

A Comparative Study of the Language Content of Employment-related Units
in Government-funded Language Programs for Newcomers in Canada and Australia

by

Yiran Zhang
Bachelor of Arts, University of Victoria, 2013

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Linguistics

© Yiran Zhang, 2018
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means, without the permission of the author.

Supervisory Committee

A Comparative Study of the Language Content of Employment-related Units
in Government-funded Language Programs for Newcomers in Canada and Australia

by

Yiran Zhang

Bachelor of Arts, University of Victoria, 2013

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Li-Shih Huang, Department of Linguistics
Supervisor

Dr. Sonya Bird, Department of Linguistics
Departmental Member

Abstract

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Li-Shih Huang, Department of Linguistics

Supervisor

Dr. Sonya Bird, Department of Linguistics

Departmental Member

In response to the scant studies comparing the language content of the employment-related units in Australia's Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP) and Canada's Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC) program, the present study examines the curriculum guidelines and the selected instructional materials of AMEP's Certificate in Spoken and Written English (CSWE) III and LINC level 4 and investigates four instructors' implementation of the curricula (two instructors from each program).

Through qualitatively analysis using NVivo, the results show that both LINC 4 and CSWE III exhibit strengths and limitations, and also alignment and misalignment, as compared to their theoretical frameworks. While LINC 4 covers more components in the framework, CSWE III demonstrates greater depth in implementing its theoretical foundation. Further, LINC 4 instructors mostly implement a task-based approach; the CSWE III instructors incorporate multiple approaches, while the curriculum claims text-based teaching as its main approach.

This study suggests that in teaching English for employment purposes, more content that introduces the different functions of language use and communication strategies would be beneficial, and authentic texts and learner experience can also be valuable. The incorporation of different teaching approaches may be advantageous. Future research can further examine newcomer language program outcomes by comparing language production data from learners of similar programs in different contexts, in order to evaluate the impact of language training on learners' ability to engage in employment-purposed communication.

Table of Contents

Supervisory Committee	ii
Abstract	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Tables	vi
List of Acronyms	vii
Acknowledgments	viii
Dedication	x
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Literature Review	4
2.1 Newcomer Language Training and Employment in A Time of Refugee Crisis	4
2.2 Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC)	7
2.2.1 Historical development of LINC.	7
2.2.2 Communicative Competence as a theoretical framework for LINC.	9
2.2.3 Portfolio-Based Language Assessment (PBLA)	16
2.3 Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP)	17
2.3.1 Historical development of AMEP	17
2.3.2 Systemic Functional Linguistics as a theoretical framework for AMEP	18
2.4 Instructional Approaches in LINC and AMEP	21
2.4.1 Task-based instructional approach in LINC.	21
2.4.2 Text-based instructional approach in AMEP	23
2.4.3 Task-based approach vs. text-based approach.	24
2.5 Language Instruction and Employment Outcomes in LINC and AMEP	25
2.5.1 Language training and employment in Canada and Australia.	25
2.5.2 Canada vs. Australia on language training and employment	27
2.6 Research Questions	30
Chapter 3 Methods	32
3.1 Selection of Documents	32
3.2 Interviews	36
3.3 Instruments	38
3.3.1 Background questionnaire.	38
3.3.2 Interview Questions.	38
3.4 Procedures	39
3.4.1 Participant Recruitment.	39
3.4.2 Interviews	40
3.5 Data Analysis	41
3.5.1 Coding Schemes	41
3.5.2 Data coding.	43
3.5.3 Qualitative analysis.	44
Chapter 4 Results and Discussion	46
4.1 Similarities and Differences in Selected Documents	46
4.1.1 Selected documents from LINC 4	46
4.1.2 Selected documents from CSWE III	50
4.1.3 Selected documents from LINC 4 vs. selected documents from CSWE III.	54
4.2 Instructors' Perspectives	71

4.2.1 Amanda from LINC 4.	71
4.2.2 Bianca from LINC 4.	75
4.2.3 Coding results from LINC 4 instructor interviews	79
4.2.3 LINC 4 instructors' perspectives vis-à-vis selected documents	82
4.2.4 Catherine from CSWE III.	87
4.2.5 Dana from CSWE III.	92
4.2.6 Coding results from CSWE III instructor interviews	97
4.2.7 CSWE III instructors' perspectives vis-à-vis selected documents	100
4.2.8 Perspectives of LINC 4 instructors vs. perspectives of CSWE III instructors.	105
4.3 Levels of Alignment to Theoretical Frameworks	111
4.3.1 LINC 4 employment vis-à-vis Communicative Competence.	112
4.3.2 CSWE III employment vis-à-vis Systemic Functional Linguistics.	113
4.3.3 LINC 4's alignment to theory vs. CSWE III's alignment to theory.	114
4.4 Implications.....	115
4.4.1 Methodological implications.	115
4.4.2 Empirical implications.	116
4.4.3 Pedagogical implications.	117
4.4.4 Practical implications.	122
4.5 Limitations	123
4.6 Future Research Directions	126
Chapter 5 Conclusion.....	128
References	131
List of Appendices	148
Appendix A. Background Questionnaire for LINC 4 and CSWE III Instructors	148
Appendix B. Interview Questions for LINC 4 Instructors	149
Appendix C. Interview Questions for CSWE III Instructors	151
Appendix D. Instructor Participants Recruitment Flyers Posted on Twitter	152
Appendix E. Definitions and Examples of Nodes Used for Coding.....	154
Appendix F. Examples of Noteworthy Points from Instructor Interviews	160
Appendix G. Comparison Table for Results from LINC 4 and CSWE III.....	165

List of Tables

Table 1 <i>Difficulties since Arriving in Canada (IRCC, 2016)</i>	5
Table 2 <i>Language Ability Model by Bachman and Palmer (1996, 2010)</i>	9
Table 3 <i>Communicative Competence Model by Celce-Murcia et al. (1995)</i>	12
Table 4 <i>Strengths and Limitations of Task-based and Text-based Instructional Approaches</i>	24
Table 5 <i>Selection of documents from LINC 4 and CSWE III</i>	33
Table 6 <i>Participant Descriptions</i>	37
Table 7 <i>Coding Scheme for LINC 4 based on the Communicative Competence model proposed by Celce-Murcia et al. (1995)</i>	41
Table 8 <i>Coding Scheme for Data from CSWE III based on Three Aspects of Language Education proposed by Halliday (1981)</i>	42
Table 9 <i>Examples of Areas of Disagreements</i>	44
Table 10 <i>Code Coverage in LINC 4 Curriculum Guidelines – Employment and LINC 4 Classroom Activities – Employment</i>	47
Table 11 <i>Code Coverage in Certificate III in Spoken and Written English and Living in Australia, Intermediate – Units 1, 2 and 3</i>	51
Table 12 <i>Code Coverage in Amanda’s and Bianca’s Interview Transcripts</i>	79
Table 13 <i>Underrepresented Communication Strategies in LINC Theoretical Framework and Examples of Their Potential Use in Employment-related Contexts</i>	87
Table 14 <i>Code Coverage in Catherine’s and Dana’s Interview Transcripts</i>	97

List of Acronyms

ACT – Australian Capital Territory
ADET – Australian Department Education and Training
ADFAT – Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
ADHA – Australian Department of Home Affairs
ADIC – Australian Department of Immigration and Citizenship
AFLN – AMEP Flexible Learning Network
AMEP – Adult Migrant English Program
BC – British Columbia
CCLB – Centre for Canadian Language Benchmarks
CIC – Citizenship and Immigration Canada
CLB – Canadian Language Benchmarks
CSWE – Certificates in Spoken and Written English
DILGEA – Department of Immigration, Local Government, and Ethnic Affairs
EAP – English for Academic Purposes
ESL – English as a Second Language
GARs – Government-Assisted Refugees
IELTS – International English Language Testing System
IRCC – Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship Canada
ISSofBC – Immigrant Services Society of BC
L1s – first languages
LINC – Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada
NSW AMES – New South Wales Adult Migrant English Services
ON – Ontario
UNHCR – United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
PSRs – Privately Sponsored Refugees
SFL – Systemic Functional Linguistics
TAFE – Technical and Further Education
TESL – Teachers of English as a Second Language or Teaching English as a Second Language
TESOL – Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages

Acknowledgments

It feels like yesterday when the idea of crossing the finish line seemed unimaginable, yet with the support of so many incredible individuals, here I am.

This journey would not have been possible without my supervisor Dr. Li-Shih Huang, whose profound wisdom and unwavering support guided me through and lifted me up during the tough times. I am immensely grateful for the knowledge, mentorship, and trust Dr. Huang has generously shared with me; it is because of her that I can now confidently embrace the next phase of my career and life.

I was able to further enhance my study with Dr. Sonya Bird's valuable insights and feedback. I deeply appreciate the time and support she has dedicated to my work. Her comments made a significant difference to the structure and coherence to this thesis.

I would also like to thank Dr. Scott Watson for taking the time and making the commitment of being my outside member.

I am also humbled by the support of these brilliant scholars, including Dr. Ewa Czaykowska-Higgins, Dr. John C. Walsh, Professor Teresa Dawson, and Dr. Leslie Saxon. Their kind words and encouragement contributed greatly to the fruition of my study.

Further, I would like to acknowledge all the amazing English teaching professionals around the world, including my instructor participants from Canada and Australia, members of the BC TEAL community, Ms. Jennifer Walsh Marr, and many more, for their help and support. Also, I thank for the support from the Australian Department of Education and Training, who kindly granted me access to the curriculum documents that were used in this study.

Thanks to the dear friends that I had the privilege to know throughout the years, the graduate school experience became more enjoyable than it would have been if I were by myself.

Myles, my “partner in crime,” thank you for all the good times. I will never forget the memories we share, and I look forward to creating more with you. Amjad, thank you for being my wonderful sister; I will forever cherish the time we have spent together as colleagues and friends. Jie, thank you for being my rock and always offering me homemade Chinese food. Lisa, thank you for being such an honest and reliable friend. Ayden and Kyra, I will always miss your contagious laughter and your personalities that are brighter than the sun. Ildara and Emily, thank you for all the heartfelt conversations. Keun, Kendall, and Amber, thank you for being such wonderful and supportive friends. Katharine, thank you for all the fantastic workouts and the hilarious movie nights. Lastly, my dear sweet Jennie, thank you for teaching me what life is about and showing me love and generosity.

Dedication

To my parents Wenchang Zhang and Guozhi Wang, whose endless love and support give me the strength to defeat all adversity in life.

爸爸妈妈，我爱你们。

Chapter 1 Introduction

As of July 2018, over 5.6 million people have fled Syria since the outbreak of a civil war in the country in 2011, which makes the Syrian refugee crisis the biggest humanitarian crisis of our time (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2018). With the conflict escalating, both Canada and Australia started Syrian refugee intake on a large scale in late 2015. With the sudden increase in the number of incoming refugees, newcomer settlement and integration have become some of the most urgent tasks for the governments in these two countries. Gaining skills in official languages is one of the most pressing needs these newcomers have; obtaining employment, as one of the most integral parts of the newcomer settlement and integration processes, requires skills in official languages. The ongoing Syrian refugee crisis and the important role official language skills plays in newcomer employment have made me realize the significance of newcomer language training and inspired me to explore the language programs that are available to new immigrants in Canada and Australia; through this study, I hope to discover findings that are transferrable to other contexts where newcomer learners, not just Syrian refugee learners, have the needs to gain English language skills for employment purposes.

Canada and Australia welcome the most immigrants in the world (Clarke & Skuterud, 2013). Both countries over the years have shifted their Anglo-European focused immigration policies to accepting immigrants from Asia, Africa, and the Middle East (Clarke & Skuterud, 2013; Jackson, 2013). The more diverse source of immigrant flow has led to a higher demand of English language instruction (Chiswick & Miller, 2003; Pendakur & Pendakur, 2002).

Newcomers face challenges communicating and interacting with members of the new community who do not know their first language(s). Cultural integration becomes difficult without sufficient English language skills. In the employment context, employers' perception of

these newcomers' insufficient language skills is the top barrier to employability. Consequently, newcomers often face underemployment and unemployment (Li & Campbell, 2009). Therefore, it is crucial for government-funded language programs to prepare newcomers for employment-purposed English communication so that learners can better settle and integrate into the host community.

Both Canada and Australia have developed government-funded language programs that are free and accessible for eligible new immigrants who need to improve their language proficiency: Canada's Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC) program and Australia's Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP)¹. Recent studies have shown that the Australian immigrant language training programs result in better language and employment outcomes than do Canadian ones (Clarke & Skuterud, 2013; Jackson, 2013), and Jackson's (2013) study concluded that the newcomer language program, including program structure, scope of language training and funding, provided by the Australian government, played a role in this finding. Although there has been an increasing body of research on immigrant employment in relation to language proficiency (Boyd & Cao, 2009; Chiswick & Miller, 2003; Clarke & Skuterud, 2013; Jackson, 2013), few studies have examined the curriculum designs of these existing language programs.

The present study's significance lies within its comparison of the language curricula of employment-related units and their implementation between the Canadian LINC and the Australian AMEP programs and its resulting recommendations that would be of interest to multiple stakeholders, e.g., federal agencies, researchers, LINC providers, instructors, learners,

¹ While aware of there are other language programs available to newcomers in Canada and Australia, the present study focuses on the LINC and AMEP programs.

material and program developers. Specifically, this study evaluates the language content of the employment-related units of LINC level 4 in Canada's LINC program, and Certificates in Spoken and Written English (CSWE) level III in Australia's AMEP program, which is the equivalent of LINC 4 according to their alignments to International English Language Testing System (IELTS) test (Government of Canada, 2014; AMES, 2013). The levels were chosen because 1) language content relevant to employment is often not included in language classes at levels lower than LINC 4 or CSWE III, 2) learners who complete these two levels may continue to language courses for employment purposes, 3) it is worth investigating how language training in these two levels prepare learners for employment-related English communication, and 4) learners at these levels may still face difficulties in getting their credentials and experience recognized and finding work.

The remaining chapters are organized as follows: Chapter 2 of this study provided a literature review that included an overview of Canada's and Australia's responses to the recent humanitarian crisis and an introduction to the LINC and AMEP programs. More specifically, the chapter reviewed the respective historical developments, theoretical frameworks, instructional approaches, and language instruction and employment outcomes in the two programs. Three research questions were proposed at the end of this chapter. Next, Chapter 3 demonstrated the methods of this study, summarized the sources and procedures of data collection, introduced the coding schemes, and described the processes of data coding and analysis. Then, Chapter 4 presented the results and discussion of the three research questions, addressed the implications and limitations of this study, and offered future research directions. Finally, Chapter 5 concluded this thesis.

Chapter 2 Literature Review

This chapter first provides information about newcomer language training in Canada and Australia in a time of refugee crisis, with a specific focus on English language training and employment. Overviews for the LINC program and the AMEP program are then presented, including their historical development, theoretical foundations, and instructional approaches. Following are the two programs' employment outcomes found in the literature. Finally, three research questions addressed in this study are proposed.

2.1 Newcomer Language Training and Employment in A Time of Refugee Crisis

Since 2015, Canada and Australia have engaged in large intakes of Syrian refugees (Government of Canada, 2017; Australian Department of Home Affairs, 2017). Up to January 2017, Canada had welcomed in more than 40,000 Syrian refugees, and over 21,000 of these refugees have been assisted by the government (Government of Canada, 2017).

According to the Rapid Impact Evaluation of the Syrian Refugee Initiative (Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship Canada, 2016), many Syrian refugees could not access employment services until they were able to reach a “specific” Canadian Language Benchmark (CLB)² level³ (IRCC, 2016, p.19). On the CLB scale, the average level of newly arrived⁴ Syrian refugees was

² Canadian Language Benchmarks (CLB) are a “national descriptive framework of communicative language for adult English as a Second Language programs in Canada.” The CLB has three stages and twelve benchmarks. English proficiency of each level is divided into four skills areas of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. In a settlement English language program, each topic is taught in conjunction with the CLB. The CLB are used because such programs usually have a focus on what the learners can do with their knowledge learned in the program in the real world. Under this framework, the learners must master at least 70% of the competencies of one benchmark to progress to the next level (LISTN, 2015, p. i).

³ The Rapid Impact Evaluation of the Syrian Refugee Initiative (IRCC, 2016) does not specify what CLB level(s) learners need to reach before being able to access employment services. However, to my knowledge, many institutions start offering employment-purposed language training from LINC level 5, and learners at the entrance point of this level have CLB 6 or 7 in speaking and listening, and CLB 5 or 6 in reading and writing.

⁴ The report focused on the 25,000 Syrian refugees who arrived in Canada between November 4, 2015 and March 1, 2016 (IRCC, 2016).

at CLB 2.6 out of 12, which is considered low, while employment-purposed training is often offered to learners at CLB 5 and above (ISSofBC, 2015).

The evaluation report suggests that at the time of the survey, half of the privately sponsored refugees (PSRs) had found work, while only 10% of GARs had jobs. The report also points out that more PSRs had issues with having their education or work experience recognized, and they may need English language training to pass certificate exams before they can find work in their fields (L.-S. Huang, personal communication, July 26, 2018). Table 1 below presents the top difficulties identified by Syrian refugees (IRCC, 2016, p. 16).

Table 1 Difficulties since Arriving in Canada (IRCC, 2016)⁵

	Syrian GARs	Syrian PSRs
Finding a good job	34.3%	62.6%
Adapting to a new culture or new values	12.5%	12.4%
Learning English and/or French and facing language barrier ⁶	55.1%	32.7%
Getting education or work experience recognized	19.0%	40.1%
Finding good quality housing (e.g., good price, good quality, good neighbourhood)	37.0%	19.4%
Coping with financial constraints	24.5%	12.2%

As Table 1 presents, employment and learning official languages were perceived as the top two obstacles by Syrian refugees, and over half of GARs recognized learning official languages as the most prominent barrier for their lives in Canada. Having language skills thus appears to be the central difficulty for finding work, and language and employment are vital in facilitating cultural adaptation.

⁵ As suggested by the evaluation report, the surveys were only conducted among Syrian refugees who came to Canada between November 4, 2015 and March 1, 2016, who were 18 years or older and residing outside of Quebec. The total of the percentage may not equal 100% since multiple options could be selected.

⁶ The evaluation report identifies learning English, learning French, and facing language barrier as one difficulty the Syrian refugees face. As the report also points out, at the time of the survey, 94% of GARs and 75.3% of PSRs had taken English language classes, and 0.5% of GARs and 1.5% of PSRs had taken French language classes. Therefore, the majority of Syrian refugees face more obstacles in learning English than in learning French.

Meanwhile, the settlement process for these newcomers has been challenging. The lack of English language skills remains one of the top barriers to newcomer employment (Grant, 2016; Pruss, 2016; Lowrie, 2017). It has been reported that Syrian refugees often are waitlisted by the language program for up to one year (Carman, 2016; Rolfsen, 2016), and newcomers who came to Canada earlier might be pushed further back on the waiting list as the immigration societies prioritize newly arrived refugees (Bramham, 2016). Also, the government is reportedly not sufficiently prepared for the educational and language training needs of the first wave of Syrian refugee intake – delays in funding have resulted in cuts to settlement services, including language classes (Miller, 2017). Furthermore, the above challenges likely have impacted both Syrian refugees and newcomers of other backgrounds who are usually enrolled in the same programs.

By June 2017, Australia had granted more than 22,000 humanitarian entries in response to the Syrian and Iraqi refugee crisis (ADHA, 2017). The evaluation report for Australia's humanitarian response to the Syria crisis points out that proper consideration should be given to refugees' need for language skills, and there should be increasing resources to address this aspect of their settlement (Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2014).

In Australia, changes to the government-funded AMEP program were made in spring 2017 following budget cuts to language services in the country, which has had an unfavourable impact on the language support Australian newcomers receive. Established long-term service providers such as Adult Migrant English Services (AMES) and Navitas lost parts of their contracts to private providers (Ross, 2017), which has led to a massive employee layoff – in New South Wales (NSW) alone, 500 teachers from the AMEP program reportedly lost their jobs, and consequently, the quality of the program delivery is now under question (Chingaipe, 2017).

Similar to refugees in Canada, newcomers in Australia also need sufficient language skills to support their needs in employment. English language skills have become even more crucial to newcomer settlement recently, as the Australian federal government drafted new legislation to propose changes to citizenship requirements, among which there is the rising of the required English proficiency level from ‘basic’ to ‘competent’, equating to band 6 in the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) (Nowell, 2017). If the government passes the proposal, newcomers of all backgrounds without sufficient English language skills will face even more adversity in their settlement and integration processes.

2.2 Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC)

2.2.1 Historical development of LINC.

Prior to LINC, Canada had developed various language programs. Language training in the 1950s was held on a part-time basis and geared towards Canadian citizenship preparation. Starting from the 1960s, the emphasis of language programs shifted to training for specific types of skills and satisfying the demands of the domestic labour market (Lanphier & Lucomskyj, 1994).

From 1990 to 1994, a recommendation that the federal government should establish a national standard for language learners was proposed at four TESL Canada Learners’ Conferences (Saskatoon, Vancouver, Halifax, and Toronto) (Pawlikowska-Smith, 1996). Following the conferences, the CLB, a “national descriptive framework of communicative language for adult ESL programs in Canada”, was developed and published (LISTN, 2015, p. i). Currently, in LINC, CLB is used in assessing and placing newcomers in the right levels of language instruction (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2012), and describing learners’ language proficiency throughout their enrollment.

Founded in 1992, LINC aimed to provide a more flexible language instruction environment compared to previous programs in order to attract more newcomers to enroll in the program (Lanphier & Lucomskyj, 1994; Boyd et al., 1994). LINC has been an essential component of the federal immigrant integration strategy (CIC, 2010). The program is designed to provide learners with “basic language skills” (settlement.org, 2016, ¶ 1), which aims to help immigrants and refugees successfully integrate into Canada socially, culturally, economically, and politically, by providing language training in either English or French, as well as to provide newcomers knowledge about Canada (CIC, 2010). Through years of curriculum development, levels 1 to 5 in LINC⁷ have been made available across Canada; these levels teach learners from English literacy education to intermediate level training necessary for communication in most everyday activities (Centre for Canadian Language Benchmarks, 2012).

By 2009, all learners in Canada could choose to participate in in-class language learning or LINC Home Study Program, which was initially developed in Ontario in 1995 to serve learners in remote areas. Currently, the program provides both online learning and learning through correspondence that includes weekly phone conversations between instructors and learners (Jackson, 2013). The LINC program is free for eligible newcomers in Canada since many of them cannot otherwise afford the cost of language training. Prior to 2012, all eligible learners could study in the LINC program for up to 1,200 hours; in 2012, the federal government lifted this limit for adult learners experiencing learning difficulties, and these learners may stay

⁷ CLB divides the levels into three stages: Stage I (CLB 1 to 4) focuses on “basic language ability” necessary for communication in “non-demanding”, “common[,] and predictable contexts” in order to address “basic needs.” Stage II (CLB 5-8) teaches “intermediate language ability” that allows participation in a wider range of contexts, where learners can independently engage in “moderately demanding” and familiar yet less predictable scenarios of “daily[,] social, educational and work-related life experience.” Stage III (CLB 9 to 12) aims to equip learners with “advanced language ability”, which enables effective, appropriate, accurate, and fluent communication on “most topics” across a variety of “communicatively demanding” contexts, whether they are familiar or unpredictable, general or complex (CCLB, 2012, p. x).

in the program after they have used up their hours for as long as their settlement agencies permit (Wall & Szasz-Redmond, 2015).

2.2.2 Communicative Competence as a theoretical framework for LINC.

As addressed previously, the LINC program follows the CLB framework. The theoretical foundation for CLB (and consequently for LINC) is the model of *language ability* (Bachman & Palmer, 1996, 2010) (see Table 2), which has been used as an equivalence of *communicative competence* in the general literature, as outlined in the official theoretical framework document published by CCLB (2015). *Language ability* built upon the theory of *communicative competence* (Bachman & Palmer, 2010), which was initially developed by Dell Hymes (1972).

Table 2 *Language Ability Model by Bachman and Palmer (1996, 2010)*

Language Knowledge	Components
Organizational Knowledge	Grammatical knowledge • Knowledge of vocabulary • Knowledge of syntax • Knowledge of phonology/graphology Textual knowledge • Knowledge of cohesion • Knowledge of rhetorical or conversational organization
Pragmatic Knowledge	Functional knowledge • Knowledge of ideational functions • Knowledge of manipulative functions • Knowledge of heuristic functions • Knowledge of imaginative functions Sociolinguistic knowledge • Knowledge of genre (only in 2010) • Knowledge of dialects/varieties • Knowledge of registers • Knowledge of natural or idiomatic expressions • Knowledge of cultural references and figures of speech
Strategic Competence	Goal setting Assessment (1996) / appraising (2010)

Bachman and Palmer's model (1996, 2010) identifies *language knowledge* as “a domain of information in memory that is available to language users for creating and interpreting discourse in language use” (Bachman & Palmer, 2010, p. 44). *Language knowledge* is categorized into *organizational knowledge* and *pragmatic knowledge*. Besides *language knowledge*, Bachman and Palmer (2010) view *strategic competence* as another key component of their model, which is concerned with “cognitive processes, or strategies that implement [language] knowledge in language use” (p. 57).

Organizational knowledge controls the elements of language for constructing or understanding “grammatically acceptable utterances or sentences” and forming them into spoken or written texts (Bachman & Palmer, 2010, p. 44). Within this category, there is *grammatical knowledge* and *textual knowledge*. *Grammatical knowledge* refers to the accuracy of the utterances or sentences that language users produce or understand; more specifically, it involves language users' knowledge in syntax (grammar), vocabulary, phonology (pronunciation), and graphology (spelling). *Textual knowledge* is concerned with how pieces of information in spoken or written texts are sequenced, and covers two areas of knowledge: 1) *cohesion*, which involves how sentences are connected through the explicit use of linking words and phrases in spoken or written texts; 2) *rhetorical or conversational organization*, which is about how information is sequenced in written texts (e.g., narrative, description, argumentation, and comparison) and how interlocutors engage in conversations.

Pragmatic knowledge allows language users to produce or comprehend discourse through connecting texts, meanings, the purposes of communication, and contexts. Within this category, there are *functional knowledge* and *sociolinguistic knowledge*.

Functional knowledge allows language users to understand the relationships between texts and purposes of communication. More specifically, this knowledge can be dissected into 1) *knowledge of ideational functions*, which helps the expression or interpretation of meanings of real-life experience (e.g., expressing or exchanging ideas, knowledge, or feelings); 2) *knowledge of manipulative functions* which involves language use for making an impact to the world (e.g., getting others to do things, controlling what others do, or managing interpersonal relationships with others); 3) *knowledge of heuristic functions* that aids language use for expanding knowledge and understanding of the world (e.g., use language to teach or learn, to solve problems, and to retain information); 4) *knowledge of imaginative functions* that allows language users to create imaginations or use the language “for humorous or aesthetic purposes” (e.g., using figurative language, writing poetry, or making jokes) (Bachman & Palmer, 2010, p. 47).

Sociolinguistic knowledge involves producing or interpreting language appropriately according to the contexts of language use. Within this knowledge there are 1) *knowledge of genres*, which helps shape communication for specific social purposes; 2) *knowledge of dialects/varieties* that involves “social and regional varieties” of language use (Bachman & Palmer, 2010, p. 48); 3) *knowledge of register* that recognizes levels of formality of language use; 4) *knowledge of natural or idiomatic expression*, which involves the knowledge of expressions that identify the language users as native speakers of a particular language community; 5) *knowledge of cultural references and figures of speech* that are concerned with knowledge of cultural meanings of certain things or people and knowledge of figurative speech.

Within the context of language use, Bachman and Palmer (2010) considers *strategic competence* as metacognitive strategies that include strategies for 1) *goal setting*, which is about making the decision of what language tasks to do; 2) *appraising* (or *assessment*), which involves

assessing what is needed for the tasks, what resources are available for the tasks, and how are the performances on the tasks; 3) *planning*, which is about planning to make use of available resources for the tasks.

Over the years, the Communicative Competence theory has been elaborated upon by many scholars (Canale & Swain, 1980; Canale, 1983; Bachman, 1990; Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei & Thurrell, 1995; Bachman & Palmer, 1996, 2010). In addition to the *language ability* model, the Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) model⁸ (see Table 3) is also provided to CLB users for its suitability for English language pedagogical development and its focus on oral communication.

Building upon two previously developed Communicative Competence models, one by Canale and Swain (1980) and Canale (1983) and the other one by Bachman (1990) and Bachman and Palmer (1996), Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) propose a pedagogically driven model with five main components: *discourse competence*, *linguistic competence*, *actional competence*, *sociocultural competence*, and *strategic competence*.

Table 3 *Communicative Competence Model by Celce-Murcia et al. (1995)*

Competences	Components
Discourse	Cohesion Deixis Coherence Genre/generic structure Conversational structure
Linguistic	Syntax Morphology Lexicon (receptive and productive) Phonology (for pronunciation) Orthography (for spelling)
Actional	Knowledge of language functions:

⁸ The Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) model uses the term *communicative competence*. Moreover, Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) used Bachman's 1990 and Bachman and Palmer's 1996 model to develop a pedagogical model that bridges theories and pedagogies. In the CLB theoretical framework (CCLB, 2015), it is indicated that *language ability* and *communicative competence* refer to similar concepts, and the framework adopted the term *language ability* for the sake of consistency. In the present study, I choose to use the term *communicative competence* to minimize confusion, since the Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) model was selected to be the basis of one of the coding schemes in this study.

	• Interpersonal exchange • Information • Opinions • Feelings • Suasion • Problems • Future scenarios
Sociocultural	Knowledge of speech act sets Social contextual factors Stylistic appropriateness factors Cultural factors
Strategic	Non-verbal communicative factors Avoidance or reduction strategies Achievement or compensatory strategies Stalling or time-gaining strategies Self-monitoring strategies Interactional strategies

Discourse competence in this model involves the choice, sequencing, and patterning of words, structures, sentences and utterances to form spoken or written texts. The subareas identified within this component are: 1) *cohesion*, which is concerned with “bottom-up elements” that help produce texts using reference (*anaphora* refers back to a previous word; *cataphora* refers to a word that that is not yet mentioned), ellipsis (i.e. word omission), conjunction, and parallel structure (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995, pp. 14-15); 2) *deixis system* that connects the context with the discourse and makes it easier to understand the use of pronouns and reference words in texts; 3) *coherence*, which concerns whether sentences or utterances in a discourse are interrelated and what overall theme or message is being delivered in the texts; 4) *genre/generic structure*, which refers to the way texts are constructed within specific purposes (e.g., an official letter is constructed differently than a literary essay); 5) *conversational structure* that refers to knowing the rules to follow when taking part in a conversational exchange (e.g., when and how to open or end a conversation, when and how to take turns, and when and how to interrupt others).

Linguistic competence involves the “basic elements of communication”: sentence patterns and types, syntactic structures, morphological inflections, lexical resources, and phonological and orthographic systems (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995, pp. 16-17). Thus, this competence consists of the following subareas: 1) *Syntax*, which includes elements such as constituent/phrase structure, word order, sentence types; 2) *morphology*, which involves parts of speech, inflections, etc.); 3) *lexicon*, which concerns content words (e.g., nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc.) and function words (e.g., pronouns, prepositions, determiners, etc.), fixed phrases or (semi-)formulaic chunks (e.g., what can I do for you?), collocations (i.e., words that usually appear together), and idioms; 4) *phonology*, which involves the structure of sounds. This subarea includes both segmentals (i.e., vowels, consonants, syllable types, and sound changes like reduction between sounds next to each other in speech) and suprasegmentals (i.e., prominence, stress, intonation, and rhythm); 5) *orthography*, which is for spelling, and concerns alphabetic writing, phoneme representations in graphemes, rules of spelling, and punctuation.

Actional competence is the ability to express and understand the intention in communication, which is “matching actional intent with linguistic form based on the knowledge of an inventory of verbal schemata that carry illocutionary force (*speech acts* and *speech act sets*)” (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995, p.17). It is stressed that the *actional competence* in this model is primarily concerned with spoken communication. Within this competence, there are *knowledge of language functions* and *knowledge of speech act sets*. *Language functions* are divided into expression and interpretation of the following seven categories of communication: *interpersonal exchange, information, opinions, feelings, suasion, problems, and future scenarios*. *Knowledge of speech act sets* involves understanding the ways *speech acts* and *language functions* are patterned and sequenced in real-life contexts.

