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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of a study of English language provision for adult immigrants and/or refugees from non-English speaking backgrounds (NESB) in New Zealand educational institutions and training establishments. Conducted during the period July-August 2000, the study involved: (a) a mail questionnaire received by 155 educational institutions and training establishments; and (b) follow-up interviews with senior staff in 16 of these to identify issues, concerns and best practice features.

- Of the 107 educational institutions and training establishments that responded, 87 confirmed that they had offered English to speakers of other languages (ESOL) classes for adult immigrants and/or refugees at some time in the last five years and 78 were offering such classes in 2000.

- The 78 organisations providing ESOL classes in 2000 for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees (secondary schools: 18; tertiary institutions: 20; community education centres: 25; private training establishments: 15) offered 730 ESOL courses at different levels with content ranging from general English for communication to ESOL courses with a specific focus (e.g. English for academic purposes, English skills for employment).

- A number of different outside funding sources for ESOL provision were reported, ranging from central government bodies (Vote: Education and Vote: Employment funding through the Ministry of Education, Skill New Zealand, Work and Income New Zealand) to funding contributed by charitable organisations, trusts, local authorities etc. In many cases, the organisations received funding for ESOL classes from a mixture of sources, depending on the kinds of programmes offered.

- In general, the participating organisations expressed moderate to strong approval of the clarity of the information on contractual requirements provided by the funding source(s). However, they gave considerably less approval to the monitoring of outcomes and the level of funding commensurate with the services provided.

- Seventy-three of the 78 participating organisations (93.6 per cent) offering ESOL tuition to adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees indicated that the average size of ESOL classes was 19 or less with 27 institutions (34.6 per cent) reporting that the average class size was 10 or less.

- Adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees tended to be taught in the same classes as other NESB learners. Just 25 (32.1 per cent) of the participating
organisations said that adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees were taught in different classes to other NESB students.

- Just under half of the 78 participating organisations (47.4 per cent) had 50 or less adult NESB immigrant and/or refugee students in their ESOL programmes. Students aged 24 years or under and males were in the minority. Only 13 (16.7 per cent) said that the majority of their students had less than three years of secondary education.

- The main ethnic groups to which the adult NESB students belonged were, in order, Asian, European (other than people from the United Kingdom or Ireland), Middle Eastern, African and Pacific Islands.

- Twenty-seven (34.6 per cent) of the 78 participating organisations indicated that they had experienced problems in marketing ESOL courses and/or recruiting students into these courses. A number of these organisations reported that the increasing level of student fees had affected their enrolments. On the other hand, some said that they had waiting lists for places in their courses.

- According to the participating organisations, the main areas of difficulty experienced by NESB immigrants and/or refugees in accessing ESOL courses were personal circumstances, costs of tuition, child care, transport and family responsibilities. Half indicated that they were taking measures to assist students to overcome these difficulties. The measures mentioned included: arranging creche facilities, scheduling alternative times for classes, providing flexible entry points to courses and subsidising tuition costs.

- Just over half of the 78 participating organisations had five staff members or less involved in ESOL provision, with 37 (47.4 per cent) reporting that staff worked mainly part-time in a paid capacity and 33 (42.0 per cent) reporting that staff were mainly full-time, paid employees. Eighteen (23.1 per cent) described staff recruitment as a problem, while 17 (21.8 per cent) identified staff retention as an area of difficulty.

- Of the 626 staff members who were teaching ESOL courses in the 78 participating organisations, 523 (83.5 per cent) had both tertiary qualifications and professional training in the TESOL area, 54 (8.6 per cent) had tertiary qualifications but no TESOL training, and 40 (6.4 per cent) had TESOL training but no tertiary qualifications. Only 9 staff members (1.4 per cent) had neither tertiary qualifications nor TESOL training.
• Forty-eight (51.5 per cent) of the 78 participating organisations said that they had developed close links with non-educational institutions in connection with their ESOL programmes. These included links with ethnic community groups (including liaison with Ethnic Councils), employers, service clubs, voluntary organisations and local authorities.

• The respondents as a whole were almost unanimous (98.2 per cent) in supporting the view that English is either the key or one of the main keys to successful settlement. It was agreed by 81.3 per cent and 70.1 per cent, respectively, that changes were needed in ESOL provision to better meet the needs of (a) immigrants, and (b) refugees.

• The main issues and concerns identified by respondents in answers to open-ended questions in the postal survey and elaborated on in the follow-up interviews were: government policy gaps relating to the language needs of immigrants and refugees; under-funding and under-resourcing; difficulties encountered in dealing with some government agencies; wasteful competition amongst providers as a result of an imposed market-driven ideology; lack of understanding of the needs of ESOL students on the part of funding providers; a need for better contractual arrangements; and inappropriate requirements for some courses.

• Best practice in ESOL provision identified in the study included: the employment of competent, trained and qualified staff; well designed staff development programmes; responsiveness to individual student needs; carefully designed learning programmes; availability of suitable facilities and resources; flexibility in class scheduling; small class size to enable more personalised instruction; and provision of out-of-class opportunities to consolidate and extend students' linguistic and cultural competence.

The conclusion reached is that while educational institutions and training establishments in New Zealand are endeavouring to provide optimum English learning environments for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees, they are hampered by the lack of a cohesive policy framework at the national level. The kind of policy framework required is one which: recognises the importance of English in settlement; gives an overall direction to and co-ordination of ESOL programmes across the various sectors; is supported by appropriate, flexible funding formulae that recognise the existence of wide differences in the linguistic, social, cultural, educational and personal backgrounds of adult NESB immigrants and refugees, and which make allowance for variation in the quantity, quality and rate of their English language development.
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INTRODUCTION

This survey forms part of the New Settlers Programme (NSP), a multidisciplinary research project primarily designed and conducted by Massey University staff. The main aim of the NSP is to contribute to the development of a balanced, well integrated institutional structure of immigration (see Trlin et al. 1998). This particular study examines policies and practices concerning the provision of English to speakers of other languages (ESOL) for adult immigrants and/or refugees from non-English speaking backgrounds (NESB) in educational institutions and training establishments in New Zealand.

In order to contextualise the study, we begin with a brief overview of key issues relating to English provision for new settlers.

Importance and Politics of English Language Proficiency

During the past fifteen years the changes in immigration policy which have opened doors to immigrants from a wider range of countries have drawn further attention to the role of English in settlement. In the 1986 review of immigration policy it was claimed, for instance, that: “For immigrants...to make their place in their new homeland, it is important that they should have adequate English language skills and thus be able to communicate with the wider New Zealand community” (Burke, 1986: 16). Similarly, the 1995 policy summary stated that “English is a key to successful settlement” and went on to argue that “...a lack of language skills can impose [a cost] on New Zealand” (New Zealand Immigration Service, 1995: 10). The dual messages embodied in these statements (that possession of English language skills positively assists immigrants to adjust to a new life in New Zealand, and that a lack of such skills places a burden on the country) are not, however, new. They have been a recurrent theme in immigration discourse since the early 1900s.

Various measures have been adopted at different times to enforce these views, ranging from the 1907 entry prerequisite for Chinese immigrants that they pass an English reading test, to the English language requirement introduced in 1995 for principal applicants in the General Skills and Business Investor categories. The 1995 changes made it mandatory for principal applicants intending to enter under the General Skills and Business Investor categories to meet a band score of 5 for the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) General Module. In the case of dependants 16 years and over who did not meet this prescribed level, payment of a $20,000 bond was required which could be totally or partially refunded depending on the time taken to reach the required standard after arrival. This, it was claimed,
would "...act as an incentive for a person to rapidly acquire basic English language skills" (New Zealand Immigration Service, 1995: 10).

Such requirements have often been selective and reactive, and based more on political considerations than concern for the welfare of the immigrants themselves (Henderson, 1998). The English test imposed on prospective immigrants in the 1907 Chinese Immigrants Amendment Act was clearly designed to reduce the numbers of Chinese entering the country. In similar fashion, the introduction of the IELTS - 5 requirement in 1995 may be seen as an attempt to curb the numbers of immigrants from non-English speaking backgrounds (NESB) which had increased considerably as a result of the abandonment of the preference for immigrants from traditional (mainly British) source countries in 1986 and the establishment of a competitive, points-based system in 1991.

Following criticisms that the 1995 IELTS - 5 bond was discriminatory and punitive (see, for example, Shackleford, 1997; Forsyte Research, 1998) and concerns that it may have contributed to a marked fall-off in the number of skilled immigrants, a modification of the English language requirements was initiated in 1998. The bond mechanism was replaced by a system involving pre-purchase of English language tuition. The minimum level for General Skills principal applicants remained at 5 on the IELTS scale (on either the General Module or the Academic Module) while that for Business Investor principal applicants was reduced to 4. The latter were also eligible to enter New Zealand provided that they pre-paid the tuition fee. The same requirement was applied to accompanying family members in both categories aged 16 years or over. The pre-payment amount, up to a maximum of $6,650, depended on the levels of English of the individuals concerned. Skill New Zealand was given the task of managing the purchase of English language training from approved New Zealand providers on behalf of the immigrants affected. Although the pre-purchase requirement was, in some respects, an improvement on the bond system, it was still subject to the charge of being discriminatory and selective in that it applied only to immigrants in the targeted streams, and constituted what critics claimed to be an unnecessary deterrent to the immigration of skilled people from non-English speaking countries.

English language needs of immigrants

Setting aside the political overtones in some of the decisions made with respect to regulating entry to New Zealand on English language grounds and the arbitrary manner in which such requirements have been applied, there is still some validity in the argument that English language skills play an important role in settlement. A number of studies have referred to the problems faced by some immigrants and refugees with low levels of English in adjusting to life in New Zealand (Kaplan, 1980; Boyer, 1996; Ho et al., 2000).
Some of these concerns relate to the difficulties that new arrivals face in accessing information and services. The Health Funding Authority (1998: 20), for example, reported that: "The greatest barrier to Asians seeking a GP when they or a family member is sick, by far, was language." Similar problems in accessing central and local government services have been noted by Hoffmann and Crisp (1998) and Watts and Trlín (2000). These problems of access particularly affect refugees from North Africa, the Middle East and Eastern Europe (Christchurch City Council, 1997; Altinkaya and Omundsen, 1999).

