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ABSTRACT

The reliance upon international students in Canadian education has resulted in a growth in research investigating students’ and institutions’ academic, social, cultural, pastoral, and (English) language learning experiences from a range of research perspectives and methodological approaches. Cumulatively these studies have resulted in more informed, better designed, and more reflexive programs and services. However, the majority of research has been conducted in tertiary settings, and thus overlooks the increasingly salient role of international students in K-12 public education in Canada, particularly in secondary schools.

This year-long, ethnographic multiple case study examined the category of fee-paying international students (FIS) at the pre-tertiary level as it was realized across multiple actors, sites, and dimensions of the public education system. Broadly situated in a language socialization paradigm, the study first identifies how residency, funding, and English language function as key discursive resources in portrayals of FIS as they occur in K-12 education policy texts and in stakeholder accounts of FIS-related practices. The focus on policy and practices is followed by an analysis of four focal students’ experiences as FIS, which begins with a consideration of students’ homestay, socioeconomic, and (English) language circumstances outside of school. The analysis then concentrates on the most significant cultural process for FIS students’ school-based socialization: ‘getting out of ESL’. It highlights the situated, contingent nature of the process as it was constructed across school- and classroom-specific practices and interactions, but more consequentially, it describes how students’ economizing of the process of ‘getting out of ESL’ was central to their learning, to their varied trajectories, and thus was inextricably linked to the category of FIS.

Through the multi-level account of the significance and impact of the category of FIS in a Canadian K-12 public educational setting, and the complexity that characterizes FIS socialization in that setting, the findings of the study underscore the fundamental, though often
unacknowledged, relationship between the internationalization of K-12 public education and ESL services, teaching, and learning. In demonstrating how this relationship between FIS and ESL is relevant for students, teachers, and schools, the study identifies an important area for future research in applied linguistics.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

International education is critical to Canada’s success. In a highly competitive, knowledge-based global economy, ideas and innovation go hand in hand with job creation and economic growth. In short, international education is at the very heart of our current and future prosperity.

(Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada, 2014, p. 4)

B.C.’s education system is among the world’s best and, while we’ve always counted on it to prepare our children and youth for the future, we’ve barely begun to tap its potential to support our economic growth. With rapid economic expansion in Asia Pacific countries, more parents than ever before want their children to receive an English-language education – and we have growing opportunities to attract and retain a much higher number of international students.

(Government of BC, 2012b, p. 14)

1.1 Background

In the 2013 calendar year, almost 400,000 international students were studying in Canadian educational institutions, a number that has more than tripled since 1994 (Citizenship and Immigration Canada [CIC], 2015a). This number, and its steady increase, coincide with the mobilization of national level policies that recognize international education as a key driver of Canada’s future prosperity and recommend various ways to recruit an ever greater number of international students (Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada, 2012, 2014).

While at the national level the largest percentage of international students attend tertiary-level institutions, in 2012 almost 41,000 international students in Canada were studying at the elementary or secondary grade levels (CIC, 2013a).1 In British Columbia (BC), the province in which this study was conducted, there are approximately 17,000 elementary and secondary international students, 77% of whom study in public schools (BC Ministry of Education

---

1 The numbers reported here for pre-tertiary students are based on a 2013 publication by CIC (2013a). This publication has since become unavailable, though numbers for 2011 are still available (CIC, 2012). One potential explanation for the change in availability is that, since 2011, the CIC has changed the categories under which it reports numbers of pre-tertiary foreign students. Whereas in 2011, students’ level of study was accounted for in published statistics (i.e., “Foreign students present on December 1st by gender and level of study”, CIC [2012; emphasis added]), in the newest CIC reports the identifier “level of study” has been replaced with “age” (i.e., “International students with a valid permit on December 31st by gender and age, 1994 to 2013”, CIC [2015b]). Though the change is perhaps to allow for a larger range for comparison (i.e., 1994-2013), it is curious that the descriptor “Foreign students” (CIC, 2012) has also changed – to “International students” (CIC, 2015a, 2015b).
In BC educational policy and practice affecting K-12 contexts, the category “international student” is generally taken to mean a *fee-paying* student (FIS; see, e.g., BCMoE, 2001b, 2004/2009, 2011/2013; Kuehn, 2002, 2007, 2011, 2012a, 2012b, 2014). These are students “who have moved from outside of Canada to British Columbia and [because they] do not meet the residency requirements of Section 82 of the *School Act*” (BCMoE, n.d.-b, n.d.-c), are charged yearly tuition fees to attend public schools (Study in BC, 2011). In 2014-2015, 89% of the FIS in public schools in BC attended secondary schools (Grades 8-12) (BCMoE, 2015d).

Education policy encouraging the recruitment of FIS students in BC has, since 2002, more than doubled FIS-based revenues – to roughly $145 million in 2012/13 (Kuehn, 2014). In Vancouver, for example, it has long been alleged that the move to recruit FIS to public schools “has coincided with provincial [i.e., government] cuts to education”, leading the director of Vancouver’s International Education Program to acknowledge that the presence of FIS is “definitely subsidizing what is going on in public school districts” (Mitchell, 2004, para. 23). More than a decade later, it seems reasonable that district and provincial educational authorities would be seeking a more thorough understanding of FIS, what their school experiences are, and how they are contributing to and influencing various areas of BC’s public education system (i.e., classrooms, schools, school districts, policy). A more thorough understanding would not only offer an important gauge of the impact of FIS presence, it could offer useful insights about how best to sustain their contributions.

Beyond questions about how FIS students influence classrooms, schools, and the public education system in BC, there are also increasing numbers of fee-paying international students in public secondary schools in the province of Ontario (e.g., Lindenberg, 2015; Qian, 2012; Zheng, 2014). Beyond BC and Ontario, the role played by FIS in “keep[ing] alive programs such as arts and music for domestic students – especially in [provinces like] Saskatchewan and Newfoundland where school populations are decreasing” (Mitchell, 2004, para. 21), suggests

For these reasons, a more thorough understanding of issues related to how schools and (ELL) students conceptualize, manage, and treat FIS, and likewise how this treatment or FIS presence might impact the quality, content, sequence, or provision of provincially-mandated curriculum or instruction in schools, is crucial for maintaining inclusive/pluralistic conversations about the nature of ‘public’ education as it is ever more influenced by processes of migration, marketization, and membership in global educational fields.

1.1.1 Focus on BC: Neoliberalization and Marketization of BC Public Education

Developed against the backdrop of what has been referred to as a ‘neoliberal’ policy agenda (e.g., Fallon & Paquette, 2009; Fallon & Poole, 2013), in 2002 the government of BC implemented *Bill-34 – The School Amendment Act* (Bill 34; Bill-34, 2002). In addition to its

\(^2\) The terms ESL and ELL are used interchangeably throughout the dissertation. For the most part, the term ESL is a more participant-relevant term, utilized almost unanimously in research interviews, classroom talk, and other participant-generated data. The term ELL, conversely, is a more institutionally-relevant term, found in school, district, and government produced documents relating to English language learners.
goals of greater “fiscal and academic accountability for public education”, substantive reduction of the provincial deficit, “establishment of school councils”, and increases in “parental and student choices to attend any schools in [BC]” (Fallon & Pancucci, 2003, p. 51), Bill 34’s market ideological approach to public education imposed upon school districts the ‘flexibility’ to find non-governmental (private) sources of revenue. In simple terms, two corollaries of being granted this ‘flexibility’ were: (1) a decrease in government responsibility to fund public education, resulting in the veritable marketization of K-12 public education in BC; and (2) an increase in the competition between school districts for the students and funding they bring. In short, Bill 34 essentially re-specified schools as providers of marketable commodities, and students and parents as consumers of educational services and products.³

The present situation in BC. Although under these conditions many districts “have concentrated on low risk entrepreneurial initiatives” that include “selling advertising space on school property, renting space, selling course materials for online-education, or providing educational or administrative consulting services” (Poole and Fallon, forthcoming, p. 17), the most direct and fiscally advantageous source of non-governmental revenue has been (and continues to be) the tuition monies paid by FIS (Kuehn, 2007, 2012a, 2012b, 2014).

Thus, as a result of declining enrolment and a consistently austere provincial funding situation, BC school districts have been long been exhorted to seek non-governmental sources of revenue via market-driven funding (e.g., Fallon & Pancucci, 2003; Kuehn, 2002). For at least a decade, school districts have used the ‘value’ of BC’s high school credential (called “the Dogwood Diploma”) to recruit fee-paying international students to fill empty spots in schools and offset continued provincial cuts to public education (e.g., Kuehn, 2007, 2014). A brief synopsis of the present FIS situation in BC follows:

³ For fuller discussions of Bill 34 see Fallon and Pancucci (2003), as well as Fallon and Paquette (2009). For in-depth discussion of the current state of K-12 educational financing in BC see Fallon and Poole (2013), as well as Poole and Fallon (forthcoming).
• there are over 13,000 FIS in BC K-12 public schools (BCMoE, 2015d);
• FIS spend roughly $13,000 per student per year on tuition⁴ (e.g., Study in BC Canada, 2011; Vancouver School Board, n.d.);
• over 450 teachers in BC’s K-12 public system are reported as being paid for by revenues collected from FIS tuition fees (Kuehn, 2014, p. 2);
• more than 3800 new FIS were recruited to the K-12 public school system between 2010/11 and 2014/15 school years alone (BCMoE, 2015d, p. 1).

In addition to these material indices of how the FIS industry is impacting public education in BC, the provincial government has in recent years begun to treat ‘International Education’ as playing a central role in the province’s long-term economic health.⁵ Exemplary of this effort are three government-funded reports which include specific reference to international education at the K-12 level. The first is a report, commissioned in 2011 and updated in 2013, on the economic contributions of International Education to the province of BC (British Columbia Council for International Education [BCCIE] 2011, 2013; Kunin & Associates 2011, 2013). This report frames this impact in terms of FIS “total spending”, the sector’s “direct contributions to provincial GDP”, sector-specific “jobs created”, and “government revenue generated” (BCCIE, 2013, p. 1; also see, e.g., Kunin & Associates, 2013). The second document which foregrounds the relevance of the K-12 international education sector to BC is Canada Starts Here: The BC Jobs Plan, in which international education is presented both as a pathway for BC to recruit skilled immigrant workers and as a means for delivering quality education to ‘BC’ students

---

⁴ This is inclusive neither of the additional tuition fees FIS are charged for district-offered summer school or online courses, nor of the extra tuition fees FIS usually pay for either BC Ministry of Education-approved or privately offered forms of ‘shadow education’ (e.g., Aurini, Davies, & Dierkes 2013; Bray 1999; also see, e.g., Burch 2009: 55-76). It also is not inclusive of mandatory medical insurance FIS learners are required to purchase in most districts.

⁵ Perhaps not coincidentally, this effort has also been undertaken by the Federal Government of Canada, and has been mobilized both through commissioned reports (i.e., Illuminate Consulting Group 2009, 2011; Kunin & Associates 2009), updates to those reports (Kunin & Associates 2012), federal level advisory reports (Foreign Affairs, Trade, and Development Canada, 2012), strategy documents (Foreign Affairs, Trade, and Development Canada, 2014a), and regulations for international students (CIC, 2014b).
Finally, through what they have dubbed BC’s *International Education Strategy* (Government of BC, 2012a), the government has set the ambitious goal to increase the number of international students “by 50 per cent over four years [i.e., by 2017]” (p. 13).

**1.2 Statement of the Research Problem**

In spite of the fact that education policymakers, planners, and researchers are quick to describe the financial impact of FIS students on BC’s public education system, these descriptions have made only superficial mention of the relationship between the presence of FIS students and English language learning services, teaching, and learning. Better understanding this relationship is important for many reasons, two of which are: first, the overwhelming majority of high school-aged FIS students in BC (and North America more broadly) are from countries where English is not the dominant language of everyday interaction or schooling (e.g., BCCIE, 2014, 2013; CIC, 2015b; see also Chapter 2, Section 2.2, para. 1); and second, because there is a vast amount of research that has shown ELL students are very often marginalized in North American schools (see Section 1.1 above).

Furthermore, the very few interview-based studies that even make mention of FIS as a distinct category of student in British Columbia suggest not only that English language learning plays a central mediating role in FIS students’ personal transitions and adjustment to school and classroom life (Arnott, 2012; Popadiuk, 2009; Popadiuk & Marshall, 2011), but also, crucially, that the presence of FIS is affecting the delivery of ESL services, instruction, and ELL-related educational practice (Gunderson, 2007a, 2007b). And yet curiously, to date there have been no empirical investigations of FIS students’ (language) learning experiences or participation trajectories in actual school contexts; for example, no longitudinal or in-depth analyses have been conducted on their in-school experiences, how districts or schools recruit or accommodate them, their relations with classmates and/or teachers, or their educational backgrounds or
academic preparation. This absence of research in British Columbia (and Canada more
generally), especially in the context of the increasingly recognized role of FIS students in local
and provincial educational economies, underscores the timely and significant contribution that an
investigation of their in-school experiences would make to domestic policy and practice as it
relates to (language and literacy) education. Who are these students? How are they doing in BC’s
schools? Are their “year-long” educational experiences similar to or different from those of
‘domestic’ (i.e., immigrant ESL or non-immigrant) students, and if so, in what ways? If not, why
not? How is the category of FIS constructed and interpreted in classrooms, schools, educational
policies, and by administrators, teachers, classmates, and FIS themselves? What does the
presence and, indeed, necessity of having these “fee-payers” in public schools mean for ‘public’
education? For ESL as a programmatic option in schools?

Beyond the implications of FIS for public educational contexts in BC and Canada,
internationally some of the most salient contemporary language and literacy related issues in
applied linguistics and education-related research are being investigated vis-à-vis globalization,
‘migration’, and ‘transnationalism’ (e.g., Duff, 2012, 2014, 2015; Lo et al., 2014; Matthews,
2015; Warriner, 2007; Waters, 2006b, 2009a, 2009b. 2014, 2015). To be sure, the axis of salient
issues for researchers in these areas includes both “the extent to which people [have] actively
367) and the extent to which, in response to reduced levels of state-funding for public education,
pre-tertiary institutions from a variety of English-dominant countries have actively recruited fee-
paying students from non-English dominant countries (e.g., Arber, 2009; Farrugia, 2014; Lewis,
2005; Leve, 2011; Matthews & Sidhu, 2005).

Since the overwhelming majority of existing research about fee-paying migrant L2
learner youth has occurred outside of the schools they attend, there is a need to extend this
research by investigating FIS students’ presence and participation in classroom-, school-, district-, and policy-level processes.

1.2.1 Research Questions

The inquiry represented in the following chapters was thus guided by the following three research questions:

1) How is the category of fee-paying international student (FIS) constructed in BC educational policy?
2) How is the category of FIS constructed in BC educational practice?
3) How is the category of FIS constructed in persons (i.e., in the experiences of FIS students themselves)?

Applicable to each of these main guiding questions are further sub-questions which pinpoint the phenomenon of interest in the study:

a. How are socialization processes implicated in, made relevant by, or instantiated in these constructions? (i.e., Are ideologies of nation(ality), race, language, language learning and education implicated in these constructions? If so, how?)

b. In these constructions, how are FIS similar to or different from their non-fee paying counterparts?
   i. How are these socialization processes and similarities or differences relevant to classrooms, schools, and other sites of education?

By focusing on constructions of the category of FIS, the attendant socialization processes and impacts relevant to this category can be traced via its instantiation across multiple actors, sites, and dimensions of the public educational system.

1.3 Outline of the Dissertation

The present introductory chapter included, the dissertation consists of ten chapters. Chapter 2 provides a review of literature that highlights the shortage of research focusing on FIS
experiences or issues; situates the current study in relation to relevant research in applied linguistics, education, and geography; outlines the key theoretical framework for the study (language socialization) and introduces further conceptual resources with which it is inflected.

In Chapter 3, I locate the study in relation to different research traditions and articulate the methodological approach. I then present a detailed outline of the research context, participants, and methods utilized to generate and analyze data.

Chapter 4 presents a response to the first research question, and describes socializing processes implicated in the construction of FIS in educational policy-related texts.

In Chapter 5, I respond to the second research question by focusing on a wide range of stakeholders’ discursive constructions of FIS as well as other, more material constructions of FIS. I discuss socializing processes in these constructions and link them to everyday practices at Quondam High School (QHS) and in the Pateo School District.

Chapters 6 through 9 offer a multi-part response to the third research question. In Chapter 6, I present a narrative account of how, through the lived experiences of four focal FIS students, the category of FIS was realized through socializing processes relating to students’ living arrangements, socioeconomic positioning, and language learning and use. Chapters 7, 8, and 9 focus on how the category of FIS was realized by focal students’ navigation of a socializing process central to their school-based experiences: “getting out of ESL”. Chapter 7 traces the individual socialization trajectories of two focal participants, Ellen and Moon, and Chapters 8 and 9 those of two others, Zeejay and WoW, as each student’s experience of getting out of ESL coalesced during the 2011-2012 school year at Quondam High School (QHS).

In Chapter 10, I summarize the findings, discuss the theoretical and methodological contributions, as well as the limitations, of the dissertation. I conclude the chapter by presenting potential implications of the study, identifying areas for potential future research, and reflecting on larger questions related to public education.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMING

2.1 Introduction

The impetus for this study was a convergence of personal and contextual factors involving FIS studying in public secondary schools in British Columbia. The phenomenon of interest in this inquiry is FIS socialization, and in particular, processes and impacts relevant to the category of FIS as it is constructed across sites, texts, and actors. By focusing on constructions of the category of FIS, the attendant socialization processes relevant to this category can be traced via its instantiation across policy, practices, and persons, as well as across multiple levels of the public education system.

Chapter 2 is organized into three main sections. In section 2.2, I highlight the dearth of research focusing specifically on FIS students, and then briefly situate the inquiry in relation to relevant research spanning different fields and (sub)fields. Then, in section 2.3, I present an overview of the main theoretical framework for the study, (second) language socialization, and introduce the further conceptual notions of markets, polycentricity, timescales, and indexicality. I conclude the chapter with a brief sketch of the relationship between FIS socialization and the multiscalar, polycentric markets in which its processes are instantiated (section 2.4).

2.2 Overview of Relevant Literature

In the current context of pre-tertiary public education in Canada and the United States, the recruitment of international students (FIS) has become a progressively significant issue. This is because FIS bring tuition fees and fill empty seats in schools; the recruitment of FIS has served the purpose of offsetting simultaneous decreases in both domestic student enrolment and government (i.e., state-based) funding for public schools. Despite this growing focus on recruitment, and the more and more frequent characterization of FIS as a relevant category of student for K-12 public education in both the United States (e.g., Canfield, 2011; Farrugia, 2014; Goodnough, 2010; Hopkins, 2012; Marklein, 2015; Nuwer, 2014; Sambides Jr., 2013; Simon,
2012; Tang, 2014; Toppo, 2014; Weiss, 2014)) and Canada (e.g., Brennan, 2014; Casselman, 2012; A. Findlay, 2011, 2013; S. Findlay, 2011; Mitchell, 2004; Mui, 2013; E. O’Connor, 2014; N. O’Connor, 2012; Steffenhagen, 2012a, 2013a, 2013b, 2013c), there is an astonishing absence of research reporting on FIS students’ experiences or on the impact of their presence for public educational institutions.

In fact, the only studies that have focused on the school-based experiences of FIS in public schools have been conducted in Canada. These have primarily been magistral level studies using data collected from single, one-off interviews with individual students (e.g., Popadiuk, 2009, 2010; Popadiuk & Marshall, 2011), from single focus groups with two to six students at one time (Nelson, 2013), or from a combination of single individual interviews, a questionnaire, and field-notes (Arnott, 2012). Two doctoral level, qualitative multiple case studies have included international students among their focal participants (Qian, 2012; Shin, 2010); although English language learning featured prominently for the very few international students in each of these studies, neither study focused specifically on FIS students’ school-based experiences nor on the implications of their status as fee-payers.

Put succinctly, at the time of writing and to the best of my knowledge, almost no research has focused specifically on the FIS phenomenon, or its impact, across multiple actors or sites in a pre-tertiary educational setting (see, e.g., Matthews & Sidhu, 2005). Further to that, no studies have provided a longitudinal account of the experiences of FIS students derived from ethnographic fieldwork in actual school contexts. For these reasons alone, this study addresses several substantial gaps in the research literature: by focusing on the phenomenon of FIS itself; by investigating this phenomenon across multiple sites (i.e., in a school, a school district, in

---

6 Each of the studies authored by Popadiuk (i.e., Popadiuk, 2009, 2010; Popadiuk & Marshall, 2011) rely on data collected for the author’s magistral thesis (Popadiuk, 1998). Comments on the use of those data so long after the completion of the thesis notwithstanding, the point here is to note that these multiple articles draw on the same data set, and present very similar sets of findings.
provincial policies) and perspectives (i.e., student, teacher, administrator, and policymaker); and by adopting an ethnographic approach to research.

Notwithstanding the absence of research focused specifically on the FIS phenomenon, FIS learners, or the presence and impact of FIS on public schools, boards of education, or education systems more generally, this study can be situated at the intersection of relevant research spanning four broad thematic areas. They are: research on ESL youth and ‘transnational’ (ESL) students in North American applied linguistics and educational research; research on ‘overseas education’ in geography and in applied linguistics; work from Canada, Australia and New Zealand which has explicitly addressed issues associated with FIS from different theoretical perspectives; and discussion of how the category of FIS has become relevant in BC’s provincial policy, educational discourse, and delivery of ESL services.

2.2.1 ESL High Schoolers and ‘Transnational’ Students in North America

theoretical or analytic links to language socialization (e.g., Duff, 2001, 2002a, 2002b, 2004; Ek, 2009a, 2009b; Talmy, 2008, 2009a, 2010b, 2015), or their attention to English language learning issues across and between macro-institutional and microinteractional levels (e.g., Duff, 1995; Talmy, 2005), help to situate the study reported here. Indeed, echoing much of the research cited above, I demonstrate in chapters four through nine how English language learning is a critical mediator of the academic and social lives of FIS students, and more generally, the presence and impact of FIS students in the public education system.

However, given the centrality of English language learning to the policies, practices, and personal experiences developing from FIS education, of key interest to this study is Talmy’s (2005, *inter alia*) work to describe the cultural production of ESL as an institutional, curricular, and student identity category. Talmy demonstrates how, vis-à-vis various ‘school-sanctioned’ and student-produced ‘oppositional’ productions of ESL at Tradewinds High School in Hawai’i, the category of ESL was stigmatized in a wide variety of ways at the school. Whereas “ESL policies, administrative structures, curriculum, and instructional practice” comprised school-sanctioned productions, oppositional productions of ESL were accomplished through a recurrent inventory of student practices Talmy (2015) describes as “withdrawal from official instructional and other classroom processes; overt disparagement of ESL as an institutional category; prominent displays of distinction from [students who were] ‘FOBs’ (fresh off the boat)…[and] racist conduct directed at them” (p. 355). Talmy’s work is vital to this study in two senses. The first is that his systematic description of how the category of ESL comes to be stigmatized in schools is fundamental for understanding very similar ‘official’ and ‘oppositional’ productions of ESL in BC schools (see, e.g., Gunderson, 2007a; Wild, Helmer, Tanaka, & Dean, 2006; also Chapters 3-9 of this dissertation). The second relates to the examination of how a category of learner is produced; in this study, a similar concern for how the category of FIS is assembled across differently-constituted sites of public education policy and practice is taken up.
**Transnational students.** A more recent trend in both educational and applied linguistics research has been to discuss the experiences of migrant (ESL) students as *transnationals* (e.g., Bartlett, 2007; de la Piedra & Guerra, 2012; Duff, 2015; Hornberger, 2007; Hornberger & Link, 2012; Martin-Beltrán, 2014; McGinnis, Goodstein-Stolzenberg, & Costa Saliani, 2007; Orellana, Thorne, Chee, & Lam, 2001; Qian, 2012; Richardson Bruna, 2007; Sarroub, 2001; Sánchez, 2007; Shao-Kobayashi, 2013; Soto Huerta & Pérez, 2015; Song, 2007; Suarez-Orozco, 2001; Warriner, 2007; Wortham & Rhodes, 2013). A focus of much of this research has been on the differential processes of and investments in maintaining ties between cultural or linguistic practices associated with students’ (and/or families’) countries of origin, and how these processes are applicable to the experience(s) of schooling. Of particular mention in this research are studies which have drawn on and argued in favour of ethnographic (e.g., Bartlett, 2007; Martin-Beltrán, 2014; Shao-Kobayashi, 2013) and case study methods of inquiry (e.g., McGinnis, Goodstein-Stolzenberg, & Costa Saliani, 2007; Wortham & Rhodes, 2013) to uncover the contradictory ways in which quotidian language and literacy practices connect, reify, and challenge the sociohistorical, political, and ideological forces of (real or imagined) nation states. Relevant to the study reported here, this transnational ‘moment’ has led to calls in the literature for a re-theorizing of language as a form of Bourdieusian capital with “ideological, semiotic, and performative” attributes, *language learning* “through an ideology and identity lens”, and *secondary school-aged (im)migrant language learners* “as social actors who possess and are in the process of developing symbolic competence” (De Costa, 2010, p. 769; also see the discussion of markets in subsections 2.2.2, 2.2.4, and 2.3.2).

Also of vital interest to the study reported here, and in particular to chapters which chronicle FIS students’ varied negotiation of the key socializing process during their high school year – ‘getting out of ESL’ – is Wortham and Rhodes’ (2013) account of Annie’s development and identification as a good reader. Their case study describes both how within single instances
and “across a series of events, poetically organized signs cohere[d] and establish[ed] relevant context” from which a “solidifying trajectory” as a good reader was enabled, enacted, and interpretable (p. 539). Not only does such an approach foreground “cross-event trajectories”, it suggests that approaching a ‘case’ as a cross-event trajectory of identification allows researchers to conduct analyses outside what they refer to as “the pervasive but misleading ‘macro-micro dialectic’” (p. 539). They continue:

‘macro-micro’ accounts misconstrue heterogeneous resources from various scales, forcing them into two artificially bounded scales instead of exploring how a subset of resources from various scales become relevant to social identification in any given case. We are not arguing that ‘structure’ and ‘agency’ do not exist. Instead of one monolithic type of structure, however, there are various types of constraining processes that occur at various scales—ranging from evanescent local ones to enduring long-term ones. On the other side, innovation occurs not only because of individual acts of will but can also emerge from collective processes at various scales (Wortham, 2012). (Wortham & Rhodes, 2013, p. 539)

The utility of this type of approach for the current study has both theoretical and methodological implications. The theoretical implications (i.e., with respect to scales and socialization trajectories [Wortham, 2005]) are further discussed in this chapter (see subsection 2.3.2). Those relating to methodology (i.e., with respect to case study) are addressed in Chapter 3 (see, e.g., Section 3.1).

2.2.2 Overseas Education: ‘Capitalizing’ (on) ESL in Education Markets

Research across geography, education, and applied linguistics has explicitly linked youth migration to (English) education. Overseas education, educational migration, early study abroad and other such terms are often used by scholars in these fields to denote a trend in which school-age students with first languages other than English (temporarily) relocate to English speaking

**Geography.** A great deal of research on the topic of overseas education has been conducted in the (sub) discipline(s) of (human, social, cultural, and economic) geography. In addition to studies that have focused on overseas education as a form of marketized, “export education” related to immigrant entrepreneurship and ‘cultural tourism’ among the Korean community in Vancouver (e.g., Hiebert & Kwak, 2004; Kwak, 2008; Kwak & Hiebert, 2010), these studies have taken an interest in overseas education as “part of a more general child-centered familial strategy of capital accumulation involving migration and transnational household arrangements” (Waters, 2005, p. 360; also see, e.g., E.L. Ho & Ley, 2014; Ley, 2010; Waters, 2004, 2006b, 2009b, 2010, 2014, 2015; Zhou, 1998). The latter stream of research has been particularly robust, and relying primarily on thematic analyses of interview data, has operationalized such terms as ‘study mothers’, ‘astronaut families’, and ‘satellite kids’ in its descriptions of the overseas education phenomenon among transnational families with links to mainland China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong (e.g., Chee, 2003; Chew, 2009, 2012; E.S. Ho, 2002; Huang & Yeoh, 2005; Pe-Pua, Mitchell, Castles, & Iredale, 1998; Waters, 2000, 2001a, 2001b, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006a, 2006b, 2007, 2009b, 2010, 2014, 2015; Yeoh, Huang, & Lam, 2005). The work of geographers to spatialize educational migration in relation to distinctive markets of education and language, namely by theorizing both educational credentials and English language learning as forms of Bourdiesusian capital (e.g., Chew, 2009, 2012; Waters, 2004, 2006b, 2009b), is a key resource for the study presented here (see subsection 2.3.2 below). Additionally, Waters’ most recent work (e.g., Waters, 2014, 2015) has identified two as-of-yet
unattended to areas of research which are directly addressed by the study presented here. The first relates to the fact that much of the literature of educational migration “tends to stress the benefits/advantages” of migration, and further, to treat educational migration “as an individualistic, atomized pursuit (Holdsworth 2013) … with relatively little attention paid to the complex webs of social relations created around the process” (Waters, 2014, p. 686). The second area of research Waters identifies relates to the experiences of students themselves – often minors – in educational migration research, and can be applied to much of the literature in education-based and applied linguistics literature as well. Waters (2015) concludes her paper by alluding to its significance:

the paper points to the central role that children have to play in the process of educational migration – too often, children are marginalised in the migration literature. To date, it remains the case that far too little research has been done on the children themselves – where they are placed at the forefront, given a voice, and not subsumed within the family unit. (p. 291)

This dissertation addresses Waters’ call for students to be placed at the “forefront” of research by including the ‘voices’ of four focal FIS students in the longitudinal examination of FIS socialization, traced across the different markets made relevant by their educational migration.

