

2013

A Case Study of Bilingual Student-Teachers' Classroom English: Applying the Education-Linguistic Model

Jinghe Han

University of Western Sydney, j.han@uws.edu.au

Jun Yao

Visiting Fellow, University of Western Sydney Shanghai University of Finance and Economics People's Republic of China

Recommended Citation

Han, J., & Yao, J. (2013). A Case Study of Bilingual Student-Teachers' Classroom English: Applying the Education-Linguistic Model. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 38(2).
<http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2013v38n2.3>

This Journal Article is posted at Research Online.
<http://ro.ecu.edu.au/ajte/vol38/iss2/8>

A Case Study of Bilingual Student-Teachers' Classroom English: Applying the Education-Linguistic Model

Jinghe Han

University of Western Sydney

Australia

Jun Yao

Visiting Fellow, University of Western Sydney

Shanghai University of Finance and Economics

People's Republic of China

Abstract: This paper explores the practicum experience of a group of bilingual student-teachers who taught Chinese using English to learners of Chinese as a foreign language (CFL) in Western Sydney schools. Specifically it explores how these student-teachers used English as the instructional language in class and what strengths and weaknesses they demonstrated compared to their host teachers. Data were collected through observing and audio-recording the participants' teaching, aiming to capture the actual features of their English use in class. The data were structurally-coded employing the ELM categories. Discourse analysis was employed to interpret and understand the language use of the bilingual student teachers and also their supervising teachers. The bilingual student-teachers in this research, whose English proficiency was at IELTS 7.5, and who had experienced six months of intensive teaching practicum, were found able to demonstrate grammatically and discursively acceptable expressions throughout their teaching. The difficulties experienced by this cohort were more due to their lack of skills and flexibilities in teaching and classroom management rather than their inappropriate use of instructional English.

Introduction

Over the past two decades, Australian State and Federal Government policies have been increasingly giving attention to Asia literacy and connections with this region (e.g. Asia Education Foundation, 2011; ACARA, 2011). In response to this context, a collaborative program (Research Oriented, School-Engaged Teacher Education-ROSETE) was established between the University of Western Sydney, the Ningbo Bureau of Education in China and the New South Wales Department of Education and Community (Western Sydney Region). The ROSETE program involves bilingual student-teachers from China undertaking a research Masters degree at UWS which focuses on their teaching practicum of Mandarin (their L1) to local school children, using English (their L2) as the communicative language. Their teaching practicum extends over the eighteen months of their candidature.

This research which focuses on the language issues of bilingual student-teachers in the ROSETE program echoes the context of an increasing number of bilingual students enrolled in teacher education programs in English speaking countries. In Edwards' (2009) report, approximately 40% of student-teachers in the United States are reported as bilingual, with a similar proportion in Australia and New Zealand. Bilingual student-teachers in this research refers to those enrolled in an Anglophone dominant teacher education program, have English as an additional language and are capable of communicating in the institutional genre of

English and their home language. Language issues for this cohort have consistently been reported as creating challenges for the relevant stakeholders (Han, 2006).

This paper reports an investigation of the English language use of five bilingual student-teachers from the ROSETE program (2010 enrolment) during their Mandarin teaching with students in primary and secondary schools in Western Sydney. It begins with the literature on bilingual student-teachers' study and practicum experiences in general and reveals the gap in the literature reporting research specific to this project. It then follows with the theoretical framework, the Education-Linguistic Model (ELM) which was developed by the researchers through a reframing of Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP). The research method section provides details of the participant groups, and data collection and analysis. This research found that the participant bilingual student-teachers had linguistic competences and were able to produce grammatically correct and satisfactory instructional English during their teaching practicum. However, their instructions did not accurately address specific classroom situations, rather it encompassed general, formulaic speech and (therefore) did not have the same effect (power) as experienced teachers'.

Bilingual Student-Teachers' Experiences in Anglophone Teacher Education

Literature indicates that bilingual student-teachers have 'troubled' university teacher educators and school supervising teachers (McGarrell, 2010). This has aroused their own suspicion in their ability to be a teacher (Shin, 2008). University lecturers have criticised them as being unable to write argumentatively producing descriptive rather than synthesised essays or assignments (Han, 2006). School supervising teachers claimed communication with bilingual student-teachers was impaired by their different culture and teaching pedagogy (Ishihara, 2010; Nakahara and Black, 2007; Nemtchinova, 2005). Many of these bilingual students see themselves as lacking linguistic competence, particularly making regular errors in English during their teaching practice (Nguyen, 2009; Lin, 2011; Edwards, 2009).

