they entered the senior years of high school. My research took place during participants' final two years of high school (Years 12 and 13). In these years, the demands to acquire subject-specific disciplinary literacies are high as students trace their academic trajectories through the final years of NCEA.

This steep linguistic learning curve is compounded by the teachers' lack of contextualisation of complex academic concepts. Lecturer-style, whole-class teaching was the dominant form of pedagogy I observed over these two years at these levels. This style of transmission pedagogy (Cummins, 1986) often disadvantages EAL learners due to its lack of contextual cues and opportunities for clarification of academic terms. Participants themselves recognised the difficulty of this decontextualised pedagogy. For example, Seong asserted that "the teachers teaching is a little bit hard cause of my English sometimes". Shane felt the same about the pedagogy in Aotearoa/New Zealand classrooms, stating: "I think it is hard with the English language, I can't understand when the teacher is speaking. My English is so least so I can't understand the words I just always use the ... [gestures to his electronic dictionary]". The lecture style was often accompanied with a choral call-and-

response questioning style in which the teacher elicited short answers from the class as a whole. EAL students often remained silent in these whole-class exchanges.

May (2002) notes that this approach limits EAL students' ongoing literacy acquisition. In contrast to the L1 silencing approach, Cook (2001) identified in the Canadian context that using the L1 of all students created novel avenues for literacy acquisition. This general literacy acquisition approach, which makes use of L1, could then be applied to the subject-specific disciplinary literacies (Moje, 2007) that are characteristic of senior secondary schooling. Shanahan and Shanahan (2008) have noted that this can help with the increasing specialist characteristic of the literacy acquisition of students, as they progress from general subjects in junior school to more specialised subjects in senior school.

Richards (2006) has argued that traditional Initiation Response Feedback (IRF) patterns of classroom interaction (the choral call approach, referred to earlier) should cede way to a more dialogic perspective that embraces the notion of the classroom conversation. As with any conversation, in a classroom, each interlocutor (in this case, the teacher and the students) is seen to contribute information in a dynamic fashion. This dynamic process helps students, and in particular EAL students, to contextualise pedagogy. By contrast, traditional IRF-type classroom interactions rely on the dominant input of the teacher, which tends to decontextualise pedagogy and adds an additional barrier for EAL students. Leon identified difficulties with acquiring new disciplinary specific vocabulary in a relatively decontextualised pedagogical setting, in English, in this exchange:

Brian: Is the language component in accounting kind of hard?

Leon: Yeah, it's kind of hard, it's like new words like inventory or something like that.

Leon felt teachers could help more with his acquisition of disciplinary literacies through "more communication so I can improve my English and I can let the teacher know what I'm

doing and what I need.” The decontextualisation inherent in transmission pedagogy could be reduced through, in Leon’s words, “more communication.” White (2011) calls for educators to be more attendant to the relative levels of participation of minority students in whole class IRF-type interactions. White noted that the outward minimal participation of minorities does not reflect apathy on the students’ part, rather an effort to protect their own identity and to try to understand the norms of the new educational environment. Leon, and other EAL student participants, felt significant pressure to keep up with the lecture and IRF styles of teachers and rapidly learn disciplinary vocabulary in English. This was in spite of these styles of learning being the most difficult for Leon to learn the subject-specific terms, such as inventory.

I observed in various classes the demands placed on EAL students to acquire disciplinary literacies. For example, in one lecture in a mathematics with statistics class, Miyu, Udom and Padayao were exposed to phrases like “bivariate time series,”; “dot plots”; “skewedness”; “symmetric skewed left”; “symmetric skewed right”; and “box and whisker plots,”, all of which were delivered in a decontextualized lecture form of teaching. Similarly, a lecture in Jung Min’s chemistry class required her to understand phrases like “hydrous”; “hydrated”; “oxygen aerobic”; “hydrochloric acid”; “corrosive”; “chloroalkanes”; “ethanol”; “methanol”; “propane”; “Lucas reagent”; “chloride”; and “acetyl chloride.” Clearly, these are highly demanding disciplinary vocabulary terms that students are expected to understand and explain in order to achieve in the given subject. These vocabulary terms are not limited to mathematics and science subjects but permeate all subjects.

Tamati (2016) has noted the effectiveness of a transacquisition approach in a Kura Kaupapa Māori school. Such an approach embraces the notion of a simultaneous and dialogic acquisition of both, in the case of Tamati’s study, English and te reo Māori. A

transacquisition approach, when applied to higher levels of education in senior secondary school could help attenuate the difficulties of acquiring disciplinary literacies solely in English, a reality which was identified by participants as a source of stress. For example, Udom stated: “like, for example, science [is a challenge] because English is my second language and the words and vocabulary like in science make it more confusing, they have their own special language.” Seong echoed these sentiments in a journal entry when she noted, “I like biology but it has lots of vocabulary to remember and some words are hard to study”. The demands of acquiring disciplinary literacies in English were clearly a central concern for Udom and Seong in these statements. Perhaps this concern could be addressed through the incorporation of a transacquisition approach. As it stands, however, the normative discourse of English as the language of the academy is reinforced as demands and expectations imbue within the EAL students a set of dispositions that regards not having disciplinary literacies in English as a cognitive deficit.

These sets of dispositions are reinforced in school reports, as many teachers identified participating EAL students as needing to build disciplinary specific vocabularies and work on their language structure in English. For example, Jejomar’s history teacher noted: “he has struggled with the concepts covered in this course ... [and he] ... needs to use a dictionary for words he doesn’t understand.” Here, Jejomar’s “struggle with the concepts” is equated to his not understanding subject-specific vocabulary. Implicit in the comment that he needs to use an English dictionary is that any potential funds of knowledge he has in his L1 are not attributed capital value and thus silenced. I see in this comment the notion of divergence from normative fluency and application of this legitimate (Heller, 1996) majority language coming to be positioned as an individual failing on the part of the EAL student. “He has struggled” and “he needs to use a dictionary” position Jejomar as the author of his own

fate and removes the responsibility of the teacher to co-construct knowledge with Jejomar in the (successful) acquisition of academic English.

The example of Jejomar's report comment is not an isolated one. Comments about challenges in English are often central in foregrounding challenges with wider disciplinary literacies for EAL students. For example, Leon's accounting teacher noted that "he does have some challenges with English." As discussed earlier, Leon felt he had difficulties in accounting in acquiring disciplinary vocabulary. Here his teacher is linking Leon's own perceived difficulties to the teacher's own perception that Leon has "some challenges in English." This, in the view of their teachers, limits EAL students' ability to build academic vocabulary. Again, the position of English is privileged and the position of their L1 is silenced.

Teachers would often also identify participants' progress along expected academic trajectories as being stifled due to a limited amount of English. For example, Seong's ESOL teacher stated that she "struggles with issues of tense and verb forms and would do well to build her academic vocabulary ... she needs to increase her exposure to English in its written form." Seong's physics teacher more directly states: "her difficulties with the English language is [sic] holding back her progress in this subject." Seong's teachers make clear that they link English language ability and academic progress in these comments.

I also found in report comments that participating EAL students' perceived deficits are often reinforced in comments by teachers referring to norms of expected progress in English language development. For example, Elaine's ESOL teacher highlighted her "limited vocabulary tested at about 4000 words – ideally this figure should be closer to 8000 for a year 12." Leon was compared to the expectations of normative progress by the same ESOL teacher when this teacher commented that "it is very noticeable that he takes a long time

to complete work. What most other students complete in 2 days he might take 8 days to complete ... one reason for this slowness is undoubtedly his low level of academic vocabulary.”

The means of solving these perceived deficits is held as the responsibility of the student themselves. As was the case in Harry’s mathematics teacher’s comment: “he can achieve better grades if he studies the concepts taught in class regularly at home.” Elaine’s biology teacher similarly asserted that she “needs to continue to develop her knowledge base so she can provide more descriptions.” Harry and Elaine are both tasked, in these comments, with the individual responsibility of fixing their perceived shortcomings in their English language – and, by extension, academic – ability.

The building of disciplinary vocabulary in English is consistently linked to notions of individual effort on the part of EAL students who are positioned by teachers as needing to overcome struggle. For example, Miyu’s form teacher identifies her as “an able student [who] still needs to put in more effort to achieve at the level which her teachers believe her capable,” while her ESOL teacher states that she “needs to build academic vocabulary through a programme of intensive study.” Again, the need to build academic English is consistently linked by teachers to individualised ideas of student effort and the benefits of taking advantage of opportunities to acquire English for academic contexts.

Ideas of individual meritocratic placement also manifest in Manawa High School’s streaming system, which was based on results from the previous year assessments. A ‘00’ class denoted an accelerated-stream class that often does credits from a year above their chronological year level (for example, English 200 will do some level 3 English credits). A ‘01’ class denoted the high-standard stream, often doing 24 NCEA credits at their year level. A ‘02’ class denoted a low-standard stream, often doing less than 24 NCEA credits at their year

level. While a '03' is denoted as a low-ability class, often doing credits at a year level below their chronological year.

Across classes which have been streamed on perceived ability level, pedagogical style, and views around the need for disciplinary literacy, did not dramatically shift. For example, in Padayao's English 301 class, her teacher's comments noted: "[Padayao] is doing just enough of the written work to satisfy the course requirements. This is not helping her to develop her thinking to the level needed in Year 13. Kidlat's English 302 teacher noted he needs to get into the "habit of writing detailed responses to not only increase his writing mileage but also allow him to show depth of thought." Finally, Jejomar's English 303 teacher similarly stated:

Jejomar is working as a second language learner and, as such, the demands on him are greater. He needs to be there for every learning opportunity in order to maximise his success. He also needs to increase the use of academic language in his writing to more closely approximate the expectations of Level 2 and 3 English standards.

At each of the streamed levels, teachers expressed comments which equated use of English and practice with writing conventions in English as leading to the development of the expected disciplinary competence. These comments were formed in the context of a default style of lecture and IRF pedagogy which often lacked any context for the participating EAL students as to the meaning and application of disciplinary literacies. Furthermore, these comments from teachers had echoes of EAL students' own statements that they felt demands on them were higher when compared with English L1 students. I note again Kanda's perception that she had to work harder than normal students. Clearly the influence of teachers', and more generally the schools', normative discourse regarding achievement

and language use shapes, in turn, EAL students' own perceptions of their academic trajectories.

#### Students' perceptions of academic trajectories

Many of the participants in my research felt a heavy burden in adapting to the demands of disciplinary literacies in English. They often felt being placed in ESOL classes was a form of relegation to a less academic environment that was due to their own linguistic deficits.

Participants also perceived an academic importance attached to English for educational advancement. These multiple, often contradictory, discourses contributed to a complex process of identity negotiation around English language use for these participants.

Leon, an international student from Hong Kong, exemplified the perception of English as an academically important language when he stated during an interview: "my dad wanted me to be here for the education. For the English language and everything yeah he thinks the education compared to Hong Kong is very good." Seong, an international student from Korea, identified her rationale for learning English in Aotearoa/New Zealand by stating during an interview: "I'm looking for international university in Korea, they teaching all English there." Leon and Seong both regarded English as having functional benefits of access to a good education system and ultimately high-status, English-medium, universities.

For migrant students like Kanda, who planned to attend university in Aotearoa/New Zealand, the need for English language acquisition as inherent to academic advancement was all the more acute. Kanda stated in one of her journal entries:

I do know that there is more competition for me [to get into university] as English is my 2nd language. The major problem that I have to challenge is the opportunity that have been given to me is fewer than others.

Here Kanda asserts that her opportunity to enter an Aotearoa/New Zealand university is “fewer than others” due to English being her second language, which she regards as a disadvantage given the competitive nature of university admission. Kanda further asserted during an interview, “you get a better education with English, it gives you more opportunities in your life.” The normative discourse of English language skills as advantageous to accessing both international and national universities is clearly impacting both international and migrant students. The pressure to succeed and get into university compels these students to regard English as a prestige language that must be rapidly acquired to achieve academic success.

Participating EAL students who perceived that they were not keeping up with teacher expectations of a normative development of disciplinary literacies often felt a heavy burden over and above that of their L1 English peers. For example, Udom stated in a journal entry, “I have a feeling that vocabularies is a real struggle for second language people based from my experience”. Seong noted in one of her journal entries: “geo[graphy] is really interesting subject but they have lots of English words that I have never seen, really complicate[d] to understand even [if] I translate to Korean.” For these students the pressure to maintain pace with the disciplinary literacies’ requirements of senior school was immense. This pressure was seen to be more acute for them as they felt they did not have sufficient disciplinary literacy in English to meet class requirements.

Some participants, by contrast, perceived that they had greater disciplinary literacy in English than in their L1. In some cases, this is because they had been in the Aotearoa/New Zealand education system longer than the education system of their country of origin. In other cases, it is because English was the medium of education in their home countries. For example, I asked Jung Min, who has been in Aotearoa/New Zealand since she was eight,

“where would you rank your English reading and writing?” Her response was “I guess higher than Korean.” In Year 12, she was placed in an advanced stream English 200 class that did more NCEA credits than the general English classes. I observed in this advanced-stream English class that she exhibited a strong use of English. She freely and fluently talked with peers about class content. She tended to show familiarity with peers and seemed comfortable in the class. Further to this, she made use of the Aotearoa/New Zealand vernacular when talking. For example, she said, to her fellow student “when I write essays I feel like a flop” one morning when she was particularly tired. Jung Min had much of her educational experiences in Aotearoa/New Zealand schools and she was familiar with the demands and expectations of this environment. By her own measure she had stronger disciplinary literacy in English than her L1.

Kathy is another example of a participant who identified that she had greater disciplinary literacy in English than her L1, as this exchange in her final Year 12 interview indicates:

Brian: So, imagine you walk into you NCEA exam and on the desk is one script in English and one script in your first language, which script would you choose to do?

Kathy: English.

Brian: Why?

Kathy: 'Cause I don't really know much about my subjects in Tagalog so if I choose the one in my language it would be harder for me 'cause I don't know much words.

Brian: So, do you feel you don't have, I guess, the academic words in your language?

Kathy: Yeah pretty much cause I'm used to English now.

Compounding the fact that Kathy has been in Aotearoa/New Zealand for six years and, as such, all of her secondary education has been English medium, she also had much of her primary schooling in an English-medium private school in the Philippines. Therefore, she has had little opportunity to acquire disciplinary literacy in her L1. Kathy exhibited similar levels of comfort in class as Jung Min. In my classroom observations of Kathy, I noted that she made extensive use of one-on-one time with the teacher by asking a variety of clarifying questions. She displayed a strong level of communicative competence (Canale, 1983; Canale & Swain, 1981) in English. She was able to initiate conversation as well as respond to initiation. She was able to discuss academic concepts – for example, the uses of symbolism in magazine advertising – during English class.

In both the examples of Kathy and Jung Min, they had acquired a learned set of dispositions and communicative competency that favoured English as the language of their education. This tended to minimise the role of their L1 in their learning as it was not socially constructed in school as a relevant meaning-making resource.

By way of contrast, Leon has had much more experience than Jung Min and Kathy in L1-medium schooling. He, however, experienced similar difficulties with disciplinary literacy in L1, particularly with the higher-level academic vocabulary that is learnt at senior secondary level. He stated “I don’t know those words in Chinese ‘cause I never learned them in China.” With Leon it can be seen that even with a limited amount of time in English medium schooling (in his case three years) the disciplinary literacy demands of senior secondary school are so high that students are often exposed to vocabulary in English that they have not previously learnt in L1. As such, new disciplinary-specific vocabulary terms tended to be reinforced in English rather than in their L1.

Kathy, Jung Min and Leon all asserted that they held a greater level of disciplinary literacy in English compared with their L1, while Udom and Seong asserted that they needed to acquire academic language proficiency (see Chapter 1, p. 14) in English to ensure their desired academic trajectories. These lived experiences all, in their own particular ways, served to reinforce a normative discourse which favours English as the language of education. These participants were immersed in a social field in which English was the primary, and often only, linguistic capital for meaning making. As such, they clearly felt the need to acquire and maintain disciplinary literacies in English to continue on their desired academic trajectories.

#### Impact on language use

I found that in both the cases of long-term students and more recent arrivals, a discourse of linguistic hierarchy was evident which privileged English as the primary language of their education in the Aotearoa/New Zealand setting. The material conditions (Cavanaugh & Shankar, 2014; Shankar & Cavanaugh, 2012) of the classroom setting served to reinforce this linguistic hierarchy. In the social setting of the classroom, with its particular social practices, participating EAL students learned a set of dispositions that emphasised the role of English and minimised the role of L1 in their education.

Jung Min is an example of the clear impact an English-dominant disciplinary literacy environment has on language use. She states “I’m learning everything in English so there [is] really no point in translating it back to Korean ... I don’t think I could understand it anyway ... it’s a bit pointless to do it.” Kathy expressed similar sentiments that her disciplinary literacy had developed in English so she favours “English ’cause I don’t really know much about my language [Tagalog] ... like if I choose my language it will be harder for me ’cause I don’t know

much words". As with Jung Min, an English-language-dominant environment has led to English being the language of Kathy's academic trajectory.

Teachers writing report comments like "he needs to practise every day in an English context to make progress" (for Daniel) or "he has reached a plateau with his language development and needs to work hard to get beyond it" (for Leon); or "while these [English] skills are developing ... she is still not at the point where formal writing is easy" (for Elaine) serve to reinforce the message that EAL students must continually make use of English in order to progress academically. These comments contribute to the students' own view of language use, as is the case with Kanda's journal entry which stated, "this year it's not all about me finding it difficult to study as a English second language speaker. This year my English skills need to be closest to perfect to create the best pathway for my university."

The message of English use as the language of education is not limited to Aotearoa/New Zealand schools and teachers, however. Kathy's experience of the Filipino education system is very revealing with regard to how English use is valorised as a prestige language across educational contexts. Kathy initially attended a public school in which the medium of education was Tagalog. However, after a few years of public school she moved to a private school. She stated, "I moved to private school and we had to speak English rather than like our own language so we have to learn and speak English". The following exchange is indicative of the regard with which English is held in the Philippines:

Kathy: 'Cause like I went to a private school and we have to speak English not our language.

Brian: So even back home English is viewed as kind of the language of education.

Kathy: Yeah like in my school if we speak our language, we have to like pay. It's all right I didn't really mind it's just different from public schools. Umm it's very much the same but in private school like you get more advantage than public.

The experience of Kathy is telling. In her private school English was held in such high regard that punitive measures, such as fines for use of Tagalog, were taken to prevent students making use of their L1. The prestige of English becomes reinforced in this education system. In the public school the medium of education was Tagalog while in private schools the medium of education was English. When I pressed Kathy on which system she favoured, she asserted:

Well [in private schools] we have to speak English and in [public] schools we have to speak our language and I guess the [private school] classroom too like this is much cleaner and much better environment and the teachers are really focused and they ask about your studies.

Kathy identified that private schools in the Philippines had distinct advantages over their public counterparts. This served to reinforce, for Kathy, a learned set of dispositions that placed English language use in a prestigious position, as English comes to be associated with what is regarded as more advantageous social institutions.

In the case of Aotearoa/New Zealand school experiences, and that of Kathy in the Philippines, the role English plays as the language of education impacts significantly on the negotiation of scholarly identities which tend to gravitate towards the linguistic capital of English.

#### [Impact on the negotiation of scholarly identities](#)

I found that participating students who asserted a sense of investment in the communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998) of their classes often asserted this

investment in the context of scholarly identities that valorised English language use. For example, Kathy asserted in her final interview in Year 12, of her subject choices for Year 13: “I really like writing, history is my favourite [subject] like I like researching and writing about it. It’s the same thing with English. I like writing and with biology I like it ’cause its more writing than the other sciences.” Here Kathy is asserting that her investment in these subjects is centred on her scholarly identity as a competent writer in English. For Kathy, a positive feedback loop is identified as occurring between investment, identity and the holding of symbolically valued forms of capital – in this case, proficiency in written English.

Contrasting with this is Leon’s experience of a teacher who regarded him as not holding sufficient symbolic capital in the form of spoken English language ability. Leon stated in his final Year 12 interview: “the teacher, he still seems to think I can’t speak English very well. I had to explain to him, actually you don’t have to use that way to explain it to me ’cause he got a Chinese kid to help me. It is kind of annoying.” Leon’s experience of not being regarded as holding symbolic capital in this class led him to divest from the class as he regarded the teacher as not recognising the linguistic capital in English he did, in fact, hold. Leon found the teacher getting “a Chinese kid to help” was “kind of annoying” as this diverged from his own concept of scholarly identity in which he regarded himself as a competent user of English.

Participating EAL students often identified in interviews the explicit need to adhere to the expectations of high school in terms of behaviour and achievement in order to access tertiary education. For example, Kathy noted in her final Year 12 interview that she chose specific subjects because “I really want to get to AU [The University of Auckland] and I need more like English and writing credits.” Padayao echoed similar themes in this exchange during her final Year 12 interview:

Brian: And overall how do you feel about school?

Padayao: Umm stressful but I guess if I don't get through school, I can't exactly win at life, can I? So, well, better get it over and done with.

In both these examples, an expectation of success “to win at life” and a linking of education as a means of self-improvement led to these students’ investment in the expected norms of high school. This, in practice, meant negotiating their scholarly identities in an Anglo-normative education environment in which the use of English was dominant.

The power of those who determine what traits are attributed capital, therefore, becomes of central importance. In the case of schools, linguistic norms are established, literally, by the adults in the room who have disproportionate power over their young charges. Teachers and senior school administrators establish the norm that English is the language of academic advancement. Students, in turn, make an investment in this norm and negotiate scholarly identities which favour the use of English. These scholarly identities, EAL student participants reason, will (inevitably) lead to advancement along their desired academic trajectories.

### [English in Assessment – NCEA and English-only Assessment](#)

In this section, I will argue that the dominant role of English in assessment at senior secondary school serves as a further reinforcing mechanism to manifest a scholarly identity in EAL students which holds English as a valued capital attribute. My research, which took place during participating students Year 12 and 13 (the final two years) of high school, found that EAL students identified the NCEA assessment system as being a major reason they negotiated scholarly identities based around the use of English. All EAL students in my study participated in NCEA during their senior years of high school.

Bourdieu (1986) noted that capital is institutionalised through educational qualifications. In the case of my research site, the symbolic capital of English is, in part, institutionalised through ongoing NCEA assessment. The NCEA system is the main system of assessment in state secondary schools in Aotearoa/New Zealand. This system allocates NCEA credits (at Achieved, Merit or Excellence levels) based on both internal assessments and external examinations. As a consequence, this system is one in which students experience ongoing assessment throughout the school year. Credit acquisition becomes the prime marker of success for students. Students are often inculcated into becoming credit-accumulating machines. The message of success in NCEA as being intrinsic to success at school and advancement to tertiary education studies is constantly reinforced by teachers and school administrators.

The pressure to accumulate credits becomes most acute in the last two years of high school (Years 12 and 13) as teachers and school administrators increasingly reinforce the message that credit acquisition is of utmost importance. This is because the Aotearoa/New Zealand government has a stated target of 85% of students gaining NCEA level 2 by the end of school and teachers as well as administrators feel pressure to meet this target. In addition, NCEA level 3 credits are the marker of entry for many tertiary institutions. Students are aware of these requirements and feel pressure to gain good grades in assessments as a marker of institutionally recognised success and as a medium of access to higher levels of education.

EAL students participating in my research asserted the importance of, and pressure around, NCEA assessment. For example, Padayao stated in her interview at the start of the research, “my priority is to do my assessments and then go home.” Seong noted in a journal entry, “my school life is tough because I have many assessments.” In both the cases of

Padayao and Seong, the primary focus and source of pressure in their senior years was assessment and the acquisition of NCEA credits.

Harry shows the extent that success in NCEA achievement is wrapped up in a student's own concept of their scholarly identity when he stated, "like I got a 'merit' once and I felt really happy about it and all the rest are 'achieves' and I kind of felt flat but you look on the bright side of getting a merit." Harry goes on to make the link between credit acquisition and scholarly identity in a more strident statement:

Like in Year 9 and Year 10, I was still screwing around. I still wanted to play games in Year 11 as well and then at the end of Year 11 I looked at how much credits I had, which was 40, and I was so fucked off with myself. I was like dude why are you going to go to school if you are not going to do shit.

In his statements, Harry shows that his identity as a scholar was inherently linked to his success in the NCEA system. He placed blame on himself for what he regards as underperformance. He placed a high degree of pressure on himself to turn his performance around and accumulate credits.

Ability in English has a significant influence in shaping the ability to succeed in NCEA. As noted in the previous section, many subjects have high-level disciplinary literacy requirements. These disciplinary literacies manifest during assessment as specific styles of answers to questions and use of disciplinary vocabulary are required in English to meet the achievement criteria of the assessment. Many teachers' school reports in my research identified participating EAL students as needing to build an academic vocabulary to succeed in assessment. Work on EAL students' language structure during the writing of assessments often came through as a prime concern of teachers in their comments. For example, Jung Min's mathematics teacher wrote that she "needs to [practise] and increase the volume of

work done in her own time so that she builds experience at dealing with questions in exam times". Similarly, Padayao's mathematics teacher wrote: "she must revise carefully by working through practice exam papers in order to achieve to her potential in the external examination." Implicit in these comments is that revision should be in English with reference to previous English-medium assessments so as to adequately prepare for the current English-medium assessment.

When EAL students were regarded as not displaying sufficient academic English in assessment this was attributed to the student having limited understanding of content and/or subject specific vocabulary. For example, Elaine's chemistry teacher notes in her report that "blank areas in her recent practice exams indicate there are gaps in her understanding" while her biology teacher noted Elaine "will need to focus on vocabulary and the core biological processes for each topic to improve her chances of achieving the remaining credits in the course." In each example, the effective use of disciplinary literacy in English, or absence thereof, is linked to chances of achievement in assessment.

Limited English was, on occasions, explicitly identified as the reason for not achieving in assessment. This was the case with Daniel's art design teacher. This teacher commented of Daniel: "he has made the effort to complete the work given to him but due to the language barrier and lack of prior knowledge of art design he has only gained 4 credits"; while Seong's ESOL teacher noted that "she is working on a major challenge which is to complete her formal writing for Literacy credits. This requires a deeper level of thought and language control than she has at present." These comments came to reinforce a discourse that a lack of English is often perceived as a cognitive deficit (Wigglesworth et al., 2011) as each comment implicitly links language, and the challenges therein, to a lack of prior knowledge or deep thought.

To remedy these perceived gaps of understanding teachers lay the responsibility on EAL students to revise in English in order to effectively prepare for their English medium assessment. For example, Kathy's biology teacher comments that "to improve her grade she should continue to develop her fact base so she can provide more descriptions and ensure all test questions have been completed." Kidlat's physics teacher states that "he should work through as many practice questions as he can before the final exams and aim to achieve with at least a merit for all three standards." For both Kathy and Kidlat, the responsibility to achieve in English medium assessment is, in the view of their teachers, firmly with the student and not the teacher.

When EAL students were regarded as having achieved the necessary linguistic standard to achieve in assessment, teachers' report comments were still shaped around individualised traits. For example, Padayao's form teacher said she "worked very hard this year and is to be congratulated for gaining good internal assessment results." Others are also identified as being capable of acquiring the relevant disciplinary literacies to achieve in assessment if they put in the individual effort. This is the case with Miyu. Her physics teacher notes that "she could achieve in the exam if she puts the effort in." In each of these comments the role of English as central to assessment is either implicit or, on occasions, explicitly stated. The pressure of NCEA assessment along with teacher comments helped to shape EAL students' perceptions of NCEA and impacts on their language use and negotiation of scholarly identities in relation to assessment.

#### *Students' perceptions of the dominant role of English in assessment*

The EAL students participating in my research were painfully aware of the challenges of NCEA and the dominant role of English in their assessments. One of Kathy's journal entries made clear the unenviable position these students were placed in. She wrote:

As a student with English as their second language, it is a bit difficult for me to translate some words [in]to English. The structure of my paragraphs are a bit off due to this reason but I'm striving to finish all of my assessment tonight against all odds. Kathy felt she faces tougher odds to achieve well in assessments as compared with English-first-language speakers. She was clearly aware of the difficulty of acquiring disciplinary literacy in English and felt compelled to revise in English, as she felt that this is the most effective way to overcome her difficulties. The challenges faced by these EAL students around English-only assessment and the prime focus on success in these assessments as a marker of institutionally valued capital often pushed participating EAL students to favour English as the language of their education.

The EAL students participating in my study often expressed disappointment around assessment results and the general stress of ongoing assessments. One of Kathy's journal entries in Year 12 is exemplary of this:

[NCEA] Level 2 is one of the most difficult level[s] in high school and for me, many of my subjects requires internals that are very hard to focus on, especially when most of them are due at the same time.

The pressure of ongoing assessment was clear in Kathy's journaling and the disappointment she felt when she did not meet her own expectations of success was further clarified in a follow up journal entry. Kathy wrote:

In my practice essay I received a not achieved which is disappointing. Since English is not my first language, I am forced to study more and put all my time finishing and resubmitting.

For Kathy, the institutionalisation of capital through qualifications became all the more confronting when she recognised the additional pressures she faced having English as a

second language. The elements of L1 linguistic capital they do hold tended to be silenced in an educational environment that afforded such a high degree of symbolic capital to English.

EAL students also felt a degree of pressure to make subject choices which maximised their ability to acquire NCEA credits. Contrary to the notion that the Aotearoa/New Zealand system enabled these students to make subject choices around their interests, students felt compelled to sacrifice these choices in favour of the systematic accumulation of credits. A particular concern for these students was around level 3 literacy credits, which students must acquire to get into university. For example, Elaine discussed her rationale behind subject choices for Year 13:

Brian: So, you're dropping art? Why is that? You seemed to really like art.

Elaine: Yeah, I like art but art seems like it wastes a lot of time and I have to spend a lot of time in art like doing paintings, so I don't have time to do other.

Elaine dropped a subject she had a passion for to pick up subjects she knew would have English literacy credits so that she could meet the institutional requirements of NCEA and entry into university.

In other cases, students chose subjects because they knew they would be able to get more general credits which would also help with gaining NCEA and entry to university. For example, Miyu, a Japanese international student, stated:

I'm going to drop physics and I'm going to take Japanese, like if I go to university here, I'm planning to go to Auckland [university] and I need 280 rank score so I can get more credits in Japanese.

Here Miyu was playing the NCEA credit accumulation game by choosing a subject in which she knew she will likely gain more credits so she was able to get entry into university.

Assessment and credit accumulation as a marker of success also came to shape students' negotiation of scholarly identities. The fact that these assessments were English-only in their nature had a significant influence on participating EAL students' set of dispositions towards learning. This was an assessment environment which placed a premium on English language ability and afforded little capital value to L1 ability. The institutionalisation of capital through qualifications conspired to symbolically value ability in English over L1 as a marker of academic success. This has an impact on language use and the negotiation of scholarly identities.

#### Impact on language use

The participating EAL students in this study expressed a desire to revise for assessment in English because of the pressure to rapidly acquire Academic Language Proficiency in English. This desire manifested as one of the consequences of a highly pressurised assessment system at senior school level which privileged academic proficiency in English over a student's L1. For example, Kanda asserted a revision technique which was common across participants:

Kanda: I make notes mostly in English.

Brian: What's the reason for writing notes in English?

Kanda: So, I can get used to it when I come to do the exams.

Miyu expressed similar sentiments to Kanda in her initial Year 12 interview when she stated: "I don't say it [the definitions] back to myself in Japanese, only English." In each case, these two participants viewed revising in English as a practicality due to the nature of the English-orientated NCEA assessment.

The option to revise in L1 was often viewed as a last resort by participants. Kathy exemplifies the position of L1 as the language of last resort in this interaction:

Brian: Would all of your note taking and revision be in English?

Kathy: Yeah [laughs].

Brian: So, none of it in your first language?

Kathy: Unless I don't know a word then I would write it and find the vocabulary in Tagalog.

These students felt compelled to revise in English and only use their L1 when all other avenues had been exhausted. The combination of English-orientated pedagogy and the pressure of high stakes academic assessments in English had induced, in these students, a learned set of dispositions that favoured English as the language of study, both in class and at home during revision.

Participating students often noted that their English ability was the major obstacle to their success in NCEA. For example, Kanda stated: "I only have a problem in English. It's just a really big step between [NCEA] level 1 and level 2. English [speaking] people tend to get along well in it but I can't do it." Leon said of his achievement in Level 1 NCEA: "last year I couldn't even speak English properly and I struggle with the language and the grammar." Difficulty with disciplinary literacy in English was identified by both of these students as the major impediment to their success in NCEA. These students all felt compelled to develop a learned set of dispositions which favoured English language acquisition as the language of education in order to succeed in an English-only assessment environment. The development of these learned set of dispositions impacts on EAL students' negotiation of their scholarly identities.

#### [Impact on the negotiation of scholarly identities](#)

The burden of NCEA assessment in English served to create the conditions of negotiated scholarly identities in these EAL students that favoured the symbolic capital of English.

Participating EAL students in my research attributed any failure in assessment to their own divergence from an archetypal, illusory, image of the ideal individualistic English-speaking scholarly agent. For example, Kanda stated “maybe I’m not studying hard enough” even though she, at that stage of the research, had achieved NCEA level 1 as well as gained level 1 literacy and numeracy. Kanda was, by this measure, a successful student academically but still viewed herself as diverging from an image of a scholar due to her own individual failings in not studying hard enough.

Students tended to adopt scholarly identities that favoured the symbolic capital of English. They expressed that English L1 speakers held an advantage over them during assessment. For example, Kanda stated in her journal:

I cannot fall down at any point in my life. I have lots of disadvantage already and I will not let them be in my way. This is the only year that you cannot make a mistake. It’s the most important year for us all. I think that everybody including the English speaker student shouldn’t take it lightly.