Some of the studies have also commented on the work-related English difficulties of immigrants and refugees. Boyer (1996: 66), for instance, claimed that: "By far the most important [of problems encountered by the Taiwanese migrant in obtaining a job] are language difficulties". Winkelmann and Winkelmann (1998) in their economic study also concluded that English language proficiency is an important predictor of labour market outcomes.

However, the relationship between English and employability is not a simple one. In the High Hopes survey report (Department of Internal Affairs, 1996) the observation is made that a number of the applicants interviewed appeared to have a high level of English skills, yet were finding difficulty obtaining jobs for which they were qualified. A possible underlying reason could be discriminatory attitudes on the part of some employers (Department of Internal Affairs, 1996: 37):

> Several people whose written English comments appeared lively, correct and articulate, and who considered themselves thoroughly fluent, believed they had met discrimination because New Zealand employers did not accept their foreign accents.

A New Zealand Employment Service study (1998) made similar observations on the barriers to immigrant employment created and/or sustained by the linguistic and cultural prejudices of employers.

It must also be understood that the degree of severity of the linguistic problems faced by immigrants and refugees may vary considerably according to their particular situation. For some (doctors, lawyers, teachers etc.), the desirable or required level of English competence may be at the high end of the scale, in both the spoken and written mediums, if they expect to continue work in New Zealand in their specialist areas. A reasonably advanced level in English communication skills may also be necessary in a number of other service-related work areas, depending on the amount of contact with English-speaking New Zealanders. However, it is widely acknowledged that for some NESB immigrants and refugees who are well supported by family members and ethnic community networks, and who find employment in areas where there is not a high level of contact with native-speakers of English, more
modest levels of English may be sufficient, at least in the initial stages of settlement.

**English language provision**

Many of the published New Zealand reports and studies relating to different aspects of English language provision for NESB immigrants and refugees have focused on ESOL tuition for children and adolescents rather than adults (see, for example, Department of Education, 1973a, 1973b; Department of Education, 1976; Education Review Office, 1996; Kennedy and Dewar, 1997; Ministry of Education, 1999a, 1999b, 2000a). One of the few detailed reports on adult English language learning in educational institutions is the review conducted in 1988 by Gubbay and Cogill. Their report, prepared for the Department of Education, argued strongly for a shift in the ways in which resources for ESOL provision were being used by institutions. In particular, they criticised the non-specific nature of many of the English as a second language (ESL) programmes they had observed which did not empower learners to participate fully in social life and become productive citizens, but rather served to make them dependent (Gubbay and Cogill, 1988: 14):

> The majority of ESL classes at present are open-ended, unfocussed classes which treat the use of English in New Zealand as a subject to be taught. They have come to be known as EFE (English for ever) ... They neither facilitate students to achieve specific aims (the common language approach) nor empower them to use facilities and receive their rights (the official language approach). Nor do they give students a really accurate grasp of the language (EFL). Many potential contributors to society remain disadvantaged because they cannot relate to these classes. Of those that do, many become dependent upon them, using up valuable resources to no purpose, and draining their confidence and energy.

Whereas Gubbay and Cogill’s criticisms were mainly directed at the ways in which individual institutions manage their programmes, other reports have suggested that failings in ESOL provision stem from a lack of policy direction and oversight at the national level. McGillivray (1996: 40), for example, commented that:

> ... As long as there are no resettlement or languages policies in New Zealand, ESOL services will continue to be conducted in an uncoordinated manner, and funding will remain insufficient.

Similar criticisms that ESOL provision for adult immigrants and refugees in New Zealand is handicapped by the lack of a national languages strategy which recognises the importance of English as a settlement tool are found in,

**Funding for ESOL courses**

The New Zealand Curriculum Framework states that: “Provision will be made for all those students whose first language is not English” (Ministry of Education, 1993: 10). However, funding for NESB students depends upon their status (refugee students in secondary schools have a higher entitlement than immigrant students), their language needs, the number of years that they have been in the New Zealand school system, and their age.

The Refugee Education Policy announced in July 2000 provides for up to five years of English language support for refugee students in schools. Refugee students in years 1 to 8 attract funding of approximately $315 per term and those in years 9 to 13 approximately $450 per term for intensive support in the first two years. Refugee students are then entitled to the standard ESOL funding rate of $125 per term for up to three years. The eligibility criteria for this funding is (a) an assessment score of 112 or below on the Ministry of Education's ESOL Assessment Form¹, and (b) identification as refugee, under the quota refugee, family reunification refugee, or asylum seeker categories (Ministry of Education, 2000a).

For students aged 19 years and over who attend secondary schools, however, such provisions do not apply. In the case of adults, the official view appears to be that they can and should cover personally the costs of upskilling in English. For immigrants who have entered New Zealand under schemes which do not require pre-payment of tuition, sources of financial support for taking ESOL courses are very limited. The situation is rendered more difficult by the “stand-down” period of two years for immigrants instituted in 1999 which prevents them from obtaining student allowances to attend classes in polytechnics and universities.

In the case of refugees there is an induction course of 6 weeks at the Mangere Centre that includes an ESOL component². Quota refugees also receive a modest setting up allowance but this is obviously needed for essential items and cannot cover adequately their ESOL training needs.

---

¹ The ESOL Assessment Form is based on broad criteria for each of the four modes of English (listening, speaking, reading and writing). Students are given a score by their teachers for performance in the different categories specified (for more information, see Ministry of Education, 1999b).

² The government funded on-arrival education programme for quota refugees is managed by Auckland University of Technology’s Centre for Refugee Education at Mangere, in South Auckland (for further details of the programme, see McDermott, 1997).
Unemployed people are eligible for an annual $200 training grant which can help some to access ESOL courses. In addition, for some NESB adults who are classed as “long-term unemployed” (i.e. registered with Work and Income New Zealand for a minimum of 26 weeks) there may be the possibility of gaining places in ESOL-related courses that form part of the Training Opportunities Programme (TOP) funded/managed by Skill New Zealand. Such courses have the advantage of combining ESOL with job-seeking skills but are usually only 24-48 weeks in length. For people with low levels of English this period may not be long enough to allow major gains in English competence to occur. The short courses funded by Work and Income New Zealand, such as English for professionals, have similar limitations.

This leaves an option for NESB immigrants and refugees who are not accepted into such courses and who have limited means of joining classes run by community education providers with access to the restricted number of tutor hours paid by the Ministry of Education. These classes, which usually provide English tuition at little or no cost to learners and involve one or two hours a week of group learning, are not designed to provide the intensive, full-time tuition that some immigrants and refugees feel they require to make rapid advances in English proficiency. This drawback also applies to English conversation classes provided at the local level by voluntary organisations and to assistance through the Home Tutors scheme.

**Relationship between English language provision and other services**

English language provision cannot be seen in isolation; it is closely connected with other areas that affect the successful settlement outcomes of new settlers. As has been identified in a number of previous studies (Trlin 1993; Altinkaya, 1998; Hoffmann and Chrisp, 1998; Altinkaya and Omundsen, 1999; Watts and Trlin, 2000), there is a lack of integrated top-level policies that could provide a consistent approach to addressing the post-arrival needs of immigrants with different linguistic or cultural backgrounds. The present approach may be described as piecemeal, uncoordinated and characterised by ad hoc arrangements (Altinkaya, 1998; Lowrie-Neilson, 2000).

The Race Relations Conciliator commented in his 1998 report on the serious policy gaps which left new arrivals largely on their own to make a transition to life in New Zealand (Office of the Race Relations Conciliator, 1998: 10):

*As a country we need to develop a much more comprehensive programme to assist new migrants to settle. Such a programme should make English language classes readily available. Other settlement services should be offered to new settlers as well as the communities in which they settle.*
The importance of a more integrated approach to easing the settlement difficulties of new arrivals is accepted by the present Minister of Immigration, who said (Dalziel, 2000):

*Because a range of agencies are responsible for different components of settlement policy (for example, employment, business investment opportunities, ESOL learning and community integration), there is a need to provide an integrated oversight mechanism within Government to ensure the best outcomes.*

However, as Trlin (1993) pointed out, the fundamental needs in New Zealand immigration and settlement go much deeper than this and to be fully met require the development of a balanced institutional structure of immigration. That is: (a) an immigration policy which is well integrated with both (b) an effective post-arrival policy geared to the economic, social and cultural needs of immigrants, and (c) an ethnic relations policy consistent with a situation of emerging multiculturalism (see Trlin 1993, for further discussion).
METHODOLOGY

A 30-item questionnaire seeking information about policies and practices related to ESOL provision for adult NESB immigrants and refugees was devised, following advice gained in focus group meetings with senior teachers employed in ESOL institutions in the Manawatu region, as well as discussions with different groups and organisations in other parts of the country which have an involvement in ESOL provision (Skill New Zealand, Work and Income New Zealand, Ministry of Education, National ESOL Home Tutors Association). The questionnaire sought information about: the types and length of the ESOL courses offered; the numbers of adult NESB immigrants and refugees who took these courses; the backgrounds of these learners; the qualifications and status of teachers and support staff; the funding arrangements that applied etc. (see Appendix). Respondents were also canvassed on the difficulties experienced by adult NESB immigrants and refugees in accessing ESOL courses and the changes required in ESOL provision to better meet their settlement needs.

The questionnaire was trialled among selected secondary, tertiary, community education and private training ESOL providers in Palmerston North in June 2000. Following minor modifications, the questionnaire was sent through the post in July-August 2000 to 155 teaching institutions and establishments throughout the country which were known to have some involvement with ESOL. These comprised: (a) all polytechnics, universities and colleges of education listed in the Directory of New Zealand Schools and Tertiary Institutions 2000 (Ministry of Education, 2000b); (b) private language schools in Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch and Dunedin that responded affirmatively to telephone enquiries asking if they catered for immigrants and/or refugees; (c) secondary schools (state, integrated and private) listed in Ministry of Education databases as providing ESOL for NESB students aged 19 years and above in their day classes; (d) community education centres and evening classes attached to secondary schools that were identified by regional ESOL advisors as offering ESOL programmes for new settlers; and (e) private training establishments (PTEs) listed by Skill New Zealand as offering courses with an ESOL focus.