Discursive challenges occur for bilingual student-teachers who begin teaching English as a Second Language (ESL) in Western, English-speaking countries. Shin (2008) reports that the bilingual student-teachers in her study (with first languages Arabic and Chinese) possess advantages in their knowledge of English grammar, and also through their rich language learning experiences that they can share with learners. Shin (2008) also contends these students lack the cultural backgrounds to appropriately interpret and participate in the discourse of Western, English speaking schools and need pragmatic knowledge and an understanding of this discourse, to help them negotiate social language in such settings. The research by Shin (2008) further suggests discursive English training throughout teacher education programmes should be designed for bilingual student-teachers. However, the training should focus on helping participants achieve fluent and idiomatic use of the English language, rather than native-like pronunciation or intonation. Especially teacher education programmes should help bilingual student-teachers develop appropriate instructional classroom English, such as techniques for encouraging and praising student participation, establishing classroom rules and boundaries for misbehaviour (Shin, 2008).

Bilingual student-teachers are 'troubled' by lacking the knowledge of the rules of English writing. McGarrell (2010) conducted a comparative study of bilingual and Anglophone student-teachers enrolled in a Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) program. This bilingual student-teacher cohort included students whose first language were those spoken in Arabia, China, Germany, Japan, Korea, Russia, Thailand and Taiwan. Through questionnaires and participant discussion posts on WebCT, McGarrell (2010) was able to collect data from fifty-four participants (56% were Anglo-phone and 44% were bilingual). The data revealed that the Anglophone student-teachers were more concerned about their weaknesses in grammar *and* content, while the bilingual student-teachers provided more comments on their difficulties in expressing ideas in coherent and

grammatically accurate English (McGarrell, 2010). The data also revealed that regardless of linguistic background, all the participants expressed that it was a challenge to comment on their peers' and their own writing as they did not know the rules of the "writing game" (McGarrell, 2010, p.85). An implication from this research is that Anglophone and bilingual student-teachers similarly lacked confidence in their writing ability. This research suggests that careful training is needed for both groups of student-teachers (McGarrell, 2010, p.86).

It has also been shown that bilingual student-teachers are concerned about their 'productive' English capability. Edwards (2009, p.14) studied fifteen bilingual student-teachers (whose first languages were Chinese, Korean, Indonesian, Hindi, Gujarati, Dutch, Somali, Russian and Afrikaans) and who had completed a TESOL programme at a tertiary institution in New Zealand. The purpose of the research was to explore this cohort's perceptions of their own English proficiency and English teaching capabilities. On six areas the bilingual student-teachers perceived themselves as more skilful than their Anglophone peers. These were 'teaching vocabulary to learners', 'knowledge of grammar', 'teaching grammar to learners', 'teaching reading', 'understanding learning processes' and 'understanding learners' cultural backgrounds' (Edwards 2009, p. 21). There were also six areas in which the bilingual student-teachers perceived their Anglophone peers more skilful. These were 'modelling pronunciation', 'teaching pronunciation', 'teaching everyday spoken English', 'correcting learners' spoken English', 'correcting learners' written English', and 'teaching writing'.(Edwards 2009, p. 21). Generally, these bilingual student-teachers were confident in their knowledge of English and their receptive English language capability and less confident in their productive competence.

Bilingual student-teachers' non-colloquial expressions and 'foreign accent' have worried their supervising teachers. Nemtchinova (2005) explored the practicum performance of bilingual student-teachers in the Master of Arts (MA) TESOL programmes of six states in the United States. The data were collected from surveys completed by the supervising teachers of bilingual student-teachers whose ethnicity included Korean, Japanese, Taiwanese, Pakistani, Turkish, Russian, Polish, Slovak, South African, Brazilian, Chilean and Argentinean (Nemtchinova, 2005, p. 240). The research found that bilingual student-teachers generally demonstrated some strengths in their teaching. For example, they had a good understanding of their students' learning difficulties, and often served as role models for English as Second Language (ESL) students. They displayed competence at selecting materials, topics and activities. They also had a realistic attitude towards target cultures and could present an appropriate cultural context for their language teaching (Nemtchinova, 2005). Their weaknesses were mainly in those aspects related to language use. For example, in most cases, bilingual student-teachers could speak fluent English but sometimes it was "correct but not colloquial" with an "occasional insertion of 'coping' language-substitution of a longer structure where a native might have used vernacular expression" (Nemtchinova, 2005, p. 243). Some bilingual student-teachers have a "foreign accent" (Nemtchinova 2005, p. 247) and did not exhibit native accuracy in the language they taught. Their oral and printed instructions were sometimes unintelligible. This research also found that bilingual student-teachers lacked the skills of scaffolding learning. For example, they tended to answer the question without allowing their students sufficient time to do so; and also they were not sensitive to students' errors. However, these two problems were also shared by Anglophone student-teachers.