Kanda constructed herself in this statement as an individual who will not let her disadvantages stand in her way. Her perceived disadvantages of having English as a second language are contrasted with English-first-language speakers whom she regarded as having less pressure on them. Negotiation of scholarly identities on these terms tended to manifest individualised revision techniques which favoured English-medium resources.

When asked to describe the techniques they used when studying on their own, many participating EAL students identified that they made use of resources which were exclusively in English. For example, Seong stated:

Seong: Biology and chemistry is more words so for them I try to find out [the] word’s meaning and I’m going to watch some video that I found on You Tube.

Brian: And all these are in English?

Seong: Mmm yeah.

Kanda conducted her revision by “read[ing] up on the notes I made in class and then I will rewrite them again and read them out.” For both Seong and Kanda, all these revision notes are written in English. The symbolic capital of English thus came to dominate many EAL students’ revision practices and was further institutionalised during NCEA assessment. I view this process of linguistic domination in revision practices as an extension of the linguistic domination discussed in previous sections. This is particularly the case in relation to EAL students’ disciplinary literacy requirements at senior school and their general educational and assessment experiences in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

## Discussion

The Ministry of Education policy documents relating to the appropriate use of language in school seem contradictory. The NZC (MoE, 2007) focuses on the notion that English is fundamental to success across the curriculum. The NZC states: “students who are new learners of English or coming into an English medium environment for the first time need explicit and extensive teaching of English vocabulary word forms, sentence and text structures and language uses” (p. 16). Clearly, the role of English is paramount in this document as it emphasises that “the importance of literacy in English cannot be overstated” (p. 16).

Contradictions seem to arise when we consider wider policy documents, however. The most obvious example of this relates to policies concerning literacy. The *Dimensions of Effective Literacy Practices* (MoE, 2003) identified one of these effective practices as making use of the knowledge of the learner. When the existing knowledge of the learner is largely in

another language, as is the case with EAL students, a policy of the explicit and extensive teaching of English undermines the utilisation of L1 funds of knowledge.

Another issue identified in *Dimensions of Effective Literacy Practices* is the promotion of collaborative partnerships (MoE, 2003). One collaborative partnership EAL students can, and often do, make use of is linguistic safe houses (Canagarajah, 2004) with fellow L1 peers. When a normative discourse of English as the language for literacy acquisition is manifest, EAL students develop a learned set of dispositions that guide them away from these safe houses.

These surface contradictions, upon reflection, however, do not have to be so. When a student's L1 is recognised as a useful fund of knowledge, teachers will be more able to utilise the existing cognitive underlying proficiencies of the student as a base to build English and L1 vocabulary simultaneously. When L1 funds of knowledge are effectively utilised, L1 can be seen to develop an instrumental value (May, 2011a) in the learning of literacy in English so important to success in the NZC.

The idea of "entry into mainstream classes for those with suitable English language skills" promoted by Manawa High School on its website carries the normative, unreflexive, view of English being the language of the mainstream. Again, considering the "Dimensions" document, the question must be raised as to how students without *suitable English language skills* have opportunities to develop collaborative partnerships in relation to mainstream subjects. Manawa High School is, of course, not unique in its ESOL withdrawal/mainstream class division. This form of withdrawal from the mainstream is common across high schools in Aotearoa/New Zealand. These ESOL classes have the noble aim of "explicitly and extensively" (MoE, 2007, p. 16) teaching the various elements of

English identified as important in the NZC. However, the net result of these classes is all too often to minimise opportunities for collaborative partnerships in mainstream classes.

The experience of learning in an English-medium context, for EAL students, comes to be one in which expertise is derived from the knowledge of the expert teacher while their own L1 funds of knowledge are ignored or silenced. By using students' L1 as a meaning-making resource, teachers can make the EAL student the expert rather than the passive recipient of knowledge. This has a flow-on benefit of EAL students increasing their investment (Norton-Pierce, 1995) in the L1 as a vital fund of knowledge which is intrinsic to the negotiation of their scholarly identities.

The participating EAL students in my research all experienced a schism in their education when they moved from their country of origin to Aotearoa/New Zealand. Another schism occurs for these students when they are physically removed from a normal school timetable and placed into ESOL withdrawal classes. The common experience for the EAL students in ESOL classes was the discontinuity of educational settings. As educators, we should seek ways to minimise the potential detrimental effects of these schisms. As noted above, using EAL students' existing L1 funds of knowledge is one way to do this. In practical terms, teachers can seek out L1 medium or L1/English bilingual resources and textbooks that relate to the disciplinary literacies of their subject. The selection and analysis of these resources and texts can be a collaborative venture as the students themselves will hold expertise in elements and critique of resources selected (in their L1) that the teacher does not hold. Networks across classes and indeed schools could be established which promote collaboration of students in their L1. This could come in the form of specialist after-school tuition groups or Skype group chats with students over multiple locations. All of these elements integrate the use of L1 as a tool for acquiring literacy in English and enhancing

literacy in L1. In addition, these elements are helpful in acquiring disciplinary literacy (Moje, 2007) in mainstream subjects. The key benefit here is that using these elements means disciplinary literacy is acquired in both English and L1 in a process of transacquisition (Tamati, 2016) of knowledge across languages.

Teachers can also encourage the use of L1 for revision outside of school. This would help promote the view that one's L1 constitutes a scholastic necessity (May, 1994) and can thus subvert the linguistic domination of English. A scholarly environment that recognises the linguistic capital of EAL students will cultivate a scholarly habitus in students which disposes them to use both English and L1 in their learning. The contradictions between promoting English literacy and silencing existing funds of knowledge need not exist. With dialogue between teachers and students, these contradictions can be exposed and dismantled.

Overall, this first findings chapter has outlined the dominant role of English that permeates all levels of the Aotearoa/New Zealand education system and especially in senior high school dominated by NCEA assessment practices. The dialogue-based solutions outlined in this discussion section are a potential means of progress against a backdrop of long-established norms which have been internalised by multiple social agents in the education process. The pressures of assessment, desire for academic advancement and socialised norms of English language use create an environment in which both teachers and EAL students are conditioned to acquire a set of dispositions elevating English to an instrumentally valuable status. The elevation of English as instrumentally valuable creates a linguistic hierarchy in which the instrumental value of L1 goes unrecognised.

The absence of dialogue around the use of L1 as a key fund of knowledge is, I would argue, due in no small part to the pressures felt by EAL students to linguistically assimilate

and advance in the system they are in. This absence of dialogue is further exacerbated by pedagogical practices which funnel learning through a monolingual prism of English in an effort to meet the pressures felt by school and teachers to get students to achieve according to the assessment and social norms of the Aotearoa/New Zealand education system. The great tragedy of the pressure of these multiple monolingual pressures is the denial of EAL students' lived linguistic realities. The unintended consequences of student, teacher and administrators' efforts to enhance academic success in an English language setting is the denial and silencing of L1. These are the denial and silencing of the very resources that might, in fact, help to advance EAL learners in their pursuit of knowledge and acquisition of English.

I assert from this chapter that the net result of the myopic pursuit of monolingual norms by the Aotearoa/New Zealand education system as a whole has led to EAL students acquiring a learned set of dispositions which places primacy on the value of English. The primacy of this value has, in turn, served to frame a specific set of terms upon which scholarly identity is negotiated. The terms are those of a zero-sum game in which either you have an acceptable level of disciplinary literacy in English or you do not. The logic of this kind of zero-sum game extends to the investment in both English and L1. A cruel logic of monolingual practice develops in which the role of L1 is silenced. The reality for EAL students is that, in this environment, L1 divestment occurs which can lead to isolation from the students' own communities and related language loss as English comes to dominate. It is to these critical issues that I devote the findings in Chapter 6.

## Chapter 6: Findings - First Language Divestment, Isolation and Access to Communities of Practice

### Introduction

In this chapter I will argue that the acts of identity negotiation, discussed in the previous chapter, which occur in an English-dominant schooling and assessment environment come with unintended consequences for EAL students' L1. I will argue that efforts to reduce isolation and adhere to the English language norms of school often contributed to L1 divestment in school for participating EAL students. My argument follows that the symbolic capital of English and the pressure felt to acquire disciplinary literacy in English conspired to influence students' perceptions of their L1 in relation to school. Students' perceptions of their own L1 came, in turn, to influence their investment in L1 in school and the way they view their L1 in relation to their negotiations of scholarly identities.

### First Language Use in School

My research has identified multiple, often competing, views among participants around the role of their L1. Participants expressed a strong desire to retain their L1 and were concerned that they were losing their L1 as English came to dominate their interactions. This concern was, however, overridden by participants' pragmatic concerns to reduce linguistic isolation and acquire disciplinary literacy in English. The net result of this was the manifestation of a preference for English use over L1 in relation to school for participating EAL students. This preference was compounded for those who had been in Aotearoa/New Zealand for greater lengths of time, who felt they lacked sufficient knowledge of disciplinary literacies in their L1. Participating EAL students, who were often more recent arrivals, felt they did have disciplinary literacy in their L1. Nevertheless, these participants also felt compelled by the

social setting to negate the use of their existing L1 proficiencies in favour of the acquisition of disciplinary literacies in English.

During one of our interviews, Kanda expressed the competing concerns she felt in relation to her use of L1 compared with English in school:

Brian: And what about your language use, like you have mentioned you use your English heaps but you do have that desire to keep up your Thai? Do you think that desire has been made even stronger or it's the same?

Kanda: I think it's still the same like I really really want to study Thai but I still have no time ... the English is still the first number one priority to study.

Here Kanda is expressing a strong desire to study Thai but she regards studying in English as "the first number one priority". Kanda often expressed in journals her concern for having enough disciplinary literacy in English to gain sufficient NCEA credits in order to gain entrance to an Aotearoa/New Zealand university. This concern for academic advancement underlies her statement that English is the number one priority.

#### Language preference to reduce linguistic isolation

I have found in my research that one of the main factors which contributes to participants' preferences for English use over L1 in school was the desire to reduce their sense of isolation. Participants would often express an active rejection of practices that they regarded as increasing isolation in favour of social practices that made heavy use of English. For example, Udom stated:

I think most important thing is within yourself like some people that live in homestay they just go home and go into their room onto computer. They won't learn English much but if you come out and talk something, even if it's just a little you know.

As a result of actively pursuing English language interactions over interactions in Thai, Udom felt “my English is improving a lot and keeps improving like not stop so that’s what I’m proud of cause when I first came, I couldn’t speak at all it was just yes/no.” A sense of isolation gets replaced with a sense of integration and of pride in acquiring English. This however, often has the unintended consequence of negating L1 use, particularly in school.

In another example, Seong noted that her fellow Korean speaking students would often default back to English use with each other with regards to study:

Brian: Would you ever study with Korean friends?

Seong: Yeah, I tried once but we all speak like first time we speak Korean like we are getting to speak English and like for another Korean person I don’t know what that means.

Brian: So, you would just go back to English anyway.

Seong: Yeah yeah.

Here Seong notes that her and her fellow Korean-speaking peers initially tried to use their L1 during school-related interactions but they were all so accustomed to English use at school that they defaulted back to English use with each other. Seong attributed this to not knowing what particular words were in Korean relating to their study. For both Udom and Seong, English became the preferred language of interaction in school due to a desire to reduce social isolation and to have a mutually intelligible academic language with peers.

#### Disciplinary literacy difficulties

Difficulties with acquiring and/or maintaining disciplinary literacies in L1 was identified by participants as a contributing factor toward the preference for English language use in school. I posed a hypothetical question to participants and asked them to imagine that they were sitting an NCEA examination with two separate scripts in front of them. One would be

in English and one would be in their L1. Both scripts would have the same questions, just in different languages. The students were asked which they would be more comfortable sitting (i.e., both reading and writing in the chosen language). The purpose of this hypothetical question was to establish which language was favoured for the use of disciplinary literacies related to the high-stakes assessments students do in Years 12 and 13. Further, I sought to understand from students' answers the reasons why a particular language was favoured.

Here are some of the responses to the hypothetical question. Jung Min, a migrant student from Korea who has been in Aotearoa/New Zealand for eight years, stated "English like I can't write in Korean it's really bad it would be 3-4 out of 10." Miyu, a Japanese international student who has been in New Zealand for one year stated: "I think I would fail them all [in Japanese]. My Japanese is getting lower and lower. I think it's all getting mixed up like English and Japanese." Miyu went on to say she "just write[s] in English" when writing revision notes for examinations. Both Jung Min and Miyu favoured the English examination script as they felt they did not hold sufficient disciplinary literacies in their L1 to meet the demands of the assessment. Jung Min and Miyu had similar responses in spite of their relative lengths of time in the Aotearoa/New Zealand education system and differences in categorisation as a resident or international fee-paying student.

Fletcher et al., (2008) identified in their study of Aotearoa/New Zealand teachers' perceptions, that EAL Asian students needed extra support to learn English. This extra support often comes in the form of ESOL withdrawal classes in secondary school. As discussed to some extent in the previous chapter, this is a class in which the main foci are English language acquisition and providing additional assistance to students with the disciplinary literacy requirements of mainstream classes. While noble in their goals, these classes can often be a physical manifestation of the linguistic isolation felt by EAL migrant

and international students. These spaces also often serve to reinforce the message that disciplinary literacy in English is fundamental to success in school while the role of L1 is relatively silenced.

The participating EAL students in my research viewed this extra support as a symbol of diminished expectations around language acquisition in mainstream classes. Their preferences were to communicate with English first language peers in mainstream classes rather than be ghettoised in ESOL classes in a separate part of the school. This geographic and intellectual isolation had a significant contributing impact on L1 rejection around academic contexts by these participants. The participants were so focused on being fully mainstreamed as a “normal student” and not an “ESOL student” that all their efforts were focused on acquiring English. For example, Harry stated:

If you come to New Zealand and be in an ESOL class to learn English then you should write in English. I used to think I should just go and work on my language and get better at it but [now] I don't see a reason like I'm not going back at all it's too downgraded.

Here Harry directly asserts his learned set of dispositions in which he has developed a scholarly habitus that favours “learn[ing]” and “writ[ing]” in English. By his own acknowledgement, this favouring of English has come at the cost of his Cambodian language ability being “downgraded.”

#### [Negative report comments related to L1](#)

When analysing teachers' report comments related to participating EAL students, I found no comment about the benefit that existing L1 funds of knowledge may have for EAL students' current education. The lack of these kinds of comments helps sustain a feedback loop that minimises the role of L1 in mainstream classes. When comment was made about L1 in

reports, they often framed L1 as a deficit. Comments such as Daniel's ESOL teacher stating he is "too quick to come back to Chinese language" and "it is clear that the cause of his grammatical issues, is lack of practice and a tendency to translate his work into Chinese" cast the use of Chinese as contributing to his "issues" with the expected acquisition of English. Further to this, Leon's ESOL teacher notes, "he is easily distracted by ... other students speaking in his own language and he would do well to avoid those situations." A comment like this leads to a literal silencing of Leon's L1 in class. These kinds of comments are also in opposition to Saville-Troike's (1984) finding that children achieve best in English tests when they had a chance to discuss concepts in L1 with peers. In lieu of the opportunity to discuss concepts in L1 with peers (whether it be because of linguistic isolation or a class climate that discourages L1 use), EAL students would often group together and discuss concepts in English with each other. They considered these groupings as judgement-free zones regarding their English usage and abilities.

The distance between the language of home and school was also, on occasions, identified by teachers as an impediment for participating EAL students. This was the case for Jejomar when one teacher noted that there is a "language barrier between home and school." This comment framed language differences as a problem and not as an opportunity for home and school collaboration.

Gee and Green (1998) have written about how home-based "primary discourses" help shape identity and learning. When an EAL student's home-based primary discourse is isolated from their school's normative discourses, opportunities to negotiate scholarly identities through the medium of L1 are stifled. The lived reality of these EAL students is that they often construct identities over transnational boundaries but this is not identified by educators (Pang & McDonald, 2015). Instead, successful classroom identities are

constructed, by educators in report comments and classroom interactions, only around the building of English language ability and disciplinary literacies in English. In my view, this construction serves to manifest a negative feedback loop which renders L1 docile in a student's learning. Diversion from this construction is seen by teachers as a deficit needing to be remedied by students themselves.

School reports often failed to differentiate between EAL students. Little comment was made around a student's particular linguistic background, their previous schooling or the attendant funds of knowledge these backgrounds bring to class. Little affordance was made for the use of students' L1 in class and little opportunity was given for students to be seen and asserted as particular individuals rather than as uniform members of a minority group.

Bourdieu (1984) noted schools act as though all students have equal access to capital. The value of English as symbolic capital was central in the context of Manawa High School and teachers regarded their pedagogy as providing equal access to this capital. The absence of any mention of the value of a student's L1 in school reports served to reinforce the notion of an Anglophone meritocracy in which linguistic failings are the failings of the individual. The school report serves as an institutionalised mechanism which inculcates belief in the value of capital (Bourdieu, 1991). In this case, the symbolic capital of the English language is inculcated in EAL students to the detriment of their L1.

In my classroom observations, I saw limited affordances made for use of students' L1 in their learning. Indeed, in teachers' report comments, no comment was made as to how students might use their L1 to their advantage in class or revision activities. This pedagogic norm around the role of language tended to restrict EAL students to English and afforded limited opportunities for these students to assert their particular sociolinguistic selves.

Instances of disengagement and divestment that were observed in classroom interactions were often accompanied by examples of the student being negatively singled out by a teacher or rejected/excluded from peer groups. Participating EAL students that showed signs of disengagement were often afforded little opportunity to contextualise content knowledge through their L1 and engage in meaning-making activities in classes that were cognitively demanding.

An example of the teacher negatively singling out an EAL student can be seen in the physics class that contained Seong, Daniel, Kanda and Shane. Daniel was admonished in English by the teacher in a whole-class context for not starting the set activity immediately and then for not showing his working when writing the equations. After the individual activity was completed, he was selected to write the solution on the board. When put on the spot like this he was able to do the required calculation but could not verbally articulate the “direction of movement” of a vector. After the task on the whiteboard he appeared embarrassed and disengaged from the lesson after the negative interaction. Daniel was placed on display and required to perform in English in a whole-class situation: this negative singling out led to clear divestment by Daniel for the rest of that day’s class and perhaps longer-term implications for his investment in that class.

In these environments, English is valued and the particular languages and cultures of EAL students tend to be silenced. This situation, however, need not be the case. Kamberelis (2001) has argued that “discourse heterogeneity can disrupt dominant classroom ideologies” (p. 86). This heterogeneity of discourse could manifest in both school reports and classroom interactions. Teachers as pedagogic authorities could send a powerful message and reshape the school field by asserting the value of students’ L1. Banks (1995) noted that a transformative pedagogy could lead to a less essentialised view of habitus. A

dialogic secondary school (Higham et al., 2014) which listens to, and responds to, EAL students will help educators challenge their own ascriptions of characteristics and preconceptions of pedagogic norms. In this environment EAL students have the opportunity to view themselves as particular rather than visible minorities (Benesch, 2008) and redefine notions of symbolically valued capital around their own existing funds of knowledge.

### Students' Perceptions – Fear of Loss of their First Language

In my interviews with participating EAL students, and in their journal entries, they would often express a fear of losing their L1 as English came to dominate interactions. This was particularly the case for EAL students who had been in Aotearoa/New Zealand for a greater amount of time. For example, Harry stated of his L1:

Yeah like I lost it over these past few years like when I started, I used to know really good Cambodian but now because English has been so engrossed in me like I've basically forgotten most of my language. Like important words in Cambodian, so it's more of a hassle so, now it's more easier for English for me than Cambodian.

Here Harry is expressing that the dominance of English in his interactions has come to supplant his Cambodian usage and knowledge base. So much so that he regards it as "easier" to use English rather than Cambodian for "important words" as it is "more of a hassle" using Cambodian. Clearly, some of these important words would include disciplinary-specific vocabulary which he would need to learn to achieve in senior secondary school assessments. The relative atrophy of his L1 led to English becoming the default language for the acquisition of disciplinary literacy, while disciplinary literacy in his L1 was not enhanced.

In another example, Elaine stated of her Karen language usage, "well when they [other Karen speakers] talk ... I don't know I can't understand every word." Here Elaine is

identifying that her conversational competence in her L1, Karen, is diminishing. This contrasts with her previous assertion that she felt her L1 conversational competence was better than her English conversational competence. When asked the reason she thought she 'can't understand every word' in her L1, Elaine identified that a major reason for this loss was "I don't use my language at school I have no one to talk to. All my friends, they speak English". In the case of both Harry and Elaine the dominance of English usage in their interactions has had a detrimental effect on both their L1 conversational competence as well as the ability to acquire disciplinary literacies in L1.

#### No opportunity to use L1 for learning

The lack of opportunity to use L1 for learning often arose as a rationale for participants as to why they were losing their L1. Participants perceived that a lack of L1 interlocutors in school to share work with was a key barrier to L1 usage. This was particularly the case for EAL students from Cambodia, Myanmar/Burma, Japan, Philippines and Thailand, who would often be the only person in their class (and occasionally the only person in their year level) with their particular language background. For example, Jejomar stated in his initial Year 12 interview, "I have some Filipino friends but they don't speak Tagalog." Kanda expressed similar sentiments noting "I don't speak Thai that much in school. I have no chance, so it's kind of like I have no opportunity to speak it 'cause some of my friends don't understand." In both the cases of Jejomar and Kanda, as well with Harry and Elaine from the previous section, a lack of L1 interlocutors to share ideas with was a significant contributing factor to the limiting of L1 usage in academic contexts.

In cases where participating EAL students did have L1 interlocutors in school, they often asserted that neither they nor their peers had sufficient disciplinary literacies in their L1. In these cases, students defaulted to English use in their learning, again limiting the

opportunity for L1 to be utilised. For example, Jung Min when asked, “Do you have like many Korean speaking friends?” stated “I do but they are like me, they can speak fluently in Korean but they can’t really write or read.” In this case it was not the absence of L1 interlocutors that contributed to the supplanting of L1 in favour of English for disciplinary literacies. Rather, it was the lack of opportunity for Jung Min and her peers to utilise their L1 for disciplinary literacy acquisition over the years they had been in an English-dominant environment that contributed to the atrophy of L1 literacy skills.

#### Additional burden of first-language disciplinary literacy

Participating EAL students often stated a perception that learning L1 disciplinary literacies was an additional burden over and above that of learning in English. Seong identified this as her experience during this exchange:

Seong: I’ve actually forgotten about a lot of Korean vocabulary stuff and I only graduate primary school in Korea so my level of Korean is like primary school and now the vocabulary is like really higher so ... cause like sometimes I find the terms a little bit difficult. So, if I don’t understand the terms I like search up in Korean and I find Korean website that has the words that I don’t understand [laughs] and I search again to Korean dictionary to get a definition.

Brian: So, it’s like 3 levels you are going through to get it?

Seong: Yeah [laughs].

For Seong, the steps she feels she has to go through to gain an understanding of disciplinary specific terms in Korean are very onerous. She has the desire to understand the terms in Korean but when she finds the Korean word she does not understand them and must make a third step of referring to a Korean dictionary for the terms.

Kanda has had a similar experience of the additional burden of disciplinary literacy in her L1. She notes in a journal entry from Year 13:

This year I have used less and less of my own language to help me with study. I find it more difficult now to study with my own language, Thai. I do translate some words to get a better understanding of it but it doesn't contribute to most of my study apart of English.

As with Seong, Kanda translates difficult vocabulary into her L1 but she feels "it doesn't contribute to most of [her] study." As Kanda has become more immersed in the English dominant environment of Manawa High School, and more focused on English dominant NCEA assessment, she has "used less and less of [her] own language to help [her] with study."

When I asked Kanda during an interview to elaborate on her reasons for decreasing her use of Thai in study she stated:

Kanda: Like I think it [Thai] does help with sometimes but when I don't understand the actual Thai words than I have to translate it again and again so being able to use an English dictionary is ... better and it's more convenient that way.

Brian: So, it's almost like an added hurdle trying to learn the fancy word in Thai as well as in English.

Kanda: Yeah.

Here Kanda acknowledged her Thai can help sometimes with her study. However, just as with Seong, she felt she had to go through many steps to gain a full understanding of the disciplinary vocabulary in her L1. For Kanda "being able to use an English dictionary is ... better and it's more convenient." These participating EAL students faced an environment of ongoing high stakes assessments which is characteristic of senior secondary school. In this

environment, factors such as the predominance of English and the difficulty in understanding disciplinary vocabulary in their L1, led students to perceive English as the primary means of acquiring disciplinary literacies.

### Impacts on Scholarly Identities

My research revealed that teachers often showed little differentiation between EAL students in their classes. Le Court (2012) notes that a lack of differentiation of EAL students meant student “identities [are] acted upon as if they were authentic and unified with cultural categories” (p. 19). Participants themselves recognised this relative lack of differentiation and attributed it to EAL students acting in a particular way when they first come to Manawa High School. For example, Udom noted:

...well I think ... yeah, I agree that [teachers tend to treat EAL students the same] 'cause I don't know, 'cause like from what I see, most ... Asian students or ... international students, I don't know, when they first came they are kind of quiet so you [the teacher] don't know if they are just concentrating or don't understand [laughs].

Here Udom attributed teachers' lack of differentiation to the fact that EAL students tended to be relatively silent when first entering Manawa High School. Udom recognises the silence may be for a number of reasons, from difficulties with the language to shyness to more general disengagement. However, the silent student is acted on by the teacher as if they were a unified cultural category. Udom recognises that this may be the reason teachers tend not to differentiate EAL students.

Watkins and Noble (2013) noted that this lack of differentiation is problematic when we consider how EAL students construct a scholarly habitus and the influence this has on their negotiation of scholarly identities. Watkins and Noble (2013) reasoned that due to the

“generative nature of habitus ... [the] ... assumption of coherence within diaspora communities” (p. 3) is problematic. The lack of differentiation of EAL students with inherently differing linguistic and schooling backgrounds led to a problematic categorisation of these students as an undifferentiated whole.

The result of the assumption of coherence among EAL students and the expectation that all students have equal access to the symbolic capital of English is a default to English-dominant pedagogic norms. These norms include whole-class instruction, limited affordance of L1 in class, and limited opportunities for EAL students to assert their particular selves and developed their own notions of their scholarly habitus and scholarly identities based around existing funds of knowledge.

As Bourdieu and Nice (1980) noted, holders of capital can engage in “collective misrecognition” (p. 267) and assert that all participants in a field have equal access to capital. In this case, a misrecognition by teachers, who hold the symbolic capital of English, occurs. The use of English in senior school is regarded as the norm to which EAL students must adhere so they can become successful students. EAL students’ own existing linguistic and cultural capital tends to become minimised in a classroom environment in which the dominant culture represents itself as the culture (Hall & Jefferson, 2006).

This pattern of misrecognition is learned by EAL students and manifests in their scholarly habitus. For example, Daniel’s statement, “there’s only one teacher and we are all students, if we just teach each other it’s hard,” asserts the centrality of the teacher as knowledge holder, and holder of symbolically valued capital. In this statement, Daniel’s own existing capital and that of his peers comes to be silenced as the knowledge and capital of the teacher takes primacy.

Capital misrecognition comes to be reinforced in class when teachers engage in interactions in which their voice dominates and student voice is rendered relatively passive. The preference expressed by participating students around one-on-one teacher interactions tended to manifest during classroom interactions as a highly teacher centric dialogue. For example, during an accounting class, the teacher spent 20 minutes one-on-one with Leon. This interaction had a heavy weighting of teacher talk with one-word responses from Leon. Dialogue such as this was common during the interaction:

Teacher: What I want you to do in the next step is enter this transaction.

Leon: [Nods]

Teacher: You know how to do that aye?

Leon: Yep.

In an environment in which teacher talk dominates, be it lecture-style classroom presentations or one-on-one conversations with students, the existing capital of the teacher comes to be misrecognised as the capital of a scholar. Students', and in particular EAL students', existing capital and funds of knowledge come to be silenced. These students are induced into a passive position as recipients rather than co-constructors of knowledge.

The dominance of English as the language of academia is further reinforced by the prevalence of cognitively demanding and context-reduced pedagogy (Cummins, 1986) experienced by these students. As Ward, Bochner, and Furnham (2001) have noted, teachers are unlikely to make changes to content and tasks when they have international or migrant students in class. This was certainly the experience of the participating EAL students in my research. For example, Miyu, noted in her Year 12 interview, "last year was so hard like when I read the question, I don't understand the question but I don't know it's ok now I've been here for nearly a year." Here Miyu identifies the difficulty of entering an English-

dominant school. She notes that, during her first year at Manawa High School (Year 11), she experienced an environment when she did not “understand the question.” Miyu was new to English, she had few contextual cues to gain an understanding of the question and the teaching environment was one in which the questions were exclusively posed in English. Miyu was expected to rapidly acquire the symbolically valuable capital of English so she could answer the questions and participate in classroom norms. She identifies in the last part of the quote that “it’s ok now I’ve been here nearly a year.” Implicit in that statement is she feels she has had time to acquire sufficient English to be able to participate.

Participants expressed to me a common theme that, when they first entered the Aotearoa/New Zealand education system, they experience severe linguistic isolation. For example, Elaine stated when she first arrived “[if a teacher asked me a question] I wouldn’t have even been able to understand it,” further stating, “It took me about a year to speak with my friend and about two years to speak with teachers.” Participants like Elaine regarded their linguistic isolation as a powerful incentive to acquire English and learn a set of dispositions that asserts English as the language of school. This process relegates L1 as not being relevant to school either in a conversational sense or an academic sense.

Existing linguistic resources can go unrecognised and a lack of English language ability perceived as a cognitive deficit as students are expected to keep up with the ostensibly meritocratic delivery of content in class. Those EAL students who are seen to be unable to keep up by developing a scholarly habitus that is acceptable to pedagogic authorities can often divest from class and from negotiating scholarly identities which included a role for their L1. They have the fault of their divestment laid at their doorstep as they are perceived to have faltered in the meritocratic race of academic advancement where they supposedly have equal access to capital.

### Low expectations linked to English language ability

In my research I have found low expectations, by teachers, of EAL students perceived to have fewer English language abilities. This had the effect of marginalising these students by placing them in lower-stream classes or ignoring their potential for input in classroom interactions. The marginalisation of these students often led to their own divestment from education. For example, the teacher in Harry's low-band Business Studies 203 class indicated her expectations by stating "I don't expect you to get all this done today.... There are six exercises in the whole week." This contributed to Harry's divestment from the lesson as he was not academically challenged when he completed the first individual set task in a matter of minutes.

Shane's experience of Manawa High School was a clear example of marginalisation and divestment based on low expectations due to his English language ability and the fact that he had been in Aotearoa/New Zealand for the shortest length of time of any participant. Shane had little conversational ability in English, and in class he would often appear to work sporadically, disengage and seem reserved in group interactions. For example, in one of his mathematics 201 lessons, Shane did not have a partner to work with during group work so the teacher placed him with a group of English L1 students. He did not engage at all with these students. Nor did the students attempt to engage with Shane. He then self-selected to attempt the task on his own but eventually disengaged with the task altogether. His limited conversational fluency in English, his inability to engage with English L1 interlocutors, and the absence of choice as to who he did the task with, all led to disengagement with the content. Shane, after a period of 20 minutes of isolation, asked the teacher if he could go to the sick bay and left. After he left, one English L1 student in the group he was placed in asked another "Where did that Asian boy go?" In this case Shane's

social exclusion was a demotivating force. This exclusion led him to divest from the class and seek escape. Shane's low level of interpersonal communication led to a sense of marginalisation and clear divestment from this class.

During classroom observations I often identified instances of divestment in class which were accompanied by examples of the student being negatively singled out by a teacher or rejected/excluded from peer groups in class. In these cases, the EAL student had little opportunity to contextualise content knowledge in class as cognitively demanding concepts are expressed exclusively in English. This phenomenon in particular affected EAL students who had more recently arrived in Aotearoa/New Zealand and had not yet developed conversational competence in English.

The contrast between Shane and Elaine in their Art 201 class is a clear example of this. During observations, Elaine (who had been in New Zealand for three years at the start of my research) interacted with her peers in English about designs and the requirements of the set task whereas Shane (who arrived in New Zealand at the start of my research) would only respond with limited yes/no answers to teacher prompts and did not discuss classwork at all with other students. Shane's relatively minimal communication experience led to social exclusion in this class as well. He would often appear unsure of the requirements of a task but was unable to express that he needed clarification. This relative exclusion led to him divesting in the set task, often staring into space and not working at his art project. Even in the relatively context-embedded subject of Art, which has many non-verbal cues, Shane struggled, as the medium of instruction was exclusively in English. By contrast, Elaine who had been in Aotearoa/New Zealand for a still relatively short three years had acquired sufficient conversational fluency in English to be able to interact with the teacher and her peers.

More broadly, participants noted that they felt more comfortable in class as their English language ability increased. This comfort was linked to factors like being able to make friends easier and being able to understand the teacher more. For example, Miyu stated in this interaction:

Miyu: 'Cause I can speak English now and like have lots of friend now so ...

Brian: Do you feel more comfortable in class now?

Miyu: Yeah.

