Since its release in 2001, the course Let’s Participate: A Course in Australian Citizenship has assisted immigrants in understanding the meaning of civics and citizenship, and complying with Australian Government requirements for becoming a citizen.

Written by Professor Denise E Murray, Integrating citizenship content in teaching adult immigrants English: An evaluation of ‘Let’s Participate: A Course in Australian Citizenship’ reports on an extensive evaluation of the teaching of the civics/citizenship course, conducted in AMEP centres throughout Australia.

The report covers:
- research methodology
- respondent characteristics
- issues on course delivery
- the effect of teacher preparation on delivery
- teacher and student evaluation of the effectiveness and difficulty of the course
- perceptions of the usefulness of the materials
- findings and recommendations.

The report concludes that both teachers and students enjoy learning about Australian civics.

This volume will be of interest to experienced TESOL practitioners, policy and decision-makers, and postgraduate students. Any teacher delivering the course, or contemplating teaching the course, will find this insightful report a useful tool.

This book is the first in the new Research Collection Series which contains major research reports on studies of interest to the AMEP and the TESOL field.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

In Australia, provision of English language to recently arrived immigrants or refugees is administered by the Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP) section within the Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA). Immigrants and refugees for whom English is not a first language and who have been assessed as not having functional English language skills are entitled to 510 hours of English language instruction. The Commonwealth Government, through a competitive tendering process every five years, funds state and territory organisations to provide English language instruction as part of immigrants' settlement. The funded delivery modes for this service are: formal face-to-face courses, distance learning, home tutoring, and self-paced learning through Independent Learning Centres (ILC).

The AMEP program is unique among the English-speaking, immigrant-receiving countries for the following reasons:

• It has a more than 50-year history of English language provision to immigrants as part of their settlement process;
• It is federally funded and administered;
• It has been subject to review and evaluation, leading to changes in eligibility and curriculum;
• It has a national curriculum framework (Murray forthcoming).

The AMEP curriculum

English language provision is competency based and uses as the curriculum framework the Certificates in Spoken and Written English (CSWE) at four levels - I, II, III, and IV (NSW AMES 1998). These levels correspond as follows to the Australian Second Language Proficiency ratings (ASLPR) (Ingram 1979).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSWE Level</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>ASLPR Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSWE I</td>
<td>beginner</td>
<td>ASLPR 0 to 0+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWE II</td>
<td>post-beginner</td>
<td>ASLPR 1- to 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWE III</td>
<td>intermediate</td>
<td>ASLPR 1+ to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWE IV</td>
<td>advanced</td>
<td>ASLPR 2 and above (NSW AMES 1998: 11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Most AMEP learners are in CSWE I and II, and many learners do not progress past CSWE I even after completing their 510 hours.

Because learners entering the AMEP come from a variety of different backgrounds (see, for example, McPherson 1997), the levels are also divided into ‘bands’ denoting learning pace, as follows:

- **BAND A Slower pace**: Learners with limited learning experience in formal settings. Generally characterised by low levels of formal education, low levels of literacy in first language and possible non-Roman script in first language.

- **BAND B Standard pace**: Learners with some learning strategies and/or resources. Learners have generally accessed secondary education in their home country and are literate in their first language.

- **BAND C Fast pace**: Learners with a high level of learning resources and some post-secondary education and/or technical skills training. Literate in their first language. (NSW AM ES 1998: 11)

The CSWE framework uses a text-based approach to curriculum design. It assesses learner outcomes through achievement of competencies; for example, a competency might be ‘Can write a short informal letter’ or ‘Can read a procedural text’. For the competency: ‘Can write a short informal letter’, teachers assign students a task such as the one shown in Figure 1.

You can use your dictionary
Write about 50 words
Time: 10 minutes

You receive a letter from a friend who offers you and your family the use of their holiday house in the country during the school holidays.

Write a short letter to thank them and decline the offer.

**Figure 1 Example of an assessment task of a CSWE competency**

Learners are then assessed on whether they have met the competency (Brindley 2000; Brindley and Burrows 2001) according to the following performance criteria (NSW AM ES 1998):

- uses appropriate staging and format;
- uses conjunctive links as appropriate;
- uses reference to track people and things;
- uses appropriate vocabulary relevant to topics and level of formality;
- uses grammatical structures appropriately.

While teachers may individually choose to teach language through particular content, content-based instruction does not form the theoretical basis for adult ESL instruction in the AMEP.

**Citizenship course initiative**

In August 1998, the Australian Commonwealth Government established the Australian Citizenship Council to advise the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs on Australian Citizenship matters referred to it by the Government. Tasks assigned to the Council included advice on celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of Australian Citizenship on 26 January 1999 (prior to 1949, Australians had held British Citizenship).

A further task of the Council was to report on ‘how to promote increased awareness of the significance of Australian Citizenship for all Australians, including its role as a unifying symbol’ (Australian Citizenship Council 2000: 3).

The Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, the Hon. Philip Ruddock MP, announced his intention of having a citizenship kit developed for immigrants and refugees learning English through the AMEP. The Australian Citizenship Council endorsed this initiative, believing it would ‘improve knowledge and understanding among migrants participating in the AMEP of key civic matters and this should assist in their civic participation’ (Australian Citizenship Council 2000: 21). The AMEP Research Centre was commissioned to develop the course, in collaboration with two departments within DIMA (AMEP and Citizenship).

The course, Let’s Participate: A Course in Australian Citizenship, was officially launched by Minister Ruddock in June 2001. The course was to be 20 instructional hours of materials, and service providers were to make the course available to their clients – although students were not required to take it.

In order to become an Australian Citizen, an immigrant must:

- be a permanent resident for a total of two years in the previous five, including at least 12 months in the last two years;
- be at least 18 years of age;
- be capable of understanding the nature of their citizenship application;
- be of good character;
• possess a basic knowledge of the English language;
• have an adequate knowledge of the responsibilities and privileges of Australian Citizenship;
• be likely to reside permanently in Australia or maintain a close and continuous association with Australia. (Australian Citizenship Council 2000: 44).

If AMEP students complete 18 hours of instruction in the course Let’s Participate: A Course in Australian Citizenship, they are deemed to have met the requirement ‘have an adequate knowledge of the responsibilities and privileges of Australian Citizenship’. The broad objectives of the course, then, are to:
• help prospective applicants for Australian Citizenship to gain a more thorough knowledge and understanding of the meaning of Australian Citizenship;
• provide an overview of Australia’s history and institutions;
• assist AMEP students applying for Australian Citizenship by streamlining the application process (Harris and Hague 2001: 2).

Just as the AMEP itself is a unique language program, so too is Let’s Participate. No other English-speaking, immigrant-receiving country has a coordinated, national curriculum for the teaching of civics content. In fact, the United Kingdom does not include a knowledge of civics as a requirement for citizenship. In the United States knowledge of civics and US history is required and is assessed as part of the naturalisation process. However, while the US is currently funding (through competitive grants) the development of civics curricula, these curricula are being developed at local levels since adult ESL provision is managed locally.

Curriculum for Let’s Participate
The course in Australian Citizenship explicitly aims to ‘provide Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP) students with information about civics and citizenship in Australia within an English language learning program’ (Harris and Hague 2001: 1). In addition, it also helps them in their application for Australian Citizenship because it helps them meet one of the requirements for citizenship – adequate knowledge of the privileges and responsibilities of Australian Citizenship. AMEP students who complete the course receive an ‘AMEP Australian Citizenship and Responsibilities and Privileges Record’, which is then accepted at the citizenship interview as evidence of their understanding of the responsibilities and privileges of Australian Citizenship. In addition, the citizenship course, taken as part of the AMEP, can assist clients to fulfil another of the citizenship requirements – basic knowledge of the English language. Clients who have participated in the AMEP for 300 hours, been awarded CSWE Certificate II or III, or reached functional English, receive a record from their service provider to show as evidence at the citizenship interview.

The course in Australian Citizenship focuses on:
• the responsibilities and privileges of Australian Citizenship;
• Australian institutions and systems of government;
• the civic values of contemporary Australian society (Harris and Hague 2001: 1).

The course content is divided into six units as shown in Table 1. The first five units reflect the concepts of the Australian Citizenship pledge, while the final unit explains the process of applying for and becoming an Australian Citizen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Course content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pledge</td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From this time forward I pledge my loyalty to Australia and its people whose democratic beliefs I share whose rights and liberties I respect and whose laws I will uphold and obey</td>
<td>Unit 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course resources comprise:
• workbooks at CSWE I, II and III levels that provide content-based spoken and written texts and language practice (text types and language features being aligned with competencies of the CSWE);
variety of delivery modes in the AMEP (classroom learning, self-access and distance learning). While covering all four language skills, the materials emphasise listening and reading activities. The workbooks provide a variety of activities, such as matching exercises, ordering events, role-plays, telephone calls, filling in forms, research projects using libraries or the Internet, and discussion. Both authentic and modified texts are used, including a variety of text types such as formal letters, procedural texts, signs and advertisements. While primarily factual, the information has been integrated with personal recounts and opinions. In addition, immigrants who are already citizens were videoed talking about their experiences of becoming an Australian Citizen. These recordings were cut to fit into the different units of work on video, in the CD-ROM and for listening and reading texts in the workbook.

Contents of this book

This book reports on an evaluation study conducted during 2001/2 in AMEP centres across Australia. Chapter 2 describes the research methodology used in the evaluation. Chapter 3 discusses characteristics of the students who provided the data for the study, comparing them with clients in regular AMEP classes for the same period. Chapter 4 reports on issues around delivering a course that is required to be offered, but which learners are not required to participate in. Chapter 5 concerns the effect professional development and other forms of course preparation had on teachers' ability to deliver the course. Chapter 6 reports on teachers' and students' evaluation of the effectiveness and difficulty of the course content, while Chapter 7 discusses teacher and student perceptions of the usefulness of the materials. Each chapter concludes with a brief summary of the main findings and recommendations. The concluding chapter provides a summary of the main findings and recommendations from each section.

Notes

1 In Australia, immigrants are called migrants. However, the international nomenclature will be used here, except when referring to particular organisations in Australia that have the term migrant in their title.
2 This is the current name for the department. Over the past fifty years the department has had a variety of different names, but English language provision has always been the responsibility of the AMEP section within the department responsible for immigration and settlement. When the Citizenship Course was developed, the Department was called the Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs (DIMIA).
3 These organisations are called Service Providers and will be referred to as such throughout.
Chapter 2: Research methodology

The Department of Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (DIMIA) commissioned the AMEP Research Centre to evaluate the implementation of the citizenship course as part of its Special Project Research Program in 2001/2. The evaluation was to be formative rather than summative. Its purpose was to identify:

- reactions of learners and teachers to the citizenship materials in terms of the content (citizenship information and concepts), learning processes (experience of use of materials in the classroom/site of delivery), and student attitudes toward Australian Citizenship;
- any emerging issues in relation to modes of delivery to different groups of AMEP clients;
- any emerging issues in relation to teacher support and professional development for teachers and providers in delivering the citizenship materials.

The research methodology included questionnaires and interviews. Survey research has the advantage of being both qualitative and quantitative in nature - closed questions result in numerical data, while open-ended questions result in insights into respondents' beliefs about a particular topic. While self-report data may contain inaccurate perceptions of actual behaviour, they are 'useful for assessing how individuals make judgments about people and events' (Goetz and LeCompte 1984: 122). For this study, we were interested in teacher and learner perceptions and so self-reports were an appropriate methodology. Both teacher and student questionnaires included both closed and open questions; however, teacher questionnaires provided more opportunities for teachers to write narrative responses. Since students had limited English language proficiency, it was inappropriate to expect extended responses and so only simple open-ended questions were asked of students.

Although responses to open-ended questions are more difficult to analyse, we wanted to gain insights into teachers' attitudes to, and use of, the content and materials of the course. We therefore provided several opportunities for teachers to respond in this manner. We sequenced the questionnaire so that the
Respondents would understand the purpose of the survey (Cohen and Manion 1994). To obtain reliable results, we also avoided sexist language, loaded terms, ambiguity, culturally sensitive language, and unnecessarily complex language. Questions needed to be clear since ambiguous questions can lead to unreliable results (Mertens 1998). For items that could be potentially confusing (eg What other AMEP Classes have you attended? in the student questionnaire), examples were given to illustrate how they might answer the question (Johnson 1992). In the case of our example, the illustration was:

I nclude classes you are still attending eg CSWE Level 1,1 July to September 2001 at Springhurst Language College, Oldtown.

Interviews are often conducted in survey research as a means of collecting additional qualitative data. Interviewing allows the researcher to obtain ‘greater depth than is the case with other methods of data collection’ (Cohen and Manion 1994: 272). When interviews are used in conjunction with other methods of data collection, more detail can be gained from respondents on their reactions to the research topic. As Goetz and LeCompte note in regard to interview construction, ‘researchers are best served by seeking and following guidelines for interview construction that are consistent with the goals and designs of particular research projects’ (1984: 124). The interview questions for this study were designed to elicit additional information to that gathered through the questionnaire.

The student interviews focused on their reasons for taking the course, their understanding/interest in the content, their use and evaluation of the materials and any other information about the course the students might like to offer. Before the interview began, interviewers spent considerable time with warm-up questions. This was in order to create a comfortable atmosphere for the students – particularly important since all but three of the interviews were not conducted in the student’s L1 and many were from oppressive regimes where suspicions of government questions is the norm. Depending on responses to the warm-up part of the interview, interviewers could sometimes glean additional information about such things as students’ study or work aspirations, their family situation or how they came to Australia. Obviously, because of the way it was collected such data is not available for all students.

Teacher interviews were designed to elicit information about preparation to teach the course, use of, and attitudes to, the content and materials, and any other information teachers wanted to provide. Many, for example, commented on their students’ reasons for taking the course.

The research was conducted in two stages. In the Stage 1 (Term 3, 2002) a limited number of AMEP service providers were contacted and asked to distribute questionnaires to teachers and students and to ask for volunteers to be interviewed. The two-stage approach was needed because there were immediate questions about delivery models that needed to be investigated and reported back to DIMIA for resolution. Thus, in the first stage the three participating providers were chosen because they provided a broad range of AMEP provider types (public and private, large and small). At Stage 1, only data pertaining to administrative implementation (ie teacher responses) were analysed; however, during Stage 2 all data from Stage 1 were subsumed into the final analysis.

During Stage 1, the questionnaires were pilot-tested. As only one item was found to have significant problems, the questionnaire was not changed for Stage 2. The item students found difficult was the one asking ‘What other AMEP classes have you attended?’ Data from this question will be discussed in Chapter 3. Since there was no simple method/question for eliciting this information more reliably, the item was not changed.

In Stage 2, AMEP service providers in all states and territories were contacted by the principal researcher and asked to distribute questionnaires to students and staff participating in the citizenship course. Additional interview sites were chosen because they provided a broad range of AMEP provider types (public and private, large and small). At Stage 1, only data pertaining to administrative implementation (ie teacher responses) were analysed; however, during Stage 2 all data from Stage 1 were subsumed into the final analysis.

The student questionnaire, which consisted of 13 items (see Appendix 2), was available in translation in two languages in Stage 1 and 18 languages in Stage 2, the 18 being those languages with the highest number of clients in the AMEP. Informed consent forms were also available in the same languages. One hundred and 47 students chose a translated questionnaire; however, 51 of these students answered in English. Additionally, since the questionnaires were administered in class, teachers often provided a paraphrase and/or allowed students to discuss the questions if they were unsure of meanings. In general, however, students were able to answer the questions unassisted. Table 2 on page 12 shows the distribution of students answering questionnaires in their L1.

The teacher questionnaire (Appendix 3) consisted of 12 questions, with extensive opportunity for teachers to comment on the usefulness of the various materials.
Teachers were asked to inform their students of the goals and ethical considerations of the research (available in translation in many languages) and ask students who volunteered to complete informed consent forms. In only one case did this present a difficulty. One site coordinator, wanting her students to participate but realising the difficulty of the language in the consent form, re-wrote the consent form in simplified language instead of paraphrasing, as many other teachers did. However, in doing so, she omitted legally required language, such as the right to withdraw at any time, the details of the ethics officer at Macquarie University who should be contacted if there were any problems, and how the data would be analysed and destroyed. Thus, we were not able to use the data from the 51 students from this site. We also collected biodata from students to determine how representative a group we had compared with the general AMEP student population for the same period. These biodata are analysed in Chapter 3. We were not able to accomplish this with teachers since biodata on AMEP teachers are not held in the DIMIA database.

### Distribution of questionnaires

Almost three quarters (73.9%) of the participating centres had taught the course only once during the period, and a further 15.9% of centres had taught the citizenship course two or more times. Table 3 shows the distribution of questionnaires by state/territory.

#### Table 3  Percentage of student and teacher questionnaires returned by state/territory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Territory</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of questionnaires</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No. of questionnaires</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>527</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounding error

### Ethics considerations

In all survey research, the targeted respondents may choose to participate or not. For both teacher and student questionnaires, we sought to obtain representative data by approaching all providers. Teachers were invited to participate by program coordinators in their organisation. We have no evidence of teachers requesting not to participate, and program coordinators expressed the view that teachers were indeed eager to express their views of the content and material.

#### Table 2  Students responding to questionnaires presented in their L1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language of questionnaire</th>
<th>No. of students answering in L1</th>
<th>No. of students answering in English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese (simplified)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese (traditional)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farsi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview

We requested service providers to ask for teacher volunteers to be interviewed. We specified the numbers we needed from different providers to ensure representation across the different types of providers – metropolitan, private, government, small, large, and those with centres widely distributed across their state. Teachers volunteered to participate in follow-up interviews and also nominated students to be interviewed. We asked teachers to use the following criteria when nominating students:

- Students were sufficiently proficient in English to be interviewed in English, or had answered the questionnaires in L1 and could be interviewed in the home language.
- As a group, they covered a range of levels in the class.
- As a group, they covered a range of different languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/Territory</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of interviews</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounding error

Table 4 shows the number of student and teacher interviews on a state-by-state basis. Unstructured interviews were conducted with 21 teachers and 50 students. Interviews lasted approximately 15 minutes and were designed to flesh out the answers that students and teachers had provided in their questionnaires. Students were offered the opportunity for a translator during the interview, but only three students, all of whom had been in a bilingual program, took up the offer. Teachers and students who were interviewed came from four states (two smaller states – by numbers of AM EP-eligible clients – and two larger states) and one territory, and included seven service providers and some of their consortium partners. The interview data, therefore, is quite representative of the AM EP delivery nationally except for Victoria, which was under-represented, and Queensland, which was over-represented. Although we had requested fewer teachers from Queensland because of its smaller overall population, teachers in that state were very keen to participate.

In two centres, teachers chose to be interviewed as a focus group. However, since the interviews were transcribed, it was possible to differentiate among teacher comments and analyse their responses as individuals. Similarly, at one centre, the interviews were conducted with students in pairs (because the interviewer was male and some students were Muslim females). Again, because the interviews were audiotaped and transcribed, it was possible to separate responses and analyse them as individuals. Since these were very small numbers of the whole population surveyed, we believe the data was not distorted; nor can we find any evidence in the data that teachers or students were inhibited by having colleagues present. The interviews were transcribed and a content analysis conducted. The categories for the content analysis for student and teacher interviews appear below.

Student interview categories for analysis

1. Goal in Australia
2. Level of English – either how long or CSWE level
3. Reason for doing the course
4. Plans to take out citizenship
5. Whether they would recommend the course
6. What they found most interesting/new/or liked
7. How much enjoyed/found useful the materials:
   a. CD-ROM
   b. workbooks
   c. video
   d. tapes
   e. fact sheet in L1
   f. other.
Chapter 3: Characteristics of the student respondents

The student questionnaire asked questions about their gender, age, length of time in Australia, English level, language(s) other than English they used, and their reason(s) for taking the course. In interview, students were asked their country of origin and language(s) other than English used, their CSWE level and reasons for taking the course. The questionnaire also attempted to elicit students' English language level through a question that asked:

What other AMEP classes have you attended?
Include classes you are still attending eg CSWE Level 1, July to September 2001 at Springhurst Language College, Oldtown.

However, a large number of responses were either missing or were not quantifiable. Students listed a variety of different names for their previous and current courses. During interview, it became apparent that many learners identified primarily with the title of the course they took, these titles varying considerably across the provider centres. However, the interviewer was often able to elicit the information through more questioning or from the student's teacher.

The data from five of the biodata categories (gender, age, length of time in Australia, language(s) other than English and CSWE level) were compared with the number of students enrolled in AMEP classes at the time the research was conducted to determine how similar the students were to the AMEP client group as a whole.

Gender of questionnaire respondents

The gender representation of the students completing the questionnaire mirrors quite closely that of the general AMEP client population for the period when the study was conducted. Over three-fifths of students enrolled in AMEP classes (64%) and enrolled in the citizenship course (67%) were female. The numbers and percentages by gender for those taking the citizenship course and for total AMEP enrolment for the same period are shown in Table 5 on page 18.
Length of time in Australia of questionnaire respondents

As the project extended from Term 4 in 2001 to Term 3 in 2002, it is only to be expected that the dates of arrival of the student body predominantly stretch from 1998 to 2002, with all but 12.3% of the student respondents arriving over this five-year period. When compared with the length of time in Australia of learners enrolled in the AMEP over the same period, we find that the main difference in the data is for 2001 and 2002. A larger percentage (44.2%) responding to the questionnaire arrived in 2001 than did the general AMEP clientele (35.6%). On the other hand, only 11% of the questionnaire respondents arrived in 2002 compared with 27.3% of total AMEP population (see Table 7). This could perhaps reflect that both learners and teachers overall felt that the course was not suitable for new arrivals, who first needed to settle into their new surroundings and who would not be eligible for citizenship for two years, as one teacher responding to the questionnaire’s request for ‘general comments’ said:

I didn’t do a Level 1 course as many students want to do it either later in the 510 hours as they know it will still be some time before any can be citizens.