Yet other research found that bilingual student-teachers see their identity as a disadvantage in negotiating spaces in western teacher education programmes. Lin (2011) conducted a longitudinal ethnographic study, examining two bilingual (Chinese and Arabic) and two Anglophone student-teachers in a TESOL program in Northern California. This study found curricular design, practicum requirements, and the selected theories in this TESOL programme guided the development of these student-teachers' new identities. However the formation of this new identity was also influenced by the previous education and life experience they brought with them to the programme. These included their language

and cultural backgrounds, their personal beliefs and motivation for becoming a teacher, their experiences within the local community, and their relationships with institutional discourses. Lin (2011) concluded that due to these differences, the bilingual and the Anglophone student-teachers did not have equal opportunity to negotiate spaces in the programme and in the broader TESOL community.

Bilingual student-teachers' identity as an issue, was found to 'trouble' their Anglophone school students and teachers. Nakahara and Black (2007) explored a Japanese student-teacher's experience of teaching Japanese and Australian home economics in an Australian school. The research found while teaching Japanese language, she was regarded as a respected teacher with rich subject knowledge. However, whilst teaching home economics, she experienced a shock at the difference in students' and the practicum assessor's perceptions of her. The first question she was asked by a student in her class was "How much do you know about Australian culture coming from Asia? Isn't it strange that people who don't know about Australian culture are going to teach home economics?" (Nakahara and Black, 2007, p. 8). Further, she received prejudiced treatment by the external assessor of her practicum. Before her teaching was observed, she was warned by the assessor: "I am going to observe your class today. You need to know that teaching home economics in Australia isn't easy for you." After this warning the assessor continued: "Why did you come to Australia to teach home economics? I have heard that you are a nutritionist in Japan. Why did you give up such a wonderful career in Japan and come all the way here?" (Nakahara and Black, 2007, p. 8). The bilingual student-teacher felt that she received a strong message saying 'go back to where you belong'. Another challenge she received was learning to use the 'teacher's voice'. Although the supervising teacher suggested she use a firm and loud voice when needed, this seemingly challenged her Japanese identity - using a more normal tone and voice with students.

Bilingual student-teachers are out of their comfort zone when teaching in a culturally unfamiliar setting. Ishihara (2010) investigated the cultural difficulties that a Japanese bilingual student-teacher confronted during her English teaching practicum in America. The data were collected by observation, interviews and participant's teaching reflections. Firstly the research found that the participant felt culturally disorientated and confused about how to behave in a culturally appropriate manner. Specifically she felt lost in orally interacting with her American teaching supervisor, and eventually chose to return to her Japanese style of interaction with the supervisor and school staff. In turn her speech and behaviour confused her Anglophone supervisor (Ishihara, 2010). Secondly the research found that the Japanese bilingual student-teacher chose to isolate herself from communicating with school colleagues, for example, she remained silent unless called upon during the practicum seminar meetings. She expressed her desire to be provided with more active and directive structured support during her practicum (Ishihara, 2010). This research suggests that bilingual student-teachers be paired with supervising teachers who share their language and culture to address these issues.

Bilingual student-teachers are challenged by the conflicts between theirs and their students' culture. Nguyen (2009) studied five Vietnamese background bilingual student-teachers' experiences during their English teaching practicum in an American school. The data were collected from their pre- and post- lesson conferences, class observations, seminars and participants' journals. These student-teachers came from a country where the Confucian teacher model is followed in schools. That is, teachers have the authority, are respected and are able to command obedience from their students. In this context they also receive unquestioned support from parents and the community. They experienced culture shock at their American female students' refusal to do their assignments and glaring at the teacher. This is contrary to their expectation of how girls should behave, and violated their cultural norm and value for acceptable student conduct. The research implies that teacher education programmes should prepare this cohort with appropriate strategies for coping with and

balancing the different sets of cultural values they would experience in western education settings (Nguyen, 2009).