As the main focus of the survey was on more formally organised, classroom-based ESOL provision at the post-compulsory education level, organisations which offered ESOL assistance that was essentially informal in nature (such as Home Tutors of English, church groups, ethnic associations etc.) were omitted from the study. It is acknowledged, however, that in many cases there is a very fine line between "formal" and "informal" ESOL provision.
One hundred and seven questionnaires completed by senior ESOL teachers in the educational institutions and training establishments contacted were returned by the due date, which represents an overall return rate of 69.0 per cent.

Interviews were held with senior ESOL teachers in 16 of the educational institutions and training establishments that responded to the questionnaire. These interviews were held during October 2000 in Auckland, Hamilton, Palmerston North, Wellington and Christchurch. The organisations were selected on the basis of representing the different educational and training establishments throughout the country, as well as for the insightful perspectives and views on issues and best practice that were provided in answers to open-ended questions in the postal survey.
RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

Profile of the Participating Organisations

1. Main types and activities

One hundred and seven educational institutions and training establishments participated in the postal survey. A detailed breakdown of these institutions and establishments is given in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions/establishments</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary schools (state, integrated, private)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary institutions (universities, colleges of education, polytechnics)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community education organisations</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private training establishments</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It must be noted that there is some overlap between the functions of the different sectors. Community education, for example, may be conducted in night classes organised through secondary schools or in day or evening classes conducted by a variety of organisations. In the list above, to simplify the situation, all such organised teaching activities at the community level are grouped under “community education”.

2. Status of ESOL provision

Of the 107 participating organisations, 87 confirmed that they had offered ESOL classes for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees at some time in the last five years and 78 were offering these classes in 2000 (see Table 2). Of the 9 institutions which reported that they had previously offered but were not currently offering ESOL courses for adult immigrants and/or refugees, 4 said that they would offer such courses again if more funding was available, while 2 indicated that offering these courses in the future would depend on demand for them.
Table 2: ESOL provision for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees, participating organisations, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESOL provision</th>
<th>Secondary schools</th>
<th>Tertiary institutions</th>
<th>Community education</th>
<th>PTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL provision in the past five years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ESOL provision this year | | | | | | | | |
| Yes            | 18    | 81.8  | 20   | 87.0  | 25    | 96.2  | 15    | 93.8  |
| No             | 4     | 18.2  | 3    | 13.0  | 1     | 3.8   | 1     | 6.2   |
| Total          | 22    | 100.0 | 23   | 100.0 | 26    | 100.0 | 16    | 100.0 |

3. Types of courses offered

A question was included in the questionnaire on the number of courses offered by each organisation. This proved somewhat problematic as in some organisations there is flexible entry to courses, which means that the same “course” may be offered continuously throughout the year with different students entering at different times. In other organisations, courses have pre-determined starting and finishing dates which may vary in length from four weeks or less to a semester or more. Of the 730 courses reported, 4 were of less than 4 weeks duration, 560 between 4 and 24 weeks, 159 between 25 and 52 weeks, while 7 were of over 52 weeks.

The 730 courses were also offered at different levels: beginners (81 or 11.1 per cent), elementary (139 or 19 per cent), intermediate (236 or 32.3 per cent), advanced (126 or 17.3 per cent) and “mixed” (148 or 20.3 per cent). As might be expected, beginners/elementary courses were provided principally through community education, whereas advanced courses were offered, in the main, by tertiary institutions.

As far as the content focus of these courses was concerned, this ranged from general to specialised. Courses of a more specialised nature made up almost half (47.0 per cent) of those offered. Community education organisations
tended to provide courses of a more general nature while private training establishments usually offered courses with an explicit employment-related focus (such as TOP courses). Tertiary providers had a mix of courses, but with a strong focus on those of a bridging nature intended to assist students in advancing to higher levels of academic study or professional training (Table 3). The differences between the organisations with respect to the provision of courses of a specific nature are statistically significant (chi-square of 60.38, 3 df, p < .001).

Table 3: Focus of ESOL courses for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees, participating organisations, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of course</th>
<th>Secondary schools</th>
<th>Tertiary institutions</th>
<th>Community education</th>
<th>PTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General ESOL</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL for further study</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL courses with employment focus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL courses with non-work focus</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ESOL courses</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Funding of ESOL courses

A number of external funding sources were reported ranging from Vote: Education and Vote: Employment funding provided through the Ministry of Education (MOE), Skill New Zealand and Work and Income New Zealand to financial support contributed by charitable organisations, trusts, local authorities etc. In many cases, participating organisations received funding for ESOL classes from a mixture of sources, depending on the kinds of programmes offered. Some, mainly private language schools, received little or no outside funding, and relied primarily on student fees.

Although the questionnaire did not specifically seek details on the level of fees paid by students, as this information might have been considered to be commercially sensitive, a number of the participating organisations did volunteer general information on their fee structures. These fee structures ranged widely from no fees for classes that were fully funded, such as TOP
courses, to relatively high levels of fees in institutions which operated mainly on a user pays basis. It must also be noted that at times funding from a source not directly connected with ESOL provision for adult NESB immigrants or refugees may be used to subsidise courses of this nature. For example, in some institutions revenue obtained from full fee paying international students was employed to subsidise tuition for adult NESB immigrant and/or refugee learners.

The main sources of funding for ESOL courses for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees reported by the respondents are set out in Table 4.

Table 4: Main source of funding for ESOL courses for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees, participating organisations, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding source</th>
<th>Secondary schools</th>
<th>Tertiary institutions</th>
<th>Community education</th>
<th>PTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE funding</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding from another central government source</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding from a non-central source</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No outside funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Relationships with funding providers

The participants were invited to indicate their level of agreement ("Strongly agree", "Moderately agree", "Moderately disagree", "Strongly disagree") with statements concerning different aspects of their relationship with their main funding provider: clarity of the information provided, requirements, monitoring, level of funding and communication (Table 5). In general, the participating organisations expressed moderate to strong approval of the clarity of the information given and of the funding providers' requirements. On the other hand, they gave considerably less approval to the monitoring of outcomes and the level of funding provided. It should be noted, however, that a third of the respondents did not answer this question, either wholly or in part. This reluctance to comment is understandable in view of the somewhat sensitive nature of contractual arrangements.
Table 5: Views on relationships with main funding providers, participating organisations, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Mod. agree</th>
<th>Mod. disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know/No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clear information is given by the funding provider.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The funding provider’s requirements are reasonable.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes are carefully monitored by the funding provider.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The funding is appropriate for the service provided.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is good communication between the funding provider and the institution.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Class composition

Seventy-three of the 78 participating organisations offering ESOL courses in 2000 (93.6 per cent) indicated that the average class size in these courses was 19 or less with 27 (34.6 per cent) reporting that the average class size was 10 or less. The responses of the participating organisations also indicated that adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees tended to be taught in the same classes as other ESOL learners (i.e. international students temporarily in New Zealand or immigrants of a younger age). Just 25 (32.1 per cent) said that adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees were taught in different classes to other NESB students.
Profile of Adult NESB Students in Participating Organisations

1. Number of students

The number of adult NESB immigrant and/or refugee students enrolled in courses with an ESOL focus in the participating organisations varied from one to over 2000. In the latter case this was a university in which there were large numbers of immigrants who were taking language support courses to help them cope with the demands of academic study. Just under half of the organisations (47.4 per cent) had 50 or less adult NESB immigrant and/or refugee students in their ESOL programme (Table 6).

Table 6: Number of adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees in ESOL courses, participating organisations, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of adult NESB students</th>
<th>Secondary schools</th>
<th>Tertiary institutions</th>
<th>Community education</th>
<th>PTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-500</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 and over</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Age and gender

Younger adults (24 years or under) were in the minority: 8 (10.3 per cent) of the 78 participating organisations said that this was the main age group; 22 (28.2 per cent) indicated they had mainly adults aged 35 years and over; while 48 (61.5 per cent) said that no single age group predominated. In general, there were more females than males in the ESOL courses. Fifty-six (71.8 per cent) reported that females made up over half of the adult NESB immigrant and/or refugee student numbers.

3. Educational background

With respect to the educational backgrounds of the ESOL learners, 31 (39.7 per cent) of the organisations reported that the adult NESB immigrants and/or
refugees enrolled in ESOL courses had some previous tertiary education. Only 13 (16.7 per cent) said that the majority of their students had less than 3 years of secondary education.

4. Ethnic background

The respondents were asked to name the main (up to three) ethnic groups to which their adult NESB immigrant and/or refugee students belonged. The main ethnic groups identified were, in order, Asian, European (other than people from the United Kingdom or Ireland), Middle Eastern, African and Pacific Islands. Seventy-three (93.5 per cent) of the 78 participating organisations offering ESOL courses in 2000 listed Asians as one of the three main groups in these courses. In contrast, only 2 recorded South Americans as featuring amongst the main ethnic groups (Table 7). The participation of people with particular ethnic backgrounds, though, did alter somewhat according to the type of organisation, its location and its programmes. Pacific Islands people, for example, were represented more in the Skill New Zealand/Work and Income New Zealand courses run by private training establishments, while Asian immigrants featured more highly in the academically-oriented courses offered by tertiary providers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic groups</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islands</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Student recruitment and access

The participating organisations were asked whether they had experienced any difficulties in marketing their courses and recruiting students. Twenty-seven (34.6 per cent), mainly ESOL departments in polytechnics and language centres attached to universities, said that they had experienced such problems.
Some reported that their enrolments were affected by the changes that came into force in January 1999 and made immigrants ineligible for student allowances within their first two years of permanent residency. For private training establishments the problems lay more in obtaining funding to run English for employment courses even though they sometimes had quite long waiting lists for places.

Table 8 lists (in rank order) more specific reasons why some adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees might find it difficult to take the ESOL courses available in educational institutions and training establishments. The main area of difficulty identified was “personal reasons”. These included a variety of individual circumstances such as lack of confidence, family attitudes and religious belief. Closely linked with this cluster, and particularly important for female caregivers, was child minding. The other three main areas of difficulty were the cost of tuition, transport (especially in areas not well served by public transport) and the time of classes (some adults may find it difficult to attend day classes because of work commitments, and others have shift work or family responsibilities which limit their opportunities to attend evening classes). Selection criteria were seen as a problem by private training providers who were concerned at the eligibility restrictions on courses funded/managed by Work and Income New Zealand and Skill New Zealand.