Even in cases where participants felt they still had L1 communication skills, some felt unable to make use of these language skills with L1 peers in relation to the disciplinary literacy requirements of their subjects. For example, Kathy noted of her Tagalog L1 friends, “I still hang out with them every morning to so I still keep up with them,” but she didn’t link the benefits of having Tagalog L1 friends to her learning as she did with her English L1 friends. This may be because the EAL students participating in my research have learnt the disciplinary vocabulary of their subjects in English and felt unable to use their L1 as resource for learning as they had not learnt the same vocabulary in their L1. For example, Miyu stated, “I want to do science stuff and I’m pretty sure in Japanese it’s really really hard and my Japanese is really low.” Even if Miyu, or Kathy wanted to discuss the concepts in their L1 they were limited by not knowing these words in their L1 and were stuck in English.

#### [Desire to seek out L1 English peers](#)

Participants identified a desire to seek out English-speaking peers over L1 peers for clarification of academic vocabulary and concepts. This contributed to the reinforcement of scholarly identities which were based in English and negated their L1. For example, Udom noted “I never speak Thai ... you know it’s not appropriate to speak your own language.” He

goes on to identify if he has any difficulty with subject content: “If it’s just a little thing I just ask my friends ... I don’t really have many Thai friends here.”

Kathy identifies a combination of social and academic incentives for seeking out L1 English peers. She stated:

’Cause I knew that I really need friends in high school ’cause I can’t like be here for 5 years and not have friends. So yeah, I made friends, and like it will help me with my studies as well, like I can talk to them about it and not just keep it to myself and like go online and find it but like having people like more people around to talk about it you get more opinion and perspective.

Here Kathy notes her need for friends and regards English L1 friends as having the additional benefits of helping with her studies as she can “talk to them” and get “more opinion and perspective.” This rationale comes to reinforce a scholarly identity for Kathy which is based in English as her peers valued “opinon[s]” and “perspective[s]” are conveyed in English as is the pedagogy of class.

### Compartmentalisation of Language and Identity – First Language Use at Home

In this section, I will explore participants’ perceptions around the appropriate places they think they should use their L1. Participants expressed a strong desire to retain L1 but felt it appropriate to be used at home rather than at school. Measures to retain L1 were identified by participants as needing to occur (only) in the private sphere. English was regarded as the language of school and wider society, while their L1 was regarded as the language of family and culture. The implications of these perceptions will be explored in relation to how they help manifest a compartmentalisation of identities for participants.

In my research, participants felt they were able to retain their existing L1 abilities in their family life at home. However, as we have also seen, these participants felt that they

did not have sufficient proficiency to learn higher-level academic content in their L1 at school. Crucially this was stated by a wide spectrum of participants. Migrant students who had been in Aotearoa/New Zealand for the majority of their schooling asserted this most clearly but so, too, did some international students, who had only been in Aotearoa/New Zealand one or two years.

Stuart McNaughton (2002) identified a mismatch between school and home discourse in New Zealand. Throughout this thesis, I have broadly categorised home discourse in Gee's (2015) terms of primary discourse, while I have used Barkhuizen's (2010) term, *normative discourse*, to refer to official school discourse. This mismatch of discourses was particularly evident in students participating in my research who are from a language background that differs from the Anglophone mainstream. These students experience tensions between their academic identities and ethnic identities. Kitchen (2010, 2011) noted that New Zealand Korean students experienced a breakdown of cultural and language connections which constrained options for identity negotiations. The tension created for the students in Kitchen's study meant that they had to negotiate separate and distinct identities in the separate social fields in which they operate. My research shows similar patterns of tension and separation around identity negotiation for EAL students from a diverse range of countries in the Asian region, with a diverse range of exposure to Aotearoa/New Zealand schooling.

Rodriquez (1982) asserted that a chasm exists between private home language and the formal academic language of school. My research has affirmed the existence of this chasm. Participants asserted their perceptions of the instrumental value around English in Aotearoa/New Zealand schooling and the sentimental value of their L1 in home life and cultural practices.

## Student perceptions of compartmentalisation

During interviews and journaling, participants would often assert a strong desire to retain their L1. They would often make extra effort at home to practise and actively use their L1 to stem the tide of language loss they perceived was occurring. For example, Jung Min asserted that it was her own desire to retain her L1 that led to her practising it. She stated “oh it’s my own [desire], since I’m Korean I kind of want to be good at it.” Harry stated in his reflexive journaling:

I do not use my language enough at school, as there is not many people in the school that come from the same country as I am, which is Cambodia. As a result, I am slowly forgetting my home language although I try and practise it often.

Here we see both students have a strong desire to retain their L1 and feel that have to practise it outside of school to ensure it is retained. L1 use is compartmentalised as Jung Min and Harry try to practise it at home or other private spaces, but not at school. Notably these two students had been in Aotearoa/New Zealand for more time than most participants (Harry, 11 years and Jung Min, 8 years). As such, these participants have had the most exposure to an English-dominant environment and see most acutely the imbalance in the frequency of interactions in their L1 compared with English.

Participants identified their families and their own desire to retain elements of their language and culture as intrinsic to their own identity. For example, Jung Min goes on to state, “I think like not forgetting who I am yeah I think that’s the most important thing.” She expands on this statement when she explained:

I’m starting to forget like all these Korean traditions and stuff like that because I’m used to it here ... the kiwi way ... and my mum told me about that before ... she

doesn't mind me getting into New Zealand stuff but she doesn't want me to forget that I am Korean and I should act as I am.

When asked to clarify, Jung Min went on to identify what acting Korean meant to her:

I think like [not] talking back to my parents yeah In Korea it's really important to be like polite to them but I kind of ... sort of forget that I have to treat my parents like well ... I tend to talk back to them stuff like that that's not really good ... I think my parents they just want me to be really polite to them.

In these statements Jung Min has identified that Korean traditions are part of who she is and her mother wants her to "act Korean." Here her "act[ing] Korean" is linked explicitly to behaviours that manifest in home life. Specifically, she identifies interactions with her parents as the main example for when she must "act Korean." No mention is made of her "act[ing] Korean" in a school setting. When asked how this impacted on her language use Jung Min said:

Jung Min: They [her parents] do speak English but they prefer to speak in Korean cause obviously they were born in Korea ... but they came when they were adults so I understand that they prefer using Korean and yeah because I understand that it is difficult for them to use English I know they like using Korean I try to like...

Brian: Accommodate them?

Jung Min: Yeah.

Jung Min uses Korean as an accommodative strategy for ease of communication with her parents but does not make use of her Korean language skills in school. Clearly Jung Min's set of learned dispositions related to her "act[ing] Korean" and using her Korean language predominantly in the field of home life rather than in the field of school life.

Participating students' rationale for their preference to compartmentalise their L1 to home was often linked to a perception that they must trade off their L1 for English in school to be successful. Kanda clearly expressed this perception when she stated:

Now I struggle with speaking my first language ... I feel upset it makes me upsetting but ... if you want to gain something you have to lose something ... so if I want to get better at English I have to sacrifice and not have time to learn my own language more.

Here Kanda expressed the perception of a linguistic equivalent of a zero-sum game. For Kanda "to gain something" (English) "you have to lose something" (Thai). Kanda went on to state:

Well for me I tried my best to keep my first language but then I don't really have time to after my work and stuff ... really like sometimes if I study, I see no point of speaking Thai or learning Thai any more cause English is the focus right now ... I think maybe because English gives you more benefits later on ... than studying your own language cause English is like more commonly used elsewhere.

She uses the word "sacrifice" and notes that in order to achieve in the English-dominant environment of school she does not have "time" to keep up her Thai. The benefits of English are identified as a rationale for this sacrifice. She notes she is aware of the sacrifice and it upsets her. However, she perceives "no point" in "learning Thai any more cause English is the focus right now" in terms of her schooling.

Perceptions of L1 use as appropriate in the home environment and not the school environment had impacts on participants' negotiation of scholarly identities. A compartmentalisation of identities began to occur in which L1 was excluded from the students' identity as scholars. L1 use in school was sacrificed as acquisition of English was

perceived to be the most expedient means of achieving success in class and during assessments.

### Impact on identities

I have found that a negative feedback loop occurs when English-dominant school environments tended to lead participating EAL students to further marginalise the role of their L1 in school. In many cases this relative marginalisation led participating students to divest from their L1 in relation to their scholarly identity. They regarded their L1 as not holding the valued symbolic capital which would have them manifest the dispositions required of a scholarly habitus. These EAL students thus experience identity conflicts (Chen, 2010) which occurred across the social spaces of which they are a part.

Seeley (2014) attested to the “multiple fragmented nature of identity” (p. 33), which is influenced by the discursive and dialogic (Jenkins, 2008) factors that manifest in each unique social space. Language and identity in social spaces are dialogic in their nature. Participants have constructed place identities around the nature of local subjectivities (Dixon & Durriheim, 2000). The local subjectivities of Aotearoa/New Zealand classrooms place a high degree of capital on English language acquisition and use. As such, these EAL participants have developed place identities that emphasise the use of English. For example, Harry notes:

I see it in the sense of country like if you are in Cambodia you would speak Cambodian you wouldn't speak English ... like if you go to a specific country with a specific language then you would probably have to learn a bit of that to get a basic understanding ... like I would rank Cambodian higher if I was in Cambodia if I was in China I would speak that specific Chinese.

For Harry, English was dominant in his wider interactions, as well as school, because Aotearoa/New Zealand is an English-dominant country. The place identity of his L1, as with other participants, came to be compartmentalised within the home environment. Harry confirms the relationship between his language and his place identity when he notes, “yeah if it’s anywhere out of the home environment I will speak English fine but if it’s at home I will be more relaxed in the environment [and speak Cambodian].”

As McNaughton (2011) notes, “language signals identity and creates ways of knowing” (p. 6). In a classroom that valorises English language use and silences L1 use, an EAL student will get signals that their negotiation of scholarly identities is to be developed around English. Further to this, the social interactions with peers in class occur predominantly in English. In Manawa High School, established social groups were often difficult for new students with emergent English language abilities to access. The emphasis is often placed on EAL students to make English-medium friends in order to “fit in.” Kathy seeks to explain the potential for social exclusion when she notes:

Here we have groups, like separate groups like you’re only accepted in that group but not another group and if you [try] talk to another group you like feel left out. It’s hard to be friends with people at this school but if you are that kind of person who’s friendly like talking to anyone you want to then it’s easier for you but if you only talk to the people you choose to then you can’t fit in.

Kanda echoes a similar sentiment in this exchange during her final Year 12 interview:

Brian: And aside from Miyu and Seong what other friendship groups do you have?

Like do you have kiwi friends?

Kanda: I don’t talk to kiwi people much.

Brian: And why is that?

Kanda: I just think there is no opportunity to hang out with them 'cause they just hang around their own group.

Kanda identified a lack of opportunity due to the established social networks that English-speaking students have with one another.

By way of comparison, Leon identified the benefit of social inclusion with English-medium peers when he distinguished the experiences of his mathematics and accounting classes. He stated that “the main difference between maths and accounting is that in maths my friends all know the work but in accounting I’m on my own and I don’t really understand the teacher”. In mathematics he felt socially included in a peer group community of practice and was able to make use of established social networks, in an English-medium context, as scaffolds to understanding content. However, in accounting he felt socially excluded and overwhelmed by vocabulary and content requirements. The result for him was a level of divestment from accounting and relative underachievement compared with mathematics.

Clearly in the establishment of any community of practice, relationships are the cornerstone of success. This is particularly true for EAL students who are new to an established community of practice and initially may feel on the periphery of the community. In my view, these students have a pedagogic right to social inclusion and to feel safe to explore their emergent understanding of English such that they are able to make effective use of inclusive interactions. Schools and teachers need to seek ways to minimise the academic and ethnic identity tensions in order to create space for a post-reflexive application of EAL students’ existing cultural, linguistic and academic “funds of knowledge” (Moll et al., 1992) as a pedagogical norm. This would create space for these EAL students to draw on a greater range of meaning-making resources and increase the scholarly investment in their L1.

## Discussion

Participants had a wholly reasonable central focus on learning English. This focus was compelled by the desire to decrease their linguistic isolation in English-medium classes and increase their understanding of disciplinary literacies in English. English is clearly essential for all EAL students and, as such, part of each EAL student's cultural and social life to a greater or lesser extent. This focus, however, in many cases for the participants in my research led to linguistic isolation and divestment from their L1. Therefore, the specific focus of my research was on how the influence of the linguistic capital of English came to dominate school life and lead to the diminishing of EAL students' L1 in relation to their schooling.

All participants in this research had at some point experienced a break in L1 usage in their schooling. Factors such as time of arrival in Aotearoa/New Zealand and language medium of schooling in home countries are important to consider in relation to L1 competency and the level of pedagogical knowledge a student possesses in L1. For example, migrant students such as Harry and Jeeha who have been in Aotearoa/New Zealand for the majority of their schooling are less likely to make use of L1 as a meaning-making resource. Other students who have had greater immersion in L1 schooling are more likely to make use of L1. This was the case with Kanda who was a migrant student who had been taught in Thai for seven years prior to arrival in Aotearoa/New Zealand and Daniel, who was an international student with all but the past year of his schooling being taught in Mandarin. Teacher awareness of the level of competency in L1 can be achieved by the building of dialogic relationships between the teacher and student such that the teacher can make real and effective use of EAL students' L1 in their classes.

Teachers, as pedagogical authorities, are in a position to create spaces (both physical and temporal) in class and the wider school which can decrease the L1 linguistic isolation of EAL students. As noted earlier, integrating L1 disciplinary literacy resources with English-medium resources will help promote and utilise EAL students' L1 funds of knowledge. The key point here, however is to assert the role of the teacher. The teacher needs to actively encourage and facilitate the use of students' L1. However, as noted in the findings of this chapter, teachers tend to default away from use of L1 in learning and towards exclusive use of English. Teachers who reject this position can become advocates for the use of students' L1 in school. A heterogeneity of discourse (Kamberelis, 2001) can be created when the teacher helps students negotiate their way through differences in their primary discourses and those of the schools' normative discourse.

This chapter's findings have suggested that participants were aware that their L1 can potentially help them in their studies. They, however, did not see how to practically implement the use of L1 in study in the face of English-dominant NCEA pressures. This is where the notion of teacher as L1 advocate comes into play. Teachers can work with students in a dialogue to find ways of using L1 and English in conjunction with each other to meet the demands of NCEA. Teachers acting as advocates for students' L1 can also benefit the teacher as they build relationships and gain a deeper understanding of the languages and cultures in their class.

When the teacher adopts an advocacy approach to L1, the creeping notion amongst EAL students that their L1 must be sacrificed to increase proficiency in English can begin to be pushed back. Dialogue between teachers and EAL students around the usefulness of L1 can lead to the post-reflexive (Adams, 2006) application of L1 funds of knowledge as a meaning-making resource. This has the additional flow-on benefit of attributing L1 with a

status of a legitimate language (Heller, 1996) in educational settings. When legitimacy is recognised and the capital of EAL students' L1 is properly valued, these students are in a position to renegotiate scholarly identities based around scholarly habitus in both English and their L1.

In the following chapter, I build on this argument to show how EAL students currently use various strategies to avoid being Othered by teachers and L1 English language students. I explore how EAL students variously use silence, interaction with one another, and covert clarification from the teacher outside of class time in an effort to avoid being seen as the Other. In the final findings chapter (Chapter 8), I assert that categorisation of EAL students tends to assign trajectories according to perceived behavioural traits and linguistic capital. I identify instances in which students in my research have used translingual practices with fellow EAL students and/or with teachers to challenge the place of the monolingual mindset in their education and create space in which both their L1 and English may be used as key funds of knowledge for advancing their education. The impact these translingual practices have on renegotiating scholarly identity are then discussed.

## Chapter 7: Findings – Self-concealment Strategies

### Introduction

In this chapter, I argue that participating EAL students adopt various covert strategies to avoid being classified by English L1 peers and teachers as the Other. These strategies were adopted by students as a means of balancing their desire to not be labelled as the Other with the desire to acquire the disciplinary literacies required to achieve in NCEA assessment. I begin this chapter by considering the various covert strategies EAL students adopt to avoid Othering, such as silence in class, interaction with other EAL students in English-medium linguistic fox-holes, and covert clarification from teachers and peers outside of the gaze of the wider class. The impacts of each covert strategy will be analysed and a discussion presented which considers how teachers can make use of existing covert strategies to benefit EAL students' L1 and English use and, in turn, the negotiation of their scholarly identities.

### Silence as a Strategy

During my research, participants, in both their interviews and journaling, expressed an awareness of the difficulties of academic English. Furthermore, they would often assert that they felt judged by English L1 speakers, based on their abilities in English. For example, Harry identified the stresses he often felt in class:

Like if you are an Asian person trying to learn English and then the teacher questions you like “oh hurry up, hurry up”, and then you’re struggling really hard. If you like just judge them by how they are with that specific subject it will just get too stressful and you won’t handle the pressure any more, and like you will get angry or something like that.

A strategy to avoid the stresses associated with the judgement of English first-language speakers was that participating students would often remain relatively silent in class. For example, Kanda stated, "I think in class, in general, I believe I'm a quiet student. I don't talk much in class and every teacher says I'm really quiet but outside of class I talk non-stop, I talk always." Similarly, Kathy said, "oh I'm really quiet I don't really put my hand up. I just ask the teacher after. I don't like attention from the public I think it's my personality." Both of these students said they adopted a strategy of remaining quiet in the class even though they were clearly more conversational with friends and family in private settings.

Participants noted that this strategy was adopted due, in part, to a fear of being on display and being regarded as not holding sufficient academic or linguistic capital in English. EAL students in these instances seem to take a pragmatic choice not to stand out from the crowd to avoid the judgement of those in class. Elaine can be seen as asserting this view when she stated in this interaction:

Elaine: ... if I have questions, I ask them like not in front of people.

Brian: So why would that be?

Elaine: 'Cause I don't know I just don't feel comfortable asking questions in front of people.

Brian: Do you sort of worry that people will judge you on your language?

Elaine: Well not really, maybe that my questions are not good.

During classroom observations, it became apparent that most participating EAL students did not venture answers during class-wide discussions when the teachers sought choral (IRF) responses from the class. When prompted by the teacher, most EAL participants would only respond with minimal one- or two-word answers. This occurred regardless of the EAL students' level of conversational competence in English. I see this as a reflection of the

students' fear of being on display and related judgement by teachers and peers on their public performance using academic English.

Teachers, in their report comments, often noticed this reluctance to be on display. Teachers noted that EAL students need to be more active and perform in class as questioners. Reluctance to question was often linked, by teachers in their report comments, to the EAL students lacking understanding of content. For example, Jejomar's physical education teacher stated he "needs to participate more in class discussions and ask questions to clarify understanding." In another example, Elaine's chemistry teacher similarly commented "she needs to contribute more to class discussions and ask more questions to develop a better understanding of the concepts taught and hence enhance her achievement." For both Jejomar and Elaine, being silent was linked, in these comments, to missed opportunities for understanding and achievement. These report comments also negated the potential benefits of the one-on-one clarifying conversations EAL students were having in their peer groups rather than whole-class settings.

By contrast, students are valorised when they were seen to perform as active questioners in class. Jung Min's history teacher noted that she "seeks clarification to enhance her understanding" while her Spanish teacher stated that she "always asks questions when she doesn't understand and contributes as much as she can to the classroom learning environment." Here, Jung Min is seen to be fulfilling her performative role as a questioner and this is linked to gaining greater understanding of disciplinary content.

Contrasts also exist in the comments of teachers relating to a particular EAL student. Elaine's chemistry and biology teachers variously noted she "needs to contribute more to class discussions" and "needs to ask more questions to clarify her understanding." However,

she was praised in the same report by her mathematics teacher. Her mathematics teacher asserted that “she works well in class and has put effort into getting her grades. She asks for help when it is needed.” The same strategies are regarded as being absent by Elaine’s chemistry and biology teacher are seen as present by her mathematics teacher. This may be linked to Elaine’s level of comfort and feeling that she is amongst understanding peers in her mathematics class.

The responsibility of the individual to perform in class as the dutiful questioner and seeker of the teacher’s academic knowledge was a clear theme that arose in teacher comments with regard to EAL students. For example, Miyu was tasked with the individual responsibility of performing as a questioner when her chemistry teacher stated that she “needs to ask for help more often to reinforce the skills learnt” and her physics teacher commented she “needs to be more proactive about asking for help when she is confused.” In these comments, it was held as Miyu’s responsibility to seek out the teacher and not the other way around. These teachers, in their comments, asserted the need for active individualism in EAL students by adhering to the communal social norms of the class – that is, the norm of the student as recipient and teacher as possessor of knowledge.

Teacher comments would, on occasions, contain internal contradictions as the same teacher would make very similar comments across students, which seemed to ignore the students as individuals. For example, Seong and Shane had the same chemistry teacher. This teacher’s comment regarding Seong was, “I encourage her to ask questions to help her enhance and integrate information taught in class,” and her comment regarding Shane was “I encourage him to ask as many questions as possible to help him understand and integrate information taught in class.” These comments were essentially the same and did not account for Seong’s and Shane’s differing linguistic backgrounds, their level of disciplinary

literacy in English or L1, or indeed their individual school experiences and particular selves. The only distinction that is made between the two students in the comment is that of their gender. All other individual subtleties are rendered moot. Seong and Shane are treated uniformly in relation to their in-class strategies, rather than seen as the individuals they are.

#### *Student perceptions of silence as a strategy*

During interviews, participating students made statements which affirmed the teacher as the holder of knowledge as a rationale for their silence in class. Further to this, international student participants, in particular, expressed that they felt the teacher is best placed to help with English language acquisition. For example, Miyu a Japanese international student who had been in Aotearoa/New Zealand for one year at the start of the research, stated “it helps [my English] when the teacher gets involved.” For Miyu, the teacher is valorised as being the primary source of knowledge for English language acquisition.

Daniel, a Chinese international student who had also been in Aotearoa/New Zealand for one year at the start of the research, is a good example of the statements made by the international student cohort. He stated in his initial Year 12 interview:

I think the key to learning English is good teachers. Because some teachers in class use words that are not in the normal English, only in this subject, so you cannot understand. Maybe I know these subjects but I don't know the English words.

Here Daniel identified the disciplinary literacies of a subject, and the teachers' knowledge of these as crucial. For Daniel these disciplinary literacies, delivered by “good teachers” were the “key to learning English.” Heller's (1996) concept of legitimate language (see Chapter 2) is relevant here. In this case, the students held that the type of language used by the teacher was the (only) legitimate form in relation to the subject. In both the cases of Miyu and Daniel, the acquisition of the legitimate language of the disciplinary literacies in English

was a primary concern. This concern informed their strategy of remaining silent in class and listening to the teacher talk. The notion of teachers as pedagogical authorities (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1998) comes to be reinforced through a student discourse which asserts the teacher as knowledge holder of both legitimate English use and content knowledge.

Another reason identified by participants for adopting their strategy of silence was the feeling of discomfort in being exposed in front of peers. For example, Kanda stated, “I get very nervous when I speak cause I am constantly thinking that I am always wrong ... what I say is always wrong so that I don’t really say it out loud.” Kanda went on to state this is a feeling many EAL students have when they first come to Aotearoa/New Zealand. She said “you would be embarrassed in front of everyone and get it wrong ... so most people don’t speak much when they come.”

Jung Min notes her international student friends echo this particular sentiment. She states:

I have some international friends; they always tell me about how they feel about getting attention from the teachers cause ... I don’t know they just get really embarrassed when they get attention like, cause if they get the teacher’s attention, that would attract like draw in other students’ attention as well ... and they are only like just learning English ... like I don’t think that’s embarrassing at all, I mean they are trying. We should acknowledge their effort but yeah apparently that’s how they see it.

In Kanda’s view, this nervousness and embarrassment could be combated when teachers “just take time and get to know the student more so that they are comfortable to talk.”

While Jung Min thought, “if teachers could like stay behind after class or something and kind of get together for ... international students that would help.” Both girls noted the

helpfulness of the teacher providing spaces and opportunities for teacher–student interaction away from the potential judgement of peers. These spaces can help to reduce the image of the teacher as sole pedagogical authority and allow room for a more dialogic process of learning in which the existing funds of knowledge of EAL students are utilised in conjunction with the teacher’s knowledge.

In Leon’s statement about the use of L1, the fear of peer judgment is also evident. He stated: “I can still speak Mandarin but I just don’t like speaking it in front of people because maybe they will think you are weird or something.” The judgement of being seen to be “weird” by “normal” students when he uses his L1 has led Leon to a strategy of silencing his L1, just as he is also silent in English during class.

This silencing strategy has arisen as a pragmatic means of avoiding Othering through the judgement of peers. The strategy, however, impacts significantly on students’ choice around when and where to use both L1 and English. This, in turn, impacts on the EAL students’ negotiation of scholarly identities.

#### Impact on language use

A strategy of silence that arises out of nervousness, embarrassment and the potential to be judged by peers had a clear impact on EAL students’ language use in class. Often participants adopted novel patterns of speech in class. For example, Kanda would not respond directly to teacher-initiated, class-wide questions or seek out her teachers. She would, however, often engage in self-talk by saying the answer quietly to herself in English. The following snippet of a lesson was observed in one of Kanda’s physics classes in Year 13. This snippet is emblematic of Kanda’s pattern of speech that I often observed in class:

Physics teacher: [to whole class] What he did was he got some lights and he shone it through a hole ... and he knew that when he shone it through a hole like this comes the light as a wave. What happens when it goes through a hole?

Kanda: [to herself] Diffracts.

Physics teacher: [to whole class] It diffracts you get this diffraction. The word diffraction is just bending of light ... so we get this diffraction pattern around the side this is all Year 12 Science and Physics you all remember that word diffraction.

Kanda: [to herself] Mmm.

This pattern occurs again later in this teacher-talk dominated lesson in the following snippet:

Physics teacher: [to whole class] Here two waves that are kind of interacting with each other aww you are thinking constructive and ...

Kanda: [to herself] Ddestructive.

Physics teacher: [to whole class] Destructive interference ... so if you were actually looking at this diagram and trying to figure out ... and go oh at this point here I've got the top of that red wave and the top of that red wave is meeting up with the...

Kanda: [to herself] Bottom.

Physics teacher: [to whole class] Bottom of that other wave.

In these snippets of dialogue observed in class, Kanda showed that her strategy of silence does not mean the complete absence of speech, or indeed absence of content knowledge. Her strategy involved being silent from the perspective of the teacher and her classmates who could not hear her self-talk. In her self-talk she was making use of the subject-specific

disciplinary vocabulary required of physics by using terms like “defracts” and “destructive.” Notable within Kanda’s strategy was that her self-talk was in English and not her L1. She seemed to be using the self-talk as an aid to learning disciplinary-specific vocabulary in English. Silence and quiet self-talk as strategies can thus have a significant impact on how EAL students negotiate their scholarly identities.

#### Impact on scholarly identity

Classroom-specific identities develop over time (Wortham, 2008) around the pedagogical norms of a particular site. Students, particularly those from a minority language background, are compelled to assimilate to these pedagogical norms. Cummins (1986) noted that “transmission pedagogy,” in which the norm is a teacher-centred individualistic style of education, “creates passive roles for students” (p. 17), as they are positioned as the silent and passive recipients of knowledge rather than the co-constructors of knowledge.

This form of pedagogy can be particularly unhelpful for EAL students who are in the linguistic minority in mainstream Aotearoa/New Zealand schools. This passivity serves to further reinforce the notion of teacher as academic authority and negate the students’ own existing funds of knowledge in their ongoing education.

Cummins (1986) further asserts that “the passive roles created by transmission pedagogy induce[s] learned helplessness” (p.17). My research had similar findings, as teachers would favour transmission lecture style regardless of the linguistic make-up of the class. During classroom observations, teachers would act as content deliverers. This style also notably cut across all streamed levels – from ostensibly advanced level 200 and 300 streamed classes to more remedial 203 and 303 streamed classes. The participating EAL students in my research developed classroom-specific identities (Wortham, 2008) which adapted to this lecture style. For example, Kanda noted, “I think in class I get used to it, you

not talk, you're not allowed to talk to anyone, just do your work and write your own stuff. So, I get used to that so I don't talk in class and I just listen." Jung Min likewise comments, "I really don't mind when the teachers talking and I'm just listening, yeah I don't really mind doing that." Here both Kanda and Jung Min are indicating they acquired a learned set of dispositions over their time in class that manifest a scholarly habitus, and scholarly identities, of being quiet and simply soaking up the teachers' knowledge.

These identities were reinforced by teachers in their report comments. While participating EAL students were praised for being well behaved and quiet in class, they were also admonished when they were not seen to be engaged and attentive during whole-class instruction. Whole-class instruction, which is a hallmark of transmission pedagogy (Cummins, 1986), tends to favour students with existing linguistic capital in English due to the decontextualised nature of the transmission.

EAL students who did not participate actively in the IRF patterns typical of this kind of instruction were regarded as not adhering to classroom norms. Shane's school report can be seen as a prime example of these comments. Shane's physics teacher asserted that "he does not pay full attention during lessons" and his mathematics teacher noted that "he has taken a little while to settle in to a new style of mathematics programme." It is notable that Shane, out of all participants, was the most recent arrival to Aotearoa/New Zealand, and had the least proficiency in English. Yet the expectation was that he be fully attentive to lessons and the onus was on him to "settle" into the Aotearoa/New Zealand style of education. In many physics lessons I observed with Shane in the class, the norm for the majority of the lesson was the teacher lecturing to the class with limited scaffolding support. The class was treated as a unified entity and little differentiation of pedagogy was evident. Little affordance was made for Shane's language proficiencies and it was expected that he

was equally able to acquire the same academic English in the short time he had been in class as his Aotearoa/New Zealand counterparts had acquired in 12 years of English-medium education.

Participating students, in their school reports, were encouraged by teachers to contribute to class and to not avoid engaging in whole-class discussions. For example, Miyu's Year 13 chemistry teacher noted that "she needs to contribute more in class discussions and ask more questions to reconfirm her understanding of the concepts taught and hence enhance her achievement." Henry's ESOL teachers likewise noted that he "struggles with a low work output and often tries to fly under the radar as a work avoidance strategy. This is not due to a lack of competence."

In these report comments, teachers noted that EAL students' actively seeking interaction was linked to enhanced understanding of concepts and achievement of NCEA assessments. These interactions, in the view of the commenting teachers, should be initiated by the students. However, when a scholarly identity based around a strategy of silence is adopted, opportunities for students to engage in interactions become more limited.

#### [Interaction in Linguistic Fox-holes as a Strategy](#)

During interviews, participants expressed that when student–teacher classroom interactions did occur, they held a preference to for one-on-one clarifications rather than asking questions in a whole-class forum. For example, Miyu stated: "if I don't get the definitions, I will go and talk to the teacher." Leon also expressed: "if you got questions, you just raise your hand and they will come to help you face to face. I think that's the best way."

The onus should thus be placed on teachers to recognise that decontextualised pedagogy with high-level academic English vocabulary requirements must be effectively

scaffolded. This is true for all students, but particularly EAL students, who often regard their English to be “not as good” with those students they perceive to be “normal” L1 speakers of English. EAL students in my research held a strong desire for one-on-one instruction but often felt unable to seek it out.

In contrast to the students’ stated preference to seek out teachers for clarification during class, it was noticeable during classroom observations that it was the teacher rather than students who would initiate one-on-one interactions. For example, during art. Elaine would work independently and steadily on her project and not seek out the teacher for one-on-one clarifications. She was, however, responsive to her teacher’s advice on how to improve her art work when the teacher initiated a one-on-one conversation. This interaction with Elaine and her art teacher exemplifies those typical of this classroom:

Art teacher: How are you doing?

Elaine: [Non-verbally shows picture].

Art teacher: Are you going to add dark here?

Elaine: Yep.

After the interaction Elaine proceeded to add dark tones to her painting. While Elaine did not initiate the interaction, she did proceed to make changes to her painting based on the advice of the teacher. Note, also, here the relative silence of Elaine in the interaction. She is still minimally responsive to the teacher and takes her advice without any further clarification.

Leon’s accounting 201 class can be seen as another example of the difference of stated desire in interviews around teacher–student interactions and the realities that manifest in class. As noted at the start of this section, Leon stated a clear preference to initiate one-on-one interactions with the teacher as the “best way” to get clarification.

Contrasting this, during the actual classroom interactions observed during his accounting 201 class, he did not once initiate a one-on-one interaction. It was the teacher who did this:

Accounting teacher: Do you know what that means?

Leon: Yep.

In another one-on-one interaction between Leon and his accounting teacher, while the class was working on the Mind Your Own Business accounting software on computers, the teacher again initiates communication:

Teacher: Everything ok?

Leon: [Points to screen].

Teacher: You are missing a transaction, go back.

Leon: [Follows instructions].

Teacher: Go to your transaction balance and change to today's date.

Leon: Ok.

In a pattern of social interaction similar to that observed between Elaine and her art teacher, Leon would communicate with restraint when his accounting teacher initiated one-on-one interactions. Like Elaine's interaction, Leon did not ask clarifying questions to gain deeper understanding of content.

Elaine's and Leon's interactions were typical of those observed of EAL participants and their teachers during class. During interviews, EAL participants expressed a strong preference for seeking out one-on-one clarification from teachers. During classroom observations, however, participating EAL students would remain relatively silent and offered, at most, limited responses to invariably teacher initiated one-on-one interactions.

Udom accounted for the difference in participants' expressed preferences for interactions, and the reality of the way in which in class interactions occur, when he

observed that “it could be hard for some international students. They would be shy or be sacred to ask so ... the teacher might need to come and talk to them or make them feel comfortable.” Seong held a similar view to Udom when she asserted:

Students with English as a second language, they are shy to say cause like they come from different culture and different language ... So, I think it’s better [for the teacher] to ask first like “oh you need some help” and stuff. I think that’s really helpful.