Language background of questionnaire respondents

Where students mentioned two or more languages when answering the question: What language(s) other than English do you speak?, responses were coded according to the first language given. While this is the most reasonable way of handling these responses, it does risk attributing language background incorrectly, most notably in the case of those respondents who feel their mother tongue may not be recognised as readily as an official/national language or another language of wider communication in their country of origin.

As one might anticipate, over one quarter of the student population is of Chinese language background without differentiation between the various Chinese languages. Only nine other language backgrounds – Serbian, Arabic, Vietnamese, Bosnian, Russian, Thai, Croatian, Korean and Farsi – rate at more than 2% of the student population. Students from these ten language backgrounds alone make up over two-thirds (69.4%) of the student body, with the next ten language backgrounds contributing a further 14.3%. As can be seen in Table 8, the population in the questionnaire data for some languages – such as Serbian, Arabic and Vietnamese – is quite different from that of the general AMEP population.

---

Table 5  Gender of students taking the citizenship course compared with total AMEP student population for the same period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Students responding to the questionnaire</th>
<th>AMEP clients enrolled in same period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>100.0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounding error

Table 6  Age of students responding to questionnaire compared with total AMEP student population for the same period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Students responding to the questionnaire</th>
<th>AMEP clients enrolled in same period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 25</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 35</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 45</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounding error
Table 7  Time in Australia of questionnaire respondents compared with total students enrolled in the AMEP for the same period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of arrival</th>
<th>Students responding to the questionnaire</th>
<th>AMEP clients enrolled in same period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to 1994</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>100.0**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This category represents clients whose date of onshore determination was in 2003, but who were eligible to participate in the citizenship program in the reporting period. Since the questionnaire only had limited categories by date, students in this category probably recorded their date of arrival in one of the given categories or chose not to answer (missing data).

** Rounding error

Language background and countries of students interviewed

Numbers for language spoken and country of origin are listed in Table 9. Fifty students were interviewed but as two students nominated two languages each, the column total is more than 50. For one student, language (Chinese) was recorded but not country, for two students their country was recorded but not their language, for another two only country was recorded, and neither country

Table 8  Home language of students responding to questionnaire compared with that of total students enrolled in the AMEP for the same period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Students responding to the questionnaire</th>
<th>AMEP clients enrolled in same period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnian</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persian/Farsi/Dari</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khmer/Cambodian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dari (Afghan)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hindi</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese/Myanmar</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>100.0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounding error

Characteristics of the student respondents
nor language was recorded for another. A greater proportion of less represented languages are represented in the interviews, perhaps reflecting teachers’ desire to provide a range of language backgrounds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No. of students interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>China (4)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taiwan (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>Serbia (3)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Croatia (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>Iraq (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sudan (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnian</td>
<td>Bosnia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantonese</td>
<td>China (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>China/New Zealand (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farsi/Persian</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burmese</td>
<td>Burma (Myanmar)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinka</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonian</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>France/Vietnam</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>Israel (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>India (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khmer</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kku</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>Burma (Myanmar)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CSWE level of students responding to the questionnaire

Table 9 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No. of students interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nuer</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbo-Croatian</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamil</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CSWE level of students interviewed

Table 10 on page 24 shows the CSWE level of the students interviewed. More than half the students interviewed (63%) were in CSWE III, reflecting teachers’ desire for the students to be able to respond adequately in interview.
Also striking is the very small proportion of students (5.0%) who undertook this course to learn English. Clearly its utilitarian and content focus, in helping students to become or decide about becoming citizens, heavily outweighed its language learning aspects in most students’ minds (as it did for some teachers). Even so (as we shall see below in Chapter 6, Table 19), over 95% of students agreed that the course helped them improve their English.

Table 12 Reasons students took the citizenship course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
<th>% of cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learn more about Australia</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn more about citizenship</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to be a citizen</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help settle in Australia</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn more English</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need citizenship</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered course</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to live in Australia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instead of interview</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better future</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>714</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>141.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For this question, students could choose more than one answer, so the number of responses is different from the number of cases.

Table 10 CSWE level of students responding to questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Students responding to the questionnaire</th>
<th>AMEP clients enrolled in same period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWE I</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWE II</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWE III</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing data 408 77.4 629 2.0

TOTAL 527 100.0

Table 11 CSWE level of students interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSWE level</th>
<th>No. interviewed</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSWE I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWE II</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWE III</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>100.0*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing data 4 8

TOTAL 50 100.0

* Rounding error

Students’ reasons for enrolling in the citizenship course (questionnaire data)

Students offered a variety of reasons for enrolling in the course and some offered more than one reason. In addition, students often used a different language to express the same concept. We therefore coded answers into ten categories (see Table 12). The large majority chose one of three reasons: to learn more about Australia (48.3%), to learn more about citizenship (37.4%) and to become a citizen (33.9% – wanting or needing to be a citizen). Category 4 (help settle in Australia) reflected reasons such as ‘wanting to be an Aussie’, rather than ‘wanting to become a citizen’. Thus, it was coded separately.

The data recorded in Table 12 are borne out in the interview data for both teachers and students.¹ As one teacher noted, while most of them wanted to be citizens it was:

… for a variety of reasons, you know, from people just wanting to get a passport so that they could then go back to their own country eventually and retire on an Australian benefit. We had from that end right through to the ideological people who want to come and embrace a new culture and learn all they can and make a contribution. So you know, we just had the complete range.
Another teacher noted that:

The course asked them why they wanted to become an Australian Citizen, and for a lot of them the voting thing wasn't a very big issue at all ... there really was a minority in the class that said that they were interested in voting and said that they ... having a say in government ... for a lot of them, especially the Chinese ones, perhaps that's because they haven't had that experience before that they can't see the relevance.

In contrast, another teacher reported:

Well, sometimes, well I think when I ask them you know, why it is important to be a citizen or what's most important to them and they would say 'a passport' or 'freedom of speech because if I said this in my country tomorrow I'd be dead'.

One teacher was teaching in a program with 55 students who were given the option of taking the course. Only ten chose not to and some of these were either already citizens or it was too far away for them to be able to apply and so were not interested. Her perception is that:

Citizenship is [a] given, I think, for most of the students that I was working with ... they were already converted ... I think if you're working with stateless people, or people who have lost their country and lost everything and lost their citizenship wherever they were, it's not an issue to have to persuade them that they need Australian Citizenship.

Yet another noted that many of her students were not yet eligible, but were still keen to take the course:

There are people who are definitely keen for it [citizenship]. I think they also see it as an opportunity to find out more about Australia. And a lot of students I've had in the class, the majority would be newly arrived, definitely sort of here for six months at the most.

Interestingly, some teachers reported in interview that even AMEP clients who were already citizens enrolled in the course:

I actually had two people in there who were AMEP eligible, but already citizens and they, too, felt that they gained a lot from doing the course. Even though they were citizens, there were a whole lot of things they weren't really familiar with, or didn't understand, and now they felt they have a grasp on that.

One teacher reported that her students wanted to apply for citizenship but they 'really dread the idea of going through the interview'. One of DIMIA's reasons for having course attendance meeting the requirement of 'adequate knowledge of the responsibilities and privileges of Australian Citizenship' was to remove the burden of the interview. This teacher's comment confirms that this, in fact, was a valid reason for some students.

Teachers responding to the questionnaire request for 'general comments' also referred to student motivation for the course as shown in these comments:

This community group was particularly enthusiastic about obtaining information on citizenship. Despite very minimal English, each session was eagerly awaited. Their motives were varied. Of the seven students, five since have applied for citizenship, the other two will have to wait till their two years of residency in Australia is completed.

Most said they intended to apply for citizenship when eligible.

I was impressed by the keenness that students displayed to learn more about Australia. It was obvious to me that they valued the notion of becoming a citizen – they did not seem to take it for granted. Many Australian-born citizens probably know less than some of my Level 3 students.

The privileges of Australian Citizens had a very positive effect on students' attitudes to Australian Citizenship.

Attention and participation was very high. This made teaching easier.

Almost two-thirds (31 of 50) of the students interviewed said they wanted to learn more about citizenship, eight stating they wanted to be a citizen, eight saying they wanted to live in Australia and 12 wanting or needing citizenship. Twenty-two wanted to learn more about Australia, while 14 thought the course would help them settle in Australia. Only five said they took the course to improve their English; yet 30 said the course had improved it. Those who wanted to learn more about citizenship noted that they wanted to learn about privileges and responsibilities, understand citizenship, know how to apply, or gain information to help inform their decisions. As one student said:
I [am] really interested in what citizenship course is and before, and I really want to know before I became citizen what happens for me.

Students who said they wanted or needed citizenship gave such reasons as wanting to ‘qualify for a passport’, ‘vote’, ‘become a sponsor’, ‘have more opportunity’, ‘serve the community’, and ‘participate in the country’. The following quotations from student interview data demonstrate many students’ desire to participate in their new country.

I think I don’t want always take, take, take. I should give some. My duty and I want to vote.

Because I can have opportunity here. Like serve the community because I lost my community ... for rest of the life you can help people.

I like those [jury duty and voting] very much because I want to; I want to share, to decide everything in country.

But because here in Australia has democracy system there is freedom of speech, everyone, you can get involved, so I think that is the difference.

Those who thought the course would help them settle in Australia gave reasons such as wanting to be an Australian, loving Australia, wanting to belong or wanting to know Australia as their home as the following quotations indicate.

It’s a new country for me ... because I haven’t any background here ... And I love here, I want to be part of Australia.

... because when you’re get the citizenship, it will make me feel more part of Australia.

Those who wanted to learn more about Australia cited in particular, history, democracy, government, culture, society, Aboriginals and law. Several students (21) provided information about their goals in Australia, the majority stating that they wanted to engage in further study.

Just as students had various reasons for taking the course, teachers had various views on the focus of the course. Teachers had some conflict around the need to teach both language and content and many had concerns about learner perceptions of the course content. One teacher thought the detailed knowledge excessive, saying:

It was a bit too detailed ... for the video maybe O.K. But then it went on and on in the book as well and if you went, I think, if you asked any Australians many of them would not have a clue either so is it necessary for them to know that much there and then.

Another expressed disquiet at the idea students might see the course as trying to make them become citizens:

[I] was very careful, too, all the way through, not to make them feel as though I guess the reason for doing it is so that students who do it do become citizens. But, I didn’t ever want them to feel as though that was the main purpose of doing the course.

However, another – an immigrant herself - considered the opportunity to help students become citizens to be a privilege:

It took me many years to decide to become a citizen. But when I first started and realised how meaningful it was, I think as a teacher, it’s the most special thing to do, because you’re actually sharing something that’s so deeply meaningful to them in their lives.

Summary

The AMEP learners who responded to the questionnaire are fairly representative of the total population of AMEP learners over the same period in terms of gender and length of time in Australia. In terms of age, the 26 to 35 age group is slightly over-represented, while the over 45 cohort is under-represented. Although we have no hard data for this difference, it could be that the older learners did not take the citizenship course because they had less interest in becoming Australian Citizens, or that some were in the over-60 category for whom knowledge of the responsibilities and privileges is not required to be granted citizenship. Possibly the 26 to 35 age group is slightly over-represented because more learners in this age group are interested in becoming Australian Citizens.

While the top 20 languages are all represented in the data, some are under-represented (for example, Serbian) while others are over-represented (Arabic, Vietnamese and Japanese). In the case of Arabic, for example, this could be attributed to more learners citing as their first (of many) languages, the national standard language. In terms of CSWE level, a proportionately higher number of CSWE II and III students were in the citizenship classes than in the AMEP overall. As we will see in Chapter 4, more classes were taught at CSWE II and III levels and, indeed, this evaluation has found that the content is exceedingly difficult for CSWE I learners. Thus, it would seem that, while service providers
Chapter 4: Delivery issues

One of the goals of the evaluation of the citizenship course was to examine any issues arising from its implementation. This was particularly important since service providers are required to offer the course, but students are not required to take it – thus creating the potential for centres to have difficulty putting classes together with sufficient numbers to be viable. The focus of the data analysis and report to DIMIA in Stage 1 was on such delivery issues. However, delivery issues were also addressed in the questionnaire and interviews in Stage 2. The results presented here are a collation of data from both stages; that is, 527 student questionnaires, 69 teacher questionnaires, 50 student interviews and 21 teacher interviews.

Implementation or delivery issues raised by teachers fall into several categories: intensity of the course, time allocated for the course, CSWE levels of students taking the course, suitability for CSWE I learners, difficulty in creating classes, class size and ineligibility of non-AMEP clients. Data for each of these issues are presented below.

Intensity of citizenship course

Course intensity was a significant factor for students, teachers, and centre managers. In order to offer the course without interfering with regular language classes, centres provided a variety of different delivery modes. One teacher had taught both a CSWE II and III class: the CSWE II class in four-hour blocks at the end of the term for the last three or four weeks and the CSWE III class in two-hour blocks each week for six weeks. She commented:

For me as a teacher I would prefer two hours, but some students would prefer four hours and get on with it and finish and get out. But for me as a teacher because I wanted to go through it slowly, even if it is four hours, it’s a lot to learn and I think the more you give them the more they didn’t get that much but two hours they learn very quickly.

The citizenship course was provided in a variety of different modes, from a course spread over a full term to a 20-hour, one-week program. Table 13 shows that the majority (almost two-thirds or 60.7%) of students who responded to...
the questionnaire were in courses spread over a month or more. However, almost a quarter (22.4%) took the course in intensive mode (over 5–7 days). Intensive courses were identified as those taught over a period of 4–9 days (or perhaps seven, if it is assumed that classes were not taught over the weekend).

Table 13 Intensity of courses taken by student respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course time</th>
<th>No. of classes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;Month</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>100.0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Missing data | 26 | 4.9 |
| TOTAL        | 527 | 100.0 |

* Rounding error

Teachers interviewed taught a variety of delivery modes, from two hours each week over a term to 20 hours to one, seven-day/week period during the centre's break between regular classes. Most teachers taught classes that had been purposely brought together for the citizenship course; only two taught their own class, all of whom had volunteered to take the citizenship course.

One of the teachers interviewed had taught the citizenship course to a CSWE III class for three and a half hours and a half hours, two nights a week for three weeks. When interviewed, she was teaching the course to a CSWE II class for two hours, two nights a week for six weeks. She said that the three and a half hour course was too intense, even for CSWE III students, but that two hours ‘was just right’. In the questionnaires, another teacher of CSWE I learners felt the course was too intense for her low level learners, saying that a ‘lot of knowledge gained but too much in a short period of time’. Another felt that for CSWE I students this was ‘a very difficult course. The course also needs to be spread out during the week, so that the students are not given too much at one time’.

A CSWE III student who was interviewed wanted a longer course with ‘one unit every two days’. This student was taking the course in 20 hours in a one-week break between terms.

For teachers responding to the questionnaire, over half (53.3%) taught courses over a full term, while at the other extreme, more than a quarter taught the course over one month or less (28.4%) and 11.7% were taught in intensive classes (see Table 14). Not all students in intensive programs that were taught by teacher respondents answered the questionnaire themselves. Of the respondents completing the questionnaire, the number of teachers who taught an intensive program was twice that of students who attended an intensive program. We assume therefore, that more students from intensive programs responded to the questionnaire than did students in less intensive modes.

Table 14 Course intensity of classes taught by interviewed teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course length</th>
<th>No. of teachers</th>
<th>% of teachers</th>
<th>Valid % of teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;Month</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>100.0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Missing data  | 9               | 13.0          |
| TOTAL         | 69              | 100.0*        |

* Rounding error

Time allocated for the course

In the questionnaire, teachers were asked for general comments about the course. A common remark was that there was not enough time in most courses to cover all of the materials (although many students at more advanced levels thought the time was about right). Teachers interviewed mostly agreed. While DIMIA stipulates that students must attend the course for 18 hours to receive their certificate of completion, and had asked the course designers to build a course of approximately 20 hours, service providers may take as much time as they like to teach the course; no upper limit is mandated. However, because the AM EP is primarily focused on settlement through language instruction, most providers did not choose to teach the course for longer that 20 hours, fearing it would either take away from regular language teaching/learning or finding that scheduling was just too difficult to provide more than the basic time allocation.
One teacher who taught the course to her entire class, all of whom had wanted to take the course, stated that the integration of the citizen course into normal class routine had allowed her to extend discussions, take students on excursions, and assess their CSWE language competencies – a luxury not afforded to those teachers teaching the course in a modularised block of time.

A number of teachers commented in the questionnaire on the rush to complete the material within the 20 hours allocated. The following comments are indicative:

I feel 20 hours is very rushed, not enough time to take excursions, invite guest speakers, and not enough computer time. I would like to see longer duration – say 25 hours to enrich the course, with visits and guest speakers, etc.

I found that each three-hour session required the full time to work through the units. There was little time for real discussion.

However, my time was certainly cut out. In order to finish the units within the allocated 20 hours (seven nights over seven weeks) I had to push on, i.e. embracing content but not doing justice to the language learning involved. With such a large class I was unable to be interactive in everyone’s group – there just wasn’t time.

It has been quite a rush to finish all the useful material on Level 1. If there is going to be additional information, I am sure two to five more hours will be required to finish the whole course.

I felt the course could have been one or two weeks longer to incorporate adequate discussion of newsworthy topics and debate of pertinent issues. Also an excursion to relevant sights would have been interesting. However, for Level 3, at least, there was not enough time.

The first time I taught this, I didn’t pace the lessons and while there was plenty of time for all the theory there was no time for an excursion. The second time we managed an excursion into [the city], looking at the Law Courts, Parliament House, State Library and Government House. Unfortunately there was no time to go the Museum either but students felt that this excursion had consolidated their learning and experience of the citizenship course.

One teacher, in response to the chart requesting information on each topic area, noted that she had not taught Unit 5 (Law and democracy in Australia):

Not done – the course ran for five days and there are six units. After completing Unit 4 on Thursday, I conducted a ‘vote’ in the classroom and the students voted to do Unit 6 on Friday, therefore omitting Unit 5.

Another teacher addressed the information overload by identifying some materials that could be omitted:

Some exercises could have been left out, eg time zones in Australia, places in Australia (Cairns, the Barossa Valley, the Franklin River, etc).

Teachers interviewed agreed that there was a lot of material to cover in 20 hours. Many teachers stated the course couldn’t be covered in 20 hours. A CSWE III student interviewed also noted: ‘I think one week is not long to understand everything about Australia’. The two teachers who taught their own class had the luxury of continuing on a theme if it was of particular interest to students. Those restricted to specific time frames often felt frustrated at not being able to do some of the extension activities they thought would be useful. They were also concerned that they could not really assess for CSWE competencies since only a few of the students in the class were in their own language class.

Levels at which the course was taught

As shown in Table 15, a total of 101 courses were taught over the evaluation period by the 69 teachers who responded to the questionnaire. The courses taught were fairly equally spread across each of the three CSWE levels and a mixed offering, the latter in practice being primarily pitched at the high CSWE II and CSWE III levels (12 out of the 22 mixed classes).

Suitability for CSWE I learners

Most teachers interviewed agreed that the concepts were exceedingly difficult for CSWE I learners to understand, even with fact sheets translated in their own language. As one teacher reported:

I think the Level 1 was teaching this book was too hard for them and that’s at Level 1 so obviously we have to adapt and select from it. It would be different at a higher level, and it’s a different experience. I’ve been working with ‘preliteracy’ people as well and there’ve been quite a lot of issues that have come up of course with them as well. So you’ve got to have means and ways of communicating with some of those principles at every level.
content to those who choose not to participate. The centre simply cannot afford the extra teacher to teach the non-citizenship students.

Some students ran out of their entitlement hours, but had not completed the citizenship course, although they wanted to do so. This was problematic since, in small centres, classes consisted of AMEP, LANT4 and fee-paying students. Many AMEP students, on completing their 510-hour entitlement, stayed in the same class in a different category. Others wanted to move into other courses, but still complete the citizenship course. This was a ‘huge problem’ for teachers and timetabling – to juggle students’ hours and enrolments so that students who wanted to, could complete the citizenship course within their 510 hours. Centre teachers and coordinators devised a number of creative ways to address these delivery issues.

As a once-a-week option

One centre offered the course as an option once a week over the term, with pronunciation, an already identified need, as the alternative.

Saturday and holiday classes

Another centre offered the course on Saturday mornings when no other classes were offered, while another offered it during breaks between language terms. In interview, however, one teacher noted that offering the course during holidays was not appropriate for her centre because most students had children at home.

Choice of citizenship course and alternative class

One teacher, responding to the request for ‘general comments’ in the questionnaire, reported on the way her centre offered the course and an alternative for students not taking the citizenship course:

Initially, only one course was intended for CSWE III students for Term 4. However, due to demand, two courses were conducted.

During Term 4, there were three classes of AMEP Level 3 students – A, B, C. The teachers of A and C conducted the citizenship courses. The students from B who wished to participate were allocated to either A or C to create ‘equal’ numbers within the two classes. (They were initially given a choice as to which class they would like to join – one class made up of students with a higher English language ability).