In sum, the current studies on bilingual student-teachers' experiences have focused on the formation of their new identity, their teaching capabilities, and their language and cultural conflict with, or influence on, their new teaching environments. The majority of these studies investigated bilingual student-teachers in TESOL programs. That is, teaching English to ESL learners, using their second language in western countries (e.g. the United States, Australia and New Zealand). However, there is very limited research (Nakahara and Black, 2007) that has extensively investigated bilingual student-teachers' experiences in teaching other subjects in English in the mainstream. By reporting the case study undertaken, this paper offers new insights by exploring a group of bilingual student teachers' experiences in teaching Mandarin (L1) using English (L2) in mainstream classes.

Methodologically, most of the current research is based on non-empirical perceptions provided by the participants through interviews, surveys and reflective journals. These research methods are questionable as it has been revealed that mismatches can occur between perceived attitudes and actual practice (A'rva & Medgyes, 2000). This research was designed to collect data through classroom observations and audio-recordings of the participants' teaching. In this way the actual features of their English use in teaching practice, rather than perception-based evidence, could be captured and analysed.

Reframing Neuro-Linguistic Programming

The theoretical framework for this study has involved a critical reworking of Millrood's (2004) Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP) techniques by the researchers. NLP has been regarded as a resource to enhance the effectiveness of language instruction. NLP in the discourse of language teaching, is defined as "intervening with teacher-learner congruence by addressing learners' cognitive-emotional domain ('neuro' component) through verbal interaction with the learner ('linguistic' component)" (Millrood, 2004, p. 29). This approach focuses on the teacher's rational use of classroom language to raise the learner's self-esteem, optimizing their attitudes and motivation, and attending to the learner's emotional needs. This theory, originated from the humanistic perspective, and espouses the shortening of the psychological distance between the teacher and the learner. It is then claimed that teacher-learner congruence can be achieved and a positive classroom atmosphere is created. Millrood (2004) proposed nine categories in NLP (Table 1, Columns 1 & 2).

Column 1: Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP)*	Column 2: The conceptual ideas of the categories	Column 3: Education-Linguistic Model (ELM)**
1. Establishing teacher-learner/s rapport	building an interpersonal contact with the learner through support, interaction, and empathy	1. Rapport
2. Collapsing an anchor	reinforcing learner achievement by emphasizing success	2. Acknowledging success
3. Modelling the learner	offering strategies for the learners to achieve better results	3. Modelling
4. Creating a learner filter	monitoring 'correct'/'incorrect' behavior (or)	4. Addressing challenging behaviours
	monitoring 'correct'/'incorrect' knowledge	
5. Elicitation with learner	guiding the learner to an output	5. Scaffolding the learning
6. Leading the learner	introducing a cognitive challenge for the learner	
7. Calibration of the learner	recognizing individual differences in learners	6. Responding to the individual learner
8. Pacing with the learner	achieving harmony of teaching and learning in rate, style, and production	
9. Re-framing the approach	stopping unproductive strategies, and providing better alternatives	7. Self-monitor the teaching

Sources: * NLP categories (Millrood, 2004); ** ELM developed by the researchers with the intent to make the categories more relevant to an Education context

Table 1 Categories of NLP and ELM

However, the concepts employed in the NLP techniques approximate psychological rather than educational discourse. For instance “collapsing an anchor”, “elicitation with learner”, and “creating a learner filter” do not suit educational contexts, and make no clear sense to educational researchers. Therefore, an Education Linguistic Model (ELM) (Table 1, Column 3) was developed by the researchers in this study to replace the NLP as the theoretical framework for data analysis. Specifically, some of the NLP categories are confusing. For instance, the item “creating a learner filter” in NLP covers more than one conceptual idea. It refers to “monitoring correct or incorrect behavior” and “correct or incorrect knowledge”. In the proposed ELM, the former has been allocated the standalone category “addressing challenging behaviour”. “Monitoring correct or incorrect knowledge”, along with “elicitation with learner” and “leading the learner,” is categorised as “scaffolding the learner”. These three conceptual ideas focus on correcting, guiding, and/or challenging the learner. “Collapsing an anchor” was replaced by “acknowledging success” to refer to “reinforcing learner achievement by emphasizing success”. “Calibration of the learner” and “pacing with the learner” refer to recognizing individual differences and adjusting the teaching pace to suit the learner. These two have been combined under the category “responding to individual learners”. Lastly, “re-framing the approach” refers to “stopping unproductive strategies, and providing better alternatives”. It has been reclassified as “self-monitor the teaching” which reflects the agency of the teacher.

Method

This research was approved through the New South Wales’ State Education Research Approval Process (SERAP), and allocated the approval number 2011037.