For both Udom and Seong, shyness as well as cultural and linguistic factors, were identified as reasons for EAL students’ limited responses to teacher-initiated, one-on-one interactions. Both students felt that the more a teacher talked to EAL students one-on-one, the more helpful it was, and the more comfortable the student would become.

In lieu of the desired teacher–student one-on-one interactions, participating EAL students noted that they would adopt a strategy of one-on-one interactions in English with fellow EAL students as a way of creating a safe space to seek clarification. In contrast to Canagarajah’s (2004) notion of linguistic safe houses, in which students speak in their L1 to other students, the EAL students in my research were adopting a strategy of temporarily constructing, what I term linguistic foxholes in English with other EAL students from differing L1 backgrounds. EAL students would create temporary shared spaces (foxholes) in which they could have some haven from the symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 1984) of the judgement of English L1 peers in relation to their use of English. In these foxholes they felt able to practise their English and engage in the disciplinary literacies in English required in their subjects. The rationale for this foxhole strategy is outlined by Seong in this exchange:

Seong: Like our English is not perfect so I can feel more comfortable to ask [Miyu] like cause I also think you might not understand.

Brian: Would you feel less comfortable if you were asking an English first language speaker.

Seong: Yeah.

Brian: Why do you think that?

Seong: Because I don't know I just feel a little bit uncomfortable ... kind of like I'm scared they might say "oh your English is not that well" or like that [laughs].

For Seong, there was a degree of safety in the judgement-free zone of interactions with Miyu as she feels Miyu is experiencing similar challenges to her in relation to English. In their linguistics foxholes, Miyu and Seong together developed an esprit de corps, in which they helped each other and did not judge each other's language use. Kanda noted that she also tended to work with other "international students cause we mainly hang out together." She was willing to "work with anyone" but felt "the opportunity for me to get to [interact with English L1 students] is less than" the opportunities for interactions with fellow EAL students.

Teachers often noted in reports the need for students to interact with peers (both EAL and English L1). Seong's chemistry teacher asserted that Seong "would benefit from sharing ideas with her peers." Seong's Geography teacher also noted that "I encourage her to ask for help from her neighbouring student." These comments ignore the fact that Seong is already covertly sharing ideas and asking for help from fellow EAL students.

The metaphors of a safe house (Canagarajah, 2004) and a foxhole both implicitly make use of the idea of a response to violence. The safe house is a permanent construct in which EAL students seek shelter with other EAL students from the same L1. It is a long-term means of preserving and cultivating one's L1 in relation to the symbolic violence of English as the dominant language of school. By contrast, I imagine the foxhole as a metaphor for a more temporary construct in which EAL students seek out one another, regardless of their

L1. In these foxholes, they can work together to mitigate the symbolic violence of English by trying their English abilities in a judgement free zone with each other. As a pragmatic strategy, EAL students construct linguistic foxholes for themselves and their fellow EAL students to occupy. This creates a temporary space, free of symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 1991), in which they can have the one-on-one interaction they crave without the judgement they fear.

#### Student perception of one-on-one interactions

Students clearly perceived that one-on-one interactions with teachers and fellow EAL peers were a practical means of enhancing their understanding, while not being exposed to judgement in a whole-class situation. For example, Leon stated: “like in my group ... maybe sometimes I didn’t pay attention but I can ask someone in my group for help.” Leon had a preference to ask his fellow EAL peers rather than the teacher. He goes on to state that “I would ask my friend first, but if he really doesn’t know then I would ask [the teacher].” The perception for Leon here was that he feels comfortable enough in his EAL peer group to ask for help even when he “didn’t pay attention.”

Udom explains his similar perception that competing feelings of trust and shyness shaped his preference for interactions:

I feel that when you are in the class, and you feel a part of the classroom, then you dare to ask and you wouldn’t have that shy feeling but when you are in a class and you don’t feel like you are a part of them, then you are likely not to ask cause you feel, like, oh what is he going to think you know.

For Udom feeling “part of the classroom” was a crucial determinant of his choice of interaction. In an environment in which he did feel part of the class he would “dare to ask” questions. When Udom didn’t feel “part of the classroom,” he was reluctant to interact

because of what other students were “going to think” about him if he did ask questions.

Again, the judgment of peers is a core consideration for Udom that determines the type of interaction strategy he adopted.

When asked “when would you feel that you wouldn’t be part of the class?” Udom responded “when you don’t know everyone.” The perceptions of Udom are key here. When he does not “know everyone,” he is less likely to engage in the theatre of class-wide discussions. Rather, he adopts a strategy of silence or one-on-one interactions in linguistic foxholes with fellow EAL students.

The preference for communication with other EAL students was fairly common across participants. Kanda states a preference for interaction with fellow EAL students when she stated:

I found it quite interesting that people believe you should hang out with the fluent English speaker to get better at English. However, I don’t find it very help[ful].

Instead, I [tend] to hang out with people that do suffer like me to kind of compliment myself that I am not the only one suffer[ing], which surprisingly make me feel so much better.

Here Kanda identifies that she feels more comfortable interacting with peers who are experiencing similar challenges to her. In her words this means she is “not the only one suffer[ing]” which makes her “feel so much better.” Again, the metaphor of a response to symbolic violence is linked to the notion of being not the only one suffering this violence.

Overall, EAL students’ perceptions of trust and shyness varied according to the social context and the degree to which they knew their peers. This had a strong influence on language use in class and their negotiation of scholarly identities. It is to these issues I now turn.

## Impact on language use

In classes in which participating EAL students had only a few peers they knew, a strategy of silence or very limited one-on-one interaction was adopted. For example, in her biology class, Elaine sat with a group of three other EAL girls she identified as friends. The rest of the class were unfamiliar to her. In this class, she engaged in very little talk with the teacher or peers outside her friendship group. She, instead focused on her computer work, doing her tasks and assignments in silence. When the teacher did engage Elaine in a one-on-one interaction her replies were limited, as this exchange demonstrates.

Biology teacher: How are you doing?

Elaine: Fine.

Biology teacher: You're drawing the diagram?

Elaine: Yep.

Biology teacher: You know you can print it off?

Elaine: Yep.

When asked about this particular interaction, she stated: "the one-on-one is so hard for me ... 'cause I don't like it when people like if someone talks like everyone will look at them."

Elaine's limited language use was reflective of the environment she was in. She did not know all her peers and was reluctant to speak much due to the potential for judgement from these peers. This was even the case with her one-on-one interactions with the teacher due to her not liking "everyone look[ing] at [her]."

Kidlat exhibited a similar reluctance to interact when he was placed in a group of English L1 speakers during an English class. The teacher said to the class that she chose which groups they would be in, not by ability, but rather her desire to bring together students that are conversational and non-conversational. She specifically placed Kidlat (a

relatively non- conversational student) into a group of highly conversational English L1-speaking girls. During the group task, Kidlat engaged in only limited interaction with his group. When the teacher came to the group the following interaction occurred.

English teacher: What are you working on?

Kidlat: Not quite sure.

Peer in group: Character development and symbols.

English teacher: Ok explain that to Kidlat so I am confident the whole group [knows] what they are doing.

Peer in group: Ok.

English teacher: I will come back in five minutes to check.

The teacher did indeed come back five minutes later. During the intervening time, the majority of conversation within the group was one member of the group clarifying to Kidlat what they were doing. Kidlat was listening but did not talk much during the clarification, aside from limited one- to two-word responses. Here Kidlat was in an environment where he did not know his group very well and adopted a strategy of silence and then minimal one-on-one communication when prompted by the teacher. Kidlat did not want to appear to lack understanding in front of the group. Even when he did not understand, he did not seek out the teacher but waited until the teacher approached him before gaining clarification from peers under the teacher's instructions to do so.

When participating EAL students did sit in a group in which they had a high level of trust and felt they would not be judged linguistically, they were more likely to interact with peers. This is particularly true of settings in which EAL students were in a peer group of fellow EAL students. For example, Seong and Padayao sat together in their geography class. Seong and Padayao seemed to prefer working together and had many task-orientated

interactions in relation to the project they were doing together as part of an NCEA assessment. The interaction below is emblematic of how Seong and Padayao worked together in this class.

Seong: You want me to write again? Culture and natural stuff?

Padayao: Yeah probably.

Seong: Can I write on that?

Padayao: Yeah just make sure you leave ... before we cut off that path so we can draw squares for traction ... I think there is some grey paper in there ... I mean like inside the cupboard.

Seong: Here?

Padayao: No, that one that's open.

This interaction can be seen in contrast to the teacher–EAL student and L1 student–EAL student interactions described previously. Seong and Padayao are being highly collaborative in this interaction. They seemed to be more willing to communicate with each other as neither considered the other would judge their English use during the interaction. Here Seong and Padayao are taking advantage of occupying a linguistic foxhole together in which they both make use of English without the fear of Othering. The result was an interactive and co-operative dialogue.

Padayao was even willing to engage more with the teacher when he initiated an interaction with the two, as shown in this exchange.

Padayao to Seong: Do you want me to draw the scale now?

Seong: Yeah.

Padayao: Do you want me to draw on here?

Geography teacher comes to pair: Ok so you have done natural and cultural?

Padayao: Yep.

Geography teacher: Alright, so these are all cultural?

Padayao: That's cultural, the trees natural ... wait I think I've done one of them.

In this case Padayao and Seong's successful establishment of a linguistic foxhole made them more willing to engage in more detailed interaction with both each other and the teacher.

This contrasts with the short, one-word interaction EAL students have often had in teacher–student interaction. It also contrasts with the type of one-sided interactions Kidlat experienced with the L1 English-speaking peers in his English class. A feeling of trust and comfort had a beneficial influence on the amount of interactions these EAL students were willing to engage in. In contrast, a feeling of fear around judgement and Othering tended to limit the amount of interaction EAL were willing to engage in. This also can impact on how EAL students negotiate their scholarly identities.

#### [Impact on the negotiation of scholarly identities](#)

Canagarajah (2004) discusses the notion of linguistic safe houses in which EAL students can discuss concepts in their L1 with fellow L1-speaking peers. My research has shown that, while some EAL students were able to discuss concepts with fellow L1 interlocutors and construct a linguistic safe house, many EAL students did not have peers who spoke their L1. These EAL students variously adopted strategies of silence or one-on-one interaction, in English, with teachers or fellow EAL peers they trusted. Rather than the metaphor of the safe house to shelter from the symbolic violence of an English dominant class, I favour the metaphor of the foxhole as participants sought temporary respite with fellow EAL peers from the symbolic violence of English–dominant, whole-class forums.

Foxholes can be seen as being established by EAL students who group together in class, often from different L1 backgrounds. For example, Kanda whose first language is Thai,

Seong a Korean speaker, and Miyu a Japanese speaker, formed a strong social bond as they shared many classes with one another and spent time out of school with each other. These students would help each other with work. Communication was in English, however, because of the absence of judgement of their English language use, as discussed earlier. In their foxholes, Kanda, Seong and Miyu could thus interact with each other and enhance one another's understanding of English and the disciplinary literacy requirements of their subjects. Seong explain her relationship with Miyu and Kanda in this exchange:

Seong: So, I study with Miyu and Kanda cause we take similar subjects.

Brian: Mmm so you find that helpful? Cause I've noticed you three hang around a lot you get on well together?

Seong: Mmm yeah.

Brian: And how about any English first language students do you tend to hang round with them at all?

Seong: ... sometimes but I think [with] Kanda and Miyu its more comfortable because sometimes I don't know like some words and then they won't know the words as well, so we can figure out together. So, it's more comfortable and we have more in common.

Comfort in communication is identified as a common idea for the girls in this quote. The common experience of being an EAL student in an English-dominant environment had helped them form a strong friendship group. Kanda expressed similar sentiments to Seong during this exchange:

Brian: So, you seem comfortable talking with your friends. Are you more willing to do group work with them than other people?

Kanda: Yeah cause I'm always afraid that they will think I'm not doing the work that they will want me to do, so I just don't talk that much.

Brian: Do you think they might judge you based on your English language?

Kanda: Yes.

Again, the notion of comfort in a linguistic foxhole of fellow feeling EAL friends emerged strongly in this exchange. An awareness on the part of schools and educators of the importance of strong peer group relationships and the existence of both L1 safe houses (Canagarajah, 2004) and EAL students using English-medium foxholes with each other can help reduce the context-based shyness, fear and sense of isolation often felt by EAL students. This awareness and promotion of self-selected peers can, in turn, help reduce the disengagement and divestment often induced in EAL students as they are positioned on the periphery of the school's community of practice. By creating their own communities of practice, in their foxholes and safe houses, EAL students are engaging in efforts to renegotiate their scholarly identities based on terms more favourable to their own experiences and existing elements of their capital.

Teachers can harness the existing strategies adopted by EAL students to reinforce a message that scholarly identities can be renegotiated via a new set of learned dispositions that sets both L1 and English as essential meaning-making resources. For example, teachers can facilitate the building of foxholes or safe houses through promotion of L1 use or strategic pairing of EAL students. Kanda's ESOL teacher used her work as a positive example to another EAL student by stating that "Kanda did it this way" and encouraging the EAL student to work with Kanda. The same teacher, in Miyu's report comment, noted that "she is often a student I will turn to, to help other students who are struggling." Being seen to be a student who can help their EAL peers had a positive impact on Miyu's and Kanda's

negotiation of scholarly identities. In this case, both Miyu and Kanda were positioned as active knowledge holders rather than merely passive recipients of knowledge. Within their particular community of practice of EAL students in ESOL class, their knowledge was valued and drawn upon, rather than silenced, as was the case in more transmission–style, whole-class settings.

### Covert Clarification as a Strategy

#### Gazeless spaces

A final strategy participating EAL students adopted to avoid Othering was to seek out the teacher away from the gaze of L1 English students. When asked about the apparent contradiction between the expressed desire to initiate one-on-one student–teacher interactions and the apparent passivity exhibited in class, students’ responses were telling. They expressed a desire to seek covert clarification of concepts from the teacher outside of class time, if and when needed.

If participants did not understand a concept or wished to seek clarification, they would often remain silent during whole class contexts and wait for an opportunity after class to ask the teacher for clarification. For example, Elaine notes “if I have questions, I ask them, like not in front of people.’. In another example, Kanda’s response during an interview demonstrated her rationale for this kind of covert clarification.

Brian: So, you’ve said that you feel the teacher is the person to get the knowledge from and yet you have said yourself and your teachers have said that you are quite quiet in class. So how do you think you would be able to discuss content with teachers more?

Kanda: If I have questions, I wouldn't ask during class time I would ask after class.

Maybe the questions I have, not everybody wants to know the answer, so I don't want to interrupt their time in learning.

Here Kanda asserted that her desire to seek out covert clarification came from a desire to not disrupt the rest of the class with questions others don't have. This stated rationale contrasts with other potential reasons such as the desire to appear to not lack understanding or be seen as the Other in the judgement of L1 English peers. These unstated reasons often went unexamined in a pre-reflexive state by the participating students but had important implications for students' interactional preferences, language use, and negotiation of scholarly identities.

For example, Kanda's fear of judgement was displayed when she was prompted to answer a complicated teacher-posed question about control variables in a physics class. Kanda stumbled to answer the question and turned red, visibly embarrassed about being subjected to the gaze of the class. I asked Kanda later about how she felt about being prompted to answer a question in a whole-class setting. She stated: "it like makes me feel a little bit uncomfortable ... like even though sometimes I do know the answer, I am too afraid to say it out [loud]." Kanda went on to elaborate "I don't [feel confident]. I normally don't ask questions [in a class wide setting]." Kanda showed her preferred communicative competence in English in this class during one-on-one interactions with fellow EAL student Seong, but the fear of being put on display in a class-wide setting causes a notable reduction in her confidence and in her language use. Here she felt "afraid to say it out [loud]" due to her discomfort and fear of being judged against the communicative competence of the native speaker (Canale & Swain, 1981) by the teacher and the wider class.

In both the case of one-on-one interactions and class-wide answering of questions, the EAL students were enacting public performances (Lukes, 2005). Kanda appeared to have confidence to perform as an English-speaking student one-on-one with fellow EAL peers in linguistic foxholes. However, she seemed to lose this confidence in a whole class setting.

Teachers can help build gazeless spaces in which EAL students feel less embarrassed about seeking clarification of academic language and/or curriculum content. For example, Daniel, Leon, Udom, and Miyu shared an ESOL class in Year 13. Their teacher often made statements like “we are building a learning community in here” and “we can help each other.” Here the teacher is actively cultivating a judgement free zone in which a community of learners can help each other. Notably this class was an ESOL class and, as such, free of the gaze of L1 English peers.

#### [Student perceptions of covert clarification](#)

Participating EAL students often sought out covert clarification from fellow EAL peers. For example, Elaine noted, of a group of girls in her art class, “one is Sri Lankan and one is from Fiji [Fijian Indian]. They are similar to me because they’ve experienced something like me. They have been struggling with English.”

Often EAL students would sit in a peer group of fellow EAL students as they felt more comfortable in terms of socialisation. However, these students would often find they were unable to keep up with the highly context-reduced nature of the English-medium lesson. Padayao noted this tendency when she stated during an interview:

Like there are a whole group of us [EAL students], we actually try and sit together and help each other as much as possible but we don’t know all the things. So, more often just getting together and trying ourselves doesn’t work because we don’t know the answers.

A solution to this for Udom was, as he states, “I feel a bit like, go talk to the teacher, like after class and that would be better.” He elaborates: “I think it’s not fair for other people in class ’cause it’s like your teaching time and it’s our learning time so I would ask after class.” Udom attributed his desire to seek out covert collaboration to a perception that he may be interfering with other students’ learning time. Miyu identified a similar rationale for covert clarification when she noted:

Miyu: Cause like if I like start asking questions during the class I like stop the lecture so.

Brian: So, you feel it interrupts other people learning as well?

Miyu: Yeah.

Udom and Miyu both perceived their asking of clarifying questions as disruptive to the class as a whole. Kathy’s perception of her desire to seek out covert clarification come more from a rationale of self-preservation. She stated: “I just don’t ask when its class time like after class, I do ... I just fear public speaking.” Here the gaze of other students is a paramount consideration in Kathy’s perceptions of when she wished to seek out the teacher. This perception around the appropriate time to seek clarification and the multiple rationales behind this perception has an influence on students’ language use and the negotiation of their scholarly identities.

#### [Impact on language use](#)

Confidence in wider group settings was identified by EAL participants as a barrier to class-wide public performance. For example, Harry notes:

With things like mainstream English for speeches and essays, I don’t have the confidence for that. I get all emotional about it like I can’t do it like all these few years I can’t do it. I’ve tried to but I haven’t been able to [stand] in front of the class.

Harry displayed his confidence with one-on-one interactions during the history 202 classes I observed. He was able to make jokes with his English-first-language peer in English and laughs at the English speaker's jokes. He was accepted as a member of his peer group and seemed comfortable. However, in line with the statement he made in the interview about confidence in whole-class situations, he did not once volunteer answers to teacher-initiated question during class discussions.

As noted in the previous section, Kathy stated, "I just fear public speaking." Much like Harry, Kathy's willingness to interact in class depended largely on the nature of the interactional requirements. For example, the teacher in her English 201 class actively encouraged peer-to-peer collaboration in work and pursued a decentralised model of pedagogy. Kathy sat with an English L1 peer group. She was highly communicative and active in pointing out features of the poem the class was studying. She was clearly accepted in her group of four. All of the group were dialogically contributing to ideas about the poem. In contrast, in Kathy's classical studies 201 class a highly teacher-centric lecture style was the default form of pedagogy. With much of the lesson dominated by teacher talk, Kathy sat on the periphery, at the front corner of the class with English-first-language students. She was less communicative in this class. This was largely due to the monological nature of the communication in class and the related propensity to have whole class discussions rather than one-on-one and/or peer interactions.

Overall then, it became clear to me that there are gradations of language use based on factors such as classroom practices, confidence with peer groups and perceptions of the appropriate time to seek clarification. Students' linguistic preferences existed on a spectrum – from minimal communication in English and a preference for L1 and English communication with fellow EAL peers, all the way to the other end in which English is

exclusively used and their L1 is negated. Preferences around the type of interactions from one-on-one interaction to class-wide contributions were largely a function of the level of confidence in their English language ability, the trust they felt in their peers, and the pedagogical construction of class time.

#### [Impact on the negotiation of scholarly identities](#)

Morgan (1997) has noted that identity emerges for EAL students in meaning-making activities. These identities tend to be reinforced through interactional choices over time. The place identity (Kalantzis & Cope, 1999) for participating EAL students was in this instance constructed around the nature of local subjectivities. The subjective interpretation of appropriate interactions, as well as the desire to avoid the judgement of L1 English peers they did not know, were linked to these EAL students' place identity. When participants sought covert clarification after class, they were conscious of their place identity – of being minimally interactive in class. The classroom is a prime location for meaning making, particularly in senior high school, which is a time of high-stakes assessment. When participating EAL students felt that they could not speak up and seek clarification in class, due to fear of judgement or for any other reason, the terms upon which scholarly identities are negotiated became more limited for them. This was due to the silencing of EAL students in class, both in English and their L1. In this environment, opportunities to utilise meaning-making resources diminished.

Covert strategies, such as silence, self-talk, one-on-one interactions with EAL peers, and covert clarification from the teacher, were thus consciously adopted by participating EAL students in an effort to counter these diminished opportunities. These covert strategies were drawn upon in an effort to balance the desire to gain disciplinary literacy in a subject while avoid being classified as Other by their teachers and L1 English peers.

Participants, however, also adopted more overt strategies which sought to challenge notions of the Other and assert their particular translingual identities as intrinsic to their learning. The next chapter will explore the more overt strategies that students adopted in response to the English-dominant schooling environment.

## Discussion

The covert strategies of EAL students outlined in this chapter need not be regarded by their teachers as examples of student disengagement. Rather, teachers can accommodate existing covert strategies. As noted in previous sections, teachers in mainstream subjects often do not adjust their pedagogy for either migrant or international students. Part of this lack of adjustment is not recognising that EAL students, who may outwardly seem passive are, in fact, actively engaging in covert strategies. Teachers can make use of existing students' covert strategies such as linguistic foxholes within which to communicate, by understanding the peer group dynamics in their class. One EAL student may be comfortable communicating with a peer in one-on-one and group situations, while others may be fearful of judgement of peers in certain situations, leading to their silence. Teachers can encourage access to L1 safe houses by explicitly promoting the development of L1 peer groups and networks, as well as the use of L1 resources and texts.

Again, the notion of the teacher as advocate for L1 comes to the fore. Teachers can be allies against the onslaught of symbolic violence rather than the promoters of this violence. EAL students have already identified the covert strategies they use and feel work for them at a pragmatic level. Teachers, then, just need to listen to EAL students and dialogically co-construct strategies which both defend against symbolic violence and simultaneously promote disciplinary literacy development in both L1 and English. This dialogue would help shift EAL classroom-specific identities (Wortham, 2008) away from a

role as a passive recipient of knowledge from pedagogical authorities delivering wisdom in the social sanctioned language of English. Classroom-specific identities could then shift towards a learned set of dispositions which values both L1 and English capital as intrinsic elements in the negotiation of scholarly identities.

When strategies are adopted in which EAL students actively co-create knowledge, teacher concern over the perceived silent and passive EAL student can be ameliorated. In an environment of co-construction and the utilisation of funds of knowledge, EAL students can feel more comfortable and be more likely to engage in seeking clarification of vocabulary or concepts. The stigma of not knowing is removed as there are elements of knowledge which the EAL student can use (based on their L1 knowledge) to help the class, which are not known to any other members of the class, including the teacher. Udom noted that EAL students are less likely to be silent when they “feel part of the classroom.” Helping EAL students feel part of the classroom can be achieved when teachers work with EAL students and make more effective use of their existing in-class covert strategies. Furthermore, feeling part of the classroom can be enhanced when teachers make effective use of the EAL students’ L1 as a meaning-making resource. Dialogue and the development of strategies and pedagogy based on student voice enhances EAL students’ scholarly investment (in both L1 and English) as they feel part of the classroom. The last of the findings chapters will now consider how a process of dialogue and reflexivity, engaged in by both students and teachers, can lead to a reconsideration of pedagogy based on utilising EAL students’ existing translingual practices.

## Chapter 8: Findings – Self-reflexivity Strategies

### Introduction

In this chapter I argue that, when teachers and students work together in a dialogic fashion, incorporating self-reflexive strategies, they can effectively utilise translingual practices for the benefit of all members of the class. I begin this chapter with an analysis of the various overt strategies EAL students use to challenge stereotyping and categorisation by pedagogical authorities and wider members of the majority Pākehā population. Many participating EAL students adopted strategies which saw them break free, in their various ways, of the trajectories assigned to them via stereotyping and categorisation. One of the crucial strategies EAL participants often adopted, upon self-reflection, was to try and actively utilise their existing English and L1 skills in concert in order to work towards normalising their own translingual practices. Normalisation here refers to both a normalising of translingual practices in students' own concept of their scholarly identity, as well as in the eyes of peers and pedagogical authorities. The chapter will conclude with a discussion of how to break down effectively the monolingual mindset of contemporary schools and replace it with a more translingual mindset in contemporary Aotearoa/New Zealand society.

### Strategies to Defuse Pan-ethnic Stereotyping and Challenge Categorisation

When participating EAL students were able to engage in post-reflexive choices (Adams, 2006) around the negotiation of their scholarly identities, they were able to challenge how they were categorised by others. My research has revealed that participating students were often aware of the fact that they were ascribed particular characteristics and categorised by those in school based on their ethnic and/or linguistic backgrounds. Participants often

sought to reject the ascription of characteristics and categories, preferring to assert their own perceptions of their particular selves. For example, Padayao stated in her initial Year 12 interview:

There are some people who think stereotyping is the way to go. Considering I'm Asian they think I'm a walking talking calculator and dictionary, when I'm obviously not. I have flaws and subjects I don't like and I have my weaknesses so I find it quite difficult when people stereotype me. Some teachers know my mum is a scientist so they are more likely to be "oh she is Asian; your mum is a scientist I expect you to do well" when I'm actually my own individual.

Padayao and other participants were ever wary of the fact that they might get categorised by teachers and English L1 students based on their ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. Leon identified that this categorisation may have occurred when he first arrived in Aotearoa/New Zealand "'cause I don't speak English ... [I] like struggle with the word. I mumbled a lot and probably my accent ...so I was afraid peoples are going to like make fun of me." For Leon, fear of initial judgement around factors like his language use and accent was a clear memory.

While Leon's fear lay in linguistic considerations, Kanda's experiences were around judgements based in ethnic factors which were linked to linguistic factors. She stated:

At school people make different comments towards me based on how I look and I don't really like that 'cause they just judge me on how I look and they expected immediately that I don't speak English perfectly and I'm trying to but they don't appreciate how much work I put in to make this better. Yeah so it kind of [makes] me feel sad sometimes ... Yeah I think that makes a lot of difference cause different looks ... people with different looks always bring up the attention and not in [a] good

way sometimes ... yeah so if you fit in with the looks you will fit in with the community better.

An awareness of judgement based on how she looks was powerfully asserted in Kanda's statement. She noted a categorical assumption that she could not "speak English perfectly" was made based on her being ethnically Thai. She felt that, because she has "different looks" from the Anglo majority, it "bring[s] up the attention and not in [a] good way." Kanda felt sad that those categorising her do not consider the work she puts in to speak and act like them. In her words "to make this better" so she can "fit in with the community better." Miyu takes a more cavalier approach to the judgement of those in the majority when she states that she "just ignore[s] them."

Participants had varied perceptions around the categorisation that was ascribed to them by those in the majority. These ranged from Padayao's impassioned rejection of ascribed categories and assertion of her own particular elements of capital, through to Kanda's sadness and Miyu's general indifference. These perceptions all had strong influences on the various ways EAL students used language in school and how they negotiated their scholarly identities.

#### Impact on language use

Udom identified that some EAL students may take an individualistic approach to respond to categorisation. This idea of the rugged individual comes through when Udom notes: "I mean, they might think they can stand [on] their own legs 'cause they just don't want to talk. I don't know so that would make people think oh is he just quiet." Here Udom perceived that some EAL students try to avoid language use by working extra hard, much like Kanda, to "make [their English use] better". Paradoxically, in so doing, they disengage from other speakers and seem to be "just quiet."

Elaine was emblematic of a different response to categorisation in terms of shaping her language use in school. She stated that in some settings she is “more confident and like just ... ask questions and yeah don’t be afraid to try.” Elaine attributed her willingness to use language in some settings as arising from “helpful teachers” who help her based on the relationship they had developed with Elaine and not based on the categorisation of Elaine being from Myanmar/Burma or an L1 speaker of Karen.

That said, challenging the categorisation by EAL students as being passive and quiet was not always greeted warmly by teachers. Harry’s ESOL teacher, for example, warned him in a mid-year report that “he needs to pay attention while explanations are given instead of socialising and distracting others.” Harry was seen to be diverging from the categorisation of the earnest and focused model minority. Harry might counter the negative framing of the ESOL teacher’s comment by noting he feels freer to not have to act in the particular way deemed pedagogically appropriate by the pedagogical authority.

#### [Impact on the negotiation of scholarly identities](#)

Participants’ desire to challenge the categorisation attributed to them had significant impacts on how they negotiated their scholarly identities. Some, like Padayao and Harry, chose to adopt varied scholarly identities from the norms of the English L1 students. While others saw frustration in the fact that their scholarly identity doesn’t align with that of the majority.

Padayao negotiated a scholarly identity based around being verbally engaged in the choral (IRF) responses of her geography class when she offered answers to the teacher’s class-wide questions like “What’s a viewpoint?” to which Padayao responded “an interpretation.” In this example, Padayao was purposefully communicating with the teacher to answer class-wide questions. In this act, she was rejecting an ascribed scholarly identity

of a passive and quiet student and asserting a particular scholarly identity that more closely aligned with that which she sees as the norm among the L1 English speakers.

Harry, by contrast negotiated a scholarly identity which aligned with different traits that he observes in L1 English speakers. He stated, "I'm more relaxed and take my time sometimes." He tried to move his scholarly identity towards one of a more relaxed nature in which he "takes his time" to complete tasks and does not feel the need to be absolutely focused and diligent at all times. In both cases, contrasts can be seen with a model minority archetypal image of the ever-focused, quiet and diligent EAL student often attributed to them, particularly, international students.

Elaine provided yet another example of how participating EAL students responded to categorisation and its impact on their negotiation of scholarly identities. She stated:

Because English is my second language, I need to spend more time than other people whose English is their first language, which annoys me sometimes. I am impatient sometimes and ended up not getting work done.

Here Elaine's efforts to adhere to the scholarly identity of a proficient English user led to reduced school work getting done. An effort to shrug off the categorisation inherent in not being an English L1 speaker has clearly influenced Elaine's negotiation of her scholarly identity.

### [Breaking Free of Assigned Trajectories](#)

My research has found that participating EAL students adopted various strategies to break free of trajectories assigned to them by teachers and peers based on their ethnic and/or linguistic background categorisation. As noted in the previous chapter, these students would often create their own communities of practice in an effort to "break free of trajectories assigned to them" (Shilling, 2004, p. 474). These communities of practice may be "safe

houses” (Canagarajah, 2004) in which they work, using their L1, with other EAL students from the same L1 background. These communities of practice may also be foxholes in which they work, using English, with other EAL students with different L1s.

Although I did witness safe house communities of practice, particularly among the larger cohort of students from China, foxhole communities of practice were far more common in the classes I observed. This was particularly true of EAL participants who had few L1 interlocutors in class or over the whole school. Participating EAL students from Thailand, the Philippines, Cambodia, Myanmar/Burma, Japan and Korea would, in particular, adopt the foxhole strategy with their EAL counterparts. For example, Padayao (from the Philippines) asserted of the other EAL students she knew “we are all into supporting each other. Similarly, Miyu (from Japan) identified that “I will study after school with my [EAL] friends.” This study would be in English medium as none of her EAL friends were Japanese. Miyu went on to state the reason for studying after school with other EAL students was “‘cause Seong [from Korea] is really really smart so if I have some questions that I don’t understand I can ask her and she explains it really really well.” For Miyu access to fellow EAL students’ knowledge created a safe space (foxhole) to enhance her understanding of content in English without L1 English peer, or teacher, judgement about her English.

When I asked Seong about this, she felt the relationship she had with Miyu and Kanda (from Thailand) was reciprocal and mutually beneficial. She stated “sharing ideas with my friends is good ... I can’t understand really sometimes, so if my friends help me it’s good.” These relationships were important for participants as a way to stave off social exclusion and break free of the assigned trajectory of being a passive but diligent student with limited English language skills. Seong succinctly summarised the importance of these relationships when she noted: “I had many fun times with my friends ... my friends helped

me understand and get good marks.” Here, this trio of girls are using the generative nature of habitus to reframe their learned set of dispositions in how they approach schooling. In short, they, by their deeds, break free of the categorical notions of passivity and unquestioning deference to pedagogical authority.

When students and teachers examine their own assumptions and beliefs about how scholarly identities are negotiated, they are able to redefine elements of capital that are valued. This enables renegotiation of scholarly habitus which is amenable to all students, including those in a linguistic or ethnic minority. Many of the students during the time of this research showed various kinds of post-reflexive assertions of their scholarly identities. Often these assertions rejected the majority established norms of how they should identify and perform as model minorities. Such was the case with Miyu, Seong and Kanda who chose to work with each other and be proactive about study outside of class rather than passive recipients of rote knowledge in class. These students began to assert scholarly identities based around their particular selves and their own existing knowledge and emerging needs, rather than their visible selves (Benesch, 2006) as generic, undifferentiated, EAL students.