Sociocultural competence concerns the ability to communicate appropriately according to the social and cultural contexts. Under this component, there are four sub-elements: 1) *social contextual factors*, which involve characteristics of the interactants and the communication context; 2) *stylistic appropriateness factors*, which look at elements such as politeness, levels of formality, and field-specific registers; 3) *cultural factors*, which involve sociocultural background knowledge of the target language community, awareness of major dialect or regional differences, and cross-cultural awareness; 4) *non-verbal communicative factors* that concern elements such as body language, use of space, touching, paralinguistic factors, and silence.

Strategic competence in this model refers to the knowledge of communication strategies and the ways to use them. While Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) acknowledge that research prior to their study has identified strategies related to language learning, processing, and production (Oxford, 1990; O' Malley & Chamot, 1990; Wenden, 1991; Bachman, Purpura, & Cushing, 1993, cited in Celce-Murcia, et al., 1995), the Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) framework focuses on *communication strategies* only because they consider these strategies as the most relevant to communicative language use and language teaching. This model includes five sub-elements within *strategic competence* (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995, p. 28): 1) *avoidance or reduction strategies* (e.g., message replacement, topic avoidance, and message abandonment); 2) *achievement or compensatory strategies* (e.g., circumlocution, approximation, all-purpose words, non-linguistic means, restructuring, word-coinage, literal translation from first language (L1), foreignizing, code switching, and retrieval); 3) *stalling or time-gaining strategies* (e.g., fillers, hesitation markers, and self- and other-repetition); 4) *interactional strategies* (e.g., asking for help, asking for repetition, clarification, and conformation, expressing non-understanding,

responding with repetition, paraphrasing, expansion, reduction, confirmation, rejection, and repair, and checking comprehension with other interactants).

In this study, the Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) model was chosen to examine the data from LINC 4 since it serves the purpose of curriculum assessment more sufficiently. As suggested by the theoretical framework document, this model “seeks to establish a link between the theoretical model and its pedagogical application,” which makes it “a useful basis for developing a framework of reference for language ability to apply in pedagogical contexts” (CCLB, 2015, p. 61). Appendix E provides a table of definitions and examples for each component in this model.

2.2.3 Portfolio-Based Language Assessment (PBLA)

Since 2015, the LINC programs across Canada gradually began to implement a new assessment tool called Portfolio-Based Language Assessment (PBLA) (Pettis, 2015).

According to the official guidebook published by Centre for Canadian Language Benchmarks, PBLA offers a “comprehensive, systemic, authentic, collaborative approach to language assessment,” and instructors and learners are encouraged to work together on compiling learners’ samples of work into portfolios (Pettis, 2015, p.7). Following this assessment, instructors and learners analyze the products and reflect on the process of learning. PBLA aims to facilitate learner autonomy and the “development of metacognitive knowledge and skills that students are able to transfer to other aspects of their lives” (Pettis, 2015, p.7). In other words, PBLA, as an assessment tool, documents learners’ progress over the course of their learning (*formative assessment*), instead of their periodical test results (*summative assessment*).

PBLA follows the principles of CLB: 1) the instruction is *learner-centred* based on learners’ needs and goals, and learners should be informed and engaged in making decisions in the classroom; 2) the instruction is *task-based*, and instructors assess learners’ performance

through participating in tasks that are “based on real-world issues and events and use authentic text” (Pettis, 2015, p. 14); 3) the instruction should cover *community, study, and work-related tasks*; 4) the assessment is *competency-based* involving the competences outlined in Communicative Competence. In the context of language teaching and learning, a *competency-based* curriculum is “a performance-based outline of language tasks that lead to a demonstrated mastery of the language associated with specific skills that are necessary for individuals to function proficiently in the society in which they live” (Grognet & Crandall, 1982, cited in Auerbach, 1986, p. 413). Therefore, a *competency-based* assessment measures learners’ competency in the target language based on their performance on specific language tasks in the curriculum.

2.3 Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP)

2.3.1 Historical development of AMEP.

As a program serving similar functions that Canada’s LINC program serves, Australia’s AMEP was funded by the Department of Immigration, Local Government, and Ethnic Affairs (DILGEA). AMEP is one of Australia’s oldest and largest immigrant language training programs. The program was established in 1948 and was originally called Adult Migrant Education Scheme. Free English classes were offered to Australia’s first wave of non-English speaking immigrants to help their settlement in the country (Australian Department of Education and Training, 2017b). Currently, the program offers up to 510 hours of free instruction to eligible learners.

Similar to LINC, the primary goal of AMEP is to deliver “preliminary English skills in a specific settlement context through English language tuition while introducing newly arrived clients to Australian social norms and practices, services, and the rule of law” (ADET, 2015, p.

6). According to the program's 2015 evaluation, employment outcomes appeared to be very important to many AMEP clients. The program focuses on functionality, but demand for employment-purposed English training remains high. Further, the proficiency level at which clients become ineligible for and must exit AMEP is usually not enough for employment or further education.

In the 1940s, AMEP offered English classes to immigrants before they departed their home countries and while they were on board to Australia, and at immigrant hostels and community centres. Some classes were delivered through radio broadcasts and correspondence. At present, the nationally accredited CSWE curriculum framework is used in AMEP. The levels include Pre-CSWE level, Certificate I: Beginner, Certificate II: Post Beginner, and Certificate III: Intermediate. The program offers part-time, full-time, and self-paced online distance learning classes. As well, AMEP is delivered through the Home Tutor Scheme, which sends trained volunteers to conduct one-on-one language training in the client's home (Australian Department of Immigration and Citizenship, publication report, as cited in Jackson, 2013). In 2013 and 2014, the AMEP Flexible Learning Network (AFLN) implemented a trial of the virtual classroom. The virtual classroom allowed learners to see, listen, and talk to each other and work collaboratively over the internet. The trial was initiated to optimize the experience of distance learning students to address the issues caused by the lack of socialization in their study, which revealed that the virtual classroom was beneficial and useful for learners who have intermediate and above language proficiency and are familiar with computer and the internet (ADET, 2015).

2.3.2 Systemic Functional Linguistics as a theoretical framework for AMEP.

Stated in the CSWE III curriculum framework (NSW Adult Migrant English Services, 2013), the courses in the AMEP program are based on the understanding that there are three

aspects of English as a second language learning: *learning language*, *learning through language*, and *learning about language* (Halliday, 1979, as cited in NSW AMES, 2013)⁹.

These three aspects of language education were initially used to describe children's language development. *Learning language* refers to “construing mother tongue,” and the protolanguage young children use to express meanings (Halliday, 1981, p. 338). In CSWE III curriculum, aspect of *learning language* is defined as learning to make choices from “systems of text structures (cohesion, coherence, and comprehension of texts), grammar, vocabulary, phonology (pronunciation) and graphology (spelling),” which allows language users to communicate efficiently across contexts. (NSW AMES, 2013, p. 22). The CSWE III curriculum also outlines *prosodic features* (e.g., pausing, stress, intonation) and *paralinguistic features* (e.g., body language, facial expressions, facial expressions, eye contact) (NSW AMES, 2013), which can be categorized under the *learning language* aspect.

Learning through language concerns with gaining knowledge through spoken or written language (Halliday, 1981). In CSWE III, this aspect is about the utilization of language resources to communicate new knowledge and ideas with others, including using 1) *learner strategies* (active participation in formal learning environment, independent learning strategies, and understanding the role of assessment); 2) *communication strategies*, which include *extended turn-taking* (e.g., recounting events, telling an anecdote, expressing an opinion, seeking clarification in an extended manner, providing a description), *interaction strategies* (e.g., turn taking, asking questions, asking for repetition, indicating comprehension, responding to topic shifts, confirming and clarifying, etc.), and *negotiating exchange* (e.g., making requests,

⁹ I am not able to locate the Halliday 1979 publication cited in the CSWE III curriculum framework, so in this study, the three aspects of language education will be addressed based on Halliday's 1981 publication.

acknowledging other viewpoints, using effective questioning techniques, presenting facts logically, etc.); 3) knowledge of *numeracy* (developing mathematical knowledge and skills, and knowledge of language of mathematics) (NSW AMES, 2013).

Halliday (1981) associates *learning about language* with linguistics and the importance of studying the language. In the CSWE III curriculum, this aspect has been modified and involves having the knowledge of language choices that are available for use and how these choices are made according to different social and cultural contexts (NSW AMES, 2013).

The linguistic principles underpinning the CSWE III curriculum are from Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) theory (Halliday & Hasan, 1985), which emphasizes the notion of language function within social contexts. It considers a text as a unit of language that is meaningful within social contexts. Texts are socially constructed and with purposes; they are sequenced and patterned in certain ways to achieve specific goals. Following SFL, instruction of any language features, such as grammar and vocabulary, ideally is delivered within a socially meaningful context. Learners gain knowledge in how to make choices according to different social situations and purposes.

SFL categorizes language into spoken and written texts. Under this theory, texts are seen as units of language that are meaningful within social contexts, and the social purposes of these texts can be identified based on their structures and language patterns. CSWE III's curriculum guidelines (NSW AMES, 2013) suggest that spoken texts are of great importance when it comes to the production of written texts and often they are produced to respond to written texts. The teaching of the spoken and written texts should support each other when designing the course, which enables learners to participate in both the practice of the language and the culture (Joyce,

1992). The relationships between texts and contexts are defined through three register variables of discourse: *field*, *tenor*, and *mode* (Halliday & Hasan, 1985).

The *field of discourse* refers to the topic and the nature of the activity that is happening. The *tenor of discourse* describes the participants who take part in a situation, their characteristics, and their relationships to each other and the situation. The *mode of discourse* is about the role language plays in a situation, which can include “the symbolic organi[z]ation of the text, the status it has...[,] its function in the context,” the channel (spoken, written, or both), and the *rhetorical mode* (what the text achieves: e.g., persuasive, explanatory, instructional) (Halliday & Hasan, 1985, p.12).

2.4 Instructional Approaches in LINC and AMEP

2.4.1 Task-based instructional approach in LINC.

Under the current theoretical framework, the LINC program employs a task-based instructional approach that is communicative in nature. (CCLB, 2015). The LINC curriculum aims to provide tasks that mirror language learners’ experience with “authentic communication” in their daily lives (CCLB, 2015, p. 14).

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, task-based language teaching drew substantial attention, with many scholars proposing and refining the definition of this approach. Ellis (2003, p.13) defines a task as “a workplan” through which learners utilize their linguistic resources to make meaning in contexts. A task aims to lead to language outcomes that resemble language use in the real world.

Krashen and Terrell (1983) suggest that language learning happens subconsciously, and explicit instruction of grammar is not necessary; task-based instruction should aim to imitate the natural process of language acquisition. Moreover, later studies argue that drawing learners’

attention to L2 form, instead of explicit grammar instruction, is a more ideal approach to language teaching and learning (Doughty & Williams, 1998; Long, 1991). It should be noted that Long (1991) distinguishes ‘focus on forms’ and ‘focus on form’. The former involves explicit instruction on linguistic features separate from communicative tasks; the latter refers to covering linguistic structures through participating in tasks and is the approach Long prefers. Form-focused task-based classes can be either pre-emptive (i.e., instructors decide linguistic features for the class) or reactive (i.e., participants in the class, usually the instructor, point out linguistic features that have caused obscurity or errors) (Ellis et al., 2001), and in Long’s (2015) opinion, focus-on-form should be reactive, and the task-based approach should be based on learner needs and have specific purposes. ‘Focus on form’ thus draws learners’ attention to “linguistic problems in context, as they arise in communication,” and language instruction is a response to learners’ language production (Long, 2015, p. 317).

In terms of the types of tasks in language teaching and learning, Nunan (1989, 2004) categorizes them into *real-world/target tasks* and *pedagogical tasks*. The former involve language use in the outside world and beyond the classroom, and the latter relate to learners’ use of their grammatical knowledge to convey meaning through “comprehending, manipulating, producing, or interacting with the target language” (Nunan, 2004, p. 4). Elaborating upon the distinction between the two categories, Bachman (1991) subsequently proposed two types of authenticity – situational and interactional. *Real world/target tasks* link to *situational authenticity* and language use outside of language classrooms, and *pedagogical tasks* take place inside language classrooms and relate to *interactional authenticity*. Skehan (1998, as cited in Nunan, 2004) outlines the characteristics of *pedagogical tasks* as the following: 1) meaning is the most important; 2) learners should not repeat other people’s meaning without proper analysis and

comprehension; 3) tasks should be comparable to real-world activities; 4) task completion is prioritized to a certain degree; 5) tasks are assessed in connection with outcomes.

2.4.2 Text-based instructional approach in AMEP.

Text-based language teaching, informed by the SFL theory, serves as the primary instructional approach in the AMEP program (NSW AMES, 2013). As mentioned previously, texts are socially constructed and purposeful with social contexts, and they are patterned and sequenced in certain ways to achieve particular language goals (Halliday & Hasan, 1985).

Within text-based instruction, texts are rooted in social practices and are categorized into spoken and written ones. This approach prioritizes the role of context and the language necessary for the communication purposes within context. Learners realize the social purposes of texts through participating in text-based spoken and written activities and analyzing texts (Mickan, 2013).

The teaching of grammar in text-based language instruction has a strong functional approach. Hasan (2011) suggests the role of grammar is to “simplify the story” and to inform about how words are patterned in a context to make meanings the speaker intends to make. In text-based language teaching, words and grammar work together as lexicogrammatical resources for making meaning in contexts.

Mickan (2013) argues that through analyzing texts, learners can study how language choices relate to meaning potential. A text can be analyzed through the construct of *process*, *participant*, and *circumstance*. *Process*, which is the core of a clause, is realized through the main verb of a verbal group. Common process types are 1) *material* (e.g., bring, cook, give), 2) *mental* (e.g., think, understand, hate), 3) *verbal* (e.g., tell, ask, enquire), and 4) *relational* (e.g., appear, seem, become). A *participant*, either explicitly present or implied, can serve as an

actor/subject who actively initiates a *process*. A *participant* can also be the goal of a *process*, which functions less actively, usually as the object of a clause, and is often realized by nominal groups. Finally, a *circumstance* provides details of a clause, such as place, time, manner, and accompaniment (Hasan, 2011, pp. 16-18).

2.4.3 Task-based approach vs. text-based approach.

Theoretically, task-based instruction helps learners achieve the negotiation of meanings and acquire knowledge of language features through interactive tasks. Text-based instruction, on the other hand, treats language as a social semiotic, which explains meaning making as a social practice that is specific to a situation. Spoken and written texts construct and are constrained by social contexts, and learners realize different social purposes through analyzing these texts in spoken and written activities (Mickan, 2013). Both task-based and text-based curricula have strengths and limitations (Table 4), which need to be taken into account in classroom application.

Table 4 *Strengths and Limitations of Task-based and Text-based Instructional Approaches*

	Task-based Curriculum	Text-based Curriculum
Strengths	• Content is selected based on learner and instructional needs • Learners communicate through interacting using the target language • Introduction of authentic texts into a learning situation • A focus on both the language and the learning process • Learners use their own experience to contribute to classroom learning • In-class language learning with language use outside of class are linked (Nunan, 2004)	• Texts are embedded in sociocultural contexts • Learners work with authentic and whole texts and focus on language as a resource for meanings. • Opportunities to learn to analyze lexicogrammatical selections • Learners accumulate textual resources and produce their own texts • Learners study language patterns and choices in different texts (Mickan, 2013)
Limitations	• A requirement for teachers to have advanced proficiency	• Predictable and normative social discourses (Mickan, 2013)

- A need for readily available resources for participation in tasks and classroom conditions conducive to students working together in a target language
- Predetermination of selected language items for performing tasks is difficult
- Complex terminology and metalanguage make it challenging to apply in class (Jones and Locke, 2011)
- Close analysis of texts can be time-consuming

(Mickan, 2013)

Despite the above limitations, studies over the years have reported positive learning outcomes for both task-based and text-based language teaching. Relevant meta-analysis shows that task-based language instruction effectively promotes second language learning across global contexts and is well received by learners and teachers (Bryfonski & McKay, 2017). Additionally, in a situation where exposure of the target language is mostly limited to the classroom, task-based language teaching has been proven to be advantageous (Shintani, 2016). Through examining studies on synchronous text-based computer-mediated communication in second language acquisition, where learners use synchronous written chats (except audio and voice chat), Lin et al. (2013) suggest that this type of text-based language teaching increases learner motivation and participation, gives learners more opportunities to express themselves than in oral communication, and is the most effective among mid- to mixed-level learners. Moreover, Lin et al. (2013) also point out that intermediate level learners benefit more from text-based synchronous computer-mediated communication, compared to beginner learners.

2.5 Language Instruction and Employment Outcomes in LINC and AMEP

2.5.1 Language training and employment in Canada and Australia.

Throughout Canadian history, immigrants have contributed to the country's economy and society. In the Canadian Immigrant Labour Market Report from the Immigrant Labour Force

Analysis Series, Yssaad (2012) remarks that immigration would continue to be a major contributor to future demographic growth; by 2012, 67% of this growth came from immigration, and the study predicts that by the year of 2031, this percentage would increase to 81%.

Yssaad (2012) points out that the Canadian employment rate between 2010 and 2011 increased among immigrants with university education, mainly for full-time positions and among those who had had immigrant status for over ten years. However, the employment rate among new immigrants and refugees remains low. According to the Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Canada published in 2005, refugees, especially those who have been in the country for less than ten years, faced more obstacles such as lower employment rates and more language difficulties, compared to immigrants from other categories, such as family class and economic class immigrants (Chui & Tran, 2005). Moreover, it has been established that the lack of official language skills is one of the most serious barriers newcomers in Canada face in finding employment (CIC, 2010).

Over the years, there has been research on immigrant employment in relation to language proficiency across disciplines: e.g., Sociology and Community Studies (Boyd & Cao, 2009), Economics (Chiswick & Miller, 2003; Clarke & Skuterud, 2013), and Public and International Affairs (Jackson, 2013). All these studies demonstrated an association between proficiency in official languages and immigrant earnings. Furthermore, in a research conducted on immigrants in Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver, Pendakur and Pendakur (2002) found a positive correlation between proficiency in English and income. Chiswick and Miller's study (2004) indicated that English language proficiency affected the economic integration of Australian immigrants. Research on CSWE levels in relation to immigrant employment and socio-

biographical background (Ehrich, Kim, & Ficorilli, 2010) showed that during the early stages of settlement, the higher the CSWE level, the more likely the immigrant would have a job.

2.5.2 Canada vs. Australia on language training and employment.

Recent studies have suggested that AMEP produces more favourable results compared to LINC in terms of employment outcome (Clarke & Skuterud, 2013; Jackson, 2013). In her 2013 major research paper, Jackson compared language programs in Canada and Australia in relation to their employment outcomes, where she pointed out that other than the language training programs, the following factors also affected newcomer employment rates in these two countries: the change of immigration policies in Canada and Australia led to intakes of more newcomers from diverse linguistic backgrounds who might have lower levels of English language skills; furthermore, more Canadian newcomers than Australian newcomers identified English language skills as the top barriers to finding work, which might have been linked to differences of recruitment preferences in the two countries.

Regarding client intake in the language programs, the number of learners enrolled in the LINC program increased steadily over the years (CIC, 2010), while AMEP took up 90% of the newcomers from the humanitarian stream during 2011 to 2012, suggesting an increase in the demand of newcomer language training. As for language learning outcomes, CIC's 2004 evaluation reported that learners in the program improved their English language skills in listening and speaking, while the 2010 evaluation indicated that other factors, such as having daily interactions while living in Canada, might come into play in the process of their language acquisition, so the amount of listening and speaking skills learners gain through the LINC program is unclear. While the number of hours learners spend in LINC program made a significant difference (e.g., clients who had 1000 hours showed more significant improvement

than those who had 500 hours), LINC learners also did not show many advantages in certain initial settlement activities compared to newcomers who were not in LINC (CIC, 2010). With respect to the employment outcome of the LINC program, through surveying a random sample of LINC learners who were enrolled in the program and learners who have left the program, the 2010 evaluation showed that 26 % of LINC learners were employed and 74% unemployed. Moreover, 33.6% of LINC learners were looking for training for employment purposes (CIC, 2010).

Jackson's (2013) study pointed out several issues pertaining to Canadian language programs: restrictions on eligibility criteria, coverage, duration, and suitability of the curriculum material; lack of nationally standardized curriculum; funding arrangements, and levels of support services provided. Data also revealed that the Canadian immigrant language programs are "gender-biased, restrictive in nature, [and] lack...consistency in the level of course offered across Canada. They are also inflexible, poorly coordinated and not well-structured" (Jackson, 2013, p. 38). As mentioned previously, the LINC program has been experiencing funding delays, service cuts (Miller, 2017), and long waitlists (Carman, 2016; Rolfsen, 2016) when providing language training for Syrian refugees; the issues Jackson (2013) suggested has further highlighted the difficulties in offering newcomer language training, which can lead to obstacles for newcomer employment.

LINC, as the primary newcomer language instruction program in Canada, has a strong focus on general instruction and basic functional language skills. Levels of classes offered across Canada are inconsistent and cannot adequately fulfill the newcomers' learning needs (Jackson, 2013). Almost 80% of the LINC lessons teach Canadian civics, and the work-related content mainly covers job search skills and concepts rather than placements (CIC, 2010). Jackson (2013)

suggests that LINC program needed to incorporate work placement component to achieve better employment outcomes. Though some institutions offer employment-purposed English courses for learners who wish to learn employment-purposed English, the courses are often not offered across Canada.

Besides course content and structure, the lack of nationally standardized curriculum is another criticism of the LINC program (Jackson, 2013). LINC learners have expressed their concerns about insufficient learning materials, inappropriate assessments, and misalignment of the instruction they receive and their proficiency levels. Also, teaching materials in LINC have been criticized for being outdated, and the quality of the courses have also been questioned (CIC, 2010). In 2009 and 2010, a more structured set of LINC curriculum guidelines were established, but, based on my observations and conversations with LINC instructors, the ways of utilizing these guidelines vary drastically from teacher to teacher. AMEP, on the other hand, uses CSWE as its standardized curriculum. Complementary curriculum guidelines and workbooks have been published by New South Wales Adult Migrant English Service (NSW AMES), the leading AMEP service provider, and widely used in AMEP programs offered across Australia. AMEP service providers meet up and exchange ideas annually, while, to my understanding based on my discussion with LINC practitioners, hardly any formal LINC service provider meetings have been arranged at the national level.

More recently, the 2015 evaluation report showed that the number of learners enrolled in the AMEP program also increased steadily from 2004 to 2014. As to the language outcome, 34% of AMEP learners completed a CSWE (Certificate in Written and Spoken English) or Pre-CSWE course, and the completion rate of learning modules grew strongly from 2012 to 2014. In a 2010 study that surveyed a group of learners who were enrolled in the AMEP program, 49% of the

participants were employed, while 51% were not. The same survey also indicated that AMEP classes played a significant role in not only providing language instruction but also offering opportunities to form a social network (Yates, 2010).

Overall, Australia's leading language programs are reported to be more structured and more related to employment, and Canada could learn from Australia in making improvements to the language programs. More specifically, AMEP's success has been internationally recognized for its standardized curriculum and course delivery (Jackson, 2013).

Findings from previous studies have revealed that language training is crucial to newcomers' integration into a new community. Additionally, Jackson's comparative study of such programs in Canada and Australia pointed to a need for improvement in the LINC program, and among her recommendations, standardization of the curriculum is one critical step. Further, increasing emphasis on employment is necessary for achieving better employment outcomes (CIC, 2010). Such needs for improvement call for an investigation into the LINC curriculum in comparison to the AMEP curriculum. However, we know very little about the program details that lead to Jackson (2013)'s assessments. Hence my study offers an in-depth comparison and evaluation of these two programs drawing on data gathered from multiple sources of data, which offers valuable insights into newcomer language instruction and employment.

2.6 Research Questions

The present study compares the language content of the employment-related units in LINC 4 and CSWE III curricula through investigating the following research questions:

1. What similarities and differences do the language content of employment-related units of LINC 4 and CSWE III demonstrate in their curriculum guidelines and instructional materials?

2. What are the instructors' perspectives on the language content of employment-related units of LINC 4 and CSWE III demonstrated in the curriculum guidelines, instructional materials, and classroom implementations?
3. How are LINC level 4 and CSWE level III aligned with their respective theoretical frameworks based on what the two levels have demonstrated in their employment-purposed curriculum guidelines, instructional materials, and classroom implementations as reported by instructors?

Chapter 3 Methods

This chapter first introduces the selection of documents from LINC 4 and CSWE III used in this study, relating to English for employment purposes. The characteristics of four interview participants are then presented, followed by the description of instruments used for data collection. Detailed procedures for data collection are provided after that. Finally, data analysis regarding the three proposed research questions is presented, with a detailed description of the schemes used for coding both the selected documents and the interview transcripts.

3.1 Selection of Documents

The present study first examined the differences between LINC 4 and CSWE III in their curriculum guidelines and instructional materials for employment-purposed English language training.

Various instructional materials have been produced over the years for both LINC 4 and CSWE III, and the instructors in the two programs have the freedom to choose whatever materials they deem to be suitable for any cohort of students. There has been a large number of instructional materials published for employment-purposed English language training in both the LINC program and the AMEP program (e.g., CCLB, 2017; TAFE NSW VETRes, 2018); however, among the resources made available for me at the time of this study, the selected documents (Table 5) appeared to be the most relevant to employment-purposed English at LINC level 4 and CSWE level III. The selection of documents in this study thus does not represent all the materials developed for employment-purposed language training in LINC and AMEP. Instead, they were chosen for the following reasons: the development of the LINC 4 curriculum guidelines and instructional materials selected for this study were funded by the Canadian government. In AMEP, *Certificate III in Spoken and Written English* established national

standards for various contexts of English language education in Australia, and this curriculum is widely used in AMEP across the country (NSW Adult Migrant English Service, 2013). *Living in Australia, Intermediate* is one of the accompanying workbooks for CSWE III. Units 1, 2 and 3 in this workbook were included because of their relevance to employment-purposed English. The CSWE III curriculum document outlines the modules that learners at this level need to complete, and the *Living in Australia* workbook provides an alignment table between the units in the workbook and the modules covered in each unit. For the purpose of this study, I only chose to analyse the modules in the CSWE III curriculum document that are aligned with units 1, 2 and 3 in the workbook.

Table 5 *Selection of documents from LINC 4 and CSWE III*

	LINC 4	CSWE III
Curriculum Guidelines	<i>LINC 4 Curriculum Guidelines, Employment</i> , developed by Toronto Catholic District School Board in 2002 (6 pages, 3 topics)	<i>Certificate III in Spoken and Written English</i> , published by NSW Adult Migrant English Services in 2013 (29 pages, 10 modules)
Selected Instructional Materials	<i>LINC 4 Classroom Activities, Employment</i> , developed by Algonquin College in 2009 (34 pages, 7 activities)	<i>Unit 1 Jobseeking, Unit 2 Listening and speaking at work, and Unit 3 Reading and writing at work</i> from <i>Living in Australia, Intermediate</i> , 2 nd edition, published by NSW Adult Migrant English Services in 2013 (93 pages, 10 topics)

The *LINC 4 Curriculum Guidelines, Employment* document is six pages long, covering three topics: job interviews, job search, and skills assessment (i.e., assessing skills necessary to find work). For each topic, the document provides instructors with topic development ideas,

strategies for learners, resources for developing and teaching the topic, topic outcomes, language focus, sample tasks, and additional tasks.

The CSWE III curriculum document included in this study is 29 pages long, covering 10 modules: “advanced learning strategies,” “comprehending and participating in casual conversations,” “comprehending and negotiating complex exchanges,” “comprehending and participating in discussions,” “composing formal correspondence and completing formatted texts,” “comprehending and composing complex information texts,” “comprehending and giving complex instructions,” “language skills for jobseeking,” “comprehending and performing multiple-step calculations,” and “applying and interpreting mathematical information.” Each module contains the following components: module purpose, assessment strategy (conditions and methods of assessment), learning outcomes, assessment criteria of each outcome, range statement (e.g., what “formal learning environment” refers to in the module), and resource implications (i.e., resources that should be available to learners in order for them to complete the module).

The *LINC 4 Classroom Activities, Employment* document is 34 pages long, covering 7 main activities: “Canadian Employers: What Do They Expect?,” “Vet Clinic Interview,” “Follow-up Letter: Central Veterinary Clinic,” “Mock Interview,” “Volunteer Heroes,” “Be Positive – I,” and “Be Positive – II.” Each main activity begins with instructor notes that teachers can refer to for warm-up exercises, an overview of the tasks, answer keys to the tasks, and vocabulary. The exercises in this workbook include choosing appropriate vocabulary to fill in the blanks, using key vocabulary to answer questions about a short dialogue (less than five sentences), matching words with the correct definitions through listening or reading the script of a conversation, writing a thank-you/follow-up letter, preparing for a conversation based on

sample sentences, writing résumés, reading and responding to an email, determining true or false information from a given script, and practicing strategies for staying positive in job searching.

The units 1, 2 and 3 in *Living in Australia, Intermediate* are 93 pages long, covering 10 topics: “skills for work,” “selling your skills – résumés,” “telephoning about jobs,” “cover letters,” “one-to-one negotiation,” “negotiating in meetings,” “emails,” “letters,” “reports,” and “procedures and protocols.” The exercises in this workbook include learning about key vocabulary and filling the blanks using the words, interpreting graphs and figures, writing short paragraphs using key vocabulary, understanding abbreviations, identifying and summarizing key information from reading, identifying main parts of a résumé, organizing and writing résumés, cover letters and emails, identifying key information from listening to a conversation, discussing content of listening, completing missing pieces in a script of a conversation, preparing for a conversation based on given information, identifying the level of formality of a context, and determining true or false information from a given script.

Although the documents in this study were selected because of their relevance to employment, it is important to consider the length difference between the materials from LINC 4 and CSWE III, for which there are two possible reasons: 1) the teaching approaches the LINC program and the AMEP program employ may have played a role (i.e., materials using a text-based approach tend to include longer texts because learners need to learn through text analysis, while materials using a task-based approach tend to offer descriptions of the tasks and sample tasks, which could be shorter), and 2) it appears that the CSWE III materials are more elaborated and cover a wider range of topics. To factor in the length difference among the selected documents, all the tasks and the texts were coded and analyzed as follows: 1) tasks and texts were coded under the relevant components from the respective theoretical framework (e.g.,

based on the language skills learners were instructed to practice, a task in LINC 4 where learners were asked to engage in a mock job interview was coded under the following components from the *communicative competence* model: *conversational structure*, *genre/generic structure*, and *social contextual factors*), so the number of the codes in each data set aims to reflect the language skills covered in the materials; 2) the codes from each data set were not combined (e.g., texts in CSWE III documents were coded only to components from the *three aspects of language education*), and the number of codes in each component in the respective theoretical framework was calculated in proportion to the total number of the codes within each data set.

3.2 Interviews

Two LINC 4 instructors and two CSWE III instructors were interviewed for their perspectives on the selected documents and their classroom implementations. Their experiences as teaching professionals generally, as well as with these two programs, are presented in Table 6. All names included here are pseudonyms as assigned to participants at the beginning of their interviews. Participants' real names were used throughout the interviews, but their identities were concealed during transcription and in data presentation.

As can be seen in Table 6, all instructors have extensive experience with LINC 4 and CSWE III, ranging from 7 to 20 years. All participants in this study have received either Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) or Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) certifications. At the time of the interviews, Amanda, Bianca, and Catherine all had had the majority of their teaching careers in LINC or AMEP, and Dana had moved on to another position in an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) program. Amanda had taught LINC levels 1 to 4. Bianca had had the most experience in LINC 3, 4 and 5, and she occasionally had taught LINC 1 and 2. Catherine had had experience teaching the preliminary

(literacy) level and CSWE levels I to III. It should be noted here that Catherine's CSWE III course was entirely dedicated to employment-related language training. Commonly, instructors in language programs like LINC and AMEP decide the content of their teaching based on learners' needs, while following the same curriculum guidelines, having access to similar instructional materials, and assessing learners based on the same criteria within each program. Finally, Dana had had experience with the preliminary level and CSWE levels I to III in the AMEP program.