The teacher of B conducted a reading/writing elective for students

Table 15 Number of classes taught at different CSWE levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>No. of classes taught</th>
<th>% of classes taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSWE I</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWE II</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWE III</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWE I &amp; II (mixed)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWE I &amp; III (mixed)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWE I, II &amp; III (mixed)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWE II &amp; III (mixed)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounding error

Two teachers taught the course to newly arrived CSWE I learners who thought it was government propaganda, especially since they learned it would take two years before they were eligible to become citizens. One teacher of CSWE I learners developed a ‘completely different course’ and taught learners for only ten hours, stating that ‘ten hours was more than enough’ for this level of learner. Another teacher focused class time on discussion and listening, as the readings were beyond their English level. She also noted that for this level it would be better to spread the course out during the week, rather than being taught twice a week, which was too intensive for these students. She also recommended that teachers needed time in preteaching and follow-up for this level, which was not possible in a modularised class.3

Difficulty in creating classes

Overall, teachers interviewed commented on the difficulty involved in having to offer the course but not being able to require students to take it. This was exacerbated for centres that had mixed delivery classes. Small providers and small centres teach students funded from different sources in the same class. These centres also have only one or two classes at any CSWE level. Thus, it is very difficult to create a cohort sufficiently large to create a class. If there is only one class at the level, the teacher cannot teach both Let’s Participate and different
who did not wish to participate in the citizenship course or who were placed in Level 3 classes later in the term [after the citizenship course had started].

**As part of regular language class**

Since all students in one particular CSWE III class agreed they’d like to take the course, that centre offered the citizenship course as part of the regular language class. The advantage, according to their teacher, was that she could integrate the citizenship content and language into the entire syllabus, doing extension activities and preparation activities depending on students’ needs. This is supported by a teacher who taught a class where students had been in a variety of different classes for their previous language instruction. At this particular centre, students were offered the course as an ‘optional extra’. Consequently, only two students had been in her previous classes. She commented on the difficulty of using discussion in such a situation:

> But generally speaking, when they’re asked to discuss things about their opinions, I think in a short course like this, where even students don’t themselves know each other too well, and they haven’t developed a relationship of longstanding with the teacher, they’re a bit reserved to express their opinions.

**Bilingual offering**

Some centres decided to offer the course bilingually, especially for lower level learners where they had a sufficient number of the same language to form a class. For example, one centre offered the course over seven days, with four hours of bilingual instruction a day. However, another teacher commented in her general comments that she thought this was contrary to the very concepts of Australian content being taught in the course:

> I also felt that the concurrent running of a program for [a] specific language group of people raised questions about the genuineness in teaching and of ‘being multicultural’. AMEP English and the Citizenship Program are wonderful opportunities for migrants to truly experience and appreciate Australia’s multicultural diversity. The Citizenship Program highlights this in the material offered. I believe we should practise what we teach. That is, all citizenship courses where possible should be multicultural in make-up.

**Other delivery issues reported by teachers**

Other teachers responding to the same question reported on the various difficulties their centres encountered in trying to offer the course:

> The greatest difficulty is how to offer the course. Ours is a very small centre - we combined AMEP students from our two highest classes ranging in ASLPR from 1- to 2 (majority were 1-, 1). The other teacher had to take the [state-funded] and LANT students from these two classes while citizenship was taught, this group was not pleased about the arrangements. A block is not feasible because of timetabling and teacher hours requirements for [unreadable]. Our students would be most unlikely to attend a holiday course as most have children.

Recruiting students for the course and photocopying all the fact sheets is very time consuming. As a momentum has built, word-of-mouth is helping and relatives not in current classes, with DIMIA hours, are also joining.

> ... as the students were not normally a ‘class’ as such, it was not easy to have discussions on the core questions of each unit.

**Class sizes**

As a result of these delivery issues, there was a considerable range in the class sizes reported by teachers responding to the questionnaire. The spread was from four to 25 students, with an average class size of 16.5 students. An average class size marginally over 16 held across class types and teacher experience in teaching citizenship courses; that is, average class size was the same for classes of lower level students, for teachers who had taught the course only once and for teachers who had taught the course more than three times. Markedly smaller classes appear to have reflected difficulty in attracting numbers and a wide spread of levels: ‘four Level 1 students, with one Level 3’; eight students primarily Level 1, with one Level 3 student.

Class sizes for teachers interviewed varied from seven to 22.

**Ineligibility of non-AMEP clients**

Several providers and teachers noted the conflict between having sufficient numbers in a course to make it financially viable and having to exclude some of their clients who were ineligible. Many language classes regularly consist
of mixed clients – some AMEP-funded and others funded through other programs or self-funded. Teachers were given the opportunity to comment in general terms on the course and some of these comments related to delivery issues, with two commenting on the issue of ineligibility of some clients:

The other concern I had regards six AMEP students who exited during the time the course was run, they returned as [state-funded] or LANT students and attended every session. They (five of them) were among the students who gained the most from the course and yet aren’t officially eligible for the certificate.

This course was not integrated into the mainstream classes, but it would be great to use some of the material with other classes, who have finished their AMEP entitlement hours, but are continuing English classes. A lot of those students expressed a desire to do the course, having heard from their friends in the citizenship course how good it was.

One teacher interviewed, who had students at the centre funded from non-AMEP sources, found it difficult to keep such students away:

They wanted to know more about Australia and so the legal issue about who could and couldn’t attend was something that was a little bit awkward ... unpleasant ... It was a case where students are just hungry for information and keen and excited about the prospect ... And so, it seemed so unfortunate that there was this regulatory tone about the introduction of the program.

Another teacher interviewed also wanted the course made available to non-AMEP students, saying:

I do agree that with some of the other teachers that I don’t think its language would be lost on any students, AMEP or otherwise, so I feel, particularly sections of the book would be very useful to all of our students regardless of their particular [funding]. It would be great to see that opened a little bit, even if the students paid a little bit for the booklets or whatever. Because these students talk to the other students about what they were doing. And I actually had people come and say to me ‘Can I do that? Why can’t I do that?’ And I said it’s just this group and it’s the first time we offered. So it seemed to be something that was popular enough for people to want it.

Another teacher interviewed put it this way:

Why not open it up to everybody ... open it up to study by themselves in the ILC ... the objective is for anybody to know about it.

**Summary**

The implementation issues concerned:

- course intensity;
- time allocated for the course;
- levels at which the course was offered;
- difficulty in creating viable classes;
- class size and ineligibility of non-AMEP clients.

While courses were offered in a variety of formats to accommodate students and service provider constraints, teachers agreed that intensive mode was not appropriate for CSWE I learners. Teachers and students agreed that there was more material than could be taught and learned in 20 hours, while many wanted additional material because it was interesting.

Service providers need to be flexible about the hours devoted to the course to help students and teachers engage effectively with the content. However, this is not always possible since service providers need to find an arrangement that is economically viable. Some centres found themselves teaching very small classes in order to meet their requirement to offer the course. Teachers who taught the course to their regular AMEP class had the distinct advantage of being able to extend (or not) the citizenship material to meet the needs of students.

Now that DIMIA has permitted non-AMEP clients to take the course, some service providers will have less difficulty offering the course, both in terms of viability and in terms of equity.

**Notes**

1. As a result of the recommendations in this interim report, DIMIA has made the course available to non-AMEP clients. This change is discussed in more detail in the concluding chapter.

2. Throughout the presentation of data, to ensure anonymity of respondents and their teaching centres, all reference to names of people, places and materials that might identify people have either been removed or substituted with a neutral name.
Chapter 5: Teacher experience in and preparation for teaching the course

Since this was a new initiative for AMEP teachers, combining as it did content with language instruction, the study was interested in determining the extent to which either teacher preparation in the form of professional development, or teacher experience with such content was important for the delivery of the course. This chapter reports on teacher experience teaching the course, teacher preparation for teaching it, and the effects of such preparation.

Teachers’ experience in teaching the citizenship course

In the questionnaire, teachers were asked to comment on their experience in teaching the citizenship course (the number of courses taught, the period in which the course was taught, the number of students involved and the levels of students).

As Table 16 shows, the vast majority – 51 out of the 69 teachers – responded that they had taught the course only once, with the levels taught spread fairly evenly between CSWE I, II and III (see Chapter 4, Table 15). Eleven teachers had taught the course twice, four had taught it three times and three had taught it on more than three occasions. Two out of the four teachers who had taught the course three times had taught bilingual Chinese (both Mandarin and Cantonese). Two CSWE I, bilingual Khmer classes were also reported. Teachers interviewed also had a range of experiences, from one teacher who had taught the course five times, to many (11) for whom it was the first course.

Table 16 Experience of teaching citizenship courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of courses taught</th>
<th>No. of teachers</th>
<th>% of teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>73.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounding error
Teacher perception of their preparation and understanding

In terms of teacher preparation, the vast majority (89.7%) felt ‘well’ or ‘very well’ prepared. Perhaps surprisingly, or reflecting the experience and adaptability of AMEP teachers, an even higher percentage (98.5%) understood the course content and structure well or very well (see Table 17). The difference between responses to the ‘how well prepared’ and ‘how well understood’ is even greater in the ‘very well’ category, where more than twice as many teachers felt they understood the content and structure than felt they were prepared for teaching the course. This difference may reflect teachers’ views that, while they did not have much preparation for teaching the course in terms of specific professional development, once they became familiar with the materials as they were teaching they found that they did understand the content and structure quite well, a testimony perhaps to the clarity and structure of the materials.

Table 17  Level of preparedness and understanding of content and structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How prepared</th>
<th>No. of teachers</th>
<th>% of teachers</th>
<th>Valid content structure</th>
<th>No. of teachers</th>
<th>% of teachers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very well</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounding error

Teachers’ preparation for teaching the course

Teachers provided limited detail in response to the question: Please describe how you were prepared for teaching this course (eg PD activities). Comments by teachers did not, for the most part, reflect any concern about the amount or type of preparation they had access to for teaching the citizenship course, although some answers reflected ambiguity as to what constituted ‘preparation’. For some, being given only the kit meant they were given no preparation, for another ‘preparation consisted mainly of familiarising myself with the kit materials’.

Preparation fell into seven categories, with many teachers listing more than one of these:

- **Formal professional development (PD) workshop/session/plenary/activities** arranged by the AMEP provider or in conjunction with the AMEP Research Centre. However, there was a range of PD, from several who reported a full day spent on the course to ‘a presentation at PD day’ to ‘general introduction during PD presentation’ (N =32).
- **Involvement in the preparation of the video or trialling course materials** (N =4).
- **Sessions with program manager, mentor and/or co-teachers** (N =6).
- **Self-study of course materials**. This was often stated simply as self-study; but in other cases, teachers identified they’d been given the kit the week or day before or that they’d examined the materials or had done their own research (N =20).
- **Became a citizen myself** (N =1).
- **Previously worked with the electoral commission** (N =1).

Responses were examined to see whether the widespread view that the course was considerably more challenging, indeed too difficult, at the lower levels, was reflected in more preparation being provided or made available to teachers at these levels. Teachers’ identification of the courses they had taught did not allow for fine analysis, given that some teachers had taught several courses at different levels, and many had taught combined levels. However, the amount and type of preparation provided or time allowed at CSWE I did not differ markedly from that reported at CSWE III. Leaving aside the one teacher at each level who was unable to attend the professional development provided, seven out of 19 CSWE I teachers reported no formal professional development as compared with seven out of 14 at CSWE III. At the lower level, these teachers’ comments were:

Familiarisation with material done in own time – no problems.

Have become a citizen myself. Read manual provided and listened to cassettes and video. Researched history of Australia.
I was given the teachers’ and students’ books and tapes. I also had the opportunity of talking to a colleague who had taught the course before.

By studying the materials provided.

None.

Liaison with previous teachers of the course. Study and preparation with resources.

Preparation consisted mainly of familiarising myself with the kit materials.

In part, these comments reflect the considerable experience that AMEP teachers have developed over a period of years, their high levels of competence in incorporating materials into their teaching and their supportive, collegial approach to their profession.

Teachers at CSWE III appear to have had somewhat less interest in or need for professional development, and two referred to the type of professional development made available in quite general terms:

None specifically. General intro (PD week). My own knowledge. Then worked with contents of the course.

PD day – information given.

Typical comments of CSWE III teachers who did not participate in professional development activities were:

I was unable to attend PD, preparation was through personal knowledge. Prereading. Research.

Have worked with the Electoral Commission educating the public before past Federal and State elections. Watched video, listened to the tape, went over books before the lessons.

Personal preparation through examining supplied teaching materials.

Received teachers’ guide, workbook, video and fact sheet and read through or watched them myself.

I took part in the trialling of citizenship materials and also reported to the AMEP Research Centre. I prepared myself by reading the teachers’ guide and student workbook Let’s Participate, viewed the video and listened to the cassette. Participated in brief discussions with other teachers who were teaching the course.

• None.
• The Let’s Participate kit was given a week ahead.

The effects of preparation

Responses from questionnaires

To determine whether PD activities resulted in teachers feeling better prepared, the seven categories were tabulated against responses to How well prepared? and How well understood content and structure? (see Table 18). If teachers responded with more than one category, only the first was counted, especially since many included ‘self-study’, along with other choices such as PD. While these numbers are not sufficient to determine definitively any relationship between PD and teachers’ feelings of preparedness, several unexpected tendencies can be seen. No teachers who engaged in PD felt ‘not very well prepared’. Slightly more teachers who self-studied felt very well prepared than those who undertook PD. This could be explained by the variation in the definition of PD; however, the three teachers who specifically stated that they had had a full day of PD only rated their preparedness as ‘well’. One teacher who had participated in the trialling, however, felt ‘not very well prepared’. Both teachers who had had other experiences with the content (working with the electoral commission or becoming a citizen) felt ‘very well prepared’ and understood the content and structure ‘very well’.

Interviewee responses

During interview, we were able to obtain more complete information not only about the preparation teachers had had, but about what effect that might have had on the way they taught the course. Some teachers were not very adventurous the first time they taught the course, while others developed or found extensive supplementary materials. Without extensive preparation or previous experience teaching the course, some closely followed the workbook, as one teacher indicated during interview:

The lessons were based on the workbook. We followed the program in there because it’s the first time I’ve taught it so I didn’t want to venture out on my own. So, I used the structure suggested in the workbook.
Effective ways to teach the course by teaching it, as one teacher said during the interview:

Well, when I first taught it over a year ago, because it was the first time I'd ever taught the citizenship class I wasn't as well prepared. I did read the fact sheets and all that and did a bit of extra reading but I found that this second class, the second time round, I mean I can add so much more to it, give it a bit more variety, quite a bit more variety. Integrated with Internet activities, computer stuff and all that, so I think the second lot of students are a lot more interested and they're also fast learners as well. And the second time round has been a lot more successful for me. And I can feel the response and interest.

This teacher then went on to explain why she thought teachers needed 'a fair bit of preparation':

Because sometimes students just throw questions at the teacher, for example there was this student who asked me about the white Australia policy and I vaguely remembered reading about it years and years ago. But off the top of my head, apart from knowing it was to do with racial discrimination, I couldn't go into it in depth and I didn't want to anyway. But a couple of them were really interested in it so back to the good old Internet. Look up several sources and then I just summarised it, gave them several important points and a brief background of Australia's history and the white Australia policy and from there on several students wanted to know more about the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, back to the Internet, more. I've got all those websites here as well. So we had quite a few discussions here, discussions about certain topics that weren't actually included in the course but that had links to it.

Another teacher interviewed, who had had half a day internal training at her centre and also a workshop with the AMEP Research Centre, felt that the materials were self-explanatory.

... and that was enough because even at the beginning of each chapter they tell you what to do, watch the video, they give you the instruction, and you don't really have to prepare much. I think it is very easy materials to use.

However, she did recommend training, and was indeed offering it herself to her colleagues.
Another teacher did not need any specific preparation because she had taught a course in Australian history and culture:

I find that as far as the materials it wasn’t a steep learning curve for me because I’ve taught Certificate III before and we have covered things like the law and that sort of thing and the Australian culture and history course that I’ve taught, so I was confident with what I was going to do.

Summary

Overall, teachers found the materials sufficiently self-explanatory for them to understand the content and structure of the course without professional development, although from interview comments and questionnaire analysis, it does seem that some professional development activity results in teachers feeling better prepared. The variable of previous experience with the content, either in another setting or in the AMEP, seems more likely to result in teachers feeling very well prepared. It is also possible that some teachers’ self-study was cursory (such as the teacher quoted above who had not viewed the video or read the teachers’ guide) and consequently they did not feel as well prepared. Teachers did report feeling more confident after having taught the course once.
Chapter 6: Perspectives on citizenship content in the course

Teaching content in the AMEP

As indicated in the introduction, the AMEP curriculum framework (CSWE) is text-based, where 'A text is any stretch of language which is held together cohesively through meaning' (Feez 1998: 4). In such an approach to curriculum/syllabus design, the 'content of a text-based syllabus is based on whole texts which are selected in relation to learner needs and social contexts which learners wish to access' (Feez 1998: 3). In other words, the focus and learning objectives are language-based. Since the CSWE is a curriculum framework, the teacher is left to decide on both content and methodology. Within the AMEP, content (and sometimes methodology) are in fact decided by curriculum coordinators at a centre, rather than by individual teachers. Whichever is the case, the syllabus, and therefore the choice of content, is not prescribed. This is in contrast to content-based instruction (CBI) which is:

... the integration of content learning with language teaching aims.

More specifically, it refers to the concurrent study of language and subject matters, with the form and sequence of language presentation dictated by content. (Brinton, Snow and Wesche 1989: vii)

CBI is often associated with academic course content in schools or universities (for example, science, history, accounting); however, it is also an approach used in vocational schools. In adult ESL programs, CBI has primarily taken the form of survival English focusing on such topics as getting a job, going to the doctor or theme-based teaching where themes might include the environment or advertising. Common to all these types of CBI is the belief that a 'second language is learned most effectively when used as the medium to convey informational content of interest and relevance to the learner’ (Brinton, Snow and Wesche 1989: vii).

M. McDonald, researching a variety of adult ESOL programs in the United States, found that her data lent support to 'the theory that content-based instruction can lead to equally high gain in literacy skills as well as job related skills' (1997: 5). In other words, language gains are not sacrificed to the learning of content. Indeed, these two approaches (CBI and text-based) are not incompatible. Topics can be used as an organising principle in a text-based syllabus where the topic/theme/content can ‘generate a whole series of related contexts and texts’ (Feez 1998: 15). The citizenship course has been designed to provide such integration. While the course is designed around content, the ‘language learning elements in the workbooks, audio cassettes and CD-ROM have been designed to reflect the text types and language features of competencies in Certificates I, II and III in Spoken and Written English’ (Harris and Hague 2001: 4). Thus, learners have the opportunity to learn a ‘whole series of texts’ such as reading a procedural text, listening to an argument, writing an informal letter.

As noted in Chapter 1, however, teachers were not responsible for assessing learners on the content because DIMIA does not consider them citizenship content experts, although they could assess their language learning competencies. Some teachers were not aware that they could do this, while others took advantage of the opportunity. One of the issues often discussed in relation to CBI is whether the ESL teacher needs to have mastery over the particular content. This has led to models such as adjunct courses, where the content is delivered by a content expert while the ESL teacher provides language support. Many teachers in this study reported that students asked them questions that they did not know the answer to (e.g., If one was a resident but not a citizen and died in Australia, could one be buried in Australia?). While many teachers felt comfortable with their knowledge of the content (see below), they recognised they were not experts and also were not in a position to provide advice to learners, as one teacher expressed during interview:

Sometimes they [students] say, well, should I do this, or should I do that and I say, OK, I can't tell you. You have to work this out for yourself. Should I apply now before I finish the course or should I apply after that? So, I'm happy to talk about it but make no decisions.

Student perceptions of the citizenship course content

The questionnaires and interviews sought to elicit information about students' learning of and difficulties with the subject matter of the course. Students were asked to: Put a circle around the expression that best describes how much you learned about each part of the citizenship course
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Student perceptions of the citizenship course content

The questionnaires and interviews sought to elicit information about students' learning of and difficulties with the subject matter of the course. Students were asked to: Put a circle around the expression that best describes how much you learned about each part of the citizenship course. Choices were 'a lot', 'a little' and 'not very much'. Students' responses to this item appear in Table 19 (page 59). They were also asked: How difficult did you find each section of the course? Students responded by checking boxes for each topic, rating them as 'not very difficult', 'difficult', and 'very difficult'. Students' responses to this item appear in Table 20 (page 60). For each topic area, selected quotations from student and teacher interviews have been added to provide detailed qualitative data to exemplify the numerical data.
Student learning in the four topic areas

Four questions in the student questionnaire sought to establish the extent to which the citizenship course helped students to learn about the following topics in the course:

- Australia and its people;
- Australia’s government;
- Australia’s laws;
- The responsibilities and privileges of Australian Citizens.

Australia and its people

A large majority (83%) of students felt that they had learned ‘a lot’ about Australia and its people. Only a very small number (25 of 527 or 4.8%) felt they had learned ‘not very much’, while a slightly larger number (64 or 12.2%) felt they had learned ‘a little’.

Both student and teacher interviews explored this question in greater depth. Teachers noted that students were largely uninformed about such issues in Australia as Indigenous peoples, and even about the geography and history of the country. Reconciliation seems to have been a revelation to many students. As one teacher noted:

They don’t understand much at all in the area of things like reconciliation. The only thing you can hook onto is some of them have seen sorry in the sky and they don’t know what it’s there for. So that has given rise to lots of discussion so they don’t have an idea of what sorry is or why, absolutely why there should be a process. So the unfolding of that was what reconciliation is and what it’s for is absolutely stunning to many of them. They can’t believe it.

One student, echoing many interviewed students, expressed her initial ignorance about Australia:

I know only about Australia, about Australia is that state and capital only I know, this one, state and capital.

In interview, students also noted that they found a number of topics about Australia to be interesting or surprising, for example, Aboriginals, people of Australia (including its multiculturalism), emblems such as national anthem, flag, coat of arms, history, flora/fauna. For many, much of this was new information – especially Aboriginals, culture, coat of arms, the powers of the Queen and flora.