By asserting their particular scholarly identities, rather than the visible identities ascribed to them externally, these students began to break the “illusion of unanimity” (Bourdieu, 1984) that manifests in categorisation. In a different kind of example, Harry sought to reject categorisation and assert his particular self when he stated: “I feel like if you are not trying to be yourself and be someone else then it won’t work well.” He wished to reject the categories ascribed to model minority Asian students of passivity and acceptance of pedagogical authority. He engaged in post reflexive choices (Adams, 2006) and sought to break free of the trajectory assigned to Asian students when he also asserted that “I don’t want to go to [university] ’cause I don’t have a passion for that. I want to take

my own course for my own sake.” In this example, Harry defies the illusion of unanimity that all Asian EAL students wish to go to university and to be seen to be following assigned academic trajectories. Harry was able to negotiate his own view of his scholarly identity and place value on skills and knowledge that he “had a passion for” such as automotive mechanical knowledge.

#### Student perceptions of breaking free of assigned trajectories

In my research, participating EAL students’ perceptions about their own willingness to attempt to break free of assigned trajectories was often linked to the depth of friendships they had with peers and their general comfort in interactions with them. For example, Leon stated in his last Year 13 interview: “I got more friends and I’m getting used to it and it’s the last year. I was like very shy [before] I wouldn’t talk to people.” In effect, the strengthening relationships with his friends, in Leon’s perception, helped him break free of the assigned trajectory of being the passive and quiet EAL student.

Kanda perceived that she was more willing to assert her point of view in class due to the comfort of having friends with her. She notes:

Well I’m a bit more comfortable in class and that I do say my point of view a lot in class now ... and I ask teachers a lot of questions ... I think ... like your friends in class, your classmates, does help when you like get comfortable around them and I can speak a bit more.

Kanda also noted that her participation in my research, and engaging in reflexivity around ideas about her language and scholarly identity, helped her become more comfortable with expressing herself. This helped her break free from a trajectory of silence as she asserted her point of view to me, someone who is, after all, seen as a pedagogical authority in the school. She stated of her participation in the research:

I think it made me feel a bit more comfortable, of telling other people how I feel about my study and stuff and that I get to talk to someone and my opinions does matter more and more. And it made me feel more comfortable and I can express my opinion more outside and elsewhere.

For Kanda, supportive relationships with her friends, and with me as a researcher, had helped her “speak more” and “feel a bit more comfortable of telling other people how [she] feels.” This created space for her to assert her particular self and break free of the trajectories assigned to her visible self.

In my research, students often perceived that being in Aotearoa/ New Zealand schooling helped them, over time, break free of trajectories assigned to them by parents as well, who for the most honourable reasons wish to see their children live the migrant dream. Kathy asserted:

In my culture, like any Asian culture, like the parents are really strict with grades so like you really have to pass and get straight A’s and stuff ... cause like when I was little, I was always one of the top like people in class cause they were always forced me to get the highest mark.

For Kathy the pressure from her parents to conform to “get straight A’s” was acutely felt when she was younger. However, over time as she built relationships in Aotearoa/New Zealand with L1 English and EAL peers, and grew in confidence, she was able to become more academically independent. She went on to say: “[now] they just let me do what I want ’cause I am passing and they trust me that I can do it.” Here it is not that Kathy is rejecting being a high-achieving student, rather she has built sufficient trust with her parents and friendships with her peers to be successful on her own terms.

Padayao had more stridently broken free of her familial assigned trajectory. She is very conscious of her own efforts to do this. She stated “everything my parents expected me to be I’m actually not. I’m a tom boy, I’m bi, I’m 18 and like usually they believe when you are 18 you should get married.” She asserted she felt these pressures and expectations would be more acute if she was “in the Philippines right now” but “a lot of the things [her] parents expected of [her] didn’t happen” as she felt she was able to break free of these trajectories. In Padayao’s case, her own strength of character in which she didn’t “like being influenced” has significantly contributed to her breaking free of the trajectory her parents assigned.

Udom had similar perceptions to Padayao around parental expectations and how he was able to break free of his assigned identity when he came to Aotearoa/New Zealand.

Udom explained:

Before [my parents] kind of forced me ... they send me to boarding school, that’s because at that time they wanted me to be like a soldier or like a high position ... yeah like you have to go to school you have to graduate then you work ... my parents are too strict, so strict ... It’s quite common, I mean most of the families in Thailand, ’cause you know what they have been told is the same thing over the centuries.

By way of contrast, Udom said that now he is in Aotearoa/New Zealand in a homestay situation as an international student his “parents are [now] actually quite open.” Udom perceived that they are open now because they regard him learning English as an economic advantage (as noted in previous chapters). Udom felt that now he was not “being forced by [his] parents” into a particular trajectory, he was able to “to do something else.”

The assigning of trajectories by people who hold authority over the participating students (be they teachers or parents) was a common theme that emerged in findings.

Participating students' perceptions around this theme strongly focused on the desire to break free of parental and pedagogical expectations. The EAL students felt more emboldened to break free when supported by the friendship of their peers. The desire to break free of assigned trajectories and the central importance of friends in aiding this desire has significant implications for the language use and negotiation of scholarly identities of participating EAL students.

#### Impact on language use

When students felt more confident to break free from the passive, silent state assigned to them by pedagogical authorities, they would more often engage in class-wide discussions. For example, Miyu's mathematics with her statistics teacher praised her in a report for "consistently [seeking] feedback throughout the term." Likewise, Jung Min was praised for "always ask[ing] for clarification if she is uncertain of what is required [and] regularly seek[ing] feedback opportunities to consolidate her understanding." Meanwhile, Kathy's history teacher noted that she "is proactive in seeking advice when needed." In all of these comments, students are praised for being proactive in seeking out the teacher. As these students' comfort with classmates grew, they gained more confidence to approach the teacher in an overt manner during class time as opposed to covertly after class. While positive, these interactions exclusively occurred in English and are framed by teachers in comments as the students', rather than their own, responsibility. This means that as the EAL students grew in confidence in class, English as the exclusive language of their learning came to be more crystallised as a concept.

For example, Jung Min had witnessed in her classmate Kanda this growing confidence and willingness to communicate in English. Jung Min stated:

She's changed a lot, like she's in my class and she was so quiet like I couldn't approach her in year 9 but now she's the one that always talks to me about like yeah ... whatever ... I haven't told this to her but I think its cause her English got better over time, so that could be one of the reasons and because, I mean, we've been together for 5 years our form class we kind of ... grew up together, so like she's become closer.

Again, the notions of close and friendly relationships with classmates developing over time came to the fore as students came to negotiate their scholarly identities in light of their language use.

#### Impact on the negotiation of scholarly identities

As students gained in confidence in class, and with English, they would also become more willing to engage in chat not strictly related to the work at hand. For example, Harry was engaged in a social conversation with his peer unrelated to the subject (history). His teacher spotted this, and this exchange then occurred:

History Teacher: Harry, I hope you talking about history son.

Harry: Yep good history Sir.

History Teacher: Good.

Harry then proceeded with the conversation with his peer after a few seconds. While this knowing exchange is familiar to any teacher, or indeed student who has spent time in a secondary school class, it is revealing in a number of ways. Firstly, Harry is breaking free of the silent and passive trajectory often assigned to EAL students by the mere act of the conversation. When challenged by the teacher he responds in a respectful but brazen way that he was talking about 'history Sir'. This response shows he is not disrespectful to his teacher but willing to subtly subvert the image of the teacher as pedagogical authority who

must be obeyed. When I asked Harry about this incident his response revealed much about how he framed his particular scholarly identity. Harry stated:

For me, it's more the interests I have in like what I want to do, such as history this year. I wanted to change and go to a different class and I couldn't really cause of it like being full and other stuff like that so yeah, I've had to stay in that and I haven't done so well cause I haven't found any interest in doing the work.

Here Harry's relaxed response to the incident in his history class indicates that his socialising in class was due to a lack of desire to do the subject. He felt that his subject choices were constrained so he did not feel like he needed to invest his scholarly identity in his history class due to a lack of interest. Harry went on to note he is aware that this approach to negotiating his scholarly identity differs from many of his fellow EAL students. Harry asserted many fellow EAL students default to a kind of scholarly identity assigned to them by their "parents like some people in [his ESOL class] they say 'oh I didn't do that well' and like they will push further" and continue to try to adhere to their assigned trajectories.

Just as with Harry in history, Leon has been identified by some of his teachers as "spending too much time socialising in class." While cast in a negative light, this socialising might, in fact, be a way for EAL students to break free of the scholarly identity assigned to them by pedagogical and parental authorities. In the case of Harry, he freely admitted that he did not wish to align his identity in school with a subject he had no interest in. In the case of Leon, his socialisation might, in fact, be productive in negotiating a scholarly identity which invests in a particular subject. As noted in the previous section, participating EAL students noted a positive correlation between their comfort in class and willingness to communicate with peers. Kathy was very sociable in her media studies class as she took this class with students (both EAL and English L1) she identified as being friends with since Year

9. She was comfortable with her peers and her language was mostly directed to peers for social purposes. The following exchange is emblematic of the mix of social and subject related chat Kathy and her peers engaged in during media studies:

Kathy: So, you're coming to my birthday?

Peer: What day?

Kathy: Saturday.

Peer: What date?

Kathy: 30th.

Peer: I'm back on the 25th.

Kathy: How long are you going to stay?

Peer: 4-5 days.

Kathy: That's the first week of the holidays, right?

Peer: Second but my mum's making me do all the work to look for places to stay.

Kathy: Trivago.

Peer: What?

Kathy: Go on Trivago ... you know that website.

Peer: Hang on [typing] ... guys where's some nice accommodation in Queenstown?

Kathy: Ok so we are filming ... what period?

Peer: Lunch and 5th.

Kathy: Can we film during bio?

Peer: Probably not.

Kathy: So, we are filming lunch and 5th period. 5th period is media?

Peer: Yeah.

Kathy: So, we are not filming second period?

Peer: No. Why would we film second period?

Kathy: I thought you said 2nd period what do we have last?

Peer: Media.

Kathy: Where are we going to film now? ... can you send me the script so I know?

This conversation combines the logistics of her peer planning her holiday and Kathy planning her birthday with the logistics of the group planning their filming for a media studies assessment. In this interaction, Kathy clearly had a strong social bond with her peers, discussing her birthday party with them but this did not serve to undermine the scholarly objective of the filming task. Indeed, I would argue that the strong social bond of Kathy and her peers has helped Kathy negotiate her scholarly identity in this particular task around being a contributor in the co-construction of a film to achieve assessment success.

More broadly, one of the strengths of the Aotearoa/New Zealand classroom that I identified in my research was that participating EAL students found the learning environment fun and friendly. Students liked when they were able to work with peers and often regarded this as one of the key differences to the learning environment in their home countries. For example, Miyu stated in her final Year 12 interview, "I think New Zealand school is much fun cause we can talk to each other." Classroom communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998) can be reconfigured by teachers and students by building relationships to take better advantage of these existing strengths.

In my research, students expressed relationships with teachers and peers in their community of practice being important for their ongoing investment in schooling. Kathy demonstrated this clearly in her initial Year 12 interview when she stated:

[Teachers can help by] actually knowing what I need to achieve in school so like after school you could ask students if they need help or they could come to you and they

could ask you questions about how you're going in your studies and stuff being kind of friends with your students actually knowing your students.

Jung Min also asserted a preference for teachers with a more relational style. As shown by this exchange:

Jung Min: I think I'm good with teachers that actually talk to me a lot... young teachers [laughs]. I tend to get along well with young teachers.

Brian: Why do you think you get along better with the younger rather than older teachers?

Jung Min: I think talking's easier [with them].

Brian: So easier to relate to?

Jung Min: Yep.

Jung Min was more able to engage with these teachers, particularly younger ones, who she felt adopted a more relational style. This kind of community of practice enhanced her sense of investment in those particular classes. The tendency to find difficulty with, and divestment from, a class was notably lessened when a teacher cultivated a dialogic community of practice which encouraged support and built real ongoing relationships with and between students. Padayao summed it up well when she stated, "there aren't any classes I find difficult only because I have a lot of support from my teachers and peers." She, just like Kathy, Miyu and Jung Min, felt accepted and supported in her classes. In each case, the cultivating of a more dialogic community of practice enhanced the students' scholarly investment and created spaces for them to negotiate scholarly identities on their own terms.

Breaking free of assigned trajectories had various impacts on the scholarly identities of participating EAL students. Some, like Harry, tended to divest from a scholarly identity in

a particular subject and focus on socialising. Others, like Leon, Udom, Kathy and Jung Min negotiated scholarly identities which were based on a mix of social and academic interactions in class. Notably the examples given earlier are all examples of when students break free of assigned trajectories using the medium of English. There were also examples when participants adopted a strategy of using both L1 and English to break free of a different trajectory, that of a monolingual scholarly identity. In these cases, participating students renegotiated their scholarly identities by investing in the scholarly use of translingual practices.

### Strategies to Utilise Translingual Practices and Renegotiate Scholarly Investment

Scholarly Investment (Norton, 1997, 2000; Norton-Pierce, 1995) can be renegotiated and enhanced to include existing linguistic and cultural capital when an EAL student feels they have a strong relationship with their teacher and are a valued part of the community of practice. A learned set of dispositions around an appropriate way to learn creates a scholarly habitus (Watkins & Noble, 2013). A scholarly habitus, in turn, cultivates notions of scholarly identities and the way an EAL student should play the role of a good student.

When teachers help manifest practice that encourages active learning and use of meaning-making resources, this will, in turn, create spaces in which EAL students can develop a learned set of dispositions and identity that favours use of L1 meaning-making resources in their studies. When an EAL student feels that their existing capital is recognised as intrinsic to the development of their scholarly identity and habitus, they will have a higher degree of investment in that particular classroom community of practice.

As we have seen, for example, Jung Min was one of the EAL student participants who felt that she had positive relationships with her teacher and that she had a scholarly habitus of an active learner. In her advanced-stream English class, she displayed a high level of

scholarly investment. She appeared relaxed and willing to interact during group discussions. Her contributions to the group showed a high level of comprehension. She followed teacher instructions with no further cues required. Jung Min's high degree of scholarly investment in a very high-level class with strong academic English requirements was reinforced by the community of practice cultivated by the teacher. The teacher offered a very organised and structured lesson with set groups already on the board and clear learning outcomes and expectations for the groups. She offered strong feed-forward comments as she circulated around the groups and allowed space for a reflective academic environment which encouraged students to comment. Here Jung Min was free to make use of all the meaning-making resources she felt appropriate. In this case, however, these resources were exclusively drawn from her use of English not her L1 (Korean). Her scholarly investment was enhanced by being empowered and regarded as a co-constructor of knowledge. It could, however, be further enhanced by the pedagogical inclusion of Jung Min's L1 as a meaning-making resource in the co-construction of knowledge.

The idea of investment (Norton, 1997, 2000; Norton-Pierce, 1995) encapsulates EAL students' relationship with English and their L1 in the context of their education. The extent to which students feel their L1 is recognised as a meaning-making resource will influence their sense of investment in their L1 as a form of symbolic capital. This, in turn, comes to manifest dispositions toward learning, which influence EAL students' negotiation of scholarly identities.

In some classes, teachers would explicitly encourage scholarly investment in both L1 and English. For example, the ESOL teacher of Daniel, Leon, Udom and Miyu said to the class, "I encourage you to use your own language." Seong likewise felt a relationship with

her geography teacher could be cultivated around the fact that this teacher taught in Korea for a number of years and gained some knowledge of Korean. She stated:

Seong: ...for my geo teacher, he used to teach in Korea so he like can speak a little bit of Korean and he can sympathise more about second language students, cause he knows we struggle with English and geo is very English based.

Brian: And it helps he understands a bit of Korean as well?

Seong: Yeah and some more like social stuff, so he compares with Korean social things 'cause like I know Korea a lot more than New Zealand so he just compare[s] it.

Here, Seong's teacher acknowledged her existing funds of knowledge via comparisons between Korea and Aotearoa/New Zealand that they both understood. This helped build a relationship based on dialogue, shared knowledge and trust. The building of relationships with teachers who encourage the use of both English and L1 had a beneficial effect on EAL students' perception of their own language and identities. This, in turn, enhanced their scholarly investment in particular classes.

#### Students' investment in their L1

Some students perceived that they had greater comfort with disciplinary literacies in their L1. For example, Daniel, who was an international student from China and had been in Aotearoa/New Zealand for one year, felt he was academically stronger in Chinese than in English. The following exchange shows Daniel's reasoning:

Brian: So, would you be more comfortable sitting [exams] in Chinese or English?

Daniel: Of course, Chinese.

Brian: Explain why?

Daniel: It's easier to understand. Like in physics we have some explanation questions and in English I don't have some of the words so in Chinese it would be way better.

Here Daniel is expressing that he has existing disciplinary literacy in Chinese for the physics concepts but has not yet developed these literacies in English. He therefore has access to these linguistic resources and expressed that he identifies his L1 with his education.

#### Impact on language use

By learning from EAL students' existing social strategies and linguistic practices, teachers may engage in translanguaging (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; Garcia & Li, 2014) practices in class which promote both English and EAL students' L1 as meaning-making resources.

Engaging in and enhancing the relationships with EAL learners by teachers provide the foundation for a more inclusive educational environment. This would embrace the inherently translingual social environment characteristics of these participants' lived experiences. Kathy's chats during her break time are emblematic of this translingual lived experience:

Brian: And when you hang out at morning tea and lunch would you be like discussing the day's events in English or would it be in your first language?

Kathy: 'Cause our language is kind of like both English and Taga[log] ... Philippines so we just put them together.

She will then return from her translingual milieu of break time to the monolingual milieu of class time. A translingual approach to language in class breaks the artifice of linguistic silos created by the monolingual mindset of education in mainstream Aotearoa/New Zealand classes. This approach would acknowledge participants, like Daniel, who feel comfortable making use of their L1 in demanding academic settings with discipline-specific vocabulary. In

my research, these participants, for the most part, had already learned subject-specific concepts in their L1 or had ongoing discussions with interlocutors in their L1 about concepts. As such they had adopted a translingual approach to their education environment which was very much independent of the direction of the teacher and wider school and national educational policies. For example, Kanda noted during this exchange about the exam script hypothetical question:

Brian: So, if you had to write exams in Thai do you think you would be comfortable with that?

Kanda: Yeah yes.

Brian: Why do you think that?

Kanda: Because I usually talk to my friends about what I study so I try to translate that so I can talk to my friends and they can help me.

Brian: Are these friends back in Thailand?

Kanda: Yes.

For Kanda, the key factor in developing her L1 disciplinary literacies was retaining contact with friends in Thailand and discussing subject concepts with them in her L1. This gave her the access to subject specific content in her L1 which was not available in class. Kanda had been in Aotearoa/New Zealand longer than many of the participants who did not feel comfortable with L1 disciplinary literacies. The crucial difference was that she maintained active contact with, and access to, L1 resources that helped her develop her L1 disciplinary literacies, including her Thai friends back in Thailand. These resources were cultivated by Kanda independently of her teachers and school. This also contrasts with participants who had been in Aotearoa/New Zealand for longer periods of time, who had perhaps lost contact with L1 peers in their country of origin. Language use of both English and L1 for academic

purposes can help develop and maintain scholarly investment based around translingualism and not monolingualism.

#### Impact on the negotiation of scholarly identities

When participating students did have access to linguistic resources in their L1 that could develop their L1 disciplinary literacies, they developed learned dispositions and expressed post-reflexive choices which bring their L1 with their academic identities into greater alignment. Crucially, it was not length of time, or whether the student was a migrant or international student, that seemed to be the significant factor in whether the students felt comfortable with L1 disciplinary literacies. Rather, it was access to socially constructed communities of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) in their L1 that helped these students acquire L1 disciplinary literacies. These communities of practice could have been the classes in which students had learnt concepts in their country of origin or, as with Kanda, peer groups they retained contact with and discussed concepts using their L1. In each case, students had access to socially constructed linguistic concepts which could act to complement the English-based disciplinary vocabularies learnt in their Aotearoa/New Zealand classes.

In cases where students felt they did not have access to linguistic resources, be they L1 peer groups or existing disciplinary literacies in their L1, these participants tended to exclusively favour English when negotiating their scholarly identities. These participants had manifested a scholarly habitus that valorised English as the language of academia. This scholarly habitus was acquired via a learned set of dispositions in a context of academic linguistic isolation from their L1. Given language is a socially constructed phenomenon, it is little wonder that those students, denied opportunity to construct academic language in a

social environment with L1 peers, did not make use of their existing conversational and academic language competences to extend and acquire L1 disciplinary literacies.

The pressure of NCEA assessment and the need to deliver content such that students can acquire credits is often the justification for traditional transmission-style pedagogy conducted in an exclusively symbolically valued English medium environment. When consistently exposed to this environment, EAL students develop an individualised scholarly habitus that values English as the language of scholarship to the detriment of their L1. However, students breaking free of these trajectories, who are often helped by the actions of individual teachers, show that this need not be the case. Even with the pressures of NCEA assessment, a more collaborative and transformative style of pedagogy may be engaged in that encourages all students to utilise all the existing funds of knowledge they possess, including their L1.

My research shows that this style of pedagogy can help EAL students overcome the pressures of high-stakes assessment and cultivate a translingual scholarly habitus which values both L1 and English as essential meaning-making resources. This is the case with Miyu's attempts to maintain her academic Japanese, as she notes in this interaction:

Brian: So now that you have done all this academic learning in English how do you think you will cope going back to the Japanese learning environment?

Miyu: I used to have the online class like after school in Japanese so ...

Brian: So, you have taken the initiative to keep up your own Japanese academic language?

Miyu: Yep.

Brian: Would you find it helpful if the school did that sort of thing as well like helped you maintain your Japanese academic language

Miyu: Yeah [laughs].

Here Miyu demonstrates a clear desire to invest in translingual academic practices. This desire to invest in translingual practices has particular impact on the cultivation of translingual scholarly identities and related pedagogical practices.

### Translingual Practices and Transformative Pedagogy

Transformative pedagogy, according to Banks (1995), comes to question and renegotiate habitus to a less essentialised view. As noted in previous sections, EAL students' scholarly habitus tends to be essentialised in more traditional styles of pedagogy around model minority characteristics which induced passivity in the learners.

When a participating EAL student felt the teacher knew them well as a particular person, and not an essentialised model minority, they felt more comfortable questioning their construction as passive learners. This was the case for Kathy, as demonstrated during this interview interaction:

Brian: Ok so how are you feeling about your teachers this year?

Kathy: Oh, I like all my teachers this year, especially my English [teacher], she is very helpful like when we need more time with work, she will give more time.

Brian: So, you feel you have quite a positive relationship with her?

Kathy: Yeah so, I can go to her with my work and like ask questions if I want to, she's like really open minded and not biased.

As noted earlier, this was a class in which Kathy felt she was a key member of the community of practice and was free to draw on meaning-making resources as she wished. The positive relationship and co-constructed nature of the pedagogy coupled with the teachers' adaptability and open mind all contributed to the development of a less essentialised scholarly habitus and a more transformative pedagogical environment. The

one key element missing in this otherwise transformative pedagogical environment is the incorporation of Kathy's, and other EAL students', translingual identities and practices.

Pang and Macdonald's (2015) study of Chinese students in Australia found that these students construct their identities over transnational boundaries but this identity construction is often not identified by their Australian educators. When teachers and students engage in a dialogue around how the students construct their scholarly habitus, educators are more likely to utilise factors from EAL students' translingual identities. When educators move away from an essentialist view of the EAL student as either representing or diverging from characteristics of the model minority, they are more able to see the student as a particular individual and build a mutually constructive relationship with them.

EAL students in a reflexive, non-essentialised environment are also able to cultivate a scholarly habitus which invests a high degree of capital in their L1 as intrinsic to their scholarly identities. When these students feel able to make use of a wider range of meaning making resources in class, such as their L1, they will be able to more meaningfully benefit from transformative pedagogy. This is the kind of pedagogy that reconfigures communities of practice and values the forms of capital of the increasingly multilingual communities in modern Aotearoa/New Zealand society. This approach better aligns with the lived experiences of today's Aotearoa/New Zealand high school students.

#### Students' perceptions of translingual practices

Some students expressed, during interviews and journaling, the usefulness of using combined L1/English study methods (such as bilingual flash cards/study notes) during exam preparations. This propensity toward translingual study practices particularly emerged towards the end of the academic year. This contrasted with resistance to making use of their L1 in academic contexts, displayed by many during initial interviews. For example,

Daniel said he was going to some group revision in Chinese when he stated in his final year 12 interview: “I will do revision with my friends, three or four friends want me to teach them maths and maybe that will help me revise.” Here Daniel is adopting translingual practices in which he is revising with his Chinese L1 peers for an English-medium assessment. Notably, Daniel is also positioned as the expert, which allowed him to more comprehensively link his scholarly identity with his existing linguistic capital in Chinese.

When teachers develop a reflexive awareness of the variety of linguistic resources in their class, they can more effectively cultivate translingual scholarly habitus and identities in which students make use of both their L1 and English. Kanda suggests “sometimes with more complicated topics it’s like try to do things slower.” Here Kanda suggests an awareness on the teacher’s part of the often-onerous language requirements of subject content on, in particular, EAL students. Which could lead to more scaffolded and contextualised forms of pedagogy and revision. This would create a space for students to make use of their L1 in class and during revision and adopt a translingual scholarly habitus and identity to help with this contextualisation.

Students often made use of their L1 in study outside of class as a complement to the learning they had done in class, in English. Padayao stated of her study habits, for example:

Padayao: we usually do study groups, like especially for geography for example, my best friend, the one I said I speak Tagalog to, he hates the paper I’m really good at. I hate the paper he loves, so often we all get together in group and we all study together.

Here Padayao is making use of her L1 to help both her and her best friend with the achievement standards in which each has a respective strength.

When I asked students at the end of the research period for their reflections upon the benefits of participating in the research, EAL student responses ranged from a focus on language use to a focus on identities. For example, Padayao stated in this interaction:

Brian: Do you think talking about these issues over the past few years and thinking about these issues has helped you in any way?

Padayao: I think it does cause it kind of forces me to reflect on how I can improve. It does make me think about like the really great and fun moments I have with friends when I'm sharing a language and the fact, I'm not Pākehā, in fact I'm actually Filipino. It does give me a bit of a sense and insight.

Elaine, an L1 speaker of Karen, stated if she was talking to her younger self she would "advise myself to read books in my language." She further stated:

I would like to do that [use her language for school work] but I have no time ... like when I start to read it, like there are lots of words that I don't understand and I have to ask my parents cause, yeah, I don't know where to find the dictionary.

Here Elaine identified her aspirations to retain and use her L1 are stifled by a lack of time and L1 resources.

Kathy also noted the benefits of thinking about her L1 (Tagalog) and identity during the research. She stated:

without this [research] I don't think I would be about to think about my language and how it's important to me ... so yeah, like with this and with the questions, it helped me remind me of my background as well and how it's important to keep your own language.

When asked to reflect upon language use and identities in school, many of the participants asserted a desire to retain and use L1 in school but still often felt constraints on this desire.

As Daniel noted, “yeah I really want to like talk about the Chinese culture with my friends and this really beautiful language and the grammar is really beautiful but they don’t know anything.” The development of translingual identities thus only occurs when students have both the opportunity and desire to make use of their L1 as an essential meaning-making resource in school.

#### Impact on language use

I observed many clear examples of translingualism in action among participating EAL students. Daniel, Leon and Shane would often communicate in Chinese in classes they shared. Some teachers promoted this while others reviled it. Regardless of the teachers’ perceptions of their L1, the use of Chinese provided some contextual support for their learning. In other examples, students would make use of their L1 with other EAL students’ who spoke a different L1. For example, Leon and Udom were working on a task together and Udom was encouraged, by the teacher, to use his Thai to look up websites. The following interaction occurred:

Udom to Leon: I feel like my topic is too hard.

ESOL Teacher: [Comes over] you feel like your topic is...?

Udom: Too hard I can’t find anything.

ESOL Teacher: Why don’t you research in Thai ... research in your first language?

Udom: Err ...

Teacher: There is no reason [not to] ... as long as the notes you are taking and recording is in English so I am able to analyse it, then you can do your research in your own language ... I still need the resources like the URL and that ... can you search in Thai in this?

Udom: Yeah, I think so.

Teacher: Show me how.

Udom: Umm I need a ...

ESOL Teacher: .... different browser?

Us: Thai translate ... I mean key board cause...

Leon: I know what you're talking about.

ESOL Teacher: I need to know how to enter Thai on the key board, can you do it?

Leon: Yep (searching on computer) Keyboard ... language... yep change keyboard language.

ESOL Teacher: [To Leon] ok great, so you show him ... [to Udom] then you can write in Thai and if you remember this pathway this will help you not only here but in other subjects ... if you do that it would make me happy.

This interaction is a wonderful example of the effects the positive positioning of L1 by teachers and peers can have on translingual practices. In this case, neither Leon nor the teacher spoke Thai but they both helped facilitate Udom's use of Thai which ultimately benefited his research, as he was able to find much more information in his L1 than in English. The promotion of these translingual practices by this particular teacher was not unique to Udom. He also encouraged Miyu by asking "do you know there is a way of writing in Japanese on the browser?"

EAL students can also be positioned as experts when their L1 is utilised. This was the case with Miyu when she was tasked with being a buddy for a Japanese exchange student. Miyu was able to be positioned as holding expertise that teachers did not and this helped Miyu affirm the role of her L1 in school. The wider promotion and use of L1 in class, as with the examples shown in this section, can thus have a positive feedback effect on students' scholarly investment and the negotiation of scholarly identities in relation to their L1.

### Impact on scholarly identity

Translingual scholarly identities can be negotiated when teachers adopt collaborative styles of pedagogy. Some teachers did display this style during observed lessons which often contained assessment work. It was perhaps most evident in classes that had assessments around large ongoing project work, such as Udom's digital technology 201 class and Elaine's and Shane's art 201 class.

The teacher in Udom's digital technology 201, for example, had a collaborative teaching style with helpful clear instructions at the start of the lesson. She provided multiple templates and denoted key stages and check-ins of progress on a 10 credit NCEA project creating a portfolio of design work. Udom was communicative with the teacher, seemed comfortable with one-on-one interactions, and was responsive to teacher interactions. The teacher also encouraged him to seek out online resources in Thai which helped him do the assessment. These multiple, contextual cues and use of meaning-making resources enabled Udom to negotiate a translingual scholarly identity in this class for the purposes of his assessment. He was able to ask specific questions of the teacher during one-on-one interactions and to seek clarity around the task. The teacher used Udom's visual diary as an example to two other students who were struggling as to what to do. Here Udom's existing linguistic capital was valued and becomes intrinsically linked to his identity as a successful scholar in this class.

Equally, during Elaine and Shane's art class, the teacher encouraged opportunities to manifest a translingual scholarly habitus. This teacher also had a collaborative teaching style, making recommendations around each student's art project, and allowing students to make final decisions around what art to do. From this, she facilitated and made recommendations around processes and appropriate resources to use. This included the

encouraging of student research of different art styles online, including ones from their country from websites that are L1 medium. The strong use of visual aids and teacher collaboration created a much less pressured assessment environment in which both Elaine and Shane were able to use elements of their first language and culture in their art.

In an environment which promotes translingual practices, EAL students are more able to negotiate scholarly identities based on their already existing translingualism. This interaction with Daniel exemplified the desires and complexities associated with translingualism.

Brian: So, you would ideally like both of them [English and Chinese] to be strong?

Daniel: But cannot be the top strong ... 'cause I'm just human.

Brian: So, you feel you can't push all that information into your head?

David: Yeah yeah yeah you are confused sometimes ... but my friend who don't like the Chinese culture they don't care they just keep going the New Zealand way.

Jung Min echoed a similar point in this statement:

Jung Min: Oh, I've always felt that like I'm a Korean but a New Zealander at the same time I never like see myself as one thing and not the other thing.

Brian: So, you feel comfortable having that dual identity?

Jung Min: Yeah.

The dual nature of language and identity is also expressed by Kathy.

Kathy: I'm comfortable with it now, cause ... like my friends even if they are Filipino, they still speak English.

Brian: So, you feel you can exist pretty easily in both environments?

Kathy: Yeah, I just blend it.

Brian: And you've already mention that in your language anyway is a mix of English and Tagalog?

Kathy: Yeah, we don't really speak Filipino 'cause I can't really speak like full Filipino ... it's still my first language I still want to learn it I wanna learn both .... Yeah, it's like balance.

For Kathy, as with other EAL participants who engaged in a reflection on the role of L1 and identity, it was not a matter of having to sacrifice her Tagalog in favour of English. Rather, Kathy asserted a blended, balanced identity. This kind of identity is more conducive to making use of translingual practices and the ongoing, dynamic negotiation of scholarly identities based in both the use of English and EAL students' L1.

## Discussion

Reflexivity has been central to my research. It has helped participating EAL students refine their understandings of their own translingualism and the role it plays in their schooling. Reflexivity has also helped me as a researcher in refining my own understanding of EAL students, not as *visible* selves but as *particular* selves. I found out about the different personalities and approaches to language use and identities of all my participants. This helped me to see the participants as particular selves and enhanced our relationship as researcher and participants. Indeed, the very act of categorisation of a student being *EAL*, which is central to this thesis, is an act of universalisation (and reductionism). This term itself should be subject to reflexive critique when we recognise the particulars of individual students.

Central to the recognition of particular selves is the questioning of a dialogue of a universal academic trajectory for EAL students. As noted in this chapter, participants wished to assert their own particular views about desired academic trajectories, rather than simply

to accede to others' categorisations and/or expectations of them. These student assertions often were in line with normative notions of movement to tertiary studies. Some students, however, constructed alternative views about their desired academic trajectories.