Table 6 *Participant Descriptions*

	Years of English Language Teaching Experience	Years of Experience with LINC/AMEP	Relative Certificates and Training Received ¹⁰	Information of the Institutions ¹¹	Levels Have Taught in LINC/AMEP
LINC 4 Instructor Amanda	Twenty years	Twenty years	TESL certificate	LINC program offered in Metro Vancouver area, British Columbia (BC), Canada	LINC 1, 2, 3, and 4
LINC 4 Instructor Bianca	Eight years	Eight years	Post-graduate TESL program	LINC program offered in Toronto, Ontario (ON), Canada	Mostly LINC 3, 4 and 5, occasionally LINC 1 and 2
CSWE III Instructor Catherine	Seven years	Seven years	Graduate Diploma in TESOL	AMEP program offered in	Preliminary CSWE,

¹⁰ TESL stands for Teaching English as a Second Language, which refers to teaching English in English-speaking countries to students whose first languages are not English. TESOL stands for Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages, which is a general term for English teaching regardless of the context being English-speaking countries or not (Witol, 2017).

¹¹ The locations of the institutions have been altered to ensure confidentiality of participants' personal information.

				Sydney, NSW, Australia	CSWE I, II, and III
CSWE III Instructor Dana	Thirteen years	Eight years	Graduate diploma in TESOL; master's degree in TESOL	AMEP program offered in Canberra, Australian Capital Territory (ACT), Australia	Preliminary CSWE, CSWE I, II, and III

3.3 Instruments

This study included three instruments: a background questionnaire for LINC/AMEP instructors (Appendix A), interview questions for LINC instructors (Appendix B), and interview questions for AMEP instructors (Appendix C).

3.3.1 Background questionnaire.

A brief questionnaire was designed to collect the following background information from the participants at the beginning of each interview: language background, years of English language teaching experience, years of experience with LINC/AMEP, background and training as a teaching professional, and levels they have taught in LINC/AMEP.

3.3.2 Interview Questions.

Two sets of interview questions were developed based on the theoretical frameworks provided by the two programs' curriculum guidelines. Participants were asked to respond to questions related to their experience teaching employment-related English in LINC 4 or CSWE III. Those questions included the goals and objectives the instructors set up for their courses, their selection and ways of utilizing course materials, activities and tasks they used, challenges

they encountered in teaching English for employment purposes, and their perspectives on how the curricula could be improved to fulfill learners' needs in communication for employment purposes. All interview questions were designed to be open-ended to give participants the chance to elaborate on their answers fully.

3.4 Procedures

3.4.1 Participant Recruitment.

Upon receiving ethics approval (protocol number: 17-005), emails were sent out to managerial contacts of institutions or organizations that offered LINC in British Columbia and AMEP in New South Wales, but there were few respondents since the school term was coming to an end at the time. A request of modification to the original ethics application was subsequently submitted to facilitate the recruitment of participants from across Canada and Australia using Twitter, a popular social networking platform for English language teaching professionals, as an alternative recruiting method. Interested participants then responded to the recruitment flyer (Appendix D) on Twitter via private messaging and email. Through private communication, I confirmed four participants' eligibility to participate in the study by asking about their teaching experience and familiarity with employment-purposed language instruction in LINC 4 or CSWE III. After that, consent forms were emailed to the participants, who, upon reviewing, provided their signatures, and then returned the consent forms to me. Dates and times for each one-on-one interview were then scheduled.

3.4.2 Interviews.

Besides Amanda, whom I interviewed in-person, the three other participants were each interviewed independently using BlueJeans, a video conferencing service supported by the university's Media Services.

The procedures of the interviews were as follows:

- For Amanda's interview, I communicated with her via email, and we agreed on a time and location for the interview to take place. For the other three participants, a unique URL link to the BlueJeans video conferencing room was sent to them a day before their scheduled interview, and they were asked to test the connection 30 minutes before the interview.
- On the day of each interview, I thanked the participant for their time and support for the study. Before ongoing consent was obtained, participant consent was reviewed. I informed the participant that they could refuse to answer any questions and they could stop the interview any time they wished. The content of the interview would be audio-recorded using QuickTime for transcriptions later. Their personal information would be kept strictly confidential, and only pseudonyms would be used in transcriptions and data dissemination.
- All the participants answered each question based on their experience with teaching English for employment purposes. Interviews lasted from 70 to 110 minutes.
- Upon completion of each interview, I thanked each participant again for their time and insight. I then asked if they would be willing to answer any follow-up questions should they come up, and all agreed. After data coding and analysis, it was decided that no follow-up questions were necessary for this study.

3.5 Data Analysis

3.5.1 Coding Schemes.

100% of the audio recordings of all four interviews were transcribed by me using ELAN [version 5.0.0-beta] (Sloetjes & Wittenburg, 2008), which is a professional tool that can create annotations for audio resources. Selected documents and interview transcriptions were then coded in four separate files using NVivo Pro 11: documents from LINC 4 and documents from CSWE III, and interview transcripts of LINC 4 instructors and CSWE III instructors. Nodes¹² were created based on the theoretical frameworks suggested in the two programs' curriculum guidelines, which are Communicative Competence (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995) and the three aspects of language education (Halliday, 1981), respectively. Tables 7 and 8 provide overviews of the nodes generated for data from LINC 4 and CSWE III, respectively. It should be noted that CSWE III does not provide a comprehensive list of elements of the theory its curriculum was built upon, so the coding scheme for data from CSWE III was generated based on its curriculum guidelines informed by the SFL theory. For specific definitions and examples of the nodes, refer to Appendix E.

Table 7 Coding Scheme for LINC 4 based on the Communicative Competence model proposed by Celce-Murcia et al. (1995)

Competences	Components
Discourse	Cohesion Deixis Coherence Genre/generic structure Conversational structure
Linguistic ¹³	Syntax (Grammar)

¹² A node is “a collection of references about a specific theme, place, person or other area of interest.” References are gathered through data coding (QSR International, n.d., ¶4).

¹³ “Morphology”, which was a component under “Linguistic Competence” in the Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) model, was not included in the coding scheme here since it does not apply to the context of language instruction.

Actional	Lexicon (receptive and productive) Phonology (for pronunciation) Orthography (for spelling) Knowledge of language functions: • Interpersonal exchange • Information • Opinions • Feelings • Suasion • Problems • Future scenarios
Sociocultural	Knowledge of speech act sets Social contextual factors Stylistic appropriateness factors Cultural factors
Strategic	Non-verbal communicative factors Avoidance or reduction strategies Achievement or compensatory strategies Stalling or time-gaining strategies Self-monitoring strategies Interactional strategies Learner strategies ¹⁴

Table 8 Coding Scheme for Data from CSWE III based on Three Aspects of Language Education proposed by Halliday (1981)

Aspect of Language Education	Components
Language learning	Choice from grammar system Choice from vocabulary system Choice from phonological system Choice from graphological system Choice from prosodic features Choice from paralinguistic features Choice from text structure system Spoken or written texts • Cohesion • Coherence • Comprehension
Learning through language	Learner strategies • Effective participation in formal learning environment • Independent learner strategies

¹⁴ The component “learner strategies” is not outlined by the Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) model, but it came up in both the selected LINC 4 documents and instructor interviews. Therefore, a node was created for this component.

Learning about language	• Understanding the role of assessment Communication strategies • Extended turn-taking • Interaction strategies • Negotiating exchange Language as resources to interact with new knowledge Numeracy • Developing mathematical knowledge and skills • Language of mathematics Relationship between language choices and English-speaking culture Relationship between language choices and social situations • Spoken or written texts - social contextual purpose Understanding the choices available in language system
-------------------------	--

3.5.2 Data coding.

Three rounds of coding were completed, and I took a one-week break before each new round of coding, so as to approach each coding session with a fresh perspective. I coded 100% of the data for the first round, 60% for the second round, and 30% for the third round. Coding comparison was then run on NVivo Pro 11, and the percentage of agreement between first and second coding round was calculated as 81.57%; the percentage of agreement between second and third coding round was 84.68%, which suggested high agreement for intra-rater reliability.

Areas of disagreement in the coding process were mainly due to 1) *double-coding*, which means a reference that repeatedly appeared in the data is coded more than once. Such references were being coded only once in later rounds of coding; 2) *discovery of references that should have been coded in the previous round but were not*.

In Table 9, for example, the LINC 4 data reference could have been coded under the node “information,” but it was missed in the first round. Similarly, the reference from *CSWE III*

Curriculum Document shown in Table 9 was supposed to be coded under the node “spoken or written texts – social contextual purposes,” but it was missed in the first round of coding.

Table 9 *Examples of Areas of Disagreements*

	Area of Disagreement (node)	Example
LINC 4 Data	Actional Competence/Knowledge of language functions/Information	“Not just the same, um, the one that comes to mind is reading not just taking an answer right from our reading, and, uh, you know, uh, I forget what those are called, it’s um, comprehending information which is the easiest one to do, you give a reading, you have questions, you answer the questions. But then there’s the reproducing information.” (LINC 4 Instructor, Amanda)
CSWE III Data	Learning About Language/Relationship between language choices and social situations/spoken or written texts – social contextual purposes	“This module covers the skills required to read texts that have an impersonal tone and present information as facts. These texts are commonly found in sources such as brochures, fact sheets, websites, and reports. This module also covers the skills required to write workplace reports such as progress reports, simple problem/solution reports and descriptive reports.” (CSWE III Curriculum Document)

3.5.3 Qualitative analysis.

After coding, reference counts generated by NVivo Pro 11 were recorded to determine the frequency of occurrence for each node in the data of LINC 4 and CSWE III. I calculated the coverage percentage of each node out of the total number of references coded in each source of

data. Observations were made of each node, duplicated codes were eliminated, and similar nodes were collapsed into the same node.

The first research question examined the differences and similarities LINC 4 and CSWE III demonstrate in their curriculum guidelines and instructional materials for employment-purposed English language skills. Themes and patterns that emerged from the LINC 4 and CSWE III data were discussed as follows: selected documents from LINC 4, selected documents from CSWE III, curriculum guidelines vis-à-vis instructional materials, and selected documents from LINC 4 vs. selected documents from CSWE III.

The second research question involved the perspectives of LINC 4 and CSWE III instructors from these two programs. First, each instructor's perspective was introduced as an individual profile, and themes and patterns that emerged from the coding results of each interview were presented. Second, the instructors' perspectives were compared to the selected documents they use. Finally, comparisons were drawn to find differences and similarities between the perspectives of LINC 4 and CSWE III instructors.

Lastly, the third research question inquired about the alignment between LINC 4 and CSWE III curricula and their respective theoretical frameworks based on what they demonstrated in their employment-purposed curriculum guidelines, instructional materials, and classroom implementations as reported by instructors. Analyses for the first and second research questions were incorporated to identify the level of alignment across the selected curriculum and instructional documents, instructors' teaching experience, and the theoretical frameworks of LINC 4 and CSWE III.

Chapter 4 Results and Discussion

This chapter presents the results and discussion of the three proposed research questions. First, the differences between LINC 4 and CSWE III are illustrated and discussed, as represented in the employment-focused curriculum guidelines and instructional materials. Next, LINC 4 and CSWE III instructors' perspectives are reported, regarding documents selected for this study and their classroom implementations. Levels of alignment between the two curricula and their respective theoretical frameworks are then examined, incorporating the results from the first two research questions. Finally, implications and limitations of this study and future research directions are presented.

4.1 Similarities and Differences in Selected Documents

Research Question 1: What similarities and differences do the language content of employment-related units of LINC 4 and CSWE III demonstrate in their curriculum guidelines and instructional materials?

4.1.1 Selected documents from LINC 4.

LINC 4 Curriculum Guidelines, Employment was coded under 29 nodes in the coding scheme generated based on the Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) model. *LINC 4 Classroom Activities, Employment* was coded under 26 nodes from the same coding scheme. Each node's percentage coverage in these two documents is presented in Table 10, and the number of times each node was coded is provided in parentheses.

Table 10 *Code Coverage in LINC 4 Curriculum Guidelines – Employment and LINC 4 Classroom Activities – Employment*

Competences	Components	% Coverage Curriculum Guidelines	% Coverage Instructional Materials
Discourse		37.02% (77)	36.69% (51)
	Cohesion	7.69% (16)	5.04% (7)
	Deixis	0.48% (1)	N/A
	Coherence	9.13% (19)	9.35% (13)
	Genre/generic structure	14.42% (30)	11.51% (16)
	Conversational structure	5.29% (11)	10.79% (15)
Linguistic		12.98% (27)	12.95% (18)
	Syntax (Grammar)	5.77% (12)	1.44% (2)
	Lexicon (receptive and productive)	5.77% (12)	9.35% (13)
	Phonology (for pronunciation)	1.44% (3)	0.72% (1)
	Orthography (for spelling)	N/A	1.44% (2)
Actional		19.71% (41)	17.27% (24)
	Knowledge of language functions:	14.90% (31)	16.55% (23)
	• Interpersonal exchange	1.44% (3)	0.72% (1)
	• Information	10.10% (21)	6.47% (9)
	• Opinions	0.96% (2)	2.88% (4)
	• Feelings	0.96% (2)	5.04% (7)
	• Suasion	N/A	1.44% (2)
	• Problems	N/A	N/A
	• Future scenarios	1.44% (3)	N/A
	Knowledge of speech act sets	4.69% (10)	0.72% (1)
Sociocultural		27.40% (57)	28.06% (39)
	Social contextual factors	16.35% (34)	19.42% (27)
	Stylistic appropriateness factors	0.48% (1)	0.72% (1)
	Cultural factors	9.62% (20)	7.19% (10)
	Non-verbal communicative factors	0.96% (2)	0.72% (1)
Strategic		2.88% (6)	5.04% (7)
	Learner strategies (not outlined in the program's theoretical framework)	0.96% (2)	5.04% (7)
	Avoidance or reduction strategies	0.48% (1)	N/A
	Achievement or compensatory strategies	N/A	N/A

Stalling or time-gaining strategies	N/A	N/A
Self-monitoring strategies	N/A	N/A
Interactional strategies	1.44% (3)	N/A

Note. The total number of codes was 208 in *LINC 4 Curriculum Guidelines – Employment* and 139 in *LINC 4 Classroom Activities – Employment*.

In both the LINC 4 employment curriculum guidelines and the instructional materials, *discourse competence* (37.02%, 36.69%) had the highest occurrence in coding among the five competences outlined in the theoretical framework, followed by *sociocultural competence* (27.40%, 28.06%), *actional competence* (19.71%, 17.27%), *linguistic competence* (12.98%, 12.95%), and *strategic competence* (2.88%, 5.04%).

Discourse competence concerns forming spoken or written texts through the choice, sequencing, and patterning of words, structures, sentences, and utterances. Within this competence, how texts could be constructed for different purposes (*genre/generic structure*) were covered the most for both selected documents from LINC 4. In the curriculum guidelines, the relationships between sentences or utterances in discourse and the overall theme or message being conveyed in a text (*coherence*) and how parts of texts are connected (*cohesion*) weighed similarly, and conversational rules (*conversational structure*) weighed slightly less. However, in the instructional materials, *conversational structures* and *coherence* had a similar amount of percentage coverage, while *cohesion* was covered less. *Deixis system*, which connects the context and the discourse using pronouns and reference words, was covered the least (0.48%) in the curriculum guidelines, and it had no occurrences in the instructional materials.

Sociocultural competence involves communicating appropriately in different social and cultural contexts. Within this competence, both selected documents from LINC 4 showed similar patterns in their percentage coverage. The characteristics of the interactants and the

communication context (*social contextual factors*) had the most references. Knowledge and awareness of different cultures (*cultural factors*) occurred less than *social contextual factors*. *Non-verbal communicative factors* (e.g., body language, use of space, touching, paralinguistic factors, and silence) and *stylistic appropriateness factors* (e.g., politeness, formality, field-specific registers) appeared the least, covering less than 1% of the codes in both selected LINC 4 documents.

Actional competence had similar numbers of references in both selected documents from LINC 4. The majority of this competence's references were coded under *knowledge of language functions*; in contrast, knowledge of language patterning and sequencing in real-life situations (*knowledge of speech act sets*) had much fewer occurrences. Among the *language functions* included in the theoretical framework, both documents touched upon expressing and interpreting *information* the most, and they represented language for carrying out *interpersonal exchange* and expressing and interpreting *opinions* in very few references. Language for expressing and understanding *feelings* had only a few references (0.96%) in the curriculum guidelines, but this language function had a higher number of occurrences (5.04%) in the instructional materials. Language for persuading others (*suasion*) did not appear in the curriculum guidelines, but it had a few references in the instructional materials. Talking about *future scenarios* appeared in the curriculum guidelines a few times, but it did not occur in the instructional materials. Understanding and talking about *problems* had no references in both selected documents from LINC 4.

In *linguistic competence*, grammar (*syntax*) and vocabulary (*lexicon*) had the highest number of references in the LINC 4 employment curriculum guidelines (both 5.77%), while pronunciation (*phonology*) was less represented. In the instructional materials, *lexicon* was the

primary focus. *Syntax* and *phonology* had very few references, though the former appeared more in the documents. The curriculum guidelines did not address spelling (*orthography*), while this element had a small number of occurrences in the instructional materials.

For *Strategic competence*, among the five communication strategies included in the Communicative Competence (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995) theoretical framework, only two strategies had references in the LINC 4 employment curriculum document: *avoidance or reduction strategies* (e.g., message replacement, topic avoidance, and message abandonment), and *interactional strategies* (e.g., asking for help/clarification/repetition/confirmation, expressing non-understanding, responding with paraphrasing, etc.). Although *learner strategies* (e.g., participating in classroom discussions, group works, learning independently) was not outlined in the theoretical framework, it had a number of occurrences in this document. In the instructional materials, none of the five communication strategies had references, and only *learner strategies* had occurrences.

4.1.2 Selected documents from CSWE III.

Certificate III in Spoken and Written English was coded under 28 nodes developed based on CSWE III's theoretical framework informed by Halliday's SFL theory (1985) and three aspects of language education (Halliday, 1981); *Living in Australia, Intermediate – Unit 1, 2 and 3* was coded under 26 nodes from the same coding scheme. Table 11 provides the percentage coverage of each node in these two documents, with the number of times each node was coded included in parentheses.

Table 11 *Code Coverage in Certificate III in Spoken and Written English and Living in Australia, Intermediate – Units 1, 2 and 3*

Aspect of Language Education	Components	% Coverage Curriculum Guidelines	% Coverage Instructional Materials
Learning Language		57.64% (132)	50.90% (197)
	Choice from grammar system	6.99% (16)	4.90% (19)
	Choice from vocabulary system	4.80% (11)	13.95% (54)
	Choice from phonological system	2.18% (5)	N/A
	Choice from graphological system	0.87% (2)	1.29% (5)
	Choice from prosodic features	2.62% (6)	N/A
	Choice from paralinguistic features	0.87% (2)	N/A
	Choice from text structure system - Spoken/written text	39.30% (90)	30.75% (119)
	• Cohesion	13.10% (30)	10.08% (39)
	• Coherence	15.28% (35)	9.04% (35)
	• Comprehension	10.92% (25)	11.63% (45)
Learning through language		16.16% (37)	14.47% (56)
	Learner strategies	5.68% (13)	5.94% (23)
	• Effective participation in formal learning environment	3.06% (7)	5.43% (21)
	• Independent learner strategies	2.62% (6)	0.52% (2)
	• Understanding the role of assessment	N/A	N/A
	Communication strategies	10.04% (23)	7.49% (29)
	• Extended turn-taking	1.31% (3)	N/A
	• Interaction strategies	6.99% (16)	5.17% (20)
	• Negotiating exchange	1.74% (4)	2.33% (9)
	Language as resources to interact with new knowledge	0.44% (1)	0.78% (3)
	Numeracy		
	• Developing mathematical knowledge and skills	N/A	0.26% (1)
	• Language of mathematics	0.44% (1)	0.52% (2)
Learning about language		26.20% (60)	34.63% (134)
	Relationship between language choices and English-speaking culture	0.44% (1)	2.84% (11)

Relationship between language choices and social situations	25.76% (59)	31.78% (123)
Social contextual purpose in spoken/written text		
Understanding the choices available in language system	N/A	N/A

Note. The total number of codes was 229 in *Certificate III in Spoken and Written English* and 387 in *Living in Australia, Intermediate – Unit 1, 2 and 3*.

In both CSWE III curriculum guidelines and instructional materials, the code coverage of the three aspects of language education, ranked from high to low, were *learning language* (57.64%, 50.90%), *learning about language* (26.20%, 34.63%), and *learning through language* (16.16%, 14.47%).

The aspect of *learning language* concerns learning to make choices from linguistic systems (i.e., text structures, grammar, vocabulary, phonology, and graphology) that allows language users to communicate effectively across contexts (NSW AMES, 2013). Under this aspect, choices from *text structure system* was the primary emphasis for both selected documents from CSWE III, and this element also weighed heavily among all the elements within the framework (39.30% and 30.75%); within this element, *cohesion*, *coherence*, and *comprehension* all had close to even representations. *Choice from vocabulary system* had a greater number of references in the instructional materials (13.95%) compared to curriculum guidelines (4.80%). While all elements within *language learning* occurred in the curriculum guidelines, choices from *phonological system* (pronunciation), choices from *prosodic features* (e.g., pitch, intonation, stress), and choices from *paralinguistic features* (e.g., body language, gesture, facial expressions) were not present in the instructional materials.

Learning about language involves knowing language choices that are available for use and knowing how these choices are made according to different social and cultural contexts

(NSW AMES, 2013). Both selected documents from CSWE III primarily emphasized the relationship between *language choices* and *social situations* focusing on the social contextual purposes in spoken or written texts; by contrast, the relationship between *language choices* and *English-speaking culture* had far fewer references in both documents. “Understanding the choices available in language system” (i.e., understanding that knowledge in one’s L1 can serve as one of the resources for learning another language and knowing language choices made in one text have the potential to become a resource for another text) had no occurrence in either selected documents from CSWE III.

Learning through language is about using language resources to communicate new knowledge and ideas with others (NSW AMES, 2013). Within this aspect, both selected documents from CSWE III emphasized *communication strategies* the most, among which *interaction strategies* (e.g., asking questions, asking for repetition/clarification/confirmation, indicating comprehension, responding to topic shifts) had the most references in both documents. *Negotiating exchange* (e.g., making requests, acknowledging other viewpoints, confirming information, providing feedback) had a few occurrences in both documents. *Extended turn-taking* (e.g., recounting events, telling an anecdote, expressing an opinion, providing a description) had a few references in the curriculum guidelines, while this element was not included in the instructional materials. In connection with *learner strategies*, both the curriculum guidelines and the instructional materials did not include “understanding the role of assessment”, which requires learners to understand the requirements for completing a course and what roles those assessments play in their learning. “Effective participation in formal learning environment” and “independent learner strategies” had similar numbers of references in the curriculum guidelines, while the former was heavily emphasized in the instructional materials for CSWE III

employment. “Language as resources to interact with new knowledge” – *numeracy* had less than 1% of code coverage in both selected documents from CSWE III; this element’s sub-element “developing mathematical knowledge and skills” was not included in the curriculum guidelines.

4.1.3 Selected documents from LINC 4 vs. selected documents from CSWE III.

The results from coding the selected documents from LINC 4 and CSWE III bring forth a comparison between the curriculum guidelines and instructional materials in each program, as well as a discussion surrounding the similarities and differences the two curricula present in the selected documents.

LINC 4 discourse competence. Based on the percentage coverage of each node from LINC 4’s theoretical framework (Table 9), *LINC 4 Curriculum Guidelines – Employment* and *LINC 4 Classroom Activities – Employment* both have the heaviest emphasis on *discourse competence*, within which emphasis is placed primarily on *genre/generic structures* of texts in both selected documents. The instructional materials appear to focus on *conversational structures* more than the curriculum guidelines, which can be a mismatch between the two documents. Both selected documents from LINC 4 focus the most on how texts with a specific purpose are constructed, but the instructional materials emphasize more on the rules to follow when participating in a conversation compared to the curriculum guidelines.

Through the above analysis, it appears that both selected documents from LINC 4 recommend teaching and learning English for employment purposes through instruction on text structures specific to communication purposes. However, based on my observation of the documents, the instructional materials are more oriented towards participating in brief spoken exchanges, which can create challenges for learners and instructors in learning and teaching English for employment purposes. As discussed previously, over half of GARs expressed their

urgent needs in learning the official languages and finding a good job. Brief spoken exchanges, included in the selected instructional materials in this study, may not suffice in building learners' *discourse competence* for their real-life workplace language needs. To develop learners' *discourse competence*, Ananyeva (2014) suggests using a learner-centred and *content-based* (i.e., specific to learners' field of work or area of interest) curriculum. A language curriculum that is relevant to learners' professional needs builds upon both their interests and language learning needs, increases learner motivation, combines the discourses learners can use in the workplace, and "teaches meaningful language embedded within relevant discourse" (Nordmeyer & Barduhn, 2010, p. 4). At the language program level, studies suggest that dividing classes based on learners' needs and having a course dedicated to workplace English could lead to positive results. Durkin and Main's (2002) study shows that the attendance rate in discipline-specific ESL programs is higher than that of generic programs. Furthermore, through a 12-month study, Baik and Greig's (2009) suggests that discipline-specific courses can help improve learners' academic outcomes and potentially lead to long-term academic success. Learners find the content in discipline-specific courses more relevant and useful, and learners who attend those courses more often out-perform learners with lower attendance. Besides learner attendance, Baik and Greig (2009) also acknowledge that there are other contributing factors in learners' academic success, such as content and tasks specific to the discipline, and identification and intervention of learners' language learning needs during early stages of their studies. Though the context for the above two studies is English for Academic Purposes, similar implications can be drawn from adult workplace English teaching and learning. Therefore, within the development of course materials in programs like LINC, instead of brief spoken exchanges, the inclusion of discourses that can be utilized by learners in employment-related situations can have a desirable impact on

their language learning experience and outcomes. For newcomers who have undergone traumas and losses, course materials that they find relevant and useful can help reduce their frustration and stress while they improve their English language skills; more importantly, they can more effectively engage themselves with discourses that apply to their professional needs.

LINC 4 sociocultural competence. Second to *discourse competence*, *sociocultural competence* appears the most in both the curriculum guidelines and instructional materials for LINC 4 employment. Within this competence, *social contextual factors* and *cultural factors* are the primary foci. This heavy emphasis on *sociocultural competence* reflects the program's priority on newcomer settlement in the new communities.

Some studies identify culture as an integral part in communication. "Culture determines the way communication proceeds and people decipher the messages they get. The process of communication is often realized through language exchange in a situation, which involves the transmission of socio-cultural knowledge" (Kozhevnikova, 2014, p. 4462). Improving learners' *sociocultural competence* can help learners recognize the cultural differences and the social contexts of communication, and they can learn what is appropriate and acceptable in their use of English (Yu, 2011). Learners often benefit from an English language curriculum that integrates their home cultures and English-speaking community cultures, and the instructional materials may relate to learners' backgrounds, nationalities, workplaces, languages, and cultures in order to promote learner participation and create a productive learning environment (Bista, 2011).

Besides *social contextual factors* and *cultural factors*, *non-verbal communicative factors* and *stylistic appropriateness factors* within *sociocultural competence* are measly presented, with less than 1% of coding coverage in both LINC 4 documents. *Social contextual factors* and *cultural factors* play more important roles in learners' communication since these factors directly

help construct and construe a communicative situation. Nevertheless, embedding *non-verbal communicative factors* and *stylistic appropriateness factors*, in tasks designed around *social contextual* and *cultural factors* has the potential to further enhance learners' English communication skills. Though the Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) framework listed the four factors under *sociocultural competence* as individual factors, they are in nature inseparable to a certain degree (Richard, 2011). For example, certain gestures convey entirely different messages in different languages, cultures, and social contexts. *Non-verbal communicative factors*, such as facial expressions and body language, can act as cues for emotions and attitudes, and knowledge of these factors gives learners access to both express and detect the cues that occur in communication (Missaoui, 2015). *Stylistic appropriateness factors*, on the other hand, help address issues like politeness, formality, and field-specific registers. Since every society has its own linguistic norms connotating the unspoken rules of what is appropriate to say and what is not, knowledge of these rules reduces misunderstanding and miscommunication (Song, 2012) and enables learners to present a more positive image in different contexts.

Based on the above discussion, updated curriculum and teaching materials, incorporating Canadian cultures and cultures of the newcomers and familiarizing learners with various social communication contexts, can help both the learners and the instructors understand the needs, values, and expectations of cultures they are unfamiliar with. At the same time, the factors of *non-verbal communication* and *stylistic appropriateness* in English can be embedded in the larger sociocultural contexts for the learners. While the four factors within *sociocultural competence* can be recognized as individual elements of communication, the curriculum guidelines can suggest facilitating learners' knowledge of these factors together, and the

instructional materials can provide sample tasks and activities that involve learning all four factors.

LINC 4 actional competence. When it comes to *actional competence*, both the curriculum guidelines and the instructional materials have more emphasis on *language functions* compared to building *knowledge of speech act sets* (i.e., focusing more on how to interpret given information than how information is sequenced and patterned in real-life situations). Among all the *language functions* outlined in the framework, LINC 4 curriculum guidelines and instructional materials on employment both focus heavily on having learners express and interpret information. Three other *language functions* that are less frequently included in both LINC 4 documents are related to talking about feelings, expressing opinions, and having interpersonal exchanges. The curriculum guidelines touch upon the language used to talk about future scenarios, which is not present in the instructional materials. The instructional materials include language for persuading others, which is not outlined in the curriculum guidelines examined in this study. Neither document includes language for expressing or interpreting a text about problems. In terms of *language functions*, the emphasis on expressing and interpreting information suggests that the primary aim of LINC 4 curriculum is to have learners navigate through their daily lives in their communities, which echoes with the program's priority on newcomer settlement. However, the question remains whether LINC 4 provides learners with essential language skills that they need for employment purposes.

The lack of representation of how language is patterned and sequenced in real-life situations (*knowledge of speech act sets*) in both selected documents suggests a need for the incorporation of authentic texts in the curriculum. Authentic texts expose learners to English and English-speaking community culture, which can help them succeed in English language learning

(Kozhevnikova, 2014; Ciornei & Dina, 2015). Furthermore, Gilmore's (2011) study shows that the use of authentic texts offers learners richer input that they can work with in the class, which raises learners' awareness of a wide range of linguistic, pragmatic, strategic, and discourse features of the English language.

The term *authentic text* has been defined as a text created to fulfill certain social purposes in the language community where the text is produced (Little et al., 1988), and the text is "intact, rather than processed, adapted, or simplified" (De Chazal, 2014). It has been suggested that the concept of authenticity lies within not only the text but also the related context and tasks.

Therefore, with learner needs and goals in mind, an authentic text can be selected to create level-appropriate and achievable tasks (De Chazal, 2014). For example, when introducing learners to real online recruitment advertisement, instructors need to decide whether the learners have to understand the text as a whole or identify smaller components in the texts, such as vocabulary.

Within the language curriculum, it may be plausible to include sample authentic texts in curriculum guidelines or instructional materials. However, it is also important to provide instructors with direction and recommendation for choosing authentic texts and designing tasks, given that the implementation of authentic texts can be demanding of instructors' skills, experience, and time (Moglen, 2014). Moreover, Liu (2016) points out that the use of authentic texts without proper adaptation can be too complex for the learners. The use of authentic texts in a language classroom should thus be treated with careful consideration of learner proficiency levels, learner needs and goals, as well as the social contexts and purposes of the texts.

Therefore, in the context of teaching English to newcomer learners, skilled use of authentic texts can better serve these learners' needs of language learning that is relevant to finding employment, considering the social, cultural, and linguistic difficulties they experience.

LINC 4 linguistic competence. Regarding *linguistic competence*, both documents selected from LINC 4 employment focus the most on building vocabulary out of all the other components. There is more content related to grammar in the curriculum guidelines compared to the instructional materials. Pronunciation is less of a focus for both documents, and spelling is touched upon briefly in the instructional materials. This observation can suggest that compared to pronunciation and spelling, accumulating vocabulary and learning about English grammar are the primary emphases at LINC 4 level. Though *linguistic competence* is the second least emphasized competency in LINC 4 employment, instruction on its sub-elements (e.g., grammar, spelling, pronunciation, and vocabulary) supplemented by authentic materials has the potential to increase learners' acquisition of linguistic features in English (Gilmore, 2011).

LINC 4 strategic competence. *Communication strategies* that are present in the curriculum guidelines are *learner strategies*, *interactional strategies*, and *avoidance or reduction strategies*; however, instructional materials only included *learner strategies*. *Achievement or compensatory strategies*, *stalling or time-gaining strategies*, and *self-monitoring strategies* are not included in either of the LINC 4 documents. It appears that the two strategies that have the most representation in data are *learner strategies* and *interactional strategies*. It is worth considering how the strategies not included in the selected documents can benefit learners in work-related communication.