Table 8: Perceptions of the reasons why some adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees do not take ESOL courses, participating organisations, 2000 (N = 78)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived areas of difficulty</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal reasons</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child minding</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of classes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection criteria</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student loans</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of course</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of course</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (miscellaneous)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Half of the participating organisations indicated that they were taking some measures to assist students to overcome these difficulties of access. The
measures mentioned included: arranging creche facilities, scheduling alternative times for classes, offering courses of different length, providing flexible entry points to courses and subsidising tuition costs.

Profile of Staff Involved in ESOL Instruction

1. Number and status of staff

The number of staff members in participating organisations employed to teach ESOL to adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees varied from one to over 50. The majority had a small number of ESOL teachers; 40 (51.3 per cent) had five staff members or less, while at the other end of the range 5 (6.4 per cent) had over 30. Slightly more of the 78 participating organisations (37 or 47.4 per cent) reported that their staff worked in a mainly part-time paid capacity as opposed to those organisations where the staff were mainly full-time, paid employees (33 or 42.3 per cent).

2. Qualifications and training

On the basis of information supplied, staff in the participating organisations were, in the main, qualified and trained. Of the 626 staff members identified, 523 (83.5 per cent) had both tertiary qualifications and professional training in the teaching of English to speakers of other languages (TESOL). On the other hand, there were 9 staff members (1.4 per cent) who had neither tertiary qualifications nor TESOL training (Table 9). However, the employment of staff with appropriate tertiary qualifications and/or training varied considerably according to the type of ESOL provider. As expected, the tertiary institutions had the highest percentage of staff with both tertiary qualifications and TESOL training, followed by the private training establishments. The differences between the four sectors are statistically significant (chi-square of 19.60, 3 df, p < .001).

3. Employment of NESB staff

Only 36 (46.2 per cent) of the 78 participating organisations reported that they had NESB staff members who contributed in different ways to the ESOL programme. These 95 NESB staff members were engaged in a variety of teaching, administrative, clerical/secretarial and counsellor roles. A number were appointed as bilingual teacher aides to assist in beginners' classes. As well as their involvement in the teaching programme they also acted as translators and interpreters when required. The major ethnic groups to which they belonged were, in order, Asian, European, Pacific Islands, African and Middle Eastern.
Table 9: Qualifications and training of teachers involved in ESOL courses for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees, participating organisations, 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff qualification and training</th>
<th>Secondary schools</th>
<th>Tertiary institutions</th>
<th>Community education</th>
<th>PTEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary qualification and TESOL training</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary qualification, but no TESOL training</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESOL training, but no tertiary qualification</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No TESOL training, no tertiary qualification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total staff</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Staff recruitment and retention

Eighteen (23.1 per cent) of the participating organisations described staff recruitment as a problem, while 17 (21.8 per cent) identified staff retention as an area of difficulty. In the main, it was the community education organisations that experienced difficulties in recruiting staff as the pay rates were usually lower than those in secondary or tertiary institutions.

Links with Other Groups

Forty-eight (51.5 per cent) of the participating organisations reported that they had developed close links with non-educational institutions in connection with their ESOL courses. These included links with ethnic community groups (including liaison with local Ethnic Councils), employer groups, service clubs, voluntary organisations and local authorities.

ESOL and Settlement

All 107 organisations that responded, whether or not they were offering ESOL courses to adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees in 2000, were invited to answer the final section of the questionnaire. First, they were asked to
indicate whether they viewed English as: (a) the key factor in successful settlement, (b) one of the key factors, or (c) a minor factor. It was not surprising that no responses were received in favour of (c) but the responses were fairly evenly balanced between (a) and (b) (see Table 10). However, the views of the respondents were more clear-cut with respect to the follow-up question: “Do you think that changes are required with respect to the provision of English language courses to better meet the settlement needs in New Zealand of adult NESB immigrants?” and a similarly worded question concerning English language provision for adult NESB refugees. Only two respondents replied in the negative to the first question and one to the second, while 87 (81.3 per cent) agreed that changes should be made in ESOL provision for immigrants and 75 (70.1 per cent) affirmed that changes should be made in ESOL provision for refugees. In considering these results, however, it should be noted that a fairly high percentage replied “Don’t know” or gave no response.

Seventy-nine organisations made comments on ways in which the system of ESOL provision for adult NESB immigrants should be improved. They provided 182 instances which ranged from policy considerations to matters relating to local arrangements. Overall, matters concerning government policy and resourcing comprised 61.0 per cent of these suggested changes (Table 11). In particular, the organisations identified access to ESOL as a major issue. A number of the respondents suggested that additional funding was needed to provide effective tuition for adult NESB immigrants. There was support also for ESOL courses for immigrants with low levels of English to be free or heavily subsidised by the government, and it was felt that policy deficiencies at the central level needed to be addressed to ensure a more coherent system. At the provider level the organisations pointed to the importance of up-to-date courses relevant to student needs, staff qualifications, assistance with child care and transport costs, flexibility in enrolment and scheduling, better information on courses available, and greater accountability.

Sixty-eight respondents also gave 135 instances of areas where they would like to see changes in ESOL provision for refugees. Again, over half of these instances related to government policy and/or resourcing (Table 12). The views echoed many of those expressed with respect to ESOL provision for adult NESB immigrants (better access to ESOL courses, free or low cost tuition for refugees with low levels of English language proficiency, assistance with child care, and better information). At the local level, some of the respondents saw a need for locally based courses, and for more involvement of ethnic communities.

The concerns and issues which have been introduced above will be discussed more fully in the next section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESOL is the key factor in the successful settlement of immigrants and/or</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refugees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL is one of the key factors in the successful settlement of</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immigrants and/or refugees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL is a minor factor in the successful settlement of immigrants and/or</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refugees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes are required with respect to ESOL provision to better meet the settlement needs of immigrants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>87</th>
<th>81.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/No response</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes are required with respect to ESOL provision to better meet the needs of refugees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>70.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know/No response</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11: Changes needed at government, provider and local/individual levels in ESOL provision to meet the needs of adult NESB immigrants, participating organisations, 2000 (N = 79)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of concern</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to ESOL</td>
<td>“Need to make sure that all migrants have access to appropriate ESOL classes”</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course fees</td>
<td>“Free or heavily subsidised courses should be available”</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall funding</td>
<td>“Increase the level of funding for ESOL classes”</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy deficiencies</td>
<td>“A more coherent system is needed”</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National curriculum</td>
<td>“A national curriculum would help”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>“More funding for research”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provider level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course content</td>
<td>“Courses should be up-to-date and respond to student needs”</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/qualifications</td>
<td>“Monitor the qualifications of tutors in community education”</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials/resources</td>
<td>“More authentic, New Zealand-based materials”</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>“Clear information on the types of ESOL courses available”</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class organisation</td>
<td>“More flexibility in enrolment and scheduling”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care</td>
<td>“Child care assistance is a must”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different modes of delivery</td>
<td>“Offer options of face-to-face tuition or distance education”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>“More accountability amongst providers”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>“An agreed system of benchmarking”</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>“Give public transport grants”</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local/Individual level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes locally based</td>
<td>“Local classes help meet local migrant needs”</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve the local community</td>
<td>“Bring in bilingual people from the community”</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12: Changes needed at government, provider and local/individual levels in ESOL provision to meet the needs of adult NESB refugees, participating organisations, 2000 (N = 68)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Changes required</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to courses</td>
<td>“Provide more opportunities for those with few financial resources to upskill in English”</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheaper classes</td>
<td>“Free or low cost basic tuition especially in survival English”</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy deficiencies</td>
<td>“A cohesive national approach to ESOL instruction is wanted”</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall funding</td>
<td>“More funding, more resources”</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>“Base decisions on better research”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public awareness</td>
<td>“Develop greater public awareness of the needs of refugees”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National curriculum</td>
<td>“A national approved programme as a guide”</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provider level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course content</td>
<td>“Offer more job skill packages”</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/qualifications</td>
<td>“Reward qualified staff”</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>“Provide assistance with transport”</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care</td>
<td>“Assist with child care arrangements”</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>“Give good up-to-date information on services”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class organisation</td>
<td>“Small classes are essential for the development of literacy skills”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>“Better assessment tools are needed”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>“More bilingual teaching”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local/Individual level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes locally based</td>
<td>“Quality local provision to cater for local needs”</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve the local community</td>
<td>“Involve members of ethnic groups in running programmes”</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERVIEWS WITH SENIOR STAFF IN SELECTED ORGANISATIONS

Issues and Concerns Relating to ESOL Provision for NESB Adults

The issues and concerns expressed by the spokespersons for the participating organisations in the postal survey were elaborated upon by senior teachers and/or managers in the 16 educational institutions and training establishments selected for follow-up interviews. These issues and concerns included the following:

1. Government policy

There are, in the view of those interviewed, serious policy gaps relating to the English language needs of immigrants and refugees. Typical of comments received on this topic was the observation of a senior ESOL teacher in a tertiary institution:

   It is not realistic for us to accept people and then not give them very much support in standing upright in terms of English language or how to cope with society in New Zealand. The more the Department of Immigration decides to do about this the better.

The ESOL department head of a large community education centre attached to a secondary school was even more forthright in her opinion:

   We have a moral obligation, if we are going to take them [refugees/immigrants] to put money where our mouth is - we cannot just say “OK you’re now here, you’re a New Zealand citizen, you’ve got PR, now look after yourself”...There needs to be a centrally driven policy and we need to acknowledge that we must put more resources into these people. It’s no good saying at the United Nations “Oh we bring 750 [refugees] here, aren’t we wonderful, we’re only a small country”. We’re only taking them and just abandoning them really.

2. Funding

Funding was consistently identified in the interviews as a major constraint on the operations of organisations offering ESOL courses. The view was strongly held that ESOL at the adult level was seriously under-resourced. As a result, some adults were not gaining access to the specialist tuition they needed to advance rapidly in English. With more funding the ESOL
providers would be able to lower fees, increase accessibility and provide a wider range of learning options. As the senior teacher in charge of a university ESOL support programme said:

If we had more funding, more control, then we could do more for the students’ benefit - build up resources, initiate activities of all kinds which would enhance language development.