Furthermore, EAL students' desire to engage in translanguaging in their schooling was heavily influenced by factors such as L1 competence and time in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

Participants increasingly recognised over the two years of research how their L1 was present, or otherwise in their schooling. They sought to grapple with this recognition simultaneously expressing a desire for increased L1 use in school but understanding the impediments that existed to this.

My understanding of the particular views of participating EAL students has made me call into question and reject universalising notions of "model minority" EAL students who work diligently and follow a uniform academic trajectory to enter higher academic institutions. This understanding recognises the complex relationship between linguistic and cultural fluidity and seeks to avoid essentialism of the particular role L1. Miller (2000), researching migrant students in Australia, notes that language use is influenced by identity and social interaction. Factors such as self-representation within institutional contexts, availability of language resources and social identities were identified by Miller (2000) as influencing language use. Academic trajectories are messy and not uniform. The relationship between L1 and learning varies widely for each EAL student over the course of their own particular academic trajectory.

Teachers can also reflect upon how they assign trajectories and recognise the diversity of identities constructed in relation to school and future pathways. Opportunities for students to construct their identities across transnational boundaries can allow EAL students to move from the periphery of a community of practice to its centre. This happens

when the L1 of all the participants in the community of practice becomes intrinsic to the success and advancement of the community of practice as a whole.

The importance of relationships in helping develop self-reflexive strategies cannot be overstated. Students' peer groups were of central importance to them, be they L1-English-speaking peers (as was the case of many of Kathy's friends in classes), or fellow EAL peers (such as the relationships of Kanda, Seong and Miyu or Jung Min and Kanda). When students are in peer groups with L1 English speakers or EAL students with a different L1 to their own, the socialising factors determine that English is the choice of languages (Clyne, 1991a, 1991b). When, however, EAL students are in peer groups with fellow L1 speakers, space is created to make the choice to use L1 for learning.

Another important relationship for EAL students identified in this chapter was with their parents. Some felt high expectations placed on them by parents. Others, such as Leon, Harry, Kathy and Jung Min felt that their parents were more positive when it came to their schooling in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Parental expectations weigh on all students but this weight may be all the more heavily laden on the participating EAL migrant students in my study. These students recognised the additional expectation by their parents that they should live the migrant dream and/or acquire English as a tool for economic advancement.

The final relationship of great importance for participants was the teacher–student relationship. Some teachers were vocal in their negation of students' L1 and the need for EAL students to rapidly assimilate to the pedagogical and linguistic English language norms of Manawa High School. Other teachers held views which promoted L1 as a useful resource and an opportunity to “build a community” of learning based in the use of all community members' funds of knowledge.

The latter teachers are more likely to build a relationship with EAL students which enhances the students' scholarly investment in their own L1. The attachment of value to L1 and the aligning of this capital value with that of the school space can enhance EAL students' relationship between their L1 and their identities as scholars. Teachers can encourage the sharing of translingual study methods such as those already identified by participants in this chapter. A vocal teacher acting as an advocate for EAL students' L1 can help shift these students' default study habits away from a monolingual mind-set and towards a translingual mind-set. A co-construction of knowledge based in dialogue, along with an understanding of the diversity of the translingual practices of EAL students, can create more genuine opportunities for learning than the meritocratic façade of the monolingual English language norm of Manawa High School.

These lofty goals are by no means easy to implement. The co-construction of discipline-specific knowledge and literacy based in the use of students' existing funds of knowledge is an inherently democratising process. Democratic teaching practices are noisy, often messy (Law, 2007), and inefficient. It is much easier for a teacher to default to transmission-style pedagogy more akin to an autocracy. Under an autocrat, subjects are silenced and the efficient will of the leader is implemented. Teachers tend towards privileging the efficiency of content delivery, due to pressures of NCEA over the noisy, but ultimately more effective, co-construction of knowledge. There are understandable difficulties for teachers in the implementation of a more dialogic, translingual pedagogy. There will be wide variability of L1 abilities of L1 students and ever-present and rapidly increasing level of linguistic demands associated with discipline-specific literacies. Listening to the particulars of EAL students' experiences will help teachers and researchers adapt to the linguistic variability of these students and embrace the potential of translingualism as a

resource for learning. Tamati's (2016) concept of transacquisition in which L1 and English are used interdependently as mutually reinforcing resources is useful here. Transacquisition, when applied to pedagogy, allows for the possibility of meeting the social necessity of English and reducing the symbolic violence associated with the exclusion of L1 from pedagogy. The embracing transacquisition as a core pedagogical method by pedagogical authorities will lead to an enhanced investment in EAL students L1 over time. This, in turn, helps the negotiation of scholarly identities which recognises both L1 and English as intrinsically valuable elements in the learning of disciplinary knowledge and wider academic success for EAL students.

## Chapter 9: Conclusion

My research was motivated by the desire to understand the relationship between EAL students' language use and their negotiation of scholarly identities. This focus had arisen because, as a teacher at Manawa High, I had become acutely aware of the link between the personal, political and educational, and the associated difficulties of being an EAL student in an Aotearoa/New Zealand schooling context. As such, I wanted my research to help make a critical but pragmatic difference to the EAL participants who were generous enough to join in on this research journey. In beginning this journey along the path of discovery that is PhD research, I quickly discovered that the relationship between language and identity was vastly more complicated and contradictory than I had initially anticipated. My research was a response to the demographic changes I saw in my own classroom over my years as an economics teacher. The diversity of participants purposefully selected in my research is reflective of the diversity of my classes more broadly.

Generalisations are not appropriate for such a diverse range of students, even from such a small sample. Nuance is required when considering the realities and experience of these students. Each participant's particular experiences and perceptions were inherently their own. As such, this research has been cognisant of the need to explore the particulars of individuals and to reject universal ascriptions based on categorical traits.

Universalisms such as the construction by pedagogical authorities of Asian EAL students as the model minority were explicitly critiqued through a social constructivist approach. Duff (2000) identified a process of socialising novices in a particular setting to think, feel and act in accordance with the values, ideologies and traditions of the group. The notion of a model minority imposes a specific set of dispositions around how an EAL student

*should* frame their scholarly identity. The socialising of EAL students by pedagogical authorities too often accords with the notion students should seek to adhere to their positioning as the model minority in the group.

The adoption of Bourdieu's theory as method encouraged an interpretivist and reflexive approach to my findings in which I constantly sought to feed back my interpretations to participants so their voice had an ongoing input into the findings.

This process of voice-informed findings helped me clarify the relationship between language use and the negotiation of scholarly identities for the EAL students in my study. For example, the participants helped me understand the nuance around how they see their own scholarly identity in relation to L1 and English. Variability was clear amongst participants, some like Leon (an international student from Hong Kong), were not disposed to use their L1 in school and tended to favour English use over L1 in school and with peers outside school. Others, like Kathy (a migrant student from the Philippines), had experienced elite private education in English-medium education in their home countries. In this case English was already established in the home country as holding an elite status. Clearly when English is privileged over L1 even in the students' home country the tendency will be for that student to favour their L1 even less when they move to an English-dominant country such as Aotearoa/New Zealand. Participants' complex relationship to language use was a continual theme that arose in this research. They and their teachers raised this theme in various forums. Various, L1 was constructed as enhancing or undermining the chances of scholarly success in the Aotearoa/New Zealand secondary school context. These constructions, on the part of both participating EAL students and their teachers, served to frame the terms of the EAL students' scholarly identities as being negotiated translingually, in both L1 and English, or monolingually in English only.

My findings revealed that EAL students tended to want to acquire English rapidly, along with all its attendant capital value. This is because of the generative nature of habitus formation, leading students to construct scholarly identities that place a high value on the symbolic capital of English. This default desire, by the students' own identifications, often undermined their L1 use. It must be noted however, that, while this habitus is generative and deeply established, it is not unchangeable. For example, when considering Harry's approach to his scholarly habitus we can see shifts over time. Early in his high school years Harry felt he diverged from the model minority archetype. He felt he did not focus, had little work ethic or deference to pedagogical authorities. He, however renegotiated his own scholarly identity to align with doing the scholarly work necessary to become a qualified mechanic. Harry felt he needed to focus in important classes relevant to achieving this goal and less so in classes with little relevance to his own academic trajectory. Harry could be seen as divergent from the model minority and a particular learned set of dispositions that adhere to this model. He has, however, reformed his own scholarly identity such that he constructs a learned set of dispositions sufficient to meet his own measure of success. Countering the generation of a particular (monolingual – either/or) scholarly habitus, is essential to opening up avenues for alternative dialogue around scholarly habitus. The role of bridging forms of habitus should be emphasised here. For example, Wise and Velayuthan (2013) note intercultural habitus can be developed by interacting with key individuals in EAL students' communities such as shop owners or pastors. Similarly, Bauder (2005) argued that migrant habitus can be developed through existing shared ethnic and language networks. Each of these bridging forms of habitus help create alternatives for new dialogue in class as alternative learned sets of dispositions are integrated into a more fully informed notion of scholarly habitus.

Teachers play a key role in working with EAL students to proactively promote students' L1 as a meaning-making resource. Since language use and identity are informed by social interaction (Miller, 2000), teachers and students could work together to create institutional contexts and language resources which enhance the role of L1 in the everyday social interactions of school which come to frame the norms of the classroom. This reframing of class norms sees the key role of the teacher as an advocate for EAL students' L1, acting at the forefront to counter the symbolic violence inherent in the dominance of English-only pedagogy.

My research shows that seemingly contradictory Ministry of Education policy documents around L1 and/or English language use can, in fact, be reflected upon as complementary and can also frame L1 as intrinsic to the rapid acquisition of English and disciplinary-specific literacies. I also contend that, at a school level, principals and school administrators should be reflective of the messages they are sending in their promotional materials about the dominance of English and the relative absence of talk about the value of L1 in learning, in these materials.

At a class level, as already noted, teachers as advocates acting against the tendency toward pedagogical authority can cultivate a more overtly translingual scholarly environment in their classes. One way of cultivating this environment would be to apply feedback loops to pedagogy. Hammond and Gibbons (2005) have suggested a scaffolding model which could support EAL learners in mainstream settings. This model provides teachers with a systemic approach to implementing feedback loops in their pedagogy. A sequence which makes use of student prior knowledge coupled with the scaffolding of semiotic elements through the teachers' elicitation of verbal and gestural cues. Hammond and Gibbons (2005) assert that this process be sequenced so that student prospectiveness

and productive sequencing increase with time. The development of a dual metalinguistic and metacognitive awareness is the aim of this process. Students' attention to language elements and self-production of these elements increase over time when explicit focus is drawn to the elements. The same prospectiveness and productive sequencing should include an EAL student's L1 given this prior knowledge is essential to Hammond and Gibbons (2005) "supporting up" scaffolding model. Handing over to students the productive element of transferring existing understanding to new tasks is a dialogic model that can enhance the teacher–student relationship. This helps EAL students see the options available to them that are created by their own affective and cognitive resources for a translingual negotiation of classroom practice. These practices can enhance EAL students' scholarly identities by encompassing both L1 and English as mutually enhancing resources.

The framing of academic trajectories as being dominated by English can also come to be reflexively questioned. Wingate (2015) suggests that ESOL teachers and subject teachers could work more collaboratively over the disciplinary-specific literacy requirements of a subject. ESOL teachers have an understanding of EAL students' language backgrounds and the requirements for literacy development. Subject teachers have an understanding of the disciplinary-specific literacy requirements of their subject. Wingate (2015) suggests practical tasks such as analysis of a subject's exemplar texts to identify textual features and patterns. This initially can be a collaboration between ESOL and subject teachers. Subject teachers could then bring these texts to class and make time for *literacy windows* in which explicit focus on the disciplinary requirements of a particular text is carried out. Over time, the aim of these literacy windows would be to increase student involvement in analysis of text as they grow to understand the disciplinary literacy requirements of particular subjects. Translingualism can be made use of in this process as EAL students could contribute

exemplar texts in their own L1 in which they could collaborate with other students and the teacher to translate the text. In this process the EAL student is gaining a metalinguistic awareness of the features of the text in both their L1 and English. The adoption by advocate teachers of the concept of translanguaging as inherent to academic development can open space for new knowledge in the class and enhanced understanding of content for both EAL and English L1 students.

The pressure of NCEA assessment was found to often be a cause for students to divest in relation to their L1. This divestment was reinforced, as noted previously, by a message that English (only) use was the normative means of achieving academic success. This message permeated through from policy level to classroom interactions. The unintended consequence of the pedagogical and assessment focus on English was a clear divestment by many EAL participants in relation to their L1 use in school. Miller (2011) in interviews of teachers in Melbourne, Australia, noted that teachers felt institutional constraints such as time and workload pressures tended to isolate and disempower them. These pressures led teachers to struggle balancing the needs of content knowledge acquisition with the underlying language and literacy needs required to effectively acquire this content knowledge. Similar pressures are felt by teachers in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The drive for NCEA credits tends to lead teachers toward adhering to rigid assessment and pedagogy timeframes. NCEA ostensibly promotes the idea of autonomy for teachers to construct relevant assessments and pedagogical methods. The unintended consequence of such a system, however, is the focus on credit acquisition in favour of a deeper metacognitive and metalinguistic awareness of the specific literacy requirements and current literacies levels of students. Teachers need time to develop context-specific dialogic relationships with their students. This is particularly true for EAL students as they will have

specific prior knowledge and skills but also specific requirements around scaffolding understanding of disciplinary literacies.

Teachers acting as advocates can also help here. The pressure of NCEA assessment can be alleviated if teachers create spaces for students to make use of existing funds of knowledge and capital as meaning-making resources. For example, Hall (1995) suggests teachers can help develop interactive resources through explicit focus on the discourse and socio-cultural norms of the class. Recognising the capital and habitus that exist in class opens up dialogue around these elements can be renegotiated with the inclusion of the value of L1. This will create a space in which EAL students can develop and reinforce disciplinary literacies in both English and L1 as both are key elements of linguistic capital and scholarly habitus.

The theme of a compartmentalisation of identity emerged in findings for participating EAL students as language use tended to be bifurcated between home and school settings. In many cases, English came to dominate classroom and wider social interactions while L1 was used only in the home (if at all). In a few other cases, while English did dominate the classroom, some students adopted strategies or had more social interactions which made use of their L1 in relation to their studies. This was particularly true of students with large numbers of peers from the same language background. The best example of this was a group of students who all came from Shanghai, China (including Daniel, who participated in my research). These students were much more likely to use L1 and English in class and across other social settings. I contend that this willingness to use L1 was both an effort to resist the symbolic violence of an English-only education and an example of EAL learners using trusted friendships to establish safe houses (Canagarajah, 2013) in their L1. Students who had few L1 interlocutors or resources available in their L1

would adopt instead a foxhole strategy, communicating mainly with other EAL students in English as a means of socialisation and clarification of content.

The clearest example of this was Elaine, the sole Karen speaker in the school, who had few resources which she could draw upon in her L1 and thus had to adopt English exclusively as the language of her learning. She would often seek out other EAL students as English-medium interlocutors in class in order to avoid the judgement of peers. The foxhole strategy was effective for Elaine in the class space as a pragmatic way of socialising and clarifying content. This, however, also led to the clearest example of the bifurcation of language of any of the participants in the school. In spite of her own expressed desire, Elaine's Karen was silent inside the school gates. She could not speak it with interlocutors or read it in text books or online resources. Her scholarly identity in school was negotiated on solely monolingual, English terms. Elaine did make use of Karen at home and in church and community groups. However, the opportunities to do so in an education setting were completely absent for her. The net result for Elaine was a bifurcation in which English was the language of school and wider Aotearoa/New Zealand society while Karen was the language of family and her church.

The tendency to bifurcate language use and operate exclusively in English when in school was also strongly influenced by participants' desire to avoid linguistic isolation. Teachers and schools can help the avoidance of linguistic isolation by encouraging the development of networks of fellow L1 speakers. These networks may be intraclass, interclass or even interschool. These networks can reduce the sense of linguistic isolation and tendency to compartmentalise identities and language use. This is because EAL students gain the opportunity to use their L1 meaning-making resources with other L1 speakers in a meaningful way that contributes to language development and assessment achievement.

I have shown that, in an effort to acquire the linguistically valued capital of English, participating EAL students adopted various covert strategies to avoid the judgement of teachers and English L1 peers. Participants variously used silence, self-talk, one-on-one chat with fellow EAL students in linguistic foxholes or safe houses, as well as seeking covert clarification from teachers outside of the gaze of English L1 peers. These covert strategies should not be stigmatised by teachers but, rather, teachers as advocates should seek to recognise why students are resorting to their use. Accordingly, teachers as advocates should gain an understanding of how to best utilise these already established strategies to enhance students' co-construction of knowledge.

The role self-reflexivity played in my research was crucial. For me as a researcher, self-reflexivity helped in refining my understanding of the space I was researching and the EAL students participating in my research. I was constantly challenged by students' responses to interview questions and actions in class to question my own judgements and framing of participants. For the student participants, self-reflexivity helped them articulate and assert their particular selves. Through the assertion of their particular selves, participants were more able to resist categorisation and the assignment of normative academic trajectories by pedagogical authorities.

I was privileged to see that participants often adopted translingual practices which enhanced investment in their L1 and its linking to a translingual scholarly habitus and scholarly identities. Participants who had access to either interlocutors or resources in their L1 would readily make use of their L1 for their learning. This utilisation of their L1 would most often occur without the direction, or indeed knowledge, of the teacher. Teachers should be aware of the dynamic nature of translingual practices as they arise for students both in class and when they leave the school gates. Rather than proscribe this use, teachers

as advocates should seek to understand its functional purpose for EAL students and how it may be used in class to enhance their, and other students', learning.

For my own part, seeking to understand these EAL students' experiences has been central to my own research journey. Understanding comes not from listening to the sound of your own voice, rather it comes from listening to and engaging with the voices of others. The voices of EAL student participants have thus been echoing in my mind throughout the thesis.

With this in mind, I would like to summarise, as best as I can, the main themes I have come to understand to be important to EAL students in relation to their language use and identity in an Aotearoa/New Zealand secondary school context. Relationships and trusted friendship were essential to EAL students in class. The development of these relationships, whether they be with EAL peers, English L1 peers, or teachers, was important to EAL students, as it helped minimise the gaze they often felt, which marked them as the Other in the eyes of the majority. In a class where relationships are actively cultivated by advocate teachers, the gaze associated with Othering is minimised as it is a class of *us* not *us and them*. Such classes would be the essence of a gazeless space in which EAL students no longer feel inhibited by a sense of being Other. EAL students already seek out gazeless spaces. As we have seen, they make use of both safe houses and foxholes. They use various covert and overt strategies to maintain understanding of content. Teachers can learn from this and advocate for a class which makes use of existing relationships and individual funds of knowledge in order to maximise opportunities for the contextualisation of disciplinary literacies across languages.

These elements could serve to reframe the generative nature of habitus. A reframing such as this along more translingual lines can counter "conforming notions of the ideal

pupil” (Gewirtz & Cribb, 2009, p. 95), in which the model minority is expected to conform to the norms of the majority. When habitus is reframed in these ways, the opportunity to elevate EAL students’ L1 capital to its rightful place is enhanced.

As Dornýëi (2005) noted, we all construct an ideal self. For many EAL students in my research, this ideal self in its most positive form was a self that comfortably existed in both L1 and English across various social spaces, including school. Kathy summarised it best when she stated of her language use: “Yeah I just blend it.” Kathy was a participant who existed comfortably across social contexts and was able to utilise both her L1 and English across these settings. As with all of us, Kathy was working towards this ideal self. She felt ideally that her L1 could be better employed/utilised in her schooling in conjunction with English. Kathy’s statement shows the optimism of this cohort of participating EAL students. I was humbled to witness the pragmatic means they used to negotiate their way through the challenging last years of high school, with all its attendant pressures, in a language not of their birth.

I have argued in this thesis, with all the disciplinary literacy I can muster, that we as professionals in the education sector must hear the voices of all of our students. This is especially true of those voices who seem most outwardly silent in our classes. Listening to the wisdom of what these voices convey will help all of us in the sector to move away from the monolingual mindset and towards a classroom in which transacquistion (Tamati, 2016) is the norm and EAL students’ existing funds of knowledge are promoted as essential meaning-making resources.

Overall, my research journey has been just that: a journey. On the way, I have visited many sites and met many interesting characters. Along the way, the, experience of this research has changed me as it has made me more aware of the need for dialogue, student

voice, and greater differentiation in my own pedagogy. I hope that the encounters participants had with me on this journey have also had a positive influence on them. I am at least heartened to know that many participants expressed a reaffirmed desire to retain and expand their L1 due to participation in the research. Even in the face of the normative dominance of English, these participants have found a renewed passion to assert their own scholarly identities based around their own particular, translingual selves.

### Limitations

In this research, I have contributed an understanding of the relationship between EAL students' language use and the formation of their scholarly identities. This research does, however, have its limitations. My research had 14 participants. While good for gaining in-depth details around participants' experiences, a sample size this small creates a limit on any potential generalisability of the research. My research was conducted at one school site. This was good from an ethnographic standpoint to gain an in-depth understanding of place and space. One school site does, however, expose the research to the particular peculiarities of a site which may not be applicable to other sites. I have sought in this research to provide detailed profiles of both participants and the research site. These profiles were an effort to show readers my particular research circumstances. Any profile and/or description is inherently incomplete, but I have taken pains to show participants as particular selves and the research site as a particular place. These particularities, by their very nature, place limits on the potential to generalise findings or transfer these findings to other contexts. I also acknowledge that my findings as expressed in this thesis are inherently subject to my own interpretive lens. My own personal biases colour the pages of this text. I have thus sought to outline my own subject position and engage in reflexivity to better understand my own personal biases and to make them as transparent as possible.

To this end, I adopted a dialogical, social constructivist, framework throughout this research. By its very nature, this style of research is process orientated and constantly subject to reinterpretation. The findings I have laid out are explicitly my own interpretation of themes raised in multiple interviews, journal entries, and classroom observations. I have sought to place student voice and their reflections on my interpretations to the fore in the thesis. But ultimately, in the end, I am the one writing it.

My research had sought to shed light on one small group of students at one research site. The transferability and generalisability of my research should rightfully be questioned. I do, however, hope my research encourages other researchers in the future to investigate further the crucial relationship between language use and the negotiation of scholarly identities among EAL students.

#### Recommendations for Future Research

The need for continued research in the area of EAL learners' language use and negotiation of scholarly identities is urgent. This is particularly true for countries like Aotearoa/New Zealand that are experiencing rapid demographic diversification. Research based around similar questions of the relationship between language use and the negotiation of scholarly identities should be conducted at other sites. It will be interesting to see if the findings which manifest from participants at my site differ from or are similar to those at other sites. Subtle differences in the material conditions of schools occur across school sites, even within the same city. These differences are widened as we consider schools based in different cities, smaller rural communities or, indeed, other countries.

Future research should extend the scope of what I have aimed to achieve here. Research with a larger number of participants from a wider range of home countries would help expand on my findings. My research focused on problematising the particular category

of the Asian EAL student (particularly, the model minority). As such, I purposefully selected students from Asian countries. Future research of EAL students from other source countries would help shed further light on my findings. I would be particularly interested in research in a similar vein to mine of Pacifica students, their experiences with their L1s, and their negotiation of scholarly identities in an English-dominant school environment. These research pathways will continue to add voices to the growing chorus of researchers, teachers, parents and students who assert the vital role of L1, as well as English, in the negotiation of a diverse range of scholarly identities.

## Appendix 1 – Initial Ssemi-structured Interview Questions

Subsequent interview questions will be generated as a result of this data along with classroom observation and journaling data

### **Start of the interview**

- Introductions by participant and researcher
- Purpose and focus of study restated by researcher
- Outline of the procedures of the research restated by researcher

### **Body of the Interview**

#### **Circumstances and experiences**

Why did your family move to Aotearoa/New Zealand?

Do you remember experiences of school in your home country?

Do you remember any experiences of those schools that have influenced your view of school now?

Can you tell me about the challenges you face in school and particular classes?

Describe your most significant classroom experience at this school.

Describe times in class you feel you are learning best.

#### **Activities and Practices**

What sort of student do you think you are?

How do you define success at school?

What are the attributes required to be a successful student?

#### **Scholarly Identity**

To what degree and in what ways do you think you have these attributes?

What are the important parts of your own identity?

### **Negotiating Identities**

What on-going challenges do you face as a new migrant student in this school?

What kinds of support/opportunities can teachers and the school provide?

## Appendix 2 – Classroom Observation Schedule

### Classroom Observations – General Observations

Name of student(s):

---

Name of Teacher: \_\_\_\_\_

Class/Date of observation: \_\_\_\_\_

Content of work/Reference to Curriculum:

---

---

---

Teaching style: -

---

---

---

Resources used/Artefacts recorded:

---

---

Organisation/Structure of Lesson: -

---

---

---









---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Group activities:** e.g. Students' initial reaction i.e. acceptance/resistance? What is the sequence of events? What parts are played by teacher/student? How does student respond to ongoing teacher directions? What does student do if he/she does not participate?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Effectiveness of interactions** (denote interactions with A – Active participation P – Participated somewhat Q – Quiet)

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



---

---

---

**Socialisation factors:** e.g. Students' attitudes towards people i.e. affection/ trust, suspicion/ hate. Strength of child's feeling i.e. deep/casual/indifferent.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Intellectual involvement:** e.g. Does student respond to questions with variety of answers? Is student relaxed or anxious in academic situations? Does student work steadily? How does student respond to academic challenges? Does student display factors of emergent literacy?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Language use for social purposes:** e.g. What is range of students use of language for social purposes? Language directed to teachers/students i.e. evenly distributed? Manner of communication i.e. with assertion, restraint, affection hostility?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Comprehension:** e.g. Student remember/follow instruction? Require visual aids?  
Understand non-verbal cues? Picking up/use of phrases?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Social influences on learning:** Influence of social interactions, interpersonal relations and communication with others. Cultural perspectives on autonomy, Motivational hazards of living up to model minority label, Motivational consequences of social exclusion, Minority students' achievement/goal orientation in the context of other goals and motivations.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Appendix 3 – Participant Information Sheet (Board of Trustees)

Te Puna Wananga



Epsom Campus  
Gate 3, 74 Epsom Avenue  
Auckland, New Zealand  
Telephone 64 9 623 8899  
Facsimile 64 9 623 8811  
[www.education.auckland.ac.nz](http://www.education.auckland.ac.nz)  
The University of Auckland  
Private Bag 92601,  
Symonds Street  
Auckland 1150, New  
Zealand

### **PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET** (Board of Trustees)

Project title: The Spectacle of the Self: New migrant students' linguistic capital and scholarly identity in senior secondary school

Name of Principal investigator: Prof Stephen May

Name of Co-Investigator: Dr Richard Pringle

Name of PhD student: Brian Davy

#### **Researcher introduction**

Hello, my name is Brian Davy. Currently I am completing my thesis toward a Doctor of Philosophy (Education). I am also a teacher of Economics at Massey High School; none of the research that will be conducted will be of students that I teach. This project is focused on students I have had no previous teaching relationship with in order to ensure the integrity of research and minimise any disruptions to classroom activities.

## **Project description and invitation**

### **The research will be guided by this core question:**

How do schools categorise and position various new migrant students in terms of their language use and socio-cultural background?

### **Sub questions will examine in more detail:**

Similarities and differences in school positioning of English Additional Language (EAL) and English First Language (EFL) new migrant students.

The relationship between discourse and the students' own identity construction.

The extent to which new migrant students, that are participants in the research, engage in shifts of identity construction over the course of one academic year.

This project seeks to examine the ways in which new migrant students, both English Additional Language (EAL) and English First Language (EFL), negotiate their scholarly identities in mainstream secondary settings. In addition, the study will explore the categorisation of students within this setting. Particular attention will be paid to discourse around EAL and EFL students' use of first language (L1) in academic contexts. Exploring this discourse is important for teachers and students as various studies have revealed discourse and language practices are inherently linked in school settings. It is hoped that a close examination of your student's identity construction as well as the schools' categorisation techniques, particularly relating to L1 and home culture, will go some way to creating professional dialogue driven by the specific language strengths and needs of this ever-growing community. I would appreciate your school taking part in the research due to your linguistically diverse student population.

### **What will happen if the school takes part?**

I seek permission to access your organisations facilities, students and teachers as well as the student database. The Board of Trustees will have access to the research findings once published in November 2016. All identities of participants and their contributions to

findings will remain confidential. As such the Board of Trustees will not be granted access to any raw data.

Every effort will be made at all times to maintain the integrity of on-going school activities during the conduct of the research. This research seeks to act to minimise disturbances to your institution and maintain the integrity of your schools' timetable, as such a timetable of interviews and observations will be negotiated with the Principal to best accommodate the needs of the school.

### **Project Procedures**

Your participating Year 12 new migrant students (up to 12 students) will be asked to express their views about their construction of identity in school in a series interviews during the academic year. Classroom observations will also be made of the students' interactions and engagement in class and as such some teachers may be impacted by the research. Your students and teacher's participation in this research are voluntary. Explicit assurance is sought from the Board of Trustees and Principal that participation or non-participation of employees in research will not affect the employment status of the teachers and participation or non-participation of students will not affect the position in school of these participants. All participants reserve the right to withdraw participation at any time. Your students will be asked take part in a series of individual on-going interview sessions taking about 20-30 minutes each and be observed during selected classes throughout the academic year. Additionally, they will be asked to keep a written record of their experiences during the academic year. The project takes place from February when initial interviews and observations will be held. On-going semi structured interviews and classroom observations will be conducted, twice a term, throughout the academic year until November.

### **Data storage/retention/destruction/future use**

Audio recording during the interview session is essential as the method of language analysis employed in this research relies on an accurate transcription of the conversation. This is best achieved by audio recording. Data in the form of observation

notes and interview transcripts will be stored securely in the office of my supervisor at the University of Auckland Faculty of Education. Data will be destroyed after a period of six years following the completion of the research. Recorded interviews of this type cannot be shared with third parties such as employers.

Ownership of the audio recordings and transcriptions will be held by the researcher and participant students collectively and data will be held in a research archive accessible to the researcher and supervisor only. Interviews will be numerically coded to allow students' withdrawal if they choose. Your students, teachers and institution will remain confidential in all published findings accessible to third parties through this coding process. Transcriptions and interview sessions are coded participant 1-12 and a list is maintained separately to link your students with the transcripts and ensure their confidentiality. Published information will be managed in a way that does not identify a particular student as its source.

Your students' responses in the interviews will be analysed in order to establish discourse themes based on Critical discourse analysis (CDA). On-going feedback sessions will be held during the semi structured interviews to achieve an iterative research methodology and emergent analysis of themes.

### **Right to Withdraw from Participation**

Your students have the right to withdraw from participation at any time. Core participating EAL and/or EFL students have the right to withdraw any of their data up to two weeks after its collection. Non-core participating students who are only part of the observed class which the core students are in cannot, however, withdraw information after the event to which they have consented. The withdrawal from participation will apply to any subsequent collection of data, in which these non-core students' interactions in class will not be part of data collection or research analysis. This will be achieved by only considering interactions by the core EAL/EFL student participant that is not with the non-participating, non-core, students. Any subsequent interactions with this

non-participating and the core participating EAL/EFL student in class will not be observed or recorded by the researcher. Non-core students' decision to withdraw participation will not affect their normal class activities and they will not be expected to do anything different in from their normal activities class. Students, parents and teachers in this research may withdraw participation by emailing the researcher Brian Davy at the email address stated below.

### **Anonymity and Confidentiality**

I will ensure confidentiality of all identities through a coding process designed to maintain anonymity for the purposes of review by third parties or publication. I will maintain confidentiality to the extent required by law in the Privacy Act (1993).

### **Contact Details**

#### **Researcher:**

Brian Davy

[bdav030@aucklanduni.ac.nz](mailto:bdav030@aucklanduni.ac.nz)

#### **Supervisor:**

Prof Stephen May

[s.may@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:s.may@auckland.ac.nz)

(09) 373 7599 ext 48410

#### **HOD:**

Dr Jenny Lee

[Jenny.lee@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:Jenny.lee@auckland.ac.nz)

(09) 373 7599 ext 48125

Chair contact details: —For any queries regarding ethical concerns you may contact the Chair, The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee, The University

of Auckland, Research Office, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142. Telephone 09 373-7599 ext. 87830/83761.

Email: [humanethics@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:humanethics@auckland.ac.nz)

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON 13<sup>th</sup> JANUARY  
2015 FOR (3) YEARS REFERENCE NUMBER 013184

## Appendix 4 – Consent Form (Board of Trustees)

**Te Puna Wananga**



Epsom Campus  
Gate 3, 74 Epsom Avenue  
Auckland, New Zealand  
Telephone 64 9 623 8899  
Facsimile 64 9 623 8811  
[www.education.auckland.ac.nz](http://www.education.auckland.ac.nz)  
The University of Auckland  
Private Bag 92601,  
Symonds Street  
Auckland 1150, New  
Zealand

**CONSENT FORM** (Board of Trustees – School site and database access)

### **THIS FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A PERIOD OF 6 YEARS**

Project title: The Spectacle of the Self: New migrant students’ linguistic capital and scholarly identity in senior secondary school

Name of Researcher: Brian Davy

The Board of Trustees have read the Participant Information Sheet, we have understood the nature of the research and why the school has been selected. We have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to our satisfaction.

The Board of Trustees agrees that teachers and students in the school may be approached to take part in this research.

The Board of Trustees agree to grant access to our organisations’ facilities.

The Board of Trustees agrees to grant access to our schools' database in the form of reports and NCEA results for participating students, provided parents/students have also granted consent.