Research has suggested that instruction of *communication strategies* can help learners boost their performance in using the English language (Dörnyei, 1995; Rabab'ah, 2016; Kuen et al., 2017). Specifically, learners can use these strategies, *circumlocution*¹⁵ (i.e., using many

¹⁵ Circumlocution is listed as one of the ten common types of achievement or compensatory strategies by Celce-Murcia et al. (1995).

words to describe a word one is unfamiliar with), for example, to cope with lexical difficulties (Celce-Murcia et al., 1995). Moreover, equipping themselves with *communication strategies* would also help learners gain confidence and become willing to communicate (Mirsane & Khabiri, 2016). *Communication strategies* can thus empower learners in their English language use. In a workplace context, many newcomers can use these strategies to cope with communication breakdowns, improve their language skills, and assist them to adapt to a new working/living environment. For the above reasons, covering more communication strategies in language curriculum guidelines and instructional materials can have a positive impact on newcomer learners' language skill development.

Turning to the selected documents from CSWE III, based on the percentage coverage of each node from CSWE III theoretical framework (Table 11), both the curriculum guidelines *CSWE III Curriculum Document* and unit 1 to 3 in *Living in Australia, Intermediate* have the most substantial emphasis on *learning language*, while *learning about language* is the second most prominent focus for both selected documents. Both documents selected from CSWE III focus on *learning through language* the least.

Both the proficiency levels of learners and the purposes of their learning are important factors to consider when deciding which aspect of language learning to focus on in a class. In discussing children's language development, Halliday (1981) points out that a child begins learning the language from the moment of birth through involving in communication and exchanging signals with other people around them. Then the child learns through the language and uses the language to construct the reality around them. Finally, the child comes to understand the nature and functions of language itself. Hence, there are three aspects of language learning: *learning the language*, *learning through language*, and *learning about language*.

Though the original proposal of the three aspects of language learning did not discuss its implication for adult language learners, the CSWE III curriculum adapts and modifies this proposal into a framework the course uses. While the process of English language development for newcomer learners, especially those who are adults, is unlikely to be entirely linear as they may have acquired one or more languages prior to coming to an English-speaking country, Halliday's (1981) proposal offers some valuable insights that can be modified and applied in teaching these newcomers English for employment purposes. Specifically, the three aspects of language learning could unfold simultaneously, with different primary focus throughout different stages. Under the theory of SFL, it is crucial for learners to understand the relationship between grammatical choices and sociocultural contexts, and they need to develop an understanding of the systems of grammar. Through gaining knowledge in grammar and learning about how grammatical choices make meanings across contexts, learners can expand their meaning potential in their language use (NSW AMES, 2013). Learning the language and the systems of grammar in the language thus serves as a foundation for meaning making and the primary emphasis during early stages of language learning.

CSWE III learning language. For *language learning*, content involving choices made in spoken or written texts, including *coherence*, *cohesion*, and *comprehension*, is the strongest focus in both the curriculum guidelines and the instructional materials. Other than these components, the *CSWE III Curriculum Document* includes the most content for building grammar, followed by accumulating vocabulary, practicing pronunciation, learning to use *prosodic features* and *paralinguistic features* of English, and finally spelling. On the other hand, the first three units in *Living in Australia, Intermediate* primarily focus on building vocabulary,

grammar, and spelling. No content is dedicated to pronunciation, *prosodic features* or *paralinguistic features* of English.

Instruction on linguistic features in English, such as grammar and vocabulary, can easily be decontextualized. Thus the design of curriculum guidelines and instructional materials can place more focus on developing learner awareness and knowledge of contexts and the functions and the purposes of their choices in these linguistic features (Mart, 2013). Regarding other linguistic features, such as pronunciation and prosodic and paralinguistic features, it is worth discussing why the CSWE III instructional materials do not include content on these features as they are outlined in the guidelines.

The SFL theory, in an ESL context, usually uses grammar as a starting point. First instructors help learners notice how grammar works in specific contexts. Then the class explores how meaningful grammatical choices are made. Finally, learners make use of the resources they gained to make meaning in different contexts on their own (Jones & Lock, 2011). With the heavy emphasis on English grammar, it is possible that in the case of *pronunciation*, *prosodic features*, and *paralinguistic features*, learners in CSWE III are to notice the grammatical choices across contexts, so these language features are not explicitly stated in the instructional materials for this level. While this is a speculation made based on the data included in this study, I believe that learners can benefit from having exercises and activities designed surrounding these features in instructional materials like *Living in Australia*.

Learning and teaching pronunciation often are associated with *prosodic features* (e.g., pausing, stress, intonation) (Derwing et al., 2012); in the context of communication, *paralinguistic features* (e.g., body language, facial expressions, eye contact, tone, and pitch) are also discussed (Yamashita, 2013). Traditionally seen as “variations in the perceived pitch of the

speaking voice” (Brazil, 1997), intonation in language includes the following features: 1) a stream of speech is divided into *intonation units*, 2) a syllable in a word is assigned with the *tonic status*, and 3) a pitch is chosen for the intonation units (Cruttenden, 1986). Research has shown that EAL learners’ accuracy regarding the word stress patterns can affect the intelligibility of their speech, particularly when they are speaking to native English speakers (Zielinski, 2008). Moreover, learners’ production of stress at the sentence level in English is frequently associated with their first language(s) (L1s) (i.e. sentence stress is more salient in some languages and less so in other) (Ng & Chen, 2011; Derwing et al., 2012), so speaking with proper sentence stress can be challenging for some learners. Incorrect intonation can cause misunderstanding and even conflict in spoken exchanges (British Council, 2007), so it is important for learners to have an awareness of how intonation functions in their speech. Studies have suggested that instruction on intonation could lead to the improvement of learners’ communication skills (Celik, 2001; Derwing et al., 2012). Interlocutors’ intonational choices can often affect the flow of a spoken exchange, and the meaning intonation conveys is often interactional and interpersonal (e.g., use intonation to signal turn-takes) (Szczepek Reed, 2006). Additionally, both the production and the perception of *prosodic features* deserve equal attention in the classroom (Derwing et al., 2012) because efficient communication is never unilateral, and learners need to be understood as well as understand others.

Wennerström (2001) defines paralinguage as “the variation of pitch, volume, and voice quality that a speaker makes for pragmatic, emotional, and stylistic reasons and to meet the requirements of genre” (p. 60), showing how *paralinguistic features* of a language deeply interconnect with other aspects of communication. Based on Yamashita’s (2013) study, where she advocates for building corpora for paralinguistic research, knowledge of paralinguistic

features can help speakers sound more natural, express emotions and attitudes, recognize other people's emotions and opinions, and detect emphases in speech. Therefore, knowledge in *paralinguistic features* is an integral part of smooth communication, and learners can further improve their communication skills when they understand and effectively make use of these features.

Instructors could more effectively raise learners' awareness of pronunciation and prosodic and paralinguistic features of English and how they impact their use of the language when relevant activities are included in the instructional materials. Instructions on these factors can be particularly helpful to newcomers, given many of them come from cultural and linguistic backgrounds that are drastically different from those of English-speaking countries. A greater linguistic distance¹⁶ often results in more difficulty in learning English and longer time to integration (Beenstock et al., 2001), which is the reality many newcomers face. Instruction on pronunciation, prosody, and paralinguistics can help them gain more understanding of and confidence in language use.

CSWE III learning about language. Regarding the aspect of *learning about language*, spoken or written language choices made within different social contexts are the primary focus in both selected documents from CSWE III. The relation between language choices and English-speaking culture appears in both the curriculum guidelines and the instructional materials; however, it has more references in the instructional materials compared to the curriculum guidelines. Similar to LINC 4, CSWE III appears to emphasize the roles of social and cultural factors in English for employment purposes. Such emphasis is also reflected in the program's aim to equip newcomer learners with "preliminary English skills in a specific settlement context"

¹⁶ Linguistic distance refers to the degree of contrast between two dialects (Mayhew, 2015).

and to introduce them to “Australian social norms and practices, services, and the rule of law” (ADET, 2015, p. 6). The language content of the employment-related units of LINC 4 and CSWE III thus both focus on civics and general settlement training, and employment purposed language instruction is underemphasized.

CSWE III employment curriculum does not seem to promote learners’ *understanding of the choices available in the language system* as this element is not present in either selected document. This is interesting because ‘meaning’ and ‘choices’ are core to the SFL theory in language education, and learners’ awareness of having choices to make meanings in the target language is an important step. As Halliday (1995) suggests, language learning is learning how to mean, and it is essential for language instruction to take making meaning into account. Language learning experience can thus become a process where learners become aware of the rich meaning potential of language. Following the implementation of the SFL theory in the language classroom, language learning becomes empowering to learners when they understand the choices they can make in English and how the choices shape their communication (Meyer, 2008). Furthermore, Schleppegrell (2004) points out that “judgement about students’ abilities are often based on how they express their knowledge in language” (pp. 2-3). In the employment context, employers often assess newcomers’ abilities as employees or job candidates based on their presentation of skills through language; knowing what language choices are available to them, instead of being told what is right or wrong, provides them with more control and confidence when they face unpredictable communicative situations at work.

From my perspective, besides understanding the choices one can make in the target language, “understanding the choices available in the language system” also includes knowing one’s knowledge and experience in L1s and other additional languages can become resources for

language learning and meaning making in the target language. Incorporating learners' L1s in language learning can help raise the awareness of differences and similarities between the languages they know of and the target language, show appreciation and respect towards learners' cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and promote a positive attitude to English learning (Schweer, 1999; Brooks-Lewis, 2009). The inclusion of learners L1s can also reduce learners' anxieties, engage learners to share their life experiences, and create a more learner-centred curriculum (Auerbach, 1993). For newcomers who live in English speaking countries, they can be more empowered and encouraged when their language programs show them that their first languages can be useful in their English language learning.

Therefore, learners' knowledge of language choices in the target language, their first languages, and other additional languages can help promote language learning, and the element of "understanding the choices available in the language system" deserves more emphasis in the CSWE III employment curriculum. The curriculum guidelines can provide recommendations for instructors to utilize this element in their teaching, and the instructional materials can include related exercises and activities designed for employment purposes. For example, the class can discuss different choices in work-related English and how they impact the results of communication; learners can also be encouraged to brainstorm what consequences similar language choices in their first languages can bring within the same context.

CSWE III learning through language. Turning to the aspect of *learning through language, communication strategies, learner strategies*, and using "language as resources to interact with new knowledge" (numeracy related language, knowledge, and skills) are all covered in the selected CSWE III documents. The most often mentioned *communication strategies* in the documents are *interaction strategies* (e.g., asking for clarification and

repetition), while strategies for *negotiating exchange* are less of a focus. Strategies for making *extended turn-taking* are included in CSWE III's curriculum guidelines, yet they have no references in the instructional materials. Practicing turn-taking can provide learners the opportunity to learn to exchange turns with other people and respond politely and respectfully to other people's opinions. Therefore, turn-taking skills help learners become more active when taking part in communication (Rahmat et al., 2015). Further, in job-related situations, people are often required to talk about their skills and experiences in an extended manner. Effective use of turn-taking strategies can show assertiveness, present good conversation skills, and establish rapport (Maat et al., 2011), all of which can assist learners in work-related contexts. Insofar as the stress of coping with employment situation goes, many newcomers can benefit from learning about *extended turn-taking* strategies, and readily made activities to practice these strategies can help both the learners and the instructors in addressing language needs.

In both documents, there are references on *learner strategies* for “effective participation in formal learning environments,” while “independent learner strategies” are only covered by the curriculum guidelines. While learners' participation in the classroom is an integral part of their learning, their time receiving in-class instruction is often limited. Skills to learn independently are thus crucial for their success in the program, especially for learners in remote areas who enroll in virtual learning programs. For new immigrants, particularly those with little to none experience with the formal learning environment, it can be tremendously stressful to be in a language classroom. When they need to study on their own, many of them may face difficulties in locating and utilizing suitable learning resources. Research has suggested that effective self-regulatory strategies¹⁷ impact how learners make use of learning resources and information

¹⁷ The *CSWE III Curriculum Document* does not offer a clear definition of *independent learner strategies*, though the term is often associated with 1) learning through using a wide range of resources, and 2) learning through the use of

technology when they study the target language independently (Kormos & Csizér, 2014). With these strategies, learners are able to keep progressing when they are not in class. Hence, instruction on strategies for independent learning has long-term benefits for the learners as they extend their learning beyond the classroom setting.

“Understanding the role of assessment” is not included in either of the documents, and it could be argued that this component is covered in lower levels and thus no longer the focus for level III in CSWE. However, as a program that practices continuous intake, newly enrolled learners still need to be informed of the role of assessment in this program. Within AMEP, learners are assessed based on explicitly stated competences, and assessments are outcome-oriented within the program (McKay, 2007). However, assessments are not only about moving up to higher levels, they also provide learners the chance to receive feedback from their instructors. A good understanding of the role of assessment and the course requirement facilitate meaningful discussion and reflection on the feedback and improvement of language skills. This study thus recommends that CSWE III can familiarize learners with the assessment criteria and encourage them to use the criteria for their learning purposes.

When comparing the selected documents from LINC 4 and CSWE III, it becomes obvious that the CSWE III documents cover more employment-related topics than the LINC 4 documents do (refer to Section 3.1). Building upon the above comparison based on the coding results in this study, some key similarities and differences LINC 4 and CSWE III demonstrate in the selected documents, other than the number of topics being covered, can be summarized as follows (see Appendix G for a comparison table):

English-speaking environment beyond the classroom and the Internet. Kormos and Csizér (2014) define self-regulatory strategies as 1) “satiation control” (overcoming boredom and make language learning fun), 2) “time management” (controlling procrastination and planning study schedule), and 3) “opportunity control” (taking control of and looking for language learning and language use opportunities) (pp. 286-287).

Similarities. The employment-purposed instructional materials of LINC 4 and CSWE III both emphasize the importance of text structures, including cohesion, coherence, and comprehension. Both curricula highlight the role of social contexts in the production and interpretation of texts, and they both focus the most on vocabulary building when it comes to acquiring knowledge of the linguistic features of English. The guidelines of both curricula outline non-verbal communication or prosodic and paralinguistic features, but these features are rarely included in their instructional materials. Pronunciation receives little focus in the instructional materials of both LINC 4 and CSWE III. Regarding strategy use, both curricula focus on *interaction(al) strategies* and *learner strategies* the most. Other *communication strategies* presented in their frameworks have little to no representation in both curricula.

Differences. Besides having different theoretical frameworks, there are other key differences between the selected documents from LINC4 and CSWE III. While LINC 4 employment primarily focuses on building *discourse competence*, CSWE III employment focuses more on *learning language* that corresponds to *linguistic competence* and *discourse competence* in LINC 4. When it comes to building learners' knowledge in the linguistic features of English, LINC 4 curriculum guidelines emphasize accumulating vocabulary and building understanding in grammar the most, with the two components covering equal percentage of the codes (5.77%). CSWE III documents focus on building understanding in grammar more than LINC 4 documents do. Though both LINC 4 and CSWE III cover *learner strategies*, these strategies are only explicitly outlined in CSWE III curriculum. Knowledge of *numeracy* is only included in CSWE III curriculum.

4.2 Instructors' Perspectives

Research Questions 2: What are the instructors' perspectives on the language content of employment-related units of LINC 4 and CSWE III demonstrated in the curriculum guidelines, instructional materials, and classroom implementations?

This section addresses the second research question through presenting each interviewed instructor's perspective on teaching English for employment purposes in their programs, comparing the coding results of the interview transcripts of instructors from the same program, comparing the coding results of the interview transcripts of instructors with the selected documents from the programs they worked for, and finally comparing LINC 4 instructors' perspectives with CSWE III instructors' perspectives.

4.2.1 Amanda from LINC 4.

Amanda had approximately 25 years of teaching experience at the time of her interview. She had been teaching in a LINC program offered in Metro Vancouver area, specifically LINC level 1 to 4, for 20 years at the time of her interview. In her own words, she “[had] been through all the changes” of the program.

Employment was a theme that came up regularly for Amanda's LINC 4 classes, though the program was set up to teach on a different theme each month. She frequently answered employment-related questions (e.g., résumés) from her learners. As a monthly theme, employment came up once in the fall and once in the spring. Besides working with monthly themes, Amanda also had to cover topics as they came up. For example, she had to be flexible and add classes to teach learners about elections in BC when it was election month.

When planning on teaching employment, Amanda first assessed the needs of her learners through surveying what they would like to learn the most from a selection of topics (e.g.,

résumés, reading an ad, writing a cover letter, mock interviews, and volunteer), and the most popular choices would become the instructional topics for the employment-related units of the class. Before each unit of instruction, Amanda spent six to seven hours on planning the class a week in advance. Each day she also spent half an hour to one hour for planning as her class progressed, and she usually spent the additional time searching for resources online (e.g., real application forms) to support her instruction.

Amanda preferred using “real-world materials” (e.g., online job advertisements) and having learners work with those materials. She would analyze jobs learners desired to apply for in reality. For example, Amanda would start with introducing vocabulary associated with the jobs, and then move onto tasks such as writing emails to ask for time off, answering questions about taking an extra shift. Amanda shared that she tried not to make modifications to the materials because the materials present what learners would get in real-life employment contexts. However, Amanda would make changes or work on one topic for a longer period when it was necessary, depending on the level of the class. More specifically, she would divide one topic into sections to work on with her students. For example, for a job application, she looked at smaller sections of it, but she also tried not to make too many modifications so that students could familiarize themselves with what they were likely to encounter in real life. Amanda could use government-funded materials for her class, but she often turned to her colleagues for advice and searched for additional resources on Tutela¹⁸, an online community for language teaching professionals (Tutela, 2016).

¹⁸ Funded by IRCC, Tutela (www.tutela.ca) is a non-profit online community for ESL and French as a Second Language (FSL) professionals. The website provides its users with access to classroom materials, lesson plans, assessment information, and learning objects. This website also offers its users the opportunity to share materials, find solutions, and connect with other professionals through organized online meetings, webinars, and conferences (Tutela, 2016).

Amanda's institution started implementing PBLA (see Section 2.2.4) in early 2016, and it had since then taken her more time to prepare lessons. She gave the example of examining a McDonald's job application online. For this particular instance, she had to create the materials, including listening, speaking, reading, and writing, centring around this one specific topic. In her words, "...basically, you get the real-world paper and then you create everything that goes with it. So, that's a tremendous amount of time."

When sharing her opinion on what could be improved in the materials she works with, Amanda further expressed her frustration:

The biggest complaint that sits around our lunch table every day is that we're basically being thrown into it with nothing, and then expected to create everything on our own...in order to do true needs-driven, you have to create the materials. The reality is that you're gonna have teachers who will be so tired. So it's uh, you have to learn to do a mix of needs-driven and already made materials. So the biggest complaint that I have and I hear from my colleagues is that the program is implemented without some very solid templates and ideas and examples of...like a module on something very standard like a job interview that you could then use to get started instead of having to spend a gazillion hours making everything up.

Every time there was a new class of learners or a new monthly theme, Amanda and her colleagues had to repeat the same process.

Another struggle for Amanda when working with classroom materials is to find videos that were appropriate to the language proficiency levels of her class, especially for lower level learners. To compensate for this issue, she often had to make the videos herself. For this reason,

she suggested that a “bank” of audio or video recordings on common themes designed based on real-world tasks, such as job interviews or parent-teacher interviews, would be handy.

In regard to the strengths of the materials Amanda worked with, she thought the CLB had comprehensible guidelines for the types of tasks instructors were supposed to cover in the classroom and the criteria necessary for assessing learners. These assessment criteria also provided the learners with a clear understanding of the requirements to fulfill in order to complete a level. Despite the increase of workload with the implementation of PBLA, Amanda appreciated the switch in language ownership from instructors to learners with this new assessment tool. Learners could thus become more active in and accountable for their learning. As a language instructor, PBLA made Amanda reflect on her teaching and discover what worked well and what did not work in her class; also, PBLA built her learners’ understanding of education system and provided them with study skills that learners could use when they study outside of the classroom.

Amanda walked through how she would teach employment-related lessons using the example of a volunteer job application, which is a module she was particularly pleased with because it worked very well with PBLA. Through a website, the class looked at different volunteer job application forms in groups. During the first few classes, Amanda often had to cover computer skills (e.g., turning on the computer, searching for the website). After the class found the jobs they wanted to work with, they studied the key vocabulary. Then Amanda incorporated listening, speaking, reading, and writing tasks for her learners. They then applied for those positions, invited the coordinator to talk to the class, and finished the module with learners taking part in a shift of volunteer work. The entire process took a month to complete. When her learners faced difficulties in completing specific tasks, Amanda encouraged them to

form support groups and help each other out because they all had different skill sets that could complement and assist each other as a team.

The goals Amanda set up for her learners were: filling out an application correctly (i.e., knowing what information goes into which part of the application), understanding work-related vocabulary and abbreviations, basic workers' rights (Amanda shared that she could not cover on this aspect extensively since LINC 4 was still considered as a lower level), Canadian cultural practices, workplace conversations, dress code, and so on. When teaching workplace communication, Amanda mentioned that LINC 4 only covered the "basics," such as writing emails to ask for a day off; more complicated communication, such as politely addressing an issue via email, was usually covered at LINC 5 and above.

In Amanda's opinion, the employment-related units of LINC 4 prepared the learners for their communication needs for employment purposes "in a very narrow way," which was due to the limitations of part-time classes. She further elaborated that many of her learners had to work or take care of their family, so they were attending the program part-time. As a part-time class, LINC 4 could not cover much content. However, PBLA required her to focus on one task at a time, and she often had to compromise and cover topics very selectively. Therefore, to an extent, PBLA could disrupt the sequencing of the tasks instructors designed and lead to challenges, particularly for part-time learners.

4.2.2 Bianca from LINC 4.

Upon finishing a post-graduate TESL program, Bianca's second career landed in the field of English language teaching. At the time of her interview, she had been teaching in a LINC program offered in Toronto, Ontario for eight years. Her experience with the program had mostly been with LINC 3, 4, and 5, but she occasionally also taught LINC 1 and 2.

Same as what Amanda shared, Bianca's institution implemented monthly themes, and there would be one month dedicated to employment. The content she aimed to address during that month included but was not limited to job titles, job descriptions, and ways to get a job.

When it comes to planning the lessons on employment, Bianca reused the lessons she had created over her years of teaching, with modifications based on the learners' levels and needs. In general, she spent an hour to an hour and a half every night on planning the class, and she taught five and half hours during the day.

As her preference, Bianca made use of resources available at her school when preparing for her class, and she would modify the materials to suit the learner's and her instructional needs. Overall, Bianca was satisfied with the materials she had access to. One difficulty Bianca had experienced when teaching the employment-related units was having to balance different needs in a classroom, with some learners wanted to work in Canada and others who had no intention to find employment. In Bianca's opinion, if she had taught a small size of the class, she would have had her class tailored for each individual learners' needs, addressing their work needs in Canada and their past employment history. To Bianca, it was a challenge to balance the diverse learner needs and goals in her class: "I don't want the highly motivated students that want to learn and want to work...I don't want them to fall through the cracks." She tried to focus on what learner needed for finding work, and "others can just come long for the ride."

The LINC program practices continuous intake of learners and having new learners in the class in the middle of a school semester could be stressful to cope with:

You do your unit on employment, and three months later, you have three new students join the class. They're highly motivated, and they start asking you about working and 'how do I get a job in Canada? And what should I do?' So now do I go back? And do I

repeat everything I did three months ago? And all the other twenty students already heard it? That's a challenge...If you teach to the themes, theoretically they would wait till the next year, but I don't do that. If I see a big need, I'll just go over again...we do that all the time...It's not so rigid that you must stay with that one month and forget it till the next year".

When asked to provide some examples and briefly described how she taught employment-related components, Bianca shared that she would probably start with introducing learners to relevant vocabularies, such as job titles and words learners needed to know in their daily lives. She also taught verbs and grammar that were associated with the jobs, further discussing what people with those jobs did and what responsibilities they had.

Volunteerism was another topic Bianca covered in her class. She thought for learners who wanted Canadian work experience but could not find a job when they were learning English, volunteer work was a great way to gain more experience they could write on their résumés. For a writing lesson, Bianca would have the learners attempt to fill out an application form for a volunteer job. However, she did not include résumé writing in her class because her institution collaborated with a nearby employment agency to help the LINC learners find jobs, and Bianca and her colleagues often referred their learners to that agency for assistance on résumé, and job search.

Inside her class, Bianca would address the topic of interviews: what learners could expect to hear on an interview, the types of questions they needed to familiarize themselves with, legal issues associated with Canadian workplace, money and finance, and workplace dress code. The Canadian context was very important to Bianca when talking about the above topics. For example, she would discuss the types of jobs around Canada, and minimum wage across

different provinces in the country. She incorporated reading comprehension using stories about Canadians, and then the class would have group discussions as their speaking activities. For example, her class talked about whether a woman could be a police officer or serve in the military, and these were unimaginable for learners from some countries. Then the class expanded on that topic and had discussions about what was acceptable in Canada. Moreover, Bianca also addressed the topic of money, such as inappropriate questions to ask about money in Canada.

Building a sense of cohort in the classroom was very important to Bianca because she thought the classroom environment was to a degree comparable to the work environment. She often asked her learners to think about how to work together as a group, how to solve problems as a team, and how to encourage each other when things were not progressing well. Bianca believed that through practicing in class, learners would be able to carry these skills forward into the workforce in the future.

With respect to the goals and objectives Bianca set up for her class, she shared that she would like her learners to understand how to get a job, how they would get paid, the risks involved in unreported employment, and the employment/further education resources that were available for them.

Bianca shared that she often faced the challenge of student absenteeism in her teaching. Learners in the program often had to tend to family or health issues, which caused them to miss classes. If the learners had been in class for the entire month for the topic on employment, they would have a good understanding of the expectations of working in Canada.

Bianca had not experimented with PBLA in her class at the time of her interview. She was unsure about the change this new assessment tool might bring when she reflected on teaching learners to write work-related letters and emails. Bianca expressed her concern over

whether PBLA would hinder her ability to compare writings in different contexts and for different purposes since PBLA might restrict learners to practicing writing in one given context. Bianca also expressed her concern over using PBLA for teaching and assessing English grammar since she could not be sure whether teaching grammar without giving contexts still had value with the implementation of PBLA.

4.2.3 Coding results from LINC 4 instructor interviews

Amanda's interview transcript was coded under 28 nodes of the coding scheme generated based on the Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) model. Bianca's interview transcript was coded under 27 nodes from the same coding scheme. Each node's percentage coverage in this transcript is listed in Table 12.

Table 12 *Code Coverage in Amanda's and Bianca's Interview Transcripts*

Competences	Components	% Coverage Amanda (216)	% Coverage Bianca (147)
Discourse	Cohesion	28.24% (61)	21.77% (32)
	Deixis	3.24% (7)	4.08% (6)
	Coherence	N/A	N/A
	Genre/generic structure	6.94% (15)	6.80% (10)
	Conversational structure	11.57% (25)	5.44% (8)
		6.48% (14)	5.44% (8)
Linguistic		10.65% (23)	17.69% (26)
	Syntax (Grammar)	2.78% (6)	5.44% (8)
	Lexicon (receptive and productive)	4.17% (9)	6.80% (10)
	Phonology (for pronunciation)	2.78% (6)	2.72% (4)
	Orthography (for spelling)	0.93% (2)	2.72% (4)
Actional		29.63% (64)	23.81% (35)
	Knowledge of language functions:	19.91% (43)	21.77% (32)
	• Interpersonal exchange	7.41% (16)	4.08% (6)
	• Information	9.26% (20)	12.93% (19)
	• Opinions	0.93% (2)	2.72% (4)
	• Feelings	0.46% (1)	0.68% (1)
	• Suasion	N/A	N/A
	• Problems	1.85% (4)	1.36% (2)
	• Future scenarios	N/A	N/A
	Knowledge of speech act sets	9.72% (21)	2.04% (3)

Sociocultural	28.70% (62)	33.33% (49)
Social contextual factors	16.20% (35)	21.77% (32)
Stylistic appropriateness factors	2.77% (6)	N/A
Cultural factors	8.33% (18)	10.20% (15)
Non-verbal communicative factors	1.39% (3)	1.36% (2)
Strategic	2.78% (6)	3.40% (5)
Learner strategies (not outlined by the program's theoretical framework)	1.39% (3)	2.04% (3)
Avoidance or reduction strategies	N/A	N/A
Achievement or compensatory strategies	N/A	N/A
Stalling or time-gaining strategies	N/A	N/A
Self-monitoring strategies	N/A	N/A
Interactional strategies	1.39% (3)	1.36% (2)

Among the five competences outlined in the framework, Amanda's interview transcript has the most references in *actional competence* (29.63%), followed by *sociocultural competence* (28.70%), *discourse competence* (28.24%), *linguistic competence* (10.65%), and *strategic competence* (2.78%). For Bianca's interview transcript, *sociocultural competence* (33.33%) has the highest occurrence, followed by *actional competence* (23.81%), *discourse competence* (21.77%), *linguistic competence* (17.69%), and *strategic competence* (3.40%). It appears that *actional competence*, *sociocultural competence*, and *discourse competence* have a similar number of references in Amanda's interview, while in Bianca's interview, *sociocultural competence's* occurrence has a more prominent difference compared to the less represented competences.

For *sociocultural competence*, both Amanda and Bianca focused on *social contextual factors* the most, so the characteristics of the interactants and the contexts of communication were essential for both LINC 4 instructors in their teaching for employment purposes. *Cultural factors* and *non-verbal communicative factors* appear to have a similar percentage of code coverage in both Amanda's and Bianca's interview transcripts, though *stylistic appropriateness factors* came up in Amanda's interview only.

When it comes to *actional competence*, both Amanda and Bianca placed their primary emphasis on learners' *knowledge of language functions*, among which being able to express and comprehend *information* was the main focus. Neither Amanda nor Bianca mentioned teaching learners how to persuade others (*suasion*) or talk about *future scenarios*. Both instructors talked about engaging in *interpersonal exchange* and learning how language is patterned and sequenced in real-life situations (*knowledge of speech act sets*), though Amanda's interview had more references to these two elements compared to Bianca's interview.

Within *discourse competence*, *cohesion*, *coherence*, and *conversational structure* all had similar code percentage in both Amanda's and Bianca's interview transcripts. Both instructors did not mention teaching learners to use the system of reference to connect texts and contexts (*deixis*). Amanda shared more about teaching learners to construct texts in accordance with the purposes of communication.

Bianca talked about building learners' *linguistic competence* more than Amanda did. Within this competence, learning about grammar (*syntax*) and improving spelling (*orthography*) came up during Bianca's interview compared to Amanda's interview. The primary focus for both instructors appeared to be accumulating vocabulary (*lexicon*), and they had a similar amount of emphasis on pronunciation (*phonology*).

Regarding *strategic competence*, both Amanda and Bianca talked about teaching *learner strategies* that could assist learners to participate in the learning process both in class with classmates and independently outside of class. Regarding *communication strategies*, both instructors focused on *interactional strategies* that learners would use to seek repetition, clarification, confirmation, and so on. *Avoidance or reduction strategies*, *achievement* or

compensatory strategies, stalling or time-gaining strategies, and self-monitoring strategies did not appear during both Amanda's and Bianca's interviews.

4.2.3 LINC 4 instructors' perspectives vis-à-vis selected documents

Through comparing Amanda's and Bianca's perspectives and results from analyzing LINC 4 employment documents, it appears that both instructors teach beyond the topics that are provided by the documents. Also, it can be observed that the two instructors present different emphases in teaching employment-purposed classes, while the curriculum guidelines and the instructional materials have similar focuses on the five competences outlined in the theoretical framework. While both selected documents from LINC 4 place primary emphasis on developing learners' *discourse competence*, emphasizing the importance of constructing texts for different purposes, the major focuses for Amanda's and Bianca's classroom instruction are *actional competence* and *sociocultural competence*, respectively. As both instructors have shared, they often have to create additional materials to cater the diverse and changing needs of their learners, so the classroom implementations of similar materials can vary drastically.