3. Difficulties in dealing with different agencies

The respondents complained of receiving sometimes conflicting and contradictory information from government funding organisations. Not only did different organisations appear to have different sets of expectations but there was also variability in the requirements of agencies within the same organisation (for example, according to some of the respondents, different information had been received from Work and Income New Zealand offices in different regions of Auckland).

4. Wasteful competition amongst providers

A further area of concern that emerged was that an imposed market-driven ideology had led to increased competition between providers which in turn resulted in wastage of time and resources. The director of studies of a private training establishment made this observation:

We’ve been forced to tender and put a lot of work into putting up proposals and competing with other very good institutions. Our time and their time is wasted. We end up being very wary of each other instead of saying “Let’s be rational about this, let’s work on this together”.

5. Lack of understanding of the needs of ESOL students

A view expressed by many of those interviewed was that there existed (outside the profession) a widespread lack of understanding of the needs of ESOL students. While those intimately involved in assisting adult immigrants and refugees realised that for many of the new arrivals progress in acquiring English skills is a long and slow process, funding providers (and the wider public) are often unaware of the extent to which the personal trauma that refugees have suffered in their homelands can affect their settlement in New Zealand (see Madjar, 2000). Additionally, many refugees have little or no formal education and are illiterate in their own language. Such people face a potentially lengthy period of adjustment in a new language and cultural environment and need special support (see Humpage, 2000).
6. Lack of recognition of the efforts made by immigrants and refugees

Linked with a lack of understanding of the needs of ESOL students was insufficient recognition by the wider public of the investment of money, time and energy made by adult NESB immigrants and refugees themselves to upskill in English. Examples were given of the considerable financial sacrifices made by some NESB adults to enrol in relatively expensive ESOL courses, of immigrant and refugee families who pooled resources so that one family member could enrol in ESOL courses, and of immigrants and refugees walking long distances to attend classes as they could not afford the costs of public transport.

7. Need for better contractual arrangements.

Training providers wanted better contractual arrangements with funding agencies. They felt that some present funding arrangements were unsatisfactory as they were based on short-term contracts. The view was expressed that to enable organisations to plan ahead, longer funding cycles were essential. This would give more certainty as far as securing staff was concerned and make it worthwhile for providers to invest more in plant and resources.

8. Inappropriate outcomes

A common concern was that the outcomes expected of programmes funded/managed by Work and Income New Zealand (WINZ) and Skill New Zealand were too narrowly linked with predetermined employment outcomes. While acknowledging employment as a legitimate goal, the senior staff members interviewed believed that for many NESB learners with modest levels of English language proficiency, employment immediately at the end of a short course was an unrealistic prospect. The director of studies of a private training establishment said that compliance with strict employment-related outcomes had made its courses less relevant to the needs of clients.

*When we originally did the selection process for the very first course that we ran, we selected the participants on how we really felt we could help them. We realised after that, that even though we were doing wonderful things for these people who really needed it, the next time we really had to focus on the immediate outcomes with employment as the number one priority... If you don't have the outcomes, then you won't get the next contract. We've been arguing with WINZ on that aspect.*

Another training provider commented that outcome requirements did not discriminate between appropriate and inappropriate employment.
You may achieve an outcome of employment that is entirely unsatisfying - that’s hopeless. If you’ve got an engineer who’s working in a factory at the end of the course, that’s useless, they’re not going to stay there.

Best Practice in ESOL Provision

The interviews also produced the following views on what constituted best practice in ESOL provision for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees.

1. Competent staff

The firm view expressed was that staff should be qualified and have specialist training related to the second language teaching area. Some of those interviewed felt that ideally the staff in an institution should present a blend of training and experience, with older, more experienced staff providing guidance for younger staff. However, more important than age or experience were personal attributes, such as patience, sensitivity to individual needs and empathy towards people of different cultural backgrounds.

2. Bilingual teachers

Different views were held on the value of bilingual teachers. One point of view was that New Zealand-born staff are needed to provide students with exposure to the linguistic and cultural norms found in New Zealand society. More advanced students, it was suggested, prefer native speakers of English as teachers rather than people with non-native English speaking backgrounds, however competent they may be in English. On the other hand, there was a view, such as that expressed below, that students at the beginner level were advantaged when they were taught by teachers who shared their language backgrounds:

I believe personally that the numbers have increased here with minimal advertising due to the influence of one of our Chinese members of staff and he’s taught at the lower level. One of the difficulties is to get the students to leave him and move on to another level. The more mature students clearly like the bilingual speakers - some of [these students] have very minimal English. Using bilingual teachers at the beginner and elementary level and then weaning them off to native speakers is the way to go.

However, whether bilingual staff were employed as teachers, tutors or aides, the strong view was that they should have proper training. It was recognised by the respondents that there was an unfilled need for a specialist professional training programme for teacher aides.
3. Staff development

On-going staff development that covered topics related to programme planning, teaching approaches, materials design and evaluation were advocated as essential to good practice. At the tertiary level, these development sessions may also be used to introduce staff to current research related to classroom teaching and to encourage them to share the findings of action research projects. As described by one respondent, the system followed in a particular university English language centre was as follows:

We have a fairly structured staff development programme that runs through the year. There are three different strands to that. One is a full-time week in the middle of the year. The second strand is Friday afternoon meetings which take place every six weeks. The programme is planned differently every year according to a survey of the teachers needs and wishes and they go from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. The third strand is called journal lunches (we hold them once a month) and that's designed to encourage our tutors to keep up with the latest research.

4. Good resources and facilities

Effective teaching relies on the availability of good resources. A number of the respondents referred to materials which had been prepared by individual staff members or staff teams, to make up for the lack of suitable New Zealand-based materials at appropriate levels. The students should also have opportunities to supplement their classroom instruction with individual work in self-access facilities equipped for computer-assisted language learning (CALL) and providing a selection of up-to-date audio-visual and textual material.

5. Flexibility in scheduling

Best practice involves organising courses in modules or blocks that allow for multiple entry points and thus avoid a lengthy wait for those who wish to join a class. The respondents cited classes held during the school day to allow caregivers to attend ESOL classes while their children are at school, and alternative arrangements (evenings, Saturday morning classes) for those who have work commitments.

6. Class composition

In the opinion of some senior teachers mixed classes of people from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds encourage students to interact and communicate in English. However, there was general agreement among
those involved in the follow-up interviews that in certain situations (pre-literate beginners, Moslem refugee women) separate classes were preferable. A virtually unanimous view was that an ideal class size was 10-12 students. Larger classes made it difficult for teachers to cater for individual needs, while smaller classes limited opportunities for group work.

7. Course design

Best practice in the selection, arrangement and presentation of course content involves: a carefully prepared set of objectives relevant to the needs of the students, a planned sequence of lessons designed to cover the content necessary to meet these objectives, and an integrated set of materials that reflects the aims and objectives of the particular course. Best practice also entails provision for recycling and revising items earlier learnt and linking these with new content.

8. Assessment and feedback

Careful assessment of adult students on entry is of crucial importance to ensure that they are placed into classes that best match their level of attainment in English. This initial placement, said the respondents, must be regularly reviewed to enable students to advance according to their rate of progress. Students should be given regular feedback by teachers on their progress and, in turn, should be given opportunities to comment on their courses. In some organisations, according to the respondents, this assessment comprises written questionnaires as well as personal interviews. For example, in a TOP course the following system is used:

We have individualised interview times at the end of each day with tutors. The other thing we like to do is [to] have class meetings with a formal agenda - and that brings up issues also.

9. Out-of-class activities

A number of the respondents reported that their organisations used visits to local places of interest to widen the linguistic and cultural experiences of students as well as to enhance teacher-student rapport. In some cases, members of the adult students’ families were also invited.

10. Networking with community groups

The respondents generally felt that best practice included forging links with local ethnic communities as well as employer groups, government agencies, service clubs and voluntary organisations. One institution, for example, reported that it had regular functions to which representatives of different
groups (ranging from employers to local authorities) were invited to meet staff and students.

**Case Studies of Selected Organisations**

**Case Study A**

A good example of a well-run private training establishment (PTE) was a multicultural learning centre that specialised in English language tuition. The centre was established in 1991 and shared a facility with two other organisations which were involved in providing information and assistance to refugees and immigrants. This facility received financial support from the local city council. The PTE was accredited by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA)³ and offered a range of 27 training courses such as an interpreters' driver's licence course, cultural orientation for new arrivals, computer training, IELTS preparation, vocational and work-based training, as well as classes in general English. It also carried out professional assessment of students' needs and made referrals to other agencies for specialised support. Although originally catering for Pacific Islands people it had large numbers of students from different backgrounds, catering for approximately 250 immigrants and refugees from 41 nationalities. The centre employed 15 staff of whom 7 had NESB immigrant or refugee backgrounds.

The director of this centre believed that a major strength of the organisation lay in providing practical, client-centred learning, based on authentic course materials that deal with aspects of New Zealand life. A further strength was the strong emphasis on pastoral care of the students and an understanding of their individual needs. In the opinion of the director, funding providers are sadly lacking in this understanding:

> Refugees and migrants are not a homogeneous group. You might have a nomadic, illiterate goat herder sitting next to a highly qualified professional - their levels of oracy might be very similar but the progress they make is quite different.

Hence more flexibility should be allowed in terms of reaching the desired outcomes, such as obtaining employment at the end of a short TOP course.

The director believed that a lack of adequate funding was restricting access to courses.

---

³ The New Zealand Qualifications Authority was established in 1989 to coordinate national qualifications. It also has responsibility for the registration of private training establishments. PTEs require NZQA accreditation for access to government funding.
Since 1991 there hasn't been any increase in funding for us. And yet compliance costs and administrative requirements have increased dramatically...The private training sector has 30 per cent less funding than polytechnics and universities.

However, even more of a concern to him was the lack of a national framework for ESOL support for immigrants and refugees.

We need a cohesive approach nationwide. We need robust, intelligent, well designed programmes that reflect the needs of the group and I think the key to this is a synergy between funding organisations and providers on a national scale. There is a great patchwork of provision at the moment, with varying standards of accountability etc. I think we've got to streamline that. Within ESOL a National Advisory body is really needed with good representation of the various sectors, and we need a national languages policy. I think a national advisory body, with a national resource centre, with curriculum development and a small secretariat appointed to do this, would have great merit.