As one teacher interviewed said:

They didn’t know much about it [Aboriginals], so they think the music and the pictures. I think the video [on this topic] was well done … just the visuals and the sounds, and they went ‘wow’ and you can see them react to it and as I said many of them have only been here for a very short class and every teacher is committed to the Koori background.

Yet another reported:

At the beginning of the video, where it plays the national anthem, I suddenly realised that the video was about to start and had the national anthem playing, I just stopped the tape and asked, ‘What’s that music?’ They didn’t know.

One teacher in interview noted that, while the materials gave her ‘a fair bit of liberty to do the things that we would normally do in terms of introducing different aspects of Australia’, she was concerned to ‘present the features of the country without it being caricatures’. She considered that the materials ‘did a good job’ in that regard, especially in trying to be ‘equitable as far as the states were concerned’. Another teacher felt ‘Australia and its people’ was the only unit he didn’t cover to his satisfaction, ‘because it’s such a wide and diverse issue’.

Teachers also often focused considerable attention on areas of their own interest and what they consider important for citizens to know. For example, one teacher reported:

It’s a particular interest I have but it’ll be nice, I suppose, if I have more time to show more things about birds or even plants and trees and how unique and special they are. I think there’s a sense of specialness of this particular place, it’s worth also … perhaps it’s to instil a bit of awe about what a strange, dry, fragile land this is; plus and the society built on it – it needs to be, in some sense I guess, integrated with it.

Australia’s government

Fewer students, although still a majority (75.3%), felt they had learned ‘a lot’ about Australia’s government, a finding borne out by student and teacher comments about the difficulty of this subject matter. Only 34 of the 527 (or 6.5%)
students thought they had learned ‘not very much’, while 95 or 18.2% felt they had learned ‘a little’.

Teacher and student interviews revealed areas that students found most interesting about Australia’s government. One teacher noted:

Some of them start off by saying they’re not interested in politics, and the course is very good I think in introducing people to the notion that politics is about what happens in your street. So the local government stuff is new to them, how they can actually contribute. So I had people moving from ‘I’m not interested in politics’ through to becoming really quite engaged and involved in discussions about how people contribute to all these processes of civic responsibility.

Ten of the students interviewed found information about government to be interesting/surprising. Several expressed surprise at jury duty, one being unsure whether she really wanted to take on such a responsibility. As one student noted:

But I feel for people who don’t speak well English. It’s maybe it’s difficult but it’s O.K., it’s part of rules we have to pass.

Others expressed surprise at voting being mandatory and many were very interested in the freedoms/equality that both citizens and residents have. The same student who expressed doubts about her ability to serve on a jury went on to say:

At eighteen years old you have right to vote, and you are sure that your vote is coming at right place ... not like in my country, you vote for one man and for next day they said you vote for another.

Another student expressed surprise at voting being compulsory:

Voting is not free here. For me is not very usual, cause in my country in Iran, if a person want to vote and don’t want, don’t vote.

Several teachers had class discussions comparing Australia’s system with those from which the students had come. Many of the students were impressed with Australia’s system, as reported by one teacher during interview:

... and some of them from places like South America and Chinese speaking countries, South East Asian places, they have voting systems similar to ours and so on, but I found them comparing, ‘O h, we have something like that but it doesn’t work as well as that here in Australia’. One person said we’re supposed to have that but everything is corrupt, and had to come to terms with here that’s not corrupt.

Another teacher, however, found that her CSWE I students did not really respond very much to the content on government because ‘they all found it a bit overwhelming’. This was in contrast to issues they did find fascinating, such as freedom of religion.

**Australia’s laws**

Even fewer students (64.5%) felt they had learned ‘a lot’ about Australia’s laws, a finding also confirmed in student and teacher interviews and comments on the difficulty of this topic. However, only 40 of the 527 (7.8%) students felt they had learned ‘not very much’, with 27.7% stating they had learned ‘a little’ about Australia’s laws.

A number (17) of students interviewed found the law interesting/surprising. One student, when asked what he found most interesting, stated:

Especially the law and the democracy, apply to Australia here. Everyone is considered to be equal and right to equal treatment and structures of laws. Yeah I think that is the most important.

Another student, commenting on both law and freedom, expressed it this way:

What I find most interesting is the laws of Australia, and the most important is to know the laws of Australia and the people of Australia. I think the law express to how you take care of yourself, if you are, if you misuse your life, yes, so you misuse the law. But if you respect yourself, also you respect the laws. What I found very interesting here is that here people are treated equally ... and there is a freedom for women.

Another student, also stating his interest in the law, expressed it this way:

Voting is not free here. For me is not very usual, cause in my country in Iran, if a person want to vote and don’t want, don’t vote.

Several teachers had class discussions comparing Australia’s system with those from which the students had come. Many of the students were impressed with Australia’s system, as reported by one teacher during interview:

... and some of them from places like South America and Chinese speaking countries, South East Asian places, they have voting systems similar to ours and so on, but I found them comparing, ‘O h, we have something like that but it doesn’t work as well as that here in Australia’. One person said we’re supposed to have that but everything is corrupt, and had to come to terms with here that’s not corrupt.

Another teacher, however, found that her CSWE I students did not really respond very much to the content on government because ‘they all found it a bit overwhelming’. This was in contrast to issues they did find fascinating, such as freedom of religion.

**Australia’s laws**

Even fewer students (64.5%) felt they had learned ‘a lot’ about Australia’s laws, a finding also confirmed in student and teacher interviews and comments on the difficulty of this topic. However, only 40 of the 527 (7.8%) students felt they had learned ‘not very much’, with 27.7% stating they had learned ‘a little’ about Australia’s laws.

A number (17) of students interviewed found the law interesting/surprising. One student, when asked what he found most interesting, stated:

Especially the law and the democracy, apply to Australia here. Everyone is considered to be equal and right to equal treatment and structures of laws. Yeah I think that is the most important.

Another student, commenting on both law and freedom, expressed it this way:

What I find most interesting is the laws of Australia, and the most important is to know the laws of Australia and the people of Australia. I think the law express to how you take care of yourself, if you are, if you misuse your life, yes, so you misuse the law. But if you respect yourself, also you respect the laws. What I found very interesting here is that here people are treated equally ... and there is a freedom for women.

Another student, also stating his interest in the law, expressed it this way:

Voting is not free here. For me is not very usual, cause in my country in Iran, if a person want to vote and don’t want, don’t vote.

Several teachers had class discussions comparing Australia’s system with those from which the students had come. Many of the students were impressed with Australia’s system, as reported by one teacher during interview:

... and some of them from places like South America and Chinese speaking countries, South East Asian places, they have voting systems similar to ours and so on, but I found them comparing, ‘O h, we have something like that but it doesn’t work as well as that here in Australia’. One person said we’re supposed to have that but everything is corrupt, and had to come to terms with here that’s not corrupt.
Yet another teacher noted her students’ interest in and surprise at the jury system:

I can think of one example that generated a lot of interest and it was when we were talking about how the court system works. A lot of them coming from various places where they don’t have a, they’re supposed to come from democracy but it doesn’t work very well perhaps.

Another teacher, commenting on their interest in the unit on law, tied it to their rights:

Last week with the law, there were quite a lot of questions about everyday situations like noise in flats and aggressive dogs and they were really interested in that ... If someone is selling the flat you’re living, do you have rights etc ... I do a lot of anecdotal stuff - trying to contextualise this issue of why become an Australian Citizen. I’m not sure whether this is convincing about the advantages of becoming one. You can vote, and I try to link it to having the power of influence if you want to do it, it comes through all the time - your rights, your privileges, your responsibilities.

Responsibilities and privileges of Australian Citizenship

Despite the reported abstract nature and difficulty of this subject (see below for comments), a large majority (87.1%) of students felt they had learned ‘a lot’ about the responsibilities and privileges of Australian Citizenship, with only 22 (4.4%) feeling they had learned ‘not very much’, 43 or 8.5% of students said they learned ‘a little’ about the responsibilities and privileges of Australian Citizenship.

In interview, students expressed interest in the fact that the laws of Australia applied to them as residents, especially laws that protected their freedom and equality. Much of the difficult language was a result of legislation about Australian Citizenship and the requirement that the sections on privileges and responsibilities be written in the language of the legislation so as to avoid ambiguity. However, teachers paraphrased to help their students understand. As one teacher explained in interview:

I spent a lot of time on that unit [4: Rights, responsibilities and privileges]. There were probably times where the explanations were perhaps in terms or language that didn’t help them to understand, so you had to bring it down to sort of everyday kind of situation, to explain what responsibilities or rights or whatever.

One teacher interviewed indicated that her students were interested in this topic:

The privileges of Australian Citizens they really appreciated more because in their countries they don’t have privileges. One of my students, I think from Bosnia, he said no, he did not have any citizenship. I thought he meant that ‘I was from nowhere, I was from Bosnia, but was a refugee in Germany and I can’t be a citizen in Germany’ and they are happy to be in Australia because I can be a citizen. So many of them, all those things, because I asked them at the end of the course to write some, ah, there were questions and they had to write an essay about what does becoming an Australian Citizen mean to you, and everybody says it means a lot to them and they’re doing this course reinforced their desire to become citizens.

Comparison of learning in the four topic areas

A very clear majority of students responding to the questionnaire found the course helped them learn ‘a lot’ in every category (Table 19). However, they found the course helped them less in the more abstract and complex areas such as law and government, a finding supported by the interview data for both teachers and students. Interestingly, many students found these more abstract and less familiar topics of great interest (as noted above in student comments on law and government).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student perception of how much unit helped them learn</th>
<th>Responsibilities &amp; privileges</th>
<th>Australia</th>
<th>Australia’s government</th>
<th>Australia’s laws</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very much</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students interviewed commented on their general impressions of the course, with many (36) responding about the usefulness of learning about citizenship and living in Australia as follows:
It's useful for everyone, if you want to become citizen or you want to know about the government and citizenship.

This course made me more understand about everything, about citizenship. So, I'm pretty happy with that.

I can't learn the lesson off the sheet or from the neighbour.

This course is very useful for me. Not only for me, for all the people who want to live here, they must be, I think, they must learn this course.

Before this course, I didn't know about citizenship. I didn't know what's the difference between permanent residency or citizenship. Since I learned this course, I just found out the benefit of citizenship and I started think very seriously about becoming an Australian Citizen.

### Difficulty of the four content areas

Another four questions asked explicitly about the difficulty of the four content areas, the statistics for which can be seen in Table 20 (page 62). Just as students found the more abstract and less familiar areas of the course less helpful for their learning, so too they found these topics more difficult, as reported in the questionnaire data. However, in the interview data - mostly when they were asked about what they found difficult - students referred to language, especially vocabulary, rather than content. Often when they did comment on the difficulty of content, they elaborated, saying that their teachers helped them to understand it. Their teachers, on the other hand, did refer to the difficulty of the abstract concepts for their students and the difficulty of trying to help them understand.

### Australia and its people

The vast majority (91.5%) of students found this topic 'not very difficult' and only four of the 527 (0.8%) students found it 'very difficult' while 40 (7.7%) found the topic 'difficult'. Not surprisingly, given that this topic was not considered very difficult by the majority, it was also considered interesting and many students wanted more information on this topic.

### Australia's government

Fewer students (75.5%) found this topic 'not very difficult', 118 (22.8%) found this topic 'difficult' and only nine of the 527 (1.7%) found it 'very difficult'.

Several teachers commented in interview that students wondered whether Australian-born citizens knew this much information, as one teacher interviewed said:

I think the government, the Australian government, the unit, I cannot remember the unit but it was a bit dense that one. They were thinking, that it's too much knowledge, do I really need all this to become citizen and do the normal Australian Citizens themselves know these sort of things.

Another teacher commented on the difficulty of getting across the concepts of the Australian voting system, especially preferential voting. One of the students interviewed with an interpreter said (in the interpreter's words):

The one [unit] on the government is hard. The rest was quite OK, like rights and responsibilities, just the one on the government. The law wasn't that hard and you have to learn to obey the law - you can't break rules like 'no smoking', that sort of thing.

### Australia's laws

Compared with the unit on Australia's government, slightly fewer (73.7%) students found the topic of Australian laws 'not very difficult', and more students (16 of the 527 or 3.1%) found it 'very difficult'. Almost the same amount (120 or 23.2%) found it 'difficult'.

Teachers interviewed noted the difficulty of the concepts concerning the Australian legal system. One teacher commented on her students' difficulty understanding the jury system:

They couldn't understand the concept of lay people, if you like, being part of our law, our legal system. For example, citizens who have no legal training, being on a jury. That was an extremely difficult concept for them to cope with - if they haven't had any legal training, how can they judge somebody. I had a lot of difficulty explaining that it was the solicitors in the court and the judge who dealt with the legal aspects, and that the jury probably just get the facts and have to judge on the facts.

On of the students interviewed also commented that the unit on Australia's legal system was difficult.

### Responsibilities and privileges of Australian Citizenship

Students overwhelmingly (93.8%) found this topic 'not very difficult' with only seven of the 527 (1.4%) finding it 'very difficult' and 25 (4.9%) finding...
it ‘difficult’. In interview, a couple of students commented that this unit was difficult, but that their teacher’s explanations helped them to understand.

**Comparison of perceived difficulty of the four topic areas**

Somewhat surprisingly, the ‘responsibilities and privileges of citizens’ topic was found the least difficult (93.8% ‘not very difficult’), just ahead of ‘Australia and its people’ (91.5% ‘not very difficult’). This may reflect in part the relative interest of students, with many wanting to learn their prospective rights and responsibilities, and teachers’ desire to ensure their learners were familiar with this section of the course. Compared to these high percentages, almost one quarter of students found the section on Australia’s laws difficult, with 3.1% finding this topic ‘very difficult’ with marginally fewer giving a similar response to Australia’s system of government (24.5% ‘difficult’ or ‘very difficult’). But, as one teacher who recognised the difficulty of the concepts noted:

> We really are seeing a lot more of the basic settlement issues than we used to see before. I think that’s why some of these African guys are having such problems with a few of these concepts because they really only have just arrived. And they’ve come from days of fleeing through the bush to escape, and suddenly they’re confronted with this course that says freedom of speech and innocent until proven guilty. And should we wonder why it’s hard for them to understand these concepts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student perception of level of difficulty (N=527)</th>
<th>Responses of total as a percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibilities &amp; privileges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very difficult</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very difficult</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data from the questionnaire as tabulated in Table 20 are supported by the interview data. Students mostly said that the new vocabulary was difficult and that the areas of law and government were the most difficult. When asked what changes they’d like to the course content, they answered as follows (the number in brackets is the number who made this suggestion):

- More information on Australia (N =13) eg on culture and society, geography, general facts/information.
- More information on the law (N =7) eg social law, everyday law.
- More information on history (N =4).
- More information on the government (N =5).
- More information on politics and political parties (N =4) eg party differences and ideology.
- Information on general services/benefits (N =5) eg education, employment, hospitals, family assistance.
- More information on rights and responsibilities (N =2).
- Permanent resident vs citizenship information/benefits (N =1).
- Practical information on how to vote (N =1).
- More information on Aboriginals (N =1).

So, while students may have found some of the content challenging, they also found it interesting and sufficiently intriguing to want more.

**Student perception of achievement of course objectives**

**Questionnaire findings**

The final two questions asked of students addressed the parallel course objectives: improving students’ English and helping them to become Australian Citizens. Students overwhelmingly responded positively to both goals (Tables 21 and 22). Teachers also felt that their students had learned both language and content (see below for comments). However, one teacher who taught a particularly linguistically able CSWE III class felt that she would have preferred the materials to have gone into ‘the really gutsy such as about politics and history and less of the language’, but realised that for CSWE I, language would have been an important priority.

One teacher interviewed discussed how she would tie the course to CSWE competencies when she next taught the course:

> I would be saying to my students, ‘I’m going to tie the CSWE’s competencies into this material’, and I think the materials very much lend themselves to that, and it would give the opportunity to, for example...
for Unit 6, you’ve got telephoning for an application form, that’s one of the CSWE competencies - transactional phone call - so you’d look ahead and see what outcomes you can achieve through that.

Even the bilingual teacher interviewed noted the importance of English, as the following exchange demonstrates:

Teacher: Yes, because the materials are good; the workbook, the tapes, everything's good. However, it's still a bit difficult when we look at the language for a Level 1 class.

Interviewer: That's the English?

Teacher: Yes, that's right. And we also want to teach them some English, not just the knowledge, because ...

Interviewer: They're in an English class.

Teacher: That's right. And one of the conditions for becoming a citizen is that they have to show they have basic English language ...

Interviewer: That's right.

Teacher: So we do have to look after that area.

The structure of the questions does not permit any evaluation of the extent to which the course did improve students’ English (only their perception of their improvement), or whether the difficulty of the course content for some impeded their progress in language learning.

Table 21 Student perception of improvement in English due to citizenship course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helped improve English</th>
<th>No. of students</th>
<th>% of students</th>
<th>Valid % of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>100.0*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounding error

Table 22 Student perception of value of course in making decisions about Australian Citizenship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Helped decide to become a citizen</th>
<th>No. of students</th>
<th>% of students</th>
<th>Valid % of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already citizen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already decided</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course confirmed decision</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No effect</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haven’t decided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview

Of the 50 students interviewed, 37 stated that the course helped them make a decision about becoming a citizen or were planning to become a citizen, while almost two-thirds (30) thought it had improved their English, one of whom stated in response to the interviewer’s question: So do you think you learned very much English as well?

Yes, yes because when I was in English class, it's not so interesting as the other subjects but in this subject very interested and I very, I was very interesting Australian and I learned a lot of things.

Several (seven) also commented that it had helped their understanding of the news.

One student, who was interviewed through an interpreter, explained how the course had helped her know how to apply for citizenship:

She said: ‘Before doing this course, no idea at all. But now I know one of the procedure, how to fill in the form and all that about citizenship.’

One of the teachers interviewed observed that the course had affected her students’ views on becoming an Australian Citizen:
One interesting thing was, in the very last session we were talking about the course and becoming a citizen and they were asking me what I felt about being a citizen and when did I decide and talking about whether you can have dual citizenship or not ... but some of them were saying the course had made them really think about it and some of them felt they would like to become citizens as soon as possible. And others were having to really consider when they would be ready to [because] maybe they had a clear understanding of what it meant. It wasn't just an automatic sort of thing. You know, talking about the defence of Australia, that was, people were saying well, 'who are our enemies?'

Another teacher said her students were worried about some of the responsibilities of citizenship:

Yeah, and they're worried about that [jury duty]. They really don't want, they want just to become citizens, to be citizens, to be ... the community, well you don't need to. But they are really worried about that part and some of them were worried about voting. The voting system, the issues, well I said to one of them 'Why would you like to apply?' they said 'Yes, but we are a little bit worried in jury, that bit' and he said they it's not in their culture, it's going to take them a long time before they ...

Teachers' perceptions of student learning of content

Teachers were asked on the questionnaire to Briefly comment on the extent of learning by students in each unit. They were asked to complete a chart (see Figure 2 in Chapter 7) commenting on various aspects of the materials and content for each of the topic areas. The comments on materials are reported in Chapter 7. The comments on content are reported here.

Overall, teachers who responded to the questionnaire felt that students had acquired considerable understanding of the course content, despite its difficulty. Table 23 summarises teachers' comments from the part of the chart which asked for comments on each of the four content areas in terms of materials used, learning activities, extent of content learning and usefulness of DIMIA materials. Teachers' comments on the extent of content learning have been categorised into three areas: learned a lot (includes comments such as 'high level of learning', 'extensive learning', 'very good'), adequate (includes comments such as 'basic understanding', 'some knowledge gained', 'concepts difficult to understand'), and limited (includes comments such as 'minimal', 'very little'). Some teachers interpreted this question to mean 'level of student interest'. Those who interpreted the question this way stated that learners were 'motivated', 'they were engaged', 'much enthusiasm', and 'class interested'. Others interpreted it to mean what aspects of the topic students had learned. Teachers also noted the difficulty of answering this question since they were not required to conduct any formal assessment of student learning of content. However, it was possible to group these comments into the overall categories. Totals are not the same as the total number of teachers who responded to the questionnaire (69). Five teachers did not respond to this question at all and several others did not respond to some units within this question.

Interestingly, teachers perceived that it was the section on Australia and its people that students learned most from, with 35 saying their students learned 'a lot'. This contrasts with student perceptions, as students felt they had learned more about the responsibilities and privileges of Australian Citizenship' (see Table 19, page 59). Student ranking of their learning was (in order from highest to lowest): responsibilities and privileges, Australia and its people, Australia's government, Australia's laws. Teachers, while feeling that students did understand the section on responsibilities and privileges, were concerned that 'most of the students were unfamiliar with citizenship matters. They were happy and interested to learn, but the huge amount of material was too much'.

Table 23 Teachers' perception of extent of student learning of content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher perception of extent of learning</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned a lot</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited (too difficult)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As well as asking teachers to complete a chart in which they commented on each of the four content areas in terms of materials used, learning activities, extent of content learning and usefulness of DIMIA materials, teachers were also asked
I feel they have benefited a great deal from this course. It has been informative, interesting and the students enjoyed the discussion groups we held. It also gave the students the opportunity to present and give their opinions in front of the class.

Students were very committed to extending their knowledge, particularly in government and law.

Students continually expressed that they were so thankful to be learning so much information about their ‘new’ country. My teaching style included reviewing previous lessons by questioning about course content – students generally displayed comprehensive knowledge of course subject matter.

They became fully aware of how they can be eligible for Australian Citizenship, understood Australian civic values, enjoyed singing the anthem and learning of the national symbols of Australia. Found Unit 3 [government] too difficult but managed to understand this through diagrams etc. In general, the students have become well grounded on how they can be effective citizens.

The students have learned very clearly the different responsibilities and privileges of being an Australian Citizen. They are also very keen to know the Australian history, its people, and particularly, their own eligibility for citizenship.