When talking about the resources they have used to fulfill learners' work-related needs, Amanda has mentioned that since many learners have been in part-time classes, and the implementation of PBLA has not led to ideal results, the design of the employment-related units in LINC 4 could not fully prepare learners for their work-related communication needs. Moreover, Amanda and her colleagues have not been provided with sufficient instructional resources within the program to cover the topic of employment. Limited by their language proficiency level, learners in Amanda's class could only participate in short exchanges that do not match real-life work situations. Bianca, on the other hand, has been satisfied with the teaching resources. Her main challenge when teaching English for employment purposes has

been balancing different students' needs using resources that have been designed for more general purposes.

The coding coverage of *non-verbal communication factors* and *stylistic appropriateness factors* in Amanda's and Bianca's interviews are roughly in line with the results based on the selected documents from LINC 4 employment, so both elements play less significant roles in LINC 4 instructors' teaching. As discussed previously, incorporating these two less emphasized elements in LINC 4 employment curriculum can benefit newcomer learners' language learning by familiarizing them with the social and cultural values and expectations in Canada, introducing them to non-verbal communication cues, and teaching them appropriate ways to present themselves and interact with others.

Lexicon is the most significant factor in regard to building *linguistic competence* for both Amanda and Bianca, and pronunciation has been mentioned to a similar extent in their interviews. Thus, both instructors have focused on accumulating work-related vocabulary as resources learners can utilize for their own purposes. However, Bianca has stressed grammar and spelling more than Amanda has, and overall, she has talked about *linguistic competence* more. The above findings are in line with what the LINC 4 documents present. The differences between the two instructors' instructional approaches can be due to different preferences or learner needs, resulting in different levels of coverage of grammar and spelling in different classrooms.

Compared to what LINC 4 employment curriculum guidelines and instructional materials outline, *actional competence* has been emphasized more in both Amanda's and Bianca's employment-purposed instruction. Both instructors have focused more on building learners' knowledge of *language functions* than their knowledge of how *speech acts* and *language*

functions are patterned and sequenced in real-life situations (*knowledge of speech act sets*). This finding is in line with what is presented in the documents. As discussed previously, the curriculum guidelines and instructional materials also do not emphasize the component of *knowledge of speech act sets* (see Table 10), so the underrepresentation of how language works for different purposes in real life situations in the instructor interviews can be explained by the same lack in the teaching resources they used. Hence, the results of the instructor interviews might imply a need for incorporating more authentic texts in the curriculum and its supplementary materials.

The benefits and possible use of authentic texts have been discussed previously (see Section 4.1.3), so here I would like to point out that the connection between teaching resources and instructors' instructional focus underlines the significance of developing a curriculum and accompanying instructional materials that can accommodate the ever-changing needs of newcomers in programs like LINC. Perry and Hart (2012) state that adult refugee learners have educational needs that are unique from other language learners. As a result, instructors who teach adult refugees often have needs that are different from other language teachers. Through interviews with educators of adult refugees, Perry and Hart. (2012, pp. 118-119) conclude that these teachers desire and can benefit from the following types of support: teaching tools and techniques (e.g., general training, teaching materials, teaching ideas/activities, curriculum and lesson plans, and "pedagogical content knowledge," meaning what and how to teach the class), people resources (e.g., mentoring, a "reference person", and social networking opportunities), and support on cultural awareness and education; in particular, what Amanda has shared in her interview suggests these needs.

Corroborating what the selected documents present, for both LINC 4 instructors, having learners express and interpret information is the primary emphasis among the seven language functions outlined in LINC 4's theoretical framework. Differing from coding results of the selected documents, *interpersonal exchange* plays a more significant role for both Amanda and Bianca in their employment-purposed instruction. In addition, both instructors have taught learners to express and interpret utterances surrounding *feelings* and *problems*, while they have not mentioned teaching language functions of talking about *future scenarios* and persuading others in their interviews. This finding can be again explained by the absence or underrepresentation of these functions in the curriculum. However, the function of interpreting and resolving problems, persuading others, and talking about the future can be valuable in employment-related situations (e.g., conflict resolution, selling the skills at job interviews, discussing possibilities or capabilities to complete tasks), and these *language functions* enable learners to engage in some of the most common communicative events in a work environment (Kassim & Ali, 2010). Knowledge in *language functions* thus can help learners understand what they can achieve through their language use and empower and motivate learners. Such knowledge is especially important for newcomer learners with employment needs, who can benefit from empowerment and motivation when facing multiple sources of stress from learning the language and making a living in a new country.

Regarding *discourse competence*, Amanda's employment-purposed instruction focuses primarily on looking at the structures of different genres of texts, while Bianca's class emphasizes improving learners' *coherence* in English communication. Building learners' ability to produce cohesive texts and understand different rules when taking part in a conversation are both included in their classrooms.

Neither of the two instructors has talked about teaching *deixis*, the reference system between the text and the context. The absence of the element of *deixis* can be because the system is introduced along with grammar, cohesion, and coherence in the instruction. Regardless, explicitly teaching deictic words and how they function in texts can raise learners' awareness of their language use and enhance cohesion and coherence of learners' language production. From a grammatical standpoint, Harman (1990) states that teaching deictic items has important pedagogical implications because in order to clearly express the meaning of an utterance, it is often inevitable to manipulate the three variables of person, place, and time. Looking at the sociocultural impact of *deixis*, Zhang et al. (2013), through comparing Chinese and English, suggests that the use of deictic words can function to show empathy or apathy, and intimacy or distance. For example, the use of *we* in both languages generally indicates consideration and inclusion of participants in communication. As previously addressed, a linguistic distance between learners' L1(s) and English may hinder newcomer learners' ability to communicate in English clearly through suitable choices of deictic words. Instructors can thus consider incorporating relevant activities and tasks to enhance learners' language use.

Both Amanda and Bianca have incorporated *learner strategies* and *interactional strategies* in their employment-purposed instruction. *Avoidance or reduction strategies*, *achievement or compensatory strategies*, *stalling or time-gaining strategies*, and *self-monitoring strategies* did not come up in either of the interviews. This observation is mostly in line with what has been presented in curriculum guidelines and instructional materials. The underrepresentation of *communication strategies* other than *interactional strategies* (e.g., asking for clarification, seeking repetition) in both LINC 4 classroom instruction and the selected

documents accentuates the need for including more activities based on other listed strategies that learners can use in work-related situations (Table 13).

Table 13 *Underrepresented Communication Strategies in LINC Theoretical Framework and Examples of Their Potential Use in Employment-related Contexts*

Type of Strategies	Examples
Avoidance or reduction strategies	• Learn to refuse politely to answer illegal or embarrassing questions (<i>LINC 4 Curriculum Guidelines, Employment</i>) • Avoid or reduce talking about weaknesses during job interviews
Achievement or compensatory strategies	• Paraphrase unfamiliar words to make self understood • Explain technical terms to the general audience
Stalling or time-gaining strategies	• Fill in the silence when one cannot remember what to say next, or when the audience does not respond
Self-monitoring strategies	• Elaborate on presented ideas to make them clearer to the audience

The advantages that knowledge in communication strategies can give to newcomer language learners have been discussed earlier in this study (see Section 4.1.3). Instructors can consider introducing these strategies and related contexts to their class to teach English for employment purposes.

4.2.4 Catherine from CSWE III.

After seven years teaching at an AMEP program in Sydney, NSW, Australia, Catherine's institution, among many other service providers across the country, lost its contract and could no longer offer the program (see 2.1.2).

Catherine's background was in human resources, and she worked in the field for about fifteen years before she had a career change and became an English language teaching

professional. She received a master's degree in human resources and a graduate diploma in TESOL.

Catherine taught the following levels in the AMEP program: Course in Preliminary Spoken and Written English (Pre-CSWE), CSWE I, II, and III. When she was in the program, she taught five hours per day, three days a week, and each week she spent on average five hours preparing the lessons.

CSWE level III at Catherine's school offered separate courses for learners who wished to pursue further education and those who desired to enter the workforce. The course Catherine was in charge of was called *English for Employment*, and the class was entirely dedicated to employment-purposed language training. The course spread over two school semesters, and each semester was ten weeks. Learners could enroll in the course as long as they needed, though most of Catherine's learners stayed from start to finish. Taking advantage of her HR background and contacts in the recruitment positions, Catherine often invited guest speakers to talk to her learners about interviews after she completed teaching the language component.

As to the materials she used for her class, Catherine referred to AMES publications and other books she found for work-related language classes. She also found realia (i.e., objects from real life used in the classroom to enhance learners' understanding) on the Internet, such as real job applications and immigration-related content.

When answering a question on whether she modified any of the materials she used for her class, Catherine commented that the *Living in Australia* workbooks were "clunky," so she only used them for structuring language points she intended to teach and to find realia (e.g., job application forms). However, sometimes the realia she wanted to use in the workbooks did not resemble real-life texts. For example, if one of the application forms she wanted to use did not

appear realistic, she would create her own form using Google Docs¹⁹. Also, Catherine thought the 2013 edition of *Living in Australia* included some outdated content (e.g., formatting of résumés and CVs, topics like ‘faxing’ that is irrelevant to most people’s lives now). Regarding the question of how *Living in Australia* worked well for her, Catherine thought the book provided balanced information about Australia while learning English with the example of teaching learners about the Australian national employment standards. The class was able to learn about contracted employment and the language surrounding this topic, and they also looked at real contracts and practiced filling the forms.

Regarding the curriculum guidelines *CSWE III Curriculum Document*, Catherine commented that she used this document for reporting learners’ learning outcomes in the programs to the Department of Immigration:

[T]he outcomes are what they (the learners) need to pass. It’s a competency-based program, so we need to tick all the competencies they demonstrate...and that provides a structure for all your students”.

However, Catherine reflected that she often had to go beyond ticking boxes listed in the curriculum. For example, the curriculum outlined learners needed to understand federal employment, but in Catherine’s opinion, her class needed to learn much more to build up to this component. In other words, learners must be able to read a letter before signing it. By contrast, topics relevant to employment-purposed communication (e.g., taking annual leaves, attending meetings) did not come up in the curriculum at all. Consequently, when Catherine’s supervisor

¹⁹ Offered by Google, Google Docs is an online word processor that allows more than one person to create, edit, and collaborate on the same document (Google, 2018).

told her to ensure the learners to pass a certain number of modules, she did more than what the curriculum required.

For her *English for Employment* course, the first ten weeks was titled as *Looking for Work*, and the class would begin with modules directly related to job seeking (e.g., calling about jobs, résumé writing, reading a job advertisement, and interviews). Catherine called the second ten weeks of the course *At Work*, when she would teach learners how they could operate at work (e.g., meetings, negotiating with the boss, writing emails, and filling out forms).

Catherine then provided more details on how she taught the course. She shared that the knowledge and past employment experience of the adult migrants in her class provided a model for her teaching. Specifically, the content of her class included teaching key vocabulary, looking at a model, and then covering the grammar, all of which was taught within the context of work. Catherine then emphasized the role of teaching learners about teamwork in an Australian workplace. Through collaborating with others, Catherine's learners gained valuable experience and skills that they could talk about in an interview. To give her learners such experience and skills, Catherine initiated a project for the class for ten weeks based on the learners' needs and experience, and the learners worked as a team to deliver the project:

Something like we would talk to my boss, and we discovered that the school didn't have recycling bins. So we set up project teams to introduce recycling bins in the school. And the project was ten weeks in which to find out how they can do it, what's involved, and then introduce it and make sure the students knew what they (recycling bins) were there for and how to use them.

During the five years when Catherine taught the course, she organized about sixteen projects with different foci (e.g., marketing videos to promote the school). Catherine knew the reason

why adult migrant learners often could not find work was because they lacked local experience, so even a course-based project in the language program would benefit the learners and give them the experience to talk about in an interview setting.

Besides teamwork experience and skills, Catherine also experimented with LinkedIn²⁰, which helped her learners to gain networking skills. She acknowledged the importance of networking in job hunting, though the curriculum did not cover the topic. Thereby, in her class, Catherine looked at ways to increase her learners' network of people so that they could later use that to find work.

Due to the high volume of content she had to cover in her class, Catherine could not be more specific about the activities she did in her class. As examples, she shared that there would be listening to recordings of meetings where people talk about their strategies for communicating with each other; the class also talked about résumé writing, which would start with looking at sample résumés and then proceed to writing résumés. For interviews, Catherine would play video clips of interviews and get her learners to practice interview language.

Though employment was the common goal for all the learners in Catherine's class, she still had to address different needs of learners since their language skills varied from person to person. She aimed to find a balance in setting challenges for learners with different skill sets, encouraging learners to keep strengthening their skills and giving them the opportunities to work on the things they found challenging. In the classroom, Catherine sometimes mixed learners with different skill sets into one group and had them collaborate in activities. By facilitating teamwork in her class, Catherine's learners formed a strong bond with one another even after they finished

²⁰ LinkedIn is the largest online networking platform for professionals in the world, with over 500 million users across 20 countries. Employers can hire talents and market for their businesses on the website, and individual users can connect with other professionals, learn about the latest news and skills in their fields, and apply for employment (LinkedIn, 2016).

the course; they often shared updates in their lives on social media and group chats, congratulated each other when good things happened, and lifted each other up when they went through adversity.

The main challenge Catherine had in teaching the course was learners' lack of confidence. With the help of a variety of technologies (e.g., blogging tools, WhatsApp²¹), Catherine encouraged her learners to write more and communicate with their peers so that they slowly became more confident in using English. Moreover, she sympathized with the difficulties her learners faced and motivated them when they received rejections and lost hope. Though learners could not gain all the language skills in those ten weeks, Catherine aimed to build learners' confidence, enhance their understanding of Australian labour market in terms of employer expectations, "lift the sophistication" of their vocabulary and grammar, and provide them work-related resources and strategies so that they know where and how to seek employment even when the course is finished.

4.2.5 Dana from CSWE III.

Before changing her career to become an English teaching professional, Dana worked in the field of information technology. While working overseas, she met her interest in language teaching when people asked her to teach them English. After she went back to Australia, Dana started volunteering as a tutor in the AMEP program and at the same time studying for a graduate diploma in TESOL. She later was employed by the program and continued her education to receive a master's degree in TESOL.

²¹ WhatsApp (2018) is a instant messaging smartphone application that supports private text messaging between two individual users, group conversations, phone calls, and video chats.

For the next eight years, Dana taught in an AMEP program in Canberra, ACT, Australia. Like Catherine, Dana also has experience teaching Pre-CSWE and CSWE I to III, though she is most familiar with level III. She mainly taught evening classes and distance learning classes (either through phone calls or online classes).

Most of the learners in Dana's CSWE III evening classes were working during the daytime, though many of them were not in their desired positions. Thus, Dana frequently had to address employment-related issues as they happened in learners' everyday lives (e.g., workplace discrimination, miscommunication). Regarding the content Dana prepared for her class, she discovered that she could not focus on particular industries or workplaces; instead, she taught more "generic skills" in her class, such as communication and teamwork.

Besides responding to learners' questions as they came up, at the beginning of each semester, Dana would conduct a needs analysis on her learners. She then selected materials for the course based on learner needs and the requirements of the curriculum. As Dana recalled, learners at her school did not prefer an employment-focused course where they could learn about things like job searching or interviews in Australia; they wanted to gain skills to interact with others at a workplace (e.g., casual conversations with coworkers). Dana shared that she often had to balance different learner needs and preferences. For example, some learners were in class for the work-related content, some simply wanted to gain language skills regardless of contexts. Dana welcomed learners' expression of their needs as she believed learners themselves were most eligible to assess what they needed from the program. For example, Dana might be more aware of what learners needed to function in a work situation, whereas the learners might want to have the ability to socially interact with colleagues at work. More specifically, Dana would include the following topics in her CSWE III class: workplace culture in Australia, formality

versus informality in communication, teamwork skills, and workplace rights. Dana would spend time on each of the topics and revisit them when learners raised relevant questions.

In Dana's experience, not every instructor had the opportunity to do needs analysis since it was not within the curriculum. Teachers were frustrated because going through the textbook often made up the entirety of their instruction. When working with course materials, Dana thought many course books, such as *Living in Australia*, were not so relevant to a cohort of learners who had jobs. Therefore, she was very selective of the materials she used in class, and she often made modifications to them and found additional materials. For example, when teaching learners how to write cover letters and CVs, instead of working with the example given by the course book, Dana asked her learners to write their own first and work with what they produced.

When answering my question on what could be improved with publications like *Living in Australia*, Dana commented that she did not prefer using coursebooks and textbooks for her learners, partly because learners might assume they had fully understood a topic after completing a number of exercises in the books, while Dana believed they most often needed more instruction and practice. As another example, Dana shared her experience substituting other instructors' class where she found coursebooks or textbooks unhelpful. Dana was asked to go through certain pages in the book but felt that was "boring" and not addressing learners' real needs. For that reason, when she did use any coursebook or textbook in her class, Dana always added additional content that she saw as suitable for her learners' needs, and she preferred using authentic resources. Another aspect Dana did not like was "the more glossy published headway cutting-edge" design of coursebooks and textbooks. She found that type of books had "too many coloured photos" and were "too busy." Still, Dana would use those books for particular activities

and build on them using other resources. Concerning aspects that had worked well for her when using the materials, Dana thought they were helpful as a structure for her instruction.

Reflecting on her experience using the CSWE III curriculum guidelines, Dana shared that she “sometimes found it a bit prescriptive.” Though Dana felt comfortable using the assessment criteria and learning outcomes outlined in the curriculum document, which provided clear purposes of the activities she did in her class, she was unsure how the criteria and outcomes affect the learners within the curriculum. For example, if the curriculum said the students could only make two spelling mistakes on a certain task, Dana preferred leaving some room for the instructor to decide without “hard-and-fast” assessment criteria while ensuring the students met the course requirements.

In teaching, Dana would combine spoken and written modules for her class. For example, she would combine the oral presentation module (understanding and giving oral presentations) and the report module (reading and writing a reports). Learners were asked to conduct research for the oral presentation, and then they would write a report with the information they gathered from the same research. Besides individual work, Dana also facilitated group work in her classroom. To her, it was crucial to raise learners’ awareness that by helping other people, they could benefit themselves as well.

Compared to working with modules with the CSWE III curriculum, Dana shared that her experience with a language program of similar context gave her more flexibility in teaching. Within that program, instructors could choose the text types, texts, and assessment conditions for their learners. Similar to what Catherine reported, Dana also believed that language teaching should be more than ticking off competency boxes. She commented that “the problem is the busyness of the curriculum in a classroom.” Dana witnessed fellow instructors being under

pressure of finishing teaching a certain number of modules within a given period of time, while many of them wished to give their learners more time to practice their language skills.

As to instructional materials, Dana tried to find authentic resources that were suitable for each cohort of learners. She used learners' writing samples or utterances they produced to design activities, such as role plays, and discussions on the purposes of communication. Dana believed that at CSWE III, learners should understand why they were doing the activities. To teach writing a cover letter, for example, Dana would start with a chosen text to introduce the topic; then the class would look at cover letters and the particular jobs the learners might have applied for. Learners would study how Dana put the elements of a cover letter together and how they could write one for their own use. Dana then walked me through how she used text-based instruction to teaching writing a cover letter in her class:

[I]t's kinda what you're trying to achieve through writing the cover letter, what the structure of that letter is and what language register you're using...and a lot of it I think the way I explained to students – how formal or informal it needs to be, and how you're using tense to meet the needs of that letter...but a lot of it is the sort of structural and what's appropriate and what's not appropriate in that particular context.

With the writing templates provided in the course book, Dana expressed her worry of whether learners would be able to move out of those templates and produce texts on their own. To address this concern, she often analyzed those templates from different angles and worked with students to enhance the ready-made content in the course books for different purposes.

Dana shared that diversity of the learners' proficiency levels (i.e., different spoken or written skills) and the continuous enrollment were the most difficult to cope with when she was teaching CSWE III. Other challenges Dana identified were: student absenteeism, lack of access

to a computer in class to assist her instruction, and balancing diverse experience and needs of learners.

Dana thought the goals and objectives for her CSWE III class were determined by the assessment criteria and conditions mandated in the curriculum guidelines. Within the curriculum guidelines, she focused on what learners desired to achieve. She mentioned that the curriculum in some respects helped her learners achieve the goals and objectives, but the majority of the responsibility fell on the instructors as they were the ones who needed to utilize the curriculum to their learners' benefit through balancing what was required in the curriculum and what learners wanted to do in class.

4.2.6 Coding results from CSWE III instructor interviews

Catherine's interview transcript was coded under 24 nodes in the coding scheme developed based on CSWE III's curriculum guidelines informed by Halliday (1985)'s SFL theory and three aspects of language education (1981); Dana's interview transcript was coded under 22 nodes from the same coding scheme. Table 14 provides the percentage coverage of each node coded in these two transcripts.

Table 14 *Code Coverage in Catherine's and Dana's Interview Transcripts*

Aspect of Language Education	Components	% Coverage Catherine (106)	% Coverage Dana (113)
Learning language		47.17% (50)	42.48% (48)
	Choice from grammar system	2.83% (3)	6.19% (7)
	Choice from vocabulary system	6.60% (7)	4.42% (5)
	Choice from phonological system	0.94% (1)	N/A
	Choice from graphological system	1.77% (2)	1.77% (2)
	Choice from prosodic features	0.94% (1)	N/A
	Choice from paralinguistic features	N/A	N/A

Learning through language	Choice from text structure system - Spoken/written text	33.96% (36)	30.09% (34)
	• Cohesion	10.38% (11)	7.96% (9)
	• Coherence	13.21% (14)	11.50% (13)
	• Comprehension	10.38% (11)	10.62% (12)
		8.49% (9)	7.96% (9)
	Learner strategies	2.83% (3)	3.54% (4)
	• Effective participation in formal learning environment	2.83% (3)	2.65% (3)
	• Independent learner strategies	N/A	0.88% (1)
	• Understanding the role of assessment	N/A	N/A
	Communication strategies	5.66% (6)	4.42% (5)
	• Extended turn-taking	N/A	N/A
	• Interaction strategies	3.77% (4)	2.65% (3)
	• Negotiating exchange	1.89% (2)	1.77% (2)
	Language as resources to interact with new knowledge – Numeracy	N/A	N/A
	• Developing mathematical knowledge and skills	N/A	N/A
Learning about language	• Language of mathematics	N/A	N/A
		44.34% (47)	49.56% (56)
	Relationship between language choices and English-speaking culture	7.55% (8)	14.16% (16)
	Relationship between language choices and social situations	35.85% (38)	32.74% (37)
	• Social contextual purpose in spoken/written text		
	Understanding the choices available in language system	0.94% (1)	2.65% (3)

The code coverage of the three aspects of language education in Catherine's interview transcript, ranked from high to low, are *learning language* (47.17%), *learning about language* (44.34%), and *learning through language* (8.49%). For Dana's interview transcript, *learning about language* (49.56%) has the highest occurrence, followed by *learning language* (42.48%) and *learning through language* (7.96%). It appears that both Catherine and Dana placed similar

emphases on *learning language* and *learning about language* in their CSWE III classes while *learning through language* was the least of their instructional focus.

For the aspect of *learning language*, teaching learners about *choice from text structure system* (spoken or written) is the primary focus for both Catherine and Dana; within this component, *cohesion*, *coherence*, and *comprehension* were all mentioned during the interviews, though *coherence* was the primary focus for both instructors. Teaching grammar appears to be more important for Dana while having the learners accumulate vocabulary appears to play a more significant role for Catherine. Dana did not talk about improving learners' pronunciation and teaching prosodic features, while Catherine briefly mentioned these two components. Teaching paralinguistic features did not come up during either of the two CSWE III instructor interviews.

In regard to *learning about language*, both Catherine and Dana prioritized teaching learners about the language choices they make in relation to the social contextual purposes in texts. Both instructors talked about the role English-speaking culture played in their language classrooms, more Dana than Catherine. Catherine and Dana both mentioned building learners' understanding of the choices available in language system, which enables learners to use their existing knowledge of languages and better understand the choices they can make across texts.

Within the aspect of *learning through language*, both Catherine and Dana shared their experience on teaching *communication strategies* than they did with teaching *learning strategies*. Under *communication strategies*, *interaction strategies* were the primary emphasis for both instructors. Strategies for *extended turn-taking* did not come up in either of the CSWE III instructor interviews. Learners' "effective participation in formal learning environment" was the main focus for both instructors when it comes to *learner strategies*. Catherine briefly mentioned

the use of “independent learner strategies”, while Dana did not talk about this component. Neither “understanding of the role of assessment” nor *numeracy* was mentioned in Catherine’s and Dana’s interviews.

4.2.7 CSWE III instructors’ perspectives vis-à-vis selected documents

It appears that the selected CSWE III documents provide a good range of employment-related topics. However, both instructors have reflected that the documents are often used for course structure, and they teach beyond the content that is covered in the documents. Catherine has shared that the documents are text-heavy and outdated; Dana has pointed out that the documents do not support learners’ needs very well when instructors are pressured to go through the required modules and assess the learners based on a list of criteria. Based on the coding results of Catherine’s and Dana’s interviews, it appears that the two instructors have given *learning language* and *learning about language* similar amounts of attention. However, *learning language* is the most emphasized aspect of language education in both selected documents from CSWE III. While the instructors have a more balanced view on teaching the choices learners can make in English language systems with teaching the social and cultural aspects of language use, the selected documents are more oriented towards gaining knowledge on making choices in English language systems.

For the aspect of *learning about language*, both CSWE III instructors have placed primary focus on developing learners’ understanding of the relationship between *language choices* and *social situations*, more specifically *the social contextual purposes of a spoken or written text*; relationship between *language choices* and *English-speaking cultures* is represented less in both interviews. This finding corresponds with what the selected documents present, where the effect of English-speaking cultures on language choices is less emphasized, and the

CSWE III curriculum guidelines have very little representation (0.44%) of this element.

Understanding of the culture of the new community positively impacts newcomers' integration process and enhances their interactions with others in work-related situations (Pendakur & Pendakur, 2002; Chiswick & Miller, 2004). Since the instructors reported that such content was still essential to their employment-purposed language instruction, particularly for newcomer learners that are unfamiliar with the new country's cultures, there is a need to include more content on English-speaking culture in the curriculum guidelines.

Both instructors – though Catherine less so – have talked about having learners *understand the choices that are available in language systems*, a component that does not appear in either of the selected documents from CSWE III. One of the core values of the SFL theory and its implementation in language education is that learners need to become aware of the choices they have in their use of the language and the purposes and effects of making these choices across contexts (Halliday, 1985). More content addressing this component of language education can benefit both learners and instructors. As pointed out earlier in this study (see Section 4.1.3), language learning brings empowerment to learners when they understand the choices they can make in English and the impact of these choices on their communication (Meyer, 2008), which provides learners with more confidence and control in work-related communication. Besides knowing the language choices available in English, learners' knowledge of and experience with their L1s have great potential in their development of skills in English. The inclusion of content relating to learners' L1s is particularly beneficial to newcomer learners because it helps create an engaging, safe, welcoming (Schweer, 1999; Brooks-Lewis, 2009), and learner-centred learning environment (Auerbach, 1993). Instructors can consider experimenting with gap-noticing activities in their classroom, which can raise learners' awareness of the sociocultural and

linguistic differences between their home countries and the new community. By relating learners' existing knowledge to the new knowledge they need to learn, learners may be more encouraged and have an easier time making sense of the content in the language classroom.

When it comes to *learning language*, content involving choices made in spoken or written texts, including *coherence*, *cohesion*, and *comprehension*, is the primary focus for employment-purposed instruction for both instructors. This result aligns with what is presented in the selected documents. Other components of language learning such as vocabulary, grammar, spelling, and pronunciation are weighed similarly in both instructors' interviews, except *prosodic features*, which were only mentioned by Catherine. *Paralinguistic features* did not come up in either interview. The patterns shown in the two interviews are more in line with the curriculum guidelines than with the instructional materials, pointing to a need for improved teaching resources that instructors can use.

To recapture and extend beyond the previous discussion on the prosodic and paralinguistic features in English, the instruction of these features of English in employment-related contexts can aid learners' communication needs. Learning about and making use of *prosodic features* (e.g., intonation, stress, pausing, and rhythm) can help learners increase the comprehensibility and fluency of their speech (Baker, 2011) and assist learners in achieving desired effects in communication. Moreover, recognizing these features in other people's speech can assist learners in interpreting texts and discourses. Teaching *paralinguistic features*, which concerns features such as body language, facial expressions, eye contact, pitch, and tone, can help learners appear more confident and culturally and social contextually appropriate when they talk. When teaching newcomer learners English for employment purposes, instructors can make use of English prosody and paralinguistics to help them better understand others and express

themselves in work-related interaction, possibly through identifying and comparing the differences of these features in English and learners' L1(s), with contributions of learners' experience and knowledge.

In terms of *learning through language*, both Catherine and Dana talked about *communication strategies* and *learner strategies*, which matches what the selected documents from CSWE III present. Different from the selected documents, the two instructors did not mention *numeracy* related components. This absence could be because the numeracy component in CSWE III is considered optional (NSW AMES, 2013), and it is not seen as an essential skill for learners to retain employment. However, knowledge and skills in mathematics and mathematical language can be a valuable component in English instruction for employment purposes. As a country that shares similar approaches with Australia in adult newcomer language training, New Zealand's Tertiary Education Commission (2009) views both *literacy* and *numeracy* as two integral parts of vocational training and defines *numeracy* as "the bridge between mathematics and real life," and it is the mathematical knowledge and understanding a person uses to fulfill different needs relating to personal lives, school, and work (p. 41). Through numeracy instruction, learners develop skills to solve mathematical problems, follow instructions clearly, understand and use relevant vocabulary correctly and appropriately. Some may assume that mathematics does not require a strong command of language, but mathematical language involves specific words and discourse features (Kang & Pham, 1995, cited in Jarrett, 1999), and some everyday vocabulary can carry different meanings in mathematics (Dale & Cuevas, 1992). Developing numeracy skills in English thus requires learners to build their knowledge in mathematics through a language that they are simultaneously learning. This process could create challenges for both the learners and the instructors in an adult English language learning

environment. Language instructors without training in teaching math might struggle to explain mathematical concepts in class. To counteract such difficulties, language programs can consider offering research-informed professional development and qualification opportunities regarding teaching adult newcomers numeracy skills for employment purposes.

Similar to what the CSWE III selected documents present, *interaction strategies* get more emphasis compared to *negotiating exchanges* for both CSWE III instructors. *Extended turn-taking* strategies have not come up in either of the instructors' interviews, which matches the patterns shown in the instructional materials. As discussed previously, Learners can benefit from knowing strategies to take extended turns in employment-related contexts. Turn-taking skills help learners take active roles in communication (Rahmat et al., 2015) and present a positive image to other interlocutors (Maat et al., 2011). The lack of these strategies in CSWE III instructors' classroom implementation could be because it is not emphasized in the curriculum documents. When teaching newcomer learners English for employment purposes, instructors can consider introducing *extended turn-taking* strategies to their learners and showing them different ways to utilize these strategies (e.g., give turns to others, respond politely, think critically about others' and their own speech).

Both Catherine and Dana have talked about "effective participation in formal learning environment" when it comes to teaching *learner strategies*, while only Dana has briefly mentioned "independent learner strategies." I have discussed earlier why strategies to learn independently are essential to newcomer learners (see Section 4.1.3); additionally, these strategies can help lighten the burden of instructors, who often have to balance the diverse learning needs in a large class. Given that learners' time in class, instructors' time and energy are often limited, it is necessary for learners to have the skills to learn on their own both inside and

outside the class. Instructors can share learning resources (e.g., websites, libraries) they find helpful with their learners, organize learners into study groups, and teach them research skills for finding information.

“Understanding the role of assessment” is not presented in either of the CSWE III instructor interviews. The patterns of *learner strategies* presented in the CSWE III instructor interviews mostly align with what I discovered in the selected documents. As reflected by Dana in her interview, assessment conditions and criteria were mainly for program administrators’ and instructors’ use, and their effect on learners remained unclear. Dana’s experience might have revealed the reason why “understanding the role of assessment” is not in the present data, and learners may not play an active role in the assessment process in CSWE III. Nevertheless, knowledge of what assessment involves enables learners to set practical goals in order to complete the current level, facilitates meaningful discussions with instructors regarding learners’ performance in the program, and promotes self-reflection for both the instructors and the learners. In the context of English for work purposes, goal-setting and self-reflection encourage learners to focus on the language functions and the vocabulary they need to accomplish communicative tasks, which help increase learner awareness and confidence (Lozano Velandia, 2015). Therefore, instructors can consider engaging learners more in the assessment process through giving feedback based on the assessment criteria, encouraging learners to discuss the comments they receive, and set achievable goals according to both their learning needs and the program requirement.