**Educational and applied linguistics.** In educational and applied linguistics research, an increasing amount of recent work on overseas education has occurred among researchers interested in the “early study abroad” (or jogi yuhak) experiences of Korean school-aged students (or jogi yuhaksaeng; e.g., K. Kim & Yoon, 2005; ten chapters in Lo et al., 2015; E. Park, 2007; J.S-. Y. Park & Bae, 2009; Shin, 2010a, 2010b, 2012; Song, 2007, 2010, 2011, 2012a, 2012b). The breadth of foci represented in this work ranges from case studies of children’s language socialization (e.g., E. Park. 2007; Song, 2007, 2012a), to work on language ideologies as they relate to common sociocultural and linguistic practices and geographic choices which are
salient in early study abroad practices (e.g., Lo et al., 2015; J.S.-Y. Park & Bae, 2009; Shin, 2010a, 2010b, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015; Song, 2010, 2011; see also studies in J.S.-Y. Park & Lo, 2012a). Of particular note here is Shin’s variously reported (2010b, *inter alia*) ethnography of secondary school aged ‘visa students’ (i.e., *yuhaksaeng*) students in Toronto, in which she emphasizes the hybrid Korean languacultural practices these students “deployed” in their attempts to contest their marginalized statuses and relationally construct their identities as distinct from long-term immigrants and Canadians (though cf subsection 2.2.3). Important for the current study, and in a strikingly similar way to De Costa’s (2010) study and work being done on educational migration by other scholars (e.g., Chew, 2009, 2012; Waters, 2004, 2006b, 2009b), Shin espouses a “globalization sensitive” approach to second language learning research in which languages are conceptualized as sets of resources (i.e., Bourdieusian capital), and language learning is treated as an economic activity mediated by its interactions with the language education industry and education markets more generally.

2.2.3 ‘Unexamined and Overlooked’: From Overseas Study to FIS

Although many of the more recent studies of ESL in North America have noted the transnational character of language learners’ secondary school experiences, very few have specifically identified groups of (international) ESL students that are qualitatively different from immigrant ESL learners (though cf. Duff, 2002a; Qian, 2012; Kanno & Applebaum, 1995; Shima, 2011; Shin, 2010a, 2010b, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015). In addition to the fact that there has been so little research, how these ‘different’ ESL students have been identified has varied across these studies.

Kanno and Applebaum (1995) focused specifically on the experiences of three Japanese-speaking international ESL students attending Toronto secondary schools. Describing their

---

7 Shin has characterized her study in the following, potentially disparate, ways: “a critical sociolinguistic ethnography” (Shin, 2010b, p. 34); “a sociolinguistic ethnography” (Shin, 2012, p. 186; Shin, 2013, p. 532); an “ethnographic case study” (Shin, 2014, p. 100); and an “ethnography” (Shin, 2015, p. 67).
participants as “children of Japanese businessmen who were on temporary overseas assignment,” Kanno and Applebaum argue that they are a “categorically different group from immigrant [ESL] students” (Kanno & Applebaum, 1995, p. 34). They continue:

It must be emphasized that these students did not intend to stay in Canada permanently. For this reason, they constitute a categorically different group from immigrant students in terms of language learning. That is, they had less motivation to approach the learning of English as a lifetime commitment than immigrant students and, conversely, had more practical incentives to maintain their first language. Despite such differences, however, we feel that a number of issues illuminated by their experiences are relevant to immigrant students, especially those who have recently arrived from the Far East. (p. 34)

Though there are many features of this description which deserve detailed commentary, for the purpose of this section it will suffice to note two related issues. The first concerns Kanno and Applebaum’s characterization of students as “not intend[ing] to stay in Canada permanently”, and then linking this to their having “had less motivation to approach the learning of English as a lifetime commitment than immigrant students”. Not only does this kind of characterization frame students’ length of study abroad as directly linked to their motivation for learning English, it implicitly treats (im-)migration in ‘settlement’ terms. The second point is that despite being described by Kanno and Applebaum as being ‘categorically different from immigrant [ESL] students’, this description is not representative of these students’ institutional status. That is, from a school or governmental perspective, the students in Kanno and Applebaum’s study are in fact categorized and funded in a way that is identical to immigrant students. Because their fathers
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8 Like Kanno & Applebaum (1995), albeit in the US context, Shima (2011) also differentiated the ESL experiences of non-immigrant, short-term ‘Japanese expatriate’ students from those of their immigrant peers. Participants in this study were studying, short term, at high schools in the United States because their “fathers were sent to Japanese branch offices in the foreign country” (Shima, 2011, p. 8). The question of whether these students were required to pay fees to attend schools is not topicalized in the study. I discuss the relevance of student categories to this dissertation further in subsection 2.2.4).
were legally employed in Canada at the time of their studies, these students would not have been required to pay tuition fees to attend public schools, and any supplemental state-funding for ESL would have been available to their schools as a result of their presence. As I demonstrate through the analyses in this study, detailed attention to the two issues identified here is crucial for a thoroughgoing and ethnographic understanding of FIS students’ statuses as (im-)migrants or students; more broadly, attention to these issues is necessary for understanding how globalization, migration, and internationalization is related to and potentially affects ESL services, teaching, and learning.

Shin’s (2010b) doctoral study subsumed, under the cover term ‘visa students’ (i.e., yuhaksaeng), the experiences of students who were permanent residents of Canada (i.e., were landed immigrants) and students who held Canadian citizenship. In fact, of the four focal ‘visa students’ students in Shin’s dissertation, only two were actual visa students (see, e.g., Shin, 2010b, p. viii, 45-49; also Shin, 2013, pp. 532-533 for descriptions). This conflation of categories of student is a researcher-based analytic move, and thus raises questions about the work’s representativeness as an “analysis [which] examines new transnational subjectivities of yuhaksaeng (visa students)” (Shin, 2010b, p. iii)⁹; in addition, because the blurring of these categories of student under the cover term ‘visa students’ renders invisible very important institutional attributes which make each unique, Shin’s (2010b) study in itself is a strong warrant for focusing specifically on the FIS (i.e., ‘visa student’) category.

Duff’s (2001, 2002a, 2002b, 2004) ethnographic study of “the linguistic socialization of immigrant students into new discourse communities at [a Canadian] school” (Duff, 2004, p. 239) identified “Barb” – an international student from Indonesia (Duff, 2002a, p. 298) – among the 19 students who participated in the research. While it is noteworthy that Duff distinguished between

---

⁹ Indeed, in recent publications (e.g., Shin, 2012, 2013, 2015), Shin’s selective focus on only the participants from her dissertation study that actually were ‘visa students’ suggests she is also (now) aware of the difference between the categories of student.
Barb and the other ESL students in the school, neither Barb’s institutional status as a fee-payer nor the differences in her experience as a student were a main focus of the study. Similarly, although Qian (2012) clearly articulated differences in the fee-paying versus non-fee-paying statuses of the late-arriving Chinese participants in her study, these differences were passed over to focus on similarities between ‘late-arriving’ students.

In Australia and New Zealand, work on the internationalisation of public secondary schools has explicitly focused on FIS as a distinct category of student (e.g., Arber, 2009; Evans, 2011; Everts, 2004; Lewis, 2005; Leve, 2011; Matthews, 2002; Matthews & Sidhu, 2005; Richardson, 2007; Tudball, 2007). Though these studies have employed the use of market metaphors to conceptualize the recruitment of international students to public schools as “the commodification of public education” (Leve, 2011, p. xiii; see also, e.g., Arber, 2009; Matthews & Sidhu, 2005), they have not focused on ESL services, learning, or teaching specifically in relation to FIS presence. Of particular relevance to the study presented here, however, is these studies’ description of issues relating to FIS pastoral care (Everts, 2004; Lewis, 2005) and social integration of FIS in schools (Evans, 2011: Richardson, 2007).

More provocatively, but also relevant to this dissertation, is the discussion of ideological processes salient to international education in the Australian context. Matthews (2002), for example, has challenged popular discourses which uncritically promote “the idea that internationalisation invariably strengthens international and intercultural relationships” (p. 369); furthering this challenge, Matthews and Sidhu (2005) have argued that international education does not “automatically give rise to globally oriented and supra-territorial forms of subjectivity” (p. 49). Summarizing a study in which they analyzed interview data from 56 FIS and four teachers at two public secondary schools in Australia, Matthews and Sidhu (2005) write:

First, the normalizing discourses of nationality, race and ethnicity permeate international education to reinforce old ethnic and national affiliations while stimulating new ‘racial’
formations. Second, given its economic rationale, practices of international education uphold the global spread of hegemonic social practices such as the marketization of education. Under these conditions international education does not necessarily establish the conditions for unsettling ethnocultural and nationalistic persuasions and practices and thus misses the opportunity to sponsor cosmopolitan identification and globally oriented subjectivity. In short, international education is as likely to give rise to profoundly conservative ethnocultural affiliations and largely instrumental notions of global citizenship as to generate a collective and compassionate global subject. (p. 50)

As I demonstrate in chapters four through nine, not only did such types of ‘normalizing discourses’ get mobilized by students, teachers, administrators, and policymakers in this study, Matthews’ (2002) challenge (i.e., to the discourse of international education as intercultural capital exchange) was echoed by a wide range of participants.

2.2.4 FIS in BC: Provincial Policy, Marketizing Discourse, and Learning English

Provincial policy. The BC Ministry of Education (n.d.-c) defines international students (also: non-resident students) in the following terms: “Students who have moved from outside of Canada to British Columbia and do not meet the residency requirements of Section 82 of the School Act” (para. 1; original emphasis). Not meeting residency requirements (i.e., requiring a student visa; cf. discussion of Shin, 2010b, above) also means the host school is ineligible for state-based educational funding, apart from cases in which an exception to this rule applies.

Though when this study first began, the provincial policy which governed international students’ education and funding in public schools (BCMoE, 2001b) was “under review”, by the time my fieldwork was complete a new policy, called the Eligibility of Students for Operating Grant Funding (BCMoE, 2011/2013), had replaced it. In Chapter 4 I discuss the factors around which this policy shift coalesced, as well as its discursive and material features, functions and impact at multiple levels of the educational system.
**Marketizing discourse.** In the marketizing educational discourse used to actively recruit international students to study in British Columbia, a consistent focus has been on the quality of programs and the value of credentials obtained in BC schools. Using a document from BC’s largest city as an example, in “Study in Vancouver: A Smart Way to Learn” international students are encouraged to study in Vancouver because it’s schools “offer high quality programs, dedicated teachers and excellent facilities.” It is further claimed that “[c]redentials earned in the Vancouver school district are recognized worldwide” (Vancouver School Board, 2010). The BC Ministry of Education (2004/2009) also asserts that “[m]any [international] students come to [BC] because they and their parents value the high quality of education provided by the [BC] school system” (para. 5; also see, e.g., Mitchell, 2004). Though the discourse of their documents constructs the programs, credentials, and the general school system as being valuable for and valued by international students, to date neither the BC Ministry of Education nor any of its school districts have conducted empirical investigations of FIS students’ experiences in, or their impact upon, BC schools. By focusing on what international students can gain from BC schools’ programs and credentials, this discourse implies a one-way transfer and mobilization of linguistic, educational, and cultural (symbolic) capital from schools to students; similarly, the total revenue BC’s school districts have generated from the tuition fees paid by international students has more than doubled since 2002, to more than 145 million dollars (Kuehn, 2014; see also e.g., BCCIE, 2013, 2014 for descriptions of the key role played by international education in BC’s provincial economy). This focus and the reported gains in revenue strongly suggest that in both discursive and material senses, there is an increasingly systematic and strategic marketization of BC’s public education system. It is thus all the more curious that no studies have been done to examine the socializing impacts of these marketization processes for either FIS or domestic students, for teachers or schools, or for the larger education system or policies.
Learning English. Among the studies conducted in British Columbia that have mentioned international students, some have also raised issues relating to English language learning (e.g., Arnott, 2012; Nelson, 2013; Popadiuk, 1998, 2009, 2010; Popadiuk & Marshall, 2011). Gunderson’s (2007b) presentation of student, parent, and teacher reports on the situation in Abbotsford schools, for example, suggests that ESL services are differently conceptualized, divided, or delivered to fee-paying versus non-fee paying students depending on any given number of management-level or structural issues. Gunderson (2007b) quotes three respondents who note that this differentiation actually favours FIS:

There is much more money for International students; they are often serviced at the expense of time for the immigrant population; they come at the front of the line; there are decreased services for the immigrant population; it is an elitist split (CIA Helping Teacher).

International students are getting more attention than the ESL students who were born here (Middle Teacher).

International assistants are very helpful but they are only available to non-landed immigrant status students; it would be great if they were for landed immigrants as well (Secondary Counsellor). (p. 40)

In contrast to the views of stakeholders presented in Gunderson (2007b), students’ interview and focus group narratives reported in the studies by Arnott (2012), Nelson (2013), Popadiuk (2009, 2010), and Popadiuk and Marshall (2011) also implicate English language learning as a central, and sometimes contradictory, mediating locus of social and academic inclusion and exclusion. Popadiuk & Marshall’s (2011) interview study, which recontextualizes data from Popadiuk’s (1998) magistral thesis on counselling issues for FIS, showed FIS students discussing English language learning in a markedly different way: as an impediment to academic progress; as an institutionally recognized linguistic capital that served as the basis for different
curricula (i.e., ESL versus for-credit courses); as a pursuit that was hindered by their use of their first language; and as an arbitrator of social and cultural integration with both international and non-international student peers. Like many of the studies mentioned above, Popadiuk and Marshall characterize English, and students’ perceptions of it, as “the much-sought-after world language of global and local importance that will bring new social, linguistic, and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1994) to international students by facilitating success in their future lives” (p. 223).

2.2.5 Summary

Clearly, the internationalization of education, realized in the literature, through increasing interest in processes related to overseas education in general and the presence of FIS in public schools in particular, is a growing area of research for scholars in a variety of different fields. In the context of Canada and BC more specifically, and given the exponential growth of international education programs and the revenue they bring worldwide, there is a critical need for empirical research which investigates processes relevant to FIS students’ presence and participation trajectories in actual school contexts and the K-12 public education system more generally. In this respect, drawing on the widely used notion of capital as a means for conceptualizing FIS students’ pursuit of language and credentials in an international education marketplace, also seems apt for such a study. A longitudinal exploration which focuses on the educational migration process of students themselves but at the same time takes pains to situate the account in “the complex webs of social [and educational] relations created around the process” (Waters, 2014, p. 686) is eminently suitable for this task.

In conjunction with research that has drawn attention to or obscured differences between immigrant and international ESL students in high schools (e.g., Duff, 2002a, 2004; Kanno & Applebaum, 1995; Popadiuk & Marshall, 2011; Qian, 2012; Shin, 2010b), Gunderson’s (2007b) study can be heard as a clarion call of sorts: “issues related to International students were extremely contentious.... [w]hile the mandate of this [study] was to focus on ESL matters, not the
International Program, it turns out that they are highly related and inter-woven issues” (p. 20). These studies suggest that research which examines relations between (the categories of) ESL and FIS would offer a much needed contribution to our understanding of the myriad ways in which FIS are gaining from and contributing to the secondary level educational landscape in BC and potentially elsewhere.

2.3 Theoretical Framing

In the sections that follow, I first present a theoretically-focused overview of (second) language socialization, highlighting recent developments which have described its effectiveness for examining contingent and sometimes unpredictable processes at the intersection of migration, language learning, and formal education. I then outline the concept of market (Bourdieu, 1991), and inflect this concept with the notions of superdiversity, polycentricity, scales, indexicality, and interdiscursivity.

2.3.1 (Second) Language Socialization

The key theoretical framework informing the study is language socialization (LS; e.g., Baquedano-López & Hernandez, 2011; Duff, 2008b; Duff & Hornberger, 2008; Duff & Talmi, 2011; Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Rymes, 2008; Wortham, 2005), a framework used by researchers to conceptualize and investigate “how persons become competent members of social groups and the [central] role of language in [mediating] that process” (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986, p. 167). In order to gain ‘membership’ in a particular (sub) cultural group, individuals must learn how to recognize and accomplish the relevant linguistic and contextual conventions of that group, as well as how to perform “appropriate identities, stances (e.g., epistemic or empathetic) or ideologies, and other behaviors associated with the target group and its normative practices” (Duff, 2007, p. 310).

Second language socialization (L2 LS; e.g., Baquedano-López & Manguel Figueroa,
applies the LS framework to instances in which socialization occurs in and through a language being learned in addition to the learner’s first or dominant language. Like LS, it is concerned with processes in which these learners “seek competency in the [additional] language and, typically, membership and the ability to participate in the practices of communities in which that language is spoken” (Duff, 2012, p. 564); however, L2 LS tends to focus explicitly on L2, foreign language, bi- or multilingual settings in which learners are older children, teenagers, and adults (Duff, 2012; Talmy, 2012). Despite the distinct importance of language learning in these settings, however, L2 LS involves much more than “the acquisition of a code”; by describing how meaning is assembled via indexical links between instances of language use and the contexts in which language is used, a central aim of L2 socialization research is to account for “the many kinds of cultural knowledge and social relations that are learned both in and through language” (Talmy, 2012, p. 573).

In addition to a social practice approach to language, which recognizes that individuals’ participation in social spaces, and indeed social spaces themselves, are mediated by (agentive) language use, (L2) LS research also shares a preference for longitudinal research designs, ethnographic methods, and discourse analytic approaches (e.g., Bronson & Watson-Gegeo, 2008; Duff, 2008, 2010; Duff & Talmy, 2011; Garrett, 2008; Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004; Watson-Gegeo & Bronson, 2013). It is these predispositions that position (L2) LS as particularly apt for investigating multidirectional “language and literacy socialization of individuals in superdiversity” (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011, p. 14).

**L2 LS in superdiverse settings.** Processes of globalization, diversity, (im-)migration, as well as the theoretical and methodological implications for researching individuals and

---

10 These methodological preferences of (L2) LS research are discussed in greater length in Chapter 3, Section 3.1.
institutions affected by these processes, have been a consistent topic of discussion across the social sciences (e.g., Agamben, 1998; Appadurai, 1996, 2003; Beck & Sznaider, 2006; Blommaert & Rampton, 2011; Clifford, 1994; Ong, 1999; E.L. Ho & Ley, 2014; Ley, 2010, Robertson, 2013; Wimmer & Glick-Schiller, 2002). Vertovec (2007) has contributed to this discussion by arguing for a more “multidimensional perspective on diversity” (p. 1026). Using the summary term ‘superdiversity’ to characterize the “dynamic interplay of variables” realized in the day to day realities of (institutional) spaces to which migrants arrive and are received, Vertovec has argued that beyond ethnicity, first language, and country of origin, there are additional variables which have “mutually conditioning effects” (p. 1025) on the experience of migration for people, institutions, and states. Included this wider range of variables are “differential immigration statuses and their concomitant entitlements and restrictions of rights” (p. 1025), as well as variable interpretations of each for differently positioned actors. Finally, acknowledging the quotidian status of discrete “variables of super-diversity”, Vertovec argues that it is the complex interplay of these variables across policy- and practice-related configurations and scales that require not only “conceptual distinction”, but also approaches with which researchers can more accurately describe and “appreciat[e] the coalescence of factors which condition people’s lives” (p. 1026).

Given its conceptualization of language as a contested and changeable social practice that “constitute[s] and is constituted [by] particular sociohistorically-, socioculturally-, and socio-politically situated communities” (Talmy, 2012, p. 573), LS provides a robust framework for addressing the superdiverse ‘coalescence of factors’ made relevant as migrant groups “negotiate participation in and influence new communities and social institutions” (Baquedano-López & Mangual Figueroa, 2011, p. 537; see also, e.g., Duff, 2015; Talmy, 2015). Recently, researchers working from LS perspectives have called for the investigation of such coalescences in and
across sites where migration, language learning, and formal education intersect (e.g., Duff & Talmy, 2011).

Talmy (2015) has noted that because there is so little applied linguistics research focused explicitly on the topic of pre-tertiary (i.e., K-12) ESL, and further that because even among the studies that have been done very few have drawn on LS or L2 socialization perspectives – “more and better investigations are needed that concern the growing complexities of ESL learning in superdiverse public school settings” (p. 365). Echoing Talmy’s earlier work to identify and trace the problematic “school-sanctioned cultural productions of the ESL student” (2015, p. 355; also, e.g., Talmy, 2004, 2005, 2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2010a, 2010b), Duff (2015) has argued for LS as a highly suitable approach for conceptualizing and understanding the conditions under which highly mobile, transnational students “are [often] viewed as one massive, undifferentiated category (or problem)—*English language learners*—obscuring tremendous differences in their backgrounds, resources, goals, abilities, and trajectories” (p. 10). The need for this type of understanding becomes even more urgent given that, as she points out, “in the current neoliberal economy, [these students] are being actively recruited by institutions abroad seeking international school-aged…full-fee paying students” (Duff, 2015, p. 10; also, e.g., Deschambault, 2012a, 2012b, 2013a, 2013b, 2013c, 2014). Finally, and of critical relevance to this study, is Baquedano-López and Manguel Figueroa’s (2011) suggestion that although LS-based research has yielded a wealth of knowledge about (im-)migrant students and their parents, we know very little about how immigrant groups socialize one another and even less about how immigrant groups influence the cities or locales they inhabit. As such, a strong call is put forth for studies that foreground the bidirectional nature of socialization and that expand the socialization sites studied to include events across the multiple sites of cultural and linguistic contact (p. 555).
Taking up their call for studies which, in addition to the experiences of migrant students themselves (i.e., what I refer to as ‘FIS in persons’, Chapters 6-9), I examine how the recruitment of and reliance upon FIS students has played a socializing role in cities and locales (i.e., what I refer to as ‘FIS in practice’, Chapter 5), and also expand the application of the LS framework by including a site of cultural and linguistic contact not often studied (i.e., what I refer to as ‘FIS in policy’, Chapter 4).

**Multidirectionality, contingency, and appropriative practices in L2 LS.** (L2) LS offers a conceptual and empirical means for describing how individuals come to recognize and accomplish relevant linguistic and contextual conventions, and to perform ‘appropriate’ identities, stances or ideologies, and ‘normative’ practices associated with the ‘cities or locales’, institutions or other spaces they inhabit. Contemporary theorizations have emphasized that LS processes are “dynamic, bi- or multidirectional, political, and highly contingent” (Duff, 2008b, p. 110), as a reminder that LS is “an interactive process” in which the newcomer or (im-)migrant “is not a passive recipient of sociocultural knowledge” but rather a “selective and active participant…in the process of constructing social worlds” (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986, p. 165); that LS provides a potent theoretical and analytic means for identifying more- and less-subtle forms of resistance, adaptation, reaction to, and even appropriation of ‘normative’ practices (e.g., Duff, 2002a, 2003; He, 2003b; Talmy, 2008); and that LS can facilitate a better understanding of how, through the use of language and to use language (Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986), the practices of newcomers or (im-)migrants come to have a socializing impact in cultural and linguistic contact zones across the locales they inhabit.

Discussing the “empirical challenge[s] that diversity presents to presumptions of shared knowledge”, Blommaert and Rampton (2011) have used the phrase “appropriative practices” to describe how individuals or groups actively and selectively contribute to the construction of their social worlds (p. 8). Though their discussion refers specifically to ‘linguistic norms’ (see quoted
passage below), for the purpose of the study I extend (or appropriate) their notion to discuss cultural or interpretive practices. This is because, as they have argued:

First, they [appropriative practices] allow us to observe linguistic [cultural, or interpretative] norms being manufactured, interrogated or altered, or to see norms that have changed and are new/different in the social networks being studied. We can see, in short, the emergence of structure out of agency. And second, there are likely to be social, cultural and/or political stakes in this… (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011, p. 8).

The notion of appropriative practices suggests both a motivated or interested participation by newcomers or (im-)migrants in negotiating the norms and conventions of their communities; at the same time, this notion allows for consideration of how the practices or trajectories of these individuals or groups elicit changes to those norms, consolidation of them, or altogether new configurations.

Given that LS “shares many underlying principles with other socially oriented theories” (Duff & Talmy, 2011, p. 96), in the next section I introduce a recurring conceptual metaphor which is referred to throughout the dissertation, that of multiscalar, polycentric markets. I then describe the concepts of indexicality and interdiscursivity.

2.3.2 FIS Socialization in Multiscalar, Polycentric Markets

My use of the term ‘market’ is derived from Bourdieu (1984, 1986, 1991), who has argued convincingly that the social world as we know it is comprised of human actions situated in multiple markets.11 For Bourdieu, the notion of a ‘market’ designates a metaphorical space, structured and delimited by a (semi-)stable system of value-attributions, in which actors struggle

---

11 It is important to recognize here, as have others (e.g., J. S.-Y. Park & Wee, 2012; Thompson, 1991), that Bourdieu (e.g., 1984, 1986 1991) sometimes uses the term field interchangeably with the term market. Although Thompson (1991) has claimed that Bourdieu’s “preferred technical term” is field, an important qualifier is that market is also commonly used by Bourdieu “in ways that are at least partly metaphorical” (p. 14). I have chosen to use the term market in the dissertation for the following reasons: to foreground Bourdieu’s assumption about the link between actions and interests; because it aligns well with issues relating to the marketization of public education and the category of fee-paying international student; and because as a metaphor, it has been fruitful for understanding participants’ management of educational processes directly relevant to the presence and status of FIS.
to acquire and mobilise economic, cultural, and social forms of capital. While in their economic (i.e., material wealth), cultural (i.e., distinction demonstrable via cultural practices), and social forms (i.e., the ‘credit’ endowed by one’s network of relationships and group-memberships) each type of capital is treated as distinct, within the logic of a given market’s system of value-attribution one form of capital can be exchanged for another.12

Perhaps not surprisingly, markets are *de facto* sites of struggle, where what is at stake for the actors within them is the preservation or alteration of how capital(s) specific to those markets are recognized and distributed. Though controversial, related to this struggle is Bourdieu’s (1984, 1986, 1991) assumption that individuals’ actions undertaken within such markets are always motivated or interested (Thompson, 1991). Bourdieu (1990) argues that:

> even when they give every appearance of disinterestedness because they escape the logic of ‘economic’ interest (in the narrow sense) and are oriented towards non-material stakes that are not easily quantified…practices never cease to comply with an economic logic.

(p. 122)

We see differently inflected forms of actions which display just these sorts of economizing logic in Chapters 4-9. In the chapter which discusses FIS in policy (Chapter 4), this type of motivation is highlighted in the BC Ministry of Education’s articulation of a broader, more encompassing categorization of fee-paying student, as well as in the discursive shift in its policy rationale which grants local educational bodies authority to supersede national immigration categories. In the chapter which discusses FIS in practice (Chapter 5), we see an interested willingness to treat

---

12 These different forms of capital allowed focal FIS to position themselves (and be positioned by others) in the various markets relevant to their experience as international students at QHS. For example, the ability to mobilize economic capital might have allowed a student to live closer to QHS, to register in more expensive face to face (versus online) summer courses, to travel ‘back home’ during school holidays, or to afford extracurricular tutors. The ability to mobilize cultural capital might have meant a student could communicate academic or social needs more effectively or proficiently in English, that they had greater adeptness with institutional processes such as the ‘lobby’ (see Chapters 6-9), or (in the unique case of QHS) had an L1 that was other than Mandarin (see Chapters 5-9). The ability to mobilize social capital might have meant that prior to Canada a student had studied at a foreign language high school, that they ‘knew’ people at QHS prior to their arrival, or that they had a comparatively more developed a sense of rapport with teachers at QHS than other FIS.
FIS as identical to their immigrant peers based on perceived similarities in their racial, ethnic, and languacultural (Agar, 1995) backgrounds, while at the same time recognizing important differences in their residency, funding, and ELL statuses. Finally, in the chapters on FIS in persons (Chapters 6-9), we see students’ motivated choices to maintain (or not) a particular living arrangement (i.e., Ellen/Moon/Zeejay), or to treat assigned work in ELL classes either as significant (WoW) or insignificant (Zeejay).

Two further caveats about the assumption that actions within markets are undertaken with an economizing logic are particularly salient for framing the study.

The first caveat is that this assumption is also “a heuristic principle,” which obliges the researcher to detail across relevant markets, “the specific interests at stake in the practices and conflicts which take place in particular [markets]” (Thompson, 1991, p. 16). Not only does this mean elucidating the practices and conflicts in markets significant to individual focal students’ trajectories of socialization during their school year at Quondam High School (QHS), it means attending to how these trajectories themselves are situated within and indeed triangulated by larger socializing processes and markets made relevant by the fact that it is possible, desirable, and increasingly necessary for FIS to study in the BC school system. For instance, the widespread internationalization of public school education in countries like Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States capitalizes on the closely related (though not often discussed) relationship between the commodification of language (i.e., English) and the commodification of education (i.e., credentials).

Where language is concerned, J. S.-Y. Park and Wee (2012) use the term “markets of English” to describe such treatment of language as a discrete, commodifiable resource (see also, 13 The notion that an economizing logic governs the actions of individuals in markets also applies to this study. That is, the inquiry itself, in its focus, design, and reporting, respond to (and arguably create) niches within variously constituted academic ‘research markets’. Elsewhere, I have demonstrated how even student participants oriented to the study, and their participation in it, as markets in which different forms of capital could be strategically pursued and mobilized for their benefit (Deschambault, 2013b).
e.g., Duff, 2015; Heller, 2003; J.S.-Y. Park & Lo, 2012). Given the “growing recognition that English is a key to the global economy”, and for many, English “is considered critical for continued progress upstream in the education system or access to better-paying jobs” (J. S.-Y. Park & Wee, 2012, p. 10), the market metaphor is a well-suited lens through which to conceptualize the commodification of English language at local, national, and international levels.

Where education is concerned, similar market metaphors have long been used to describe how increasingly “anorexic funding policies” (Kenway et al., 1994, p. 318) from state-level educational authorities resulted in the international marketization and commodification of (public) educational spaces, products, and services as necessary and legitimate sources of revenue (Kenway et al., 1994; see also Ball, 1993; Bartlett et al., 2002; Kenway, Bullen, & Rob, 2003; Kenway & Epstein, 1996; Kuehn, 2002).