Conceptually the course is difficult but very informative. Students learned new information (rights and privileges, jury duty, voting) with interesting discussion and comparisons to their own countries.

Students were really committing themselves to the course – feeling that they understood a lot more about Australia after the course.

Class evaluations indicated that knowledge of subject matter ranged from average to very high.

I believe students gained much invaluable knowledge about citizenship.

The response of the students, their interest and appreciation as well as the quiz at the end indicate that a lot was learned and with the workbook they will have the possibility to consolidate.

The information provided was very relevant and useful for this level.
The students were able to acknowledge the need to familiarise themselves with certain aspects of Australian culture and the responsibilities attached to being an Australian Citizen.

My particular group of students (mainly young, well motivated, advanced, educated learners) showed an excellent grasp of the curriculum (particularly citizenship issues which was the main focus). The more advanced learners chose to engage with the materials in English first and coped very well for the main part.

High students were highly interested in the course content.

**Progress**

Six of the 40 teachers who were most positive about the extent of content learning reported that their class comprised or included CSWE I students, including two bilingual classes. Their comments indicate that even these lower proficiency learners acquired content knowledge:

The self assessment was very positive by all my students.

I believe the students gained a good knowledge of the course subject.

The students have learned very clearly the different responsibilities and privileges of being an Australian Citizen. They are also very keen to know the Australian history, its people, and particularly, their own eligibility for citizenship. More time to discuss and explore issues would be beneficial.

Bilingual support helped students understand.

Students understood basic responsibilities, rights, laws and the democratic process and ceremony.

Students found the course very useful in terms of learning a new subject [i.e. Australian Citizenship].

In addition to the 40 teachers who were most positive about the extent of content learning, a further 15 teachers felt that, despite the difficulty of the course, their students had made significant strides in their understanding of the concepts and were making progress, as indicated by the representative sample of comments below:

Although the concepts are very difficult at this level [Level 1] students gained acceptable knowledge of the subject.

Many of the students were unfamiliar with citizenship matters and found it useful. They progressively gained important information.

When the students first started the course their knowledge about citizenship was almost nil. However, due to diligent study and extra work outside class their knowledge has increased a lot.

They did show an understanding of Australian Citizenship, its responsibilities and privileges, Australian government, laws, elections, reasons they have for seeking citizenship.

All students learned something - about Australia and its people particularly. They realise now that citizenship carries responsibilities as well as gives privileges.

Several teachers remarked that there was no formal assessment of content learning, and that they were judging by appearances only. DIMIA had deliberately chosen not to have teachers assess content since AMEP teachers are language teachers, not necessarily experts in assessing citizenship content. Teachers’ perceptions were that learners appeared to have made progress in content understanding:

No formal assessment - but many were clearly able to demonstrate/discuss an increased understanding.

The course was not formally assessed. My own observations were that the students found parts of the course more relevant than others, and struggled with the new texts. They had a much broader understanding of Australian society by the end.

As far as could be ascertained students understood facts and concepts.

Students appeared to have an increased understanding on what it actually means to be an Australian Citizen.

The more concrete the core information, the more easily it was ‘digested’ - or so it appeared. Information on laws and regulations was always treated with great interest - did they see these as having a direct impact on their lives here?

Comprehensive to my knowledge, though no formal testing was done.

Some others qualified their responses, emphasising the possibility that students knew the fundamentals, or basic concepts, but possibly little more:
Most of the students were diligent and keen and mastered the fundamentals of the course.

Students said they had gained understanding generally of main issues involved.

Students understood the basic concepts of all units but not in detail.

I think students gained an awareness of the subject matter, but, in general, no depth of understanding.

I believe that the students (except those for whom no L1 fact sheets were available) generally understood the course subject matter reasonably well.

I feel the students mastered the subject matter satisfactorily, whether they can espouse the values of respect and tolerance, which are included in citizenship, and acceptance and multiculturalism and reconciliation in the full sense of those terms is another matter.

**Too hard for some students**

More than half of the teachers who assessed the course content as being too difficult, were teaching classes that included CSWE I students:

Students needed to rely heavily on translated fact sheets. They all improved their knowledge re citizenship but found the content very daunting.

With Level 1 students, to understand the course content well they would need either 1) bilingual support eg L1 materials/instructions, or 2) more simplified course book and tapes.

The material in my opinion was too difficult for Level 1.

A lot of knowledge gained but too much in a short period of time.

Limited by low level learners.

Comments at some higher levels also reflected hesitation about the extent of learning:

The knowledge acquired varied enormously according to the attitude of student. Subject matter was very great.

Huge - for many students these were very new concepts and the vocabulary was quite difficult.

The content of the curriculum was useful but the students commented that ‘too much reading’ was involved.

**Teachers’ comments on student language learning**

Consistent with teachers’ generally positive attitudes to the course, were many positive comments about language learning outcomes. Teachers were asked to comment in terms of language (including vocabulary, structures and syntax of English and relevant genres) learned. The following comments illustrate their opinions of the extent of student language learning.

*Quite appropriate selection of learning materials. Vocabulary, grammar and syntax – right level.*

*The course provided many opportunities for language learning but some students were struggling with the level of the workbook.*

*It was good – especially the pronunciation.*

*Good for language learning. Students keen to try any reading and writing associated with citizenship. Workbooks were treasured.*

*Material provided a good stimulus for reading and writing extension materials.*

*Very useful for general language development.*

*In general the course helped the students to improve their English.*

*The units incorporated every aspect of language learning eg reading, writing, listening, speaking, discussion, group and pair work, comprehension, vocal development, pronunciation, structures, conducting surveys, researching information, self-assessment, comprehension, CSWE competencies Level 1.*

*I believe that the students have benefited a lot from the activities presented in the course book.*

*Structures/syntax was generally good. I would have liked more time to develop this area more thoroughly.*

Perhaps because it was the area of greatest difficulty for lower level students, the vast majority of the teacher responses concerning student language learning were about vocabulary. Thirty of the 69 teachers commented on increased familiarity with the language/vocabulary of Australian Citizenship, as the following comments indicate:
Vocabulary development was very good to excellent.

Students learned many new words and were more confident using them in their casual conversations.

Some language development - especially vocabulary and skills (eg listening with the tapes).

Some also mentioned that improved pronunciation accompanied practising new words:

It was good - especially the pronunciation. There were many words that needed to be repeated a few times before they could get it right. They are quite useful and important words eg democracy, privileges, legal etc.

The course certainly extended their vocabulary and improved their pronunciation.

Class evaluations indicated learning:

- Vocabulary - very high.
- Pronunciation improvement - very high.
- Other average improvements.

The fact that vocabulary was ‘new, interesting, hard’ and ‘very formal and loaded with abstract vocabulary’ meant that other learning had to take second place for many students:

Increased vocabulary considerably - didn’t really explore genres or elaborate on grammar etc.

Vocabulary was covered and learned adequately, but other items were treated in passing.

However, syntax, structures, and genres took a back seat due to demand on understanding new vocabulary.

Some key vocabulary was learned. Learning of new structures and syntax was difficult to gauge.

More emphasis on grammatical structures and rules of genres/text types would be useful.

Students did learn some vocabulary, improved their listening, but most of the time was spent on learning content. There was not enough time to get the most out of each unit in terms of language learning.

At CSWE II level, students ‘learned a lot of new vocabulary’ and developed their ‘ability to use it in context’. However, in the view of another teacher, while the language in Workbook 2 was at the right level for high Level 2 students, ‘average students or slow pacers would need the vocabulary explained in order that comprehension by the students takes place’.

At CSWE II level, one teacher found ‘this area was more difficult to assess – students were at disparate levels’. Another referred only to ‘some language development - especially vocabulary and skills (eg listening with the tapes)’.

In general, advanced students and those of higher educational backgrounds appear to have taken the materials in their stride and to have benefited most:

- They found the course useful and educational and approached the course as part of their English curriculum.
- Activities similar to any other Level 3 materials covering macro skills.
- At Cert 3 [CSWE III] the students are familiar with the various structures, syntax of English and genres used in the workbooks.
- At Level 3, students tackled language exercises with relative ease but time did not allow for any assessment - nor do I think that’s necessary.
- Having had only Level 3 students I have formed the opinion that this course is most valuable at this level. They bring to the learning situation sufficient language skills to participate in the subject - discuss, share and develop a greater freedom to participate in discussion, reading, researching, living in Australia with understanding and the possibility of participating.

For a high Level 3, the language, vocabulary and grammar was very appropriate.

Indeed, some teachers found the materials did not extend the most advanced students:

- The material was enjoyable but didn’t really extend this strong Stage 3 class.
- Language learning reinforced structures already encountered.
At the lower levels, teachers mostly commented on language difficulties, especially vocabulary:

Most Level 1 students had found the amount and complexity of language printed in the book and tapes overwhelming. As a teacher, I had to selectively focus on teaching the most essential vocabulary/structures which were important for their understanding of the subject matter.

The vocabulary was difficult especially for one student who didn’t have access to any dictionary or grammar in her language. A lot more time was needed for discussion when the topic was unfamiliar, e.g. Australian political parties: Unit 4, Ex 12.

Language had to be simplified throughout. Role-plays necessary.

Struggled with vocabulary – it’s quite a leap from ‘eat’, ‘go’ to ‘pledge’, ‘responsibility’.

Most of the vocabulary required extensive explanation.

One teacher commented extensively on the difficulties experienced even by some of her faster paced students:

Students were familiar with genres and activities from their classroom CSWE study so this was a great help to them. This enabled them to understand the difficult concepts a little. Some students had a greater knowledge of language, some to a lesser degree. For two students much was difficult (no L2 dictionary). Workbooks: students were familiar with activities but many texts were far too dense. I had to simplify these for them. Fact sheets were too dense even in L1.

Teachers of mixed classes also noted difficulties with language:

Time constraints (just 20 hours for six units) didn’t allow for much practice or consolidation. Therefore, real language outcomes were probably somewhat limited.

With a lot of hard work and with the help of dictionaries, L1 fact sheets and the video, as well as teacher explanation, the students managed reasonably well.

Less of this [language learning] achieved. I feel the course was best taught for its content. Students wanted things explained more than language tasks which sometimes seemed a distraction from the content.

Overall, the language of the workbook was within the students’ reach, but some concepts were difficult to explore because of language difficulties.

The language is very formal and loaded with abstract vocabulary. [So] The language was brought down to their level of understanding and the abstract vocabulary explained in very simple language.

Some teachers felt communicative competence was improved:

I think listening skills benefited greatly.

The extra discussions I inserted improved their communicative competence as they were motivated to talk about what was meaningful to them.

At this level (Level 2) there was a large amount of vocabulary to learn, pronunciation, spelling checks etc, and recycling of the vocabulary. This class focused on listening tasks to develop understanding of spoken English.

Negative assessment of language learning

A small minority of teachers concluded that the dual objectives of the course were such that there may have been little language learning:

Because the term was short (only 7 x 2.5 hr sessions), I think language learning would be minimal, but students did become familiar with the language/vocabulary of the Australian Citizenship (e.g. responsibilities, privileges).

Not enough time for actual language learning at ASLPR below 1+, in 20 hours, only enough time to get ‘facts’ across.

The content of subject matter was too large to allow much time for too much language development, apart from natural absorption.

The course provided many opportunities for language learning but some students were struggling with the level of the workbook. But time constraints prevented intensive language teaching.

At CSWE II level, one teacher found that ‘the students did not really extend their knowledge of language structures, because the text didn’t present them with anything new’.
Bilingual classes
Teachers in bilingual classes were focused on the content, and language learning was not a priority:

- In a bilingual class it was concepts and content rather than language focus.
- Being bilingual classes, students did not have a lot of time for language learning as their level was low and the amount of information was enormous.

Teachers’ ‘other’ comments
Teachers were invited to comment in general terms on the course. This gave them an important opportunity to highlight those aspects of the course, its philosophy and its delivery that seemed most important to them. Of the 69 respondents 49 made additional comments on the course. Some of the teachers’ comments below apply differently to different levels, even where this is not specified.

Two views stand out among teachers’ general comments on the course. They were overwhelmingly supportive of it, but found it extremely challenging – even too demanding for CSWE I students and, in the view of some, even for lower CSWE II students.

Enthusiasm for the course
Of the 49 teachers who made general comments 24 chose to mention the fact that they and their students had very positive experiences of the course. The word ‘enjoyment’ occurred frequently.

- All enjoyed it and felt it was worthwhile.
- Both myself and the students enjoyed the course. Many meaningful discussions were generated through students’ questions and/or my anecdotes.
- An excellent course.
- I felt all students enjoyed the course.
- Overall the course is a pleasure to teach and very well resourced.
- The course was very successful. Students enjoyed every minute of it.
- Thoroughly enjoyed teaching it.

- I believe this was a very good course, and was very well appreciated by the students, who showed great interest.
- I enjoyed teaching the course and found the materials valuable.
- Generally though, I thought the course was extremely well produced and informative, as did the students.
- Students’ feedback was positive, they enjoyed all aspects of learning the content of this course. Overall I found the course excellent, the students have always been appreciative of it and I thoroughly enjoyed teaching it.

Even where students were described as slower paced learners, aged mainly between 30 and 60 years, ‘all said they enjoyed learning about Australian history, people and government’.

Against this overwhelmingly positive background, there was a widespread view that the course was very demanding for students with lower English proficiency and that more time could usefully be allocated to the course. While specific experience in teaching the course at CSWE I level produced the most comments and suggestions, even teachers of more advanced classes anticipated or sympathised with colleagues who were teaching CSWE I learners:

- I suspect Level 1 is very difficult and may need to be simplified.

Typical comments from CSWE I teachers included:

- For Cert 1 [CSWE I] students this was a very difficult course. This group of students had minimal educational background in L1. They understood by discussion and listening, but the amount of reading was far beyond them.
- While students were interested for the most part and attendance was good, the extent of learning is limited for the low level learning students.
- The workbook and concepts were a bit above Level 1.
- Only those who were particularly interested in politics/government were able to cope with the density of the content material at Level 1.
- While I believe Level 1 should not be disadvantaged with the citizenship course (especially because some students remain in Level 1 for their entire 510 hours so they should be offered the course), however
One teacher commented that, for really able students:
The discussion points were not interesting. The students weren’t intro-
duced, or offered an opportunity through the text to find out for
themselves information. I think a self-study component in each chapter
would be interesting.

For these advanced students materials could easily be expanded upon by teachers who had no time constraints,
and whose classes/students indicated a desire to follow-up or expand
on the topics covered.

Suggestions
A number of teachers suggested strategies for addressing the difficulties experi-
enced by lower-level students (see also Chapter 7 for suggestions for materials):

I think if the course is to be taught to [CSWE Level 1] students, it
should be to those with adequate education in L1.

Copies of the tapes would probably be helpful to these students.
The course also needs to be spread out during the week, so that the
[L1] students are not given too much at one time.

For Level 1 students bilingual teacher or bilingual support enhances
learning and saves time.

My Level 1 group found some of the course at an appropriate level
but much was too difficult, however, this was overcome with the use
of OHT’s, discussion, and whole group answering.

Overall for Level 1/low literacy in first language students the fact
sheets in first language should be in simplified L1.

Clarification of course objective
While teachers held very positive attitudes to the course and citizenship, some
teachers mentioned the dilemma they faced between focusing on language
learning as in other courses, and the content and understanding objectives of the
citizenship course:

The course attempted to combine CSWE learning outcomes and
grammar points in with the topic. Usually these points were too basic
or, for the students, they seemed to be unrelated to the course content.
The students were more interested in learning the rights and responsi-
bilities alone without the English content.
If I were to teach the course again at this level I would give less attention to the language learning aspect, and more attention to discussion.

**Student learning about Australia**

General comments on this topic were uniformly positive, but add little to answers to the specific questions:

- All students, even those who found this challenging, learned something about Australia, citizenship and/or vocabulary.
- The issues dealt with are very important - enormously so in today's society, but I felt that it was only possible to treat them superficially.
- The students are now well informed and can be effective citizens later on.

**Summary**

Students and teachers alike enjoyed and were interested in the content and found it useful for their lives in Australia. The largest obstacle to understanding of the content was the abstractness of much of the content and its unfamiliarity, even in L1, for many of the students who came from non-democratic systems of government.

While teachers thought their students learned most about Australia and its people, students felt they had learned most about responsibilities and privileges - although these differences were not great. Perhaps these different perceptions are more the result of different goals and different perceptions of necessary learning on the part of teachers and students. For students focused on becoming citizens or deciding whether to become citizens, the unit on responsibilities and privileges is likely to be considered most important, and learners perhaps felt they'd learned enough for their requirements. However, teachers may have expected complete mastery of this quite demanding material and have been frustrated by the level of language required for legislative reasons. Students and teachers agreed that the topics least well learned (but still largely understood) and difficult were the topics on Australia's laws and government.

Teachers in particular considered the material too difficult for CSWE I learners; yet, as some pointed out, many AMEP learners never progress beyond CSWE I before they have completed their allotted 510 hours and these students would be seriously disadvantaged if they were not offered the course. This was, in fact, one of the reasons DIMIA wanted course materials written at all three levels.

Teachers therefore recommended that simpler materials be available for CSWE I learners.

Some teachers were also concerned about the dual objectives of language and content, finding that in such a short course content took precedence and so perhaps language teaching and learning were put on hold, except for vocabulary. As one teacher noted:

> I think their main focus is content, so they sort of, sometimes I got the feeling that they couldn’t see the point of doing perhaps intonation.

However, in contrast, many teachers noted that students did develop vocabulary and improve their listening and pronunciation.

**Overall recommendations then are:**

- to continue to offer the course at CSWE I level, even though the language is better suited for CSWE II and II learners;
- to develop additional materials designed specifically to meet the needs of CSWE I learners;
- for teachers to focus more on content than language with lower level learners;
- to develop content under the topics of Australian law and government that are more closely tied to the lives of learners (eg rental laws).
Chapter 7: Student and teacher perspectives on the course materials

... because of the diversity of the materials, we can cater for different learning styles. (Teacher interviewed about the citizenship course)

For AMEP teachers, the provisions of integrated content materials was mostly a new experience. As discussed in Chapter 1, while the CSWE is the required curriculum for the AMEP, this is a framework and does not specify content. ‘For some [teachers], commercial materials deskil teachers, rob them of their capacity to think professionally and respond to their students ... For others, the role of teaching materials is potentially more positive’ (Crawford 1995: 25). One of our evaluation aims was to discover whether teachers accustomed to having integrated language and content materials provided, felt deskilled or found the citizenship materials useful and effective for their teaching of citizenship content.

Both teachers and students were asked to evaluate the materials. In the questionnaire, students were asked for their perceptions concerning the helpfulness of each type of material: workbook, L1 fact sheets, audiotapes, CD-ROM, video, classwork and explanations by the teacher, other (non-DIMIA) materials and other activities (e.g. excursions). Teachers were asked in the questionnaire (see Appendix 3) about their perceptions of the appropriacy of the various materials: workbooks, audiotapes, L1 fact sheets, video, CD-ROM, teachers’ guide. As well as judging appropriacy on a three-point scale, they were also invited to make comments. Just under half (32) of the 69 teachers responding to the questionnaire chose to make such additional comments, and even these did not comment on all the different materials. A further question in the teacher questionnaire (Q 7) asked teachers to identify materials used and types of learning activities, to comment on student learning of the content and on the usefulness and impact of the materials (data from the latter two categories were presented in Chapter 6). Students and teachers were also encouraged to comment on the materials in interviews. The sections in this chapter report on these findings.

The first section reports on student perceptions of the helpfulness of each type of material. The second reports on teachers’ perceptions of the appropriacy of each type of material, the third on the materials and the types of learning activities teachers used in each unit of the course. The fourth section reports on teachers’ perceptions of the usefulness and impact of the materials while the fifth section reports on supplementary materials teachers used. The final section lists the suggestions teachers made for additional materials to be provided.

Students’ perceptions of helpfulness of materials

Students were asked to rate their perception of the usefulness of the course materials on a three-point scale. The data show that the CD-ROM (which was used comparatively little) was the least useful resource, and that students perceived teachers themselves, together with the video and the workbook, to be the most useful learning materials, followed by the audio tapes and fact sheets (see Table 24, page 91).

Workbook

Since the workbook was provided for all students and provided the major resource for student activities, it is not surprising that only three (0.6%) of the 527 students said the workbooks were not used. The overwhelming majority (97.5%) found them ‘very useful’ (69.2%) or ‘useful’ (28.3%). Only ten (1.9%) found them ‘not very useful’.

Students interviewed also noted that the workbooks were helpful as the following comments indicate. Numbers in parentheses refer to the number of students responding this way.

• useful/helpful/good (N = 16)
  If I had a problem I looked at the book.

  I got lots of information from the workbook.

  I check the book, very, very good book. Very wide, very clearly ... very comprehensive, all the main ideas ... people can very clearly remember.

  Materials, the book was very good because it covered each part, like the first section we learned more about the flag and other things. We could not get this information from outside.

• easy/not difficult (N = 10)

• detailed/clear (N = 6)

• learned a lot/important information (N = 4)

• interesting/liked (N = 3)

• can revise (N = 1)
Fact sheets in L1 and English

Since the content of the course involves abstract concepts, includes complex, advanced vocabulary in English, and topics about which many immigrants and refugees are unfamiliar, it was decided to offer fact sheets for each unit in both English and community languages. It is, however, unrealistic to provide citizenship fact sheets in all the languages of students wishing to take the course, given the range of L1 spoken by AMEP clients. It can be seen from Table 8 (page 21) that there were a relatively large number of student respondents (16.3% of total) in the ‘other’ category for first or other language(s). This group includes students from 48 different language backgrounds, which highlights the high cost and impracticality of responding to student and teacher requests for fact sheets in every student language.

