

Planning English Lessons for Refugee-background Students

Jiaji Zhang^{1,*}

¹*The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia*

^{*}*Corresponding author. Email: jiajifiona@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

This study illustrates how instructors in secondary school training programs prepare courses for English as an Additional Language (EAL) pupils from refugee backgrounds, the major planning problems that instructors encounter, as well as methods used to deal with them. It shows that there is a significant disparity between the lesson plan and teacher development training pedagogies, which is owing to instructors' dependence on the intuitive knowledge accumulated from interacting with students in multiple learning environments, as well as their own different backgrounds. Considering the significance of good pedagogical planning, it concludes with areas for future improvement in teacher learning and training.

Keywords: *EAL students, lesson plan, refugee-background students, English teaching*

1. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

Planning, as an integral part of teachers' job, is usually based on a degree of consistency in learning goals and instructional environment. The focus of this study is how transitional courses' instructors coordinate the situation while they are inconsistent, that is: Adjustment courses for kids with different socio-economic backgrounds should be specific. The composition of transitional courses varies on a regular basis, as new students arrive from language courses and others enter mainstream classrooms or leave the school entirely. This is partly due to the volatility in students' lives. Students from refugee backgrounds bring a plethora of linguistic, literacy, intellectual, emotional, and social demands to the classroom, which may overload instructors' ideas of a fixed curriculum and instruction [1]. Transitional courses often have unclear learning goals, including academic content change in a particular subject (e.g., mathematics or science), training in school survival and study skills, and comprehensive language teaching. This instability is exacerbated by frequent changes in the distribution of teaching duties [2]. Although instructors are capable of adapting their methods, working with children from refugee backgrounds poses significant challenges for preparation, which may be tough at times.

With the world's refugee population reaching an all-time high, Australian schools are seeing an increase in

the number of learners from Afghanistan, Burma, and Sudan [3]. According to Australian education official records, "the enormous majority of these students are from refugee families entering in Australian schools would have suffered some interruption to their education anterior to their arrival in Australia" [4]. Although this is a diverse group, we concentrate on their connection to literacy in this section, defining literacy as the capacity to 'participate fluently, effectively, and critically in the many text- and discourse-based activities that define modern semiotic societies and economies'[5]. In this study, the term 'low literacy refugee-background'(LLRB) is described as a unique cohort that fails to comprehend all forms of education.

Numerous LLRB teenagers encounter financial difficulty, social alienation, housing problems, concern about permanent residency, and new bureaucratic processes upon arriving in Australia [1]. Students who have had interruptions in their education have not yet had the chance to acquire the social and cultural interpretations, cognitive and emotional abilities, and learning methods that are expected of learners [1]. Mastering the linguistic features of academic writing genres in certain topic fields is especially difficult for refugee- background students [6], [7], [8], and may take seven to ten years [9].

LLRB students, as with all new English as an Additional Language (EAL) immigrants in Australia,

undergo a one-year intensive training at a language learning centre before entering mainstream schools. Numerous children start high school with reading and writing skills comparable to those of lower elementary school learners [10] and prior research has indicated that current time spent in language schools is insufficient [11]. Traditionally, academic administrations may not evaluate these students individually, and instead include them with the larger context of ESL [12]. The admission of low literacy refugee-background (LLRB) children has caused a theoretical and practical change in schools that is still being studied, especially in the socially disadvantaged outskirts of metropolitan areas [13]. LLRB learners, like many fresh ESL entrants, have a one-year rigorous English language training in segregated classrooms before entering mainstream schools. A handful of Australian secondary schools that receive a high number of LLRB students have established specific courses to help pupils integrate into the mainstream secondary schools. Although some courses cover the whole syllabus, others contain only specific topics, such as physics or chemistry.

2. PREPARATION FOR LEARNERS FROM REFUGEE BACKGROUNDS

Cassity and Gow [1] appeal to programmes for LLRB learners to stress on raising community welfare consciousness and explicit language learning. As a beginning point, a recurring topic is that instructors need to properly appreciate their learners' cultural and political origins [1]. The significance of fundamental abilities such as calligraphy, chances for practice and reprocessing, linkages to personal experiences and urgent needs, as well as the necessity of rich verbal and contextual aids has been emphasized [14].

Gibbons contends that instructors should concentrate on recognizing and expanding pupils' previous language skills [15], [16]. While communication and subject are linked, the key to consistency in classes, according to him, is establishing instructional goals at the preliminary stages [15]. Teachers should examine the topic of teaching 'through the prism of linguistics' to find the communicative aspect of the syllabus [15]. In other words, they ought to be aware of the language demands of the course or subject in terms of general form, vocabularies, syntax, and linguistic mega abilities. Furthermore, through the evaluation methods, instructors must confirm what learners can and cannot accomplish with communication (e.g., instructors' observations of student achievement, educator-learner's relationships, learners' goal achievement, presentations, and self-assessment) [15]. Generating teaching materials, described by Nunan [13] as an interaction among classroom instruction and delivering, is a crucial center for language learning.