The second caveat about the assumption that actions within markets are undertaken with an economizing logic relates to the impact of superdiversity on common presuppositions about how things are evaluated in markets. Bourdieu’s (1984, 1986, 1991) notion posited that actors within markets share common presuppositions “about the game they are playing, and [about] the value of what is at stake in the struggles they are waging” (Thompson, 1991, p. 16). However, recent work drawing on the conceptual notion of markets has argued that, in times of globalization and increasing transnational movement, a more sophisticated understanding of how value-attribution works, what is at stake for actors, and how each of these is implicated in a particular market is necessary (e.g., Blommaert, 2007, 2010; Blommaert & Rampton, 2011; J. S.-Y. Park & Lo, 2012; J. S.-Y. Park & Wee, 2012). With diversified, often contingent, and potentially conflicting understandings of what is at stake and how value-attribution works, how actors constitute and are constituted in the multiple markets in which they are embedded becomes a complex empirical concern.
**Polycentricity.** For the participants in this study, the multiple discursive and material configurations of markets rely on reference and orientation to multiple centering forces – something Blommaert has referred to as “polycentricity” (Blommaert, 2007, 2010). Whether these centering forces are singular people, groups or collectives, or less-tangible entities or principles (Blommaert, 2007, 2010), proximal or distal to the educational institutions or interactions in and for which they become relevant, these contribute to an understanding and articulation of “communicative markets that vary in their reach, value and (partial) relations of sub- and super-ordination” (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011, p. 14).

**Timescales.** The metaphor of multiple markets of varying size and influence, perceptible across a continuum from macro-institutions to microinteractions, offers the conceptual backdrop in relation to which the phenomenon of FIS socialization is examined. But in order to suitably investigate this phenomenon, it is necessary to theorize how resources at different levels of social organization (i.e., in policy documents; in the high school; in the experiences of focal students) work to construct the category of FIS, and in turn, to represent the phenomenon of FIS socialization as the product of assemblages of interconnected resources and processes which implicate this category in their co-occurrence across various spatial and temporal scales (Wortham, 2012; see also, e.g., Harklau, 2008; Wortham & Rhodes, 2012, 2013). Describing a timescale as “the characteristic spatiotemporal envelope within which a process happens”, Wortham has argued convincingly that complex human phenomena cannot be understood as a process happening at a single timescale—whether that is recurrent events characteristic of a culture at the social-historical timescale, or psychological properties of an individual emerging at an ontogenetic timescale (Wortham 2006). […] We must understand events, trajectories, social-historical and local categories, and their interrelations. The processes and phenomena studied by anthropologists of
education thus emerge from interconnections among heterogeneous resources drawn
from disparate scales (Latour 2005; Scollon and Scollon 2004). (Wortham, 2012, p. 133)
Thus, as I demonstrate in the analytic chapters that follow, issues of temporality factor explicitly
into processes FIS related policy and practice, and in turn, in the more micro-level processes
relating to focal FIS students’ experiences at school, in classes, and with respect to their living
arrangements and pastoral care. In and through their uses of language, focal students and other
participant actors often simultaneously orient to processes occurring at multiple timescales as
explanatory, descriptive, and/or economizing resources.

**Indexicality.** It is through the lens of these intersecting and polycentric markets that I
present an account of FIS socialization as a multiscalar and multidirectional phenomenon.
Mediated as they are by language in myriad ways, the participant accounts on which my account
is based are reliant on the concept of indexicality (e.g., Bucholtz & Hall, 2010; Duff, 2012; Ochs
as a conceptual and analytic apparatus, indexicality is an important means for understanding how
language or linguistic forms are linked to contexts of use, and thus, how beliefs and values (i.e.,
ideological structures) are relevant to FIS socialization. The linkages between language and
contexts of use, or the beliefs and values that are keyed through these links, are indexed by such
phenomenon as explicit mention, implicatures and presuppositions, evaluative and epistemic
orientations, or linguistic structures or forms that are ideologically associated with specific types
of people or groups (Bucholtz & Hall, 2010, p. 21).

Relatedly, the notion of interdiscursivity is an additional resource both for
conceptualization and analysis of the socialization trajectories of individual FIS students and FIS
socialization more generally. By interdiscursivity, I mean tracing how indexical links work to
“establish forms of connectivity across events of using discourse” (Agha, 2005, p. 1; see also J.
2.3.3 Summary

The account of FIS socialization offered in the following chapters relies on simultaneous attention to processes and practices on multiple levels. These levels include the internationalization of public school education to the quotidian mediators of students’ movement across borders (i.e., ranging, for example, from ‘nation’ to ‘category of student’ [ELL/non-ELL]). They include “discursive work, including patterns of interaction across different social contexts and policy discourse” (J. S.-Y. Park & Wee, 2012, p. 40) that frame and inflect the meaning of FIS in relevant ways. And they also include the ways in which participants appropriate, negotiate, contest, or reify indexical meanings across multiscalar, polycentric markets which constitute the educational context in which the study was conducted.

2.4 Conclusion

In this chapter I presented a selective review of literature, locating the study of FIS socialization at the intersection of work spanning the fields of applied linguistics, education, and (human, social, cultural, and economic) geography. I then articulated the key theoretical framework for the study, (second) language socialization, and introduced the concepts of markets, polycentricity, timescales, and indexicality as useful implements for describing socialization processes in superdiverse environments. In Chapter 3, I outline the general methodological approach for the study, and discuss data generation methods, the context for the study, and the research site and participants.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

3.1 Introduction

Building on the review of literature and theoretical frameworks outlined in Chapter 2, in this chapter I provide details about the study’s methodology and methods. I begin the chapter with a description of the research traditions at the core of the study, and discuss the way these have been operationalized for its specific purposes (subsection 3.1.1). This is followed by an explanation of the general theory of methodology that informs the study (subsection 3.1.2). In the second section of the chapter, I provide specific details about the research context and methods used. These include accounts of the general education context (subsections 3.2.2-3.2.3), participants (3.2.4), and procedures relating to data generation (3.2.5), management (3.2.6), analysis (3.2.6), and quality (3.2.8). The chapter then concludes (section 3.3) with a brief summary and preface to the analytic chapters that follow.

3.1.1 Research Traditions

This study is conceived as a linguistic ethnographic (Creese, 2008; Rampton et al., 2004), multiple-case study (e.g., Bartlett & Vavrus, 2014b, p. 139; Duff, 2008a, p. 34; Merriam, 1998, p. 40; Stake, 1998, p. 89). Duff (2008a) has suggested that although both established research traditions implied in this conception (case study, ethnography) often differ in scope and focus (i.e., on “individuals/entities” versus “collectivities”), that the articulation of “a defined cultural group” in ethnographies often “include[s] focal participants who are members of a culture to illustrate features of the whole” (p. 34; see also Richards, 2011, p. 207; van Lier, 2005, p. 206).

As a means for balancing these similarities and differences, I follow Duff’s (2014) suggestion that “case study is more than just the description of a person or linguistic site” and that ‘the case’ is an exemplar of the phenomenon being studied (p. 5). However, rather than drawing strict boundaries around ‘the case’ as an exemplar, I treat the notion of ‘multiple’ (i.e., in multiple-case study) as having representational implications. In so doing, I align with Bartlett
and Vavrus (2014b), who have argued for an approach that “interrupts such strict boundaries by examining [cases as] assemblages across time and space” (p. 139). Such an approach, they continue, “incorporates an explicitly comparative perspective, urging attention across locations (the horizontal axis) and micro-, meso-, and macro-levels (the vertical axis) in ways that move beyond the traditional multiple case study” (Bartlett & Vavrus, 2014b, p. 139). Specifically for this multiple-case study, then, ‘the case’ is the category of FIS; the notion of multiple refers to the ways that this category, and the socialization processes implicated in, made relevant by, or instantiated through its articulation, coalesces in discursive and material formations across time and in different sites, processes, and experiences of multiple informants. Finally, and in keeping with my research questions (Chapter 1, section 1.2.1) and the methodological orientation for the study (see next section [3.1.2]), understanding multiple-case study in this way has two further benefits: the first is that it recognizes the research narrative I have created as one more site where the category of FIS has been constructed (see, e.g., Dyson & Genishi, 2005, p. 2); the second is that it treats as a resource the understanding that data from multiple participants, sites, and other texts “cannot be merged into a single, ‘true’ and ‘certain’ representation” of the phenomenon being studied (Silverman, 2006, p. 291).

My use of ‘linguistic ethnographic’ is used to highlight particular methodological orientations to ethnography and language that are central to the study (Creese, 2008; Rampton et al., 2004; see also Blommaert, 2007; Duff & Talmy, 2011; Wortham, 2008). The first of these orientations, characteristic of much L2 socialization research, is a commitment to an ethnographic perspective and, where possible, prolonged engagement, thorough observation of the context(s) in which language is being learned and used, and comprehensive description and analysis of these contexts (e.g., Bronson & Watson-Gegeo, 2008; Duff & Talmy, 2011; Talmy, 2012; Watson-Gegeo, 1988). The second orientation, also common to much L2 socialization research, is a discourse analytic perspective which recognizes how “language and the social
world are mutually shaping, and that close analysis of situated language use can provide both fundamental and distinctive insights into the mechanisms and dynamics of social and cultural production in everyday activity” (Rampton et al., 2004, p. 2; see also Duff & Talmy, 2011; Talmy, 2012; Wortham, 2008).

Cumulatively, then, the conjoining of these linguistic and ethnographic sensibilities is mutually reinforcing. That is: discourse analytic approaches can work to strengthen ethnographic claims about and descriptions of processes, practices, and actors; and at the same time, to insist that “the situated and dialogical character of ethnographic knowledge itself – reflexivity” (Blommaert, 2007, p. 682) be available to and relevant for discourse analytic claims (also see, e.g., Atkinson, Okada, & Talmy, 2011).

3.1.2 Social Constructionist Approaches to Methodology and Researcher Reflexivity

L2 socialization researchers’ acknowledge that the “communicative competence(s) and knowledge(s) of the values, practices, identities, ideologies and stances” associated with the sociocultural worlds they investigate are both co-constructed by social agents participating in those worlds. They also recognize that “myriad complexities concerning relations of power, access, identity, and sociopolitical and sociohistorical constraints” (Duff & Talmy, 2011, p. 98), which mediate those worlds and the construction of them, have important implications for data generation and analysis in a linguistic ethnographic multiple-case study.

Acknowledging the co-constructed, contingent, and mediated nature of knowledge, the social world, and the meanings these obtain for individuals is in keeping with a social constructionist epistemology (Crotty, 1998; Gergen, 1994; Schwandt, 1998). It is this position that informs the research traditions as they have been articulated for the purpose of this study, a position that has been characterized by Schwandt (1998) as follows:

the world of lived reality and situation-specific meanings that constitute the general
object of investigation is thought to be constructed by social actors… [who] fashion meaning out of events and phenomena through prolonged, complex processes of social interaction involving history, language, and action. (p. 221)

Fundamental to this perspective is the understanding that the researcher is also a ‘social actor’ who is implicated in the collaborative construction of ‘the general object of investigation’ vis-à-vis generation and interpretation of that data, and further, through the eventual account(s) produced about that object. This stance does not necessitate, however, that these data, interpretations, or accounts are unable to represent social phenomena. Rather, as Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) have argued, such a perspective indexes a rejection of the idea that social research is, or can be, carried out in some autonomous realm that is insulated from the wider society and from the biography of the researcher, in such a way that its findings can be unaffected by social processes and personal characteristics. (p. 15)

Reflexive recognition of how my own situated positionality (e.g., as an additional language learner, teacher, graduate student, parent, etc.) shaped fieldwork, data analysis, and research writing is thus also necessary. Simply put, and to the extent that one can, ethically, and practically given space constraints and the goal of producing a readable text, I subscribe to the view that the researcher’s responsibility to participants and readers is to make plain “the complex relationships between the various explicit and implicit messages that go into the [production of the] whole ethnographic text” (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007, p. 206; also, e.g., Edge & Richards, 1998).

In this section, I have located the study in relation to research traditions, paradigms, as well as ontological and epistemological perspectives. In the next section, I describe the research context, participants, methods and approaches that are foundational to this narrative.
3.2 Research Context, Participants, and Methods

*I need to begin by insisting that I cannot write a chapter about methods as though methods were technical skills. I see them as practices of enquiry, shaped by the questions we ask, and by what we experience.* (Heller, 2012, p. 24).

3.2.1 Introduction

The analyses and findings in this study are drawn primarily from data generated over the course of ten months (September 2011–June 2012) of fieldwork at Quondam High School (QHS), a public secondary school in a large city in western Canada. After receiving permission from the University of British Columbia’s (UBC) Behavioural Research Ethics Board and the Research Committee of Pateo School District, I received permission from the QHS principal to conduct the study. For a period of six months during the 2010-2011 school year, I served as an occasional volunteer in a for-credit (i.e., mainstream, ‘regular’) English class at the school. As a volunteer, I had the opportunity to become acquainted with members of the administration, teaching and support staff, some of whom became important contacts, facilitators, and informants during my fieldwork. Beyond QHS, additional data were generated with representatives from the larger school district, the BCMoE, and the Canadian Association of Public Schools International (CAPS-I) in research interviews, via email correspondence, and at a BC Ministry of Education K-12 International Education stakeholders meeting (see, e.g., BCMoE, 2013a).

3.2.2 Educational Context in B.C, 2011-2012

The context of labor relations for K-12 public education in British Columbia during fieldwork is important to note. In June of 2011, the labor contract for teachers and other members of the BC Teacher’s Federation ([BCTF], the union for BC’s certified K-12 teachers) expired, which precipitated a lengthy and highly politicized contract renegotiation process between the provincial government and the BCTF. In short, the BCTF argued in favour of salary increases for teachers, as well as a greater amount of contract language which granted them more
‘say’ in the determination of size and composition of their classes (for further details, see, e.g., Canadian Press, 2011; CBC News, 2011). The province, via the BC Ministry of Education, argued that BCTF demands were financially unreasonable, particularly in view of contracts negotiated with other public service unions.

As a response, BCTF staged job-action throughout the 2011-2012 school year as contract negotiations continued. ‘Job action’ meant that, by law, teachers were permitted to cease all non-teaching related duties, which included supervision of extracurricular activities, meeting with administrators, communicating with parents, and even filling out or completing report cards. In March of 2012, job-action escalated to a full three-day teachers’ strike (e.g., Drews, 2012), though the general ‘job-action atmosphere’ had material impacts on school processes until a temporary agreement between the BCTF and the government was reached (e.g., Keller, 2012). Though there is much more to the politics, rhetoric, general relations, and contract negotiations between the BCTF and BC’s Ministry of Education in recent decades (see e.g., Fleming, 2011), these are beyond the scope of the dissertation. I mention them here since they are the conditions under which I negotiated access to participants and classrooms, and carried out all aspects of fieldwork. These conditions were most relevant to the study in the sense that at times during the different phases of job action and different times during the school year, they resulted in what I would characterize as high levels of stress and a diminished sense of morale – for students, teachers, and administrators.

3.2.3 Quondam High School

My first trip to QHS occurred in early 2011, midway through the 2010-2011 school year. I was to meet Mrs. Bee, a teacher to whom I had been introduced by a mutual colleague, and who was open to the idea of having me as a volunteer in her classroom. Beyond the fact that I had never met Mrs. Bee, I had not been in a high school since 2006; these two things were all the reason I needed to be terrified the moment I opened the door to the building: students crowded
the hallways as they moved between classes, in an animated combination of language(s), energy, but unlike me, with a clear sense of where they were going. The few looks I received from students – looks which I interpreted to be either overt indications that I was out of place, or conversely, which expressed curiosity about who I was or which teacher I would be ‘subbing for’ that day – only made me more nervous. Thankfully Mrs. Bee’s classroom was in the same hallway, and my terror was interrupted by her smiling voice calling my name: “Ryan! Over here. Come on in – you look lost.” It was during that first trip that Mrs. Bee introduced me to the principal, the vice principal, and other members of the school staff. Beginning that day, and continuing throughout my volunteer activities of the 2010-2011 year, Mrs. Bee and I chatted more and more comfortably as friendly colleagues. I also became friendly with other members of the teaching and administrative staff. These relationships would become paramount in the final selection of QHS as a research site, as well as in the successful recruitment of participants for the study, especially in the context of job action described above.

**QHS in the larger school district.** At the time the study was conducted, QHS was an average-sized high school (grades 8-12) when compared with other secondary schools in the district. In the 2011-2012 school year, the number of students attending QHS who reported using English at home was lower than the 49.3% district average (BCMoE, 2014a, p. 7; Pateo School District [PSD], 2012b, p. 3), and had been slowly decreasing since 2008 (BCMoE, 2011b, p. 7). Similarly, a growing number of students attending QHS had reportedly been born outside Canada (PSD, 2012b, p. 3). However, English still ranked quite high among the top ten reported home languages among students at QHS, alongside named languages such as Arabic, Cantonese, Chinese, Korean, Mandarin, Persian, Russian, and Spanish (BCMoE, 2011b, p. 7).

**English language learners at QHS.** QHS, like many other schools in the Pateo School District, has an increasing population of English language learners (ELLs). A BC Ministry of Education designated category, ELLs are immigrant or Canadian-born students “whose primary
language, or languages, of the home are other than English”; as a result, they “require additional services in order to develop their individual potential within British Columbia’s school system” (BCMoE, 2009/2013, p. 4). According to the Ministry, these ‘additional services’ help students to “become proficient in English, to develop both intellectually and as citizens, and to achieve the expected learning outcomes of the provincial curriculum” (BCMoE, n.d.-d, para. 3). Students are identified as ELLs (by a school’s ESL Department) on what is known to insiders as a 1701 form, and identification allows “a Board of Education to qualify for Supplemental Funding for English Language Learning” (BCMoE, n.d.-d, pp. 8-9; also, e.g., MsJ:315-331; MrsB1:188-207). This supplemental funding, according to Wild, Helmer, Tanaka, and Dean (2006), is approximately “$1100.00 per Ministry designated ESL student on top of the base amount per student” (p. 3). But they continue:

funding for ESL services is not targeted; this means that school districts are not required to show how ESL funds are spent. The allocation of funds is dependent upon the knowledge base and attitudes of senior administrators and principals toward ESL learning and programs. Funds can be easily redirected to other programs with the rationale that ultimately they will benefit ESL students. (p. 3)

The designation of students as eligible for ELL supplemental funding via the 1701 form is also the means by which the BC Ministry of Education calculates the number of ELL students in British Columbia. In other words, and of particular consequence to this study, if students are not designated ELLs for supplemental funding purposes, they are not officially counted as ELL learners in BC Ministry of Education statistics.

In the 2011-2012 school year, the ELL population at QHS had increased from the year previous, a trend that was not consistent across other secondary schools in the Pateo School District. This meant that a significant number of the school’s students were designated ELLs, that is, eligible for additional ELL services and supplemental state-funding available for students
with this designation (BCMoE, 2011b, p. 2). This increase was manifest most obviously in
classes offered to students in grade ten, where the increase in ELL-funded learners from the
previous year was more than 12 percent (BCMoE, 2011b, p. 12). Due to a QHS report which
identified “a new trend of lower level [ELL] students entering [QHS] at later grade levels (10, 11,
12)” (PSD, 2011, p. 2; also MsJ:227-243), one of QHS’s stated goals for the 2011-2012 school
year was to carry out a full review of its ELL program as a means to appraise the services
offered specifically to these late-arrivers, the explicit mandate being that “more emphasis and
time needs to be devoted to our late arriving [ELL] students” (p. 7). Given that all but one of the
focal participants in the study began their school years at the grade ten level enrolled in
dedicated ELL courses, the ELL numbers at QHS provide a salient contextual nuance to an
account of focal students’ experiences over the year.

Fee-paying international students at QHS. Although mentioned earlier, it bears
repeating that fee-paying international students (FIS) are students who pay roughly $13,000/year
in tuition fees to be able to attend BC’s public schools. During the 2011-2012 school year, over
five percent of students attending QHS were FIS (BCMoE, 2011b, p. 12). Though FIS met the
criteria used in the BC Ministry of Education’s definition of ELL (i.e., FIS were students “whose
primary language, or languages, of the home are other than English” and who “require additional
services in order to develop their individual potential within British Columbia’s school system”
[BCMoE, 2009/2013, p. 4]), their statuses as neither immigrants nor Canadian citizens meant
that they could not be officially designated as ELLs on the 1701 form.

And yet, despite the fact that a large majority of the FIS attending QHS were receiving
ELL services, QHS officials did not keep an official list of the number of FIS who were placed
in ELL-specific courses. Based on my own reading of QHS-generated ELL testing and FIS lists
obtained from the school, I estimated that between 60-70% of all FIS attending QHS were receiving ELL services during 2011-2012 (e.g., Cfn03N11:50-51; Gfn23O11:42-43).14

Keeping in mind QHS’s plan to review its ELL programs based on the growing number of ELLs entering at higher grades (PSD, 2011), it is also worth noting two related FIS-specific trends during 2011-2012: (1) 83% of all the FIS attending QHS were in grades 10, 11, or 12; and (2) that FIS in grade 10 constituted almost half of the total FIS population (BCMoE, 2011b, p. 11).

**ELL classes at QHS.** Much the same as in other secondary schools in the district, ELL services at QHS were delivered through sheltered content ELL classes offered for the following core subjects: Social studies (‘Socials’), Science, and English Language Arts (‘English’). A brief summary of the content and rationale for each of these courses is presented below (paraphrased from the QHS website):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELL Socials – (sheltered content social studies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content:</strong> Canadian history, geography, and cultural makeup of Canadian society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale:</strong> for students to learn content concomitant with grade 8/9 social studies curriculum, and to develop the vocabulary and skills required to enter grade-appropriate Social Studies courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELL Science – (sheltered content science)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content:</strong> earth science, biology, chemistry, and physics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

14 Based on what I had learned at QHS about the proportion of FIS who were receiving ELL services (i.e., that it was quite high), in late 2012 I contacted the Pateo School District office to inquire as to whether there was any way to calculate the proportion of FIS were also receiving ELL services at the district level. A field services representative responded to my email as follows, noting that the unit had “a new program code ELL International to track the number of international students who also receive ELL support services” (personal communication, October 2, 2012). Upon learning further from Pateo District representatives that these data were not publicly available, and that “The ministry [i.e., BCMoE] does not track the number of students with the ELL International program code” (personal communication, March 12, 2014), I requested access to the data from the school district. I discuss these data in greater detail in Chapter 5.
- **Rationale**: to focus on skills necessary for participation in ‘labs’ (class time during which laboratory experiments are conducted), and to develop English language skills required for grade-appropriate Science courses

- **ELL English** – (sheltered content English language arts)
  - **Content**: English literature; focus on reading comprehension and vocabulary development
  - **Rationale**: to increase overall English proficiency levels and cultivate an appreciation of English literature

QHS also had two additional dedicated ELL classes focusing specifically on English language learning. These were:

- **ELL Writing**
  - **Content**: how to express ideas in English, English grammar, paragraph and essay structure
  - **Rationale**: to help students develop their written English

- **English Language Center (‘ELC’)**
  - **Content**: emphasis on spoken English skills (e.g., phonetics, public speaking, debates, interviews, plays, oral reports)

Consistent with research findings in BC and elsewhere, my experiences during fieldwork suggested that there was a general derogation and stigmatization of all ELL courses and arguably, of those teaching and learning in them at QHS (see, e.g., Breshears, 2004; Eamor, 2006; Gunderson, 2007b, 2008; Naylor, 1994; McKay & Wong, 1996; Talmy, 2005, 2008, 2009).

For example, all ELL classes (i.e., sheltered content and dedicated ELL) at QHS were composed of students whose English abilities spanned a vast range of proficiencies as measured by locally-preferred standardized tests (see next subsection for a description of these tests) and
locally-derived assessments of students’ listening, speaking, reading, and writing proficiency.\textsuperscript{15} In addition to the range of proficiency levels, students in QHS’s dedicated ELL courses ranged across grade levels as well, from grade eight to grade 12 (see, e.g., Tables 3.1 and 3.2). The composition of these classes proffered them a less-than-admirable status among both students (e.g., EllenI3:1173-1186; JR:104-126) and teachers (e.g., MrsB1:152-178; MrW:881-898), who reported this range of levels to be a major source of grief for both learning and teaching.

Other potential factors contributing to the less-than-admirable status of ELL classes at QHS (see, e.g., Chapters 7-9) – though also relevant to and reinforced at the district and provincial levels – was the lack of accountability for the content or quality of these courses. Though locally at QHS these classes were listed on students’ timetables as ELL Social Studies, ELL Writing, ELL Science, ELL English, or ELC, in official BC Ministry of Education records the title used to represent \textit{all} ELL classes was simply “LD Locally Developed 10E”, and showed no indication of grade levels, subject, or content area (BCMoE, 2011a, pp. 3, 5-6). In contrast, non-ELL, ‘regular’ classes were referred to in the same BC Ministry of Education records as “Social Studies 9”, “Foundations of Math and Pre-Calculus 10”, or “English 11” (BCMoE, 2011a, pp. 3, 5-6). In addition, and of great relevance to this study, was the fact that because all ELL courses were defined as “ELL services” rather than ‘curriculum’ per se, high school ELLs did not receive course credits (i.e., towards their graduation) for the work they did in these courses. Not only did this render any grades they received in ELL classes essentially meaningless (Wild \textit{et al.}, 2006, p. 2), it positioned non-credit ELL classes as inferior to credit-bearing ‘regular’ classes.

In short, the lack of official (i.e., provincially recognized) grades and ELL course names, concomitant with wide ranges in grade-, age-, and English proficiency levels in these classes all

\textsuperscript{15} The locally derived standards used to assess students’ speaking, reading, and writing were based on the BC Ministry of Education’s standards for secondary aged learners (BCMoE, 2001a, pp. 45-67).
contributed to a wide-ranging denigration of these courses and towards those teaching and learning in them.

**ESL Department at QHS.** QHS’s ELL department was the unit within the school charged with the responsibility for assessing non-English L1 using students’ linguistic proficiency at intake, managing their designation as ELLs (i.e., working with *1701 forms*), placement in and promotion out of the ELL program at QHS (though see next sub-section), and ongoing assessment of their progress during the year in liaison with teachers from other content areas. The ELL department’s schedule for assessment of non-English L1 using students’ proficiency throughout the year was as follows:

- mid-September (*Comprehensive English Language Test* [*CELT*] – Structure subtest) (Canadian Test Centre, n.d.; also see, e.g., Purpura, 2004, pp. 194-202)
- late November (*Woodcock Reading Mastery Test* [Woodcock]) (Woodcock, 2011)
- late April (*CELT* – Structure and Vocabulary subtests) (Canadian Test Centre, n.d.)

Typically, students’ scores on these tests would determine their designation as ELL or not, the number of non-credit ELL courses in which they were placed (to a maximum of 50% of their course load [QHSPr2:456-462]), and less overtly, which for-credit ‘regular’ courses they would be counseled to enroll in.

Though focal FIS understandings of the role played by these tests in securing their promotion out of non-credit ELL courses and into ‘regular’ classes were by no means uniform, the tests themselves were central to FIS participation in both sheltered ELL content and dedicated ELL classes and thus important mediators of their socialization trajectories as they worked to ‘get out of ESL’ (see, e.g., Chapters 7-9).

**ESL Department vs. English Department.** Members of QHS’s English Department claimed that the ELL Department’s testing regime was antiquated and untrustworthy, and
resultantly, that many students who were being absolved of their ELL designation (i.e., promoted out of QHS’s ELL program) based on the results of that testing regime were unprepared for the demands of ‘regular’ (English) classes. Despite the fact that a drop in grades, “particularly in English”, is quite common when secondary level students are promoted out of ELL programs (Gunderson, 2007b, p. 177), during the 2011-2012 school year the English Department argued for, and was successful in implementing, their own ELL exit test. Only students who had successfully passed the ELL Department’s testing regime were eligible to write the English Department’s new test. The English Department’s test (Appendix A) was implemented twice during the 2011-2012 school year:

- in ‘pilot’ form in early January 2012 (after the ELL Department’s November test), and
- in late-May 2012 (following the ESL Department’s April test)

The combined testing regime delivered by both departments through the year is represented in Figure 3.1. A crucial contextual detail about the addition of the English Department’s new layer of testing is that a large majority of ELL students, both non-FIS and FIS, were unaware that they would be asked to write these new tests, let alone given guidance on how to prepare for them (e.g., Wandal2:473-581).

In both November and late-May, many students who were in dedicated ELL courses – and despite having successfully passed the ESL Department’s tests – were unable to meet the reading and writing demands of the English Department’s test. This caused some students to take action by approaching the QHS principal to discuss the outcome of the test (e.g., Zard [Cfn31Ma12:16]), and, in some cases, for teachers to take action on students’ behalves. I present a fuller account of the latter type of action taken for one focal FIS (WoW) in Chapter 9.16

---

16 Indeed, after ongoing disagreements between the English Department and members of the ESL Department about which students, and based on what criteria, should be promoted out of the ELL program, an administrative decision
3.2.4 Participants

**Key gatekeeper participants at QHS.** I was given the opportunity to observe three different dedicated ELL classes at QHS on a regular basis throughout the year. How these classes were chosen relied initially on the good will of Mrs. Bee, with whom I had developed a good rapport while working as a volunteer during the previous year. Indeed, Mrs. Bee served as a point of connection and entrée, a key ‘gatekeeper’ (Erickson, 1986; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Hatch, 2002; Richards, 2003) to QHS as a research site. Not only did she play a vital role in helping me first to establish access to the school (by vouching for me with the principal), she also put me in touch with teachers who ultimately allowed me to observe their classes (Mr. Whee and Ms. Jay). Given the ongoing job-action in which BC teachers were involved, and the concomitant reduction in their ‘extra’-services (and general morale), I was grateful that the research had even made it to this point. Fortunately for me, Mrs. Bee would also become a research participant and key informant during my fieldwork.