The Board of Trustees understands we will be able to access the research findings once published in November 2016.

The Board of Trustees understands all identities of participants and their contributions to findings will remain confidential.

The Board of Trustees understands we will not be granted access to any raw data.

The Board of Trustees agrees that participation or non-participation of employees in research will not affect the employment status of the teachers and participation or non-participation of students will not affect the position in school of these participants.

The Board of Trustees wish / do not wish to receive the summary of findings.

The Board of Trustees understands that data will be kept securely for 6 years, after which they will be destroyed.

Please state Email Address and/or Postal address summary of findings may be sent to:

---

---

---

---

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON 13<sup>th</sup> JANUARY  
2015 FOR (3) YEARS REFERENCE NUMBER 013184

## Appendix 5 – Participant Information Sheet (Parents)

Te Puna Wananga



Epsom Campus  
Gate 3, 74 Epsom Avenue  
Auckland, New Zealand  
Telephone 64 9 623 8899  
Facsimile 64 9 623 8811  
[www.education.auckland.ac.nz](http://www.education.auckland.ac.nz)  
The University of Auckland  
Private Bag 92601,  
Symonds Street  
Auckland 1150, New  
Zealand

### **PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET** (Students' Parent/Guardian)

Project title: The Spectacle of the Self: New migrant students' linguistic capital and scholarly identity in senior secondary school

Name of Principal investigator: Prof Stephen May

Name of Co-Investigator: Dr Richard Pringle

Name of PhD student: Brian Davy

#### **Researcher introduction**

Hello, my name is Brian Davy. Currently I am completing my thesis toward a Doctor of Philosophy (Education). I am also a teacher of Economics at Massey High School; none of the research that will be conducted will be of students that I teach. This project is focused on students I have had no previous teaching relationship with in order to ensure the integrity of research and minimise any disruptions to your sons/daughters' studies.

#### **Project description and invitation**

**The research will be guided by this core question:**

How do schools categorise and position various new migrant students in terms of their language use and socio-cultural background?

**Sub questions will examine in more detail:**

Similarities and differences in positioning towards English Additional Language (EAL) and English First Language (EFL) new migrant students.

The relationship between school categorisation and the students' own identity construction.

The extent to which new migrant students, that are participants in the research, engage in shifts of identity construction over the course of one academic year.

This project seeks to examine the ways in which new migrant students, both English Additional Language (EAL) and English First Language (EFL) develop a sense of self in school. The study will also explore what categories are used to by the school to inform the schools sense of a students' identity and achievement. Particular attention will be paid to the use of first language (L1) in academic contexts. Exploring these themes around identity is important for students as various studies have revealed sense of self and language practices are inherently linked in school settings. It is hoped that a close examination of your sons'/daughters' sense of self, as well as the schools' use of various categories, will go some way to creating a professional dialogue, in the school, driven by the specific language strengths and needs of your son/daughter. I would appreciate your son/daughter taking part in the research.

I seek permission to interview and observe in class your son/daughter. I also seek permission to gain access to your sons'/daughters' information that is stored on the school's data base. You will have access to the research findings once published in November 2016. All identities of participants and their contributions to findings will remain confidential. As such you will not be granted access to any raw data.

Every effort will be made at all times to maintain the integrity of your sons'/daughters' studies during the conducting of the research. This research seeks to act to minimise disturbances to your sons'/daughters' studies, as such a timetable of interviews and observations will be negotiated with your son/daughter to best accommodate their needs.

### **Project Procedures**

Your son/daughter will be asked to express their views about their sense of self in school in a series interviews during the academic year. Classroom observations will also be made of your sons'/daughters' interactions and engagement with peers and teachers in class and as such some teachers and other students may be impacted by the research. Additionally, they will be asked to keep a written record of their experiences of school life during the academic year. Your sons'/daughters' participation in this research is voluntary. Explicit assurance has been given from the Board of Trustees and Principal that participation or non-participation of your son/daughter will not affect the position in school of your son/daughter. All participants reserve the right to withdraw participation at any time. Your son/daughter will be asked to take part in two individual semi structured interview sessions per term taking about 20-30 minutes and be observed twice per term during one selected class throughout the academic year. The written journal will be a summary of the events of school during the week and should take 10-20 minutes at the end of each school week. The journal may be completed in English and/or your sons'/daughters' first language. This journaling activity seeks not to interfere with school and/or family duties and acts to provide an opportunity for self-reflection of your sons/daughters schooling activities for that week. The journal entries will be discussed during interviews as part of the researchers aims to understand your sons'/daughters' sense of self in school. The project takes place from February when initial interviews and observations will be held. On-going interviews and observations will be conducted throughout the academic year until November.

### **Data storage/retention/destruction/future use**

Audio recording during the interview session is essential as the method of language analysis employed in this research relies on an accurate transcription of the conversation. This is best achieved by audio recording. Data in the form of observation notes and interview transcripts will be stored securely in the office of my supervisor at the University of Auckland Faculty of Education. Data will be destroyed after a period of six years following the completion of the research. Recorded interviews of this type cannot be shared with third parties such as teachers.

Ownership of the audio recordings and transcriptions will be held by the researcher and participant students collectively and data will be held in a research archive accessible to the researcher and supervisor only. Interviews will be numerically coded to allow students withdrawal if they choose. Your son/daughter will remain anonymous in all published findings accessible to third parties through this coding process. Transcriptions of interview sessions are coded participant 1-12 and a list is maintained separately to link your son/daughter with the transcripts and ensure their confidentiality. Published information will be managed in a way that does not identify a particular student as its source.

Your sons'/daughters' responses in the interviews will be analysed in order to establish the ways participating new migrant students' talk about school and interacts with his/her peers and teachers. On-going feedback sessions will be held during the interviews to achieve an on-going understanding of the themes which emerge during classroom observations and within journal entries.

### **Right to Withdraw from Participation**

Your son/daughter has the right to withdraw from participation at any time. Additionally, the school counsellor will be made available if your son/daughter gets upset during the interview or during a particular classroom incident this is to ensure both physical and psychological harm minimisation is maintained as a paramount concern during research.

Your son/daughter is considered a core participant in this research. These participants have the right withdraw their observation data and/or interview responses from the research up to two weeks after each set of data (e.g. interview or observation) is collected. This right applies to core participants and/or their parents only. You and/or your son/daughter may withdraw participation by emailing the researcher Brian Davy at the email address stated below.

### **Anonymity and Confidentiality**

I will ensure confidentiality of all identities through a coding process designed to maintain anonymity for the purposes of review by third parties or publication. I will maintain confidentiality to the extent required by law in the Privacy Act (1993).

### **Contact Details**

#### **Researcher:**

Brian Davy

[bdav030@aucklanduni.ac.nz](mailto:bdav030@aucklanduni.ac.nz)

#### **Supervisor:**

Prof Stephen May

[s.may@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:s.may@auckland.ac.nz)

(09) 373 7599 ext 48410

#### **HOD:**

Dr Jenny Lee

[Jenny.lee@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:Jenny.lee@auckland.ac.nz)

(09) 373 7599 ext 48125

Chair contact details: — For any queries regarding ethical concerns you may contact the Chair, The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee, The University

of Auckland, Research Office, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142. Telephone 09 373-7599 ext. 87830/83761.

Email: [humanethics@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:humanethics@auckland.ac.nz)

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON 13<sup>th</sup> JANUARY  
2015 FOR (3) YEARS REFERENCE NUMBER013184

## Appendix 6 – Consent Form (Parents)

**Te Puna Wananga**



Epsom Campus  
Gate 3, 74 Epsom Avenue  
Auckland, New Zealand  
Telephone 64 9 623 8899  
Facsimile 64 9 623 8811  
[www.education.auckland.ac.nz](http://www.education.auckland.ac.nz)  
The University of Auckland  
Private Bag 92601,  
Symonds Street  
Auckland 1150, New  
Zealand

### **CONSENT FORM** (Students Parent/Guardian)

#### **THIS FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A PERIOD OF 6 YEARS**

Project title: The Spectacle of the Self: New migrant students' linguistic capital and scholarly identity in senior secondary school

Name of Researcher: Brian Davy

I have read the Participant Information Sheet; I have understood the nature of the research and why my son/daughter has been invited.

I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction.

I understand that my sons/daughter's participation in this research is voluntary.

I understand assurance has been given by the Board of Trustees and Principal that my sons/daughters participation or non-participation in this research will not affect their position in school.

I agree to allow my son/daughter to take part in this research.

I understand the identity of my son/daughter will be protected.

I understand a coding process will be used to ensure my sons'/daughters' identity is kept confidential for publication purposes.

I understand if any information my son/daughter provides is published, this will be done in a way that does not identify him/her as its source.

I understand that my son/daughter is free to withdraw participation at any time, and to withdraw any interview or classroom observation data from the research up to two weeks after the collection of data.

I understand the process of informing the researcher of my sons/daughters' withdrawal from participation.

I understand the school counsellor will be made available if my son/daughter gets upset during an interview or during a particular classroom incident.

I agree to grant access to my sons/daughters' information on the schools' data base in the form of reports, family background and NCEA results.

I agree to allow my son/daughter be interviewed out of class and observed during class time.

I agree to allow my son/daughter to be audiotaped.

I understand all tapes will be transcribed by the researcher.

I understand that all tapes be held in a secure location at the University of Auckland.

I agree to allow my son/daughter to keep a written journal of their experiences during the school year.

I wish / do not wish to receive the summary of findings.

I understand that data will be kept for 6 years, after which it will be destroyed.

Please state Email Address and/or Postal address summary of findings may be sent to:

---

---

---

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON 13<sup>th</sup> JANURARY

2015 FOR (3) YEARS REFERENCE NUMBER 013184

## Appendix 7 – Participant Information Sheet (Principal)

**Te Puna Wananga**



Epsom Campus  
Gate 3, 74 Epsom Avenue  
Auckland, New Zealand  
Telephone 64 9 623 8899  
Facsimile 64 9 623 8811  
[www.education.auckland.ac.nz](http://www.education.auckland.ac.nz)  
The University of Auckland  
Private Bag 92601,  
Symonds Street  
Auckland 1150, New  
Zealand

### **PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET** (Principal)

Project title: The Spectacle of the Self: New migrant students’ linguistic capital and scholarly identity in senior secondary school

Name of Principal investigator: Prof Stephen May

Name of Co-Investigator: Dr Richard Pringle

Name of PhD student: Brian Davy

#### **Researcher introduction**

Hello, my name is Brian Davy. Currently I am completing my thesis toward a Doctor of Philosophy (Education). I am also a teacher of Economics at Massey High School; none of the research that will be conducted will be of students that I teach. This project is focused on students I have had no previous teaching relationship with in order to ensure the integrity of research and minimise any disruptions to classroom activities.

## **Project description and invitation**

### **The research will be guided by this core question:**

How do schools categorise and position various new migrant students in terms of their language use and socio-cultural background?

### **Sub questions will examine in more detail:**

Similarities and differences in school positioning of English Additional Language (EAL) and English First Language (EFL) new migrant students.

The relationship between discourse and the students' own identity construction.

The extent to which new migrant students, that are participants in the research, engage in shifts of identity construction over the course of one academic year.

This project seeks to examine the ways in which new migrant students, both English Additional Language (EAL) and English First Language (EFL), negotiate their scholarly identities in mainstream secondary settings. In addition, the study will explore the categorisation of these students within this setting. Particular attention will be paid to discourse around EAL and EFL students' use of first language (L1) in academic contexts. Exploring this discourse is important for teachers and students as various studies have revealed discourse and language practices are inherently linked in school settings. It is hoped that a close examination of your students' identity construction as well as the school's categorisation techniques, particularly relating to L1 and home culture, will go some way to creating professional dialogue driven by the specific language strengths and needs of this ever-growing community. I would appreciate your school taking part in the research due to your linguistically diverse student population.

### **What will happen if the school takes part?**

I seek permission to access your organisations' facilities, students and teachers as well as the student database. You will have access to the research findings once published in

November 2016. All identities of participants and their contributions to findings will remain confidential. As such you will not be granted access to any raw data.

Every effort will be made at all times to maintain the integrity of on-going school activities during the conduct of the research. This research seeks to act to minimise disturbances to your institution and maintain the integrity of your school's timetable, as such a timetable of interviews and observations will be negotiated with you to best accommodate the needs of the school.

### **Project Procedures**

Your participating Year 12 new migrant students (up to 12) will be asked to express their views about their construction of identity in school in a series interviews during the academic year. Classroom observations will also be made of the students' interactions and engagement in class and as such some teachers may be impacted by the research. Your students' and teachers' participation in this research are voluntary. Explicit assurance is sought from the Board of Trustees and you that participation or non-participation of employees in research will not affect the employment status of the teachers and participation or non-participation of students will not affect the position in school of these participants. All participants reserve the right to withdraw participation at any time. Your students will be asked take part in a series of individual on-going interview sessions taking about 20-30 minutes each and be observed during selected classes throughout the academic year. Additionally, they will be asked to keep a written record of their experiences during the academic year. The project takes place from February when initial interviews and observations will be held. On-going semi structured interviews and classroom observations will be conducted, twice a term, throughout the academic year until November.

### **Data storage/retention/destruction/future use**

Audio recording during the interview session is essential as the method of language analysis employed in this research relies on an accurate transcription of the conversation. This is best achieved by audio recording. Data in the form of observation

notes and interview transcripts will be stored securely in the office of my supervisor at the University of Auckland Faculty of Education. Data will be destroyed after a period of six years following the completion of the research. Recorded interviews of this type cannot be shared with third parties such as employers.

Ownership of the audio recordings and transcriptions will be held by the researcher and participant students collectively and data will be held in a research archive accessible to the researcher and supervisor only. Interviews will be numerically coded to allow students' withdrawal if they choose. Your students, teachers and institution will remain confidential in all published findings accessible to third parties through this coding process. Transcriptions and interview sessions are coded participant 1-12 and a list is maintained separately to link your students with the transcripts and ensure their confidentiality. Published information will be managed in a way that does not identify a particular student as its source.

Your students' responses in the interviews will be analysed in order to establish discourse themes based on Critical discourse analysis (CDA). On-going feedback sessions will be held during the semi structured interviews to achieve an iterative research methodology and emergent analysis of themes.

### **Right to Withdraw from Participation**

Your students have the right to withdraw from participation at any time. Core participating EAL and/or EFL students have the right to withdraw any of their data up to two weeks after its collection. Non-core participating students who are only part of the observed class which the core students are in cannot, however, withdraw information after the event to which they have consented. The withdrawal from participation will apply to any subsequent collection of data, in which these non-core students' interactions in class will not be part of data collection or research analysis. This will be achieved by only considering interactions by the core EAL/EFL student participant that is not with the non-participating, non-core, students. Any subsequent interactions with this

non-participating student and the core participating EAL/EFL student in class will not be observed or recorded by the researcher. Non-core students' decision to withdraw participation will not affect their normal class activities and they will not be expected to do anything different in from their normal activities in class. Students, parents and teachers in this research may withdraw participation by emailing the researcher Brian Davy at the email address stated below.

### **Anonymity and Confidentiality**

I will ensure confidentiality of all identities through a coding process designed to maintain anonymity for the purposes of review by third parties or publication. I will maintain confidentiality to the extent required by law in the Privacy Act (1993).

### **Contact Details**

#### **Researcher:**

Brian Davy

[bdav030@aucklanduni.ac.nz](mailto:bdav030@aucklanduni.ac.nz)

#### **Supervisor:**

Prof Stephen May

[s.may@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:s.may@auckland.ac.nz)

(09) 373 7599 ext 48410

#### **HOD:**

Dr Jenny Lee

[Jenny.lee@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:Jenny.lee@auckland.ac.nz)

(09) 373 7599 ext 48125

Chair contact details: —For any queries regarding ethical concerns you may contact the Chair, The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee, The University

of Auckland, Research Office, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142. Telephone 09 373-7599 ext. 87830/83761.

Email: [humanethics@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:humanethics@auckland.ac.nz)

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON 13<sup>th</sup> JANUARY  
2015 FOR (3) YEARS REFERENCE NUMBER 013184

## Appendix 8 – Consent Form (Principal)

**Te Puna Wananga**



Epsom Campus  
Gate 3, 74 Epsom Avenue  
Auckland, New Zealand  
Telephone 64 9 623 8899  
Facsimile 64 9 623 8811  
[www.education.auckland.ac.nz](http://www.education.auckland.ac.nz)  
The University of Auckland  
Private Bag 92601,  
Symonds Street  
Auckland 1150, New  
Zealand

**CONSENT FORM** (Principal – School site and database access)

**THIS FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A PERIOD OF 6 YEARS**

Project title: The Spectacle of the Self: New migrant students’ linguistic capital and scholarly identity in senior secondary school

Name of Researcher: Brian Davy

I have read the Participant Information Sheet; I have understood the nature of the research and why my school has been selected. I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction.

I agree that teachers and students in my school may be approached to take part in this research.

I agree to grant access to my organisations’ facilities.

I agree to grant access to my schools' database in the form of reports and NCEA results for participating students, provided parents/students have also granted consent.

I understand I will be able to access the research findings once published in November 2016.

I understand all identities of participants and their contributions to findings will remain confidential.

I understand I will not be granted access to any raw data.

I agree that participation or non-participation of employees in research will not affect the employment status of the teachers and participation or non-participation of students will not affect the position in school of these participants.

I wish / do not wish to receive the summary of findings.

I understand that data will be kept securely for 6 years, after which they will be destroyed.

Please state Email Address and/or Postal address summary of findings may be sent to:

---

---

---

---

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON 13<sup>th</sup> JANUARY  
2015 FOR (3) YEARS REFERENCE NUMBER 013184

## Appendix 9 – Participant Information Sheet (Student)

**Te Puna Wananga**



Epsom Campus  
Gate 3, 74 Epsom Avenue  
Auckland, New Zealand  
Telephone 64 9 623 8899  
Facsimile 64 9 623 8811  
[www.education.auckland.ac.nz](http://www.education.auckland.ac.nz)  
The University of Auckland  
Private Bag 92601,  
Symonds Street  
Auckland 1150, New  
Zealand

### **PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET** (Student)

Project title: The Spectacle of the Self: New migrant students’ linguistic capital and scholarly identity in senior secondary school

Name of Principal investigator: Prof Stephen May

Name of Co-Investigator: Dr Richard Pringle

Name of PhD student: Brian Davy

#### **Researcher introduction**

Hello, my name is Brian Davy. Currently I am completing my thesis toward a Doctor of Philosophy (Education). I am also a teacher of Economics at Massey High School; none of the research that will be conducted will be of students that I teach. This project is focused on students I have had no previous teaching relationship with in order to ensure the integrity of research and minimise any disruptions to your studies.

## **Project description and invitation**

This project seeks to examine the ways in which you develop your sense of self in school. The study will explore what categories are used to by the school to inform the schools sense of your identity and achievement and how this may contribute to your own sense of self in school. Particular attention will be paid to the role of your first language (L1) use in school contexts. It is hoped that a close examination of your sense of self as well as the way school uses various categories will help your teachers enhance their understanding of the role of your language and culture in your school life. I would appreciate your participation in the research.

You will have access to the research findings once published in November 2016. All identities of participants and their contributions to findings will remain confidential.

Every effort will be made at all times to maintain the integrity of your studies during the conduct of the research. This research seeks to act to minimise disturbances to you and maintain the integrity of your studies.

## **Project Procedures**

You will be asked to express your views about your sense of self in school in a series of semi structured interviews during the academic year. Classroom observations will also be made of your interactions and engagement in class and as such some classes and other students may be impacted by the research. Additionally, you are asked to keep a written record of your experiences during the academic year. This written journal will be a summary of the events of school during the week and should take 10-20 minutes at the end of each school week. The journal may be completed in English and/or your first language. This journaling activity seeks not to interfere with school and/or family duties and acts to provide an opportunity for self-reflection of your schooling activities for that week. The journal entries will be discussed during interviews as part of the researchers' aims to understand your sense of self in school. I also seek permission to gain access to your information that is stored on the schools' database. Your participation in this

research is voluntary. Explicit assurance has been given from the Board of Trustees and Principal that your participation or non-participation will not affect your position in school. All participants reserve the right to withdraw participation at any time. You will be asked to take part in two individual semi structured interview sessions taking about 20-30 minutes per term and be observed twice a term during one selected class throughout the academic year. The project takes place from February when initial interviews and observations will be held. On-going interviews and observations will be conducted throughout the academic year until November.

### **Data storage/retention/destruction/future use**

Audio recording during the interview session is essential as the method of language analysis employed in this research relies on an accurate transcription of the conversation. This is best achieved by audio recording. Data in the form of observation notes and interview transcripts and journal entries will be stored securely in the office of my supervisor at the University of Auckland Faculty of Education. Data will be destroyed after a period of six years following the completion of the research. Recorded interviews of this type cannot be shared with third parties such as teachers.

Ownership of the audio recordings and transcriptions will be held by the researcher and participant students collectively and data will be held in a research archive accessible to the researcher and supervisor only. Interviews will be numerically coded to allow you to withdraw if you choose. You will remain anonymous in all published findings accessible to third parties through this coding process. Transcriptions of interview sessions are coded participant 1-12 and a list is maintained separately to link you with the transcripts and ensure your confidentiality. Published information will be managed in a way that does not identify a particular student as its source.

Your responses in the interviews will be analysed in order to establish the ways you talk about school and interact with your peers and teachers. On-going feedback sessions will be held during the interviews to achieve an on-going understanding of the themes which emerge during classroom observations and within journal entries.

## **Right to Withdraw from Participation**

You have the right to withdraw from participation at any time. Additionally, the school counsellor will be made available if you get upset during the interview or during a particular classroom incident this is to ensure both physical and psychological harm minimisation is maintained as a paramount concern during research. You are considered core participant in this research. Therefore, you have the right withdraw your observation data and/or interview responses from the research up to two weeks after each set of data (e.g. interview or observation) is collected. This right applies only to core participants and/or your parents. You may withdraw participation by emailing the researcher Brian Davy at the email address stated below.

## **Anonymity and Confidentiality**

I will ensure confidentiality of all identities through a coding process designed to maintain anonymity for the purposes of review by third parties or publication. I will maintain confidentiality to the extent required by law in the Privacy Act (1993).

## **Contact Details**

### **Researcher:**

Brian Davy

[bdav030@aucklanduni.ac.nz](mailto:bdav030@aucklanduni.ac.nz)

### **Supervisor:**

Prof Stephen May

[s.may@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:s.may@auckland.ac.nz)

(09) 373 7599 ext 48410

### **HOD:**

Dr Jenny Lee

[Jenny.lee@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:Jenny.lee@auckland.ac.nz)

(09) 373 7599 ext 48125

Chair contact details: —For any queries regarding ethical concerns you may contact the Chair, The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee, The University of Auckland, Research Office, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142. Telephone 09 373-7599 ext. 87830/83761.

Email: [humanethics@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:humanethics@auckland.ac.nz)

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON 13<sup>th</sup> JANUARY  
2015 FOR (3) YEARS REFERENCE NUMBER 013184

## Appendix 10 – Consent Form (Student)

**Te Puna Wananga**



Epsom Campus  
Gate 3, 74 Epsom Avenue  
Auckland, New Zealand  
Telephone 64 9 623 8899  
Facsimile 64 9 623 8811  
[www.education.auckland.ac.nz](http://www.education.auckland.ac.nz)  
The University of Auckland  
Private Bag 92601,  
Symonds Street  
Auckland 1150, New  
Zealand

### **CONSENT FORM** (Student – Core Participant)

#### **THIS FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A PERIOD OF 6 YEARS**

Project title: The Spectacle of the Self: New migrant students’ linguistic capital and scholarly identity in senior secondary school

Name of Researcher: Brian Davy

I have read the Participant Information Sheet; I have understood the nature of the research and why I have been invited.

I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction.

I understand that participation in this research is voluntary.

I understand assurance has been given by the Board of Trustees and Principal that my participation or non-participation in this research will not affect my position in school.

I agree to take part in this research.

I understand the identities of myself and any other students will be protected.

I understand a coding process will be used to ensure my identity is kept confidential for publication purposes.

I understand if any information I provide is published, this will be done in a way that does not identify me as its source.

I understand that I am free to withdraw participation at any time, and to withdraw any classroom observation data from the research up to two weeks after the collection of data.

I understand the process of informing the researcher of my withdrawal from participation.

I understand the school counsellor will be made available if I get upset during an interview or during a particular classroom incident.

I agree to grant access to my information on the schools' data base in the form of reports, family background and NCEA results.

I agree to be interviewed out of class and observed during class time.

I agree to be audiotaped.

I understand all tapes will be transcribed by the researcher.

I understand that all tapes be held in a secure location at the University of Auckland.

I agree to complete an on-going written journal of my school experiences during the year.

I wish / do not wish to receive the summary of findings.

I understand that data will be kept securely for 6 years, after which it will be destroyed.

Please state Email Address and/or Postal address summary of findings may be sent to:

---

---

---

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON 13<sup>th</sup> JANURARY

2015 FOR (3) YEARS REFERENCE NUMBER 013184

## Appendix 11 – Participant Information Sheet (Teacher)

**Te Puna Wananga**



Epsom Campus  
Gate 3, 74 Epsom Avenue  
Auckland, New Zealand  
Telephone 64 9 623 8899  
Facsimile 64 9 623 8811  
[www.education.auckland.ac.nz](http://www.education.auckland.ac.nz)  
The University of Auckland  
Private Bag 92601,  
Symonds Street  
Auckland 1150, New  
Zealand

### **PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET (Teacher)**

Project title: The Spectacle of the Self: New migrant students' linguistic capital and scholarly identity in senior secondary school

Name of Principal investigator: Prof Stephen May

Name of Co-Investigator: Dr Richard Pringle

Name of PhD student: Brian Davy

#### **Researcher introduction**

Hello, my name is Brian Davy. Currently I am completing my thesis toward a Doctor of Philosophy (Education).

## **Project description and invitation**

### **The research will be guided by this core question:**

How do schools categorise and position various new migrant students in terms of their language use and socio-cultural background?

### **Sub questions will examine in more detail:**

Similarities and differences in positioning towards English Additional Language (EAL) and English First Language (EFL) new migrant students.

The relationship between school categorisation and the students' own identity construction.

The extent to which new migrant students, that are participants in the research, engage in shifts of identity construction over the course of one academic year.

This project seeks to examine the ways in which new migrant students, both English Additional Language (EAL) and English First Language (EFL) experiences of mainstream secondary settings. In addition, the study will explore the categorisation of students within this setting and the discourse these manifests. Particular attention will be paid to discourse around EAL and EFL use of first language (L1) in academic contexts. It is hoped that a close examination of your students' identity construction as well as the school's categorisation techniques will go some way to creating professional dialogue driven by the specific strengths and needs of this ever-growing community. I would appreciate your participation the research due to your schools linguistically diverse student population.

I seek permission to access your classroom to complete a series of up to eight observations of 50 minutes each throughout the academic year. You will have access to the research findings once published in November 2016. All identities of participants and their contributions to findings will remain confidential. As such you will not be granted access to any raw data.

Every effort will be made at all times to maintain the integrity of on-going classroom activities during the conduct of the research. This research seeks to act to minimise disturbances to your class and maintain the integrity of your pedagogy as such a timetable of observations will be negotiated with you to best accommodate the needs of your class.

### **Project Procedures**

Your participating EAL and/or EFL students will be asked to express their views about their construction of identity in school in a series of semi structured interviews during the academic year. Classroom observations will also be made of the students' interactions and engagement in class and as such some of your classes may be impacted by the research. Your students and your participation in this research are voluntary. Explicit assurance has been given from the Board of Trustees and Principal that your participation or non-participation in research will not affect your employment status and participation or non-participation of your students will not affect the position in school of these students. All participants reserve the right to withdraw participation at any time. The project takes place from February when initial interviews and observations will be held. On-going interviews and observations will be conducted throughout the academic year until November.

### **Data storage/retention/destruction/future use**

Audio recording during the interview sessions are essential as the method of language analysis employed in this research relies on an accurate transcription of the conversation. This is best achieved by audio recording. Data in the form of observation notes and interview transcripts will be stored securely in the office of my supervisor at the University of Auckland Faculty of Education. Data will be destroyed after a period of

six years following the completion of the research. Recorded interviews of this type cannot be shared with third parties such as employers.

Ownership of the audio recordings and transcriptions will be held by the researcher and participant students collectively and data will be held in a research archive accessible to the researcher and supervisor only. You, your students and institution will remain anonymous in all published findings accessible to third parties through this coding process. Transcriptions and interview sessions are coded participant 1-12 and a list is maintained separately to link your students with the transcripts and ensure their confidentiality. Published information will be managed in a way that does not identify a particular student as its source.

Your students' responses in the interviews will be analysed in order to establish discourse themes based on Critical discourse analysis (CDA). On-going feedback sessions will be held during the semi structured interviews to achieve an iterative research methodology and emergent analysis of themes.

### **Right to Withdraw from Participation**

You have the right to withdraw from participation at any time. Teacher participants cannot, however, withdraw information after the event to which they have consented. The withdrawal from participation will apply to any subsequent collection of data, in which these teachers' interactions in class will not be part of data collection or research analysis. You may withdraw participation by emailing the researcher Brian Davy at the email address stated below. Data collection on you will stop from the date the email is received.

### **Anonymity and Confidentiality**

I will ensure confidentiality of all identities through a coding process designed to maintain anonymity for the purposes of review by third parties or publication. I will maintain confidentiality to the extent required by law in the Privacy Act (1993).

## **Contact Details**

### **Researcher:**

Brian Davy

[bdav030@aucklanduni.ac.nz](mailto:bdav030@aucklanduni.ac.nz)

### **Supervisor:**

Prof Stephen May

[s.may@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:s.may@auckland.ac.nz)

(09) 373 7599 ext 48410

### **HOD:**

Dr Jenny Lee

[Jenny.lee@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:Jenny.lee@auckland.ac.nz)

(09) 373 7599 ext 48125

Chair contact details: —For any queries regarding ethical concerns you may contact the Chair, The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee, The University of Auckland, Research Office, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142. Telephone 09 373-7599 ext. 87830/83761.

Email: [humanethics@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:humanethics@auckland.ac.nz)

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON 13<sup>th</sup> JANUARY  
2015 FOR (3) YEARS REFERENCE NUMBER 013184

## Appendix 12 – Consent Form (Teacher)

**Te Puna Wananga**



Epsom Campus  
Gate 3, 74 Epsom Avenue  
Auckland, New Zealand  
Telephone 64 9 623 8899  
Facsimile 64 9 623 8811  
[www.education.auckland.ac.nz](http://www.education.auckland.ac.nz)  
The University of Auckland  
Private Bag 92601,  
Symonds Street  
Auckland 1150, New  
Zealand

**CONSENT FORM** (Teacher – Classroom observations)

**THIS FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A PERIOD OF 6 YEARS**

Project title: The Spectacle of the Self: New migrant students’ linguistic capital and scholarly identity in senior secondary school

Name of Researcher: Brian Davy

I have read the Participant Information Sheet; I have understood the nature of the research and why I have been invited.

I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered to my satisfaction.

I understand that participation in this research is voluntary.

I agree to take part in this research.

I understand the identities of any students in class observations will be protected.

I understand a coding process will be used to ensure my identity is kept confidential for publication purposes.

I understand if any information I provide is published, this will be done in a way that does not identify me as its source.

I understand that I am free to withdraw participation at any time, and cannot, withdraw information after the event to which I have consented.

I understand the withdrawal from participation will apply to any subsequent collection of data, in which my interactions in class will not be part of data collection or research analysis.

I understand the process of informing the researcher of my withdrawal from participation.

I wish / do not wish to receive the summary of findings.

I understand that data will be kept for 6 years, after which it will be destroyed.

I understand the Principal and Board of Trustees have provided the assurance that my participation or non-participation in research will not affect my employment status.

Please state Email Address and/or Postal address summary of findings may be sent to:

---

---

---

---

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

APPROVED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND HUMAN PARTICIPANTS ETHICS COMMITTEE ON 13<sup>th</sup> JANUARY  
2015 FOR (3) YEARS REFERENCE NUMBER 013184

## References

- Adams, M. (2006). Hybridizing habitus and reflexivity: Towards an understanding of contemporary identity? *Sociology*, 40(3), 511-528.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities*. London, England: Verso.
- Archer, L., & Francis, B. (2005). "They never go off the rails like other ethnic groups": Teachers' constructions of British Chinese pupils' gender identities and approaches to learning. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 26(2), 165-182.
- Archer, L., & Francis, B. (2006). Challenging classes? Exploring the role of social class within the identities and achievement of British Chinese pupils. *Sociology*, 40(1), 29-49.
- Asher, N. (2007). Education made in the (multicultural) USA: Unpacking tensions of race, culture, gender, and sexuality. *Educational Researcher*, 36(2), 65-75.
- Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (2010). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays* (Vol. 1). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Ball, S., Davies, J., David, M., & Reay, D. (2002). "Classification" and "judgement": Social class and the "cognitive structures" of choice of higher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23(1), 51-72.
- Banks, J. (1995). The historical reconstruction of knowledge about race: Implications for transformative teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 24, 15-25.
- Barkhuizen, G. (2011). Narrative knowledging in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 45(3), 391-414.