A larger preparation literature has emphasized the importance of instructors' evaluation- whether the planned goals will be achieved [17]. Establishing precise goals at the beginning allows instructors to define explicitly and correctly what, how, and when they will assess learners' progress, which contributes to successful assessment of teaching [18]. Observation may assist instructors discover answers to issues, which can provide an additional level of assessment [17].

3. PREPARATION AND THE PRACTICE OF TEACHING

Multilingual knowledge is hard for educators to grasp, and some feel that integrating linguistic competence into teaching is beyond their reach [19]. This seems to be certainly relevant for instructors of science and physics who have less experience in learning English. Preparation for a lesson varies in many ways from suggested methods. A number of interconnected factors may oppose preparing as a key in educators' jobs [20]. Certain duties seem nearly natural, whereas others are pushed to the sidelines as other objectives and administrative mandates remain intact. Time constraint, instructors may refrain from making specific plans before the teaching practice; a cooperating educator might not even prepare for instructing; so not all plans are utilized in the session, teachers sometimes need to deviate from them [14].

According to Hatton [21], most instructors' practice may be compared to that of prendergasts, who choose resources at haphazard instead of moving from objectives to methods.— specifically, rather than beginning with planned instructional goals, instructors often examine the resources availability. The teachers tend to accumulate lesson plans in the hope that they will be useful one day, collecting teaching tactics in unorthodox ways owing to the impact of background knowledge instead of conceptual interpretations of pedagogy. Moreover, many instructors react to emerging educational difficulties not via thought or any theoretical underpinnings. However, by improvising short patch remedies without addressing the long-term consequences or answers to these difficulties [21]. According to Hatton [21], the origins of these instinctive teaching methods may be traced back to instructors' different backgrounds, and also their educational programmes.

4. MAKING PLANS FOR MIXED-ABILITIES LESSONS

The diversity of learners' prior theoretical, disciplinary, and linguistic knowledge, exacerbated by the significant concentrations of presumed knowledge in accessible materials, has been highlighted as a key problem by instructors in their preparation [22]. The

usage of resources (such as: CDs, webinars, hardcopy, assignments, monographs, social media and reference books) are fraught with administrative and methodological issues. For instance, one of the instructors noted that booking the gear was difficult. Another student said that the classroom computers were outdated, sluggish, and badly maintained. Due to a lack of adequate capacity and increasing schedules, many instructors have to depend on their well-prepared educational expertise and abilities [23], [24], [25]. Here are some suggestions for making lesson plans.

4.1. Differentiation of instruction

Differentiated teaching includes whole-group instruction, diverse group works, and individualized instruction. It enables teachers to design student-centered educational experiences that emphasize various methods of material, method, and outcome. Furthermore, it allows for a continuous, integrated, genuine evaluation of learners' abilities, passions, and learning styles [26].

Despite being based on study and effective practise, this is not a given assumption that certain instructors have a great way to establish classrooms, provide required scaffolding and effective teaching changes. What follows is a deeper look at a teaching approach that will aid in the incorporation of relevant material, required scaffolding, and diversified instructions to suit the requirements of older EAL students in a multi-ability class [26].

4.2. Differentiation of student's learning styles

Language skills of listening, speaking, reading and writing are closely related. Secondary school training programs require students to master comprehensive academic language relevant to subjects. Thus, this demonstrates how much pupils differ in their tastes and preferences. It is impossible for an instructor to satisfy all of their pupils all of the time [26]. There are many methods that the instructor may use. The utilization of diversity in instructional planning is required. In every class, teachers should aim to include at least four tasks that need each of the abilities (listening, speaking, reading and writing), as well as build a good interaction with the students [27].

5. CONCLUSION

Rather than attributing responsibility to educators who often work in difficult circumstances, the focus is a number of basic principles of educational practice that help the most disadvantaged children. Combining communication and curriculum at the preliminary stages will continue to be important for educators and administrators, necessitating collaborative methods to career growth and funding. The research presented here

emphasizes the importance of reconstructing lesson preparation and instructional practices as essential components of this approach. It suggests three distinct objectives to accomplish this. To begin with, new teachers need a clear emphasis on design and lesson planning, when the critical links between objectives and methods are established. Cross-curricular lesson plans, in other words, guide the choice and adjustment of instructional resources and activities. Secondly, when student demographics shift, career development programmes that refresh teachers' understanding of effective responses to these shifts are required. Cooperation between EAL specialists and mainstream subject area instructors is an important component of this. Finally, in order to react to the diverse range of contemporary students, a dynamic program that emphasizes learning objectives, as well as the creation of tailored resources, including through technology, is essential.