---

was made for the following school year: to dissolve the ESL Department and transfer to specific subject area departments the responsibility for promoting ELL students to ‘regular’ courses (e.g., MrsB2:608-624; MsJ:1486-1533; MrW:647-704; QHSPr2:435-490).
Having received the email addresses of two prospective non-focal teacher participants in early September 2011 from Mrs. Bee, after a series of emails I was able to meet both Mr. Whee and Ms. Jay mid-month. I prepared a summary of what I had hoped to accomplish, the types of questions I was interested in, and the types of students I had hoped to recruit as participants. During those meetings both agreed to have me in their classrooms, and in this way became gatekeepers to the next level of access: potential student participants. Although I had initially hoped to be able to observe focal FIS students in ‘regular’ (i.e., for credit, non-ELL) courses and dedicated ELL courses, the classes Mr. Whee and Ms. Jay would allow me to observe were a dedicated ELL course (ELL Writing) and a sheltered content ELL course (ELL Socials). This meant that the potential range of FIS who would receive letters of introduction about the study would be limited, and concomitantly, that my options for observing them would be confined to ELL courses only. When formal classroom observations began, Ms. Jay’s ELL Socials class ended up having three focal participants (Bessie, Bone, WoW), and Mr. Whee’s ELL writing course had five (Bessie, Bone, Wanda, WoW, Zeejay).

I was also subsequently invited to be a monthly ‘visitor’ in the English Language Center (ELC), a dedicated ELL class taught by Mrs. Bee that was described by one focal FIS as “like higher than ESL and […] a little bit lower than regular class” (DaneL2:403). The stipulation about ‘visiting’ was that I could do so to shadow one of the focal participants that had been recruited (Dane), but that I should neither take any notes during the class nor request to audiorecord. Dane was the only focal FIS not required to enroll in ELL courses when he entered QHS, meaning he was one of the few FIS at the school who were had 100% course load of regular (i.e., non-ELL, for-credit) courses. As it worked out, however, Dane reported that he had no choice but to enroll in English Language Center (ELC), a dedicated ELL class for which he received no credits or grades on his transcript, because the only two other courses possible to take at that time were French or “skills” (i.e., woodworking; DaneL2:398-455).
A further unanticipated twist in teacher recruitment occurred shortly before the winter/new year break. In early-January 2012, Ms. Jay informed me that a pre-service teacher named Mr. Nobli would be taking over her class for 16 weeks from February to mid-May, and that I should contact him about the prospect of continuing my observations while he was teaching. An identical situation occurred with Mrs. Bee’s ELC class, to which a pre-service teacher named Ms. Edm had been assigned for 16 weeks. Fortunately, both Mr. Nobli and Ms. Edm were willing to have me continue my observation and ‘visitation’ in these classes.

The unpredictable nature and contexts of negotiating entry to the research site, and to being granted differential access to potential participants was, despite the time and efforts I had spent establishing field relations prior to or following the commencement of my formal fieldwork, to a large extent beyond my control. This unpredictability does, however, nicely illustrate the ‘normal’ contingency with which the process of conducting qualitative research in schools is imbued: “Having a solid plan as part of research design is essential, but being prepared to make adjustments as the plan unfolds is also important.” (Hatch, 2002, p. 47). Similarly, this contingency, coupled with my status as an ‘outsider’ to QHS (e.g., Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007), make “opportunistic” and/or “convenience” sampling (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 28) excellent descriptors of the process of participant selection where teachers were concerned.

Though I did try, on three separate occasions during the school year, to recruit other teachers for the purpose of observing focal FIS students in both mainstream and dedicated ELL classes, these efforts were ultimately unsuccessful.

**Non-focal participants at QHS.** Non-focal participants from QHS included students, teachers, and administrators. Since the classrooms to which I had been granted access by Mr. Whee and Ms. Jay involved audio-recordings and a complex process of seeking and securing consent and assent for non-focal students’ participation, I will describe those first; Mrs. Bee’s
class, in which my visits did not include audio recording, will be described last. Table 3.1 presents a summary of which classes, and for how long, I observed or visited.

Table 3.1. Total Classroom and Testing Observation Time by Month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs.B/Ms.Edm</td>
<td>170m</td>
<td>85m</td>
<td>85m</td>
<td>85m</td>
<td>85m</td>
<td>85m</td>
<td>85m</td>
<td></td>
<td>11h20m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.J/Mr. Nobli</td>
<td>170 m</td>
<td>85m</td>
<td>340m</td>
<td>340m</td>
<td>255m</td>
<td>425m</td>
<td>425m</td>
<td>85m</td>
<td>35h25m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Whee</td>
<td>425m</td>
<td>85m</td>
<td>340m</td>
<td>340m</td>
<td>255m</td>
<td>340m</td>
<td>340m</td>
<td>170m</td>
<td>38h15m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Test Day</td>
<td>120m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Test Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12h45m</td>
<td>4h15m</td>
<td>12h45m</td>
<td>12h45m</td>
<td>9h55m</td>
<td>16h10m</td>
<td>16h10m</td>
<td>4h15m</td>
<td>89h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Whee’s class (ELL Writing). Mr. Whee’s ELL Writing class was the largest of the classes I observed, averaging about 30 students throughout the year. Mr. Whee reported having taught in the public high school system for six years in BC (Gfn23O11:6). He had come to QHS in 2010-2011 from a half-time (.5) teaching load at a different public high school where he taught Physical Education, but had switched to QHS because he was able to secure a fuller (i.e., .75) teaching load (MrW:19-30). In 2011-2012 at QHS, he was responsible for teaching a course entitled ELL Writing, and later in the year reported also teaching Skills, Physical Education, and Drama classes (MrW: 864). Prior to his teaching in Canada, Mr. Whee had spent almost four years in Thailand teaching English as a Foreign Language in private language schools. Despite openly discussing that he had received no formal training to work with ELLs specifically, Mr. Whee reported that his experience as an English teacher in Thailand and “being somewhat fluent” in Thai helped him to empathize with his ELL students and “have a general idea” of their experiences as language learners (MrW:55-63). It is important to note that although Mr. Whee’s ELL Writing class had been assigned a classroom, as a less-than-full-time teacher, he was itinerant in the school: he did not have a classroom of his own (Gfn04N11:3, 32).

In fact, the classroom to which Mr. Whee’s ELL Writing had been assigned ‘belonged’ to another, veteran ‘regular’ English teacher who was on leave (Gfn04N11:37-44). Despite being
on paid leave, this teacher was regularly present at the school, and often stayed at their desk while Mr. Whee was teaching (e.g., Gfn04N11; Gfn10N11). Perhaps as a result, the veteran teacher would occasionally participate in ways that Mr. Whee reported to be challenging (e.g., Gfn04N11:37-44; Gfn10N11:33). More broadly, since Mr. Whee did not have his own classroom, he had to store and transport his teaching materials in a green plastic basket which he carried with him as he moved from classroom to classroom. These and other details were shared with me during informal chats I had with Mr. Whee before or after classes, and in other venues in the school, and were written up as part of my fieldnotes. In addition to these informal conversations I conducted one formal, semi-structured research interview with Mr. Whee in late June 2012.17

Five of the participating focal FIS were members of Mr. Whee’s class when the study began (Bessie, Bone, Wanda, WoW, and Zeejay). The process of seeking and obtaining completed (parent/guardian) consent and (student) assent forms from non-focal students in the ELL Writing class was time consuming and took until mid-November to be fully completed, after which point I commenced audiorecording. Prior to that I was able to observe and generate helpful fieldnotes to orient myself to the classroom, teacher(s), and students.

Table 3.2 presents a list of demographic information about the students in Mr. Whee’s ELL Writing class. Students from whom I did not receive parental/guardian consent or students’ assent to participate are listed simply as ‘student’ in the Table. The information presented here was obtained through a combination of a brief, self-report questionnaire distributed to students in the class in March 2012 and ‘informal’ (i.e., Richards, 2003) interviews conducted during fieldwork and observations before, during, or after classes.

---

17 On two occasions, Mr. Whee was absent from his class when I was scheduled to observe and audiorecord. On each of those days I met with and received consent from the substitute teachers to use audiorecorded data from those classes (Gfn24F12; Gfn02Ma12).
Table 3.2. Mr. Whee’s ELL Writing Class: Focal and Non-Focal Student Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Participant Status</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gr</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Citizen or PR?</th>
<th>Lang(s) in add’n to English</th>
<th>Time in Can. School (as of March 2012)</th>
<th>Live w/ Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WoW</td>
<td>Focal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Korean; some German</td>
<td>2yrs</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Focal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>7mo</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bessie</td>
<td>Focal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>2yrs</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeejay</td>
<td>Focal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mandarin; Cantonese</td>
<td>7mo</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanda **</td>
<td>Focal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Cantonese; some Mandarin</td>
<td>7mo</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thin-man</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>6mo</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>7mo</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like2sk8</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>6mo</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJ **</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>1yr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumyar</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandarin; Cantonese</td>
<td>6mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wuhanese</td>
<td>6mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YA</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>2 yrs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nita *</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>1mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eww</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>7mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HaZ</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>7mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JR</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>7mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zard</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Pashto; Urdu</td>
<td>1yr8mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aha</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>2 yrs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VW</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>7mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NaPa</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>1mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lolz</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Korean; Japanese</td>
<td>1yr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myZ</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>2yrs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flower</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>2mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iTelo</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>6mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Farsi</td>
<td>4 mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZB</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>3mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>“years”</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18 Names and information of FIS students is presented in **bold** text; focal FIS students’ names are presented against a shaded background. All focal FIS participant pseudonyms were self-selected; this was also the case for most of the non-focal student participants.

19 Double asterisks next to a student’s name are used to indicate the student left the class at some point during the year. While in Wanda’s case, she left because she was promoted out of ELL courses (and moved to ELC), MJ had left the class because he had returned to Korea in February.

20 A single asterisk is used to indicate that a student entered the class at some point during the year. In this case, Nita entered QHS as a new student in May.
Ms. Jay’s class (ELL Socials). Ms. Jay’s ELL Socials class had an average of about 27 students for most of the year, and was held in the same room where Ms. Jay taught all of her classes. Ms. Jay noted that she had been teaching for 13 years in the public school system in BC, seven of them at QHS (MsJ:03-08).

During her time at QHS, Ms. Jay reported having taught all of the dedicated ELL courses except ELL Science and ELC, but was also responsible for teaching ‘regular’ (i.e., for-credit, non-ELL) content-area ‘Humanities’ courses at all grade levels (MsJ:60-960). She self-identified as a child of second-generation immigrants; despite using primarily English with her parents at home, she reported having learned her parents’ mother tongue from her grandmother until the age of seven, learned it formally during her undergraduate study and on a short study abroad course as well (MsJ:124-160, 823-825). Though she did not receive formal ELL training as part of her teaching degree, she noted that she found her language learning experiences useful not only for forming relationships with ELLs at QHS because of shared sociocultural understandings, but also valuable when communicating with students’ parents (MsJH:161-204). In addition to ethnographic interviews and informal chats before, during, and after classes, and in other venues in the school – which were written up as part of my fieldnotes – I conducted one formal research interview with Ms. Jay in late June 2012.21

From February to mid-May 2012, Mr. Nobli, a pre-service teacher, carried out his ‘long practicum’ assignment (i.e., about 16 weeks) in Ms. Jay’s classes (Cfn:02F12). Mr. Nobli reported that although he had been born in Canada, he had spent the early years of his life overseas. Despite having grown up overseas, he noted that he spoke primarily English, and cited having attended international schools to account for not having learned any additional languages; however, he also stated that his overseas experiences likely helped him to empathize with

---

21 There was only one occasion when Ms. Jay was absent while I was observing and a substitute teacher filled in; this teacher consented to participation in this study (Cfn19J12:9, 42-43).
students in the class (Cfn30Mr12:27-29; MrN:02-21). When Mr. Nobli’s practicum was completed in mid-May, Ms. Jay returned to class for the remainder of the school year (Cfn17Ma12). In addition to informal chats before and after classes – which were written up as part of my fieldnotes – I did one research interview with Mr. Nobli in early May 2012.

Three of the participating focal FIS were members of Ms. Jay’s/Mr. Nobli’s class for the duration of the study (Bessie, Bone, and WoW). The process of seeking and obtaining completed (parent/guardian) consent and (student) assent forms from non-focal students of this class, too, was time consuming and took until late-November to be fully completed, from which point I commenced audiorecording. Prior to that I was able to observe and generate fieldnotes to orient myself to the classroom, teacher(s), and students. Table 3.3 (next page) presents a list of demographic information about the students in the ELL Socials class. Students from whom I did not receive parental/guardian consent or students’ assent to participate are listed simply as ‘student’ in the Table. The information presented here was obtained through a combination of a brief, self-report questionnaire distributed to students in the class in March 2012 and informal interviews (Richards, 2003) conducted during fieldwork and observations before, during, or after classes.

**Mrs. Bee’s class (ELC).** Mrs. Bee’s ELC class had an average of about 27 students during the 2011-2012 school year, and was held in ‘Mrs. Bee’s’ classroom (i.e., like Ms. Jay, she taught all of her courses in that classroom). Mrs. Bee was born and raised in Canada and had taught many years in BC public schools (MrsB2:25-31). She reported that the ELC class was the fourth time she had ever taught ELL (MrsB1:148), and was something she “was not keen about” (MrsB1:653). Though she had not been specially trained as an ELL instructor, Mrs. Bee had completed graduate degrees in English and French. She reported that having learned French to a high level of proficiency was a useful-but-insufficient means for understanding the situations of her students (MrsB1:679-705; MrsB2:80-90). In addition to informal chats with Mrs. Bee
Table 3.3. Ms. Jay’s ELL Socials Class: Focal and Non-focal Student Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Participant Status</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gr</th>
<th>Place of Birth</th>
<th>Citizen or PR?</th>
<th>Lang(s) in add’n to English</th>
<th>Time in Can. School (as of March 2012)</th>
<th>Live w/ Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WoW</td>
<td>Focal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Korean; some German</td>
<td>2yrs</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>Focal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>7mo</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bessie</td>
<td>Focal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>14mo</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thin-man</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>6mo</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>7mo</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like2sk8</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>6mo</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MJ**23</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>1yr</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bsidebk2sk8</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>6mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neon**</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>7mo</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>7mo</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>@front</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandarin; Cantonese</td>
<td>7mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wuhanese</td>
<td>6mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLA</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Study Visa, Portuguese</td>
<td>6mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>13mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nita**24</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>1mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VW</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>7mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaLu</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>6mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZB</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>3 mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rad</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>years</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CK</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>7mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flower</td>
<td>Non-focal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>2 mo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22 Names and information of all FIS students is presented in bold text; focal FIS students’ names are presented against a shaded background.

23 Double asterisks next to a student’s name are used to indicate the student left the class at some point during the year. In this case, MJ left to return to Korea in February to attend high school there; Neon had returned to China in March, after administration had contacted his parents (in China) about his high level of truancy.

24 A single asterisk is used to indicate that a student entered the class at some point during the year. In this case, Nita entered QHS as a new student in May.
throughout the year, I conducted two research interviews with her during the 2011-2012 year.

Similar to the situation in Ms. Jay’s class, from February to mid-May Mrs. Bee had agreed for a pre-service teacher, Ms. Edm, to carry out her 16 week practicum assignment in the ELC class. Ms. Edm had had little previous experience working with ELL students, and was a monolingual English speaker with some proficiency in French (Efn1Mr12:07). I did not conduct a research interview with Ms. Edm.

Only one of the focal FIS was a member of the ELC class (Dane). Though I sat in on eight occasions during the year, I was introduced to the class as a ‘visitor’ rather than as a researcher (e.g., Efn08N11:12; Efn18A12:06).

**QHS principal.** In addition to having been an administrator in different schools in the greater school district for many years, QHS’s principal had also worked for a number of years as a classroom teacher (QHSPr2:19-27). During that time, the principal reported having seen and been affected by a variety of changes to ELL and international student program policy and practice at the district and provincial levels (QHSPr2:40-144). In addition to informal chats throughout the year, and an informal interview recorded during one of these chats, I conducted one research interview with the QHS principal at the end of the school year (late June 2012).

**Non-focal participants not from QHS.** Different non-focal participants from important institutions beyond QHS also consented to participate in research interviews and email exchanges with me at different points during the 2011-2012 school year and in follow up interactions. These representatives were from the International Education Program in the Pateo School District, the BC Ministry of Education, and the Canadian Association for Public Schools-International (CAPS-I).

**Summary of non-focal participant data generation.** Table 3.4 presents a summary of type, source, and amount of data generated with non-focal participants.
Table 3.4. Summary of Type, Source, and Amount of Data Generated with Non-Focal Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Non-Focal Participant</th>
<th>Data Source (mins)</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QHS (Students)</td>
<td>RAD and St.</td>
<td>formal interview (32)</td>
<td>30 April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SLA</td>
<td>formal interview (40)</td>
<td>01 May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JR (with Wanda)</td>
<td>formal interview (33)</td>
<td>01 May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>@front and VW</td>
<td>formal interview (29)</td>
<td>02 May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ZB</td>
<td>formal interview (32)</td>
<td>02 May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YA</td>
<td>formal interview (35)</td>
<td>03 May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HaZ</td>
<td>formal interview (29)</td>
<td>07 May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>formal interview (31)</td>
<td>07 May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thin-Man</td>
<td>formal interview (29)</td>
<td>08 May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zard and iTelo</td>
<td>formal interview (45)</td>
<td>31 May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QHS (non-Ss)</td>
<td>Mrs. Bee</td>
<td>informal talk in/after class and around the school, formal interview (97), formal interview (76)</td>
<td>throughout year, 02 Feb 2012 - 26 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>informal talk in/after class and around the school, formal interview (48)</td>
<td>19 Jan 2012 - 27 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Whee</td>
<td>informal talk in/after class and around the school, formal interview (59)</td>
<td>throughout year, 27 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Jay</td>
<td>informal talk in/after class and around the school, formal interview (59)</td>
<td>throughout year, 26 June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Nobli</td>
<td>informal talk in/after class and around the school, formal interview (54)</td>
<td>Feb-May 2012 - 09 May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Edm</td>
<td>informal talk in/after class and around the school</td>
<td>March-May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pateo School District</td>
<td>Senior Administrator International Education Program</td>
<td>formal interview (98), email exchanges</td>
<td>06 June 2012 - May 2011-June 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field Services Rep (Data dude) International Education Program</td>
<td>telephone conversations, email exchanges</td>
<td>various phone and email conversations from Oct. 2012 – March 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia Ministry of Education</td>
<td>3 Representatives (1 from Governance, Legislation, and Regulation Branch) (2 from K-12 International Education Branch)</td>
<td>formal interview with 2 representatives (49), email exchanges</td>
<td>13 Sept 2012 - Feb 2013-Jan 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Association for Public Schools International (CAPS-I)</td>
<td>1 Representative</td>
<td>formal interview, by telephone (53)</td>
<td>16 May 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Focal FIS students.** Recruitment of focal participants involved both Mr. Whee and Ms. Jay distributing letters introducing the research to the students in their classes, thus providing FIS with the opportunity and means to contact me if interested. Of the 14 or so students who contacted me originally, nine were interested in participating as focal students and were provided with letters of consent to be signed by their parents or guardians. Eight of these students returned consent forms that had been signed by their parent or guardian, after which they each signed an assent form of their own. As a form of remuneration in exchange for their participation in the study, all focal students chose to receive volunteer hours that could be counted toward a service component all students were required to complete as part of the high school credential.

Each of those original FIS students (N=8) remained involved in the study throughout the year, participating to the degree that they were comfortable, though I was able to observe only six of the focal FIS during their classes (Bessie, Bone, Dane, Wanda, WoW, and Zeejay). Below I present a snapshot of each focal FIS using biographical information obtained during my first research interview with each (Table 3.5). Keeping in mind the reduction of complexity that occurs when biographical details obtained in research interviews are represented in tabular format (Deschambault, 2011), I present a more detailed and complex version of four of these focal FIS’ biographies (Chapter 6) and socialization trajectories in relation to ‘getting out of ESL’ in chapters seven through nine (Ellen, Moon, WoW, and Zeejay).

Five of eight focal FIS were born in mainland China (Bessie, Bone, Ellen, Moon, Zeejay), two in Korea (WoW, Dane), and one in Hong Kong (Wanda). All but Dane (who was 13) were 15 years old at the time the study commenced. The length of time students had spent in Canada was by no means uniform, since they had been in the country from two months (Wanda, Bone, Ellen, Moon, Zeejay), to eight or nine months (Bessie, Dane), to 19 months (WoW).
Table 3.5. Focal FIS Age, Birthplace, Length of Residence (LOR), Living Situation, and ELL Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym (M/F)</th>
<th>Age / Birth Country</th>
<th>LOR as of Sept 2011</th>
<th>Living situation</th>
<th>Placed in ELL? (as of Sept 2011)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bessie (F)</td>
<td>15/China</td>
<td>9 months</td>
<td>homestay (aunt and uncle)</td>
<td>Yes (4/8 classes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone (F)</td>
<td>15/China</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>homestay (no prior relationship)</td>
<td>Yes (4/8 classes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moon (F)</td>
<td>15/China</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>1) homestay (July-mid-August) 2) with mother (mid-August -)</td>
<td>Yes (4/8 classes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen* (F)</td>
<td>15/China</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>homestay (family friend)</td>
<td>Yes (3/8 classes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanda* (F)</td>
<td>15/Hong Kong</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>homestay (no prior relationship)</td>
<td>Yes (2/8 classes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WoW (M)</td>
<td>15/Korea</td>
<td>19 months</td>
<td>with guardian (family friend) and his older brother</td>
<td>Yes (4/8 classes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeejay (M)</td>
<td>15/China</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>homestay (aunt and uncle)</td>
<td>Yes (4/8 classes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane* (M)</td>
<td>13/Korea</td>
<td>8 months</td>
<td>with mother and older brother</td>
<td>No (but taking ELC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Except for Dane, Ellen (3 ELL courses), and Wanda (2 ELL courses), the remaining six focal students (Bessie, Bone, Ellen, Moon, WoW, Zeejay) were assigned to the 50% maximum number of ELL courses allowable. Finally, while only two of the focal students lived with one of their actual parents (Moon, Dane), others lived with family members (Bessie, Zeejay), friends of their families (Ellen, WoW), or families they had never met prior to arriving in Canada (Bone, Wanda). I have chosen the data in Table 3.5 for the explicit purpose of constructing the group of participating focal FIS as: (1) a representative sample of the larger population of fee-paying attending QHS, and (2) a representative sample of the larger population of students receiving ELL services at/from QHS.

**Summary of focal participant data sources.** Data generated with each of the focal participants during the 2011-2012 school year spanned classroom observations, students’ wearing of T-microphones during their classes, formal interviews, email reports, and students’
self-selected documents from their classes. Table 3.6 presents a summary of data sources for each focal student.

In the next subsection I describe the procedures used to generate data with both focal- and non-focal participants.

Table 3.6 Summary of Focal Participant Data Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Interviews (total minutes)</th>
<th>Email Reports (total words)</th>
<th># of Documents</th>
<th># of Class Obs. (which class)</th>
<th># Times T-Mic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>4 (228)</td>
<td>5 (1131)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (ELL test)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moon</td>
<td>4 (249)</td>
<td>5 (1218)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2 (ELL tests)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanda</td>
<td>4 (288)</td>
<td>5 (2115)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 (ELL Writing)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane</td>
<td>4 (287)</td>
<td>5 (1057)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8 (ELC)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeejay</td>
<td>4 (248)</td>
<td>7 (2849)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26 (ELL Writing)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bessie</td>
<td>3 (196)</td>
<td>4 (333)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52 (ELL Writing and ELL Socials)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>4 (258)</td>
<td>5 (733)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52 (ELL Writing and ELL Socials)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WoW</td>
<td>4 (241)</td>
<td>5 (791)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52 (ELL Writing and ELL Socials)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.5 Data Generation Procedures

In keeping with the overall social constructionist methodological approach to the study, and the representation of the processes and participants which should inhere in such an approach, each of the data generation procedures described in this section are, in general terms, conceptualized as collaborative achievements by the researcher and participants in specific social circumstances. I describe the procedures I used to conduct the study, in the following order: participant observation, fieldnotes, interviews, email reports, audiorecorded classroom interaction, and different types of documents.

Participant observation. Like interviews, participant observation is considered a common form of data generation in both ethnographic and case study research (e.g., Duff, 2008a; 25 A more detailed representation of focal participation data sources can be found in Appendix B. 26 This tally is representative of whole documents, and not the total number of pages. Some of the documents students submitted were comprised of multiple pages.)
Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Hatch, 2002; Richards, 2003). Although “not [necessarily] always a central feature of case studies” (Duff, 2008a, p. 138), the purpose for relying on this method of data generation in this study was to develop a fuller understanding of the spatial, social, and languacultural (Agar, 1995) contexts in which focal FIS students were participating at QHS, specifically, those that were germane to their classroom experiences. Additionally, information gleaned through early, more “open” (Richards, 2003, p. 144) participant observation was also used to inform ongoing conversations with both focal and non-focal participants, future interviews, and a more ‘motivated’ type of observation (cf. Richards’ discussion of “closed” observation [2003, pp. 144-148]) as I developed a sense of the classroom settings and routine activities in them. Finally, ongoing participant observation played a key role in identifying eventual important analytic foci.

Though literature discussing the role of observation in ethnographic research commonly describes and discusses a researcher’s more- or less-complete status as a ‘participant’ or ‘observer’ as locatable along a kind of continuum (e.g., Adler, & Adler, 1994; Wolcott, 1988; see also, e.g., Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Punch, 2009; Spindler & Spindler, 1992; Spradley, 1980), I prefer to conceptualize all of my observations as participant observations. There are two very simple rationales for this preference: the first, in keeping with the overall constructionist approach to methodology taken up in the study, acknowledges that through any kind of researcher presence (including emblematic indices of presence like an audio-recorder) in the research context, the researcher is always-already potentially, and hence fundamentally, a co-participant in the context and hence in data generation (e.g., Deschambault & W. Kim, 2013; W. Kim & Deschambault, 2014); the second argues for a reflexive shift of focus, so that the term ‘participant’ refers to study-participants-in-context as well as the researcher as a co-participant, thus foregrounding the research related auspices under which they have become co-emplaced in
a particular context and backgrounding the activities in which they may or may not co-participate in while emplaced within that context (see also, e.g., Atkinson, 2015).

With these points in mind, participant observation ranged:

1. from “systematic, focused observation[s] of case participants in their [classroom] contexts” (Duff, 2008a, p. 138) that occurred once a week throughout the school year (i.e., Mr. Whee and Ms. Jay/Mr. Nobli’s class); to

2. less systematic, mostly-unplanned, and opportunistic ‘shadowing’ observations that were largely dependent on teachers’ preference but occurred roughly once monthly during the school year (i.e., Mrs. Bee’s/Ms. Edm’s class); to

3. semi-formal observations during exit tests staged by both the ESL and English Departments; to

4. informal observations at school assemblies, information meetings, and other school functions (e.g., drama night).

**Mr. Whee’s class.** My role in the ELL Writing class shifted throughout the year between more and less involved, with the shifts being determined by Mr. Whee, who often recruited me as an assistant during self-directed student activities (to circulate and answer questions) or to assist him in other ways during the implementation of classroom activities. This was not unexpected, since during our first meetings I had mentioned I would be willing to help out or contribute in any way I could. I took handwritten fieldnotes as often as possible, sometimes using a dedicated notebook and other times using whatever paper I had to hand. Especially on days when Mr. Whee requested my assistance, the look and content of these fieldnotes were thus markedly different from those taken in Ms. Jay/Mr. Nobli’s class. As soon as possible following my observations, I expanded on whatever form of notes I had managed to make in typed form on my computer.
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Ms. Jay/Mr. Nobli’s class. Despite my offer to serve as a classroom assistant, the preference of both Ms. Jay and Mr. Nobli was that I remain peripherally involved in the ELL Socials class. By peripherally I mean, for example: receiving copies of handouts as students did; switching desks as students did before and after tests in the class; and occasionally being recruited to provide technical assistance with the computer or the (new) classroom projector as required. Otherwise, my role was almost exclusively as a weekly visitor to the class, though one with whom both teachers felt comfortable interacting during individual or group work.

Mrs. Bee/Ms. Edm’s class. My role in this class amounted to sitting-in on the class, on a roughly once-a-month basis. Following each class I wrote fieldnotes about what I had observed. The content of my entries focused primarily on Dane’s (a focal FIS) participation or interactions with his teachers.

ESL test days. Late in the school year, I had the opportunity to be a participant observer during the ESL Department (April) and the English Department (May) proficiency tests for ELL students. My role during these tests ranged from observation as teachers distributed test sheets and as students wrote the tests (April), to finding extra desks for a larger number of students than had been anticipated (May). The circumstances and context of these tests will be described in greater detail in chapters seven through nine.

Fieldnotes. Fieldnotes were the by-product of the different forms of participant observation in the field at QHS, and for the purpose of this study were utilized as a means for documenting the “context, actions, and conversations” (Hatch, 2002, p. 77) I felt were relevant to the questions guiding the research as these played out in different venues in the school. Theorized as selective “expression[s] of [my] deepening local knowledge, emerging sensitivities, and evolving substantive concerns” (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 2001, p. 355, as cited in Richards, 2003, p. 136), the length, content, and structure of the handwritten notes I made while at QHS were largely dependent on “the social characteristics” of a particular venue, tasks students or I
had been asked to accomplish in it, and the materials for writing I had to hand (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007, p. 142). For example, fieldnotes from Ms. Jay’s/Mr. Nobli’s class were always written in a notebook, and were almost always longer and more comprehensive than notes taken in Mr. Whee’s class, where notes ranged from lengthy notebook entries to just keywords written on a class handout. Regardless of the quality of these handwritten notes, while typing them up as soon as possible after each observation, the notes became permeated with further detail and contextualization, in addition to my “bracketed” (Hatch, 2002, pp. 86-87) insights, reactions, and further questions (see also, e.g., Richards’ [2003, pp. 137-138] discussion of ‘memos’). In helping to refine both the focus of my observations and my awareness of important issues for participants at QHS, fieldnotes and the ‘bracketed memos’ they helped generate played a central role in the ongoing and recurrent analysis of data during the study.