Case Study B

Examples of a number of best practice features at the community education level were evident in an inner-city community education centre catering for the more disadvantaged immigrants and refugees, particularly pre-literate adults with family responsibilities. The centre employed paid staff as well as volunteers and offered 8 ESOL-related courses (4 at the absolute beginners' level) including those that focused on literacy, numeracy and parenting. The students were mainly from North Africa (Ethiopia, Somalia), the Middle East (Syria) and Asia (Cambodia).

A feature of the centre was that it combined tuition in ESOL with a variety of other activities intended to assist refugees and immigrants, including counselling, advice on obtaining housing, employment etc. The centre maintained close contacts with ethnic communities and had on its board representatives of refugee and immigrant groups. A special grant towards its operating costs was received from the Ministry of Education as well as community education funding, but the centre also carried out fund raising activities to help to keep the tuition costs as low as possible. The centre catered for 100 students but had a long waiting list, which suggests that there is a large unfilled need among immigrants and refugees for affordable, basic English language programmes in some areas of New Zealand.

The centre operated a child education programme. This began as a play group for young children while their mothers studied English. The play group activities had subsequently expanded into a more structured programme to
help children learn English as well as to prepare them for schooling in New Zealand. The child education programme was directed by a staff member with assistance from volunteers and had proved very successful.

Overall, the director felt that the range of programmes provided by the centre had gone some way towards filling the gap in ESOL provision that existed at the pre-literacy level in the urban area concerned but that far more needed to be done nationally to assist refugees.

There are so many people who have so little formal education and they really struggle to acquire the literacy skills they need to get further training and employment. We have not thought as a country of the results of bringing in a population who have different cultures and traditions, look visibly different, who come into a small country that has a tradition of having very British attitudes to immigration. So I feel that people motivated by humanitarian impulse, as much as I admire that, are bringing people into the country who end up suffering because provision for them is inadequate...We need special schools during the day for refugees - this will cost money but the costs if you don't are worse.

A strong view held by the director was that ESOL should be viewed holistically and should not be labour market driven. Initially, the survival needs of families should have major emphasis. In particular, attention should be given to ways of assisting parents and supporting them in their parenting roles.

Families are having difficulty because children adapt very quickly, but if the parents are making really limited progress because they're not getting the right kind of course, the whole parental authority is undermined. That's very destructive.

A further concern for the director was the lack of co-ordination of ESOL provision which made it hard on learners: “They sign themselves up everywhere as they don’t know what will happen - what course they can get into.” More careful overall monitoring of support for immigrants and refugees was also needed: “There is a lot of money being spent with no purpose - there needs to be greater accountability in community education.”

Case Study C

A further exemplar of good practice was an urban secondary school which had a large adult roll in its day school operations. The ESOL department had 16 staff and 3 teacher aides and catered for approximately 400 adult NESB students a year.
The ESOL department was well resourced, though the large roll had caused space problems. Apart from ESOL courses tailored to the needs of NESB adolescents, the unit provided 9 courses for adults at different levels, including 2 full-time courses with 20 hours of instruction per week: one a full year course which emphasised English for communication and which aimed to develop skills in listening, speaking, reading, writing and understanding of the media; the other, a six months course preparing students to pass the IELTS test requirements for entry to tertiary-level studies. In order to make ESOL instruction more accessible to adults, classes were scheduled both during the day and in the evening. A creche was also available on site. The school employed two bilingual teacher aides. The senior teachers interviewed endorsed the value of bilingual assistance and would like to see more bilingual people trained as ESOL teachers. They also felt that there should be far more attention to teacher training in the ESOL area generally, as competent, trained, well qualified staff were essential to effective ESOL provision for immigrants and refugees.

There are lots of untrained ESOL teachers out there. There should be a national standard. You wouldn't employ a maths teacher with no maths in their degree. Why do you employ someone as an ESOL teacher with no training?

The senior staff also believed that some of the main problems faced by NESB immigrants and refugees stemmed from discriminatory attitudes in New Zealand society. In their school considerable emphasis was placed on developing among the student body a positive orientation towards diversity and a race relations module had been developed. However, in the opinion of the senior teachers there should be a concerted national education effort aimed at shifting the thinking on cultural diversity.

Case Study D

Finally, a good example of best practice in ESOL provision at the tertiary level was a large ESOL department in a metropolitan polytechnic. The ESOL department employed 36 staff and provided 56 ESOL-related courses that catered for students with a wide range of proficiency from pre-literate beginner to advanced. The courses available included general English courses, vocationally-oriented courses, IELTS preparation and academic English to prepare NESB students for postgraduate study. Over 1000 students were enrolled in the ESOL programme, of whom approximately 60 per cent were female.

The major strengths of the ESOL department’s activities, according to the Head of Department were “good staff and relevant programmes”. The class times were arranged to suit the circumstances of students with a mix of
courses during the day and in the evening. Frequent placement tests were made to enable students to move into classes that best suited their levels of English and their rate of progress. Course materials were chosen on the basis of their relevance to English communication situations in New Zealand. Staff supplemented textbooks with resources drawn from local newspapers, magazines, and television and radio presentations.

A major concern of the Head of Department was funding. The course costs were believed to act as a deterrent to many refugees and immigrants who did not come under Skill New Zealand or Work and Income New Zealand funding. In recognition of this problem, the department provided from its own operational budget a small refugee scholarship that helped 5 or 6 people to access courses over a semester or year.

Staff development was an important priority in the institution. As well as its own staff development programme, the ESOL Department had also been involved in providing input in workshops for staff in other teaching units to assist them to become more aware of the learning needs of NESB students in the mainstream. However, the Head of Department felt that more attention should be given to raising the consciousness of people outside the institution on the difficulties faced by such people. The public at large needed to be aware that for immigrants and refugees who arrived in New Zealand with very little education and little or no knowledge of English, a lengthy programme of English language study was required to prepare them for work.

If you are pre-literate you need probably 5 or 6 years and even if you are further on you need at least 3 or 4 years of English language before you get to square one where the native-born New Zealanders are at. So the person [with low English skills] who enrolls at an institution such as ours has to pay 4 years of fees before they get to the point of being able to cope with a health sciences course or an engineering course. And there's just no way that an individual can carry that...You'd think it would make economic sense to give 5 years of English support to [NESB] adults as they would then be more work ready.

The Head of Department did admit though that discriminatory attitudes and behaviours on the part of employers could affect the opportunities of even well qualified, skilled immigrants who were proficient in English.

You can prepare them right up to IELTS - 7, but they mightn't get jobs, because of a slight foreign accent and the foreign flavour of their qualifications.
DISCUSSION

The organisations which participated in this survey varied considerably in their activities. Some catered primarily for adolescents while others provided courses mainly for adults. Some offered an ESOL programme of a more general nature while others offered courses which focused on a particular area. Some offered ESOL courses for pre-literate beginners and others specialised in providing English language support at the higher academic level.

Taken together, the different providers form a mosaic of ESOL provision. On the surface this appears to suggest that adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees have many choices as to which organisation(s) would best suit their particular English learning needs. As many of the respondents pointed out, however, there is no guarantee that NESB learners will find a course in their local area appropriate to their learning needs and within their means. Access to English language tuition is affected by a large number of personal, social, cultural and situational factors but there is little doubt that one of the main barriers is financial. English language learning can be a lengthy process, especially for refugees or immigrants who arrive with little or no English, and the costs for English classes as well as other associated costs (loss of income, costs of transport, materials etc.) may well be prohibitive (Altinkaya and Omundsen, 1999).

As far as the response of the ESOL providers to the problems faced by some adult immigrants and refugee students in accessing appropriate courses is concerned, the study has noted that, in general, the organisations were aware of these difficulties. Half of those participating in the survey were taking or had taken positive steps of different kinds to make it easier for adult NESB immigrants and refugees to enrol in their courses, which does suggest, of course, that there is more that could be done in some cases.

It was noted earlier in this report that some of the criticisms made of adult ESOL provision in New Zealand in the past were levelled at the courses provided. Gubbay and Cogill (1988), for instance, pointed to deficiencies in the provider organisations and suggested that the apparent emphasis on general English locked NESB learners into a dependency on classroom-based instruction and did not empower them to participate on equal terms with other citizens in the real world, either socially or in the workplace. However, the situation appears to have changed considerably; courses of a more focused nature made up almost half of the total number of courses offered by the participating organisations. Indeed, if criticisms are to be made of the content of courses offered in New Zealand’s educational institutions and private training establishments, it could be that some are too narrowly focused on
labour market outcomes. As a number of very experienced ESOL teachers observed, such courses do not necessarily meet adult learning needs, particularly those of immigrants and/or refugees with low levels of English. For such adults the pressing need is first to develop general communication skills and/or basic literacy in English. However, it must also be noted that the New Zealand Employment Service evaluation of the ESOL for Professionals Programme concluded that it “successfully assists in moving participants towards employment and training” (New Zealand Employment Service, 1998: 18).

Although there appear to be some areas in which individual educational institutions and training establishments could do more to cater for the needs of adult immigrant and/or refugee students, the main problems seem to exist at the national level. One of the major difficulties, for example, lies in obtaining clear, comprehensive information and advice on the kinds of ESOL programmes available to immigrants and refugees that would best fit their learning needs. Similar criticisms of the lack of information and advice with respect to English language learning opportunities, as well as information on other services, have been made by Ho et al. (2000). The absence in New Zealand of a national network of agencies which could help guide immigrants and refugees in their choice of ESOL courses contrasts with the availability of Migrant Resource Centres in some overseas countries (notably Australia). These centres act as a “one stop shop” to provide information and referral services as well as orientation, communication skills and literacy training (Stevens, 1999).