Fact sheets were available in 18 languages in Stage 1 and 22 in Stage 2. These languages reflect the major language backgrounds of recently arrived immigrant and refugee populations in Australia. Allowing for somewhat different ranking orders, the largest groups in the students surveyed during this study reflect all 18 of these languages with two exceptions: Assyrian and Somali speakers do not figure in the survey. Perhaps speakers of these languages listed in their survey responses languages of wider communication or education in their countries of birth. Often these other languages are seen as high status languages, for instance Assyrian speakers from Iraq may have listed Arabic as one of the languages they speak, but listed it first. On the other hand, Polish and Albanian backgrounds were marginally over-represented in the survey population.

Allowing for these marginal differences from the rankings in the total immigrant and refugee intakes in recent years, the L1 fact sheets catered for over three quarters of the students who responded to the questionnaire (75.5%). Adding translations in even a further ten languages would likely cater for no more than an additional 6.9% of students, leaving 17.6% with no such aid. Teacher comments make it clear that consideration also needs to be given to the likely literacy and educational levels of students from some of these language backgrounds, with the suggestion to provide fact sheets on audiotape for such clients.

The majority of students who used the fact sheets in their L1 reported in their questionnaire that they were ‘very useful’ (311 or 61.6%) or ‘useful’ (127 or 25.1%) with ten (2.0%) of the 527 students claiming they were not very useful. Only 11.3% (57) of students indicated that fact sheets were not used, which is not surprising given that the fact sheets were not available in all students’ L1.1 Students interviewed also talked about the L1 fact sheets with the following comments:

- **useful/helpful (N=13)**
  It’s great ’cause this wasn’t so long because if long then say I don’t want. But was short with the main information.

- **didn’t use: non-specified (N=6)**
  Not available in L1 (eg French, Hebrew, Burmese, Nuer, Kuku)

- **didn’t use: specified (N=5)**
  So sometimes I feel it’s very helpful for me to read English and write in English.

  English, because it give me the meaning. Arabic is different and it can give you many meanings.

  No [the fact sheet in Korean] more difficult. The language is more difficult and it’s more serious. English is better.

  No I didn’t because when I’m reading in my language [Farsi] I confuse it, I want to know if my teacher is reading English I don’t understand, you know sometimes it’s so difficult to translate.

  Because we have different grammar in Polish and different grammar in English and when I start translating to Polish I just confuse myself ... and after that I have to think double.

- **problem with the simplified Chinese translation (N=4)**

- **liked (N=1)**

Audiotapes

The overwhelming majority of students (321 or 89.8%) found the audiotapes ‘very useful’ or ‘useful’. Surprisingly, 34 (6.8%) students said they were not used. This seems unlikely as no teachers stated they had not used the audiotapes. Only 17 students (3.4%) found the audiotapes to be ‘not very useful’.
Three of the students interviewed commented that the audiotapes were useful, with five saying they were easy and five saying they were too fast.

**CD-ROM**

It is not surprising that many students (161 or 36.1%) did not use the CD-ROM as 16 of the 32 teachers who commented on the materials said they did not use the CD-ROM - either because their centre had old machines, students were not given access, or the CD-ROM was not available at their centre. However, of those students who did use them, an overwhelming majority (263 or 93.3%) found it ‘very useful’ or ‘useful’. Only 22 (7.7%) of students using the CD found it ‘not very useful’.

Fourteen of the students interviewed also indicated that they had not used the CD, but six of those who had, found it useful:

Yes, use computer, you can use English more, yes.

Yes, it was very good, particularly the CD was very helpful to learn the course, to understand the next package ... about the structure, how it is easy to use ... In the computer is more easy than in the workbook.

**Video**

Students considered the video almost as useful as the workbook, with only one student stating he/she didn’t use it. This seems highly unlikely since the video was shown in classrooms and all classes had more than one individual student. Perhaps this student was confused in answering this question. Of the students answering the questionnaire, 371 (72.6%) found the video ‘very useful’ with a further 132 (25.8%) finding it ‘useful’. Only seven students (1.4%) considered the video as ‘not very useful’. These could be the students who, at CSWE III, found the video slow and condescending (see teachers’ comments, pages 97–100).

Twenty-four of the students interviewed commented on the usefulness of the video, with comments such as:

Yes, also can learn this, yeah, pick up the main word ... the first stage is very important for citizenship. It is very useful.

It was great. The people it wasn’t Australian people. Like they weren’t born in Australia. They were Asians and a lot of different countries. So I think this help more the people from different backgrounds so they can see their friends from different countries.

It was very helpful for, yeah, it and the man, the program explain about Australian Citizenship and where the pictures of so has been in screen, we discussed them. It made it easier for us to understand. Someone explaining and you’re watching the real action on TV.

**Classwork and explanations by the teacher**

Classwork and explanations by the teacher were rated most highly by most students. However, since this category subsumes some of the other materials (workbooks, audiotapes and video), this is not surprising. Only eight (1.6%) students rated classwork and explanations by teacher as ‘not very useful’, while 422 (82.6%) rated them as ‘very useful, with a further 81 (15.9%) rating them ‘useful’.

Fourteen of the students interviewed commented specifically that their teacher was good. The following is typical of students’ praise for the expertise of their teachers:

She’s a very good teacher. She’s always teaching students lessons that are very interesting for us. She explained very good, not fast, her speech is not fast. I could understand everything. She always ask you couldn’t understand this and she always explained new words. And she would write down new words. Like if you ask me what’s reconciliation, I can answer. I understand everything. I think all students can understand. And for example, today was a new lesson for us, and next lesson when we came back to this class, [the teacher] would always ask what did we study last lesson. It’s a very good system, and she always check homework.

**Other materials**

Students were asked to rate the usefulness of the other materials teachers used. Again, this item was rated highly by students, but perhaps they were not able to distinguish between the DIMIA provided materials and those provided by the teacher, a distinction that was much clearer to teachers (see teachers’ comments, pages 105–7). There was a total of 284 (58.8%) students who found the other materials ‘very useful’, and a further 159 (32.9%) found them ‘useful’. Only 14 (2.9%) found them ‘not very useful’.

Twenty-four of the students interviewed also indicated that they had not used the CD, but six of those who had, found it useful:

Yes, use computer, you can use English more, yes.

Yes, it was very good, particularly the CD was very helpful to learn the course, to understand the next package ... about the structure, how it is easy to use ... In the computer is more easy than in the workbook.

**Other activities**

A large number of students (155 or 33.8%) did not participate in other activities, a finding borne out by teachers’ comments that they didn’t have time for
excursions and guest speakers, especially on their first time teaching the course when they were spending most of their time understanding the materials provided and supplementing them with their own or their centre's materials. Another 68 (12.9%) students did not answer this question. Of the 304 students who did participate in such activities, a large majority (60.8%) found them ‘very useful’, with another 34.2% finding them ‘useful’. Only 15 (5.0%) found them ‘not very useful’.

Five of the students interviewed commented on the usefulness of excursions. One student said:

The excursions that we went and saw all of that and I got it better than sitting in the class and watching the video and the tape and all that stuff ... I've been in Australia before and I've saw Parliament House before. But it wasn't useful because that time I came and I saw Parliament house no one told me this is the House of Representatives, this is the Senate ... yeah, it was just a building. You look at it and come out, but this time we even played the thing where Mr Speaker ... we played that and I understood how is going on, what is going on here and how is the Bill going to be.

Another student commented on a visit to a magistrate's court:

Magistrate court. This is very good activity because I didn't know about court but when I go there, it's very good activity. We know about the magistrate and lawyer and judge. What's the difference between magistrate, court, and the district court and the Supreme Court. I know them correctly.

Comparison of student perception of the different materials

The value of the CD-ROM, of course, depends largely on students' educational backgrounds, previous exposure to computers and access to suitable equipment or an ILC. Given these considerations, and the low educational levels of a proportion of the student body, the fact that 37.7% found this tool ‘very useful’ and the majority (59%) found it ‘useful’, is still encouraging (see Table 24).

Suggestions for changes to materials

In the interviews, students were asked about changes they would like to the course materials and made the following suggestions (the number in brackets indicates the number of students making the suggestion):

Table 24 Student perception of the helpfulness of the different materials (in order of usefulness)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers for each type of material as a %</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Video</th>
<th>Work-book</th>
<th>Audio</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Fact sheets</th>
<th>Other activities</th>
<th>CD-ROM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very useful</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useful</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very useful</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage not using</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- more materials (N =6) eg more audio, more video, more fact sheets, vocabulary list;
- visiting speakers (N =5) eg successful migrants, immigration, specialists, police, history;
- excursions (N =3);
- information to take home (N =3) eg fact sheets on history, tape/video.

General impressions

Students were also asked about their general impressions, and 24 commented that the materials were good/clear. For example:

[materials] very clear and easy to follow
variety of teaching materials
all materials very complete and very useful

Teacher' perceptions of appropriateness of materials

Teachers were asked to rate appropriateness of the six types of materials provided in terms of content and language. The majority of teachers (37 out of 69) made no specific additional comments about the individual materials; however, 32 chose to make written comments. These comments are of interest in terms of the items respondents chose to mention. One teacher of a CSWE II and III mixed class made the overall comment that the course was ‘heavily loaded with new..."
vocabulary, language too formal, but these are offset by the use of the students’ interests and background in the explanations given’. In other words, while the vocabulary was difficult for many students, they were interested in the topics and the explanations provided by the materials were related to student interests and backgrounds. For example, students appreciated that other migrants spoke about the issues in the video. They could therefore relate to the person, even if the content was difficult.

The majority of the other comments referred to the CD-ROM, generally because it was unavailable, and to the fact sheets, frequently because they too were unavailable in specific languages and because they were perceived as invaluable.

The final question on the questionnaire asked teachers to add any general comments. Many of these referred to the materials, others to the content. The comments to this question were categorised and those relating to materials are provided here under each of the different materials types. One summative comment about the materials was:

Learning materials were very well organised, easy to follow and very interesting.

This is corroborated by a teacher in interview who said:

But for me this is a treat, like to actually have the material, to have a video with the quality and tapes that all work together is like I want it forever.

The strongest endorsement was given to the fact sheets, video, and workbook, in that order – and also to the CD-ROM by those who used it. Table 25 (page 103) summarises teachers’ ratings of the various materials. Comments from this question, the final question in the questionnaire, and from interviews are added in each section to flesh out the quantitative data.

Workbooks

The vast majority (86.8%) of respondents found the workbooks ‘very appropriate’ or ‘appropriate’, with almost half (32 or 47.1%) rating them ‘very appropriate’. Only nine (13.2%) considered them to be ‘not very appropriate’.

Few teachers commented on the workbook. Those that did were especially concerned that the course is very demanding for Level 1 students:

Abstract concepts very difficult for Level 1.
Activities were good, related to those taught in the classroom to achieve CSWE competencies, vocabulary difficult for L1.
But couldn’t cover all the exercises because of pace of learners [Level 1].
Appropriate for four of my students but not very appropriate for three of my students [ASLPR 0 to 1].

Teachers provided few general comments on the workbook itself, although they did report that students were delighted to have their own workbooks:

Students were given their books at the beginning of the course (they loved this!) and could have prepared themselves for any new language features, yet I doubt whether they did this (remember that many of the students were working full-time and studying AMEP the previous two nights).

Students liked having their own workbook.

More general comments reported were:

I think the books are a big plus and that the students will read them again in the holidays.

Key word exercises at the beginning of each unit was a good idea, but most dictionaries didn’t have these in them.

I personally thought some of the comprehension work could have been a little more extensive.

The units were too long to be completed in one session.

Finally, the text had the answers in the back. As a result, if a student didn’t know an answer, he/she had to simply reference the back of the book and I became superfluous.

One teacher interviewed suggested that at CSWE I level, it would be helpful to have the grid with important meanings and words translated and inserted into the L1 fact sheets so teachers could refer students to these for understanding of new vocabulary/concepts. The same teacher observed ‘they loved the book, loved having a book they could take home’. Another, teaching a CSWE III class, found the workbook appropriate for this level. She found she could use it as normal teaching material at that level. Another CSWE I teacher stated:
The book is very well designed, except the language complexity and the amount of vocabulary, I guess it’s a bit too much for Level 1.

This same teacher suggested including the interview process step-by-step in the workbooks.

**Audiotapes**

Again, the vast majority (91.1%) of respondents found the audiotapes ‘very appropriate’ or ‘appropriate’, with slightly more (33 or 49.3%) choosing ‘appropriate’ to ‘very appropriate’ (28 or 41.8%). Only 9% (six) of teachers thought the audiotapes were ‘not very appropriate’.

Only a few of the 32 teachers who commented on the materials commented on the audiotapes as well as rating them. The teachers who did, judged them either too slow or too fast, depending on the students’ level:

- Usually too fast for slow-paced learners.
- Minimal use [a teacher of students at ASLPR 0 to 1].
- A little too fast for CSWE II.
- Good pace.
- Too easy for high level CSWE III group.
- Some of the dialogues were somewhat stilted and with unnatural stress and intonation [a teacher with experience teaching ASLPR 1+ to 2+].

Only one teacher commented on the audiotapes in the question asking for general comments:

- The sequenced learning activities were not balanced, eg long sequences of listening or several reading tasks together. The listening in Level 2 was challenging and required many listenings (Level 2 pp 44 – 6). Also in Level 3 two consecutive listening texts with several tasks.

Few teachers interviewed commented on the audiotapes. However, one teaching a CSWE I class noted the difficulty of the vocabulary, but praised the listening activities:

- The listening was terrific; the tape was very good. The questions related to the tape for listening activities were good. They could understand them. They were used to putting things in the right order and putting in missing words. That sort of thing was fine because the vocabulary for those exercises was simple enough for them to understand. That was good.

Two CSWE I teachers felt the speed was too fast for Level 1, although one of them noted that ‘you want natural speed’. Her concern was more that, because the content was so difficult, natural speed made it even more difficult for some learners. But a CSWE III teacher found the tapes to be at the usual language level for that group.

**Fact sheets**

An overwhelming majority (93.4%) of respondents found the fact sheets ‘very appropriate’ or ‘appropriate’, with almost two-thirds (62.3% or 38) finding them ‘very appropriate’. Only 6.6% (four) of teachers found them ‘not very appropriate’. The fact sheets were widely regarded as invaluable:

- … students used at home (wanted both English and own language for self-study).

Because teachers highly appreciated the fact sheets, they made negative comments in the case of languages where they were unavailable, specifically for Khmer and Polish, and more generally made comments such as ‘not available for some of my neediest students’. There was even one teacher at CSWE II level who commented ‘not all languages available … this can disadvantage students’, whereas another teacher reported that ‘Level 3 used English’.

Relative disadvantage was also the focus of another teacher’s comments on the questionnaire:

- Very dense sophisticated language even in L1. L1 information simplified for Level 1/low literacy students. Not available in L1 for some students who are therefore disadvantaged – especially at Level 1.

In their response to the questionnaire’s request for general comments, teachers demonstrated their perception of the value of the fact sheets in L1:

- The fact sheets also were a good idea, though some of these students read L1 with difficulty. However, in the holidays they will also read the fact sheets again with members of their family.

Also, the fact sheets were invaluable!
The translated fact sheets [Chinese] are very useful in helping students understand the content.

L1 fact sheets for Level 3 should be in English in the students' workbook. This would save photocopying them.

Teachers who considered that students without access to fact sheets in their language were at a disadvantage commented on the questionnaire as follows:

Essential to have multilingual fact sheets in all languages present in class at below 1+ level. Four students from Cambodia did not have Khmer language sheets.

Fact sheets were not available for my two weakest students in their own language - Greek and Telugu [India].

Tagalog [Philippines] and Rumanian language was not provided.

L1 sheets should be provided for all languages.

Thirdly, the fact sheets as compared to the text (which was below intermediate level at times) are very comprehensive and far above the students' comprehension level. I know it has been translated into a number of different languages but only two of my students had access to a translation.

Vocabulary lists should be on translated fact sheets for each unit - in more languages than is currently available.

Teachers in the first stage of the evaluation project experienced more difficulties than those in Stage 2. Additionally, some centres started teaching the course before receiving all the materials, leading one teacher to note that 'Not all material was available Term 3 as expected, no video, no CD-ROM or multilingual fact sheets'. This impacted teaching and therefore some responses in Stage 1.

Teachers used the fact sheets in English and L1 in a variety of ways. For example, one teacher reported during interview that:

My students preferred English ones. I got a couple of students who asked for it [in L1], but not for themselves. I think they had a wife or something like that.

Another chose to use the fact sheets in English only because:

I didn't want to give them in a language because I wanted them to just stretch their language skills that little much more and they did.

This teacher, who had a quite advanced CSWE II class, went on to explain how she had used the fact sheets differently for the current unit she was teaching:

Because I’m finishing [Unit] 5 and doing Unit 6 today, what I’ve asked them to do, I’ve just handed out the fact sheets to them which is completely different to the way I did the first three days. The first three days I would actually explain to them, I wouldn’t give them the fact sheet at all. I’d just explain to the detail, the content included in the fact sheets. And after that we’d do the exercises and then I’d give them the fact sheets. But first of all I’d explain to them, or I’d ask them certain questions just to brainstorm what knowledge, what basic knowledge they already had. And after that I’d ask them questions. And putting down details on the board, I’d explain to them and then we’d watch the video. Sometimes we’d also read the fact sheets first, and then do the exercises or do the exercises first because I wanted them to think for themselves, just based on what I’d already explained to them and then give them the fact sheets. But today I thought I’d do it differently. I just handed out the fact sheets and I said ‘today you be the teacher’ and read the fact sheets with a dictionary and then we watch the video and when I go back from here I’m going to ask them to just stand up and give a short presentation on each different topic of their choice.

Just as this teacher used the fact sheets differently with the same class, so different teachers used the fact sheets in a variety of ways - one as a summary at the end of the day and another as a preteaching exercise, giving students the fact sheets the week before ‘so they could take them home, read them, and have a basic idea what was being covered’. Another, teaching CSWE II students, used some of the fact sheets in English as reading exercises to meet the CSWE competency of ‘reading information text’. However, others stated that they used English-only fact sheets because of the inconvenience of printing out L1 fact sheets from the CD-ROM and then copying them. In other centres curriculum coordinators took on this responsibility for the teachers.

Video

A majority of teachers (89.6%) perceived the video to be ‘very appropriate’ or ‘appropriate’, with almost two-thirds (42 or 62.7%) rating it as ‘very appropriate’. Only seven teachers or 10.4% stated it was ‘not very appropriate’.
Teachers’ responses overall made it clear that the video was the most helpful of all the materials provided. However, only a few (five) made additional comments:

- Video is very appealing and makes a big impact (may be a bit ‘glamorous’).
- Good for revision.
- Information okay, level of language too easy [for CSWE III].
- For Level 1 far too difficult, but pictures were good.
- Not enough video-related tasks.

While the student responses make it clear that they found the video the most useful of the resources, only one teacher singled it out for positive comment when asked for general comments in the questionnaire. Perhaps this reflects the video’s centrality as the key resource which was therefore taken for granted by many. Given the chance to comment in general terms, a few (five) teachers found room for improvement:

- Music on the video was that much louder than the speech that it became annoying.
- But for Level 1 it needs to be simplified and perhaps a separate video for L1.
- Listening to people from other countries speaking with a broad Australian accent was very frustrating, eg if someone identifies themselves from Greece/Italy they should use an Italian or Greek person.
- Video Music too repetitive. Lex Marinos too flat, ie came across as being indifferent. I guess his presentation was boring. But the context was okay.
- The videos could be longer, with more student-centred tasks.

While most teachers (89.6%) found the video appropriate, some teachers commented during interview on the variable usefulness of the video for different language levels. For example, one teacher, who taught a group that was high CSWE II felt that the video could have been longer and included more information, whereas another, who taught a CSWE I level class, commented:

We did use the video of course, that was, you know, a lot of that you were relying on the images and there was a lot of heads talking too and very little actual, well there were a few street scenes and things like that but but it was still very much a verbal text I think.

Another, teaching a CSWE II group, had a different perspective, particularly commenting on the use of personal experiences of immigrants who’d taken out Australian Citizenship:

Actually, the video I thought was wonderful. They all found that the video was great. I found you could show it in small pieces, and if they didn’t quite understand things, we could watch little bits again. I think the visual presentation of a lot of the stuff was very good for them, as well as the people speaking in the video – about their feelings ... and what they liked and what they found hard. The students could really relate to that.

One respondent, teaching a CSWE II class with strong oral/aural skills, concurred:

I thought it was the presentation of the video was clear and it had clear breaks between things. And not, the sessions with each individual person weren’t too long. So they could grasp that. And there were clear between one topic and another within a unit so you could actually stop the tape easily and discuss that.

It would seem, then, that teachers’ perceptions of the appropriateness of the video was directly related to the language level of the students, as the above teacher goes on to say:

It was really suited to this level group. Sort of, yes a Stage 2 who have been here a while with a reasonable amount of English.

Yet another teacher interviewed also agreed, saying:

I think everything seemed more geared for a Stage 2 level really and in the CDs as well ... I think it would have been hard for Stage 1, and Stage 2 might have been, Stage 3 might have been a bit ho hum.

One teacher commented that the music seemed louder than the voices on the video and she had to keep jumping up to turn it down so as not to annoy the class next door.

A CSWE III teacher in interview reported that her students said the video:

... was very clear, they liked it, they could easily understand it. Some specific words they missed, but they could understand the concepts...
and they liked listening to the other migrants on the video, their opinions of why they became citizens. And I think that stimulated quite a bit of discussion in the classroom, on advantages and disadvantages, perhaps of becoming citizens. And why would want to and why they would not want to.