**Interviews.** Interviews are a common form of data generation in ethnographic and case study research (e.g., Duff, 2008a; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Hatch, 2002; Richards, 2003). However, citing existing work on theoretical discussions of interviews (and interview data) from across a range of other disciplines, Talmy and Richards (2011) have argued that theorization of research interviews has important methodological implications. Indeed, in alignment with the overall constructionist orientation of the study, I adopt what Talmy (2010c) has called an *interviews as social practice* perspective (see also Holstein & Gubrium’s notion of “active interview” [1995, 2003]). When theorized as people’s participation in particular social practices, the research interview is understood as an encounter in which the interlocutors use available linguistic and other semiotic resources to (de-)construct, (dis-)affirm, and (re-)formulate facts and details relevant to the research. In short, as co-participants in this encounter, both interviewers and interviewees are centrally implicated in the production of accounts, which both know will be treated and interpreted as data (e.g., Duff, 2008a; Holstein & Gubrium, 1995, 2003; Richards, 2003, 2009; Talmy, 2010c, 2011; Talmy & Richards, 2011). Although this perspective
does urge researchers to keep a critical eye on how interview accounts are co-constructed, this does not mean that what is reported in interviews are “of value only as displays of perspectives or discourse strategies” (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007, p. 109). For each of the analytic chapters, this is an important theoretical and methodological perspective to bear in mind. This is because the focus of analyses across the chapters highlights and attends, variously and at different points, to the ‘whats’ (i.e., content) or the ‘hows’ (i.e., interactional features) of interview data for different purposes. At all points, and regardless of the focus of the analyses or treatment of data, the overarching status attributed to these data is that they are co-generated by participant and researcher.

I conducted formal (e.g., Richards, 2003) and semi-structured (e.g., Kvale, 1996) interviews with focal- and non-focal participants at different times throughout the duration of my fieldwork. In addition to having been “arranged in advance and all parties understand[ing] what [wa]s taking place” (Richards, 2003, p. 51), I began each of these interviews with a general sequence of pre-developed questions I had planned to ask. Still, in an attempt to be attentive to the contours of the in-situ interactions with each participant, I tried to maintain “an openness to changes of sequence and forms of questions in order to follow up the answers given” (Kvale, 1996, p. 124) and at the same time not to lose focus of my own agenda (Richards, 2003, p. 63).

At different times during my fieldwork, I also conducted ‘informal’ (e.g., Richards, 2003) interviews. These “spontaneous, informal conversations” (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007, p. 108) took place during classroom- and other forms of observation and participation at QHS and had not been arranged in advance. Richards (2003) suggests that this type of spontaneous, informal conversation “becomes an interview when the researcher designs their contribution to elicit responses focused on a particular topic…[but] that such things are rarely cut and dried” (p. 50). Records of these interview interactions were recorded in different ways (i.e., in some cases as part of the audio-record, in others written up as fieldnotes).
**Formal interviews with focal FIS students.** Each of the four formal interviews with focal students (Bessie, Bone, Dane, Ellen, Moon, Wanda, WoW, and Zeejay) corresponded with specific temporal points of reference in their school year: the first, with the beginning of their school year, the second, with the start of their second term and following the Winter Break; the third, as close as possible to the final ESL exit tests of the year; and the last interview, at the end of the school year. These were typically held in Mrs. Bee’s empty classroom after school or, if scheduled during school hours, sometimes in a meeting room across from the main office. I did share the interview protocols with focal participants in advance of our meetings. A summary of data generated via interviews with focal participants can be found in Table 3.6.

**Formal interviews with non-focal participants.** I also conducted formal interviews with non-focal students, teachers, and administrators at various points during the course of the research. Interviews with non-focal students were held in open classrooms or the meeting room across from the school’s main office; with teachers, in their classrooms (though Mr. Whee and I sat outside); with the QHS principal in their office; in the Pateo School District International Education Program administrator’s office; at the BC Ministry of Education office; and with an administrator from the Canadian Association for Public Schools International over the telephone. Though I shared the interview protocols with each of these participants in advance of our meetings, not once did this practice result in us following the precise sequence of topics outlined in the protocol, and very rarely did it result in us following the exact wording or structure of the questions in the protocol. A summary of data generated via formal interviews with non-focal participants can be found in Table 3.3 (pp. 64-65 above).

**Email reports.** Once it became clear that none of the focal students’ were interested in completing reflective, journal-like “self-reports” on a twice monthly basis as I had originally anticipated, focal participants and I compromised with what I refer to as Email Reports. Despite their use of writing as the sole medium of communication, email reports are theorized in this
study as co-accomplished by me and each focal participant (see, e.g., Wernicke-Heinrichs, 2013). Comprised of students’ written responses to tailored sets of questions derived from my observations and fieldwork, these written reports ended up serving three main purposes during the study: first, these reports allowed me to raise questions with the focal students about classroom conduct, work, or interactions; second, they allowed me to remain in contact with students in whose classes I was unable to negotiate access for participant observation; third, they served as a vehicle for discussion of focal students’ experiences not related specifically to school (i.e., filling forms; meeting with tutors; attending cram schools; etc.); and finally, they served as yet another source of practice for students to write in English. A summary of data generated via Email Reports with focal participants can be found in Table 3.6 (also see Appendix B).

**Audiorecorded classroom interaction.** I used audio-recording devices in both Mr. Whee’s and Ms. Jay’s/Mr. Nobli’s classes on an ongoing basis (see Table 3.7 for a summary of recording schedules) throughout the school year, but only on days when I was physically present for participant observation in either class. Three types of audio-recording were done during these observations: whole-class, student-carried, and researcher-carried recordings.27

Whole-class recordings were made with a Roland R-05 digital handheld recorder, which was placed at the back of the classroom on a bookshelf (Mr. Whee’s class) or in the windowledge (Ms. Jay’s/Mr. Nobli’s class). This device picked up teacher fronted activity, and depending on speaker’s proximity to the device, background noise, and overall classroom bustle, often also picked up teacher-student and student-student interactions. On two occasions during

---

27 There were quite a few instances in the student-carried audio-recordings when focal participants or their peers addressed me directly or oriented to an audio-recording device in a way that evidenced their awareness of the ongoing research project (see, e.g., Deschambault & W. Kim, 2013; W. Kim & Deschambault, 2014; Talmy, 2005). Though I do consider the content and quality of many of the interactions in the classroom to have been generated in an inherently more ‘natural’ way than, say, the content of formal research interviews, I do not consider them to “be entirely independent of the researcher’s [influence], categories, and judgments [and] [f]or this reason the term *naturalistic* data is preferable” (Potter, 2008, p. 547, italics in original). In short, the classroom data obtained for the study, although naturalistic in the sense that they capture the goings-on of each class over a lengthy period of time, cannot forego conceptualization as co-constructed products of a research initiative.
student presentations in Ms. Jay’s/Mr. Nobli’s class, the recorder was placed at the front of the class, to obtain better quality audio-recordings of students’ presentations.

Prior to these classes on a monthly basis (once every four observations or so), classroom participants were reminded that their interactions could be recorded by any of the three devices. Students who volunteered to wear the T-mic were taught how to operate the recording devices so that they were able to turn off the digital recorder at any time. Though all participating students were encouraged to wear the T-mic, only on two occasions during the year did non-focal participants wear the T-mics.

Table 3.7 includes a summary of the amount and distribution of the roughly 68 hours of whole-class recordings. Overall totals (rightmost column and bottom row) are presented as hours and minutes (i.e., 34h10m as 34:10), whereas monthly totals for each location (center of table) are presented in minutes (i.e., 1h25m as 85).

Table 3.7. Amount and Distribution of Whole-class Audiorecordings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELL Socials</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>34:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Writing</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>34:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5:40</td>
<td>2:50</td>
<td>9:55</td>
<td>11:20</td>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>12:45</td>
<td>12:45</td>
<td>4:15</td>
<td>~ 68:10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student-carried recordings involved the use of an omnidirectional stereo lavaliere T-mic, which was clipped on the lapel of a student’s shirt or jacket. The T-mics were wired into one of two personal portable digital recorders (Olympus WS 700M), and were attached to nylon lanyards that students wore around their necks. The student-carried recordings resulted in high volumes of naturalistic peer-peer and student-teacher interactions pertaining to classroom and/or school business. Of course, there was equally as much interaction that pertained to anything but classroom business. A massive amount of the peer-peer interaction occurred in students’ L1s. The most dominant among L1s being used in class was Mandarin, though other languages heard on the recordings were Cantonese, Korean, and Arabic. This meant that apart from the Korean
language use, other L1 data were unintelligible to me. I discuss these data further in the sections below. Table 3.6 includes a summary of the amount and distribution of student-carried recordings.

Researcher-carried binaural earphone recordings were generated using ultra-low noise binaural microphones which dangled from around my neck at the front of my shirt, much like earphones from an iPod. The binaural microphones were wired to a personal portable digital recorder which was kept in my pocket. Despite the fact that the overwhelming majority of data generated by this means offered just a different aural perspective on events in the classroom, the benefit was that it also allowed me to record my own interactions with students and teachers during participant observation, shortly before and after the ‘official’ class had started.

**Questionnaire.** In order to gain a better sense of non-focal student backgrounds and their living situations and residency status, I distributed a simple questionnaire (Appendix C) to both Mr. Whee’s ELL Writing class and Ms. Jay’s ELL Socials class in March 2012. Part of the reason for distributing the survey late in the year resulted from the iterative analytic trajectory the study was taking. Specifically, despite having heard from teachers and students that there were few differences between FIS and BC Ministry of Education funded ELL students, these questionnaires helped identify some of these differences and allowed me to present a more comprehensive demographic snapshot of each of those classes (e.g., Tables 3.2 and 3.3).

**Documents.** Documents I amassed during fieldwork at QHS included: focal FIS students’ self-selected homework, essays, and other assignments completed by focal FIS participants (see Table 3.6 [pp. 67] for a summary of focal FIS documents); ESL placement and testing materials; mixed paperwork related to student recordkeeping and ESL levels; class handouts and worksheets distributed during class, as well as other materials (i.e., Prezi or Powerpoint presentations) made available to students through class websites (e.g., Mr. Nobli’s site); information made available by and about the school on the internet (e.g., Descriptions of courses;
Information for parents and students, Annual School Plans, QHS-specific student and teacher statistics, etc.).

Further documents collected and reviewed were collected via the internet or in person at stakeholder meetings and district meetings/information sessions open to the public, and included: newspaper articles relating to international student issues at local, national, and international levels; the international student program offered in/by the larger school district (i.e., program descriptions and marketing materials; student application forms; homestay information); BC Ministry of Education policy documents relating to student funding, categorization, statistics, and specifically to do with international students at the pre-tertiary level (e.g., Chapter 4); provincial and federal level government commissioned reports examining the importance of international students to economies at both of these levels of government (e.g., Kunin & Associates, 2011, 2012); and documents prepared and distributed by both government and non-government agencies and stakeholders relating to the branding of ‘Canadian’ education as a marketable commodity (e.g., Illuminate Consulting Group, 2009).

3.2.6 Data Management

The amount of data generated during fieldwork was substantial and required a system for management and organization. Aside from handwritten notes taken in the field (though many of these were later typed up and became digital), almost all of the data were saved, logged, and stored digitally on password protected and encrypted hard drives. The external drives with copies of the data were kept in a secure location in my work area at home.

Handwritten fieldnotes were transcribed into digital versions as soon as possible after each observation. Classroom interaction data were transferred to my hard drive and, based on my fieldnotes, selected segments of each file were briefly summarized for later transcription. The incidence of L1 data – especially Mandarin, though some Cantonese and Korean was also audible – was so pervasive in these data during non-teacher-fronted, student-student interactions
it would have been impossible to flag each instance, short stretch of talk, or lengthy conversation in which an L1 was used let alone afford to have all of these translated. This was exacerbated by the fact that some of the Cantonese/Mandarin bilingual focal-students (i.e., Zeejay; Wanda) sometimes switched between the two languages depending on whether there was a Cantonese speaking non-focal student sitting near them. Talmy (2005) has pointed out that the sheer amount of L1 usage, not only in ELL classes but the school in general, “in itself is an interesting finding” (p. 189; also e.g., Tollefson & Tsui, 2004). Indeed, the classroom data from Mr. Whee’s and Ms. Jay’s ELL classes, as a small but representative index of the pervasive use of students’ non-English L1s both in- and out-side of ELL classes at QHS more generally, contributed to the production of the FIS category in practice vis-à-vis stereotypical similarities between ‘international’ and ‘immigrant’ students, as well as between ‘international’ and ‘Asian’ (see, e.g., Chapter 5). Further to this, as Talmy (2005) has also suggested, the ubiquitous use of Mandarin (and other prominent L1s) “complicates important earlier calls for teachers not to exclude students’ L1s from the classroom (e.g., Auerbach, 1993; Lucas & Katz, 1994)” (p. 190; also see, e.g., García, Kleifgen, & Falchi, 2008; Talmy, 2013b). Despite calls to use students’ L1s as a resource, students in ELL classes (as well as teachers) routinely acknowledged the ubiquitous-yet-paradoxical use of Mandarin, especially so in ELL classrooms at QHS. Thus, for L1s I did not understand (Mandarin, Cantonese) and which were used frequently by the focal participants, I flagged the instances of L1 use in student-student interaction that occurred in sequential proximity to teacher-talk, teacher-student interaction, peer-peer English language interaction (and sometimes hearably jocular peer-peer L1 use). These L1 data were then played for a Mandarin speaking translator, whose oral translations helped to identify which segments of L1 data did not seem to be related to or relevant for themes and issues I had identified through

28 I acknowledge funding made possible through the Department of Language and Literacy Education’s Mary Ashworth Memorial Graduate Scholarship in Education, which helped finance the translation and transcription of portions of the Mandarin and Korean language data.
ongoing analysis. Given limited funding for this specific purpose, selected translations were then prioritized for written transcription in Mandarin and translation into English.

3.2.7 Analysis of Data

I did not conceptualize the analysis of data as a discrete stage of the research process, but rather as one that begins in the pre-fieldwork phase, in the formulation and clarification of research problems, and continues through to the process of writing [...] Formally, it starts to take shape in analytic notes and memoranda; informally, it is embodied in the [researcher’s] ideas and hunches. And in these ways, to one degree or another, the analysis of data feeds into research design and data [generation].” (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007, p. 158)

Indeed, ethnographic research and the iterative process it requires have often been described as having a ‘funnel structure’ (e.g., Duff, 1995; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007; Watson-Gegeo, 1988), through which the scope and focus become increasingly clarified as the study progresses. Below I provide a brief overview of the analytic process from the time data generation began, and orient the reader to the general analytic approach I adopted for the study. Given that the range and combination of analytic resources varies for different analyses and according to chapter and focus, I save detailed discussions of those resources for Chapters 6 through 9.

While fieldwork was ongoing, I regularly reviewed the “quite thick” (Carspecken, 1996; see, e.g., pp-44-54) digital fieldnotes and summaries that were developed from my handwritten notes taken in the field. Since these fieldnotes and the summaries of interview data generated during processing were replete with references to what I had identified as important processes, events, interactions, and exchanges, regular review of these notes helped me to develop insights and questions that implicitly shaped the direction of the study. These insights and questions then became topics about which I could ask participants, seek more information, and/or (dis-)confirm.
through further, and sometimes more motivated observations, interview protocols, and email report questions. The process of reviewing these notes was also helpful in the sense that because during fieldwork I was, like many other people at my life stage, managing work and family responsibilities in addition to my research and studies, the references I had made to important events and/or interactions during my classroom observations allowed me to spend whatever extra time I could spare on focused transcription efforts. In this respect, though I recognize that “engaging in sustained data analysis alongside data collection is often very difficult in practice” (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007, p. 160), I found that beyond regular time set aside for the transcription of interviews and classroom data that a key means for maintaining engagement with my data has been preparation for conference and invited presentations (e.g., Deschambault, 2012a, 2012b, 2013a, 2013b, 2014). At the same time, international education, both in the context of BC and in the context of Canada more generally, was (and is) becoming a burgeoning area of both government and scholarly interest. This meant that engagement with data was always occurring alongside, in relation to, and sometimes as a result of, developments in these areas.

As different forms of data were gathered, transcribed, and sorted, I separated those that could be electronically coded into separate hermeneutic units using Atlas.ti qualitative research software (Version 7.1.8; Scientific Software GmbH, 2014; see also, e.g., Dowling, 2008). Atlas.ti software enables an interpretive approach to coding data, specifically because it allows for the concise identification, archiving, and location of both uncoded and coded instances of text and/or data. This ability to code by chunks of talk, text, or image, or by line or word kept me immersed in data, and facilitated an inductive process of identifying important thematic and discursive patterns, processes, and orientations. Importantly, especially given that there were multiple interviews with focal FIS students, coding allowed me to trace these patterns across the year, to perceive connections between patterns, and to be able to situate these in relation to
important in- and out-of-school processes that were salient (e.g., an ESL test; an incident related to homestay or living situation). In short, using Atlas.ti allowed me to maintain a data-near, inductive process during the important early phases of analysis (see, e.g., Charmaz, 2000).

**Transcription.** An important consideration is the role played by transcription in the iterative analytic process. Indeed, transcribing was central to analysis: from handwritten notes to elaborated or shortened versions of these notes into computerized documents, or from audio-recordings to orthographic representation, to give two central examples. A constructionist approach to methods recognizes how the “practice of transcription . . . requires the transcriber’s cognizance of her or his own role in the creation of the text and the ideological implications of the resultant product” (Bucholtz, 2000: 1440; also, e.g., Ochs, 1979).

The process for transcription of these data early on followed a general protocol and was based loosely on Richards (2003, p. 184): (1) provide a general categorization of the type of interaction is occurring; (2) recognize the unmistakeably salient features of that particular interaction; (3) focus on the organizational (cf. “structural”; Richards, 2003, p. 184) elements of the interaction; and (4) develop a description of what is occurring in the interaction. Of course, neither the process nor the protocol for transcription was linear, since these too were affected by developments during fieldwork or which were germane to the research.

Particularly where the final representation of audio-recorded talk is concerned (i.e., from interviews or classroom interaction), it is important to note that throughout the dissertation there are instances in which these extracts are transcribed with differing levels of detail. Rather than viewing these differences as a methodological irregularity, it is in keeping with the constructionist approach to consider these differing levels of details to be illustrative of the analytic purpose for which a particular extract is being woven into the research narrative (Bucholtz, 2007). Thus, where special conventions or notation are used to represent the transcribed talk (i.e., pauses; laughter; non-verbal actions; multilingual talk; etc.), these are
employed to highlight features of the talk or interaction that are relevant to a particular analysis (see Appendix R for a list of conventions and notation). It is important to note that readers should not interpret the absence of special conventions or notation in a given transcript to mean a change in the status of the data as a co-constructed product of the research enterprise.

‘Critical’ discourse analysis. The analytic approach adopted for the analysis of text and talk in the study is, roughly speaking, ‘critical’ discourse analysis (C/DA). An important distinction between the way CDA has conventionally been articulated (e.g., Fairclough, 1992, 1995, 2001, 2003; van Dijk, 2001, 2013) and the way I am making use of the framework here, has explicitly to do with the term ‘critical’.

Fairclough (2001, p. 230) has argued that there are two “senses” in which CDA is ‘critical’. The first is that CDA “seeks to discern connections between language and other elements in social life which are often opaque”, and that the focus of such analyses can include “how language figures within social relations of power and domination; how language works ideologically; [and] the negotiation of personal and social identities…in its linguistic and semiotic aspect” (p. 230). In this sense of the term ‘critical’, the linguistic ethnographic multiple-case study methodology articulated in the first part of this chapter (e.g., Section 3.1.1) is well-suited for this form of ‘critical’ engagement. Its suitability for such engagement is a result of its scalar approach to understanding the notion of multiple-cases and blending of ethnographic with discourse analytic approaches to the representation and substantiation of research claims.

The second sense in which CDA is ‘critical’, and where my own use of the term departs from conventional articulations, is in its “commit[ment] to progressive social change” insofar as “it has an ‘emancipatory’ knowledge interest” (Fairclough, 2001, p. 230). Teun van Dijk (2001; see also van Dijk, 2013) has also described this ‘critical’ sense of CDA, albeit in less mitigated terms, as an essential “sociopolitical position”:

…CDA is a – critical – perspective on doing scholarship; it is, so to speak, discourse
analysis ‘with an attitude’. It focuses on social problems – and especially on the role of discourse in the production and reproduction of power abuse or domination. Wherever possible, it does so from a perspective that is consistent with the best interests of dominated groups. It takes the experiences and opinions of members of such groups seriously, and supports their struggle against inequality. That is, CDA research combines what perhaps somewhat pompously used to be called ‘solidarity with the oppressed’ with an attitude of opposition and dissent against those who abuse text and talk in order to establish, confirm or legitimate their abuse of power. (p. 96)

The ways in which this type of “sociopolitical position” characterises, not to mention presents the identification of (“the best interests of”), “dominated groups” does not align with the approach to, process of, or purpose for analysis in this study. In addition to the presumption that an analyst’s responsibility, wherever possible, is to be in “solidarity with” these groups as they “struggle against inequality” and that these groups want (or need) the analyst’s solidarity, is the underlying suggestion that ‘inequality’ is something other than a process deeply embedded in a matrix of more- and less-stable, individual or institutional accomplishments occurring at different levels of scale and occurring along more- and less-observable timelines.29 Indeed, and further to this point, Talmy (2010a) has noted the ‘difficult’ nature of any attempt to define the notion of ‘critical’ in applied linguistics (research) more generally:

To arrive at a settled-upon definition would be to deny a productive dissensus among critical researchers, who would prefer ‘to avoid the production of blueprints of sociopolitical and epistemological beliefs’ (Kincheloe & McLaren 2000, p. 281), since such a perspective would ‘assume an epistemological stance in which the social world

---

29 Talmy (2010a, citing Simon & Dippo, 1986) has discussed the importance of historicization in critical research in applied linguistics, noting that constructs such as “society, power, agency and culture do not exist atemporally; they are sociohistorically situated” (p. 129; original italics). To this list, then, I might add van Dijk’s (2001, p. 96) notions of ‘best interests’ and/or ‘dominated groups’.
can be precisely defined – a position that is not very critical’ (Quantz 1992, p. 448).

(Talmy, 2010a, p.128)

For the purpose of this study, then, I use the term ‘critical’ in Fairclough’s (2001) first sense: that it “seeks to discern connections between language and other elements in social life which are often opaque”, and that the focus of these types of analyses takes interest in the role language plays in realizing socially relevant power relations, ideological orientations, and identity ascriptions and performances in text and in talk. Rather than adopt CDA because it “is rather a social or political movement than a method”, or because “the kind of DA [critical discourse analysts] do, should be adequate to realize their critical goals, namely to analyze and denounce domination and social inequality” (van Dijk, 2013, para. 1), my use of the term ‘critical’ is here meant to refer to two general orientations. The first is a reflexive recognition of my own analytic product as a situated, indeed ‘sociopolitical’ account (cf. Fairclough’s [2001, p. 236] call to “reflect critically on the analysis”). The second takes seriously the view that because CDA’s analytic object/s is/are embedded in “polycentric and stratified” environments, where processes like ‘inequality’ are often “attached to a multitude of [scalar] centers of authority” (Blommaert, 2007, p. 2), that ‘solidarity with the oppressed’ in globalizing and superdiverse times presents too simple a view when issues of normativity are becoming increasingly more complex (e.g., Blommaert, 2010, pp. 36-37).

Methodologically, I focus on the construction of the category of FIS, particularly as this is realized in discursive and material ways in different forms of policy- (e.g., BC Ministry of Education documents) and practice-related texts (e.g., school documents), talk (e.g., focal- and non-focal participant interview accounts and narratives), and embodiments (e.g., classroom composition). At the same time that CDA scholars have argued “there is not ‘a’ or ‘one’ method of CDA, but many” (van Dijk, 2013, para. 6; see also van Dijk, 2001), and that “‘protocols’ for [CDA] analysis should be left deliberately contingent and porous, rather than being contained by
a universalist procedure of strict and continuous explications of research choices” (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 2010, p. 1217), Fairclough (2001) presents a constellation of CDA procedures which are useful for characterizing the approach to analysis adopted for the study. These procedures revolve around a researcher’s concentration on an issue (here: a category) that has social relevance. Once this issue has been identified, analysts can focus on “the network of practices [that the issue or category] is located within”; on the relationships between the meanings that obtain for the issue, or are mobilized around it, and how those relate “to other elements within the particular practice(s) concerned; and on the use of different forms of analysis – which include but do not necessitate structural, interactional, interdiscursive, and linguistic and semiotic methods” (pp. 236-239).

Given van Dijk’s (2013) assertion that for CDA a “good method is a method that is able to give a satisfactory (reliable, relevant, etc.) answer to the questions of a research project”, the procedures outlined in Fairclough (2001) are augmented by broadly discourse analytic approaches specifically for the analyses of text (e.g., Drew, 2006; Fairclough, 1992; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997) and talk (e.g., de Fina, 2009; Heritage, 1988, 2005; Ochs & Capps, 2001; Schegloff, 2007; Talmy & Richards, 2011). Writing about the use of CDA in applied linguistics research specifically, Talmy (2010a) has suggested that such an augmentation can be referred to as “lower-case ‘critical discourse analysis’” (p. 131). In each of the analytic chapters that follow (i.e., Chapters 4-9), I present a brief description of the analytic approach relevant to the specific chapter.

3.2.8 Quality

Given the social constructionist orientation outlined in Section 3.1.2 of this chapter, it is important to discuss the different methods used to generate data as they relate to the notion of quality. The notion of quality is invoked here as a means for asserting what Duff (2008a) has referred to as “accuracy” and “truthfulness” in the accomplishment of the larger research project.
The notion of quality in this study is invoked to relay that data have been generated and handled conscientiously, and to assure that “perspectives, observations, and biases [have been conveyed] with care”, that “attention [has been] paid to meaningful details”, and that as a researcher I have been “accountable to the data” (Duff, 2008a, p. 179). At the same time, the notion of quality relates to my being accountable to participants and readers: that claims I have made are sufficiently grounded in and demonstrated by reference to data and/or existing sources; that both the small- and larger-arguments made in the study, as well as the analytic process via which they were arrived at, is documented in a way that is orderly, coherent, and plausible.

Although quality is very much “related to the trustworthiness and credibility of the researcher and the results” (Duff, 2008a, p. 179), for the purpose of this study it does not rely on conventional understandings of triangulation (e.g., Denzin, 1978). That is, triangulation is not taken to mean the “that any bias inherent in particular data sources, investigator, and method [can] be neutralized when used in conjunction with other data sources…and methods” (Cresswell, 1994, p. 174), or further, that “getting a fix on” (Richards, 2003, p. 251) a truer, more certain, or more valid representation of a research object is a possible or desirable goal (e.g., Silverman, 2006, p 291; Wernicke-Heinrichs, 2013, pp. 93-95; Wood & Kroger, 2000, p. 176). Rather, triangulation contributes to the quality of the study by recognizing that different methods and sources of data generation are separately, though not necessarily equally, valuable to the research narrative (see, e.g., Talmy, 2013a, p. 5); and that from the constructionist perspective taken in this study (Section 3.1.2), it enhances quality by “add[ing] rigor, breadth, complexity, richness, and depth” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 5) of possible response to the research questions. Finally, because they can be used “to generate, warrant and elaborate (critical)

---

30 Duff (2008a) has noted that member checking is sometimes treated as “another form of triangulation” (p. 171). Although focal and non-focal participants were invited to view transcripts and uses of related data in early drafts of chapters, this invitation to ‘member-check’ was not conceptualized as a means for triangulating the research narrative; rather, the invitation was made to keep a promise I made to each participant during fieldwork. Only one (focal-) participant, Dane, requested access to his data.
claims in demonstrable and data-bear terms” the use of different discourse analytic approaches under a broader framework of CDA (or ‘lower-case critical discourse analysis’) is a powerful resource for bolstering the quality and rigour of the study (Talmy, 2010a, p. 131).

3.3 Conclusion

In the first part of this chapter, I have outlined the research traditions, methodological design, and epistemological orientations with which the study is aligned; in the second, I have described the principal research site, focal and non-focal participants, and methods of data generation general approach to data analysis. I have concluded the chapter with a section on ‘quality’, embedded in which is the discussion of accuracy, trustworthiness, credibility, and triangulation. In the chapters that follow I present analyses of how the category of fee-paying international student is constructed across different scales of representation: in policy, in practice, and in person.
CHAPTER 4: CONSTRUCTING FIS IN BC EDUCATIONAL POLICY

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter I provide a two-part response to the first research question proposed for the study: *How is the category of fee-paying international student (FIS) constructed in BC educational policy?*

The chapter is organized into four sections. In Section 4.1, I situate BC Education policy in local, national, and international educational marketplaces, introduce the theoretical framework and analytic approach for the chapter, and recapitulate information introduced in Chapter 1 that is relevant to the analyses.

In Section 4.2, I demonstrate how the category of fee-paying international student (FIS) is discursively constructed in a complex nexus of official BC Ministry of Education documents related to its definition of “international students”. I focus on how the ‘fee-paying’ modification is only ever made implicitly, through the mobilization and strategic uses of criteria relating to students’ residency status, eligibility for state funding, and second language competency. I make two basic claims: (1) that the implicit nature of the label “international student” is in fact synonymous with FIS, and (2) that the category FIS is very often a euphemism for unrecognized, unfunded, and unofficial ELLs. For my analysis in this section, I draw from both policy documents and BC Ministry of Education publications related to K-12 student statistics.