This research was designed as a qualitative case study, focusing on the practicum of a group of students who were enrolled in the ROSETE program – a Research-Oriented School-Engaged program in a Western Sydney university. The participants were all in their early twenties. They were conducting their research Masters (in Education) and at the same time were undertaking a practicum, teaching Mandarin, in primary and secondary schools. English

was the communicative language in their teaching. Their research focused on exploring their own or their peers' Mandarin teaching. These students' English proficiency was at an average of IELTS 7.5. Audio-recordings and researcher observations were employed to collect data from these participants. As a parameter, data were also collected from their school supervising teachers and some of their classroom teachers.

Data collection

Five bilingual student-teachers were recruited from the ROSETE program to participate in this case study. Data were collected after the student-teachers had completed six months of teaching at their allocated schools. Sixteen lessons conducted by the bilingual student-teachers in primary and secondary schools were recorded and observed. Each lesson was approximately 45 minutes. Their classroom teachers from primary and supervising teachers from secondary were present during their teaching. If they intervened during the lesson, this was also recorded and observed. These teachers maintained a support role throughout the bilingual student-teachers' lessons. They mainly helped with classroom management and additional explanation when needed between the students and student-teachers.

In addition, four language lessons conducted by two secondary Mandarin teachers (Anglophone) were observed and audio-recorded. They supervised some of the bilingual student-teachers. The observation technique was note taking. This aimed to complement the limitation of audio-recording in order for the actions and reactions between the participants and their students to be captured. The data included some students' responses during their Mandarin lessons, but the focus of this study was the student-teacher participants. Therefore school students are not considered as participants.

Data analysis

The transcribed data from the recordings were supported by the researchers' observation notes in the data analysis. The data analysis involved two stages. The first stage involved structural coding (Saldana, 2009, p. 66) where the similar segments of the data were grouped and labeled according to the ELM categories. Secondly, discourse analysis was employed to interpret and understand the language use of the bilingual student-teachers and also their supervising teachers. The data from the two supervisors and the classroom teachers were set as a parameter in analysing the student-teachers' strengths and weaknesses in language use. For example, in the analysis, if the student-teachers paused, searching their memory for the appropriate expression and in this circumstance the classroom teacher interjected, this would exemplify a weakness in this area of their language use. Also if the student-teachers' instructions confused students and they became disengaged (i.e. they started to talk to peers, distracted) and where the supervising teacher's instructions enabled students to respond appropriately, this would be identified as another weakness.

Excerpts from the data were anonymized by using the following generic codes: "BST" to indicate a quote from a bilingual student-teacher; "SLT" for secondary school, language teacher (i.e. an Anglophone supervising teacher); "PCT" as the code for a primary school, classroom teacher (i.e. an Anglophone classroom teacher), and "S" for a student.

Findings: Bilingual Student-Teachers' Instructional Language

The data revealed that the bilingual student-teachers exhibited both strengths and weaknesses in their use of English in their Mandarin teaching. They were particularly successful in establishing a rapport with students, scaffolding learning and modelling. Some successful use of modelling was also evident. However, acknowledging success, responding to the individual learner and addressing challenging behaviours were less successfully implemented by the student-teachers. Therefore in these three categories, a comparison of English use by the student teachers and their supervising or class teachers is particularly displayed and discussed. No evidence was found in terms of the student teachers' ability to self-monitor their teaching strategy.

Rapport

The BTSS in this case study particularly excelled in establishing a rapport with their students. The following examples illustrate how these student-teachers developed a rapport with their students to maximize a relaxed and enjoyable classroom atmosphere.

BST: This is one of my favourite Chinese singers. Is he handsome?

S: [laughter].

[The teacher is introducing the names of the countries by showing pictures taken at 2010 Shanghai World Expo.]

BST: Inside the pavilion of 土耳其 (Turkey), there're some sections and some demonstrations of the culture in 土耳其...One thing about 土耳其 is...

S: Ice-cream.

BST: Yes. Awesome!

S: Yes. I love ice-cream.

BST: How to say "do you like coconut man"?

S: 我喜欢可口可乐。(I like coco-cola)

BST: 我喜欢可口可乐。Yeah. It's not good for your health.

S: When they say "butterfly", it sounds a bit like "who's there"?

BST: Who's there? 蝴蝶 (butterfly). A little bit like that. 蝴蝶. Who's there?

Butterfly is there.