REFERENCES

- [1] E. Cassity and G. Gow, "Making Up for Lost Time," in *In Partners 4 Learning.*, 2005.
- [2] J. Miller, "Teachers' work in culturally and linguistically diverse schools," *Teach. Teach.*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 451–466, 2011.
- [3] T. Ziaian et al., "Refugee youth and transition to further education, training, and employment in Australia: Protocol for a mixed methods study," *JMIR Res. Protoc.*, vol. 8, no. 7, p. e12632, 2019.
- [4] DEECD, "Strengthening outcomes: Refugee students in government schools," 2008.
- [5] P. McKay, Ed., "Steps for planning an integrated program for ESL learners in mainstream classes."
- [6] K. G. Sarr and J. Mosselson, "Issues in Teaching Refugees in US Schools," *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, vol. 109, no. 2, pp. 548–570, 2010.
- [7] A. Joyce, J. Earnest, G. de Mori, and G. Silvagni, "The experiences of students from refugee backgrounds at universities in Australia: Reflections on the social, emotional and practical challenges," *J. Refug. Stud.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 82–97, 2010.
- [8] M. Crock and L. Berg, *Immigration, refugees and forced migration: Law, policy and practice in Australia*. Annandale, NSW, Australia: Federation Press, 2011.
- [9] L. Baecher, J. Kasper, and J. Mincin, "Educating Students of Refugee Backgrounds: Critical Language Teacher Education in TESOL,"

- CATESOL Journal, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 165–179, 2019.
- [10] M. Pang, “Pedagogical reasoning in EFL/ESL teaching: Revisiting the importance of teaching lesson planning in second language teacher education,” *TESOL Q.*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 246–263, 2016.
- [11] L. Olliff and J. Couch, “Pathways and pitfalls: The journey of refugee young people in and around the education system in greater Dandenong, Victoria,” *Youth Studies Australia*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 42–46, 2005.
- [12] R. Sidhu and S. Taylor, “Educational provision for refugee youth in Australia: left to chance?,” *J. Sociol. (Melb)*, vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 283–300, 2007.
- [13] D. Nunan, *Language teaching methodology: A textbook for teachers*. London, England: Prentice-Hall, 1991.
- [14] J. Miller, “Teaching Refugee Learners with Interrupted Education in Science: Vocabulary, literacy and pedagogy,” *Int. J. Sci. Educ.*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 571–592, 2009.
- [15] P. Gibbons, *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: Teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom*. Portsmouth, VA: Heinemann Educational Books, 2002.
- [16] P. Gibbons, *English learners, academic literacy, and thinking: Learning in the challenge zone*. Portsmouth, VA: Heinemann Educational Books, 2009.
- [17] G. Butt, *Lesson Planning*, 2nd ed. Continuum International Publishing Group, 2006.
- [18] K. Nelson and K. Price, *Planning effective instruction: Diversity responsive methods and management*, 6th ed. Mason, OH: CENGAGE Learning Custom Publishing, 2017.
- [19] J. Hammond, “Intellectual challenge and ESL students: Implications of quality teaching initiatives,” *The Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 128–154, 2008.
- [20] G. Bull and M. Anstey, Eds., “Literacy as engaging with new forms of life: The ‘four roles’ model.”
- [21] E. Hatton, “Levi-Strauss’s Bricolage and theorizing teachers’ work,” *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, vol. 20, pp. 74–96, 1989.
- [22] Org.au. [Online]. Available: http://www.tesol.org.au/files/files/254_jenny_miller.pdf. [Accessed: 17-Jul-2021].
- [23] T. Ferfolja and M. Vickers, “Supporting refugee students in school education in Greater Western Sydney,” *Crit. Stud. Educ.*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 149–162, 2010.
- [24] J. Rutter, *Refugee children in the UK*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press, 2006.
- [25] J. Matthews, “Schooling and settlement: refugee education in Australia,” *Int. Stud. Sociol. Educ.*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 31–45, 2008.
- [26] C. A. Tomlinson and C. A. Strickland, “Differentiation in practice: A resource guide for differentiating curriculum, grades 9-12,” ASCD, 2005.
- [27] Z. Tomaš, R. Farrelly, and M. Haslam, “Designing and implementing the TESOL teaching practicum abroad: Focus on interaction,” *TESOL Q.*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 660–664, 2008.