In Section 4.3, I trace the recent re-articulation of the BC Ministry of Education’s (2001) *International Student Policy*. I focus on how the BC Ministry of Education’s altered discursive and ideological orientation to the category of FIS, and specifically the discursive and material work and implications of this altered perspective, are sites which index the permeation of BC’s K-12 education system by the FIS industry and competing ‘neoliberal’ cultural approaches to public education. I situate this ‘discursive shift’ (da Silva & Heller, 2009; Heller, 2012) in
relation to the (educational) practices of educational im/migrants, against a backdrop of provincial and federal efforts to reframe international education in explicitly market-economic terms. For my analysis in this section, I draw both from policy documents and from interviews with representatives from the BC Ministry of Education and the Pateo School District’s International Education Program.

I conclude the chapter with a summary of the analyses, and briefly preview how these answers to the first research question are taken up in Chapter Five.

4.1.1 BC Education (Policy) in Local, National, and International Marketplaces

It is important to note that in Canada, K-12 educational policy is developed and implemented by provincial rather than federal authorities (Levin & Young, 1994); as a result, analyses of educational policy and practice are often focused at the provincial level (Bray, 1999). However, it is also important to recognize the “authority of the nation-state as [a] given” (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, p. 13) in discussions of international education in BC. For example, at the same time that a representative from the BC Ministry of Education noted in our research interview that “K-12 education is a hotly protected provincial jurisdiction” (BCMoe: 25), they also characterized BC’s “thriving [K-12] international education sector” as having benefited from the fact that “the brand really is Canada” (BCMoe: 37-41). The brand, known more formally as “Imagine Education in/au Canada,” was established by the Council of Ministers of Education (CMEC; 2011, p. 6) as a strategic unifying umbrella under which individual international education providers at the K-12 level (i.e., school districts from different provinces) might market their schools at international education fairs overseas.

BC’s “thriving [K-12] international education sector,” and the policies that enable and constrain it, are also situated by processes located well beyond provincial or national borders. For example, in positioning this sector, the same Ministry representative drew on BC’s international OECD achievement rankings at the K-12 level (i.e., “so internationally we’re
somewhere between the top 5 to 10 depending on the subject area” [BCMoE:38]), as well the Ministry’s borrowing from the government of New Zealand to assist in its ongoing developing of K-12 international education policy (BCMoE:621-630). These examples suggest that internationally recognized educational processes, what Steiner-Khamsi (2004) refers to as “lessons from elsewhere” (p. 217), are also highly relevant to discussions of international education specifically as it occurs onshore in BC.

4.1.2 Theoretical Framework and Analytic Approach

Given the relevance and authority of both the Canadian nation-state and more global organizations to discussions of international education policy in BC, it is clear that FIS-relevant educational policy in BC is situated in a polycentric (Blommaert, 2010) nexus of local, national, and even international (e.g., Mawhinney, 2010; McKenzie, 2012) education markets. For this reason, it is necessary to maintain a situated and interpretative understanding of policy documents and analysis of them (e.g., Codd, 1995; Drew, 2006). Rather than conceiving of policy in instrumentalist terms (i.e., “as a tool for regulating populations from the top down, with predetermined universal aims” [McKenzie, 2012, p. 170]), an interpretative perspective recognizes that while “policy ensembles, [and] collections of related policies, [do indeed] exercise power through a production of truth and knowledge” (Ball, 2006, p. 48), that the ‘truth’ and ‘knowledge’ indexed in policy texts is “not necessarily clear or closed or complete” (Ball, 1993, p. 11). This is especially the case in superdiverse (Vertovec, 2007) education markets, when different resources for interpretation and value-attribution are in play, and where meanings can vary in different contexts of communication (e.g., Salter, 2013; also Blommaert & Rampton, 2011).

Similarly, an interpretative approach underscores that conceptualization and analysis of policy must remain cognizant of “links among acts of discursive production involving the (always) multiple stakeholders, and unfolding in multiple discursive spaces” (da Silva & Heller,
2009, p. 112; see also McCarty, 2011, p. xii). This is important not only for the production of (written) policy documents themselves, but also for what can be counted as policy more broadly. In many senses, da Silva and Heller’s (2009) reminder is even more significant in (super-) diversified jurisdictions where highly mobile and multilingual students often receive formal (public) education in a language that is different from their first, home, or previously schooled languages. Thus, useful for the present chapter and the larger study is Lo Bianco’s (2010) argument “for an expanded understanding” of language policy and planning which is sensitive to the “essentially continuous sequence of actions of ‘acting on’ language” that constitute policy development, articulation, and implementation (p. 154). Such an expanded view is especially pertinent where international education in BC is concerned, because it fosters sensitivity to the possibility that, and ways in which, education policy is in effect language policy (e.g., Burnaby, 2006; Hult, 2014; Tollefson, 2002); to the ways in which “communicative practices, institutional policies, and wider socio-economic transformations, are interwoven in the production of daily life in different educational communities” (Pérez-Milans, 2015, p. 99; see also Lo Bianco, 2010; Tollefson, 2015).

Given these understandings of (written) policy documents, the analytic approach I adopt treats the use of language in policy texts as a form of social practice, which “implies a dialectical relationship between [policy documents] and the situation(s), institution(s) and social structure(s) which frame [them]” (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p. 258). As such, this approach is situated generally within a Critical Discourse Analysis framework (CDA; e.g., Fairclough, 1992, 1995, 2001; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997), but follows scholars who have argued for ethnographically-attentive approaches to both CDA (e.g., Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000; Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 2010; Talmy, 2010a) and policy analysis (e.g., da Silva & Heller, 2009; Hornberger & Johnson, 2007; Johnson, 2009; Pérez-Milans, 2015). Fairclough’s (1992) articulation of CDA outlines three levels at which analysts can focus when describing how discourse “constitutes situations,
objects of knowledge, and the social identities of and relationships between people and groups of people” (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p. 258). The first attends to uses of structure, cohesion, grammar, and vocabulary in the text, treating them as indexical of the text producer’s orientation to content and preferred range of interpretation. The second attends to coherence and intertextuality – with an interest in how these uses of structure, cohesion, grammar, and vocabulary in the text are embedded in, indicative or constitutive of context. Of key import is Fairclough's (1992) distinction between "constitutive" and "manifest" intertextuality. The former refers to the heterogeneity of conventions, types, and styles with which any text is constructed (i.e., mixes of purposes, genres, registers); the latter refers to the explicitly selection of, reference to, or (re-)contextualization of other concrete texts (i.e., directly quoting another text). The third is focused on how discourse is central in the mobilization and functioning of ideological processes as flexible resources in the production (and arguably, circulation, distribution, and consumption) of meaning. Fairclough argues that the flexibility of ideologies is indexed in discursive changes, which can highlight "the emergence of new orders of discourse, struggles over normativity, attempts at control, and resistance against regimes of power" (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000, p. 449).

Concomitant with an approach to this CDA framework which argues that “‘protocols’ for analysis should be left deliberately contingent and porous, rather than being contained by a universalist procedure of strict and continuous explications of research choices” (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 2010, p. 1217), the analysis of BC Ministry of Education texts below “aims to examine how the texts are written, how people and events are described, and how, through use of language, [educational practices, relations, and identity categories] are constructed” (Drew, 2006 p. 65). These analyses include, and are contextualized by: considerations of how politico-economic changes have influenced educational organizations; logics that have been mobilized to discipline and attribute value to language practice in educational spaces; and how (language)
“valuation dynamics” and ideological clusters have changed over time (Pérez-Milans, 2015, p. 104).

4.1.3 Background for the Present Chapter

In Chapter 1 (subsection 1.1.1) I briefly described the development and emergence of what has been described as a ‘neoliberal’ policy agenda in K-12 Education in BC (e.g., Fallon & Paquette, 2009; Fallon & Poole, 2013; Kuehn, 2002). Specifically, these descriptions focused on the then-BC-government’s implementation of Bill 34: The School Amendment Act [Bill 34, 2002]), and of key relevance here, the part of Bill 34 which pressured school districts to secure non-governmental (i.e., private) sources of revenue. Not only did this pressure respecify schools as providers of marketable commodities, and students and parents as consumers of educational services and products, it allowed for the provincial government to take a more “hands-off” approach toward the funding, regulation, and provision of public education (see, e.g., Fallon & Paquette, 2009; Fallon & Poole, 2013). Given these consequences, it is worth noting that the province’s International Student Policy (BCMoE, 2001b), the first relating to the regulation of international education in K-12 schools, was implemented just one year prior to Bill 34 (Bill 34, 2002).

In this environment, where school districts were pushed “to market and sell their expertise and programs effectively in order to keep enrolment and revenue at a healthy level” (Fallon & Pancucci, 2003, p. 158), it may not be surprising that for districts the most expedient and economically strategic source of self-generated revenue was the tuition paid by FIS (Kuehn, 2007, 2012a, 2012b, 2014). While government sources (e.g., British Columbia Center for International Education, 2013; Kunin & Associates, 2011), education policymakers (e.g., Government of BC, 2012a), and non-governmental researchers (e.g., Fallon & Poole, 2013) have been quick to describe the impact of these students on BC’s K-12 education system for better or worse in economic terms, very few have systematically examined how the recruitment of fee-
paying international students – ostensibly precipitated by Bill 34 (Bill 34, 2002) – might be influential for or impacted by other (educational) policies, practitioners, or students. It is to this task that I now turn in this chapter.

4.2 Constructing FIS: “International Students” and the Policy Nexus

I begin by considering how the category of fee-paying international student (FIS) is constructed specifically in BC Ministry of Education public school policy. It is important to note at the outset that the BC Ministry of Education makes no explicit mention of the category of FIS in any of its K-12 policies. The pervasive category throughout BCMoE policy documents is simply “International student”; as mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, the ‘fee-paying’ modification is only ever made implicitly, through a nexus of intertextual references (e.g., Bakhtin, 1986; Fairclough, 1992) to other legal and policy documents. Thus, the BC Ministry of Education category “International student” serves as a euphemism for fee-paying international student (FIS), a fact that is underscored through its contrastive relationship to another BCMoE category: English Language Learner (ELL). Next, I show how this implicit, euphemistic characterization has been achieved in a complex nexus of policy documents which foreground three themes crucial to the category of FIS: residency status, eligibility for State funding, and English language learning.

4.2.1 BC Ministry of Education Policy Glossary Definition of “International Students”

By early 2011, the BC Ministry of Education’s International Student Policy (BCMoE, 2001b) document had gone offline. After an extensive search for this policy using links to it that had been embedded in other BC Ministry of Education web documents, I learned that the policy document itself was no longer publicly available on the internet. Among the web sources that were linked to the International Student Policy was the BC Ministry of Education’s (n.d.-b) Policy Glossary definition for “International Students” (Figure 4.1). The Glossary definition became a central resource for gaining insight into the description, portrayal, and positioning of
FIS in official K-12 policy for two reasons. First, despite repeated requests to the Ministry via email and telephone for a copy of the International Student Policy beginning in late 2011, I did not receive any response and thus the Glossary was all I had to work with. Second, as I quickly learned, the Policy Glossary’s definition of “International Students” was an excellent point of departure from which to explore the nebulous network of policies through which the category FIS was constructed.

Figure 4.1 BCMoE (n.d.-b) Policy Glossary: “International Students” (screen shot: ~Oct. 2012)

The Glossary definition is composed of three paragraphs, each of which serves a different function and includes manifest intertextual references (Fairclough, 1992), in the form of hyperlinks, to other policy relevant documents. The first paragraph offers a general definition of International Students, relying in part on a linked external reference to the BC School Act (BCMoE, 1996/2013). The second paragraph defines International Students “for the purpose of the International Student Graduation Credit Policy” (BCMoE, 2004/2009), and includes a hyperlink to that policy. The third paragraph notes that certain “exceptions” allow some students

---

31 Thankfully, though frustratingly, I finally received a copy of the policy in December 2013, when an administrative-level Ministry representative I had met at a BC Ministry of Education Roundtable Meeting for International Education Stakeholders answered their assistant’s telephone by chance. The administrator arranged for the assistant to email me a .pdf of the old International Student Policy as well as answers to questions I had posed about why it had been replaced with the Eligibility of Students for Operating Grant Funding policy (see Section 4.3).
to avoid the economic and institutional consequences of being labeled an international student. It also contains a link to a list of those exceptions in the *International Student Policy*.

Table 4.1 presents a summary of discursive resources used to define “International Students” in the *Glossary* definition. The summary is arranged according to the centrally defining notions of Residency Status, Eligibility for State Funding, and English Language Learning (i.e., leftmost column), and by paragraph and the policy documents to which each is hyperlinked (i.e., Paragraph 1 refers to the *BC School Act*; Paragraph 2 refers to the *International Student Graduation Credit Policy*; Paragraph 3 refers to the *International Student Policy*).

*Table 4.1 Residency Status, Eligibility for State Funding, and English Language Learning*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Paragraph 1</strong></th>
<th><strong>Paragraph 2</strong></th>
<th><strong>Paragraph 3</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residency Status</strong></td>
<td><strong>BC School Act</strong></td>
<td><strong>Int’l St. Graduation Credit Policy</strong></td>
<td><strong>Int’l Student Policy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) “students who have moved from outside Canada to British Columbia”</td>
<td>a) “a student from outside of Canada”</td>
<td>a) “students who are eligible for provincial funding under exceptions in the <em>International Student Policy</em>”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) “students who…do not meet the residency requirements of Section 82 of the School Act”</td>
<td>b) “a student who is in British Columbia for the purpose of obtaining an educational program”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eligibility for State Funding</strong></td>
<td>a) Implied via intertextual link to <em>BC School Act</em></td>
<td>a) “a student…who is…not eligible for provincial or federal funding”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **English Language Learning** | a) “…whose language of instruction in the previous two years of education was neither French nor English” | a) Implied via intertextual reference to the *International Student Graduation Credit Policy* | a) Implied via intertextual reference to the *International Student Policy*
|                            | b) Implied via intertextual link to *International Student Graduation Credit Policy* | |

**Residency Status.** With the phrase “from outside Canada”, found in Paragraphs 1 and 2, the BC Ministry of Education mobilizes a spatio-temporally mediated reference to a student’s length of residence in Canada: they are from “outside”, not from here originally, and “do not

---

32 This entire clause is in fact a manifest intertextual reference (Fairclough, 1992), reproduced in the Glossary definition verbatim, to the *Graduation Program Order* (Ministerial Order 302/04). *This Order* is part of the larger policy nexus in which the category of International Students is embedded, and is mentioned and (hyper-)linked in, the *International Student Graduation Credit Policy* (BCMoe, 2004/2009).
meet the residency requirements of Section 82 of the School Act”. Indeed, as Paragraph 2 reinforces and makes further explicit, in addition to being “from outside Canada”, international students are “not ordinarily resident in British Columbia” and are “in British Columbia for the purpose of obtaining an educational program”. Implied in these descriptors is that international students are neither citizens nor permanent residents of Canada (i.e., are short-term residents), and whose purpose for moving to BC was education-based (i.e., “to obtain an educational program”).

The repetitive nature of phrases explicitly mentioning ‘residency’ (i.e., “do not meet the residency requirements” and “not ordinarily resident”) is, in fact, closely related to international students’ eligibility for State funding.

(In-)Eligibility for state funding.

**Paragraph 1.** The intertextual reference to Section 82 of the *BC School Act* (BCMoE, 1996/2013) in Paragraph 1 of the Glossary is the first example of how the category of “International Students” is discursively constructed as a euphemism for FIS. This section of the School Act is titled “Fees and Deposits” (p. c-66; Figure 4.2).

**Figure 4.2 Section 82 of the BC School Act (BCMoE, 1996/2013, p. c-66)**

**Fees and deposits**

**82** (1) A board must provide free of charge to every student of school age resident in British Columbia and enrolled in an educational program in a school operated by the board, 

(a) instruction in an educational program sufficient to meet the general requirements for graduation, 
(b) instruction in an educational program after the student has met the general requirements for graduation, and 
(c) educational resource materials necessary to participate in the educational program.

(2) For the purposes of subsection (1), a student is resident in British Columbia if the student and the student’s guardian are ordinarily resident in British Columbia.

Because international students are not “residents” of BC, they are ineligible to attend public schools “free of charge” and thus must pay tuition fees to attend public schools.
There are two further features of the Section 82 of the *BC School Act* (BCMoE, 1996/2013) text that require mention at this point, since at the policy level they are implicated in the replacement of the *International Student Policy* (BCMoE, 2001b) by the *Eligibility of Students for Operating Grant Funding* policy (BCMoE, 2011/2013; see Section 4.3). The first is that, unlike the *Glossary* definition, the *BC School Act* makes clear that “the student and the student’s guardian” must be “ordinarily resident” in BC (BCMoE, 1996/2013, p. c-66; my emphases) to be able to attend a school “free of charge”. The second is the phrase “ordinarily resident”, which is not defined in the text of Section 82 (nor anywhere else) in the *BC School Act* and also appears verbatim in paragraph two of the *Glossary* definition. I will discuss each of these (i.e., ‘guardianship’; ‘ordinary residence’), and their fee-paying ramifications for students who are landed immigrants (i.e., permanent residents) and citizens in Canada, in Section 4.3.

**Paragraph 2.** The second instance in the *Glossary* in which “International Students” are constructed indirectly as FIS occurs in the second paragraph, and in relation to the highly specific *International Student Graduation Credit Policy* (BCMoE, 2004/2009), where they are characterized as “not… eligible for provincial or federal funding”.33

**Paragraph 3.** The third instance in which the *Glossary* constructs “International Students” euphemistically as FIS occurs in the third paragraph, which introduces explicit “exceptions” to the definition of “International Students” that it has constructed in its first two paragraphs. The omission of the qualifier “international” in the description of students here (i.e., “students who are eligible for provincial funding”) stands in contrast to the definition of “International Students” that has been worked up in the previous two paragraphs.

The introduction of exceptions is accomplished through a single sentence, and through a hyperlinked reference to the *International Student Policy* (BCMoE, 2001b; Appendix D).

---

33 This has changed, somewhat, with the BC Ministry of Education’s announcement that beginning in 2016 they will offer scholarships for K-12 aged international students to attend BC public educational institutions (see, e.g., BCMoE, 2015c).
Despite its name, and perhaps ironically, this policy was created to “provide Boards of Education with detailed information as to what circumstances would qualify an international student for a provincially funded education” (BCMoE, 2001b, para. 2). In other words, its purpose was to provide information as to how students could be exempt from the restrictions and requirements that would otherwise apply to international students. Of key relevance to this chapter and for focal participants in the study, are two of the exceptions articulated in the policy for students whose guardians:

a) “ha[ve] been admitted to Canada for permanent residence (i.e., landed immigrant) or has applied for permanent residence from within Canada and can substantiate this with documentation from CIC” (BCMoE, 2001b, para. 10)

b) “ha[ve] been admitted for temporary residence in Canada for a term of one year or more and holds a student authorization or employment authorization from CIC” (BCMoE, 2001b, para. 10)

The introduction of “exceptions” in the International Student Policy (BCMoE, 2001b) thus introduces caveats by which would-be international students are “eligible for provincial funding” and thus need not meet the (extra) requirements of the International Student Graduation Credit Policy (BCMoE, 2004/2009).

**Summary.** The very inclusion of criteria and details regarding students’ (in-)eligibility for State funding in the Glossary definition of “International Students” strongly implies, as does the relevance of “exceptions” to those criteria and details (i.e., in Paragraph 3), that (in practice) the issue of how to allocate State funding has been problematic and thus that it requires further elaboration (see also Section 4.3). As I demonstrate in the remainder of this section, this

---

34 A complete list of would-be international students who, based on a list of exceptions, “would qualify” for a State-funded education can be found in Appendix D.
'problematic’ is related both to general State funding for public education but also, and most crucially, to supplemental State funding made available to English Language Learners.

**English language learning.** Though indexed in various ways in paragraphs one and three of the *Glossary*, the notion of English language learning (i.e., or international students’ lack of English proficiency), is introduced explicitly in paragraph two when they are defined as students “whose language of instruction in the previous two years of education was neither French nor English”. In the context of the *International Student Graduation Credit Policy (ISGCP; BCMoE, 2004/2009)* framing the paragraph, a further ascribed meaning is that international students are likely to require special language-related programming and circumstances relating to their accumulation of “Graduation Credits” (i.e., this is why they need a distinct “Graduation Credit Policy”, applicable only to them).

However, for the focal participants in this study, for those at QHS, and for the overwhelming majority of international students in BC’s K-12 public schools, that English – *and not French* – is the ‘official language’ international students have come to BC to learn. According to provincial student statistics, none of the 36 schools under the jurisdiction of the *Conseil scolaire francophone* (District 93) enrol ‘Non-resident’ students (BCMoE, n.d.-e). The mention of ‘official languages’ in the *Glossary* definition is thus perplexing, and may be no more than an example of “the authority of the nation-state as a given” (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, p. 13) manifest in provincial education policy. In fact, since the additional language in which learning occurs for international students in BC is almost universally English, I argue that the very mention of two (official) languages in the *Glossary* definition – i.e., the suggestion that there is a/any relationship between international students and French, French Immersion, or even core
French language education in BC – functions to distance the category of “International Students” from that of English Language Learner.\textsuperscript{35}

The use of an ‘official languages’ discourse to distance international students from the category of ELL, and the notion of (English) language learning to construct the category of international students, however, is most prominent in the hyperlinked \textit{International Student Graduation Credit Policy} (BCMoE, 2004/2009). To date, the ISGCP remains the only K-12 provincial educational policy that includes the words ‘International Student’ in its title. The policy, which works on the premise that “[e]ach year, many students come to British Columbia because they and their parents value the high quality of education provided by the [BC] [high school] education system” (BCMoE, 2004/2009, para. 3), is meant to “provide Boards of Education and independent school authorities with the \textit{flexibility} to offer programs that meet the needs of international students” (BCMoE, 2004/2009, para. 2; my emphasis).

Extract 4.1 (next page) displays language-proficiency related text from paragraphs five (lines 01-05) and six (lines 06-08) of the \textit{International Student Graduation Credit Policy} (ISGCP; BCMoE, 2004/2009). As is evident, international students are positioned in this extract as seemingly longer-term study abroad students, whose “adequate preparation for post-secondary education” (line 01) requires their “enrolment in BC schools” (line 03) and that they “meet all graduation requirements as well as the requirements set out in [the ISGCP]” (lines 06-07; my emphasis). Though these extra requirements are notable for the way they distinguish international from ‘resident’ students, recurring references to language competency (i.e., lines 01-02, 07-08) construct this competency as a salient issue for international students. What is most curious about the ISGCP’s frequent mention of language competency is the discourse of ‘official languages’ (line 08; also lines 01-02) in which competency is framed.

\textsuperscript{35} Further to this point: as Figure 4.3 (pp. 103) illustrates, it is also the case that the BC Ministry of Education’s statistical enumeration of students treats international students (i.e., “Non-Residents”) as a category of student that is separate from students in “French Immersion”.

Extract 4.1 “ways that ensure competence” in the ISGCP (BCMoE, 2004/2009)

01 In order to ensure adequate preparation for post-secondary education and competencies in English or French, this policy requires that international students earn credit for many core courses in the Graduation Program through enrolment in BC schools. Only a limited number of courses in the Graduation Program level may be credited through challenge or equivalency assessments to ensure the international credibility of the Dogwood Diploma. (para.5; my emphasis)

06 Regardless of when students begin their graduation programs, international students must meet all graduation requirements as well as the requirements set out in this policy in ways that ensure competence in one of Canada’s two official languages in order to obtain a Dogwood Diploma. (para. 6; my emphasis)

Of interest in Extract 4.1, is the repetition of ‘ensure’ (i.e., lines 01, 04, 07). In lines 01-05, the parallel semantic relationships made possible through the repetition of ‘ensure’ suggest that the (English) language competence of “International Students” is centrally significant to “international credibility of the Dogwood Diploma” (lines 04-05). The ISGCP’s links between ‘ensuring’ both international students’ (English) language competence and the “international credibility” of the Dogwood Diploma are further indices of how the BC government’s foray into the K-12 international education marketplace is directly linked to ELL education, and suggest a policy agenda that is underwritten by a move to commodify not only (BC) education but also (English as an additional) language (cf. “more parents than ever before want their children to receive an English-language education – and we have growing opportunities to attract and retain a much higher number of international students” [Government of BC, 2012b, p. 14]).

As the analysis of material and discursive sources in this subsection suggests, the notion of English language proficiency is central to the construction of the international student category and the international student industry more generally. An important corollary of this construction is the way in which specific policy, namely the ISGCP (BCMoE, 2004/2009), constructs the (English) language competence of “International Students” as insufficient, and thus international students as potential threat to the value of the BC Dogwood Diploma.

36 The Dogwood Diploma is the name of the certificate awarded to high school graduates in BC.
4.2.2 FIS ≠ ELL: Distinguishing Residency, Funding, and (English) Language Learning

As might be expected, residency status, eligibility for State funding, and English language learning are vital criteria mobilized in the BC Ministry of Education’s tracking of K-12 student demographics and academic achievement. Specifically, criteria relating to residency status and ineligibility for State funding are merged in the label *Non-resident*, as shown in Figure 4.3. Presented in this Figure are student “Headcount” numbers (i.e., #) and percentages (i.e., %) for “All Schools” “All Public Schools” and “All Independent Schools” from the 2009/10 school year to the 2013/2014 school year.

*Figure 4.3 “Student Statistics 2013/14- Public & Independent Schools: Headcount” (BCMoE, 2014b)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>All Schools</th>
<th>All Public Schools</th>
<th>All Independent Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>72433</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>68206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>71606</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>67387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>69625</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>65525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>68155</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>63701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>66365</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>61947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Learner (ELL)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>64808</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>61976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>64461</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>61344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>65277</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>62081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>64714</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>61296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>64810</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>61395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Immersion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>44452</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>43984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>45327</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>44851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>48858</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>46394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>48309</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>47857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>49982</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>48451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>11713</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>9014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>11918</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>9300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>12558</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>13040</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>14135</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other than labels referencing gender (not shown in Fig. 4.3), the Ministry uses four specific labels to identify students in its overall ‘Headcount’ of students: *Aboriginal, English Language Learner (ELL), French Immersion,* and *Non-residents*. The category *Non-Residents*, here synonymous with FIS, refers to “Students who are not ordinarily residents and whose parents/guardians are not residents of British Columbia” (BCMoE, 2012, p. 99).
The most significant material implication of the *Non-resident* label, however, is the way in which it distinguishes FIS from ELLs. This is because what FIS and ELLs most often have in common is that their L1 is “other than English [and] [f]or this reason, [that] they require additional services in order to develop their individual potential within British Columbia’s school system” (BCMoe, 2009/2013, p. 4). But because *Non-residents* are enumerated separately from *English language learners* in BC Ministry of Education statistics (i.e., as exemplified in Figure 4.3), FIS’ omnipresent need for “additional [ELL] services” within the K-12 public school system is not officially recognized or represented in provincial student statistics. This means that in effect, in a large majority of cases, FIS are unrecognized, unfunded, and unofficial ELLs: “[ELLs] may be immigrants or may be born in Canada. Schools should ensure that students are entitled to educational services in British Columbia public schools by verifying their age, residency, and immigration status.” (BCMoe, 2009/2013, p. 4).

The BC Ministry of Education’s treatment of “International Students” as a category of student that is different from English language learners, both for the purpose of funding allocation and delivery of ELL services, is an issue of considerable urgency given the already stigmatized status of ELL services, teaching, and learning at QHS, in BC, and more generally (see e.g., Chapter 2, subsection 2.2.1; Chapter 3, subsection 3.2.3). It is also, as I demonstrate in Chapters 7-9, an issue of considerable urgency and importance in the lived experiences of FIS students themselves.

**4.2.3 Summary**

Using the BC Ministry of Education’s policy *Glossary* definition of “International Students” as a point of departure, in section 4.2 I have presented an analysis of how the category of FIS is discursively constructed across a complex nexus of intertextually-linked, official BCMoe documents. I have shown how the notions of residency status, eligibility for State

---

37 This is the BC Ministry of Education’s own (2004/2009) definition of ELL.
funding, and English language learning play a central role in how “International Students” are used to work up a version of “International Students” in these documents. Most importantly, I have shown that the BC Ministry of Education category of “International Student” is in fact a euphemism for fee-paying international student (FIS), and that a pivotal feature of this euphemistic definition is its contrastive relationship to another BC Ministry of Education category: English Language Learner (ELL).

**4.3 Discursive (Policy) Shifts: Expanding the Range of “International Students”**

Sometime after October 2012, the BCMoE updated its *Glossary* definition of “International Students” (Figure 4.4). Comparison of the two versions (Figures 4.1 and 4.4) highlights two changes in the *Glossary* definition and evidence of a discursive shift in the BC Ministry of Education’s policy approach to both international students and international education more broadly. The first change, at the end of Paragraph 2, is the removal of the clause which referred to Canada’s official languages or “language of instruction”. The second change, in Paragraph 3, is the replacement of the previously dead-link to an *International Student Policy* (BCMoE, 2001b; cf. Figure 4.1) with a hyperlinked intertextual reference (Fairclough, 1992) to a new policy entitled *Eligibility of Students for Operating Grant Funding* (BCMoE, 2011/2013). I discuss each of these changes separately below.

*Figure 4.4. BCMoE (n.d.-c) Policy Glossary: “International Students” (screen shot: ~Oct. 2014)*

**International Students**

Students who have moved from outside of Canada to British Columbia and do not meet the residency requirements of Section 82 of the *School Act*.

For the purposes of the *International Student Graduation Credit Policy 2009*, an international student is a student from outside of Canada who is in British Columbia for the purpose of obtaining an educational program, is not ordinarily resident in British Columbia nor eligible for provincial or federal funding.