S: [laughter]

In the first conversation, the BST tried to use personal pronouns (my, he) to engage her students and the students responded with "laughter". In the second conversation, the BST successfully engaged students by using young students' language (awesome). It is obvious that the BST aimed to teach the students how to say "Turkey" in Mandarin. Although she didn't achieve this aim, she enlisted students' responses relating to their personal "likes". In the third conversation, the BST commenced with a topic "coconut man", assuming the students would be interested. This stimulated a student's association with "coco" in "coco-cola". To establish further teacher-student harmony, this BST also used a pronoun (your) to make the conversation relaxed and personal. In the last excerpt, the BST relied on the sound similarity between English "who's there" and Mandarin "蝴蝶" to engage her students. The students' spontaneous responses and laughter indicated that the BST successfully developed an interpersonal contact with the students. These BSTs proved to be successful in developing strategies to address teacher-student rapport.

Scaffolding Learning

The BSTs also demonstrated their strengths in scaffolding learning:

BST: Have you found any...something in common between the two characters? Anything in common?

S1: Yes! They both have water on the left.

S2: They are made of water.

BST: Ok. If we take a close look at this character here. Does it look like a black TV or...?

S1: It looks like a TV box.

S2: It looks like a music stand.

BST: What if I add one tree to this tree. Now guess what's the meaning? Just guess, take a wild guess.

S1: Two trees.

S2: Maybe a group of trees.

S1: Woods! Woods!!

BST: Excellent! What if I add two more trees to this tree?

S3: It must mean many trees!

S4: It's forest!!

S5: Yes, forests! Must be forests! It is interesting, Miss.

In the first and the third excerpts, both of the BSTs tried to scaffold the students by providing minimum but necessary hints rather than telling students the answer straight away. The first BST asked the students to do a comparison and analysis of the two characters and to deduce the meaning by themselves. The third BST guided the students to deduce the meaning of an ideographic character based on the knowledge the students previously learned. In the second conversation, the BST used the pictographic features of Chinese characters to guide the students to outputs. In all three cases, none of BSTs simply provided statements of new knowledge to the students. Instead, through questioning, they built on what the students already learned and guided them to the new language points. This allowed the students to play a full and active role in the lesson, which maximized their learning opportunities and achievement in class. From the students' correct guess of the new words, it can be seen that the BSTs were successful in effectively employing scaffolding.

Modelling

This research found that modelling was successfully implemented by the student-teachers and well received by their students. Examples were:

BST: Everyone read after me...

[The whole class followed]

...

BST: I want you now to copy all the characters on your workbook. Each character you copy three times.

[Some students started to talk to each other a bit while getting their workbook ready]

BST: If you don't know how to write the strokes in the right order, please look at the board and follow me. Now let's start...

[Most of the students raised their head and looked at the board]

While modelling the learning, the BSTs used straight-forward strategies such as "read after me" or "follow me". The researchers regarded the BSTs' modelling strategies as simple but successful. Although the data excerpts under this category were similar the students responded appropriately. Millrood (2004) argues that excessive use of modelling in language

teaching can create a learning environment where students may easily become disengaged. However, no evidence in this study indicated that students resisted this strategy.

Acknowledging success

These BSTs demonstrated strengths in promptly acknowledging students' success. However, compared to their SLT, their articulations were quite different (Table 2).

Bilingual student-teachers (BST)	Secondary Language Teachers (SLT)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. You did a good job. 2. Good! 3. Well-done! 4. Very good! 5. 非常好 (Very good)! 6. Excellent! 7. 很好 (Very good)! 8. Fantastic! 9. You're smart! 10. Good memory! 11. Sounds like you're Chinese. 12. Very good! You got it right. 13. You have always been great and I think you'll continue to be great. Will you? 14. Very good! I'm going to give you a big applause. 15. You're so smart. 16. Fantastic! I like your pronunciation. 17. Nice guessing. 18. That's very good! 19. Good job! 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It's amazing how quiet you can be when you try. 2. Give him a clap please. 3. Well-done! Another kid writing characters. Excellent! 4. Year Three and Four, you are perfect, working silently. 5. [a student's name], well-done! It's pretty! 6. And some of you have actually done that. That's very very good! 7. That's correct! Well-done! 8. Well-done! Seven N, you've done a good job translating that. 9. Really good trying. 10. OK. Not bad. We got better at it as we went through. I reckon this side were more cooperating with each other. This side are all good people, but there were some people who weren't keeping up for some reason. 11. Very good! Can we give them a clap please? Very good work! And [student's name], in particular your tone is going really well. Both of you, your pronunciations were really good! 12. You did it very well. You did a very good job! We're learning. We're learning from your pronunciation. 13. Well-done! This side of the room actually leading their way into what they need to be doing.