This lack of a national network of agencies links with a further problem that emerged in the survey: the uncoordinated nature of ESOL provision in post-compulsory education. There is a lack of integration between the different sectors and a marked absence of an overall strategy for adult ESOL provision. This contrasts with the situation in Australia where the long-established Australian Migrant English Program (AMEP), administered by the Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, provides for up to 510 hours of free tuition for new arrivals who have not reached a functional level in English (Martin, 1999). A similar model is the Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC) programme (see Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2000). The LINC programme and the smaller associated Labour Market Language Training (LMLT) programme, which replaced previous federal language training assistance schemes in 1993, represented a significant step forward in the direction of “...inclusion, flexibility, and sensitivity to holistic needs” as far as ESOL provision in Canada is concerned (Burnaby, 1996: 201). Both the Australian and Canadian nationwide programmes provide funding to accredited public and private organisations for the provision of basic English language instruction to adult newcomers. They also allow for a variety of training interventions, and include mechanisms for monitoring courses to ensure quality control and
accountability, areas of deficiency identified by participants in the present study. Finally, the Australian and Canadian programmes oversee data collection and research, assist in the development of resources and play a part in the professional development of ESOL teachers - activities which closely resemble those proposed at various times in New Zealand (see, for example, Department of Education, 1976; Waite, 1992) but which have not yet been acted upon.

The Australian and Canadian programmes outlined above provide some possible solutions to another problem raised by the participants in the survey - the need for nationally agreed benchmarks to assist in the assessment and placement of adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees. The present situation is far from satisfactory with little consensus among institutions of what constitutes "elementary", "intermediate" or "advanced" levels. The Australian Second Language Proficiency Rating Scale (ASLPR) and the Canadian Language Benchmarks Assessment (CLBA) may provide possible models for New Zealand in this connection.

A common thread that runs through the survey responses is criticism of the under-funding of adult ESOL programmes in New Zealand. This reiterates comments expressed in a number of other surveys and reports (McDermott, 1997; Forsyte Research, 1998; Ho et al., 2000). The survey participants are firmly of the belief that any future improvements in the quality and range of ESOL provision depends on an increase in the level of funding from central government as well as additional financial support from other groups (i.e. local authorities, community groups, the private sector etc.). The strongly held view of the senior teachers who filled in the questionnaire and/or participated in the follow-up interviews is that English is a key (if not *the* key) settlement factor. For many immigrants and refugees a period of English language tuition is necessary to equip them to participate fully in and contribute productively to New Zealand society. A nationally organised and appropriately funded ESOL programme must, therefore, be regarded as an essential settlement tool to ease the transition to life in this country for NESB immigrants and refugees. Admittedly, the costs of providing such a comprehensive programme may be substantial, but as one of the participants in the study remarked, "the [personal/social/economic] costs if you don't are worse".
CONCLUSION

It is acknowledged that the survey described in this report has a number of limitations. It does not cover all the institutions currently engaged in ESOL provision for adults; it focuses only on educational institutions and private training establishments that provide more formally organised, classroom-based instruction. Organisations that provide less formally organised English language learning opportunities - such as the ESOL Home Tutor Scheme, social English groups and conversation classes conducted by a variety of community organisations (such as churches, ethnic councils and voluntary organisations) - have not been targeted in this particular survey, but will be examined in a forthcoming New Settlers Programme study by White, Watts and Trlin.

However, taking into account these limitations, the survey provides a snapshot of features of ESOL provision in a number of New Zealand educational institutions and training establishments. Best practice in ESOL provision identified in the study included: the employment of competent, trained and qualified staff; well designed staff development programmes; responsiveness to individual student needs; carefully designed learning programmes; availability of suitable facilities and resources; flexibility in class scheduling; small class size to enable more personalised instruction; and provision of out-of-class opportunities to consolidate and extend students' linguistic and cultural competence.

The study has also identified some issues and concerns that limit the effectiveness of the ESOL provision made by educational institutions and training establishments in meeting the needs of adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees. These include: government policy gaps relating to the language needs of immigrants and refugees; under-funding and under-resourcing; difficulties encountered in dealing with some government agencies; wasteful competition amongst providers as a result of an imposed market-driven ideology; lack of understanding of the needs of ESOL students on the part of funding providers; a need for better contractual arrangements; and inappropriate requirements for some courses.

While educational institutions and training establishments in New Zealand are endeavouring to provide optimum English learning environments for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees, they are hampered by the present "ad hocery" in the system (Altinkaya, 1998: 184) which stems from the lack of a cohesive policy framework at the national level. The kind of policy framework required is one which: recognises the importance of English in settlement; gives an overall direction to and co-ordination of ESOL programmes across the various sectors; and is supported by appropriate,
flexible funding formulae that recognise the existence of wide differences in the linguistic, social, cultural, educational and personal backgrounds of adult NESB immigrants and refugees, and which make allowance for variation in the quantity, quality and rate of their English language development.

Finally, it is suggested that New Zealand could profit from studying and applying the best features of models of nationwide ESOL services for NESB immigrants and/or refugees; that is the Australian Migrant English Program (AMEP) and the Language Instruction for Newcomers to Canada (LINC) programme.
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English Language Provision for Adult NESB Immigrants and/or Refugees in Educational Institutions and Training Establishments in New Zealand

This project is part of a larger research programme concerned with the experiences of immigrants in New Zealand. In this particular survey we are focusing on policy and practices concerning English language provision for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees in public and private educational institutions and training establishments.

This is the first time that a comprehensive survey of this kind has been conducted in New Zealand. We believe that the results will assist in the further development of policies and practices to address the English learning needs of adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees.

You are invited to participate in this survey by completing the questionnaire on behalf of your institution. Your response is confidential and will not be traced to you. The code number on the first page of the questionnaire is simply to assist us in any follow-up, if necessary. The raw data will be seen only by those closely involved in the research project. Findings from the postal survey will be reported in aggregated form only. All other rights of participants are safeguarded. It is assumed that filling in the questionnaire implies consent. If you agree to participate, you have the right to decline to answer any particular question.

The project is part of the New Settlers Programme which is supported by the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology with a grant from the Public Good Science Fund. The Programme Leader is Associate Professor Andrew Trlín, School of Social Policy and Social Work, Massey University, Palmerston North.

(Continued on p.3)
For this survey the principal researcher is Associate Professor Noel Watts and he can be contacted at:

- School of Language Studies
  Massey University
  Palmerston North
  Tel: 06 3505799 Extension 2406
  Fax: 06 3505633
  Email: N.R.Watts@massey.ac.nz

If you wish to obtain a summary of the overall findings please indicate this in the section at the end of the questionnaire.

Please return the questionnaire in the self-addressed envelope enclosed by 25 AUGUST 2000 whether or not it has been completed (note: postage has been pre-paid).
**Terminology:**
(a) In this survey the term "course with an ESOL focus" is meant to include any course in which the teaching of English to speakers of other languages is an important component.
(b) "NESB" refers to people with non-English speaking backgrounds.

**Section A** First, we would like to ask you some general questions about your institution/establishment, particularly in relation to courses with an ESOL focus which cater for adult immigrants and/or refugees with non-English speaking backgrounds (NESB). (Note: this does include courses where immigrants/refugees are taught in the same classes as international students).

1. Please indicate the type of institution/establishment in which you are working and answering on behalf of.

   - State school
   - State integrated school
   - Private school
   - Polytechnic
   - College of Education
   - University
   - Private training establishment
   - Community organisation
   - Other (Please specify):

   ........................................................................................................
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2(a). During the past five years, has your institution/establishment provided one or more courses with an ESOL focus for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees?

Yes □ (Please go to Question 2(b))
No □ (Please go to Question 27)

2(b). If yes to Question 2(a), is your institution/establishment providing at any time during this year one or more courses with an ESOL focus for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees?

Yes □ (Please go to Question 3)
No □ (Please go to Questions 2(c) and 2(d))

2(c). If no to Question 2(b), please indicate why such courses are not offered this year.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

2(d). Would your institution/establishment be likely to again make available courses with an ESOL focus if more government funding for ESOL provision for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees was provided?

Yes □ (Please go to Question 27)
No □ (Please go to Question 27)
Don’t know □ (Please go to Question 27)
Not applicable, □

because........................................................................................................

(Please go to Question 27)
3. How many courses with an ESOL focus are being or will be provided by your institution/establishment during this year for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees?

Number: __________________________

☐ ☐

4. What are the different types of course(s) with an ESOL focus for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees provided this year by your institution/establishment? (Please specify the number of courses in each category)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>General English</th>
<th>☐ ☐ 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>English for further study</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>English for employment (TOP etc.)</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>English for particular non-work related areas (e.g. to gain a driver's licence, to help meet citizenship requirements)</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please specify the type(s) below):

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
5. **What are the English language levels** of the course(s) with an ESOL focus for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees provided this year by your institution/establishment? (Please specify the number of courses in each category)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolute beginner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g. course(s) with mixed levels) (Please specify below)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **What is the length** of the course(s) with an ESOL focus for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees provided this year by your institution/establishment? (Please specify the number of courses in each category)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 4 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 weeks to 12 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 weeks to 24 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 weeks to 52 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 52 weeks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. What is the average class size for the course(s) with an ESOL focus for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees provided this year by your institution/establishment? (Please tick one of the following)

- 10 students or less
- 11-19 students
- 20 students and over

8. What is the usual class composition in the course(s) with an ESOL focus for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees? (Please tick one of the following)

(a) Adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees are taught in the same class(es) as other NESB students (i.e. NESB immigrants and/ Refugees of a younger age group, full-fee paying international students).

(b) Adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees are taught in different classes to other NESB students.

(c) Combination of (a) and (b) above

(d) Other (Please specify): ..................................
9(a). What are the outside sources of funding for the course(s) with an ESOL focus for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees this year?

(Please tick all that apply)

(a) Ministry of Education EFTS funding

(b) Community Education funding (Ministry of Education)

(c) Funding from another central government agency (Work and Income, Skill New Zealand etc.)

(Please specify)........................................................................

(d) Funding from a non-central government source (e.g. city/town council, trust)

(Please specify)........................................................................

(e) No outside source of funding

If you answered any of (a), (b), (c) or (d) above, please go to Questions 9(b) and 9(c). If you answered (e) only, please go to Question 10(a).

9(b). Which one of the categories in Question 9(a) above is the main source of outside funding for the course(s) with an ESOL focus for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees offered by your institution/establishment this year?