Note that students who are eligible for provincial funding under the exceptions listed in the *Eligibility of Students for Operating Grant Funding* do not need to meet the requirements of the International Student Graduation Credit Policy.
4.3.1 Removal of ‘official language’

In paragraph two of the new Glossary definition (BCMoE, n.d.-c), the clause which once described International Students as students “whose language of instruction in the previous two years of education was neither French nor English” (see Figures 4.1 vs. Figure 4.4) has been removed. This removal facilitates a broadening of the definition of “International Students” in two ways, both of which relate to the notion of (English) language learning and further establish the relational link between the categories of FIS and ELL.

The first way in which the updated Glossary definition works to make the definition of “International Students” more flexible is through the deletion of any mention of official languages. Interpretable as the elimination of an explicit link between the ‘official’ definition of ‘International Students’ and (English) language learning, the removal is reminiscent of what Irvine and Gal (2000) have called erasure: a process whereby the notion of insufficient (English) language competency has become so naturalized to the category of “International Students” that it need not be mentioned in the Glossary, thus can be relegated to a more subtle, yet equally implicative, embedding in the hyperlinked International Student Graduation Credit Policy (BCMoE, 2004/2009).

The second way in which the updated Glossary definition works to expand the definition of “International Students” is by removing mention of length of time (i.e., “in the previous two years of education”). In so doing, this definition articulates a set of circumstances in which students who have studied English or French for more than two years in Canada can also be subjected to the requirements of the International Student Graduation Credit Policy (ISGCP; BCMoE, 2004/2009). Given the ISGCP’s stated goal of protecting the credibility of the Dogwood Diploma (see, e.g., section 4.2.1 above), the removal of this temporal reference implies that “International Students” require more than two years of study in English to satisfy the requirements needed to earn a Dogwood Diploma.
While the removal of official languages-related wording in the *Glossary* definition provides further evidence of the connections between “International Students” and English language learning, in what follows I focus on a more obvious index of the BC Ministry of Education’s changing orientation to the category of “International Students” and international education more generally: the replacement of the *International Student Policy* (BCMoE, 2001b) with a policy called the *Eligibility of Students for Operating Grant Funding* policy (BCMoE, 2011/2013).

### 4.3.2 On the Change in Policy from ISP to ESOGF

Since 2001, the most notable change to BCMoE policy relevant to international students has been the replacement of the *International Student Policy* (*ISP*; BCMoE, 2001b) with the *Eligibility of Students for Operating Grant Funding* policy (*ESOGF*; BCMoE, 2011/2013). The phrase ‘Operating Grant Funding’ in the policy title refers to two types of funding. The first is the general fund made available to school districts per full time student enrolled at a school in their district. The second type of funding is supplementary to the first; it is proffered by the BC Ministry of Education to school districts on a per student basis for students who have been identified as English Language Learners (ELLs).

Despite the fact that both the old and new policies list 10 identical “exceptions” under which international students can be eligible for provincially funded public education, the wording and focus of the new policy index and articulate the BCMoE’s change in stance towards “International Students”. Part of this change in stance is realized in more material ways. For example, there are differences between the old and new policies in terms of length, layout, and surface content:

- The *ISP* does not include information that would assist in interpreting the “exceptions” it lists, whereas the *ESOGF* has extended definitions of key terms on which interpretations
of the “exceptions” hinge (i.e., “guardianship” [BCMoE, 2011/2013, para. 5-11];
“ordinarily resident” [para. 12]);

- The ISP has an entire section called “International Students Living without Parental,
Guardian or Adult Supervision” (BCMoE, 2001b, para. 11-13) which articulates the
responsibilities of School Districts toward the health and welfare of “International
Students”. However, the ESOGF policy has no wording related to the responsibilities of
school boards for the care and welfare of ISs.38

The ESOGF’s provision of extended definitions of key-terms (i.e., “guardianship” and
“ordinarily resident”), as well as its additional intertextually-linked references to constrain the
interpretation of these terms, suggests that: (a) these key-terms have in the past been sources of
dispute, ambiguity, or misinterpretation, and (b) that the BC Ministry of Education had a clear
interest, be it educational, economic, or otherwise, in decreasing the possibility of dispute,
ambiguity, or misinterpretation.

The BC Ministry of Education has, in fact, framed the change from ISP to ESOGF as a
response to the “appropriative practices” (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011, p. 8; cf. Talmy, 2015)
of “International Students” and their parents in the interpretation of BCMoE policy. Blommaert
and Rampton (2011) describe “appropriative practices” as one of the “empirical challenge[s] that
diversity presents to presumptions of shared knowledge”; and though their discussion refers
specifically to “non-standard mixed language practices” (p. 8), here I extend their notion to
discuss interpretative practices (see, e.g., Chapter 2, subsection 2.3.1, p. 32).

In the case of the BC Ministry of Education’s decision to replace the original ISP with
the ESOGF, the “norms” that are ‘manufactured, interrogated, or altered’ relate to the

38 Unrelated to the ESOGF, recently developed draft policy relevant to K-12 international education does include
language related specifically to the Pastoral Care provided to FIS (BCMoE, 2013a). This draft policy is framed
within the discourse of “Quality Assurance”, and relates to the BC Ministry of Education’s work to cultivate a
‘brand’ of education concerned with the legal responsibilities to care for FIS students – who are often not yet legally
considered to be adults.
identification and arguably agentive utilisation of “loopholes” by would-be international students and their parents. Indeed, a BC Ministry of Education representative reported that the rationale for the change in policies was that: “Districts advised that the funding categories for non-residents as articulated in the old policy had loopholes under which students who should have been fee-paying international students were attempting to access public funding.” (MR3, personal communication, 06 December 2013). In what follows I argue that in the shift from the ISP to the ESOGF, these loopholes, constructed by MR3 as being exploited by the ‘appropriative practices’ of students, become a site of interpretative struggle which at once index and are emblematic of socialization through the use of (policy) language and socialization to use (policy) language (cf. Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986).

Policy titles. The BC Ministry of Education’s change in stance is keyed initially through the title of the new policy. This is manifest in the way the ESOGF foregrounds the importance of eligibility for State funding in the actual title; rather than a noun which describes a specific category of students and thus denotes who the policy is ‘for’ (i.e., “International Student Policy”), the new title is a noun describing a quality that can be applied to any student (“Eligibility of Students for Operating Grant Funding”). More specifically, because the new policy is not explicitly linked to international students in any way other than its being hyperlinked in the Glossary definition of “International Students”, the policy is now more flexible, allowing its consequences and implications where (in-)eligibility for State funding is concerned (i.e., fee-paying status) to become indisputably applicable to/for a wider range of students – not just “International Students”.

Policy statements and rationales. A comparison of the first two paragraphs of each policy, titled “Policy Statement” and “Rationale” respectively, further indexes the BCMoE’s change in stance (Table 4.2). I discuss each in further detail below.
Table 4.2 Change in BCMoE Stance on International Students: Old and New Policy Rationales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Statement (Paragraph 1)</th>
<th>(Old) International Student Policy (2001- May 2011)</th>
<th>(New) Eligibility of Students for Operating Grant Funding (May 2011-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International students are not eligible for a provincially funded education, as they do not meet residency requirements. This policy outlines the limited exceptions to this rule for international students who wish to attend public school. (BCMoE, 2001b, para. 1)</td>
<td>This policy outlines the circumstances in which the Ministry of Education will provide operating grant funding to boards of education for students enrolling in their district. (BCMoE 2011/2013, para.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale or purpose of policy (Paragraph 2)</td>
<td>The Ministry of Education provides resident children, as defined below, a free education. Due to a variety of circumstances, some international students could be regarded as “ordinarily resident.” This policy provides Boards of Education with detailed information as to what circumstances would qualify an international student for a provincially funded education.” (BCMoE, 2001b, para.2)</td>
<td>The policy ensures that the Ministry of Education provides operating grant funding to boards of education in a fair and equitable way. This policy is not intended to enable a person whose primary purpose for coming to British Columbia is to attend a public school and who would normally be charged tuition fees to avoid paying those fees. (BCMoE 2011/2013, para. 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of the “Policy Statement” in the old and new documents, similar to the change in titles between the new and old policies, exhibits the removal of the mention of “International Students”, in both name and focus. The action the policy describes itself accomplishing shifts as a result: for example, rather than “outlin[ing] the limited exceptions to [the] rule” by which international students would normally have to pay fees (ISP; BCMoE, 2001b), the new policy articulates its goal as being to “outline the circumstances under which the [BCMoE] would provide funding to boards of education” for any student (ESOGF; BCMoE, 2011/2013).

Whereas the old ISP policy acted to assist in identifying how “International Students”, because of exceptional circumstances, could be eligible for State funding, the new ESOGF policy action is to outline a more general set of “circumstances” under which even students “meeting the residency requirements” could be categorised as ‘fee-payers’ and assessed tuition fees.

Differences in the wording of the “Rationale or Purpose” (Table 4.2) presented in the old and new policy documents further index the BC Ministry of Education’s orientation to the “appropriative practices” (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011) of would-be international students. In place of the old ISP’s focus on “information” to help “Boards of Education” understand how
“international students” could be deemed “ordinarily resident” and thus qualify for “free public education” (BCMoE, 2001b), the new *ESOGF* policy focuses instead on the Ministry’s “fair and equitable” provision of “operating grant funding” to “boards of education” (BCMoE, 2011/2013). In addition to the removal of any mention of “international students” in the *ESOGF* rationale is the removal of any wording related to residency or residency status. This is because the “loopholes” around which students’ appropriative practices became relevant had precisely to do with residency status (see next paragraph). Also juxtaposed in the policy language of the *ISP* and the *ESOGF* are BC Ministry of Education orientations to education as a holistic endeavour (i.e., “free public education” and “provincially funded education” [*ISP]*) versus education as a business-like, more technical ‘operation’ (i.e., “operating grant funding” [*ESOGF*]).

But apart from the aforementioned difference in the policies, the clearest indices of the BC Ministry of Education’s change in stance are perhaps found in the policy language which positions the practices of international students (and the Ministry itself in relation to those practices). Unlike the old *ISP*, whose stated aim is to “provide detailed information as to what circumstances would qualify an international student for a provincially funded education” (BCMoE, 2001b, para. 2), the new *ESOGF* policy (BCMoE, 2011/2013) articulates what its outlining of the same exceptions “is not intended to enable” (i.e., “a person whose primary purpose for coming to British Columbia is to attend a public school and who would normally be charged tuition fees to avoid paying those fees”, para.2). Through this reframing, would-be international students are constructed as having appropriated the previous policy to their own advantage (i.e., to have taken measures “to avoid paying those fees”) and hence as morally corrupt; the BC Ministry of Education’s own position on these types of “appropriative practices” (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011), namely, that they are unacceptable, is also implied in the wording changes and greater aims of the new *ESOGF* document.
**The education-migration nexus.** When considered together with the comparative differences in policy titles and “Policy statements”, the shift in the policy “Rationale” is perhaps the most salient manifestation of the BC Ministry of Education’s discursive work to position would-be international students as potentially unscrupulous (ab)users of the BC educational system. An important corollary of this positioning work is the articulation of links between BC’s K-12 international education sector and (im-)migration processes. Robertson (2013) has described such links as part of ‘the education migration nexus’, which she understands as …both a political and a social process, emblematic of the emerging acknowledgement that the internationalization of education is deeply implicated in broader social transformations taking place across national, transnational and global scales (Stromquist and Monkman, 2000; Mok, 2003; Collins, 2004, 2010; Huang and Yeoh, 2005; Lewis, 2005; Waters, 2005). (pp. 3-4)

In the context of BC, acknowledgement of the link between international education and immigration processes, and the influential role of this link “in broader social transformations”, is made evident in processes like the change from the *ISP* (BCMoE, 2001b) to the *ESOGF* (BCMoE, 2011/2013). In material terms, this influence has been that immigration statuses which once guaranteed unquestionable provision of “free public education” – that is, permanent residency or Canadian citizenship – are no longer recognized in BC as *de facto* qualifications for the provision of “free public education”.

During a research interview with two representatives from the BC Ministry of Education, I asked if they would mind speaking about why the policy had been changed (i.e., from *ISP* [2001b] to *ESOGF* [2011/2013]). One of the representatives (MR1) asked if I meant “the residency piece” (BCMoE:397). Following my clarification of the question, the following interaction occurred.
Extract 4.2 “tightened up the policy” (BCMoE:401-409 [33:58-34:27])

01 MR1: they m- you know we saw large numbers [of (im-)migrants] move here, buy property, leave.
02 (smiling)) .tch .hh but their kids stayed here
03 RD: to go to school
04 MR1: a:nd go to school but the parents didn’t l live here, didn’t contribute to the tax base, didn’t (.) you know
05 06 RD: right
07 MR1: and uh so um uh tightened up the policy to kind of, jus- uh we-, you know c- we have to be able to afford the system that we offer (.) and uh so [it’s]
08 RD: [as a sort of legal recourse I suppose]
09 MR1: mm hmm.
10 RD: if necessary
11 MR1: mm hmm. to- so um: international students are students who- (.) whose uh- whose guardian does not normally reside here

As a means for responding to my query about the change in policy, in lines 01-02 MR1 draws on resources relating to the (im-)migration-related practices of parents (e.g., “we saw large numbers move here, buy property, leave.”) and their school-aged children (e.g., “but their kids stayed here”). Interesting work to position the immigration-related practices of parents is accomplished through the terminative drop in pitch (“leave.”, line 01), and further through MR1’s smiling, subsequent tongue click, in-breath, and use of the contrastive conjunction “but” (line 02). Because these features of the talk offer a context in which to hear the utterance “their kids stay here” (line 02), MR1 implies that these immigration-related actions were not for their permanent settlement purposes; rather, albeit elided from MR1’s suggestion, is that the “kids stayed here” for education purposes. My line 03 utterance “to go to school” suggests that I have heard MR1’s line 01-02 in just this way, thus confirming the implicative meaning of MR1’s line 02 utterance. Indeed, given the context of the interview (i.e., as part of a research study about K-12 international education in BC) and the specific question I had posed about reasons for the change from ISP to ESOGF, these resources work up a relationship between (im-)migration practices, K-12 international education, and the change in policy.

In line 04, following an affirmation of my interpretation (“a:nd go to school”), MR1 contrasts (im-)migrant kids’ attending public schools with a specific results of their parents’ having left BC (i.e., that they “didn’t contribute to the tax base”). This contrast, in concert with
MR1’s candidate rationale for the BC Ministry of Education having “tightened up the policy” (e.g., “we have to be able to afford the system that we offer”, lines 07-08), work again to establish links between (im-)migration, K-12 international education, and the change in policy. The description that MR1 has marshaled to this point, bolstered by extralinguistic features (e.g., line 02), lexical choices (e.g., “tightened up”), and implicature which suggests that (im-)migrant parents not contributing to the tax base (line 04) has had a marked impact on the government’s ability “to afford the system we offer” (lines 07-08), construct the change in policy as a means for obstructing the ‘appropriative practices’ of educational (im-)migrants.

Here it is important to note that for most of the decade prior the replacement of the ISP (BCMoe, 2001b) with the ESOGF (BCMoe, 2011/2013), policies aimed at obstructing the ‘appropriative practices’ being described in Extract 4.2 were not considered necessary by either the BC Ministry of Education or Citizenship and Immigration Canada. In the case of the BC Ministry of Education, for example, research conducted as early as 2001 reported on high schoolers whose parents received permanent residency status through the Immigrant Investor Program, bought property, but then left their kids on their own to attend BC public schools (e.g., Waters, 2001a, 2001b, 2003). Citizenship and Immigration Canada, on the other hand, had, until it terminated the federal Immigrant Investor Program in 2014, granted investors and their families unconditional “permanent residence in exchange for a guaranteed $800,000 loan (before 2010, the amount was only $400,000)” (CIC, 2014a, para. 6). In fact, MR1’s construction of (im-)migrant parents “not contributing to the tax base” (line 04) is strikingly similar to Citizenship and Immigration Canada’s rationale for terminating the Immigrant Investor Program:

Most immigrant investors are not making a long-term positive economic contribution to Canada. They report employment and investment income below Canadian averages …

Over a 20-year career, an immigrant investor pays about $200,000 less in income taxes than a federal skilled worker... (CIC, 2014c, para. 4).
Finally, in lines 12-13 of Extract 4.2, MR1 produces a definition of international students (e.g., “students…whose guardian does not normally reside here”; cf. Figures 4.1 and 4.4), and in so doing topicalizes two of the key criteria used to identify fee-paying students in the new *ESOGF* (BCMoE, 2011/2013) policy: “guardianship” and “ordinarily resident”.

**Guardianship.** Though the term “guardianship” was not specifically included in the *ISP* (BCMoE, 2001b), the *ESOGF* (BCMoE, 2011/2013) clarifies that “guardianship” is meant in the legal sense (i.e., that none other than a student’s biological or legally adoptive parents, or legally surrogate guardians can qualify as the student’s guardian for the purpose of obtaining free public education) (BCMoE, 2011/2013, para. 7-9).

The *ESOGF* (BCMoE, 2011/2013) does not provide a rationale for the inclusion of the term, or its overtly legalistic orientation. I argue that the need for the term “guardianship” to be included in the *ESOGF* indexes its relevance as a site of interpretative disagreement or conflict; this was borne out in my experiences in the field, having spoken with many recent immigrant students, and in research interview accounts generated with representatives from the Pateo District’s International Education program (IEP:299-464). These research experiences suggest that the BCMoE wanted to ‘tighten up the policy’ (Extract 4.2, line 07) around the meaning of “guardianship” for two potential reasons. Prior to its clarification in the *ESOGF*, (im-)migrants’ appropriative practices around the (interpretation of the) term ‘guardianship’ had led to:

- situations in which students without permanent residency status (PR) or Canadian citizenship would reside with an adult - i.e., a biological relative or family friend – who did have PR status or Canadian citizenship, and apply for free public education claiming that adult to be their ‘guardian’; and
- situations in which students with PR status or Canadian citizenship status had been receiving free public education, but were residing with adults who also had PR or
citizenship status but were not the student’s legal guardians (i.e., students’ biological parents were not, according to the BC School Act or the ESOGF, ‘ordinarily resident’).

**Ordinarily resident.** The newly added section on “ordinary residence” in the *ESOGF* (BCMoE, 2011/2013, para. 15-22) includes a lengthy list of 11 “positive” and seven “negative indicators” which School Districts can use to determine whether (im-)migrant students and their legal guardians have been “ordinarily resident”, and resultantly, whether a student receives free public education or not.\(^{39}\)

At the same time, the *ESOGF* policy (BCMoE, 2011/2013) also provides School Districts greater flexibility where the interpretation of “ordinarily resident” is concerned. This flexibility was necessary because, as MR1 has suggested in Extract 4.2 (line 01), in addition to buying property many (im-)migrant families had been granted permanent residency status. In effect, the BC Ministry of Education recognized the “loopholes” in the old *ISP* (BCMoE, 2001b) as unanticipated results of the federal Immigrant Investor and Entrepreneurial Programs (CIC, 2014a, 2014b); indeed, Ley (2010) has demonstrated convincingly that among immigrants from these programs, “children’s education” was reported to be of much greater significance than were “economic prospects” (p. 77; also see, e.g., Ley, 2003). Below I quote three areas of the *ESOGF* text in which this flexibility is indexed, followed by a brief analysis.

**Extract 4.3 From Eligibility of Students for Operating Grant Funding (BCMoE, 2011/2013)**

> 01 ...the applicant [i.e., student and student’s “guardian”] must show, on the basis of objective evidence, that they have established a regular, habitual mode of life in the community with a sufficient degree of continuity which has persisted despite temporary absences. It is not enough to qualify for free public education that the applicant has taken up residence for the ‘settled purpose’ that the children of the family receive public education. (para. 17)

\(^{39}\)The section of the *ESOGF* (BCMoE, 2011/2013) dealing with “ordinary residence” clearly outlines that the responsibility for determining a student’s eligibility for free public education belongs to individual School Districts and not the BC Ministry of Education (i.e., “Boards of education must determine... whether an applicant falls within the definition of “ordinarily resident” for the purposes of Section 82 of the School Act.” [para. 15]). By making this determination the responsibility of School Districts, the BC Ministry of Education remains both removed from the process and legally able to recoup the costs for any errors in classification made by an individual school board (i.e., “Boards of Education must ensure that the criteria for provincial education funding are met. Boards will be required to reimburse the Ministry if students who are not eligible for funding are claimed for funding purposes.” [para. 33]).
Boards of education are entitled to scrutinize the purpose for which the person or family has established its residence in the community to prevent an abuse of the system under which higher fees may lawfully be charged for out of province/international students. (para. 18)

Immigration status is relevant but does not determine ordinary residence. The determination of whether a person is ordinarily resident should never be based solely on the person’s immigration status. (para. 21)

According to the policy, the benefits associated with the long-term potential for receiving free public education in BC have resulted in families “take[ing] up residence for the ‘settled purpose’ that the children of the family receive public education” (para. 17, lines 04-05). But not only does this construction of im/migrants’ reason for ‘settling’ in Canada rest on a presumption that their ‘purpose’ is static, unchanging, and impervious to changing familial, economic, or even social or educational circumstances or contexts; more crucially here, this construction makes possible the denial of (im-)migrant families’ right to free public education (to which, as permanent residents and/or citizens of Canada, they would otherwise have been guaranteed – and arguably have paid for). The possibility to use this new policy to trump the legal rights of im/migrants becomes most evident in a later paragraph of the ESOGF, which states explicitly that “immigration status is relevant but does not determine ordinary residence” (para. 21, line 01) and that decisions about free public education “should never be based solely on the person’s immigration status” (para. 21, line 02).

In addition to the ways in which the Purpose and Rationale of the ESOGF (BCMoe, 2011/2013) mark a discursive shift away from the ISP (2001) in relation to international education and the definition of “international student”, the inclusion of strictly demarcated definitions of “guardianship” and “ordinary residency” in the ESOGF index specific sites of interpretative struggle, and the economizing ‘appropriative practices’ of both families seeking public education and institutions governing the provision of it. Significantly, as the exchange in Extract 4.4 (below) documents, the ESOGF’s work to expand the interpretation of “ordinarily resident” also resulted in material shifts with symbolic relevance.
The account in Extract 4.4 is from research interview with a representative from the International Education Program (IEP) in the Pateo School District where QHS was located. Just prior to Extract 4.4, I had asked IEP about the BC Ministry of Education’s implementation of the new ESOGF (BCMoE, 2011/2013). Though the administrator claimed not be aware of any policy change at the Ministry level, when I explained that the ESOGF was about permanent resident students whose parents might not live in BC, the following exchange occurred:

Extract 4.4 “it’s about the residency of the parents” (IEP:320-331)

01 IEP: it’s about the residency of the parents if you, in terms-
02 RD: significant ties
03 IEP: if you read the [BC] School Act’s part
04 RD: it- exactly yeah so fascinating
05 IEP: so we have a number of students, probably at least twenty uh, in our program
06 RD: right
07 IEP: so they’re paying tuition fees the same way u- international students are
08 RD: but they’re PR [permanent residents]
09 IEP: but they could be Canadian
10 RD: right
11 IEP: or landed immigrant [PR]

As the IEP representative reports, there are “at least twenty uh in our program” (line 05) who are either permanent residents (line 11) or citizens of Canada (line 09) but who have been identified as not meeting the residency requirements necessary to receive free public education and thus, in spite of their immigration status, pay fees to attend public school. This is because now, explicitly, “Boards of education are entitled to scrutinize the purpose for which the person or family has established its residence” (Extract 4.3, para. 18, lines 01-02). That is: School Districts now have the authority to re-specify the meaning of federal immigration categories (lines 07-11).

4.3.3 Neoliberal Multiculturalism: Economizing Logics and (Linguacultural) Agendas

That the BC Ministry of Education has granted Boards of Education the authority to re-specify federal immigration categories presents one example of how neoliberalization can function as “a new strategy of governance that reaches well beyond economic reforms” (Hale, 2005, p. 10). But at the same time, by recognizing and responding to the economizing ‘appropriative practices’ of (im-)migrant students’ and their parents, the shift from the ISP
(BCMoE, 2001b) to the ESOGF (BCMoE, 2011/2013) is a reminder that the BC Ministry of Education’s has recognizable ‘appropriative practices’ of its own. The ESOGF, which is meant to “prevent an abuse of the system under which higher fees may lawfully be charged for out of province/international students” (para. 18; see Extract 4.5, lines 07-08), becomes a rich site for understanding neoliberalism “as a mutable, inconsistent, and variegated process that circulates through the discourses it constructs, justifies, and defends” (Springer, 2012, p. 135). Indeed, as Springer notes: “the issue is not about a purported reality…where neoliberalism is seen as an end, but the interpretation of cultural constructs (Duncan & Ley, 1993), wherein neoliberalism becomes a means” (2012, p. 142).

The ESOGF (BCMoE, 2011/2013) granted School Districts the authority to re-specify the meaning of federally defined immigration categories for the local purpose of assessing and collecting tuition fees, facilitating a form of what has been called neoliberal multiculturalism (e.g., Hale, 2005; Muehlmann, 2009). By granting this authority, not only were the legal practices of a particular group of im/migrants framed and evaluated from a standpoint that indexed the BC Ministry of Education’s oppositional (and seemingly antagonistic) ideological orientation toward those practices; it articulated for School Boards the right to exercise a form of “exclusion,” resulting in a “neoliberal incarnation of multiculturalism: a restructuring of the political arena that drives a wedge between claiming cultural rights and claiming control over the resources necessary for those rights to be realized” (Muehlmann, 2009, p. 476, paraphrasing Hale, 2005). In this case, cultural rights were those associated with im/migration status, in which permanent residency or citizenship are presumed to automatically confer on those who held them the right to receive a free public education. Claiming control over the resources necessary for those rights to be realized, however, became a site of interpretative struggle, and not least so because both sides were “engaging with neoliberal frames and agendas and reworking their common sense in response” (Hall & O’Shea, 2013b, p. 10; also, e.g., Hall, Massey, & Rustin,
2013a). While the appropriative practices of im/migrants (may have) included the use of these frames to economize interpretations of ‘guardianship’, being ‘ordinarily resident’, and education policy for their (children’s educational) benefit, the BC Ministry of Education’s (and School Districts’) appropriative practices used the same frames to characterize these appropriative practices as morally suspect, and, where necessary, to treat im/migrants’ status as permanent residents or citizens as little more than a ruse to avoid paying tuition fees to attend public schools. Because both forms of appropriative practice relate specifically to international education, they are illustrative of both the polycentric nature of the educational marketplace in which they are being played out and the notion that within such a marketplace, “practices never cease to comply with an economi[zing] logic” (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 122).

Of import for this study, and for the category of international student specifically, is the following: at the same time that the ESOGF (BCMoE, 2011/2013) provided local school districts recourse to collect tuition fees from permanent residents and citizens of Canada, the result was an undisclosed expansion of the category of international student to include citizens and permanent residents. And they too, like international students, could be charged tuition fees, be enumerated as ‘non-residents’ in provincial statistics, and in applicable cases, have their eligibility for State-funded ELL support rescinded.

The ‘appropriative practices’ and interpretative struggle amidst which replacement of the ISP (BCMoE, 2001b) with the ESOGF (BCMoE, 2011/2013) occurred are thus, following Muehlmann (2009, p. 477), a vital reminder that economizing practices and interpretative struggles are not just about (international) education; that this instance can serve simultaneously as a site for and index of larger ideological struggles relating to nationalism, immigration, official language(s), and even legitimate uses of neoliberal frames and agendas. In the case of the ESOGF (BCMoE, 2011/2013), for example, the policy response to im/migrants’ educational practices and its attendant flexibility to re-specify notions such as permanent residency and
citizenship, is evidence of scalar (i.e., local, national, global) struggles about “how cultural difference should be recognized and what constitutes that difference in the first place” (Muehlmann, 2009, p. 477).

**4.3.4 ‘Neoliberal’ (Language) Socialization, Socializing ‘Neoliberal’ (Language)**

Thus, a full decade after the ‘neoliberal frames and agendas’ (e.g., Fallon & Paquette, 2009; Fallon & Poole, 2013; Kuehn, 2002) underwriting *Bill 34 – The School Amendment Act* (Bill 34, 2002) had articulated both a decrease in governmental responsibility to fund education and a ‘hands-off’ approach to international education (i.e., responsibility for the recruitment and management of FIS was that of School Districts alone; see subsection 4.1.3), the BC Ministry of Education’s replacement of the *ISP* (BCMoE, 2001b) with the *ESOGF* (BCMoE, 2011/2013) suggests a shift to a markedly more *hands-on* approach. This shift in the BCMoE approach, framed as a response to the appropriative practices of im/migrant students and the evolution of the (fee-paying) international student presence and industry in the province, offers a convenient reminder that “The implications for the current [or any] neoliberal moment is that it is just that, a transitory moment on its way to becoming something else” (Springer, 2012, p. 142).

What is more, the divergent interpretations and practices central to the replacement of the *ISP* (BCMoE, 2001b) with the *ESOGF* (BCMoE, 2011/2013), present an empirical example of socialization through the use of (policy) language and socialization to use (policy) language (cf. Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986). While the process through which the *ESOGF* (BCMoE, 2011/2013) came to exist illustrates a situated instance of “the workings of power, agency, and multidirectionality in socialization, and its contingent, at times conflictual character” (Talmy, 2015, pp. 354), the interpretative conflict and appropriative practices which are indexed in this process must also be understood as part of a larger (though not necessarily cohesive) policy narrative. That is to say: the emergence of the *ESOGF* represents just one of a scaled series of “temporally locatable… institutional moments of discursive production” that constitute a much
larger “discursive shift” (da Silva & Heller, 2009, p. 113; Heller, 2012) in the BC government’s stance on international education specifically at the K-12 level.