Table 2: Excerpts of the Language used to Acknowledge Students' Success

When commenting on the students' pronunciation, the BSTs tended to give brief expressions such as "Fantastic!" or "Fantastic! I like your pronunciation"; whereas the SLTs tended to use elaborate English in their acknowledgements such as "Very good work! ... and [student's name], in particular your tone is going really well. Both of you, your pronunciations were really good!" The examples show that the BSTs made shorter and more general comments when they praised the students, whereas the SLTs made longer and more explicit statements. They often referred to the particular student or student groups by name and their comments were often accompanied by the reasons for acknowledging the student/s. According to the researchers' observation notes, all the BSTs tended to move on to the next activity or topic quickly after their comments. However, the SLTs tended to take their time to make their comment a case. By providing specific evidence to support their comments, they made their words convincing.

Responding to the Learner

The analysis of the data indicated that the BSTs did not acknowledge the different needs of each individual student, whereas the experienced SLTs and PCTs were identified responding frequently to the individual learner.

SLT: [Student's name], you are uncertain. You need to practice and you'll feel more certain. Do it by yourself.

SLT: [Student's name] you're just going to do a little bit more work on exaggerating the tones.

BST: All finished?

S: [No response]

PCT: Who needs more time?

[Some students responded]

BST: Have you all finished?

S: [No response]

PCT: Put up your hand if you have not completed those columns for the food table.

[Several students put up their hands.]

The data indicated that the BSTs had the intention to pace a lesson appropriately to respond to and include students with different needs. However, they tended to take the whole class as a generic group. Expressions such as “do you all understand?”, “have you all finished?” and “hands up if you all finish” were often used by the BSTs. Although these expressions are appropriate English, they were not effective as they did not address individual learners. In contrast, the classroom teachers’ questions were targeted at the particular student or student group. For example, “Who needs more time”? Their instructions received more responses from the students.

Behaviour management

It was found that the use of English to manage students’ inappropriate behaviour constituted a large percentage of teacher discourse in both the primary and secondary school classrooms. Table 3 lists some examples from each group.

Bilingual student-teachers	Experienced Teachers (SLT and PCT)
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mouth closed. 2. Attention. Pay attention. 3. Focus. Focus on the task. 4. Calm down. 5. Please keep quiet. OK? 6. OK. 安静 (quiet). 7. Everyone Listening! 8. Is everyone listening? 9. Settle down. 10. Listen up! Listen up! 11. OK. Stop! Listen to me. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Behave yourself. 2. Could you please show us the courtesy of giving us your full attention? 3. Hat off! Bag on the ground. 4. No one speaking unless you're asked to. 5. Sit on your bottoms. 6. You need to concentrate on the screen. 7. Don't call out! If you know the answer, raise your hand. 8. Excuse me! You do not call out. 9. Quiet and listen! 10. OK. Hush. Now could I get everybody's attention? Please put your pens down. Eyes to me. 11. You need sit properly in your chair. 12. Don't click your pen please. Or people will not be able to listen properly. 13. Put up your hand. Remember we're not in pre-school. So remember our manners. 14. Guys. Put your pens down. Fold your arms. Show me you're listening.

Table 3 Examples of English use for Managing Students' Behaviour

The BSTs' language was more general, brief and conventional whereas the experienced teachers' expressions were more specific, detailed and diverse.

BST: OK. Stop.

[The students keep talking]

PCT: Your manners! Right now! You do not call out. You put your hands up.

[The whole class becomes quiet]

BST: Alex. Calm down.

[Alex ignores the instruction.]

SLT: Alex. Look at the next page.

[Alex follows the instruction.]

Similarly to "Acknowledging Success", SLTs or the PCTs did not just address students' behaviors but also tended to provide reasons for doing so, and provided additional instructions for the students to follow. The language used by the BSTs was full of formulaic expressions such as "Stop!", "Focus!" "Attention!" The researchers' observation notes indicated when they articulated these words, their mind seemed engaged with other issues. Perhaps they were thinking "They are not stopping! Now what should I do?" Most of BSTs did not try to provide instructions for students to change their behaviour. Moreover, the researchers' observation notes demonstrated that whenever the BSTs disciplined the students, their voice was often soft and low whereas the experienced teachers always used a firm voice.