- Barkhuizen, G., Knoch, U., & Starks, D. (2006). Language practices, preferences and policies: Contrasting views of Pākehā, Māori, Pasifika and Asian students. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 27(5), 375-391.
- Barkhuizen, G. P. (2010). An extended positioning analysis of a pre-service teacher's better life small story. *Applied Linguistics*, 31(2), 282-300.
- Barnard, R. (2009). Submerged in the mainstream? A case study of an immigrant learner in a New Zealand primary classroom. *Language and Education*, 23(3), 233-248.
- Bartlett, L. (2007). Bilingual literacies, social identification, and educational trajectories. *Linguistics and Education*, 18, 215-231.
- Bartley, A. (2010). 1.5 generation Asian migrants and intergenerational transnationalism: Thoughts and challenges from New Zealand. *National Identities*, 12(4), 381-395.
- Bauder, H. (2005). Habitus, rules of the labour market and employment strategies of immigrants in Vancouver, Canada. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 6(1), 81-97.
- Benesch, S. (2008). "Generation 1.5" and its discourses of partiality: A critical analysis. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 7(3-4), 294-311.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. Hove, England: Psychology Press.
- Bishop, R. (2005). Freeing ourselves from neo-colonial domination in research: A kaupapa Māori approach to creating knowledge. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 109-138). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Blackledge, A. (2002). The discursive construction of national identity in multilingual Britain. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 1(1), 67-87.

- Block, K., Warr, D., Gibbs, L., & Riggs, E. (2013). Addressing ethical and methodological challenges in research with refugee-background young people: Reflections from the field. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 26(1), 69-87.
- Bloome, D. (2013). Classroom ethnography. In M. Grenfell, D. Bloome, C. Hardy, K. Pahl, J. Rowsell, & B. V. Street (Eds.), *Language, ethnography, and education: Bridging new literacy studies and Bourdieu* (pp. 7-27). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Borrero, N., & Yeh, C. (2011). The multidimensionality of ethnic identity among urban high school youth. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 11(2), 114-135.
- Borrero, N. E., Yeh, C. J., Cruz, C. I., & Suda, J. (2012). School as a context for “othering” youth and promoting cultural assets. *Teachers College Record*, 114(2), 1-37.
- Bourdieu, P. (1973). The three forms of theoretical knowledge. *Information (International Social Science Council)*, 12(1), 53-80.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1985). The genesis of the concepts of habitus and of field. *Sociocriticism*, 2, 11-24.
- Bourdieu, P. (1988). Vive la crise! For heterodoxy in social science. *Theory and Society*, 19(5), 773-788.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990a). *In other words: Essays towards a reflexive sociology*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1990b). *Sociology in question*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.

- Bourdieu, P. (1990c). *The logic of practice*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1994). Structures, habitus, power: Basis for a theory of symbolic power. In N. Dirks, G. Eley, & S. Ortner, *Culture/power/history: A reader in contemporary social theory*, (pp. 155-199). Chichester, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1996). Understanding. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 13(2), 17-37.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Practical reason: On the theory of action*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2004). *Science of science and reflexivity*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Nice, R. (1980). The production of belief: Contribution to an economy of symbolic goods. *Media Culture Society*, 2, 261-293.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1998). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London, England: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Calhoun, C. (1993). Habitus, field and capital: The question of historical specificity. In C. Calhoun, E. LiPuma, & M. Postone (Eds.), *Bourdieu: Critical perspectives* (pp. 61-88). Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (1995). From critical research practice to critical research reporting. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(2), 321-330.
- Canagarajah, S. (2004). Subversive identities, pedagogical safe houses, and critical learning. In B. Norton & K. Toohey (Eds.), *Critical pedagogies and language learning* (pp. 116-137). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

- Canagarajah, A. S. (Ed.). (2013a). *Literacy as translingual practice: Between communities and classrooms*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Canagarajah, A. S. (2013b). Negotiating translingual literacy: An enactment. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 48(1), 40-67.
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. *Language and Communication*, 1(1), 1-47.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1981). *A theoretical framework for communicative competence* (Research Report). Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED223105>
- Carrington, V., & Luke, A. (1997). Literacy and Bourdieu's sociological theory: A reframing. *Language and Education*, 11(2), 96-112.
- Castells, M. (2010). *Power of identity: Economy, society, and culture*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Cavanaugh, J. R., & Shankar, S. (2014). Producing authenticity in global capitalism: Language, materiality, and value. *American Anthropologist*, 116(1), 51-64.
- Chao, X. (2013). Class habitus: Middle-class Chinese immigrant parents' investment in their newcomer adolescents' L2 acquisition and social integration. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 44(1), 58-74.
- Charmaz, K., & Mitchell, R. (1997). The myth of silent authorship Self substance and style. In Ethnographic writing. In R. Hertz (Ed.), *Reflexivity & voice* (pp. 193-215). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chen, X. (2010). Identity construction and negotiation within and across school communities: The case of one English-as-a-new-language (ENL) student. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 9(3), 163-179.

- Chun, C. W. (2016). Exploring neoliberal language, discourses and identities. In S. Preece (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and identity* (pp. 558-571). London, England: Routledge.
- Clandinin, J., & Connelly, M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass Publishers.
- Clark, R., & Gieve, S. (2006). On the discursive construction of "the Chinese learner." *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 19(1), 54-73.
- Clyne, M. (1991a). *Community languages: The Australian experience*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Clyne, M. (Ed.). (1991b). *Pluricentric languages: Differing norms in different nations* (Vol. 62). Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.
- Clyne, M. (2005). *Australia's language potential*. Sydney, Australia: University of NSW Press.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2013). *Research methods in education* (7th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Collins, J. (1993). Determination and contradiction: An appreciation and critique of the work of Pierre Bourdieu on language and education. In C. Calhoun, E. Li Puma, & M. Postone (Eds.), *Bourdieu: Critical perspectives* (pp. 116-138). Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Cook, V. (2001). Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57(3), 402-423.
- Corson, D. (1998). *Changing education for diversity*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.
- Coxhead, A., Stevens, L., & Tinkle, J. (2010). Why might secondary science textbooks be difficult to read? *New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics*, 16(2), 37-52.

- Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal*, 94(1), 103-115.
- Crookes, G., Davis, K. A., & Goldstein, T. (1995). Interviewing in a multicultural multilingual setting. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(3), 587-593.
- Cui, D. (2015). Capital, distinction, and racialized habitus: immigrant youth in the educational field. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 18(9), 1-16.
- Cummins, J. (1981). *Bilingualism and minority language children*. Ontario, Canada: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56(1), 18-37.
- Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering minority students*. Sacramento, CA: California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Cummins, J. (2001). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. In C. Baker & N. Hornberger (Eds.), *An introductory reader to the writings of Jim Cummins* (pp. 175-194). Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (2009). Pedagogies of choice: Challenging coercive relations of power in classrooms and communities. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 12(3), 261-271.
- Darvin R., & Norton, B. (2014a). Social class, identity, and migrant students. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 13(2), 111-117.
- Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2014b). Transnational identity and migrant language learners: The promise of digital storytelling. *Education Matters*, 2(1), 55-66.
- Davies, B., & Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 20(1), 43-63.

- Davy, B. (2012). Bilingual theories, critical realities: A critical discourse analysis of teachers' subjectivities and dispositions toward English additional language students in mainstream secondary school (Unpublished master's dissertation), University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- De Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (1999). The discursive construction of national identities. *Discourse Society*, 10(2), 149-173.
- Delpit, L. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(3), 280-299.
- Denzin, N. (2001). The reflexive interview and a performative social science. *Qualitative Research*, 1(1), 23-46.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 1-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dixon, J., & Durriheim, K. (2000). Displacing place-identity: a discursive approach to locating self and other. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 39(1), 27-44.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner. Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Duff, P. A. (2007). Second language socialization as sociocultural theory: Insights and issues. *Language Teaching*, 40(4), 309-319.
- D'Warte, J. (2014). Exploring linguistic repertoires: Multiple language use and multimodal literacy activity in five classrooms. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 37(1), 21-30.
- Ellis, R. (1993). The structural syllabus and second language acquisition. *Tesol Quarterly*, 27(1), 91-113.

- Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (2001). Participant observation and field notes. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland, & L. Lofland (Eds.), *Handbook of ethnography* (pp. 352-368). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Epstein, A., & Kheimets, N. (2000). Cultural clash and educational diversity: Immigrant teachers' efforts to rescue the education of immigrant children in Israel. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 10*(2), 191-210.
- Ferrare, J. J., & Apple, M. W. (2015). Field theory and educational practice: Bourdieu and the pedagogic qualities of local field positions in educational contexts. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 45*(1), 43-59.
- Fine, M. (1991). *Framing dropouts: Notes on the politics of an urban high school*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Fine, M. (1994). Working the hyphens. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (1st ed., pp. 70-82). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Finlay, L. (2012). Five lenses for the reflexive interviewer. In J. F. Gubrium (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of interview research: The complexity of the craft* (pp. 317-332). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fitzpatrick, K., & May, S. (2015). Doing critical educational ethnography with Bourdieu. In M. Murphy & C. Costa (Eds.), *Theory as method in research: On Bourdieu, social theory and education* (pp. 101-113). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fletcher, J., Parkhill, F., Fa'afoi, A., Taleni, L., & O' Reagan, B. (2008). Pacifica students: Teachers and parents voice their perceptions of what provides supports and barriers to Pacifica students' achievement in literacy and learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(1), 24-33.

- Foster, J. (2009). Defending whiteness indirectly: A synthetic approach to race discourse analysis. *Discourse Society*, 20(6), 685-703.
- Franken, M., May, S., & McComish, J. (2007). *Languages enhancing the achievement of Pasifika (LEAP)*. Retrieved from <http://leap.tki.org.nz>
- Franken, M. P., & McComish, J. (2003). *Improving English language outcomes for students receiving ESOL services in New Zealand schools, with a particular focus on new immigrants*. Wellington, New Zealand: Research Division, Ministry of Education.
- Fung, I. Y. Y., Wilkinson, I. A. G., & Moore, D. W. (2003). L1-assisted reciprocal teaching to improve ESL students' comprehension of English expository text. *Learning and Instruction*, 13(1), 1-31.
- Garcia, G. E., & Pearson, P. D. (1994). Chapter 8: Assessment and diversity. *Review of Research in Education*, 20(1), 337-391.
- Garcia, O. (2007). Intervening discourses, representations and conceptualizations of language. Foreword. In S. Makoni & A. Pennycook (Eds.), *Disinventing and reconstituting languages* (pp. xi-xv). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Garcia, O., & Wei, L. (2014). Translanguaging and education. In *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education* (pp. 63-77). London, England: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gaudio, R., & Bialostok, S. (2006). The trouble with culture. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 2(1), 51-69.
- Gee, J. (2015). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gee, J., Allen, A., & Clinton, K. (2001). Language, class and identity: Teenagers fashioning themselves through language. *Linguistics and Education*, 12(2), 175-194.

- Gee, J. P. (1999a). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (1999b). The future of the social turn: Social minds and the new capitalism. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, 32(1-2), 61-68.
- Gee, J. P., & Green, J. L. (1998). Chapter 4: Discourse analysis, learning, and social practice: A methodological study. *Review of Research in Education*, 23(1), 119-169.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Gergen, K. J., & Gergen, M. M. (2007). Social construction and research methodology. In W. Outhwaite, & S. Turner (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of social science methodology* (pp. 461-478). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gewirtz, S., & Cribb, A. (2009). Social reproduction. In *Understanding education: A sociological perspective* (pp. 85-110). Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Gibbons, P. (2009). *English learners, academic literacy, and thinking; Learning in the challenge zone*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Giddens, A. (1976). *New rules of sociological method: A positive critique of interpretive sociologies*. London, England: Hutchinson.
- Gillborn, D. (1992). Citizenship, "race" and the hidden curriculum. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 2(1), 57-73.
- Gillborn D. (1995). Racism, identity and modernity: Pluralism, moral antiracism and plastic ethnicity. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 5(1), 3-23.
- Giroux, H. A. (1981). *Ideology, culture, and the process of schooling*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Gold, R. L. (1958). Roles in sociological field observations. *Social Forces*, 36(3), 217-223.

- Gotsbachner, E. (2001). Xenophobic normality: The discriminatory impact of habitualized discourse dynamics. *Discourse Society*, 12(6), 729-759.
- Grenfell, M., & James, D. (1998). *Bourdieu and education: Acts of practical theory*. London, England: Falmer Press.
- Grenfell, M., & James, D. (2004). Change in the field – changing the field: Bourdieu and the methodological practice of educational research. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25(4), 507-523.
- Grimmett, P. P., MacKinnon, A. M., Erickson, G. L., & Riecken, T. J. (1990). Reflective practice in teacher education. In R. T. Clift, R. W. Houston, & M. C. Pugach (Eds.), *Encouraging reflective practice in education: An analysis of issues and programs* (pp. 20-38). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Grossberg, L. (1996). Identity and cultural studies: Is that all there is? In S. Hall & P. Du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 87-107). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (2002). From the individual interview to the interview society. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context and method* (pp. 3-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (2012). Narrative practice and the transformation of interview subjectivity. In Gubrium, J. F., Holstein, J. A., Marvasti, A. B., & McKinney, K. D. (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of interview research: The complexity of the craft* (pp. 27-43). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Guillemin, M., & Gillam, L. (2004). Ethics, reflexivity, and “ethically important moments” in research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10(2), 261-280.

- Hall, J. K. (1995). "Aw, man, where you goin'?" : Classroom interaction and the development of L2 interactional competence. *Issues in Applied linguistics*, 6(2), 37-62.
- Hall, S., & Jefferson, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Resistance through rituals: Youth subcultures in post-war Britain*. Hove, England: Psychology Press.
- Hammond, J., & Gibbons, P. (2005). Putting scaffolding to work: The contribution of scaffolding in articulating ESL education. *Prospect*, 20(1), 6-30.
- Hargreaves, J. (Ed.). (1982). *Sport culture and ideology*. London, England: Routledge.
- Harker, R. (1984). On reproduction, habitus and education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 5(2), 117-127.
- Harker, R., & May, S. (1993). Code and habitus: Comparing the accounts of Bernstein and Bourdieu. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 14(2), 169-178.
- Hacking, I. (1999). *The social construction of what?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Harklau, L. (2000). From the "good kids" to the "worst": Representations of English language learners across educational settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(1), 35-67.
- Harper, C., & de Jong, E. (2004). Misconceptions about teaching English-language learners. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 48(2), 152-162.
- Hart, R. (1992). *Children's participation: From tokenism to citizenship*. UNICEF Innocenti Essays, No. 4. Florence, Italy: International Child Development Centre of UNICEF.
- Hasan, R. (1999). The disempowerment game: Bourdieu and language in literacy. *Linguistics and Education*, 10(1), 25-87.
- Heller, M. (1996). Legitimate language in a multilingual school. *Linguistics and Education*, 8(2), 139-157.

- Heyl, B. S. (2001). Ethnographic interviewing. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland, & L. Lofland (Eds.), *Handbook of ethnography* (pp. 369-383). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Higham, R. J. E., Brindley, S., & Van de Pol, J. (2014). Shifting the primary focus: Assessing the case for dialogic education in secondary classrooms. *Language and Education, 28*(1), 86-99.
- Hitlin, S., Brown, J. S. & Elder, G., Jr.. (2006). Racial self-categorization in adolescence: Multiracial development and social pathways. *Child Development, 77*(5), 1298-1308.
- Holstein, J. A., & Gubrium, J. F. (1995). *The active interview* (Vol. 37). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2007). Biliteracy, transnationalism, multimodality, and identity: Trajectories across time and space. *Linguistics and Education, 18*(3), 325-334.
- Howson, A., & Inglis, D. (2001). The body in sociology: Tensions inside and outside sociological thought. *The Sociological Review, 49*(3), 297-317.
- Israel, S. E., Block, C. C., Bauserman, K. L., & Kinnucan-Welsch, K. (Eds.). (2006). *Metacognition in literacy learning: Theory, assessment, instruction, and professional development*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Jaffe, A. (2003). Talk Around text: Literacy practices, cultural identity and authority in a Corsican bilingual classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 6*(3-4), 202-220.
- Jain, R. (2014). Global Englishes, translanguistic identities, and translanguing practices in a community college ESL classroom: A practitioner researcher reports. *TESOL Journal, 5*(3), 490-522.

- Jenkins, R. (1994). Rethinking ethnicity: Identity, categorization and power. *Ethnic and racial Studies*, 17(2), 197-223.
- Jenkins, R. (2008). *Rethinking ethnicity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jenkins, R. (2014). *Social identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Jia, F., Gottardo, A., Koh, P., Chen, X., & Pasquarella, A. (2014). The role of acculturation in reading a second language: Its relation to English literacy skills in immigrant Chinese adolescents. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 49(2), 251-261.
- Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (1999). Multicultural education: Transforming the mainstream. In S May (Ed.), *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and antiracist education* (pp. 245-276). London, England: Falmer Press.
- Kamberelis, G. (2001). Producing of heteroglossic classroom (micro) cultures through hybrid discourse practice. *Linguistics and Education*, 12(1), 85-125.
- King, K., & Ganuza, N. (2005). Language, identity, education, and transmigration: Chilean adolescents in Sweden. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education*, 4(3), 179-199.
- Kitchen, M. (2010). Vision in the New Zealand curriculum: A Korean perspective. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 45(2), 75-88.
- Kitchen, M. (2011). *Imagined lives: The Korean community and policy and practice at a New Zealand high school* (Unpublished doctoral thesis), University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Kitchen, M. (2013). Methods in focus group interviews in cross-cultural settings. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 13(3), 265-277.
- Kim, S., & Starks, D. (2010). The role of fathers in language maintenance and language attrition: The case of Korean–English late bilinguals in New Zealand. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(3), 285-301.

- Kostogriz, A. (2009). Professional ethics in multicultural classrooms: English, hospitality and the other. In J. Miller, A. Kostogriz, & M. Gearon (Eds.), *Culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms: New dilemmas for teachers* (pp. 132-150). Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Krappmann, L. (2006). The rights of the child as a challenge to human rights education. *Journal of Social Science Education*, 5(1), 60-71.
- Kubota, R. (2001). Discursive construction of the images of US classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(1), 9-38.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews. An introduction to qualitative research writing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). From the achievement gap to educational debt: Understanding achievement in US schools. *Educational Researcher*, 35(7), 3-12.
- Lankshear, C., Gee, J., Knobel, M., & Searle, C. (2008). Language and cultural process. In C. Lankshear, J. Gee, M. Knobel, & C. Searle (Eds.), *Changing literacies* (pp. 11-39). New York, NY: Open University Press.
- Lash, S. (2003). Reflexivity as non-linearity. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 20(2), 49-57.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Law, J. (2007). Making a mess with method. In W. Outhwaite & S. Turner (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of social science methodology* (pp. 595-606). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Le Court, D. (2012). *Identity matters: Schooling the student body in academic discourse*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Lee, J., & Zhou, M. (2014). The success frame and achievement paradox: The costs and consequences for Asian Americans. *Race and Social Problems*, 6(1), 38-55.

- Lee, S. J. (2015). *Unravelling the "model minority" stereotype: Listening to Asian American youth*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Liddicoat, A. J., & Scarino, A. (2013). *Intercultural language teaching and learning*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry* (Vol. 75). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lindemann, S. (2005). Who speaks "broken English"? US undergraduates' perceptions of non-native English, *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15(2), 187-212.
- Littlewood, W. (2014). Communication-oriented language teaching: Where are we now? Where do we go from here? *Language Teaching*, 47(3), 349-362.
- Llamas, C., & Watt, D. (Eds.). (2009). *Language and identities*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.
- Lukes, S. (2005). *Power: A radical view* (2nd ed.). London, England: Macmillan.
- Martin-Jones, M., & Heller, M. (1996). Introduction to the special issues on education in multilingual settings: Discourse, identities, and power, Part I: Constructing legitimacy. *Linguistics and Education*, 8(1), 3-16.
- Matsumoto, D., & Yoo, S. H. (2006). Toward a new generation of cross-cultural research. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 1(3), 234-250.
- May, S. (1994). *Making multicultural education work*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- May, S. (2002). The problem with literacy. *English in Aotearoa*, 48(4), 4-14.
- May, S. (2005). Language rights: Moving the debate forward. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9(3), 319-347.
- May, S. (2008). Language education, pluralism and citizenship. In S. May (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of language and education* (pp. 15-29). New York, NY: Springer.

- May, S. (2011a). Language Policy. In M. Grenfell. (Ed.). *Bourdieu, language and linguistics*. (pp. 147-169). New York, NY: A&C Black.
- May, S. (2011b). The disciplinary constraints of SLA and TESOL: Additive bilingualism and second language acquisition, teaching and learning. *Linguistics and Education*, 22(3), 233-247.
- McNaughton, S. (2002). *Meeting of minds*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- McNaughton, S. (2011). *Designing better schools for culturally and linguistically diverse children: A science of performance model for research*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Meadows, B. (2009). Capital negotiation and identity practices: investigating symbolic capital from the “ground up.” *Critical Discourse Studies*, 6(1), 15-30.
- Miller, J. M. (2000). Language use, identity, and social interaction: Migrant students in Australia. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 33(1), 69-100.
- Miller, J. (2004). Identity and language use: The politics of speaking ESL in schools. In A. Pavlenko & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts* (pp 290-315). Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Miller, J. (2011). Teachers’ work in culturally and linguistically diverse schools. *Teachers and Teaching*, 17(4), 451-466.
- Miller, J., Kostogriz, A., & Gearon, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms: New dilemmas for teachers* (Vol. 16). Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Ministry of Education. (2003). *Dimensions of effective practice*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education. (2007). *The New Zealand curriculum for English-medium teaching and learning in years 1–13*. Wellington, New Zealand: Learning Media.

- Mishler, E. G. (1986). The analysis of interview-narratives. In T. R. Sarbin (Ed.), *Narrative psychology: The storied nature of human conduct* (pp. 233-255). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers/Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Mitchell, J. P. (2007). Ethnography. In W. Outhwaite & S. Turner (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of social science methodology* (pp. 55-66). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Moje, E. B. (2007). Chapter 1. Developing socially just subject-matter instruction: A review of the literature on disciplinary literacy teaching. *Review of Research in Education*, 31(1), 1-44.
- Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative approach to connect homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice*, 31(2), 132-141.
- Moll, L. C., & Gonzalez, N. (1994). Lessons from research with language-minority children. *Journal of reading behavior*, 26(4), 439-456.
- Moore, R. C. (2005). A discriminative framework for bilingual word alignment. In *Proceedings of the conference on Human Language Technology and Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing* (pp. 81-88). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Morgan, B. (1997). Identity and intonation: Linking dynamic processes in an ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 431-450.
- Morrell, E. (2002). Toward a critical pedagogy of popular culture: Literacy development among urban youth. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 46(1), 72-77.
- Mu, G. (2014). Heritage language learning for Chinese Australians: The role of habitus. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35(5), 497-510.

- Mu, G. (2015). A meta-analysis of the correlation between heritage language and ethnic identity. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 36(3), 239-254.
- Nash, R. (2003). Inequality/difference in New Zealand education: Social reproduction and the cognitive habitus. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 13(2), 171-194.
- Nash, R., & Lauder, H. (2010). *Explaining inequalities in school achievement. A realist analysis*. Farnham, England: Ashgate Publishing.
- Nasir, N., & Saxe, G. (2003). Ethnic and academic identities: A cultural practice perspective on emerging tensions and their management in the lives of minority students. *Educational Researcher*, 32(5), 14-18.
- New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(1), 60-92.
- Ng, J. C., Lee, S. S., & Pak, Y. K. (2007). Contesting the model minority and perpetual foreigner stereotypes: A critical review of literature on Asian Americans in education. *Review of Research in Education*, 31(1), 95-130.
- Nieto, S. (2001). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Nieto, S. (2010). Language, diversity, and learning: Lessons for education in the 21st Century. *CAL Digest*, 1-4.
- Noddings, N. (2003). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education* (2nd ed.). Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Norton, B. (1997). *Language, identity, and the ownership of English*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(3), 409-429.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. London, England: Longman.

- Norton, B. (2010). Identity, literacy, and English-language teaching. *TESL Canada Journal/Revue TESL Du Canada*, 28(1), 1-13.
- Norton, B. (2014). Non-participation, imagined communities and the language classroom. In M. Breen (Ed.), *Learner contributions to language learning* (pp. 59-171). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Norton-Peirce, B. (1995). Social identity, investment, and language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29(1), 9-31.
- Norton, B., & McKinney, C. (2011). An identity approach to second language acquisition. In D. Atkinson (Ed.), *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 73-94). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Palmer, J. (2007). Who is the authentic Korean American? Korean-born Korean American high school students' negotiations of ascribed and achieved identities. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 6(4), 277-298.
- Pang, B., & Macdonald, D. (2015). Recognising young Chinese Australians' perceived resources within and beyond schooling. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 23(3), 1-19.
- Pang, M. (1999). The employment situation of young Chinese adults in the British labour market. *Personnel Review*, 28(1/2), 41-57.
- Pavlenko, A. (2007). Autobiographic narratives as data in applied linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(2), 163-188.
- Pavlenko, A., & Blackledge, A. (Eds.). (2004). *Negotiation of identities in multilingual contexts*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Pavlenko, A., & Jarvis, S. (2002). Bidirectional transfer. *Applied Linguistics*, 23(2), 190-214.
- Pennycook, A. (1999). Introduction: Critical approaches to TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3), 329-348.

- Pileggi, M., & Patton, C. (2003). Introduction: Bourdieu and cultural studies. *Cultural Studies*, 17(3-4), 313-325.
- Pink, S. (2011). From embodiment to emplacement: Re-thinking competing bodies, senses and spatialities. *Sport, Education and Society*, 16(3), 343-355.
- Rampton, B. (1996). Youth, race, and resistance: A sociolinguistic perspective. *Linguistics and Education*, 8(2), 159-173.
- Raymond, J. C. (1993). I-dropping and androgyny: The authorial I in scholarly writing. *College Composition and Communication*, 44(4), 478-483.
- Reay, D. (2004). "It's all becoming a habitus": Beyond the habitual use of habitus in educational research. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25(4), 431-444.
- Reay, D., & William, D. (1999). "I'll be a nothing": Structure, agency and the construction of identity through assessment. *British Educational Research Journal*, 25(3), 343-354.
- Reinharz, S. (1997). Who am I? The need for a variety of selves in the field. In R. Hertz (Ed.), *Reflexivity & Voice* (pp. 3-20). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Reynolds, T., & Zontini, E. (2015). Transnational and diasporic youth identities: Exploring conceptual themes and future research agendas. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 23(4), 1-13.
- Richards, K. (2006). "Being the teacher": Identity and classroom conversation. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(1), 51-77.
- Riley, P. (2006). Self-expression and the negotiation of identity in a foreign language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 16(3), 295-318.
- Rodriguez, R. (1982). *Hunger for memory: The education of Richard Rodriguez*. New York, NY: Bantam.

- Rogers, R. (2011). The sounds of silence in educational tracking: A longitudinal, ethnographic case study. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 8(4), 239-252.
- Royal Society of New Zealand. (2013). *Languages in Aotearoa New Zealand*. Retrieved from <http://www.royalsociety.org.nz/expert-advice/papers/yr2013/languages-in-aotearoa-new-zealand/>
- Rubie-Davies, C. M., Hattie, J. A. C., & Hamilton, R. J. (2006). Expecting the best for New Zealand students: Teacher expectations and academic outcomes. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(3), 429-444.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1984). What really matters in second language learning for academic achievement? *TESOL Quarterly*, 18(2), 199-219.
- Scahill, J. H. (1993). Meaning-construction and habitus. *Philosophy of Education*, 28,302-310.
- Schneider, B. (2005). *Linguistic human rights and migrant languages*. Bern, Switzerland: P. Lang.
- Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Seeley, J. (2014). Harrison White as (not quite) poststructuralist. *Sociological Theory*, 32(1), 27-42.
- Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content-area literacy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78(1), 40-59.
- Shankar, S., & Cavanaugh, J. R. (2012). Language and materiality in global capitalism. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 41, 355-369.
- Shilling, C. (2004). Physical capital and situated action: a new direction for corporeal sociology. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25(4), 473-487.

- Shilling, C. (2008). *Changing bodies: Habit, crisis and creativity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Shohamy, E. G. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. Hove, England: Psychology Press.
- Simpson, M., & Tuson, J. (2003). *Using Observations in small-scale research: A beginner's guide*. Glasgow, Scotland: University of Glasgow, SCRE Centre.
- Siope, A. (2011). The schooling experiences of Pasifika students. *SET*, 3, 10-16.
- Siteine, A., & Samu, T. (2011). The representation of Pacific peoples in the New Zealand School Journal. *Pacific-Asian Education*, 23(2), 139-152.
- Slembrouck, S. (2004). Reflexivity and the research interview. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 1(1), 91-112.
- Smith, M. (2013). *Multilingual practices of Senegalese immigrants in Paris and Rome: A comparative study of language use and identity construction* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), UC Berkeley, CA.
- Sommer Harrits, G. (2011). More than method? A discussion of paradigm differences within mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 5(2), 150-166.
- Statistics New Zealand. (2013). *2013 census*. Retrieved from <http://www.stats.govt.nz/Census/2013-census.aspx>
- Strauss, P., & Smedley, F. (2009). Welcoming refugee students into New Zealand schools. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 44(2), 3-18.
- Street, B. (1994). What is meant by local literacies? *Language and Education*, 8(1-2), 9-17.
- Street, B. (2003). What's "new" in new literacy studies? Critical approaches to literacy in theory and practice. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 5(2), 77-91.
- Street, B. V. (2002). *Literacy and development: Ethnographic perspectives*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Swain, J., Heyman, B., & Gillman, M. (1998). Public research, private concerns: Ethical issues in the use of open-ended interviews with people who have learning difficulties. *Disability & Society, 13*(1), 21-36.
- Talmy, S. (2010). The interview as collaborative achievement: Interaction, identity, and ideology in a speech event. *Applied Linguistics, 32*(1), 25-42.
- Tamati, S. T. (2016). *Transacquisition pedagogy for bilingual education: A study in kura kaupapa Māori schools* (Unpublished doctoral thesis), University of Auckland, New Zealand.
- Thompson, R. (2006). Bilingual, bicultural, and binominal identities: Personal name investment and the imagination in the lives of Korean Americans. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 5*(3), 179-208.
- Toloa, M., McNaughton, S., & Lai, M. (2009). Bilitery and language development in Samoan bilingual classrooms: The effects of increasing English reading comprehension. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 12*(5), 513-531.
- Tse, L. (2000). The effects of ethnic identity formation on bilingual maintenance and development: An analysis of Asian American narratives. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 3*(3), 185-200.
- Urry, J. (2003). *Global complexity*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Van Dijk, T. (1992). Discourse and the denial of racism. *Discourse Society, 3*(1), 87-118.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism* (Vol. 6). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Villegas, A., & Lucas, T. (2002). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(20), 20-32.

- Violeti, T. M. (2006). Talanoa research methodology: A developing position on Pacific research. *Waikato Journal of Education*, 12, 21-34.
- Vollmer, G. (2000). Praise and stigma: Teachers' constructions of the "typical ESL student." *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 21(1), 53-66.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wacquant, L., & Bourdieu, P. (1989). Towards a reflexive sociology: A workshop with Pierre Bourdieu. *Sociological Theory*, 7(1), 26-63.
- Ward, C. A., Bochner, S., & Furnham, A. (2001). *The psychology of culture shock*. Hove, England: Psychology Press.
- Warren, C. A. B. (2002). Qualitative interviewing. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context and method* (pp. 83-102). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Watkins, M. (2008). Teaching bodies/learning desire: Rethinking the role of desire in the pedagogic process. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 16(2), 113-124.
- Watkins, M. (2018). Little room for capacitation: Rethinking Bourdieu on pedagogy as symbolic violence. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 39(1), 47-60.
- Watkins, M., & Noble, G. (2013). *Disposed to learn: Ethnicity, schooling and the scholarly habitus*. London, England: Bloomsbury.
- Webber, M. (2013). Student ethnicity. *SET*, 1, 67-70.
- Wells, G. (1999). *Dialogic inquiry: Towards a socio-cultural practice and theory of education*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E. (1998). Communities of practice: Learning as a social system. *Systems Thinker*, 9(5), 2-3.

- White, J. (2011). Resistance to classroom participation: Minority students, academic discourse, cultural conflicts, and issues of representation in whole class discussions. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education, 10*(4), 250-265.
- Wigglesworth, G., Simpson, J., & Loakes, D. (2011). NAPLAN language assessments for indigenous children in remote communities: Issues and problems. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics, 34*(3), 320-343.
- Wingate, U. (2015). *Academic literacy and student diversity: The case for inclusive practice*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Wise, A., & Velayutham, S. (2017). Transnational affect and emotion in migration research. *International Journal of Sociology, 47*(2), 116-130.
- Wortham, S. (2006). *Learning identity: The joint emergence of social identification and academic learning*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Wortham, S. (2008). The objectification of identity across events. *Linguistics and Education, 19*(3), 294-311.
- Wragg, T. (1994). *An introduction to classroom observation*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Wright, M. (2011). Diversity and the imagined community: Immigrant diversity and conceptions of national identity. *Political Psychology, 32*(5), 837-862.
- Yair, G. (2009). *Pierre Bourdieu: The last musketeer of the French Revolution*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Yamaguchi, M. (2005). Discursive representation and enactment of national identities: The case of generation 1.5 Japanese. *Discourse & Society, 16*(2), 269-299.
- Zhang, L., & Cowie, B. (2004). Chinese-speaking students' perceptions of learning science in English in New Zealand. *SET, 2*, 40-43.

Zingsheim, J. (2011). Developing mutational identity theory: Evolution, multiplicity, embodiment, and agency. *Cultural Studies↔Critical Methodologies*, 11(1), 24-37.