4.2.8 Perspectives of LINC 4 instructors vs. perspectives of CSWE III instructors.

Based on the patterns shown through the above analyses, instructors in LINC 4 and CSWE III present both differences and similarities in their perspectives on the curriculum

guidelines and instructional materials in their respective programs (refer to Appendix G for a comparison table). This section compares and discusses LINC 4's and CSWE III's instructor perspectives based on the code coverage and prominent themes that have surfaced through coding.

Code coverage. Teaching the linguistic features of the English language (*linguistic competence*) is the second least emphasized component in both LINC 4 instructor interviews. The equivalent components in CSWE III's theoretical framework (choices from *grammar/vocabulary/phonological/graphological systems* under the aspect of *learning language*) add up to similar amount of coverage. Both LINC 4 and CSWE III instructors have focused on *coherence* more than *cohesion*, and all of them have emphasized the roles of social contexts and English-speaking cultures in the interpretation and production of texts in their interviews. *Non-verbal communication factors* in LINC 4 and their equivalent components *prosodic features* and *paralinguistic features* in CSWE III have little to none representation in all four instructors' interviews. All four instructors have incorporated *learner strategies* and *interaction(al) strategies* the most in their teaching.

Learner needs. Both LINC 4 instructors' classrooms have had learners with various needs – some learners have expressed the need and desire to enter the Canadian workforce, while others have not. For CSWE III instructors, learners of different needs have enrolled in Dana's classroom, while Catherine's classroom has been specifically dedicated to English for employment purposes. Balancing diverse learner needs appears to be a challenge in both the Canadian and the Australian contexts. Moreover, even for a curriculum oriented towards workplace English, there are different elements instructors need to take into consideration when planning for and teaching the course. In the process of achieving the goal of landing a (better)

job, learners often have the needs to integrate into the cultural, social, and economic spheres of the new community, while fulfilling different responsibilities (e.g., taking care of family and children, attending school, showing up for work). All these factors make the employment needs of adult newcomers extremely complex.

Student absenteeism and continuous intake. Bianca from LINC 4 and Dana from CSWE III both have expressed their concern over learners missing their classes. Dana has mentioned the challenges continuous intake posed on instructors' teaching. The LINC program also practices continuous intake, which has been difficult to manage according to Bianca's experience.

Technical support. All four instructors have mentioned that they need more technical support to build learners' computer literacy and optimize their learning experience when it comes to training them for employment purposes. In this digital age, where most job search and applications are done online, it is essential for learners to have easy access to computers and the Internet and to have the ability to utilize these technologies. Technologies can, in turn, assist learners in their development of English language skills.

Building a cohort among learners. For all four instructors, building a cohort among learners, where they can support each other when they embark on new endeavours in a new community, is crucial for their successful integration. When instructors take the initiative in creating a network of support, it provides newcomer learners a group of people they can turn to when they face adversity in their integration process. Furthermore, learning how to work with and support classmates can provide learners with skills that they can use in a work environment.

Authentic texts. All interviewed instructors in LINC 4 and CSWE III have shared that they aim to incorporate as many authentic texts as possible to prepare learners for using English in real-life situations. Nonetheless, such intentions have encountered challenges when the

instructional materials they use have not always been able to fulfill their learners' needs for authentic texts. Amanda has mentioned that she needed to create sample texts herself (e.g., job application forms, conversations) to supplement her instruction in class. Catherine has commented that the formatting of the sample resumes and CVs included in the *Living in Australia* workbook are out of date, and she have generated application forms on Google Docs to show the learners.

Competency-based assessments. Through the four instructor interviews, it appears both LINC 4 and CSWE III employ a competency-based approach when assessing students' language learning. Assessment criteria for learners' competencies are provided to instructors as references when deciding whether the learners had reached all requirements to move onto the next level. Catherine has reflected on her teaching and shared that the competency-based approach has not satisfied all her instructional needs and her learners' needs. She often has had to teach beyond the competencies listed in the curriculum. Dana has talked about her experience with this kind of assessments. She has thought that teaching one item and checking it off the list and then moving to the next one was not the best approach to teach or assess her learners. She could not be sure that learners would be "competent" on the items she taught, and she would spend extra time helping learners who could not complete their learning in class.

Melles (2010) argues that competency-based language instruction generated by the curriculum's assessment criteria has the possibility of conflicting with a learner-centred, needs-driven instructional approach, which makes it challenging to address the diverse needs expressed by learners fully. When pre-established criteria serve as the basis of instructional focus, it demands more of instructors' time and becomes challenging to fulfill learners' needs. Language instruction is "dynamic and complex [and] may lead to the emerges of various outcomes which

are not specified in the objectives” outlined in a competence-based curriculum (Riyandari, 2004, p. 21). The production of target language in real-life situations is creative and unpredictable by nature, and not all learning outcomes are measurable or observable. Hence, language learning progress cannot always be determined through competency-based assessments (Tumposky, 1984).

In the context of teaching newcomers English for employment purposes, a fixed list of competency items often cannot fully represent learners’ performance and the skills they need to find work. Ehrich et al. (2010) have investigated the relationship between the competency-based CSWE curriculum and learners’ employability. The results of the study show that the competency-based curriculum only helps immigrants obtain employment during the first year after they arrive in Australia, and over time the curriculum becomes less relevant to immigrant employability. Ehrich et al. (2010) conjecture that new immigrants often find entry level jobs when they first arrive; the level of education they received in their home countries plays a more important role when they begin looking for jobs that are comparable to what they had before migration. Though Ehrich et al.’s (2010) study cannot explain why the relationship between CSWE III curriculum and immigrants’ employability changes approximately one year after their arrival, the long-term effect of competency-based language curricula on immigrants’ employment, particularly of those who have lower education levels in their home countries, becomes questionable.

All four interviewed instructors have reported that they have conducted needs analysis throughout each school term, and they have planned their teaching based on the diverse needs learners expressed. However, balancing learners’ needs and fulfilling what the assessment criteria require can be difficult. It might be valuable to reconsider the ways to utilize

competency-based assessment when teaching newcomers English for work purposes, leaving room for learners to engage in the assessment process and discuss with instructors about their learning needs and goals.

Portfolio-Based Language Assessment (PBLA) in LINC 4. Though the impact of PBLA on employment-purposed English teaching and learning is not within the scope of this study, the two instructors' opinions and experiences with this assessment tool provide more insight into language instruction for employment purposes at LINC 4.

Both LINC 4 instructors interviewed for this study talked about PBLA. Amanda has expressed mixed opinions about PBLA during her interview. On the one hand, it has been time-consuming for her to work PBLA into her classroom. On the other hand, she approves of the idea of shifting the ownership of language learning from instructors to learners. Bianca has expressed her concern over whether PBLA would hinder her ability to compare writings in different contexts and for different purposes since PBLA might restrict learners to practicing writing in one given context. Bianca also has shared her worry over using PBLA for teaching and assessing English grammar since she could not be sure whether teaching grammar without giving contexts was still valuable with the implementation of PBLA.

Catherine's 'English for Employment CSWE III' class. Catherine's class is different from the other three instructors' in that her class has specifically focused on employment-purposed English language training, and all her students have been looking for work or higher employment. This separation of employment-related units from general settlement purposed training is unique to Catherine's school. To Catherine, her experience with the class has been positive, which echoes with the claims previous studies have made (Durkin & Main, 2002; Baik & Greig, 2009; Nordmeyer & Barduhn, 2010; Ananyeva, 2014). She has been able to utilize

different skills and talents learners have brought to the projects and had them work as a team both inside and outside of class. Catherine's example provides insights for benefits of having dedicated English for employment classes, which is something that program developers can consider.

Text and discourse analysis in CSWE III classrooms. One of the core components of a language classroom informed by the SFL theory is text and discourse analysis. Based on what Catherine and Dana's interviews reflect, they both have done text and discourse analyses in their classes to teach how language choices differ across a variety of contexts. Catherine has shared that she and her learners have analyzed different language features through examining these features in various spoken and written texts. Dana has talked more extensively about her experience analyzing texts and discourses in her class. She has done analyses based on both the functions and the structures of different texts so that learners can understand how they make choices in using the language to fulfill different purposes. Text and discourse analysis is not identified as a key component in LINC 4's Communicative Competence framework. Though both Amanda and Bianca have provided the workplace contexts to their teaching when covering the employment topic, the language instruction has been mostly at the lexical and sentential levels.

4.3 Levels of Alignment to Theoretical Frameworks

Research Question 3: How are LINC level 4 and CSWE level III aligned with their respective theoretical frameworks based on what the two levels have demonstrated in their employment-purposed curriculum guidelines, instructional materials, and classroom implementations as reported by instructors?

4.3.1 LINC 4 employment vis-à-vis Communicative Competence.

Based on the results from the first two research questions, components of all five competences outlined in LINC 4's theoretical framework have surfaced in both the selected documents and the instructors' interviews. However, there are also components missing from some parts of the data for this study.

Deixis. Other than showing up in the LINC 4 curriculum guidelines for employment, this component from the theoretical framework is missing from most of the data. Neither the instructional materials nor the instructor interviews cover activities teaching or having learners practice using deictic words.

Language functions. Besides focusing on expressing and interpreting information and making an interpersonal exchange, the two selected documents from LINC 4 and two of the instructors' perspectives appear to be in discord regarding what language functions are to be included when teaching English for employment purposes. Occurrences of language functions for talking about the future, dealing with problems, and persuading others are not consistently present across the four sources of data.

Strategic component. *Learner strategies* can be found in both the two selected documents and the two instructors' interviews; nonetheless, *learner strategies* are not included in LINC 4's theoretical framework since Celce-Murcia et al.'s (1995) model views these strategies as less relevant to communicative language use and language teaching compared to other strategies listed in the framework (see Section 2.2.2). While *communication strategies* are all outlined in the theoretical framework, only *avoidance or reduction strategies* have a small representation (0.47%) in the curriculum guidelines, and *achievement or compensatory*

strategies, stalling or time-gaining strategies, and self-monitoring strategies are not present in the data from LINC 4 employment.

4.3.2 CSWE III employment vis-à-vis Systemic Functional Linguistics.

Instances for three aspects of language education proposed by Halliday (1981) have been found in both the selected documents and instructor interviews. Nevertheless, there are components in the theoretical framework that have not emerged in some parts of the data in this study.

Extended turn-taking. *Communication strategies* included in CSWE III are mostly *interaction strategies* (e.g., turn taking, asking questions, asking for repetition, indicating comprehension, responding to topic shifts, confirming and clarifying, etc.) and strategies for *negotiating exchange* (e.g., making requests, acknowledging other viewpoints, using effective questioning techniques, presenting facts logically, etc.) Besides being noted in the curriculum guidelines, strategies for communicating in an extended manner are not present in the instructional materials and CSWE III instructor interviews.

Numeracy. Though categorized as an optional component, learning the language in mathematics and developing numeracy knowledge and skills are highlighted in CSWE III's curriculum guidelines, and relevant tasks are presented in the instructional materials. However, neither of the two interviewed instructors has mentioned this component.

Understanding the role of assessment. Though listed as one of the *learner strategies* in CSWE III's theoretical framework, "understanding the role of assessment" is not further explained or developed into instruction based on the patterns shown in the selected documents and the instructor interviews.

Understanding the Choices Available in Language Systems. As one of the key values of SFL, both the interviewed instructors have incorporated what learners already know into their instructions, while neither the curriculum guidelines nor the instructional materials have elaborated on the idea of “understanding the choices available in language systems”.

4.3.3 LINC 4’s alignment to theory vs. CSWE III’s alignment to theory.

Based on the findings presented in the two sections above, the language content of the employment-related units of both LINC 4 and CSWE III curricula demonstrate alignment and misalignment when being compared to their respective theoretical frameworks. It is thus outside the scope of this study to determine which curriculum leads to better language production of learners compared to the other²². However, observations made based on the first two research questions shed light on the strengths and limitations of the two curricula.

Through the findings and comparisons, it can be observed that LINC 4 curriculum employs a task-based instructional approach, while the CSWE III curriculum has a text-based approach. It appears that the employment-related units in LINC 4 covers most of the elements in its theoretical framework, though many sub-elements, particularly the ones under *discourse competence* and *strategic competence*, are missing in this study. Compared to LINC 4, the employment-related units in CSWE III appears to more sufficiently present elements for interpreting and producing texts. The aspect that shows the most misalignment is *learning through language*. Therefore, one may say that while LINC 4 employment covers more elements within its theoretical framework than CSWE III employment does, CSWE III employment shows more depth in its coverage of the theoretical foundation. Furthermore, through analyzing the

²² The present study does not measure which program has better outcomes regarding learners’ language production.

perspectives of the instructors from these two programs, it appears that two LINC 4 instructors' teaching more rigidly follows a task-based approach; while the CSWE III instructors seem to employ multiple approaches in their teaching, with text-based instruction as a predominant approach (e.g., Catherine has used both a text-based and a project-based approach in her class).

4.4 Implications

4.4.1 Methodological implications.

Comparative approach. The present study collected both documents within the curricula and perspectives of experienced practitioners from the programs in order to address the research questions. A comparative approach is suitable for similar studies as it is necessary to look at different theories and instructional approaches in practice to make improvement within programs like LINC and AMEP.

Coding schemes. For data from LINC 4, the study employs one of the theoretical frameworks included in the program's official publication as the basis for developing a coding scheme. The coding scheme for data from CSWE III was developed based on information provided in the curriculum guidelines. Coding schemes developed with specified theoretical frameworks allow collection of information from observing documents and oral reports, and detailed examination of alignment between theories and their applications in curricula.

In-depth and rich descriptions of data. A background survey before each interview was used to understand the interviewees' experience better, and open-ended interview questions gave participants the opportunity to elaborate on their answers fully. The present study also provides in-depth and rich descriptions of two sources of data – selected documents and instructor interviews, which enable investigation into any possible gaps between the curricula, theoretical foundations, and their implementations.

4.4.2 Empirical implications.

Comparison of curricula in similar programs. The present study provides new insights into language training programs for adult newcomers. Existing literature has examined language programs in Canada and Australia across disciplines (Boyd & Cao, 2009; Chiswick & Miller, 2003; Clarke & Skuterud, 2013; Jackson, 2013; Masny & Waterhouse, 2016). Nonetheless, to my knowledge, there has not been studies comparing the two government-funded language programs in Canada and Australia based on their curriculum designs.

Sociocultural focus and functional English. The findings of this study show that both LINC 4 and CSWE III extensively cover social and cultural aspects of language learning and functional English for settlement purposes. Instructor interviews suggest that the existing curricula do not suffice for learners' employment-related needs and instructors often face challenges in compiling and creating course materials. When aligning across the curricula, the instructors' classroom implementation, and their respective theoretical frameworks, both LINC 4 and CSWE III present mismatches. The results from this study demonstrate strengths and limitations for both curricula, while previous research reveals that the AMEP program has more favourable learning and employment outcomes (Clarke & Skuterud, 2013; Jackson, 2013). CSWE III's instructional depth in and focus on employment could have played a role in the conclusion previous studies drew. For employment-purposed language instruction, it is important to contextualize the curriculum to address learners' real-life employment needs (McHugh & Challinor, 2011), and the CSWE III curriculum and instruction appear to be more successful in doing so.

Alignment with theoretical frameworks. It can be beneficial for the two programs to further align their respective theoretical frameworks with their curriculum guidelines and

instructional materials, which in turn can help the instructors align their practice with the frameworks more easily. Addressing components in the theoretical framework that are relevant to learners' employment needs would help equip instructors with a more substantial body of instructional resources. Specifically, the following components are worth being emphasized more in the curriculum for English-for-employment-purposes classes:

- For LINC 4: *dexis*; language functions including *future scenarios*, *problems*, and *suasion*; strategic component including *learner strategies* and less mentioned *communication strategies* (*achievement or compensatory strategies*, *stalling or time-gaining strategies*, and *self-monitoring strategies*)
- For CSWE III: *extended turn-taking strategies*, *numeracy*, “understanding the role of assessment”, and “understanding the choices available in language system”.

With more refined curriculum guidelines and instructional materials incorporating the above components, instructors' teaching can be more well-supported. While the changes on these documents are still to be made, instructors can consider targeting these components based on learners' needs and selectively weave them into their classes when teaching English for employment purposes.

4.4.3 Pedagogical implications.

Findings in the present study provide insights on how the selected documents and participating instructors in LINC 4 and CSWE III address the learning needs of newcomer learners.

First, it is important to acknowledge that practitioners in the field of teaching newcomers are often under a tremendous amount of stress. They often have to work long hours and balance the diverse needs of students desiring more successful integration into the new communities.

With that in mind, the implications in this section are meant to present ideas instructors can work into their practice and to offer suggestions that material and program developers can consider when designing curriculum and supplementary materials for newcomer learners with the desire or need to find work or higher employment.

Importance of authentic texts. It is worth considering including more activities or tasks that can expose learners to authentic texts, both spoken and written, and give them the opportunity to practice using the English language in real-life situations, especially for learners who have the need or desire to work. Aforementioned, the social aspects of language use appear to be crucial for employment-purposed language instruction in both LINC 4 and CSWE III. However, the usage of language in real-life contexts is not sufficiently represented in the curricula. Consequently, it becomes challenging for instructors to compile authentic materials to use in class. For example, as reported by Catherine, the résumé templates in the workbook are often not up-to-date, so she used the instructional materials as a structure with the key points needed to address in her class, and she either modified what was in the workbook or created her own materials. Also, Amanda has shared her difficulties in finding level-appropriate videos to use in her class, so the use of authentic texts is demanding of instructors' teaching skills and preparation time when determining whether the texts are suitable for the learners based on their instructional purposes. Besides learner levels, some other factors to be considered are learning goals and objectives of the class, tasks associated with the texts, skills required of learners, and cultural appropriateness of the texts. Introduction of authentic texts in a language classroom thus requires the instructors to be equipped with relevant training and sufficient support.

As previously discussed, Bachman (1991) distinguishes two types of authenticity: *situational authenticity* and *interactional authenticity*, referring to language use in the real world

and inside a language classroom, respectively. The use of authentic texts thus is not limited to texts produced by native English speakers, and learners' production of language use can be equally valuable. For example, Dana has used the written texts her learners produced (*interactionally authentic*) in her teaching and she believes that method is effective in teaching writing skills for employment purposes. As Bianca has pointed out, the skills learners gain by practicing language use in the classroom can be carried forward into workplace context (*situationally authentic*). Therefore, knowledge acquired through engaging in interactionally authentic exchanges in the classroom setting can be transferred to situationally authentic exchanges outside of class.

Text and discourse analysis. The lack of ready-to-use authentic texts also creates obstacles when instructors try to analyze texts and discourses in different contexts with learners. Though most texts and discourses in the selected instructional materials provide contexts, they are often decontextualized to learners since learners' life experience cannot be predetermined. Analyzing different elements of a text or discourse in relation to the context and purpose can help raise learners' awareness of their language use. As summarized in Chapter 2, linguistic features, such as grammar and phonology, can be more efficiently developed within contexts when it comes to building newcomers' language skills for employment purposes. To compensate for the lack of authentic texts, one possible solution, as reflected by Dana, is to use the texts learners produced for analysis (e.g., use learners' writing of an email to talk about what they aim to achieve and what they could do differently).

Strategies for employment-purposed communication. Introducing communication strategies, other than interaction(al) strategies, and learner strategies, can be valuable for learners navigating through complicated workplace exchanges. In LINC 4, less-presented communication

strategies such as *avoidance or reduction strategies*, *achievement or compensatory strategies*, *stalling or time-gaining strategies*, and *self-monitoring strategies* summarized in the Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) model can be useful for learners when enhancing the clarity of communication or managing communication breakdowns in work-related contexts. Moreover, LINC 4 curriculum can consider explicitly outlining learner strategies and include more activities and tasks that incorporate these strategies. Doing so can raise learners' awareness of their strategy use and promote their participation in learning, both in class with classmates and independently outside of class. In CSWE III, it can be worthwhile to include more tasks for learners to practice taking extended turns in conversations. Particularly in work-related situations, *extended turn-taking strategies* can help learners engage in exchanges actively and effectively (e.g., establishing rapport, recognizing cues to take and give turns, and giving long answers during interviews).

Incorporation of multiple theories and instructional approaches. The above implications suggest that there is no single theory superior to the other theories in the context of language instruction, and the idea of a perfect language pedagogy does not exist. The design and development of a class or a curriculum do not have to be restricted to one theoretical framework. It is then worthwhile to consider experimenting with different theories in practice and making adjustments according to the changing needs of learners and contexts of learning.

Aforementioned, both task-based approach and text-based approach present strengths and limitations in English language instruction. Focusing on meaning and form, task-based language teaching engages learners in authentic communicative tasks, drawing on their own linguistic and cognitive resources (Ahmadian, 2016). Text-based language instruction, on the other hand, focuses on meaning and function and requires learners to understand the systems of grammar in

order to further explore the texts and contexts. Through learning how their grammatical choices lead to different meanings, learners will be able to “expand their meaning potential in English” (NSW AMES, 2013, p. 23). As discussed previously, text-based language teaching often involves technical terms of grammar, which can appear daunting to many learners, especially when their English is at a lower proficiency level; the complex terminology and metalanguage can also make it challenging for instructors to apply it in class (Jones & Locke, 2011). The two instructional approaches, however, both focus on achieving meaningful communication in the real world. Given that task-based language instruction has a lower demand for knowledge of technical terms of grammar, it can be feasible to apply this approach first, and as learners progress in making meanings in English and reach higher proficiency levels, they could be introduced with the systems of grammar and text analysis. By means of text-based language instruction, learners can learn to identify and analyze language patterns for different communication purposes (Hasan, 2011). It is possible that at LINC 4 or CSWE III level, learners are ready to receive text-based instruction and carry out text analysis with their instructors. Thus, CSWE III learners potentially progress faster and become more proficient in the production of texts. Very few studies have examined the transferability of task-related language abilities (Benson, 2016), so the suitability of task-based language teaching in developing communication skills across dynamic work contexts is still under question, and task selection and sequencing can be challenging in addressing real work situations that are less predictable. Text-based language instruction, in this case, enables learners to continue working with various texts beyond the classroom, provides them the skills to analyze texts, and integrates both spoken and written communication skills (Mickan, 2013). Though more research is needed to explore the advantages of a hybrid instructional approach, incorporating both task-based and text-based language

teaching has the potential to help fulfill the learning needs of newcomer learners who study English for employment purposes.

4.4.4 Practical implications.

Employment-specific courses. When circumstances permit, a course tailored for learners with employment needs in addition to general language training allows the programs to better assist these learners' integration. Catherine's experience teaching CSWE III course has been positive, and practioners and program administrators can consider implementing employment-focused language instruction. Having learners of similar needs in the same classroom would allow a stronger support network among the learners, and this would also help instructors more efficiently balance the learner needs in their classrooms. Some possible skill areas to cover in such course include job search, job application, interview skills, numeracy skills, as well as computer literacy that is essential to many employment-related tasks. Considering these employment-related skills that can benefit the learners, it is important to ensure instructors and learners have easy access to computers and relevant training.

Instructor professional development. Professional development (PD) opportunities for language instructors are also imperative to the success of adult newcomer learners and the overall development of language training programs like LINC and AMEP. Attending PD events helps "refresh and reshape teachers' existing knowledge, beliefs, and morals," encourages reflections on their practice (Guan & Huang, 2013, p. 2112), and facilitates long-term professional growth (Richards & Farrell, 2005). In addressing the implementation of task-based language teaching theories and research in practice, East (2017) suggests that there is often a mismatch between theory and instructors' perception of it. For example, instructors can have an entirely different understanding of what a task is in task-based language teaching, compared to

the definition scholars over the years have proposed. Therefore, it is necessary for instructors to have an occasion where they can discuss and learn about practical and effective ways to execute a lesson using the theories outlined in their curriculum guidelines. In the context of newcomer language training, instructors can form a network of support and teaching resources through connecting with each other at PD events. Such experience enriches instructors' perspectives and benefits their learners. For example, instructors like Amanda, Catherine, and Dana, who had to spend a substantial amount of time searching for or creating suitable materials for their class can benefit from attending PD events, connecting with instructors in the field, and learning about resources and tips for teaching. For the above reasons, it is necessary to have PD events hosted for instructors working in programs like LINC and AMEP. Under the current condition where many language programs experience budget cuts (see Section 2.1.2), it is crucial to sustain sufficient funding for accessible and continuing PD opportunities. Taking instructors' busy schedule into account, language programs can consider arranging a smaller number of instructors to attend PD events and organize meetings where these instructors can share their experience with colleagues. Organizations that host PD events can consider live streaming workshops and presentations for a lower cost.

4.5 Limitations

Through examining the language content of the employment-related units in LINC 4 and CSWE III curricula and the perspectives of instructors from the two programs, this study provides insights into the implementations of the two curricula and casts light on what might have led to the conclusion previous studies have drawn, regarding how the AMEP program produces more favourable outcomes. However, the findings of this study should be interpreted with the following limitations in mind.

Context-specific representations of instructors. To my knowledge, classes in both the LINC and AMEP program varied from region to region. Though all interviewed instructors had extensive experience with either LINC 4 or CSWE III, only two instructors, representing two regions in Canada and two in Australia, from each program were interviewed for this study. Moreover, individual instructors' perspectives differ from one another, depending on the context and style of teaching, so the findings in this study may not represent the experiences and opinions of instructors from other regions and teaching in different contexts using different approaches.

Perspectives of learners and other stakeholders. Through interviewing experienced practitioners, the study presented some of the critical teaching needs of instructors in LINC and AMEP and these instructors' perspectives on the curriculum guidelines and instructional materials. However, the instructors' perspectives cannot fully address the question of how to better assist newcomers with employment needs. It is also crucial to include learners' voice, in order to understand their learning needs, evaluate their learning experience, and develop ways to help them find employment through effective language training. The involvement of other stakeholders in the two programs (e.g., federal agencies, researchers, language program providers, and material and program developers) was beyond the scope of this study. However, these stakeholders' views would help me understand their perspectives on how to address newcomers' language learning needs and expand my knowledge of the two programs (e.g., program funding allocation, Canadian language policies, perspectives of researchers who study relevant topics, operational needs and challenges of the programs, and the rationales behind the development of the materials that are currently in use).

Selection of materials. Though documents selected for analyses in this study were published at a national level and used by instructors participating in this study, they were still only a small part of all the resources developed for the two programs over the years since the programs were established.

Self-reported data. The study relied heavily on instructors' self-reported data, which led to a limitation on the reliability of this study. Participants could have been affected by social desirability bias and avoided providing information that would have presented them in negative ways (Krumpal, 2013). Self-reporting also had great demands on participants' memory (Takalkar, Waugh, & Micceri, 1993). It took cognitive effort for the participants to recall scenarios from previous teaching experiences, and it was possible for participants to misremember.

Data coding. I selected the Celce-Murcia et al. (1995) model as the coding scheme for data from LINC 4 for its suitability for pedagogical development, while the Canadian Language Benchmarks considered Bachman and Palmer's (1996, 2010) model as the main theoretical foundation. Though the two models present similar components and competencies, one may argue that Bachman and Palmer's model should be used to code data from LINC 4 in this study. Since a comprehensive list of components for CSWE III's theoretical framework was not provided in their guidelines, the coding scheme for data from this program was generated based on the information in the curriculum guidelines. Doing so created limitations for this study because the coding scheme is constructed upon my own interpretation of what is presented in the curriculum documents, which could differ from the curriculum developers' understanding.

Inter-coder reliability. Another limitation of this study was the lack of a second coder to establish interrater reliability. To compensate this limitation, three rounds of coding were completed, and intra-rater reliability was established.

4.6 Future Research Directions

As historian and author Barbara Tuchman once said: “one must stop conducting research before one has finished; otherwise, one will never stop and never finish.” Research by nature is an endless process, and there are always more ways to innovate and improve a study. The limitations of this study suggest possibilities for strengthening similar studies in the future.

Due to the variation in language programs like LINC and AMEP from region to region, future studies can benefit from engaging larger number of instructors and learners, as well as other stakeholders representing different regions across the country. Also, since there is a broad range of publications for instructional materials for newcomer English instruction (e.g., CCLB, 2010, 2013; AMES, n.d.; Yates, 2008), similar studies can bolster their replicability and the generalizability of the findings by employing a qualitative approach and involving a larger corpus of documents from multiple levels and specific domains (e.g., speaking, listening, reading, and writing).

Data triangulation is also advantageous for future studies. Having multiple sources of data, including instructor interviews, learner interviews, and classroom observations, can help address the issues self-reported data presents. Furthermore, input from other stakeholders (e.g., learners, federal agencies, researchers, language program providers, and material and program developers) would provide a more comprehensive insider view about learners’ language learning, program’s funding allocation, language policy making, language program management, other scholars’ perspectives on the language programs and language curriculum development.

Engaging these stakeholders can enrich the data of similar studies, help depict a fuller picture of how the programs operate and offer more ways to assist newcomers who have needs and desires to find employment in the new country.

Future studies can further examine the outcomes of language programs in relation to the evidence that has been presented in literature. Specifically, future studies can gather language production data from learners in the programs and systemically compare the program outcomes, in order to evaluate the impact of language training on learners' ability to engage in work-related English communication.

Through the above directions, future studies can also focus on different groups of learners such Syrian refugee learners, whose migration experience makes their learning and employment needs unique from many other newcomers.

Chapter 5 Conclusion

Through qualitative analysis of a selection of curriculum documents and analyzing instructor interviews, this study has examined the similarities and differences between the language content of the employment-related units in LINC level 4 in CSWE III, as well as how the two curricula respectively aligned with their theoretical frameworks.

The study has discovered that the curricula and the implementation of both LINC 4 and CSWE III highlight the importance of knowledge of patterns and sequencing of texts and social and cultural contexts in the interpretation and production of texts. Furthermore, in both curricula, *Non-verbal communication*, or *prosodic/paralinguistic features* are underrepresented in the instructional materials. The strategic component mostly consists of interaction(al) strategies and learner strategies in both LINC 4 and CSWE III, while other strategies outlined in the frameworks are absent from most parts of the data. *Learner strategies* and knowledge relevant to *numeracy* are outlined in the CSWE III theoretical framework; however, the LINC 4 framework does not consider these aspects of language learning. LINC 4 and CSWE III also employ different instructional approaches – task-based teaching, and text-based teaching, respectively. Both approaches present strengths and limitations in the context of language instruction for employment purposes.

Regarding the instructors' perspectives on the selected documents and the classroom implementation for employment-purposed English language instruction, the roles of social contexts and English-speaking cultures in the interpretation and production of texts are emphasized in both LINC 4 and CSWE III instructor interviews. Mirroring what the selected documents present, *non-verbal communication factors*, or *prosodic/paralinguistic features* have

little representation in the instructor interviews. All four instructors have shared experience relevant to *learner strategies* and *interaction(al) strategies* the most during their interviews.

Incorporating the findings emerging from analysis on the selected documents and instructor interviews, the study has examined LINC 4 and CSWE III's levels of alignment to their respective theoretical frameworks. It seems that both curricula present matches and mismatches. LINC 4 seems to cover more elements in its theoretical framework than CSWE III does, while CSWE III appears to have achieved greater depth in implementing its theoretical foundation through emphasizing the importance of text and discourse analysis. LINC 4 instructors appear to mostly implement a task-based approach in their teaching, while the CSWE III instructors seem to make use of multiple approaches (e.g., project-based and text-based approaches).

The results from this study show strengths and limitations for both LINC 4 and CSWE III in their employment-purposed English language training. Both curricula can be improved through utilizing learners' experience and knowledge, skillfully incorporating authentic texts, introducing more strategies relevant to work-related communication, further aligning with their theoretical frameworks, and developing materials that learners can use for strengthening their employment-related language skills. Moreover, a hybrid instructional approach that incorporates both task-based and text-based teaching has the potential to help fulfill newcomer learners' language learning needs. With sustained funding, programs like LINC and AMEP can consider having dedicated English for employment courses, where learners can gain more specific workplace language skills. Finally, sufficient funding enables the instructors to have more accessible and continuing PD opportunities, more resources, and more support in fulfilling the diverse needs of newcomers.