..................................................................................................
9(c). Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements that refer to the relationship between your institution/establishment and the main funding provider this year for the course(s) with an ESOL focus for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees. (1 = Strongly agree, 2 = Moderately agree, 3 = Moderately disagree, 4 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Don’t know)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What your funding provider requires of your course(s) with an ESOL focus is clearly indicated in the information given to your institution/establishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The funding provider’s requirements are reasonable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The funding provider carefully monitors the outcomes of your course(s) with an ESOL focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The funding provided is appropriate for the service involved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is good communication between the funding provider and your institution/establishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10(a). Have links been established between your institution/establishment and non-educational organisations (such as ethnic voluntary associations, employer groups, corporations) in connection with the provision of the course(s) with an ESOL focus for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees?

- Yes
  - (Please go to Question 10(b))
- No
  - (Please go to Question 11(a))
- Not applicable, because
  - (Please go to Question 11(a))
10(b). If yes to Question 10(a), please outline the nature of these links?


11(a). Overall, what do you think are the main strengths of the course(s) with an ESOL focus for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees currently offered by your institution/establishment?


11(b). In what ways do you think that the course(s) with an ESOL focus for adult NESB immigrant and/or refugees could be enhanced if more funding/resources were made available?


Section B This next section asks questions about the adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees enrolled this year in the course(s) with an ESOL focus provided by your institution/establishment.

12. What is the estimated total number of adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees who are or will be enrolled this year in the course(s) with an ESOL focus provided by your institution/establishment? (Note: each person counts as one even if he/she is enrolled in two or more courses.)

Estimated number: ........................

13. What is the main age group of the adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees enrolled this year in the course(s) with an ESOL focus?
   (Please tick one of the following)
   
   Mainly young adults (24 years or under)  □  □  □  70
   Mainly older adults (35 years and over)  □
   Mainly a mixed age group of adults  □

14. What is the approximate percentage balance of female and male adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees in the course(s) with an ESOL focus (e.g. Females 60%; Males 40%)?

   Females...........%;

   Males...........%
15. What is the **main educational background** of the adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees in the course(s) with an ESOL focus? (Tick one box only)

- Primary education only
- Three years or less secondary education
- More than three years secondary education
- Some tertiary education
- Tertiary level graduates
- Other
  (Please specify) ..................................................

16. What are the **main ethnic backgrounds** of the adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees in the course(s) with an ESOL focus (e.g. Asian, European (non-British), Pacific Island, African, Middle Eastern)?

(Please list in order up to **three**.)

1. ....................

2. ....................

3. ....................

17(a). Have any difficulties been experienced with respect to marketing/student recruitment for the course(s) with an ESOL focus for adult NESB immigrants?

- Yes □  (Please go to Question 17(b))
- No □  (Please go to Question 18)
17(b). If yes to Question 17(a), please outline the nature of these difficulties.

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

18. Please rank in order the five main reasons which, in your opinion, make it difficult at present for some adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees who feel a need for further development in their English skills to take the course(s) with an ESOL focus provided by your institution/establishment. (Please put 1 in the box beside the most important reason, 2 for the next in importance, and so on.)

Costs of tuition
Student loan problems
Transport problems
Times at which classes are scheduled
Types of courses offered
Length of the courses
Child minding needs
Waiting lists for courses
Personal factors (shyness, work/family pressures etc.)
Students not meeting the selection criteria set down by the outside funding source
Other reason not adequately covered above (Please specify)

............................................................
19(a). Has your institution/establishment taken any measures during the past two years to make it easier for adult immigrants and/or refugees to enrol in the course(s) with an ESOL focus (e.g. through the provision of child care facilities, classes scheduled outside working hours, flexible entry to classes etc.)?

Yes □ (Please go to Question 19(b))

No □ (Please go to Question 19(c))

Not applicable, □ because the course(s) is/are offered for the first time this year (Please go to Question 20)

19(b). If yes to Question 19(a), please describe these measures.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

(Please go to Question 20)

19(c). If no to Question 19(a), please indicate why no measures have been taken to make enrolment easier.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

(Please go to Question 20)
Section C  This section relates specifically to the staff members in your institution/establishment who are involved in the provision of the course(s) with an ESOL focus for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees.

20. How many staff (full-time and part-time) are involved this year in teaching the course(s) with an ESOL focus for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees?

Number.....................

21. What are the main qualifications and training of staff involved this year in teaching the course(s) with an ESOL focus for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees? Note: “TESOL studies/training” refers below to studies and/or training related to teaching English to speakers of other languages. (Please indicate the number of staff members in each category)

Number

Tertiary qualification and TESOL studies/training ..........       0

Tertiary qualification but no TESOL studies/training ..........       0

TESOL studies/training but no tertiary qualification ..........       0

Neither TESOL studies/training nor tertiary qualification ..........       0

22(a). Have difficulties been experienced in recruiting suitable ESOL staff for teaching related to the course(s) with an ESOL focus for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees?

Yes       ☐  (Please go to Question 22(b))

No       ☐  (Please go to Question 23(a))

Don’t know ☐  (Please go to Question 23(a))

Not applicable, because............................................

(Please go to Question 23(a))
22(b). If yes to Question 22(a), please indicate the nature of these difficulties.

__________________________________________________________________________

23(a). Have difficulties been experienced in retaining suitable ESOL staff for teaching related to the course(s) with an ESOL focus for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees?

Yes □ (Please go to Question 23(b))
No □ (Please go to Question 24)
Don't know □ (Please go to Question 24)
Not applicable, because ........................................................................
(Please go to Question 24)

23(b) If yes to Question 23(a), please indicate the nature of these difficulties.

__________________________________________________________________________

24. What is the most common work status of staff members involved this year in teaching the course(s) with an ESOL focus for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees? (Please tick one of the following)

Full-time work in a paid capacity □
Part-time work in a paid capacity □
Full-time work in a voluntary capacity □
Part-time work in a voluntary capacity □
Other (Please specify) □

..................................................................................................................
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25(a). Are there staff members with non-English speaking backgrounds (NESB) who are involved this year, either as teachers and/or as support staff in the course(s) with an ESOL focus for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees?

Yes □ (Please go to Questions 25(b), (c) and (d)) □
No □ (Please go to Question 26) □

25(b). If yes in Question 25(a), how many NESB staff are there involved as teachers and/or support staff in the course(s) with an ESOL focus?

Number of NESB staff: ..................... □ □

25(c). What are the main roles of these NESB staff members? (Please tick all categories that apply.)

ESOL teacher □ □
Director/supervisor □ □
Clerical/secretarial assistant □ □
Student counsellor/advisor □ □
Other (Please specify): □ □

25(d). What are the main ethnic backgrounds of these NESB staff members (e.g. Asian, European (non-British), Pacific Island, African, Middle Eastern)? (Please list in order up to three)

1...................... □ □ 121
2...................... □ □ □
3...................... □ □
26. Please comment on any perceived advantages and/or disadvantages of having NESB staff involved in teaching/administration related to the course(s) with an ESOL focus for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees.

Perceived advantages:

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

Perceived disadvantages:

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________
Section D  Finally, we invite you to make general comments about English language assistance for adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees, in the context of settlement needs in New Zealand.

27. How important do you think that English language competence is in the successful settlement of immigrants and/or refugees in New Zealand?

- The key factor in successful settlement
- One of a number of key factors in successful settlement
- A minor factor in successful settlement

28(a). Do you think that changes are required with respect to the provision of English language courses/opportunities to better meet the settlement needs (e.g. for employment, social participation) in New Zealand of adult NESB immigrants (not including refugees)?

- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

28(b). If yes to Question 28(a), in what areas do you think that changes to the provision of English language courses/opportunities are required to better meet the settlement needs of immigrants?
29(a). Do you think that changes are required with respect to the provision of English language courses/opportunities to better meet the settlement needs in New Zealand of adult NESB refugees?

Yes  (Please go to Question 29(b))
No  (Please go to Question 30)
Don’t know  (Please go to Question 30)

29(b). If yes to Question 29(a), in what areas do you think that changes to the provision of English language courses/opportunities are required to better meet the settlement needs of refugees?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

30. Do you have any other comments to make concerning the provision of English language courses/opportunities for immigrants and/or refugees?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for taking the time to respond to this questionnaire.

Please read the important information on the next page.
Would you be agreeable to a possible follow-up interview to discuss further the way your institution caters for the English language needs of adult NESB immigrants and/or refugees?

Yes ☐

No ☐

If yes, please give contact details below:

Name:______________________________

Address:___________________________

____________________________________

____________________________________

Telephone (work):__________________

Fax:_______________________________ E-mail:__________________________

Would you like a summary of findings arising from this questionnaire?

Yes ☐

No ☐

If yes, please write your name and address below (if not already provided above):

____________________________________

____________________________________

____________________________________

Please return the questionnaire in the self-addressed, free post envelope provided by 25 AUGUST 2000.
English Language Provision for Adult NESB Immigrants and/or Refugees in Educational Institutions and Training Establishments in New Zealand

Follow-up Interview Schedule

Interview number:......................

Date:..........................

1. Day to day operations

Could you please tell me a little more about the activities of your institution/establishment with respect to ESOL provision for adult NESB immigrants/refugees?

Prompts
• types of courses
• funding sources
• staffing
• student demand
• waiting lists

2. Relationships with other providers

How do your courses for adult NESB immigrants/refugees relate to the kinds of courses provided in other institutions in your area?

Prompts:
• availability of different kinds of courses to suit different needs
• co-operation or competition between providers
• networking of language professionals

3. Best practice examples

Could you identify for me the strengths of your current ESOL provision for adult NESB immigrants/refugees?

What do you consider to be the "ideal" characteristics of an ESOL course catering for adult NESB immigrants/refugees?

Prompts:
• affordability of courses
• assessment and evaluation procedures
• course design
• materials
• methods and approaches
• staffing, including use of bilingual teachers
• scheduling
• entry points
• provision for personal circumstances e.g. child care facilities, counselling facilities

4. Issues

What do you consider to be the main issues at present concerning ESOL provision for adult NESB immigrants/refugees?

Prompts:

• government immigration/settlement policy issues
• language policy issues
• funding issues
• other issues

5. Other matters

Is there anything else that you would like to say about ESOL provision for adult NESB immigrants/refugees?
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