CD-ROM

A third (23) of teachers did not respond to this item on the questionnaire, reflecting the fact that the CD-ROM was not used in many centres. However, for those teachers who did respond, only four (8.7%) found it ‘not very appropriate’. Of the teachers who responded, an almost equal percentage found it either ‘appropriate’ or ‘very appropriate’ (47.8% and 43.5% respectively).

Of the 17 teachers who chose to comment on the CD-ROM, almost all wanted to point out that it was not used or that they were unable to access it – one specifying that inability to access it fully was ‘due to age of computers’ while another stated that it was ‘sometimes difficult to access’ and another, ‘not always user-friendly’ without further explanation. Two teachers mentioned that they would have liked to have spent more time on the CD but were restricted by their centre only providing the course for 20 hours. They felt the CD was sufficiently effective to be worth spending more time on and that even more content could be explored on CD.

General comments also focused on the CD-ROM not being readily available:

The CD-ROM was not installed for the students. Had that been done, this too could have been used as a follow up to be used in the ILC.

They did not have access to the CD-ROM or to follow-up time in the ILC.

CD-ROM extra in Library/ILC period but not all students accessed this.

We didn’t use the CD-ROM in class. I’ve had a look at it myself and felt that the hard copy of the workbook is probably more user friendly.

Again, time-wise I didn’t use the CD-ROM, it was more for individual students to follow up.

These few comments do not, in fact, reflect the relatively low usage of the CD-ROM mentioned by students. As almost a third of courses did not use the CD-ROM, it is understandable that teachers did not provide much spontaneous comment on its content or usefulness. Teachers who did use the CD-ROM noted that the language ability of their students, their age and the students’ computer literacy affected students’ responses to the CD-ROM materials (see also interview comments below):

CD-ROM material was too easy for Level 3.
I found the access to computers very good and motivating, especially for younger students using the Internet and CD-ROM, especially at Level 2.
The students would also have liked to spend more time on the CD-ROM.
This class is a community class, off-campus. We organised one visit to the main campus computer lab to look at the DIMIA computer program. Students enjoyed this activity – more time with this resource would have been useful.

The CD-ROM, as already noted, was used by few teachers; however, those who used it or viewed it saw it as an important reinforcement resource as the following comments from interview reveal:

Our machines are very old. There were five lots that were able to be loaded on to, and some of the students had exposure to it in their computer hour, but not enough of them really and not to have seen enough of the program. It would’ve been great to have had that ‘cause I looked at it myself to see how it was organised and it looked really good – for reinforcing everything. But unfortunately our equipment wasn’t up to it.

Another teacher used the CD-ROM for review and also took advantage of access to the computer lab to do extension activities online:

We used the CD-ROM and they were extremely well received. They didn’t take very long to go through because we used it as a follow-up rather than initial teaching … consolidating with vocabulary and the ideas and having the little activities … information on the CD-ROM, and that was good. And because we were using the computers they went into the immigration site [DIMIA] and we down-loaded a hard copy of the [state/territory] electoral roll and application form. And I down-loaded and showed them how to down-load the citizenship information and all the fees and that.
Another teacher found it useful for students who’d missed some of the class time. In response to an interview question asking whether she’d used the CD-ROM at all, she replied:

Only for those who had missed maybe a couple of sessions and they followed up in the computing lab looking at the CD-ROM.

One teacher, who had taught the course several times and to both CSWE II and III students commented:

The materials in the course have been appropriate except for the CD-ROM on the computer. That was not challenging enough for Level 3 ... I had half of the class in the computer lab so it’s wonderful because I have access to the Internet and you can go into the different websites. You can use the CD-ROM and that really appeals to the younger students. I mean they all enjoy, but some of the older ones are a bit reluctant, but the CD-ROM is very simple to use. I think it’s an excellent one, especially at Level 2.

One teacher, finding she didn’t have enough time to use the CD-ROM in her class, had the students use it in their ILC sessions. Her students reported that they liked it.

**Teachers’ guide**

The vast majority (92.5%) of teachers found the teachers’ guide ‘appropriate’ or ‘very appropriate’, with only five teachers finding it ‘not very appropriate’.

No teachers made additional comments on the questionnaire concerning the teachers’ guide. Few interviewed teachers commented on the teachers’ guide either, but one reported:

I didn’t find it gave me a lot more information than I got from the course book and the video [because] I suppose having taught similar materials previously I had an idea of how I would approach it any way. And having been familiar with that level of students’ grammar and construction and things like that I tended to use my own level of understanding.

**Comparison of the appropriateness of the various materials used in the course**

Despite the spread of levels and student backgrounds, the majority of teachers found all the individual components of the course materials ‘appropriate’ or ‘very appropriate’, with the workbooks and the video receiving most negative responses (even though the video also received the largest percentage of ‘very appropriate’ responses). A small minority of teachers – between 6.6% and 13.0% depending on the materials referred to – found the course materials ‘not very appropriate’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answers for each type of material as a %</th>
<th>Workbooks</th>
<th>Audio-tapes</th>
<th>L1 fact sheets</th>
<th>Video</th>
<th>CD-ROM</th>
<th>Teachers’ guide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very appropriate</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very appropriate</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9.0*</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.6*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Rounding error

**Teachers’ choice of materials and learning activities**

Teachers were also asked to identify materials and types of learning activities used for each of the four topics in the course, and to comment on student learning of the content and on the usefulness of the materials (see Figure 2 which duplicates the relevant question from the questionnaire). Table 26 (page 106) indicates the number of teachers using different materials and types of learning activities for each content area. Table 23 in Chapter 6 (page 67) summarises teachers’ comments on the extent of student learning of content. The usefulness of the materials is discussed below.

**Use of DIMIA material**

Of the 69 teachers who completed the questionnaire, four did not complete the section on the grid about materials and learning activities, and several stated ‘DIMIA resources’, without identifying which of the several resources they used. These responses were counted as using all five types of resources, although this may not have been the case. Although 27 teachers noted that they used the fact sheets, only four teachers specified whether they used the fact sheets in English...
or the students' L1 or perhaps in both. Even setting aside those teachers who did not respond and those who ambiguously stated ‘DIMIA materials’, some other teachers, while noting their use of the video, audiotape and so on, did not specify the workbook. This may be because some teachers did not have the time to complete this question, since it is quite a large task, and may have felt that their responses to the other questions on the questionnaire adequately reflected their perceptions.

Teacher responses indicate that they chose from among the different materials according to content, demonstrating the professionalism of teachers, which has been recorded elsewhere in the literature on the use of print materials by teachers. Littlejohn, Hutchison and Torres, for example, note that teachers often reject published materials because they ‘reduce the teacher’s role to one of managing or overseeing preplanned events'(1994: 316). Although some teachers did not complete Question 7 or provided ambiguous responses, there is still valuable qualitative and quantitative data contained in the responses that were recorded. The analysed data are presented in Table 26 (page 106), using number of teachers rather than percentages. This provides a clearer picture since the number of teachers responding to any particular category on the chart differs.

Of the materials supplied by DIMIA, the CD-ROM and fact sheets were the least cited by teachers (see section above on teacher responses to the question about the appropriacy of the CD-ROM for an explanation of the use of the CD-ROM). The small numbers citing use of the fact sheets is puzzling since the interview data indicate that teachers found them invaluable and the overwhelming majority of students (86.7%) found them ‘very useful’ or ‘useful’, with only 11% saying they did not use them. We can only speculate that, since teachers often assigned them for learners to read as homework in preparation for the next unit of the course, they did not specifically cite them in response to Question 7, concentrating instead on the materials they used in the classroom.

### Use of supplementary material

Teachers also indicated that they supplemented the DIMIA provided materials with a variety of other materials, some they collected for themselves and others that were already available at their teaching centres. The most common additional materials were flags (15), maps (ten), pictures (eight), electoral enrolment form (seven), materials from the electoral office, including how-to-vote cards (six), posters (five) and information from the Internet (four). Teachers used a variety of videos on such topics as Aboriginals, Australia, Australian animals and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Australia and its people</th>
<th>Australia’s government</th>
<th>Australia’s laws</th>
<th>The rights and responsibilities of Australian Citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What proportion (%) of the citizenship course was this unit?</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials used (include both DIMIA provided resources eg CD-ROM and resources from other sources)</th>
<th>Comment on the usefulness and impact of DIMIA materials in relation to each unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD-ROM and fact sheets</td>
<td>Briefly comment on the extent of learning by students in each unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2 Question 7 on teacher questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials used (include both DIMIA provided resources eg CD-ROM and resources from other sources)</th>
<th>Comment on the usefulness and impact of DIMIA materials in relation to each unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD-ROM and fact sheets</td>
<td>Briefly comment on the extent of learning by students in each unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
jury duty. Some took students on excursions to local law courts or parliament, some held a mock election, some role-played activities such as the party room in parliament and some invited speakers. Since many of these classes took place during the 2001 Federal election, teachers took the opportunity to use articles in local and state newspapers on the upcoming election.

Types of learning activities

Teachers variously interpreted the column ‘types of learning activities’. Most focused on the four macro skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing), some referred to actual classroom tasks such as research or mock elections, others referred to exercises such as cloze, while others referred to particular classroom management techniques such as pair work or group work. Table 26 lists the most frequently occurring items: speaking, listening, reading, writing, discussions, pronunciation, vocabulary and cloze. Some teachers mentioned discussion, but not listening and speaking, and so for such answers, all three items were counted; some teachers referred to ‘comprehension’ without specifying whether it was of written or spoken text and so these activities were not counted; several teachers merely stated they used the activities in the DIMIA materials. Since these include listening, speaking, reading, writing, and discussion, all five categories were counted for these responses. Despite these difficulties with interpreting the data, it can be seen that a large majority of teachers focused on the receptive skills, especially listening. But again, teachers chose activities to match the content for, as Stodolsky notes, ‘teachers are very autonomous in their textbook use and … it is likely that only a minority of teachers really follow the text in the page-by-page manner suggested in the literature’ (1989: 176).

Usefulness and impact of DIMIA materials

Respondents were asked to Comment on the usefulness and impact of DIMIA materials in relation to each unit. The goal of this question was to discover whether there were, from the teachers’ point of view, differences in the materials used for different units. However, some teachers responded generally across all units. Additionally, many did not actually evaluate the materials. It was therefore difficult to tabulate these findings in the way we were able for the other three categories in the grid for Question 7. In consequence, the data has been presented below firstly with overall comments by material type and then by topic. Comments that were not evaluative have not been included, nor have comments that repeat those of other teachers. Only representative comments have been used here.
The general comments and comments on individual material type were focused on the value and quality of the materials themselves, whereas the comments on the specific units tended to stray more into comments on content rather than materials. Comments have been categorised into general, types of material, and topic.

**General**
Overall, the general comments were extremely positive about the quality of the materials, with 13 teachers commenting positively. Negative comments were primarily related to the level of difficulty, the large amount of material to cover in such a short time and the need for teacher input. Some representative comments are as follows.

**Positive**
Information was well laid out and structured; students said this was all good for them.

Let’s Participate provided a good variety and choice of materials and exercises to use as presented; because the concepts were so difficult and new to these students at Stage 2, I think the whole course would have been too difficult for Stage 1 students.

DIMIA materials in all units were excellent; I enjoyed using them; complemented the fact sheets in a ‘lighter’ way; materials were consistently reassuring and familiar in format to other DIMIA lessons [non-citizenship].

I think all the materials prepared by DIMIA to teach this course were very clear, useful, right to the point and effective in relation to each unit.

**Difficulty of content**
Good, but language level a bit too high for Level 1; on the whole excellent teaching materials - very comprehensive

**Need more time**
Many exercises are good; material given is useful but it needs a lot more time to make use of the material and implement the activities – given that a lot of these migrants have little knowledge of different systems and new concepts.

**Teacher input**
The teacher’s own input is needed to involve students in discussion and active learning.

**Types of material**

**Workbook**
Only ten teachers specifically commented on the workbook, with half the comments being about the level of difficulty:

- Good, but a little repetitive.
- For Level 1 students the workbook is quite challenging.
- Resources book easy to follow and well prepared.
- Workbook 2 is too easy for high Level 2s.
- High Level 2 are able to cope with the language in the workbook; in groups lower than high Level 2, more explanation is required of specific language.

**Audiotapes**
Only six teachers specifically referred to the audiotapes, with all but two being positive:

- Difficult.
- Very useful.
- Authentic soundtrack for cassette.
- Speaking pace too fast for Level 1.
- Good – provided variety.

**Fact sheets**
Four teachers commented on the fact sheets, with quite different evaluations:

- Students appreciated fact sheets in their own languages.
- Information sheets were too long and difficult for Level 1 students and not available in all L1 languages represented in the class. This made discussions and understanding of some ideas and particularly abstract notions (such as in the section on rights and responsibilities) extremely hard to get across.
Use of fact sheets in their native languages was a huge advantage, particularly with lower level students.

A lot of printing errors in fact sheets (Chinese).4

**Video**

Eight teachers commented differently on the video:

- A little slow for Cert 3 [CSWE III].
- Students liked its clarity.
- Excellent video presentation.
- Speaking pace too fast for Level 1.
- The video segments need to be longer and more detailed for higher levels.

**CD-ROM**

Only one teacher commented on the CD-ROM:

The CD-ROM was popular but some advanced students became bored with the exercises.

**Comments on each topic**

The comments below have been categorised by topic. There are insufficient comments per material type to warrant classifying by material type within topic.

**Australia and its people**

Overall, teachers’ comments were positive, with 16 teachers commenting that the materials for this unit were ‘very useful’, ‘useful’, ‘very good’ or ‘good’. Only one teacher commented that this unit was difficult. Explanatory comments included:

- Put culture into context.
- Useful/easy to understand information on reconciliation; most found the national anthem interesting.
- Great historic background – useful.

Several teachers commented on specific materials, especially the video and workbook, with comments such as:

- Useful; video was good as an introduction to the unit; workbook is well set out, familiar and relevant content; audio good pace; CD-ROM not really able to be accessed as I would have liked.
- Very good; an accompanying poster in colour could be good eg Coat of Arms, 3 x flags, national colours.
- Very well received by students, who like having a workbook with a wide variety of topics in this unit.
- CD-ROM very helpful; audiocassette No. 2 very good; video very good.

Only three teachers commented on the difficulty or appropriateness for Level 1 students, and these comments are contradictory. One teacher stated ‘exercises were targeted for Level 1 students; appropriate and interesting’, while another stated ‘materials in Workbook 1 were too difficult for two students (0+), but student enthusiasm was maintained’. However, this teacher also commented that Workbook 1 had a good range of activities and that the video was good. Four teachers felt there was content missing, such as:

- Very little about the invasion of Australia by the British (terra nullius).
- This unit alone is not adequate at this level, where students begin with little knowledge of Aboriginal culture and haven’t yet positioned themselves in relation to Australian society and history.

Another teacher commented on a contradiction:

The materials talk about Australia’s population diversity and then show a predominance of white male suits in parliament.

Some other teachers made suggestions about how to enhance the materials:

- Very useful; can all be expanded on (eg Wanyarri book and video for Indigenous issues).
- Very useful; but needs more pictorial at Level 1.

**Australia’s government**

Overall, teachers’ comments were positive, with 17 teachers commenting that the materials for this unit were ‘very useful’, ‘useful’, ‘very good’, or ‘good’. Only eight referred to specific materials:

- Video simplified some of the basic information about government; visual images in workbook good.
DIMIA materials were useful in informing students of various systems in Australia and reviewing language structures.

A good attempt at making a dull topic interesting.

Wanted to know lots of details which led to a discussion of their experiences.

In contrast, four teachers commented on the difficulty of the materials:

- Difficult concepts and vocabulary, but materials useful.
- In general the material was too difficult for Level 1 students.
- Again, fairly universal concepts, except for the ‘jury’ here, however the level prevented understanding.
- Concrete contextualisation was good.

However, one teacher who said the material was too difficult said that ‘students who had a personal interest in government took time to follow the fact sheets’.

Only four teachers commented on a specific type of material:

- Video and workbook were found very useful.
- Again materials extremely helpful particularly the cassette with pronunciation.
- CD-ROM helpful; audiocassette O K.
- The video is great – clear and easy to understand.

Again, teachers made suggestions about extension materials:

- Class excursions were a most valuable learning tool.
- Procedure for making laws in Australia could have been omitted; students were more interested in what the laws were to avoid breaking them.

Rights and responsibilities

Sixteen teachers found this unit ‘very useful’, ‘useful’, ‘very good’, ‘good’ or ‘appropriate’. However, we can see from their expanded comments that many did not distinguish between the materials themselves and the content. The first comment below is one of only a few that referred specifically to the quality of the materials. The other two comments are more typical.
Useful; comprehensive and clear.

Very good, especially the discussion for/against compulsory voting; good to see balanced views as this frees students up to discuss more openly.

Very useful for students to be aware of their rights and responsibilities; students were very interested in this topic as it is so liberal compared to their countries; some students have never voted in their countries so it was a new concept for them.

Only seven teachers commented on specific types of material, with the video being cited by three, the CD-ROM and workbook by two each and the audio-tapes and L1 fact sheets by one each. Three teachers commented on the difficulty of the material, saying it was ‘too dense’ and ‘reasonably challenging’. Another teacher, while stating that the materials were ‘clear and well presented’, noted that ‘there was not a lot of substance to actually teach’.

**Teachers’ use of supplementary materials**

Teacher responses to Question 9, which asked: Did you use supplementary materials? (If so, please describe and comment on their impact), elaborate on the quantitative data presented above and present a fuller picture of the degree of autonomy and creativity teachers used in teaching the course. Their responses also point to their need for additional materials such as forms, election materials, maps and other visuals.

Almost all teachers answered Question 9 in the affirmative. Only ten did not use additional materials, as these CSWE I teachers explained:

"No time. Not to any great extent - the students needed to proceed slowly and a lot of explanation was required (vocabulary was very dense and difficult for the ability of most of this class).

20 hours allocated to the course was too short to include any supplementary materials, especially for Level 1.

I didn’t feel it to be necessary and time was short.

Responding to the request for general comments, another teacher who was pressed for time described a compromise:

I found I didn’t do any of the writing tasks in class. Some of the research tasks I was able to show how to access on the Internet because there was a computer in the room I was using. I encouraged them to follow-up and feed back what they found to the group.

For most, the range of additional materials was very great and necessarily reflected students’ language levels and interests, not to mention the range of students in the mixed level classes. Newspaper articles and pictures were widely used at all levels and there were several references to the usefulness of the Internet. Additional materials fell into several categories, relating to:

- citizenship procedures;
- Australian symbols of citizenship or nationality;
- Australian federal system of government and legal system;
- materials about Australian society more generally;
- specific language extension materials.

**Citizenship procedures**

We used the Internet and students found it very useful. For example, how to access the DIMIA website before they apply for citizenship. Internet DIMIA site [www.citizenship.gov.au]. Students were happy to know that they can apply online if they decided to do so.

Additional materials about the actual procedures for citizenship were well represented among materials cited by teachers. Understandably, the formality of the proceedings left little room for integration of ‘creative’ materials. Teachers found the following materials useful:

- citizenship application pack, including the Internet application forms;
- pictures of pledge;
- samples of ‘document translation forms’;
- posters from 50 years of Australian Citizenship;
- own translation of Australian Citizenship materials;
- Australia Day posters.

**Australian symbols of citizenship/nationality**

In this category, too, there was widespread use of Australian symbols, with some useful suggestions as to where these could be obtained:

Poster of Australian symbols or from a Centenary of Federation booklet.
Some teachers chose to highlight local government, especially because they wanted to inform students that individuals can influence policy:

- Yes, guest speakers – local councillor
- Added interest and better understanding, eg election/voting material, visits to council and local court

Teachers used limited additional materials concerning the legal system:

- Brochures from the Central Law Courts.

The variety of pictorial and other materials concerning voting easily outweighed all other material types in this category:

- Electoral Office website – application to register on the electoral role.
- Federal electoral division map – very useful.
- Electoral Dept brochure.
- Charts and pictures from the Australian Electoral Commission.
- Own materials – Hare Clark/pref. voting system.
- Used actual ‘How to Vote’ material – very useful.
- ‘Can I help you?’ from local member.
- ‘Civics 2001’ – Migrant Resource Centre – very good, clear and simple for three levels of government.
- Newspapers pre-election information.

Newspapers/pamphlets in relation to elections were useful and led to discussion and debate.

Since the Federal election was concurrent, and issues voiced in letters to the editor, these were very appropriate (eg political cartoons of issues such as Tampa).

Yes, the materials were sometimes a little too dry. I needed to set up tasks which related to my students more specifically (eg [City] Council, etc).
Jury duty attracted some attention, with at least two teachers showing a video on this topic and two introducing a ‘jury member’ guest speaker:

- Video on jury duty
- Volunteer tutor who had served on a jury, person who has done jury duty.
- Jury Duty forms.

Materials about Australia and Australian society

Materials in this category were notable for four reasons:

- They complemented the citizenship topics which were least specifically to do with citizenship, namely learning ‘about Australia and its people’.
- They enabled teachers to respond to their students’ wider interest.
- They allowed more pictorial presentation for students with low literacy.
- The variety of potentially relevant topics meant that more audio and visual resources could be incorporated in the course, time permitting.

Although many teachers had ‘no time’ to incorporate additional materials, the majority of materials that were mentioned can be classified as broadly ‘historical’ with some emphasis on Indigenous and reconciliation themes as well as multiculturalism. Other categories of material collected included flora, fauna and geography.

- Picture material on Indigenous people.
- Yes, ‘Women of the Sun’ video - really helped students understand about the history of Australia, and the need of a true reconciliation.
- Yes, a range of teacher-made materials, eg posters on major issues such as the reconciliation theme (with relevant quotes from prominent speakers, eg K eating and Patrick D odson).
- Brief history of Australia.
- Brief history before white settlement.
- Yes, historical videos - was well received because of their interesting content and visual nature, this being more appropriate to Level 1.
- Yes my own knowledge of Australian history (university studies) - very important/useful.