In response to the Syrian humanitarian crisis, Australia and Canada have both welcomed in a large number of refugees, and gaining official language skills and finding employment are among the most urgent needs to be addressed. The situation calls for more research in relevant fields to examine these demands and discover potential solutions. Rigorous studies, involving multiple stakeholders and combining different sources of data, can further enrich our knowledge on newcomers' language needs and enable the development of new methods to assist them to successfully integrate into the new society.

Immigrants are not only the people who are needing help, but they also add up to a country's social, cultural, and economic growth in the long term. To make their contribution to the country through joining the workforce, newcomers need official language skills as a foundation. Further, language learning requires serious time commitment, so programs like LINC and AMEP must be provided with continuing and sustained support.

Research helps provide theoretically sound and substantiated approach to support the success of newcomer language training. It is through research that we understand the learning needs of newcomers, the instructional needs of the teachers, the ways to address these needs better, the ways to achieve improved learning and employment outcomes, the ways to exhibit the significance of developing and maintaining language curricula that can help instructors and learners to accomplish their goals, and the ways to engage more people in the conversation and the process of improving newcomer language instruction.

References

- About LinkedIn. (2016). Retrieved from <https://press.linkedin.com/about-linkedin>
- About nodes. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://help-nv10.qsrinternational.com/desktop/concepts/about_nodes.htm
- Adult Migrant English Service. (2013). *Living in Australia intermediate* (2nd ed.). Australia: NSW AMES.
- Adult Migrant English Service. (2013). *Certificate in spoken and written English*. Australia: NSW AMES.
- Adult Migrant English Service (n.d.). *Getting it right at work - negotiating & problem solving (workbook)*. Australia: NSW AMES.
- Ahmadian, M. J. (2016). Task-based language teaching and learning. *The Language Learning Journal*, 44(4), 377-380.
- Algonquin College. (2009). *LINC 4 classroom activities*. Ontario, Ottawa: The Print Shop.
Retrieved from http://www.moresettlement.org/LINC1-4/LINC4/LINC_4_Classroom_Activities.pdf
- Ananyeva, M. (2014). A learning curriculum: Toward student-driven pedagogy in the context of adult English for academic purposes, English for specific purposes, and workplace English programs. *TESOL Journal*, 5(1), 8-31.
- Auerbach, E. R. (1986). Competency-based ESL: One step forward or two steps back? *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(3), 411-429.
- Auerbach, E. R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(1), 9-32.
- Australian Department of Education and Training. (2015). *AMEP evaluation*. Retrieved from

<https://docs.education.gov.au/documents/amep-evaluation-report>

Australian Government Department of Education and Training. (2017a). *Adult Migrant English Program service providers*. Retrieved from <https://www.education.gov.au/adult-migrant-english-program-service-providers>

Australian Government Department of Education and Training. (2017b). *Background of the AMEP*. Retrieved from <https://www.education.gov.au/background-amep>

Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. (2014, September). *Australia's humanitarian response to the Syria crisis, evaluation report*. Retrieved from <http://dfat.gov.au/aid/how-we-measure-performance/ode/Documents/australias-humanitarian-response-to-the-syria-crisis-eval-report.pdf>

Australian Government Department of Home Affairs. (2017, March 21). *Australia's response to the Syrian and Iraqi humanitarian crisis*. Retrieved from <https://www.homeaffairs.gov.au/Trav/Refu/response-syrian-humanitarian-crisis>

Australian Department of Immigration and Citizenship. (2012). *2011-12 Migration program report*. Retrieved from <http://www.immi.gov.au/about/reports/annual/2010-11/html/outcome-5/amep.htm>

Bachman, L. F. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Bachman, L. F. (1991). What does language testing have to offer? *TESOL Quarterly*, 25(4), 671-704.

Bachman, L. F., Purpura, J. E., & Cushing, S. T. (1993). *Development of a questionnaire item bank to explore test-takers characteristics*. Los Angeles: University of California.

Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. (1996). *Language testing in practice: Designing and developing*

- useful language tests*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Bachman, L. F., & Palmer, A. (2010). *Language assessment practice: Developing language assessments and justifying their use in the real world*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Baik, C., & Greig, J. (2009). Improving the academic outcomes of undergraduate ESL students: The impact of a discipline-specific intervention program for first-year Architecture students. *Higher Education Research and Development Journal*, 28(4), 401–416.
- Baker, A. A. (2011). Discourse prosody and teachers' stated beliefs and practices. *TESOL Journal*, 2(3), 263-292.
- Benson, S. D. (2016). Task-based language teaching: An empirical study of task transfer. *Language Teaching Research*, 20(3), 341-365.
- Beenstock, M., Chiswick, B. R., & Repetto, G. L. (2001). The effect of linguistic distance and country of origin on immigrant language skills: Application to Israel. *International Migration*, 39(3), 33-60.
- Bista, K. (2011). How to create a learning-centered ESL program. *English for Specific Purposes World*, 31(10), 1 –13.
- Boyd, M., DeVries, J., & Simkin, K. (1994). Language, economic status and integration. In H. Adelman, A. Borowski, M. Burstein & L. Foster (Eds.), *Immigration and refugee policy: Australia and Canada compared, Vol. II* (pp. 549-577). Toronto, CA: University of Toronto Press.
- Boyd, M., & Cao, X. (2009). Immigrant language proficiency, earnings, and language policies. *Canadian Studies in Population*, 36(1-2), 63-85.
- Bramham, D. (2016, January 21). Metro Vancouver refugees desperate for language help.

- Vancouver Sun*. Retrieved from <https://vancouversun.com/news/local-news/daphne-bramham-metro-vancouver-refugees-desperate-for-language-help>
- Brazil, D. (1997). *The communicative value of intonation in English*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- British Council. (2006). Paralinguistics. Retrieved from <https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/paralinguistics>
- British Council. (2007). Intonation. Retrieved from <https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/intonation>
- Brooks-Lewis, K. A. (2009). Adult learners' perceptions of the incorporation of their L1 in foreign language teaching and learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(2), 216-235.
- Bryfonski, L., & McKay, T. H. (2017). TBLT implementation and evaluation: A meta-analysis. *Language Teaching Research*, 00(0), 1-30.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47.
- Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and Communication* (pp. 2-27). London, UK: Longman.
- Carman, T. (2016, December 4). B. C. has longest waiting lists for English classes in Canada. *Vancouver Sun*. Retrieved from <http://vancouversun.com/news/local-news/b-c-has-longest-waiting-lists-for-english-classes-in-canada>
- Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 5-35.

Celik, M. (2001). Teaching English intonation to EFL/ESL students. *The Internet TESL Journal*.

7(12). Retrieved from <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Celik-Intonation.html>

Centre for Canadian Language Benchmarks (2010). *Occupational language analysis: small*

business owner/operator. Retrieved from [http://www.language.ca/wp-](http://www.language.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/0123_0621_0631_0632_0712_Small-Business-Owner-Operators_OLA_FINAL_reg_June_2010.pdf)

[content/uploads/2018/03/0123_0621_0631_0632_0712_Small-Business-Owner-](http://www.language.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/0123_0621_0631_0632_0712_Small-Business-Owner-Operators_OLA_FINAL_reg_June_2010.pdf)

[Operators_OLA_FINAL_reg_June_2010.pdf](http://www.language.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/0123_0621_0631_0632_0712_Small-Business-Owner-Operators_OLA_FINAL_reg_June_2010.pdf)

Centre for Canadian Language Benchmarks. (2012). *Canadian language benchmarks: English*

as a second language for adults. Ottawa, ON: Centre for Canadian Language

Benchmarks. Retrieved from [http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/pdf/pub/language-](http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/pdf/pub/language-benchmarks.pdf)

[benchmarks.pdf](http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/pdf/pub/language-benchmarks.pdf)

Centre for Canadian Language Benchmarks (2013). *Can do statements for employment*. Ottawa,

ON: Centre for Canadian Language Benchmarks.

Centre for Canadian Language Benchmarks: Publication [Web page]. (2017). Retrieved from

<http://www.language.ca/publications/>

Chingaipe, S. (2017, June 24). Migrant language service budget cuts. *Sunday Paper*. Retrieved

from [https://www.thesaturdaypaper.com.au/news/education/2017/06/24/migrant-](https://www.thesaturdaypaper.com.au/news/education/2017/06/24/migrant-language-service-budget-cuts/14982264004828)

[language-service-budget-cuts/14982264004828](https://www.thesaturdaypaper.com.au/news/education/2017/06/24/migrant-language-service-budget-cuts/14982264004828)

Chiswick, B. R., & Miller, P. W. (2003). The complementarity of language and other human

capital: Immigrant earnings in Canada. *Economics of Education Review*, 22(5), 469-480.

Chiswick, B. R., & Miller, P. W. (2004). Language skills and immigrant adjustment: What

immigration policy can do. *IZA Discussion Paper*, 1419, 1-65.

Chui, T., & Tran, K. (2005). *Longitudinal survey of immigrants to Canada: progress and*

challenges of new immigrants in the workforce (Catalogue number: 89-615-X). Retrieved from the Statistics Canada website:

<http://publications.gc.ca/collections/Collection/Statcan/89-615-XIE/89-615-XIE2005001.pdf>

Ciornei, S. I., & Dina, T. A. (2015). Authentic texts in teaching English. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 180, 274-279.

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (2010). *Evaluation of the Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC) program*. Retrieved from

<http://www.cic.gc.ca/English/resources/evaluation/linc/2010/linc-eval.pdf>

Citizenship and Immigration Canada. (2012). *Welcome to Canada: What you should know – learning English or French*. Retrieved from

<http://www.cic.gc.ca/english/resources/publications/welcome/wel-03e.asp>

Clarke, A., & Skuterud, M. (2013). Why do immigrant workers in Australia perform better than those in Canada? Is it the immigrants or their labour markets? *Canadian Journal Of Economics*, 46(4), 1431-1462.

Cruttenden, A. (1986). *Intonation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Dale, T. C., & Cuevas, G. J. (1992). Integrating mathematics and language learning. In P. A. Richard-Amato & M. A. Snow (Eds.). *The multicultural classroom: Readings for content-area teachers* (Pp. 330-348). White Plains, NY: Longman.

De Chazal, E. (2014, July 3). Using authentic texts in the EAP classroom [Blog post]. Retrieved from <https://oupeltglobalblog.com/2014/07/03/using-authentic-texts-in-the-eap-classroom/>

Derwing, T., Thomson, R. I., Foote, J. A., & Munro, M. J. (2012). A longitudinal study of

- listening perception in adult learners of english: Implications for teachers. *The Canadian Modern Language Review / La Revue Canadienne Des Langues Vivantes*, 68(3), 247-266.
- Dörnyei, Z. (1995). On the teachability of communication strategies. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 55-85.
- Doughty, C., & Williams, J. (1998). *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Durkin, K., & Main, A. (2002). Discipline-based study skills support for first-year undergraduate students. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 3(1), 24 –39.
- East, M. (2017). Research into practice: The task-based approach to instructed second language acquisition. *Language Teaching*, 50(3), 412-424.
- Ehrich, J., Kim, S., & Ficorilli, L. (2010) Competency-based assessment, employment and immigrant background: An exploratory investigation of adult language learner in Australia. *Language and Education*, 24(6), 485-494.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language teaching and learning*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R., Basturkmen, H., & Loewen, S. (2001). Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning*, 51(2), 281-318.
- Features of WhatsApp. (2018). Retrieved from <https://www.whatsapp.com/features/>
- Gilmore, A. (2011). “I prefer not text”: Developing Japanese learners’ communicative competence with authentic materials. *Language Learning*, 61(3), 786-819.
- Google Docs. (2018). Retrieved from <https://www.google.com/intl/en/docs/about/>
- Government of Canada. (2014, April 1). *Language tests equivalency charts*. Retrieved from

- <https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/corporate/publications-manuals/operational-bulletins-manuals/standard-requirements/language-requirements/test-equivalency-charts.html>
- Government of Canada. (2017, January 29). *#WelcomeRefugees: key figures*. Retrieved from <https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/services/refugees/welcome-syrian-refugees/key-figures.html>
- Grant, T. (2016, December 5). One year after arrival, Syrian refugees continue to face employment barriers. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/syrian-refugees-facing-barriers-to-finding-work-one-year-after-arrival/article33204887/>
- Grogniet, A. G., & Crandall, J. (1982). Competency-based curricula in adult ESL. *ERIC/CLL News Bulletin*, 6(1), 3-4.
- Guan, L., & Huang, Y. (2013). Ways to achieve language teachers' professional development. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(11), 2112-2116.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1979). *Curriculum development centre, language development project*. Occasional Paper No.1. Canberra, Australia: Curriculum Development Centre.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1981). Three aspects of children's language development: Learning language, learning through language, learning about language. In Y. L. Goodman et al. (Eds). *Oral and Written Language Development: Impact on Schools. Proceedings from the 1979 and 1980 IMPACT conferences* (pp. 7-19). Newark, DE: International Reading Association and National Council of Teachers of English.
- Halliday, M.A.K., & Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Deakin, Australia: Deakin University Press.

- Harman, I. P. (1990). Teaching indirect speech: Deixis points the way. *ELT Journal*, 44(3), 230-238.
- Hasan, R. (2011). Language and education. In Jonathan J. Webster (Ed.), *The collected works of Ruqaiya Hasan*. London, UK: Equinox.
- Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes. (Eds.) *Sociolinguistics: selected readings*. (Pp. 269-293). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Immigrant Services Society of British Columbia (ISSofBC) (2015). *LINC for employment*. Retrieved from <http://www.issbc.org/prim-nav/programs/LINC/LINC-for-employment>
- Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship Canada. (2016). *Rapid impact evaluation of the Syrian refugee initiative* (Reference number: E1-2016). Retrieved from <https://www.canada.ca/content/dam/ircc/migration/ircc/english/resources/evaluation/pdf/evaluation-syrian-refugee-initiative.pdf>
- Jackson, Z. (2013). *A comparison of Australian and Canadian immigrant language programs: Lessons for Canada in securing better employment outcomes?* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON, Canada.
- Jarrett, D. (1999). *It's just good teaching: Teaching mathematics and science to English-language learners*. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Jones, R. H., & Lock, G. (2011). *Functional grammar in the ESL classroom: Noticing, exploring and practicing*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Joyce, H. (1992). *Workplace texts in the language classroom*. Sydney, Australia: NSW AMES.
- Kang, H., & Pham, K. T. (1995). *From 1 to Z: Integrating math and language learning*. Paper presented at the 29th annual meeting of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Long Beach, CA.

- Kassim, H., & Ali, F. (2010). English communicative events and skills needed at the workplace: Feedback from the industry. *English for Specific Purposes*, 29(3), 168-182.
- Kormos, J., & Csizér, K. (2014). The interaction of motivation, self-regulatory strategies, and autonomous learning behavior in different learner groups. *TESOL Quarterly*, 48(2), 275-299.
- Kozhevnikova, E. (2014). Exposing students to authentic materials as a way to increase students' language proficiency and cultural awareness. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 4462-4466.
- Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (1983). *The natural approach*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.
- Krumpal, I. (2013). Determinants of social desirability bias in sensitive surveys: A literature review. *Quality & Quantity*, 47(4), 2025-2047.
- Kuen, G. L., Rafik-Galea, S., & Heng, C. S. (2017). Effect of oral communication strategies training on the development of Malaysian English as a second language learners' strategic competence. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies*, 5(4), 57-77.
- Lanphier, M., & Lukomskyj, O. (1994). Settlement policy in Australia and Canada, language, economic status and integration. In H. Adelman, A. Borowski, M. Burstein & L. Foster (Eds.). *Immigration and refugee policy: Australia and Canada compared, Vol. II* (pp. 337-372). Toronto, CA: University of Toronto Press.
- Li, M., & Campbell, J. (2009). Accessing employment: Challenges faced by non-native English-speaking professional migrants. *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, 18(3), 371-395.
- Lin, W. -C., Huang, H. -T., & Liou, H. -C. (2013). The effects of text-based SCMC on SLA: A meta analysis. *Language Learning & Technology*, 17(2), 123-142.

- LISTN. (2015). *Classroom assessment toolkit: Literacy to CLB 8*. Retrieved from <http://www.listn.info/site/resources/linc-assessment/classroom-assessment-toolkit>
- Little, D., Devitt, S., & Singleton, D. (1988). *Authentic texts in foreign language teaching: Theory and practice*. Dublin, Ireland: Authentik.
- Liu, J. (2016). Adaptation of authentic materials in english listening comprehension classes. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(9), 1774-1779.
- Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. deBot, D. Coste, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam, NL: Benjamins.
- Long, M. (2015). *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lowrie, M. (2017, March 16). Integration still a challenge for Syrian refugees one year later: researchers. *CTV News*. Retrieved from <https://www.ctvnews.ca/canada/integration-still-a-challenge-for-syrian-refugees-one-year-later-researchers-1.3328739>
- Lozano Velandia, S. A. (2015). Goal-setting and self-reflection to enhance learners' interaction in an ESP context. *Latin American Journal of Content & Language Integrated Learning*, 8(2), 131-160.
- Maat, M. T., Truong, K. P., & Heylen, D. (2011). How agents' turn-taking strategies influence impressions and response behaviors. *PRESENCE: Teleoperators and Virtual Environments*, 20(5), 412-430.
- Mart, C. T. (2013). Teaching grammar in context: Why and how? *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(1), 124-129.
- Mayhew, S. (2015). Linguistic distance. In S. Mayhew (Ed.). *A dictionary of Geography* (5th

- ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from
<http://www.oxfordreference.com.ezproxy.library.uvic.ca/view/10.1093/acref/9780199680856.001.0001/acref-9780199680856-e-1872>
- McHugh, M., & Challinor, A. E. (2011). *Improving immigrants' employment prospects through work-focused language instruction*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
- McKay, P., & Brindley, G. (2007). Educational reform and ESL assessment in Australia: New roles and new tensions. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 4(1), 69-84.
- Melles, G. (2010). Competing allegiances in ESL curriculum work. *Ethnography and Education*, 5(1), 33-47.
- Meyer, H. (2008). The 'empowerment' of students: A contribution from systemic functional grammar. *English in Education*, 42(2), 165-181.
- Mickan, P. (2013). *Language curriculum design and socialisation*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Miller, J. (2017, November 21). Delays in funding forced cuts to settlement services for Syrian refugees, auditor general finds. *Ottawa Citizen*. Retrieved from
<http://ottawacitizen.com/news/local-news/delays-in-funding-forced-cuts-to-settlement-services-for-syrian-refugees-auditor-general-finds>
- Mirsane, M., & Khabiri, M. (2016). The effect of teaching communicative strategy on EFL learners' willingness to communicate. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(2), 399-407.
- Missaoui, Y. (2015). Non-verbal communication barriers when dealing with Saudi sellers. *International Journal of Organizational Leadership*, 4(4), 392-402.
- Moglen, D. (2014). Tuning in: Using the news for a content-based ESL class. *The CATESOL*

- Journal*, 26(1), 29-36.
- Ng, M. L., & Chen, Y. (2011). Proficiency in English sentence stress production by Cantonese speakers who speak English as a second language (ESL). *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, 13(6), 526-535.
- Nordmeyer, J. E., & Barduhn, S. E. (2010). *Integrating language and content*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Nowell, L. (2017, August 15). Doubts raised over new citizenship rules. *IMPACT, AMES News*. Retrieved from <http://amesnews.com.au/latest-articles/doubts-raised-new-citizenship-rules/>
- Nunan, D. (1989). *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York, NY: Newbury House.
- Pawlikowska-Smith, G. (1996). *Canadian language benchmarks 2000: English as a second language – For adults*. Working documents. Ottawa, ON: Citizenship and immigration Canada.
- Pendakur, R., & Pendakur, K. (2002). Language as both human capital and ethnicity. *International Migration Review*, 36(1), 147-177.
- Perry, K. H., & Hart, S. J. (2012). "I'm just kind of winging it": Preparing and supporting

- educators of adult refugee learners. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 56(2), 110-122.
- Pettis, J. C. (2015). *Portfolio-based language assessment (PBLA): Guide for teachers and programs*. Ottawa, Canada: Centre for Canadian Language Benchmarks.
- Pruss, V. (2016, December 8). Syrian newcomers agree language training is key to finding work: 'It's the most important thing – to communicate with the Canadians'. *CBC News, New Brunswick*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/new-brunswick/refugee-jobs-language-training-1.3887203>
- Rabab'ah, G. (2016). The effect of communication strategy training on the development of EFL learners' strategic competence and oral communicative ability. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 45(3), 625-651.
- Rahmat, N. H., Rahman, S. A. B. S. A., & Yunos, D. R. M. (2015). Investigating turntaking strategies in class discussions among ESL adult learners. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 3(2), 139-144.
- Richard, A. (2011). Teaching non-verbal communication skills. *Education for Primary Care: An Official Publication of the Association of Course Organisers, National Association of GP Tutors, World Organisation of Family Doctors*, 22(6), 423-424.
- Richards, J. C., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers: Strategies for teacher learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Riyandari, A. (2004). Challenges in implementing competency-based English language teaching at the university level. *TEFLIN Journal*, 15(1), 14-26.
- Rolfsen, C. (2016, January 7). Syrian refugees in B. C. face long waits for English courses. *CBC*

- News, British Columbia*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/syrian-refugees-in-b-c-face-long-waits-for-english-courses-1.3394425>
- Ross, J. (2017, June 7). English training courses clouded by subcontracting practices. *The Australian*. Retrieved from <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/higher-education/english-training-courses-clouded-by-subcontracting-practices/news-story/a4def94faae40c9d33a5ad5cfba146d>
- Schleppegrell, M., J. (2004). *The language of schooling: A functional linguistics perspective*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schweers, J., & William, C. (1999). Using L1 in the L2 classroom. *Forum*, 37(2), 6-13.
- Shintani, N. (2016). *Input-based tasks in foreign language instruction for young learners*. Amsterdam, NL: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Sloetjes, H., & Wittenburg, P. (2008). *Annotation by category - ELAN and ISO DCR*. In Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC 2008).
- Song, S. (2012). *Politeness and culture in second language acquisition*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Szczepek Reed, B. (2006). *Prosodic orientation in English conversation*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Technical and Further Education New South Wales VETRes: Learning resources [Web page]. (2018). Retrieved from <http://www.vetres.net.au/home.php>
- Takalkar, P., Waugh, G., & Micceri, T. (1993). *A search for TRUTH in student responses to selected survey items*. Paper presented at the AIR Annual Forum, Chicago, IL, May 14-19, 1993.

- Tertiary Education Commission (TEC). (2009). *Strengthening literacy and numeracy: Theoretical framework*. Wellington, New Zealand: Tertiary Education Commission.
- Tumposky, N. R. (1984). Behavioral objectives, the cult of efficiency, and foreign language learning: Are they compatible? *TESOL Quarterly*, 18(2), 295-310.
- Tutela.ca - Terms of Use Agreement. (2016). Retrieved from <https://tutela.ca/TermsOfUs>
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). (2017, December 18). *Syrian regional refugee response*. Retrieved from <http://data.unhcr.org/syrianrefugees/regional.php>
- Wall, T., & Szasz-Redmond, E. (2015). Learning supports for underachieving LESLLA learners. In M. G. Santos, & A. Whiteside (Eds.) *Low educated second language and literacy education: Proceedings of the ninth symposium* (pp. N/A). San Francisco, CA: Lulu Publishing Services.
- Wenden, A. (1991). *Learner strategies for learner autonomy*. Hemel Hempstead, UK: Prentice Hall.
- Wennerström, A. K. (2001). *The music of everyday speech: Prosody and discourse analysis*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Witol, S. (2017, March 27). TEFL, TESL and TESOL: What's the difference? [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://tesol.wdw.utoronto.ca/tefl-tesl-and-tesol-whats-the-difference/>
- Yamashita, Y. (2013). A review of paralinguistic information processing for natural speech communication. *Acoustical Science and Technology*, 34(2), 73-79.
- Yates, L. (2008). *The not-so generic skills: Teaching employability communication skills to adult migrants*. Sydney, Australia: AMEP Research Centre.
- Yates, L. (2010). *Language training and settlement success: Are they related?* Retrieved from

the Australian Department of Immigration and Citizenship website:

http://www.ameprc.mq.edu.au/docs/LanguageTrainingSettlement_.pdf

Yssaad, L. (2012). *The immigrant labour force analysis series: The Canadian immigrant labour market 2008-2011* (Catalogue number: 71-606-X, no. 6). Retrieved from the Labour Division of Statistics Canada website:

http://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2012/statcan/71-606-x/71-606-x2012006-eng.pdf

Yu, M. (2011). Learning how to read situations and know what is the right thing to say or do in an L2: A study of socio-cultural competence and language transfer. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(4), 1127-1147.

Zhang, S., Wu, X., & Feng, Y. (2013). An analysis of cultural differences in Chinese and English first-person deixis from the perspective of pragmatic empathy. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(10), 1868-1872.

Zielinski, B. W. (2008). The listener: No longer the silent partner in reduced intelligibility. *System*, 36(1), 69-84.

List of Appendices

Appendix A. Background Questionnaire for LINC 4 and CSWE III Instructors

1. How would you describe your language background?
2. How long have you been teaching English?
3. How long have you been teaching in the LINC program?
4. Tell me about your background and training as a language teaching professional.
5. What levels have you taught in the program?

Appendix B. Interview Questions for LINC 4 Instructors

1. What levels have you taught in the program?
2. How much time would you devote to plan the unit on employment?
3. How much time do you spend on covering the topic?
4. What materials did you use for this unit? Did you make any modifications to these materials or adapt them as they are? What's lacking in the materials you implemented? What worked well?
5. Can you walk me through how you taught the unit? What are the goals and objectives you set up to accomplish? Does the design of unit help you accomplish those goals and objectives?
6. Tell me about the activities and tasks you do when you teach the employment-related units?
7. What did you find challenging when teaching the unit? In what ways, do you think the units prepare learner for their communication needs for employment purposes?
8. What teaching goals did you have for this unit?
9. How do you as a teacher balance different learner goals in your classroom?
10. How do you help your students gain confidence in answering questions and carrying on dialogues during an interview setting?
11. Tell me about the activities you ask the learners to do to practice writing effective, coherent, and culturally appropriate work-related emails/letter?
12. Tell me about the activities you ask your students to do to practice giving professional presentations/speech?
13. What do you do in your classroom to teach learners about culturally appropriate workplace communication?
14. How do you help learners build their knowledge in English grammar?

15. What activities did you do in this unit to develop learners' vocabulary and improve their spelling?
16. How do you help learners improve their pronunciation?
17. What do you do to help students learn about communicating in work-related situations through a culturally appropriate manner in the classes of this unit?
18. How do you help your students develop strategies to answer questions and carry on dialogues in job interview settings?
19. How do you assist the learners in developing strategies to write effective, coherent, and culturally appropriate work-related letters/emails?
20. How do you help your students acquire strategies to give professional presentations/speech?
21. How do you help the learners develop strategies to cope with workplace communication breakdowns?

Appendix C. Interview Questions for CSWE III Instructors

1. What levels have you taught in the program?
2. How much time would you devote to plan the units on employment?
3. How much time do you spend on covering the topic?
4. What materials did you use for these units? Did you make any modifications to these materials or adapt them as they are? What's lacking in the materials you implemented? What worked well?
5. Can you walk me through how you taught the units? What are the goals and objectives you set up to accomplish? Does the design of unit help you accomplish those goals and objectives?
6. Tell me about the activities and tasks you do when you teach the employment-related units?
7. What did you find challenging when teaching these units? In what ways, do you think these units prepare learner for their communication needs for employment purposes?
8. What teaching goals did you have for these units?
9. How do you as a teacher balance different learner goals in your classroom?
10. How do you help your students improve their grammar/vocabulary/spelling in your classroom?
11. Do you utilize the learners' experience in your teaching and can you elaborate on that?
12. How do you encourage learners to incorporate their experience in language learning?
13. Tell me about the activities you use to help learners improve in workplace interactions and communication.
14. How do you teach learners to comprehend and produce dialogical and monological texts in workplace situations?

Appendix D. Instructor Participants Recruitment Flyers Posted on Twitter

Research on Language Training Prior to Employment

University of Victoria [\(Canada\)](#)

Department of Linguistics

This study takes a close look at language training prior to employment at LINC 4 level by analyzing its course guidelines and materials and interviewing students and teachers about their experiences in the program.

Who is Eligible?

- Syrian LINC 4 students, 19 years or older
 - LINC 4 teachers

What Will You Be Asked to Do?

- Complete a background questionnaire
 - Complete an interview about your experience in the program
- *Your participation in the study will not affect your grades, your relationship with the teacher/students, or your class standing.

Compensation

You will receive \$50 for your participation in this study.

If you have any questions or are interested in participating, please contact:

Researcher Yiran Zhang at [REDACTED] or Email: [REDACTED]

Research on Language Training Prior to Employment

University of Victoria [\(Canada\)](#)

Department of Linguistics

This study takes a close look at language training prior to employment at CSWE level III by analyzing its course guidelines and materials and interviewing students and teachers about their experiences in the program.

Who is Eligible?

- [Syrian CSWE III](#) students, 19 years or older
 - [CSWE III](#) teachers

What Will You Be Asked to Do?

- Complete a background questionnaire
- Complete an interview about your experience in the program
**Your participation in the study will not affect your grades, your relationship with the teacher/students, or your class standing.*

Compensation

You will receive \$50 for your participation in this study.

If you have any questions or are interested in participating, please contact:

Researcher Yiran Zhang at [REDACTED] or Email: [REDACTED]

Appendix E. Definitions and Examples of Nodes Used for Coding²³

Name	Definitions and Examples
Communicative Competence	Theoretical framework used by LINC 4
Actional Competence	The ability to convey and understand communicative intent
Knowledge of Language Functions	Understanding of how languages serve for different functions
Feelings	This function involves expressing or interpreting utterances or text related to feelings, such as disappointment or satisfaction, happiness or sadness, compassion, anger, worry, etc. Example: “[L]earn how to discuss weaknesses in a positive way.” (<i>LINC 4 Curriculum Guidelines, Employment</i>)
Future Scenarios	This function involves expressing or interpreting utterances or text used to promise, predict, speculate, discuss possibilities and capabilities of doing something, to enquire about plans, goals and intention, as well as expressing and finding out about wishes, hopes and desires. Example: “[W]rite a one-paragraph description of past work experiences and plans for the future, giving reasons.” (<i>LINC 4 Curriculum Guidelines, Employment</i>)
Information	This function involves expressing or interpreting utterances or text intended to request, give or report factual information and explanations. Example: “I will look for, like the volunteer one when we write right onto the website and analyzed actual applications and jobs that they wanted.” (Amanda)
Interpersonal Exchange	This function involves expressing or interpreting utterances or text intended to interact with others on a personal level in such activities as greeting and leave taking; making introductions; identifying oneself; extending, accepting and declining invitations or offers; making and breaking an engagement; expressing and acknowledging gratitude; complimenting and congratulating; reacting to the interlocutor’s speech or text by showing attention, interest, surprise, etc. Example: “So if I ask you to work in a group, how are you gonna talk to your classmates? How are you going to encourage your classmates to help you? What are you going to do when you have a problem in your group? How are you going to handle that? What do you say?” (Bianca)
Opinions	This function involves expressing or interpreting utterances or text intended to convey opinions or attitudes, to agree or disagree, to approve or disapprove, or to show satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Example: “...and sometimes they will ask an opinion question in interviews and that’s, that’s normal, um...to be given an opinion question too. I think in a lot of places maybe you’re not given opinion questions to. Those are the feedbacks I get from my students, so. Um, yeah. They would, they want to hear your opinion on something, usually. Yeah.” (Amanda)
Problems	This function involves expressing or interpreting utterances or text intended to complain, criticize, blame, accuse, admit, deny, regret, apologize, or forgive. Example: “Um, teaching the language on moving forward. So “this didn’t work well today. How, what can I do tomorrow that’s better?” or “what do I need to do to make the workplace, you know, so that I can understand the work better?” so teaching the language skills around that.” (Amanda)

²³ The following components do not have examples because they are either not present or not prominent in data collected for this study: in the Communicative Competence framework, the nodes ‘deixis’ under ‘discourse competence’ and ‘achievement or compensatory’ under ‘strategic competence’. In the SFL framework, the component without examples is ‘understanding the role of assessment’ under ‘language as resources to interact with new knowledge and ideas’.