Self-monitoring strategies

The data revealed that the BSTs lacked self-monitoring strategies. That is, stopping unproductive strategies, and providing better alternatives.

BST: now guys! Look at the four cards, and read the English meaning on each. Who can tell me which represents the meaning of the sentence on the board?

[students were reading]

S1: B

BST: Do you think that's right? Actually, "你是妈妈的医生吗?" means "Are you mum's doctor" ?

S2: A.

BST: ... not quite.

BST: This one? Is that right?

BST: Do you remember how to say "I like something"?

BST: Now can you please say it in English?

BST: Now can you please tell me something about your favourite food?

[Silence...]

S1: This is really boring."

[Other students started to talk to each other....]

In these excerpts both the BSTs used questioning to scaffold and guide the students to the correct answer. Their scaffolding was unsuccessful in that rather than readjust the question or give more support, the BSTs kept rephrasing the same question to seek the correct answer. This eventually made the students lose interest and become distracted. In this study, although no evidence of self-monitoring strategies was identified within the two supervising teachers' classes, the assumption made by the researchers is that an experienced teacher would automatically switch to an alternative strategy if the students were not responding.

Conclusion

This study explored a group of five bilingual student-teachers' classroom English in their Mandarin classes in Western Sydney schools. Employing the Education-Linguistic Model and discourse analysis, the researchers were able to distinguish the issues related to their teaching skills from their language use. This enabled the clarification of whether their English language should be targeted as responsible for some of the challenges in their teaching or whether their skills as teachers were problematic and in need of improvement.

For student-teachers from language backgrounds other than English and who use English to teach, criticism tends to be focused on their language and culture (Nemtchinova, 2005; Shin, 2008; Ishihara, 2010). The bilingual student-teachers in this research, whose English proficiency was at IELTS 7.5, and who had experienced six months of intensive teaching practicum, were able to demonstrate grammatically and discursively acceptable expressions throughout their teaching. The difficulties experienced by this cohort were more likely due to their lack of skills and flexibilities in teaching and classroom management rather than their inappropriate use of instructional English. Their skills as educators need to continually improve in their future teaching, and their experience linking theory into practice should also continue to improve as part of their life-long learning.

The research focused on a homogenous group of bilingual student-teachers. Future research involving participants with other language backgrounds is recommended.

References

- A'rva, V. & Medgyes, P. (2000). Native and Non-Native Teachers in the Classroom. *System*, 28(3), 355-372.
- Asia Education Foundation (2011). *National Statement on Asia Literacy in Australian Schools 2011-2012*. The University of Melbourne, Melbourne:
- ACARA (2011). *The Shape of the Australian Curriculum: Languages*. ACARA, Sydney.
- Edwards, S. (2009). Developing an identity as a teacher: Perceptions of nonnative speaker teacher trainees on a TESOL programme In A. Brown (Ed.), *Proceedings of CLESOL 2008*. Auckland, New Zealand.
- Elo, S. & Kynga, S. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107–115. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x
- Han, J. (2006). *The retention of 'World English Speaking' student-teachers: A cultural studies perspective on teacher shortages in the context of the mobility of trans-national*

- knowledge workers*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. School of Education, University of Western Sydney, Australia.
- Ishihara, N. (2005). Intercultural challenges and cultural scaffolding. In M. Bigelow & C. Walker (Eds.), *Creating Teacher Community: Selected Papers from the Third International Conference on Language Teacher Education* (pp. 153–173). Centre for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.
- Lin, L.-F. (2011). *On the Developmental Journey*. Unpublished PhD Thesis. University of California, Davis, CA.
- McGarrell, H. (2010). Native and non-native English speaking student teachers engage in peer feedback. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 71-90.
- Millrood, R. (2004). The role of NLP in teachers' classroom discourse. *ELT Journal*, 58(1), 28-37.
- Nakahara, M. and Black, P. (2007). How I survived as an overseas teacher of Japanese in Australia. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30(1), 1-17.
- Nemtchinova, E. (2005). Host teachers' evaluations of nonnative-English-speaking teacher trainees- A perspective from the classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39(2), 235-261.
- Nguyen, H. T. (2009). An inquiry-based practicum model. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25(5), 655-662.
- Pearson, N. (2009). Radical Hope: Education and Equality in Australia. *Quarterly Essay*, 35, 1-105.
- Saldaña, J. (2009). *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. Sage Publication Ltd, London.
- Shin, S. (2008). Preparing non-native English-speaking ESL teachers. *Teacher Development*, 12(1), 57-65.