I used some supplementary materials which I believe made the course more authentic and gave a bit more depth to Australia’s history (videos and realia).

- Yes - video clips on Australia, N S W, N T and outback Australia – well received by students, and Wanyaarri Unit 6: The story of an Aboriginal Woman in relation to stolen generation/reconciliation.
- Personal realia – old currency, photos, maps, diagrams, reprints of old photos depicting life in early Australia.

The range of other materials is very diverse and not always specifically described:

- Pictures of Uluru [for Unit 2, Ex 22].
- A photo collage to show the multiculturalism of Australia.
- Photos.
- Pictures of Australia.
- The visual materials I prepared were particularly appreciated by the students and proved useful in personalising the course.
- Flora and fauna.
- Flowers (eg the Waratah).
- Not many – posters on Australian plants, animals, reconciliation, and other.
- Video of Australian animals.
- Demographic graphs.
- ‘Beach St’ – Australian information.
- Waltzing M atilda – song and culture.
- ‘Australia Fair’ singing tapes.
- Audio cassette of ‘Advance Australia Fair’.
- Songs.
- Poems.
- Aussie idioms and slang.
Phone book entries.

Digital camera for excursions to generate meaningful reading and writing activities.

Education system - close link with their own children or grandchildren [CSWE I bilingual].

Newspapers diagrams and stats.

A number of teachers also referred to the importance of personal experience, their own and their students.

Specific language extension materials

In commenting on other survey questions, teachers mentioned the challenge of getting information about citizenship across to students in a way that contributed to language acquisition. The following examples of additional materials mentioned by teachers are those that most clearly relate to language teaching. This is not to say that the materials mentioned under other categories above were not also carefully integrated into language teaching plans.

The most striking examples were the use or development of dictionaries, especially for the bilingual citizenship classes:

Main additional material was use of bilingual dictionaries.

I had developed a bilingual glossary in English and Chinese which included the key words and expressions from the parts of the book which we covered in class. Students found it useful.

Bilingual dictionaries and bilingual support.

Other teachers, too, focused on the demanding vocabulary associated with the course:

Yes. Vocabulary worksheets/English language, very useful, worksheets designed by me.

Yes, I used a lot of transparencies which explained a lot of the contents of the course. These transparencies helped a lot in promoting understanding of difficult vocabulary and some abstract segments of the course.

Simple dictionaries – extracted comparisons from students.

Other materials appear to reflect students’ needs and abilities:

Quiz to recap materials.

‘Let’s Read’ (Book 3).

I created original worksheets for Units 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6. I used these worksheets to concept check each unit.

Some spelling, grammar, writing exercises mostly used for revision. Impact okay because they were a small part of the lesson/day.

Some units, in particular Unit 2 and Unit 4, were supplemented by teacher produced materials, such as materials on report writing about Australian landmarks, materials on form filling and reading procedural texts.

Yes, used information from phone directories and other government brochures – very useful.

Yes, many information gap activities to complement the factual information in the text.

Text types – discussion and writing (various points of view) – very effective.

Yes, emphasis points and reinforcement.

Teacher generated assessments which students appreciated.

Additional materials needed

In response to the request for general comments, teachers also made suggestions for additional materials. Despite the lack of time to cover existing materials, a great number of teachers would like to see more, targeted materials made available, especially for CSWE I students. Two teachers suggested simplified materials for Level 1 learners, a request in response to the frequently occurring comment of the difficulty of the content for this particular group of learners. Specific suggestions were for more pictorials such as maps and posters of Australia and fewer language exercises, although one teacher did request additional sheets that explained language points for handout prior to a lesson.

One teacher commented that she felt the materials were very focused on urban Australia and that students like to learn more about the ‘bush’. She also
expressed a desire for more information on the ethnic diversity of Australia and even more on Indigenous Australians than is already provided.

Two teachers requested a more critical approach to the subject, with one stating:

Students should be given the opportunity to make comparisons between the Australian model of government and citizenship and models as they understand them from their countries of origin. Student materials could and should be designed to have students ask intelligent questions of the Australian system and so identify strengths and weaknesses with it. Students might also be given tasks and projects to encourage them to participate. These things, after all, are what democracies are all about: Participating and participating intelligently and critically.

Similarly, while the teachers interviewed were overwhelmingly appreciative of the materials provided, several made suggestions for additional materials, especially pictures for CSWE I learners. As one teacher interviewed explained when asked what else she’d like:

Basically, lots and lots of pictures are needed. I scrounged things from all over and put them all together, but it would be much simpler if it was all together, as part of the kit.

While it might be possible to include many of the suggested materials in a national course, some were state-specific, such as, ‘the schooling system’ or ‘places of interest, entertainment, museums, past-times, etc. are also of concern for those who want to settle in this country’, and so would not be suitable for inclusion in the kit.

In summary, many teachers knew that the subject matter (Australia and citizenship):

... is virtually endless and you could extend that. I think the material covered in the course prepared them for citizenship itself. And they were also interested in all the other things that came as a result of the very stimulating material that they were looking at.

Another stated:

And that’s where the materials are great in that they have collected a lot of things together that really takes a teacher a lot of time to find all these things and pull them all together in some sort of body of work.

**Summary**

Teachers and students appreciated the variety of materials and their comprehensiveness. Students found the teacher, video, workbook and audiotapes ‘very useful’, while teachers found the video, fact sheets and workbooks ‘very appropriate’, in that order. While usefulness and appropriateness are not the same measure, the difference in perception is most likely because learners realised they probably could not learn this difficult content alone (as indeed one learner noted above), while teachers (other than the bilingual teachers) realised they could not explain the difficult concepts completely without bilingual help, whether in the form of dictionaries or fact sheets, and the fact sheets were especially useful since student dictionaries often did not have the vocabulary items used in the materials.

Teachers made specific suggestions for improvements (or additions) to the materials, especially in relation to providing materials with easier language for CSWE I learners. These suggestions included:

- fact sheets in more languages;
- fact sheets audiotaped for languages where learners were likely to not be literate in their L1;
- videos specifically designed for CSWE I learners;
- extension materials for CSWE III learners;
- additional materials such as (in order):
  - flags
  - maps
  - pictures
  - electoral enrolment form
  - electoral office materials
  - how-to-vote cards
  - posters
  - Internet material and websites.

While many of these suggestions are possible, some are less practical than others. For example, as the discussion above indicates, providing L1 Fact Sheets in all learner languages would not be cost-effective. Nor would providing electoral enrolment forms be possible as these are actually different in each state and territory.
Conclusion

The data collected and analysed in this evaluation clearly indicate that students and teachers found the citizenship course valuable for both its content and its language instruction. As one CSWE III teacher said:

All I can say is that at this stage the students enjoyed the course and so did I … I felt the basic course, as it is now, worked well. It was interesting - well certainly for this class. They said repeatedly that this is good because we're learning about how this country works that they didn't know before and I think they were genuinely interested in what was going on.

Another teacher, who had taught the course five times, noted student enthusiasm for the course:

I have to say that the drop-outs I've had, which you always do have out of a course, have been basically because either they have got a job and the time means they can no longer come to class, or there has been some urgent family problem and they have had to go back or they have had to look after children who are in hospital. I've had no one that sort of said 'I don't want to come', or had feedback from others in the class that they don't want to come any more.

However, teachers and students also made consistent recommendations for changes to implementation, to content and to the materials.

Implementation

Even in Stage 1 of the project, it became clear that the requirement to offer the course to clients but not require it, and the restriction of the course to AMEP clients were major impediments to the implementation of the course. Therefore, at the end of Stage 1, an interim report was submitted to DIMIA, with implementation recommendations as follows:

AMEP providers need as much flexibility as possible in order to provide Let's Participate to learners who are interested in the course. To meet learner and provider needs:

Notes

1 The apparent discrepancy between fact sheets not being available in 25% of languages spoken by AMEP clients and the fact that only 11.3% reported that they had not used them is easily explained. The languages of fact sheets were based on reports from DIMIA and service providers concerning the major language groups in the AMEP at the time. In the questionnaire, however, students named languages that could have been subsumed by service providers, for example, Serbo-Croatian (Serbian and Croatian separately), or Tagalog (Filipino). Additionally, some students who named their language as one that did not have fact sheets, also speak languages for which there were fact sheets; for example, many Nuer speakers might be able to read Arabic. Another 4.2% of respondents did not respond to this question. Thus, while we estimate that fact sheets should not have been available for almost 25% of the students responding to the questionnaire, only 11.3% claimed they did not have this access and another 4.2% did not respond.

2 The AMEP Research Centre had some comments that the Simplified Chinese had errors; on investigation, it was discovered that the error was not in the original translations, but in the computer programs that 'read' Simplified Chinese at one specific site. The translated fact sheets are provided on CD and each site prints out their needs. In this particular case, the computer program that reads the Chinese characters and converts them for printing was inaccurate.

3 Because these are valid percentages, they refer only to teachers who responded. For the CD-ROM 23 teachers did not respond, probably because they did not use the CD-ROM.

4 As noted previously, this was later found to be the result of the program this particular organisation was using to print the fact sheets.
Much of the language used in the materials, especially for privileges and responsibilities of Australian citizenship, is part of legislation and so written in a language register quite unfamiliar to learners. Because these are legal mandates, the language cannot be glossed as it could result in varying interpretations of meaning. Teachers and learners also expressed an interest in more content, especially about Australia generally and, in the section about Australia’s laws, for content on issues of immediate need and interest to learners – renting rights, noise regulations, aggressive dogs and schooling. Despite these difficulties, the teacher and student responses to course content support the claim made by CBI proponents that ‘a second language is learned most effectively when used as the medium to convey informational content of interest and relevance to the learner’ (Brinton, Snow and Wesche 1989: vii). One student expressed this in interview:

Interviewer: So, do you think you learned very much English as well?
Student: Yes, yes because when I was in English class, it’s not so interesting as the other subjects but in this subject very interested and I very, I was very interesting Australian and I learned a lot of things.

Interviewer: So, you thought the content and the topics were really interesting to study?
Student: Yes, yes, yes I …

Interviewer: Which helps you learn the language.
Student: Yes I mean that.

Teachers and students alike felt that students had learned English as well as citizenship content, although teachers of CSWE III students felt much of the language (except for the content-specific vocabulary) was already known by these learners. The overall recommendation from teachers was that the course was not really suitable for CSWE I learners, especially those in Band A (with low levels of literacy and/or education in L1), without additional, simpler materials. Apart from solid endorsement of the course overall, the difficulties encountered by beginners appeared the most emphatic comment made by most teachers.

Materials

When asked to comment on learning materials, students perceived teachers to be the most helpful resource in their learning. They then rated the video and the
workbook to be the most useful learning materials, followed by the audio tapes and fact sheets. Teachers gave the strongest endorsement to the fact sheets, video, and workbook in that order – and also to the CD-ROM by those who used it. As noted in Chapter 7, the CD-ROM was highly rated by teachers and students who used it, but was not available for many of the respondents. Teachers in particular asked for additional materials such as:

- simpler video for CSWE I learners;
- more videos of specific content areas such as reconciliation, juries etc;
- fact sheets in more languages;
- fact sheets on audiotape for students without L1 literacy;
- more visuals, such as laminated photos of key learning objectives (flags, emblems);
- assessment tasks related to citizenship content.

Several teachers noted that the value of the course was disseminated by word-of-mouth and students, including non-AMEP students, were very interested in taking the course. Nineteen of the students interviewed were asked if they would recommend the course, which was felt to be the ultimate positive evaluation, and all agreed that they would. Some responses follow:

- Yes, I recommend my class [citizenship] and they [friends] are interested. If you organise a new course, they will join the next course, yeah.
- Sure, even when I spoke with one of my community, I was talking about the Parliament House. We went to the Parliament House not with the class but with our friends and we were talking about things and I was saying how this is the House of Senate and they are just thinking, and they are surprised and they asked many questions. And then later I explained that I’m doing the citizenship course and they said how it is going, is it interesting. I recommend so much.
- Yeah, if my friends they want to be a citizen I think it is the best way because if you don’t take this class then you don’t understand anything about Australia and what you are doing and who do you belong to.
- Yes ... when another time come ... Because many people are pressing to know how to live here in this country, and how to

be a citizen in this country because one day when you apply for citizenship you have to make an interview. It’s not enough, because you want to know more about the country ... But you don’t know what is going on and what is your right and what is your privileges in the country if you are a citizen ... And some tell me when you the time coming for the next course please tell us.

Notes

1 In late 2001, Minister Hardgrave took responsibility for citizenship and multicultural affairs, including the AMEP, within the broader Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs portfolio under Minister Ruddock.

2 The materials needed to be modified slightly to remove references specific to the AMEP clients.
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Syllabus for ‘Let’s participate: A course in Australian Citizenship’

Syllabus aims
• To develop understandings of the responsibilities and privileges of Australian Citizenship as defined in current legislation and policies.
• To develop understandings of core civic values in Australia and the institutions, values and principles that underpin them.

Unit 1: An introduction to Australian Citizenship

What students will learn in this unit

What being an Australian Citizen means.

Accepting the grant of Australian Citizenship means:
• making a commitment to membership of the Australian community
• accepting core civic values of Australian society which include:
  - the rule of law
  - democratic principles of government
  - acceptance of cultural diversity
  - equality of sexes and races
  - equality of opportunity
  - freedom of speech and religion
  - English as national language.
• accepting the responsibilities and privileges of Australian Citizenship.

Who is eligible for Australian Citizenship?

You can become an Australian Citizen if you:
• are a permanent resident
• have lived here for at least two years in the previous five years, including at least 12 months in the last two years
• intend to reside here or maintain a close association with Australia
• are over the age of 18
• are of good character
• are able to speak and understand basic English, and
• understand the responsibilities and privileges of Australian Citizenship.

Teachers’ guide – Syllabus

Unit 2: Australia and its people

What students will learn in this unit

Content
Australia’s multicultural society:
• Indigenous Australians
• descendants of 19th century settlers/migrants
• 20th century settlers/migrants/recently-arrived migrants.
Australian multiculturalism encourages:
• use of the national language – English
• use of community languages
• expression of cultural practices and religious beliefs.
Reconciliation:
• historical disadvantage of Indigenous peoples since British settlement
• steps towards self-determination
• goals of Reconciliation.
Some Australian symbols, National anthem, national flags, Coat of Arms, flora and fauna, national colours.
Some Australian landmarks and features.
Australia’s location, geographic features, climate, population distributions, States and Territories.

Unit 3: Democratic government in Australia

What students will learn in this unit

Content
• Federation, the Constitution, Federal Parliament.
Representative democracy and the three elements of Australia’s Federal Parliament.
• Three elements of Federal Parliament:
  - the Queen and her representative, the Governor-General
  - the House of Representatives:
    - the role of Government and Opposition
    - the role and functions of the Prime Minister, members of Parliament
  - the Senate:
    - Government and Opposition
    - the role and functions of Senators.
The three levels of government in Australia.
• Three levels of government:
  - Federal government
  - State/Territory government
  - Local Government.
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Unit 4: Rights, responsibilities and privileges

What students will learn in this unit

The rights of all Australians.

- All Australians are entitled to:
  - the right to equity and freedom from barriers that derive from race, ethnicity or culture
  - the right to participate fully in the Australian community.

The responsibilities of Australian Citizens.

- Australian Citizens have these responsibilities:
  - to obey the laws
  - to enrol on the Electoral Roll and vote at Federal and State/ Territory elections and referenda
  - to serve on a jury if called on
  - to defend Australia, should the need arise (subject to the same rights and exemptions as Australian-born Citizens).

The privileges of Australian Citizens.

- Australian Citizens have additional privileges that allow them to:
  - vote to help elect Australia's governments
  - apply for appointment to any public office, or nominate for election to Parliament
  - apply for an Australian passport and to leave and re-enter Australia without a resident return visa
  - claim protection from Australian diplomatic representatives while overseas
  - apply to enlist in the defence forces and for government jobs requiring Australian Citizenship
  - register children under 18 years of age born overseas as Australian Citizens by descent.
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Unit 5: Law and democracy in Australia

What students will learn in this unit

How laws are made in Australia.

- Representative democracy:
  - community participation in developing and changing laws
  - introducing/voting/passing bills in Federal/State Parliament.

How laws are administered.

- Judicial systems:
  - courts
  - juries, jury service
  - the roles of Federal, State police.

Unit 6: Becoming an Australian Citizen

What students will learn in this unit

Applying for Australian Citizenship.

- Enquiries by telephone or in person:
  - Citizenship Telephone Enquiry Line
  - local DNA offices, selected Post Offices.

Eligibility criteria (as for Unit 1)

Applying for the Grant of Australian Citizenship:

- attending a citizenship interview
- submitting documentation
- paying fee
- residency status and intentions
- understanding the responsibilities and privileges of Australian Citizenship
- English requirements
- character checks
- interview questions, responses.

Attending an Australian Citizenship ceremony.

- Participating in a citizenship ceremony:
  - the Australian Citizenship Pledge.
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Student questionnaire

Citizenship Curriculum Implementation Evaluation Project

Student Questionnaire

1. Where did you attend the AMEP Citizenship course?
   \textit{Springburn Language College, Oldham.}

2. When did you attend the AMEP Citizenship course?
   \textit{July to September 2001.}

3. Are you Male or Female?
   \textit{Female, Male}

4. Circle the age group you belong to.
   \textit{18 to 25, 26 to 35, 36 to 45, Over 45}

5. When did you arrive in Australia?
   \textit{Month and Year}

6. What language(s) other than English do you speak?

7. What other AMEP Classes have you attended?
   \textit{(Include classes you are still attending)}
   \textit{Speech Level 2, July to September 2001 at Springburn Language College, Oldham}

8. Why did you choose to do the citizenship course?

9. In the following sentences, put a circle around the expression that best describes how much
   you learned about each part of the citizenship course.

9.1 Doing the citizenship course helped me to learn about Australia and its people.
   \textit{a lot, a little, not very much}

9.2 Doing the citizenship course helped me to learn about Australia’s government.
   \textit{a lot, a little, not very much}

9.3 Doing the citizenship course helped me to learn about Australia’s laws.
   \textit{a lot, a little, not very much}

9.4 Doing the citizenship course helped me to learn about the rights and responsibilities of
   Australia’s citizens.
   \textit{a lot, a little, not very much}
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Teacher questionnaire

10. How difficult did you find each section of the course? 
   Put a tick (✓) in the box that shows how difficult you found each section of the citizenship course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Not very difficult</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
<th>Very difficult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia and its people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia's government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia's laws</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The rights and responsibilities of citizens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How helpful did you find the learning materials used in the course?
   Put a tick (✓) in the box that shows how helpful you found the learning materials that were used in the citizenship course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Very useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
<th>Not very useful</th>
<th>Did not use these resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information sheets in my first or other languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio tapes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDROM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classwork and explanations by the teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other materials the teacher used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other activities, such as excursions or visiting speakers etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Doing the citizenship curriculum helped me to improve my English.

   Agree  Disagree  Not sure

13. Has the citizenship course helped you to decide whether to become an Australian Citizen?

   Agree  Disagree  Not sure
# Teacher questionnaire

**AMEP Research Centre**  
**Citizenship Curriculum Implementation Evaluation Project**

1. **Teacher name:** ____________________________________________________

2. **Contact details:**  
   Provider/location:__________________________________________________  
   Address: ___________________________________________  
   Telephone: ( ____ ) _______________ Facsimile: ( ____ ) _______________  
   Email: ___________________________________________________________

3. **Experience of teaching citizenship courses.**  
   (Number of courses taught, period in which the course was taught, number of students involved, levels of students)
   ___________________________________________
   ___________________________________________

4. **Please describe how you were prepared for teaching this course**  
   (eg PD activities).  
   ___________________________________________
   ___________________________________________

5. **How well prepared did you feel for teaching the citizenship course?**  
   Very well   Well   Not very well

6. **How well did you feel that you understood the content and structure of the citizenship course materials?**  
   Very well   Well   Not very well

### Appendix 3

7. **Overview of teaching and learning activities and materials used.**  
   For each citizenship course taught, please complete this table in point form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date and location of course</th>
<th>Materials used (include both DIMA provided resources and other sources)</th>
<th>Comment on the usefulness and impact of DIMA materials in relation to each unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What proportion of the citizenship course was this unit?</th>
<th>Australia and its people</th>
<th>Australia's government</th>
<th>The rights and responsibilities of Australian citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(%) of the citizenship course was this unit?</td>
<td>Australia and its people</td>
<td>Australia's government</td>
<td>The rights and responsibilities of Australian citizens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of learning activities</th>
<th>DIMA activities</th>
<th>Other sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Australia and its people</th>
<th>Australia's government</th>
<th>The rights and responsibilities of Australian Citizens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. **DIMA provided materials**

Please comment on the appropriateness (in terms of content and language levels) of the DIMA materials for the students you worked with.

Put a tick (✔) in the box that shows how appropriate you found the learning materials in the citizenship course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very appropriate</th>
<th>Appropriate</th>
<th>Not very appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workbooks</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audiotapes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L1 information sheets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Video</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CD-ROM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers’ guide</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **Did you use supplementary materials?**

(If so please describe and comment on their impact)

_________________________________________________________________  
_________________________________________________________________

10. Please comment on the extent of the learning of students undertaking the curriculum, in terms of knowledge of course subject matter (citizenship).

_________________________________________________________________  
_________________________________________________________________

11. Please comment on the extent of the learning of students undertaking the curriculum, in terms of language learning (including vocabulary, structures and syntax of English and relevant genres).

_________________________________________________________________  
_________________________________________________________________