Suasion	This function involves expressing or interpreting utterances or text intended to suggest, request, instruct, give orders, advise and warn, persuade, encourage/discourage, ask for permission, or grant or withhold permission. Example: “They choose one organization and follow the example to write a one-paragraph e-mail message describing why they would be a good fit for that volunteer position.” (<i>LINC 4 Classroom Activities, Employment</i>)
Knowledge of Speech Act Sets	This component refers to “knowledge of how speech acts and language functions can be patterned and sequenced in real-life situations” (p. 21). Example: “[W]hen I ask them to produce samples of what I taught, I ask them for real-world samples. Don’t make up something else, tell me how you would use this when you leave the classroom. You know, for example, on polite questions. I do that every two months because they seem to forget. You know, ‘give me the book’, no, that’s not the polite question. So, I ask them, ‘tell me about all the places that use polite questions’. And so they have to produce that in a real-world example.” (Bianca)
Discourse Competence	The selection, sequencing and arrangement of words, structures and utterances to achieve a unified spoken or written text.
Cohesion	Cohesion refers to the bottom-up elements that help generate and understand texts, accounting for how pronouns, demonstratives, articles and other markers signal textual co-reference in written and oral discourse. Cohesion also accounts for how conventions of substitution and ellipsis allow speakers/writers to indicate co-classification and to avoid unnecessary repetition. The use of conjunction (e.g., 'and', 'but', 'however') to make explicit links between propositions in discourse is another important cohesive device. Example: “Read a cover letter and resumé and complete a table containing the following titles: Educational Background, Skills, Interests.” (<i>LINC 4 Curriculum Guidelines, Employment</i>)
Coherence	Coherence, i.e., the degree to which sentences or utterances in a discourse sequence are felt to be interrelated rather than unrelated... is concerned with macrostructure in that its major focus is the expression of content and purpose in terms of top-down organization of propositions. It is concerned with what is thematic (i.e., what the point of departure of a speaker/writer's message is). Example: “Choose an organization and reply to their advertisement. Tell what you will do, where you saw the ad, why you are interested, when you are available and how the organization can reach you.” (<i>LINC 4 Classroom Activities, Employment</i>)
Conversational Structure	Conversational structure refers to the rules used when taking part in a conversation. These rules are different in different cultures or languages. In part conversational structure involves such areas as knowing how to open or re-open a conversation or topic, how to establish a topic or change it, how to hold or relinquish the floor and how to interrupt the interlocutor. Example: “Hmm...I give them examples of the types of the questions you might be asked in an interview. And we talk, generally as a group, we talk about what the answers should be. You know, you might asked “tell me about your last job. What did you do in your last job?” Um, I talk to them about carrying on the conversation.” (Bianca)
Genre or Generic Structure	A generic structure refers to the way texts with a specific purpose are constructed. For example, an official letter has a different structure than a literary essay. In the same way, a narrative, an interview, a service encounter, a research report, or a sermon each have their own specific structure. Example: “It’s the generic...yeah. And we do a lot of everyday talking, like, you know, chit-, we always start the Monday morning off with a talking activity and so, the, the culturally appropriate, we do it more in the classroom, versus work. Because that’s where I can draw examples from.” (Amanda)
Deixis	Deixis is a system of reference connections between the text and the situational context; a way of “pointing” through language to the space, its elements and time, by using personal, spatial, temporal and textual references (e.g., he, you; this, that; here, there;

	now, before). Deictic words have the function to specify their referent in a given context.
Linguistic Competence	It is consisted of the basic elements of communication: the sentence patterns and types, the constituent structure, the morphological inflections, and the lexical resources, as well as the phonological and orthographic systems needed to realize communication as speech or writing.
Grammar	Morphological and syntactical rules that govern the word structures and how they combine into sentences. Example: "...you'll have grammar mistakes you'll have subject-verb agreement." (Bianca)
Lexicon (receptive and productive)	In its most general sense, the term "lexicon" is synonymous with vocabulary; in generative grammar, it is the component which contains all the information about the structural properties of the lexical items (Crystal, 1991, p. 200). Example: "[T]hen we also have to do a lot of very basic vocabularies to just even get there. We are doing vocabulary around, um, jobs or what kinds of, like special words used for those." (Amanda)
Orthography (for spelling)	Orthography refers to the way the sounds of spoken language can be represented using some kind of written or printed symbols. Different languages will have different ways of doing this. Knowledge of this system is crucial in the development of reading and writing. Example: "~ uses simple grammar structures, punctuation and spelling with few errors" (<i>LINC 4 Classroom Activities, Employment</i>)
Phonology (for pronunciation)	Phonology governs the structure of sounds. The phonological features of a language are often divided into two categories called segmentals and suprasegmentals. Example: "Pronunciation: stress in content or function words (I can type and use a computer, I can't drive a truck)." (<i>LINC 4 Curriculum Guidelines, Employment</i>)
Sociocultural Competence	This refers to the speaker's knowledge of how to express messages appropriately within the overall social and cultural context of communication, in accordance with the pragmatic factors related to variation in language use.
Cultural Factors	These factors include: knowledge of cultural references, literature and the arts, children's literature, pop culture, mass-media culture, significant socio-cultural events; knowledge of figures of speech and idiom, and expressions; knowledge of social and institutional structures, history, geography, sensitivity to dialects (regional variation); knowledge of social conventions, ceremonies and rituals, major values, beliefs, norms and taboos; cross-cultural/multiculturalism awareness and strategies. This also includes the ability to understand those who are culturally or ethnically different, or to deal with and reduce the level of counterproductive stereotypes and prejudice. Example: "I do some...work on voluntarism because I try and stress with them that it's important. Everybody wants Canadian experience. I say and if you don't have Canadian experience, you can get a volunteer job. That's helpful for you. You can practice your English, you can get some experience, you can put it on resume. So we talk about the different places that you could volunteer." (Bianca)
Non-verbal Communication Factors	Non-verbal communicative factors include: body language, non-verbal vocalizations, personal-interpersonal space, touching conventions, and paralinguistic factors. Example: "Like some, some of the things that, uh, we also work, we've been working a lot in my location on uh, body language, body position, how close to be to someone. Um, I would look, you know, just some very basic stuff that would affect whether you get a job or not in Canada. Because if you're interviewing me but you're looking at your feet, you're not gonna get the job. If you're interview-, I'm interviewing you and you're standing an inch away from me, you're not gonna get the job. Like there's very basic things that we work on as well, so we often stand in the middle of the room in a little square talk about space, eye contact, touching, hugging, shaking hands, like all kinds of things that would be..." (Amanda)

Social Contextual Factors	These factors concern the awareness of the way different social or age groups use language and also the fact that a place where language is used influences text and utterances. They include: participant variables (age, gender, office and status, social distance, power and affective relations, sensitivity to social variation in language), and situation (time, place, purpose of transaction, social function). Example: “If you were to say for this job as a coffeemaker, you need to be available on weekends, you need to be able to make coffee, you need to have strong interpersonal social skills, things like that.” (Amanda)
Stylistic Appropriateness Factors	These factors recognize the importance of rules of politeness as well as stylistic variations due to the degree of formality or to field-specific register. They include: politeness conventions, and sensitivity to register/style: functional stylistic variation (spoken or written), degrees of formality/registers, field-specific registers, sensitivity to naturalness. Example: “You know, there’s a birthday card, and then I talk about, you know, acronyms and things that are used in texting that are not appropriate to write in a business email. And I talk about professional and casual correspondence and examples of that.” (Bianca)
Strategic Competence	Knowledge of communication strategies and how to use them
Learner strategies (not specified in this framework)	Strategies used to navigate in formal learning environment, including participating in discussions and group work, as well as completing tasks individually. Example: “Learners can work independently or in pairs. If working in pairs, one student can be A, the other B, reading out the workplace conversations orally and discussing the answers.” (<i>LINC 4 Classroom Activities, Employment</i>)
Avoidance or Reduction Strategies	These strategies “involve tailoring one’s message to one’s resources by either replacing messages, avoiding topics, or, as an extreme case, abandoning one’s message altogether” Example: “learn strategies to refuse politely to answer illegal or embarrassing questions.” (<i>LINC 4 Curriculum Guidelines, Employment</i>)
Achievement or Compensatory Strategies	These strategies “involve manipulating available language to reach a communicative goal and this may entail compensating for linguistic deficiencies.”
Stalling or Time-gaining Strategies	These strategies include fillers, hesitation devices and gambits (e.g., ‘well’, ‘actually’, ‘Where was I?’) as well as repetition of self and others.
Self-monitoring Strategies	These strategies include self-initiated repair (e.g., ‘I mean’) and self-rephrasing or over-elaborating (e.g., ‘This is for students...pupils...when you’re at school’).
Interactional	These strategies comprise appeals for help such as direct appeals or indirect appeals and meaning negotiation strategies, which include requests, expressions of non-understanding, interpretative summary, responses such as repetition, rephrasing, expansion, reduction, confirmation, rejection and repair and, finally, comprehension checks. Example: “[i]n Canada you very clearly have to right to say ‘I’m sorry, I didn’t understand that. Could you please clarify that sentence for me.’ And I would do that if I didn’t understand the exact question. And you’ll probably hear in the interview, here, a couple of times when I’ve gone back and said to you ‘okay, do you mean like...classrooms or do you mean me?’ So I’m clarifying the question and that’s perfectly normal in Canada to do that.” (Amanda)

Name	Definitions and Examples
Systemic Functional Linguistics	Theoretical framework in AMEP CSWE III
Language Learning	
Choices from Grammar System	Choices made in a spoken or written text with regards to the morphological and syntactical systems in the target language

	Example: "...how you're using tense to meet the needs of that letter, so whether it's past tense, present or future tense, through thinking about what that letter's trying to achieve." (Dana)
Choices from Graphological System	Choices choice made in a spoken or written text in relation to spelling of the words Example: "Yeah, very much so. Um, because it's...the death of any kind of employment application is poor spelling. Um, so, but also to teach them to use the tools that on computers. Um, Quizlet has a great spelling application as well, so...the students who struggle, particularly the Arabic speakers, um, I would be putting them on Quizlet and show them how to use Quizlet on the vocabulary learning tasks. So there's a correction mode, I'm sure you've seen it in Quizlet." (Catherine)
Choices from Paralinguistic Features	Choices made in a spoken text in terms of body language, facial expressions, facial expressions, eye contact, etc. Example: "• body language • gestures • facial expressions • eye contact" (<i>Certificate III in Spoken and Written English</i>)
Choices from Phonological System	Choices made in a spoken text regarding the sound structures of words in the text. Example: "Pronounce key vocabulary and utterances with sufficient sound clarity and stress to be intelligible to the interlocutor." (<i>Certificate III in Spoken and Written English</i>)
Choices from Prosodic Features	Choices made in a spoken text in relation to pausing, stress, intonation, etc. Example: "Use pausing to divide information." (<i>Certificate III in Spoken and Written English</i>)
Choices from Text Structure System	Making a choice between spoken and written text and how the text is structured and delivered
Spoken/Written Texts	Texts that are presented via spoken/Written exchange
Coherence	This component refers to the internal [resource] for structuring the clause as a message," including the notions of 'theme' and 'information' (Halliday, 1994, p.308-309) Example: "And you know giving them opportunities to write down answers, so when they're on the phone they actually have some standard answers to kind of work through with the person. So just preparing them in that regard, and um, give them the skills to yeah...and to practice, to practice talking about the skills, yeah." (Catherine)
Cohesion	Cohesion involves the external relationship between clauses and clause complexes, which are independent of grammatical structure (Halliday, 1994). Example: "So in a presentation you know, you have an introduction, you tell them what you're gonna say, you know you break the text down for them, and then you give them a scaffold, you structure it with them, you do a model with them and then you give them plenty of time to practice and feedback." (Catherine)
Comprehension	This element refers to the understanding of presented spoken/written texts. Example: "It starts off with something you listen to, so you're listening to people talking but they also got the transcript, so then we look at that." (Dana)
Choices from Vocabulary System	Choices made in a spoken or written text regarding lexical items in the text Example: "It is important to become familiar with the terms used to describe the Australian work environment. Read about these employment terms." (<i>Living in Australia, Unit 1. Jobseeking</i>)
Learning About Language	
Relation Between Language Choices and English-speaking Culture	Choices made in a spoken or written text based on knowledge of the specific English-speaking culture (e.g., Australia, US, Britain, etc.) Example: "The other thing that I deduced which worked really really well was, um, I found that a lot of my students, and I'm sure it's the same in Canada, is teamwork and collaboration skills are highly valued here. But it's certainly not something that particular students from Asian countries are familiar with, comfortable with, or even have skills, uh, to, you know, to talk about in interviews." (Catherine)

Relation Between Language Choices and Social Situations	Choices made in a spoken or written text based on understanding of the particular social situation (e.g., interview, chit-chat, typing a business report, etc.)
Spoken/Written Text - Social Contextual Purpose	Choices made in a spoken/written text based on understanding of the particular social situation Example: “Well, I’m definitely, you know, from my point of view, it was always I had got to like, “today we’re going to learn, um, how to call about a job,” and that’s the language we would look and how you do that. We would look at a script and grammar would be embedded in that, the language would be for a purpose. So we look at a script and write it down.” (Catherine)
Understanding the Choices Available in Language Systems	Understanding the choices they can make in English and understanding that knowledge in one’s L1 can serve as one of the resources for learning another language and knowing that language choices made in one text has the potential to become resource for another text. Example: “...writing about my own experience is much easier because it’s my memory and I know that, so. As a resourceful class and as a resourceful written work, definitely using their experience, so...yeah, and it could be writing, could be you know, a student’s gonna do oral presentations, often get them to do something that would be relevant to what they already know.” (Dana)
Learning Through Language	
Communication Strategies	The ability to use strategies to communicate in target language
Extended Turn	This component may include but not limited to: recounting events, telling an anecdote, expressing an opinion, seeking clarification in an extended manner, and providing a description. Example: “Yeah, yes. Definitely, and uh, you know, tricks for preparing conversations. Absolutely, strategies for doing that. Also you know, the fact that there are multitudes, you know, giving feedback when you’re in a conversation, how to keep conversation flowing, it’s, it’s, you know, innumerable the things that you do. Absolutely.” (Catherine)
Interaction Strategies	Interaction strategies may include but not limited to: turn taking, asking questions, asking for repetition, indicating comprehension, responding to topic shifts, and confirming and clarifying. Example: “If you’re not sure of something, clarify what you need. And you might like to discuss it, it’s not a direct request.” (Dana)
Negotiating Exchange	Strategies to negotiate exchange may include but not limited to: making requests, acknowledging other viewpoints, confirming information, providing feedback, request clarification, seeking/providing repetition, using effective questioning techniques, and presenting facts logically. Example: “And there’s another one about negotiating and changing in your roster, I’m just, I’ve written this down somewhere when the boss’s complaining about something, understanding what might be meant by the way they’re talking and negotiating a time to meet with someone.” (Dana)
Language As Resources to Interact with New Knowledge and Ideas	
Numeracy	
Developing Mathematical Knowledge and Skills	This component is concerned with learners’ ability to use mathematical skills and knowledge to solve problems. Example: “Look at this graph and answer the questions about 2010-11. (http://www.abs.gov.au – accessed 27.1.13) a What percentage of employed people were professionals? b What percentage of employed people worked in sales? c What percentage of employed people worked as labourers?

	d Which category of work employed the least females? e Which category of work employed the most females? f What percentage of people were female managers? g What percentage of people were male clerical workers?" (<i>Living in Australia, Unit 1. Jobseeking</i>)
Language of Mathematics	This component relates to learners' knowledge of mathematical concepts and ideas and their ability to comprehend texts. Example: "Write numerical information correctly and completely in appropriate space." (<i>Certificate III in Spoken and Written English</i>)
Learner strategies	Strategies to learn effectively in target language. This element concerns with the role the learners play in their own language development.
Effective Participation in Formal Learning Environment	Strategies to take part in and contribute to formal learning environment. For example, participating in group/pair discussions, or conducting research relevant to given tasks, etc. Example: "So what I did was, uh, I initiated a project for the class for ten weeks and then they would have to work as a team to uh, deliver the project." (Catherine)
Independent Learner strategies	Strategies to learn on their own inside or outside formal learning environment. For example, understanding vocabulary using a dictionary, or utilizing resources to acquire knowledge and enhance learning. Example: "Take responsibility for organising study both in and out of formal learning environments" (<i>Certificate III in Spoken and Written English</i>)
Understanding the role of assessment	CSWE III curriculum employs criterion-referenced assessment. Learners are being assessed based on explicitly stated criteria. Achievement assessment or assessment of knowledge and skills are conducted at the end of a course (NSW AMES, 2013) This element requires learners to understand the requirements for completing a course and what roles those assessments play in their learning.

Appendix F. Examples of Noteworthy Points from Instructor Interviews

Name of the header	Examples
Learner needs	
Student absenteeism and continuous intake	They're sick, their kids are sick, "I have an appointment," "I don't feel good," "I have a headache". You name it. So if they miss half the month, that's gonna be a problem. (Bianca, LINC 4)
	We have continuous enrollment. So there was often times when students miss classes because of you know, personal life reasons, and so that's sustained, you know, building on what you've done, scaffolding and working on those skills. Um, but you got used to that, so that was definitely a challenge, the fact that AMEP has this continuing enrollment. (Dana, CSWE III)
	Yeah, so you know, you start, you do, you do your unit on employment. And three months later, you have three new students join the class, they're highly motivated and they start asking you about working and "how do I get a job in Canada and what should I do?" So now do I go back? And do I repeat everything I did three months ago? And all other twenty students already heard it? That's a challenge. (Bianca, LINC 4)

Technical support	So let's...the one that I did most recently was uh, the volunteer job. So, we, we went onto the website and each looked at different, you know, in groups, looked at different applications. So that whole idea of going onto the website, looking at applications, understanding applications, to an assessment, would take four or five classes to get from doing it once to the assessment stage. Because we have to, uh, at LINC 4, we have to work on even just the computer skills... Turning the computer on, they'll punch in this website, go to like, all of that. So we're, we're not even close to analyzing an application for like three or four classes. We're still doing the go onto the website, look at the website, find one job, read one job. Okay, done, that's probably an hour and a half. And then the next day, okay, go back to the website, find another one, and now we might start looking at some of the vocabulary that's on that and then...so it's a long process, and you can't do it all class. My class is two and three quarter hours long, we can't do it all class, we're doing other stuff too. (LINC 4 instructor, Amanda) Just so you know the more you engage with the words and play with them, so when you're waiting for your kids outside the school, when you're catching the bus home, so using technology to learn vocab... So, um, even Padlet is worth to drain just getting people to write. So that's, you know, kinda try to use technology to encourage them to use it, and then we analyze the grammar that they use from those platforms which they write. (CSWE III, Catherine)
Building a cohort among learners	Um, and then just make them aware that, that everybody can help you in a different way. Because the learning is your responsibility, it's your job to help your friend and it's your job to ask your friend to help you as well. So I do spend a ton of time creating, um, a friendly atmosphere in the class where people are very comfortable in the class and comfortable making mistakes and pointing out that "while Susie might be a fantastic writer, she's really struggling with speaking and you might be a great speaker but you're struggling with writing. That's perfect! Hook up, you know, help each other out. (Amanda, LINC 4) And um, something you haven't asked me, which I think is crucial is the ability of the teacher to build a community of students who would support each other, to see each other not as competitors but as allies in a, you know, pretty shitty situation – trying to get a job in an environment where your skills are not often recognized. You're all in the same boat and um, I absolutely, that's why I do things like Facebook and WhatsApp – it's, you know, "oh John got a job, yay! Everybody, congratulations to John!" And often students would tell me years later "Ma'am," they got their jobs, they got their dream jobs, and the community is there to support them. And I provided the community after the class closes. You know, I don't comment that much, but I see them, you know, they're catching up with each other and supporting each other and "hey guys, I just lost my job. Does anybody know..." you know, that kind of start is crucial for their integration and their general wellbeing. (Catherine, CSWE III)
Authentic texts	The overall modules, like some, the biggest complaint that sits around our lunch table everyday is that we're basically being thrown into it with nothing, and then expected to create everything on our own, which is part of the problem with the needs-driven versus just creating your own materials because needs-driven, in order to do true needs-driven, you have to create the materials. The reality is that you're gonna have teachers who will be so tired. So it's uh, you have to learn to do a mix of needs-driven and already made materials. So the biggest complaint that, that I have and that I hear from my colleagues is that the program is implemented without some very solid templates and ideas and examples of like a module on something very standard like a job interview that you could then use to get started instead of having to spend a gazillion hours making everything up, so. (Amanda, LINC 4)

	<i>Living in Australia</i> tends to be quite clunky, so I would just use it, um, in terms of just support language points and get realia, so they would have themselves an application form, but it doesn't look like the real form because everything's done online. So I would use Google Docs to create my own form that looks more realistic to what they'll actually be doing. So trying to match the real world. So just using it more as a structural scaffold for whatever we should do in class. You know what I mean, yeah. (Catherine, CSWE III) The formatting of resumes and CVs, for example, is changing and it's dated, so I think the last edition was from 2013, and I've seen resumes which is now almost two pages long, and that's very much following the old format of more pages or so. So you know that's the kind of things where, um, it's just not up to date. (Catherine, CSWE III) So PBLA is needs-driven and it's real world task-based. And in order to get the real world stuff, for example, let's say we look at a job application online for McDonald's, just pick something easy that my students might be able to work at. Um, the materials and the vocabulary and the listening, reading, writing and speaking that I have to use based on this, I have to create those materials on this, on this advertisement or this job application or the form that you fill out because that, it doesn't exist. There's no, there is no materials that go with the McDonald's job posting. So basically, you get the real world paper and then you create everything that goes with it. So, that's tremendous amount of time (Amanda, LINC 4).
Competency-based assessments	Hmm, yeah, but I think part of the problem is, and I think I say this, the problem is the busyness of a curriculum and a classroom. And if people were...like I'll have to talk to other teachers in other areas at other colleges and things and say we teach this module and say we teach this competency or something. We teach this for two weeks and then we move onto the next one. I think "how can you be sure that students got...is competent at that particular thing in two weeks?" Or it might be this lesson we're gonna do, we're gonna do cover letters in this lesson and then we move on. I think I was sort of talking about that when you were showing something there. Um, yeah we've done that, tick that off, and then they move onto the next thing. And you think "well, I would prefer to spend more time on something that I think the majority of the students, and it might be just some..." fortunately we had a study support area so we had one or two students who just needed extra help, I might refer them to the study support to spend more time on things or give them more practice. (Dana, CSWE III) It's a competency based program, so we need to tick all the competencies they demonstrate. So you can't do anything without knowing what the competencies are. Um, and that provides a structure for all your students. So in that sense I use it for that too – kind of ticking boxes; but in the class I actually taught, who would teach way beyond the curriculum because often we needed to. I mean, you know, uh, an example would be understanding a, uh, a letter of employment. That doesn't come up in the curriculum, but you know, you need to know how to read a letter before you sign it. Knowing employment...you know, knowing like what's annual leave, you know, all the words that we use in employment. Um, that doesn't come up at all. Another example would be, uh, meetings, you know, participating in work meetings. Uh, the cultural work meetings, again, it's not covered in the curriculum, so I would just use that document to...you know, my boss would say make sure they pass four modules, and I would choose four and make sure they pass them and we'll be doing well more in excess of what was needed to do. (Catherine, CSWE III)

Portfolio Based Language Assessment (PBLA) in LINC 4	And so, and what I do like about PBLA is, uh, the owners of learning had switched from the teachers to the students, so the student has to take on more ownership of becoming an active learner, and becoming responsible for the learning that he or she is doing, and becoming more responsible for doing more outside the classroom (Amanda, LINC 4).
	Um, I do talk about writing and writing cards, things like that, and how to sign off a card. And if you were writing something to your boss, it has to be done differently then your friend. You know, there's a birthday card, and then I talk about, you know, acronyms and things that are used in texting that are not appropriate to write in a business email. And I talk about professional and casual correspondence and examples of that. Um, I don't sit them down at the computer and say "okay, we're gonna practice. You're gonna send me an email, and you're gonna ask me for...a day off". You know, I don't do that. Yet, that may be coming in September [chuckles]. That may be part of what happens as we change and wheel through PBLA. Um, we have some meetings to go over in September about the computers that we have at school and how much access we have, and how we can better utilize them so the students can practice that exact sorta thing (Bianca, LINC 4).
	Okay, so...this is the thing that teachers are struggling with PBLA, because they tell you you're not supposed to teach straight-up grammar. You're supposed to understand the student need, and whatever the need is, then you pull in the grammar for that need, which I do and I have done that in the past, for exam-, I'll give you an example. Um, you're talking about shopping, and you're talking about how to get help in the store. I teach them polite questions – 'can you help me?' You know, I talk to them about the grammar. Do I teach a straight-up grammar lesson? Yes, I still do. And I get them to practice it. And um, when I ask them to produce samples of what I taught, I ask them for real-world samples. Don't make up something else, tell me how you would use this when you leave the classroom. You know, for example, on polite questions. I do that every two months because they seem to forget. You know, 'give me the book', no, that's not the polite question. So, I ask them, 'tell me about all the places that use polite questions'. And so they have to produce that in a real-world example (Bianca, LINC 4).
	Our school, our school had uh, three CSWE classes, and one became study focus for those who wanted to study further and they focus a hundred percent on the study modules. Mine was work-focused modules for level III, so a hundred percent on that. And there was one like a general settlement, and they would spend minimum, very minimum time. But because my class was called 'English for Employment' CSWEIII, it was a hundred percent (Catherine, CSWE III).

Catherine's 'English for Employment CSWE III' class	Well, I would, um, what I've done is I actually split the course. I look at the modules in the curriculum, and I split the course to two parts for, um, for ten weeks. The first ten weeks was 'looking for work'. So we would pick up Module O. Uh, if you look at Module O, it's resume writing, calling about jobs, and, I can't remember the other one, um...oh, reading a job ad. So those were directly looking for work, and then I'd use D, Module D, which is interviews. So I would focus everything in that ten weeks about looking for work, kinda got a package of stuff that I did for those modules. In the second part I called 'at work'. So you now got a job, how do you operate while you're at work. And then I pick up Module C, which is a complex transactional exchange. C1 – I would do meetings, negotiating with you boss, asking for things in meetings. Uh, and the other module that I picked was G, which is writing emails. So, emails, form filling that kind of things. So the focus, you can see, I've used those modules to design a course, as I said to you, I would add so much more in, in my...cuz the modules are quite boring and there's so much more to it than the modules that we have in the curriculum²⁴. So what I did was, uh, I initiated a project for the class for ten weeks and then they would have to work as a team to uh, deliver the project. Something like, um, we would talk to my boss and we discovered that the school didn't have recycling bins. So we set up project teams to introduce recycling bins in the school. And the project was ten weeks in which to find out how they can do it, what's involved, and then introduce it and make sure the students knew what they were there for and how to use them. (Catherine, CSWE III)
Text and discourse analysis in CSWE III classrooms	Yeah. Um, I guess, I, trying to explain to you how I see it, it's more in contrast to a particular, another type of text. But it's, as I said, it's kinda what you're trying to achieve through writing the cover letter, what the structure of that letter is and what language register you're using, what...and a lot of it I think the way I explained to students – how formal or informal it needs to be, and what um, how you're using tense to meet the needs of that letter, so whether it's past tense, present or future tense, through thinking about what that letter's trying to achieve. Um, but a lot of it is the sort of structural and what's appropriate and what's not appropriate in that particular context. Um, cuz I found that one thing that students did struggle with was what, um, with producing and with look I still wanna talk about the written and spoken production of texts, looking at examples from, like looking at other cover letters and looking through how that's produced. (Dana, CSWE III)

²⁴ Catherine was referring to modules presented in Certificate III in Spoken and Written English, which are the curriculum guidelines for this level. The document outlines modules for learners to complete based on different skills in spoken and written texts. There are seventeen modules for CSWE III in total, numbered alphabetically from Module A to Q.

Appendix G. Comparison Table for Results from LINC 4 and CSWE III

	LINC 4	CSWE III
Curriculum Guidelines	• Primary emphasis on discourse competence – within which genre and generic structure of texts are covered the most • Job search skills and concepts over placement and workplace language skills • Second most prominent emphasis on sociocultural competence • Focus more on constructing texts for specific purposes than instructional materials – stronger genre-specific instruction • Focus more on language functions than knowledge of speech act sets • Among language functions, expression and interpretation of information are covered the most • Include language function for talking about future scenarios • Missing language function for understanding and solving problems • Linguistic competence: vocabulary appears to be the primary focus, followed by grammar • Primarily cover interactional strategies, learner strategies, though learner strategies are not outlined in the theoretical framework. • Avoidance or reduction strategies are included briefly	• Primary focus on learning the language – primarily focus on acquisition of knowledge on linguistic features, such as grammar and vocabulary, of the target language • Learning through the language is the least emphasized • Learning the language – primary focus on choices made in spoken or written texts (coherence, cohesion, comprehension) • Prosodic and paralinguistic features are not covered • Learning about language – primary focus on relationship between language choices and social contexts • No coverage on understanding of the choices available in language system • Interaction strategies are most emphasized, followed by strategies for negotiating exchange, and strategies for extended turn-taking • Learner strategies are included – both participating in formal learning environment and independent learner strategies appear • Understanding the role of assessment is not included
Instructional Materials	• Primary emphasis on sociocultural competence • Job search skills and concepts over placement and workplace language skills • Second emphasis on discourse competence – within which genre and generic structure of texts are covered the most • Focus on conversational structures more than curriculum guidelines – stronger orientation towards oral communication • Focus more on language functions than knowledge of speech act sets • Among language functions, expression and interpretation of information are covered the most • Include language functions for persuading others • Missing language function for understanding and solving problems	• Primary focus on learning about the language – prioritize language choices made for constructing and understanding texts • Learning through the language is the least emphasized aspect • Learning the language – primary focus on choices made in spoken or written texts (coherence, cohesion, comprehension) • Prosodic and paralinguistic features are not covered • Learning about language – primary focus on relationship between language choices and social contexts • No coverage on understanding of the choices available in language system

	• Linguistic competence: vocabulary appears to be the primary focus, followed by grammar • Briefly touch upon spelling • Include only learner strategies, though they are not a component outlined in the theoretical framework		• Interaction strategies are most emphasized, followed by strategies for negotiating exchange. Strategies for extended turn-taking are not included • Learner strategies are included, but independent learner strategies do not appear • Understanding the role of assessment is not included	
Instructor Interviews	Amanda • Sociocultural competence gets priority • Did not talk about non-verbal communication • Did not talk about stylistic appropriateness factors in communication • Linguistic competence is the second heaviest focus – with pronunciation being the largest factor • Actional competence gets the third most emphasis • Focus more on language functions than how language works in real-life situations • The language function for expressing and interpreting information gets the most coverage, followed by interpersonal exchange • Talked about language for future scenarios and problems, but not for persuading others • Discourse competence – priority placed on genre or generic structures of texts	Bianca • Sociocultural competence gets priority • Teaches non-verbal communication • Did not talk about stylistic appropriateness factors in communication • Linguistic competence is the second emphasized focus – priority placed on learning vocabulary • Actional competence gets the third most emphasis • Focus more on language functions than how language works in real-life situations • The language function for expressing and interpreting information gets the most coverage, followed by interpersonal exchange • Talked about language for future scenarios and problems, but not for persuading others • Discourse competence: priority placed on coherence	Catherine • Learning about language gets the most focus • Relationship between language choices and social contextual purposes is prioritized • Talked about understanding choices available in language systems (less than Dana) • Learning the language – priority on choices made in spoken or written texts (cohesion, coherence, and comprehension) • Mentioned prosodic features in her instruction. Did not talk about paralinguistic features • Learning through language: included communication and learner strategies • Interaction strategies are covered the most • Did not talk about extended turn taking	Dana • Learning about language gets the most focus • Relationship between language choices and social contextual purposes is prioritized • Talked about understanding choices available in language systems (More than Catherine) • Learning the language – priority on choices made in spoken or written texts (cohesion, coherence, and comprehension) • Did not mention prosodic or paralinguistic features in her instruction • Learning through language: included communication and learner strategies • Interaction strategies are covered the most • Did not talk about extended turn taking • Learner strategies: mentioned

	• Did not mention deixis in her instruction • Mentioned only interactional strategies and learner strategies	• Did not mention deixis in her instruction • Mentioned only interactional strategies and learner strategies	• Learner strategies: talked about participation in formal learning environment • Did not talk about numeracy • Did not talk about understanding the role of assessment	participation in formal learning environment and briefly talked about independent learner strategies • Did not talk about numeracy • Did not talk about understanding the role of assessment
--	---	---	---	--