Extract 4.5 is taken from my research interview with two BC Ministry of Education representatives in late 2012. Just prior to line 01, we had been discussing tensions in how school districts market their schools and attempt to recruit students at overseas international education fairs (BCMoE: 77-95). MR1 had referenced Bill 34 – The School Amendment Act (BCMoE, 2002) by noting that because “School Districts are in fact separate legal entities” (BCMoE: 94):

**Extract 4.5. “a strong policy interest” (BCMoE: 96-108)**

01 MR1: to date you know we have not been very intrusive in their [School Districts’] international,
02 RD: right
03 MR1: but um we recognize that as the program grows that from a- p-a, that the government has a strong policy interest here in ensuring the integrity of the brand, and so
04 RD: yeah yeah
05 MR1: we in fact have a newly minted um uh .tch framework, and uh we’re just in the process of kind of
06 RD: mm
07 MR1: affirming kind of that we’ve gotten it right
08 RD: mm
09 MR1: you know with our partner School Districts and uh
10 RD: mm
11 MR1: but uh the expectation is that there’s going to be much stronger regulation to ensure that the
12 RD: the industry itself
13 MR1: the quality- we’re not uh, when we bring um students here uh, and I when I say we I mean the global
14 RD: we, I mean the provincial kind of
15 MR1: we mean the provincial kind of
16 RD: sure sure sure
17 MR1: education, educators, that they’re um they’re uh assured a very quality experience

MR1’s talk in Extract 4.5 notes specifically the BC Ministry of Education’s more ‘hands-on’ approach to international education (lines 01-05). In addition to contrasting the Ministry (“we”, lines 01, 04; “the government”, line 04) with school districts (“their”, line 01; “School Districts”, line 10) as individually-distinct-yet-’partnered’ (line 10) stakeholders, MR1’s talk also includes two other indices of the larger discursive shift to reframe international education in BC. The first is the explicit mention of “a newly minted framework” (line 07); the second is the displayed orientation to and construction of international students as highly informed consumers of educational products who require “much stronger regulation to ensure…that they’re assured a quality experience” (lines 12, 17). This same orientation also positions the distinct stakeholders
here (i.e., the BC Ministry of Education and School Districts) as competent (and culpable) providers of a “very quality experience”, and the to-be-affirmed policy as a would-be guarantor of ‘quality’ for international students.

The “newly minted framework” to which MR1 refers in line 07, is in fact titled the “K-12 International Education Strategic Framework and Plan” (BCMoE, 2013a, p. 30), and, like the ESOGF (BCMoE, 2011/2013), is also temporally locatable as part of a larger discursive shift in the BC government’s framing of K-12 international education. Other initiatives and documents that emerged as part of this larger discursive shift were, for example:

- the creation, in January of 2012, of an International Education branch of the BCMoE’s Governance, Legislation, and Regulation Division (BCMoE, n.d.-a) and appointment of a K-12 Director of International Education (BCMoE:151-161);

- a series of five “Regional Roundtables” in 2013 that recognized “the increasing importance of international education to the province’s education system and economy”, sought to draw on the knowledge and expertise of varied levels of stakeholders with the goal of developing “the right types of policies and regulations that [could] mitigate risk[s] [to the industry] without impeding the sector’s entrepreneurialism” (BCMoE, 2013a, p. 1); and

- the release of a report based on information and feedback generated through conversations with stakeholders at “Regional Roundtables” (BCMoE, 2013a).

At the same time that the BC government’s specific efforts where K-12 education is concerned are evidence of the importance of ‘International Education’ to that specific sector, the BC government has also framed ‘International Education’ as having a central role in the province’s long-term economic health (e.g., BCCIE, 2013, 2011; Government of BC, 2012a, 2012b; Kunin & Associates, 2013, 2011).
Perhaps not coincidentally, BC’s provincial efforts are occurring alongside those of Canada’s federal government, whose own efforts to reframe ‘International Education’ as having a vital role the country’s long-term economic health warrant mention. The federal government’s efforts can be traced to commissioned reports (i.e., Illuminate Consulting Group, 2009, 2011; Kunin & Associates, 2009), updates to those reports (Kunin & Associates, 2012), federal level advisory reports (Foreign Affairs, Trade, and Development Canada, 2012), strategy documents (Foreign Affairs, Trade, and Development Canada, 2014), newly articulated regulations for international students (CIC, 2014b), and even the termination of the IIP and EN programs (CIC, 2014c). That these national-level efforts parallel those in BC, and that both sets of efforts are also then empirically observable in K-12 public education policy texts like the ESOGF (BCMoE 2011/2013), further bolster the claim that the change from the ISP (BCMoE, 2001b) to the ESOGF is both indexical of and emplaced within a larger discursive shift.

4.3.5 Summary

Through an analysis of the replacement of the ISP (BCMoE, 2001b) with the ESOGF (BCMoE, 2011/2013), my aim in Section 4.3 has been to demonstrate how the category of international student, and more specifically its policy-based inflections related to students’ fee-paying status, has been an important site at which (language) socialization processes relevant to the experiences of im/migrant students, their families, and educational authorities can be identified and interpreted. I have argued that the rearticulation of this policy is indexical of the BC Ministry of Education’s and school districts’ response to and evaluation of would-be international students’ and their families’ appropriative practices with respect to (‘loopholes’ in) policy language. But I would also like to suggest that these practices and the responses to them, situated and temporally locatable as they are amidst a larger discursive shift in provincial and federal strategizing with respect to international education, are indications of ‘neoliberal’ socialization through the use of (policy) language and socialization to use (policy) language.
effect, that bi- or multidirectional (language) socialization is occurring: that (policy) language is influential to the economizing practices of would-be international students, whose practices are influential for the economizing (language of) BC educational policy; and that in this respect the examination of education policy might also be indexical of socialization at a larger scale – of international education on K-12 provincial educational systems, for example.

4.4 Conclusion

In this chapter I have offered a response to the first research question proposed for the study: How is the category of fee-paying international student (FIS) constructed in BC educational policy?

In this chapter I have demonstrated how, across descriptions in a complex network of BC Ministry of Education and government policy documents, the category of “International student” is discursively constructed as a euphemistic term for fee-paying international student (FIS). I have further shown that central resources used in this construction of FIS are the notions of residency status, eligibility for State funding, and English language learning. Finally, and crucially, I have articulated the ways in which the construction of the category of FIS in policy is, in both discursive and material ways, dependent on and consequential for the BC Ministry of Education category of English language learner; in short, that is, that FIS is very often a euphemism for unrecognized, unfunded, and unofficial ELLs.

I have also shown how construction of the category of FIS is centrally implicated in the recent rearticulation of the ISP (BCMoE, 2001b) as the ESOGF (BCMoE, 2011/2013). I have demonstrated how this change in policy has resulted in the expansion of the category of FIS so that its fee-paying consequences can be more readily applied to permanent residents and citizens of Canada, and have discussed the ways in which this flexibility is relevant to English language learning, K-12 public education, and federal im/migration categories. Finally, I have shown that this rearticulation of policy is a temporally locatable moment in a larger discursive shift (da Silva
& Heller, 2009; Heller, 2012) relating to international education; and how the policy ‘moment’ documented in the shift from the *ISP* (BCMoE, 2001b) to the *ESOGF* (BCMoE, 2011/2013), mediated as it is by appropriative (linguistic and social) practices of all involved, can serve as a site at which to glimpse multidirectional instances of socialization and the mutability of neoliberalism as a meaning-making resource for the interpretation and creation of cultural constructs (i.e., educational policy).

In Chapter 5 I demonstrate how in educational practice, links between im/migration and FIS, as well as the explanatory notions of residency status, eligibility for funding, and English language learning, are resources for the discursive the construction of the category of FIS.
CHAPTER 5: CONSTRUCTING FIS IN BC EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter I provide a multi-part response to the second research question proposed for the study: *How is the category of fee-paying international student (FIS) constructed in BC educational practice?* My use of the term ‘practice’, both in the title of the chapter and for the purpose of this research question, refers to how FIS have been constructed in recurrent descriptions in research interviews and other, arguably less-discursive formations (i.e., statistical categories, classroom demographics) relevant to the everyday education of FIS in the Pateo District and at QHS. In a denotative sense, the multi-part response affords a provisional and situated account of the role and impact of FIS in the everyday, local practices of a large, urban school district and one of its schools. I argue that the discursive and material formations through which FIS are described and produced across participants and levels of schooling are iconic of FIS presence in the Pateo District and at QHS, and as such that taken together these can be read as an articulation of the category of FIS in practice (e.g., Gal & Irvine, 1995; Irvine, 2005; Irvine & Gal, 2000; Kiesling, 2006).

In practice, the category of FIS is a relational production that is closely linked to immigration and English language education. In Section 5.2, I present a discussion of the historically situated relationship between immigration and the rise of FIS presence in the Pateo District, and the ensuing ‘piecemeal’ emergence of International Education program in relation to the notions of residency, funding, and language. In Section 5.3, I recontextualize the notions of residency, funding, and language as a lens for considering the construction of the FIS category in participant narratives and other data on the topics of FIS living arrangements (i.e., residency), tuition fees (i.e., funding), and L1 versus English use (i.e., language).
5.1.1 Analytic Orientation

Though in Section 5.2 I rely on data from just one participant (an administrator from the Pateo School District’s International Education Program), Section 5.3 is intentionally organized along two different axes. The first is horizontally oriented, and takes up the notions of residency, funding, and language derived from Chapter 4. On the one hand, this decision is data-driven: these notions are ubiquitous across the talk and texts that were generated through the study. On the other hand, the use of these notions provides an intertextual thread for the research narrative, working to ‘key’ (Goffman, 1974), or draw explicit attention to, the development of my own analytic focus built up through the reading and analysis of BC K-12 educational policy (Chapter 4). In both the data driven and ‘keying’ senses to which I have alluded, there are more- and less-subtle traces of residency, funding, and language that connect the construction of FIS in policy (Chapter 4) with both the discursive and material constructions of FIS in day to day practices of the Pateo School District and QHS. These notions, and their recurrence in the talk generated with multiple participants and in relation to varying topics of discussion, are thus a reminder of the link between policy and practice and of the socializing role of (English) language in animating, sustaining, and modulating this link.

The second axis along which the analysis is organized is vertically oriented, according to different ‘source’ levels of data analyzed in the chapter. This way of representing accounts is again meant to ‘key’ conventional directional, spatial, and scalar relationships between participant positions (i.e., administrator / teacher / student) and educational levels (i.e., school district / school) within the public education system. For example, the educational markets or practices in relation to which an administrator, teacher, or student uses descriptive resources relating to FIS residency, funding, or language, allows for a comparative perspective on the educational purposes, markets, and practices in and through which the category of FIS is specified.
The analytic orientation I adopt for this chapter is grounded in a constructionist, broadly discourse-analytic stance toward research interview and textual data (e.g., Drew, 2006; Holstein & Gubrium, 1995, 2003; Potter & Hepburn, 2008, 2012; Talmy, 2010c, 2011; Talmy & Richards, 2011), and has implications for both the status attributed to data and the focus of analyses. Where the status of data are concerned, this approach recognizes “the epistemic position of both the researcher and what is researched (texts or conversations)”, and treats the content and product of these data as “descriptions, claims, reports, allegations, and assertions” (Potter & Hepburn, 2008, p. 275). Specifically for the category of FIS on which this chapter focuses, this type of analysis means understanding articulations of FIS to be the result of various social practices relating to FIS presence in BC, the Pateo School District, and QHS; at the same time, treating the these data as discourse means remaining cognizant of the fact that these articulations of FIS are mobilized, in interactions between researcher/participant, within individual accounts, and across different extracts of data – for the (interview or) greater research enterprise. Thus, where the analyses in different sections of the chapter are concerned, the goal is to examine the descriptions of FIS or FIS-related processes and practices in these data primarily for their content (i.e., what descriptions are given), but with a persistently reflexive recognition of the situated conditions of their (collaborative) production.

Keeping in mind the important caveat that the use of these analytic approaches is mediated by the ethnographic knowledge that I developed during fieldwork and iterative analyses of data, in the sections that follow I present an analysis of how the category of FIS is constructed in BC educational practice.

5.2 Flipping the Advent of FIS in BC: Building Policy from Practice

At the time my fieldwork began, Pateo School District’s policy manual included a document outlining procedures for the “Admission of Exchange (and Foreign) Students” to its schools (PSD, n.d.-b). This policy laid out a set of regulations, with which representatives of the
The definition of “International students” in the District’s policy was comprised of wording almost identical to that found in the first paragraph of the BC Ministry of Education’s (n.d.-b, n.d.-c) Policy Glossary definition of “International students” (see Chapter 4). The Pateo District’s regulations state that “all students who have study permits issued by Citizenship and Immigration Canada should be identified as international students in the Ministry of Education 1701 Report”. 40 It goes on to note that study-permit holding students are ineligible for provincial funding, and that the District “may choose to charge tuition fees to these students” (PSD, n.d.-b para. 2-3; my emphasis). Following these regulations is a long list of exceptions to the rule, which are identical to those outlined in the BC Ministry of Education’s Eligibility of Students for Operating Grant Funding (ESOGF; BCMoE, 2011/2013; see Chapter 4), as well as its antecedent, the International Student Policy (ISP; BCMoE, 2001b).

That the Pateo District’s regulations are interdiscursively linked to provincial policy documents is notable, in that it suggests strong links between the two. More importantly for this section of the chapter, however, is that the District’s regulations were originally developed as principles for the “Admission of Exchange Students” in 1978, and were later revised to include and adapt to the presence of “Foreign Students” in 1987, 1988, and 2004 (PSD, n.d.-b). The timing of the changes to Pateo District regulations concerning “Foreign students”, which occurred long before the development or implementation of the BC Ministry of Education’s ISP (BCMoE, 2001b) or any kind of provincial ‘neoliberal’ education agenda (e.g., Bill 34, 2002; cf.

---

40 From Chapter 3, subsection 3.2.3:
Students are identified as ELLs on what is known to insiders as a 1701 form, and identification allows “a Board of Education to qualify for Supplemental Funding for English Language Learning” (BCMoE, n.d.-d, pp. 8-9; also, e.g., MsJ:315-331; MrsB1:188-207). The designation of students as eligible for ELL supplemental funding via the 1701 form, is also the means by which the BCMoE calculates the number of ELL students in British Columbia. In other words, and of particular consequence to this study, if students are not designated ELLs for supplemental funding purposes, they are not officially counted as ELL learners in BC Ministry of Education statistics.
Fallon & Pancucci, 2003; Fallon & Poole, 2013), very strongly suggest that in Pateo District practices, FIS students were already a recognized category of student.

In fact, although recent research has characterized ‘neoliberal’ education policy developments, in particular *Bill-34 – The School Amendment Act* (Bill 34, 2002), as foundational to the presence of FIS in school districts in the province (e.g., Fallon & Pancucci, 2003; Fallon & Paquette, 2009; Fallon & Poole, 2013; Kuehn, 2002; Poole & Fallon, forthcoming), an administrator from the International Education Program (IEP) in the Pateo School District suggested that the auspices under which FIS’ first began attending schools in the district was anything but the result of explicit educational marketization strategies or specific ‘neoliberal’ policy initiatives (see also, e.g., Beresford & Fussell, 2009).

Extract 5.1 is excerpted from a research interview with this same representative from the Pateo School District’s International Education Program (IEP). There are two aspects of the IEP administrator’s account which make it useful for framing the discussion of ‘FIS in practice’ in this chapter. The first is the way it contrasts with existing academic accounts of the inception of FIS presence in BC public schools; the second is in the administrator’s (IEP) relational construction of the “needs of these [international] students” as opposed to those of “local student[s]” (line 21-22), and the use of the notions of residency, in/eligibility for State funding, and English language to do so. The narrative in Extract 5.1 was the first of the research interview, and was prefaced by the IEP administrator as follows: “I don’t know how well you know it but maybe I could just take a moment to describe administratively how international uh education fits within this school district” (IEP:101).

**Extract 5.1 “a kind of piecemeal way” (IEP: 107-135)**

01 IEP: in this city is that the Board [Pateo School District] in the mid-uh 1980s started to have inquiries
02 RD: about you know, people had a niece or a nephew [or] a friend of the family
03 IEP: lived
04 IEP: living overseas who would like to come here and study

---

41 Beresford & Fussell (2009) note that “Since the 1990s [all school] districts have accepted fee-paying international students in their schools as a way of generating revenue.” (p. 13).
and how could they do that
and so it started to you know, happen in k- a kind of a piecemeal way and-
almost organically
and- and then all of a sudden the Board [Pateo School District] had to think okay, well we’re not
allowed to ask the Ministry of Education to fund these children, but we do happen to have some
space here or there in particular schools. so uh yeah how could we do that and so they had to come
up with a tuition fee
and come up with you know, some sort of infrastructure and so eventually, probably about 1986 or
1987 something like that, you know then they started to put in a bit of infrastructure and designate
kind of formalize yeah
particular schools that would- cou- could receive them
uh huh
and get some experience and wh-, then figure out what the needs of these students might be over and
above what a lo- what a local student might have
right
and then it went from there
right wow
so uh the program uh has existed since the mid
then eighties
nineteen eighties
yeah
and what was happening at that time hhh. is I’m told is a- a lot of people from Hong Kong were
there was a kind of a wave
were settling here
that’s right
and there were often these kind of relationships, uh uh where they wanted to bring a family
t member to come and study here
mm hmm
and so that’s that was sort of the the gi- gist of how it started

5.2.1 Variations on Three Notions: Residency, Funding, and (English) Language

Hearably ‘keyed’ (Goffman, 1974) and indexed in the attributes used to characterize
international students are the notions of residency, funding, and language.

Residency. One apparatus the IEP administrator uses in Extract 5.1 to construct the
category of international student is that of a generic immigrant family, ostensibly “from Hong
Kong” and who were “settling” (lines 29-31) in BC. International students are characterized via
using attributes which describe their position within or relationship to the families (i.e., “a niece
or a nephew or a friend of the family” [line 02]), their place of residence (i.e., “living overseas”
[line 04]), and their purpose for coming to BC which was not to ‘settle’ or immigrate (i.e.,
“would like to come here and study” [line 04]). The ideological resources the administrator uses
to differentiate these students from a generic “local student” (line 21) position FIS as visitors to BC whose reasons for coming are explicitly education-related, and importantly, temporary.

Similarly, via a claim to reported knowledge (i.e., “I’m told” [line 29]), the IEP administrator works to position these immigrant families as part of a larger and temporally situated influx of “people from Hong Kong” (line 29). In this way, because the very possibility for international students to come is linked to immigrant families (here from Hong Kong), the implication is that not only the category – but the very presence – of FIS emerged from this influx of immigrants. In characterizing the presence of FIS in the Pateo School District as having come about in response to a emergent local need – in a “piecemeal way” (line 08) rather than purposefully driven by policy – the administrator’s account presents an alternative to literature which has constructed the presence of FIS as an outcome of a top-down ‘neoliberal’ educational agenda (e.g., Fallon & Pancucci, 2003; Fallon & Paquette, 2009; Fallon & Poole, 2013; Kuehn, 2002; Poole & Fallon, forthcoming).

Constructing FIS through “needs” and “infrastructure”. Another point of interest in the construction of the FIS category is how “some sort of infrastructure” (line 15) emerged as a result of the Pateo School District’s attempt to identify “the needs” of FIS “over and above” those of “local [i.e., resident] students” (Extract 5.1, lines 20-21). Beyond the development of centrally-managed IEP procedures and language specifically (i.e., the application process for all FIS; creation and distribution of IEP-specific information [IEP:159-167]), the administrator reported that in terms of school experiences “international students are treated like other [Pateo District] students and should be” (IEP:1321). Specifically, for FIS, the administrator continued:

**Extract 5.2 “we hope for integration as far as possible” (IEP:1323-1329)**

01 IEP: the extra diligence we try to provide is to keep track a little more closely the uh, of their attendance
02 or their progress
03 RD: right
04 IEP: and through the advisor system
05 RD: yeah
06 IEP: and help them where needed, uh pro- provide a two day orientation when they first come here
07 RD: right
The “extra diligence” shown specifically towards FIS – to “track…their attendance or their progress” (lines 01-02) was largely the result of the fact that since the mid-1980s, fewer and fewer students were coming as guests of (immigrant or citizen) relatives or family friends, and were more frequently residing in homestays with varying amounts of ‘adult’ supervision (discussed later in this chapter). At the time the study was conducted, the Pateo District kept track of FIS’ attendance or progress via three seconded international student advisors (e.g., line 04) who, dividing 18 schools among them, liaised with a school-based mentor who attended to FIS concerns (IEP:831-839). The “two day orientation” (line 06), at which FIS attendance is not mandatory, includes administration of different types of language and content area exams, as well as staging of information sessions for students offered in a variety of languages other than English (PSD, n.d.-c, para. 4-5).

Significantly, the extra diligence provided by the Pateo School District is for the most part procedural, and reportedly limited to instances in which “the child isn’t being successful at school (RD: I’ve- I’ve seen it happen) and is emotionally not stable” (IEP:373-375). Though the administrator’s account here does not make any explicit mention of academic or English language support for FIS students, in the greater context of the interview the administrator reported that these supports were unique to each school and depended on school culture, relationships between teachers, “and their relationship with admin and how they all work together” (IEP:687-689; also, e.g., IEP:644-651). Not only does this absence ostensibly downplay the central role of English language in the recruitment and school-based experiences of FIS learners (see, e.g., Chapters 4, 7-9; also, e.g., Gunderson, 2007b; Popadiuk & Marshall, 2011; Qian, 2012), it implies that the academic or English language needs of FIS students are matters to be addressed by individual schools, teachers, or students themselves).
Funding. The link between funding and the category of international students, which attributes to them the status of fee-payers, is accomplished implicitly through the description of another category central to Extract 5.1: “the Board” (lines 01, 10). The IEP administrator reports that, in the attempt to accommodate the requests of international students and the families to whom they were linked, the Pateo District (i.e., “the Board”) “had to come up with a tuition fee” (lines 10-13). This is because “the Board” was “not allowed to ask the Ministry of Education [BCMoE] to fund these children”; international students, who feature in the description as “these children”, and as the elided group for whom “a tuition fee” was being created, are thus constructed as fee-payers.

The administrator’s account suggests that before explicit provincial level policies such as the ISP (BCMoE, 2001b) were put in place to officially preclude international students from eligibility for provincial funding (and stipulate circumstances which allowed for exceptions to these preclusions [see Chapter 4]), the Pateo District had already developed a set of practices to treat international students as fee-payers. By situating the emergence of tuition fees as chronologically prior (i.e., “in the mid-uh 1980s”, line 01) to the issuance of the provincial ISP (BCMoE, 2001) or Bill-34 – The School Amendment Act (Bill 34, 2002), the IEP administrator’s account presents a further plausible counter-narrative to the one presented in top-down policy analyses; that is, that BC educational policy has developed as an abstraction of, and/or in response to, situated practices occurring at the school district level.

(English) Language. English language is not mentioned explicitly in the IEP administrator’s account, though is indexed by proxy in portrayals of both international students and the immigrant families to whom they were linked. Given that the immediate members of immigrant families and international students themselves are characterized as coming from non-English dominant countries (i.e., from “Hong Kong”; “living overseas”), attributable to each by implication is thus that English is not their L1. A similar attribution of L2 English status is also
hearable in the ascription to international students that they “would like to come here and study” (line 04) – since ‘coming here’ would very likely mean to study (in) English.

Again here, given the implied relationships between the influx of immigrants and the appearance of FIS students, the administrator’s account also suggests that FIS have been present as part of the ESL population in public schools in the Pateo District for at least as long as their ‘local’ peers who arrived as part of this upsurge in immigration in the mid-1980s. In support of this suggestion, the ‘wave’ of “Cantonese- and Mandarin-speaking newcomers from Taiwan and Hong Kong” (Duff, 2001, p. 110), to whom FIS students have been linked, has been widely recognized in research concerned specifically with English language learning, teaching, and status in schools, among teachers, and for students in BC and in Canada more generally (e.g., Ashworth, 2001, p. 96; Goldstein, 2003, pp. 87-89; Gunderson, 2007b, pp. 209-214; Li, 2006, p. 39-43). Despite the foregrounding of ESL issues in these studies, FIS go almost completely unrecognized as a population of learners (though cf. Gunderson, 2007a).

5.2.2 Summary

Through an analysis of interview accounts from a senior administrator from the Pateo School District’s International Education Program and information from a range of school district and scholarly sources, in this section I have shown how the category of international student has been constructed through a variety of local school district practices. I have argued that FIS are positioned vis-à-vis discursive resources relating to the notions of residency, funding, and language; further, I have provided examples of how the presence and positioning of international students in the Pateo School District has resulted, via a “piecemeal” (Extract 5.1, line 08) process, in the development of distinct types of program- and support-related “infrastructure” (Extract 5.1, lines 15-16) available only for these fee-paying international students.
The analysis and arguments put forth in this section relate specifically to the category of FIS in practice. For example, I have suggested: (1) that BC educational policy relating to the presence of international students (e.g., BCMoE, 2001b; Bill 34, 2002) could have developed as a result of existing international student presence and practices in places like Pateo School District (cf. Fallon & Pancucci, 2003; Fallon & Paquette, 2009; Fallon & Poole, 2013; Kuehn, 2002; Poole & Fallon, forthcoming); (2) that residency, funding, and language are key notions in the construction and distinctiveness of the FIS category; (3) that the recognition of specific needs, along with the advent of specific material changes to Pateo District practice (i.e., the creation of tuition fees and infrastructure applicable to and available for only international students) play a role in constructing both who international students are and are evidence of the material and discursive socialization of the district in response to their presence.

5.3 Constructing FIS in the Pateo District and at QHS: Residency, Funding, and Language

Through an analysis of the IEP administrator’s narrative, I began this chapter with a discussion of the historically situated relationship between immigration and the advent of FIS presence in the Pateo District, and then discussed the resultant ‘piecemeal’ emergence of International Education program in relation to the themes of residency, funding, and language (Section 5.2).

In this section (5.3), I recontextualize the notions of residency, funding, and language to present a multi-level discussion of the FIS category in relation to homestay, tuition fees, and English language learning. To do so I draw on interview accounts from participants representing a range of stakeholder perspectives: the IEP administrator, the QHS Principal, as well as teachers (Mrs. Bee, Mr. Whee, Ms. Jay) and students (both immigrant ESL and FIS) from QHS.

5.3.1 Residency: Homestay and ‘Other’ Living Arrangements

Although in the mid-eighties the majority of FIS students were a “niece or a nephew [or] a friend” of immigrant families and thus resided with them during their studies in BC (Extract
5.1, line 02), since the mid-1980s these types of arrangements have become less common. This was made partially evident in participants’ interview talk that topicalized FIS living situations while studying in BC (e.g., IEP: 299-313; QHSPPr2:113-115; MrsBI2:238-240; YA:15:46-16:40; JR:02:45-3:48; Who:0:55-2:34). In these participants’ accounts, as I show in this subsection section, commonly noted descriptions included FIS’ residence in ‘homestay’ situations, and also, the absence of FIS’ parents during their studies.

**IEP Administrator’s accounts.** The IEP administrator reported that in 85-90% of the cases (IEP:307) FIS were living without the supervision of their parents (IEP:299-331), and that because “often the custodial arrangements [were] poor,” a major concern of district officials was whether or not students’ living arrangements included “appropriate” support and supervision (IEP:371-391). As a result of the high number of FIS living without their parents, the IEP administrator spoke about how the district’s own monitoring and accountability practices had changed in 2011.

**Extract 5.3 “the good care that they’re going to give the student” (IEP:391-443)**

01 IEP: [...] we also try to ensure all of our high school students have a custodian
02 RD: yep
03 IEP: and we don’t use the same document that Canada immigration uses because uh we know that that’s often a tool of convenience, that custodian statement
05 RD: sure
06 IEP: just to get, so you know a the agencies overseas may use someone locally here to be that custodian or s- it’s really just signing the document
08 RD: for them
09 IEP: and our point of view is uh no, we need to know actually
10 RD: who
11 IEP: who’s going to be taking care of this child, and we um instituted a new policy last year that they need to appear in front of a District staff person and show us uh
12 RD: kind of I.D. [identification]
14 IEP: BC uh BC I.D. [i.e., a permanent resident card or BC Driver’s License]
15 RD: yeah
16 IEP: and uh then we have a chance to kind of discuss the good care that they’re going to give the student
17 RD: sure
18 IEP: so we’ve found that to be very uh successful and really cut down on a lot of the poor arrangements
19 that again some parents allow their children live in when they’re here
The “document” to which the IEP administrator refers in line 03, the Citizenship and Immigration Canada\footnote{The form is entitled “Custodianship Declaration: Custodian for Minors Studying in Canada” (Appendix E).} custodianship form (CIC, n.d.), is described as a “tool of convenience” (line 04) for agents in students’ countries of origin (line 06). These “agencies overseas” employ a local notary public or affiliate (i.e., “someone locally here”, line 06), whose signature is required on the form, to sign as the student’s ‘custodian’ (lines 06-07). But since the CIC does not have any mechanisms in place to verify these custodians are in fact taking care of students after they have entered a Canadian province, and provides “almost no support” to the Pateo District (IEP: 505-515), the International Education Program decided to “institute a new policy last year that they need to appear in front of a District staff person” (lines 11-12) and show BC provincial identification (line 14).\footnote{During my 2011-2012 fieldwork, there were no provincial mechanisms to regulate the homestay aspect of the FIS industry either. As of July 2013, however, the BCMoE had tabled draft policy which, under the auspices of a “Quality Assurance Model” (BCMoE, 2013, p. 31) aimed to address homestay issues related to the K-12 International Education industry. The evolution of this policy, given the experiences of the Pateo and other districts, is another potential example of the “emergence of structure out of agency” (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011, p. 7) – in the sense that: the agentive actions of District officials to adapt and respond to the custodianship practices of overseas agents have precipitated a draft policy at the provincial level.} The IEP administrator’s account here draws on a comparison of national (i.e., CIC) and local (i.e., Pateo School District) procedures relating to ‘custodianship’ to position the District as more actively concerned for the welfare of FIS than Citizenship and Immigration Canada.\footnote{A further point of interest here is the relationship, similarities, ambiguities, and tensions surrounding the federally-coined term ‘custodian’ (CIC, n.d.) and the provincially and locally preferred term ‘guardian’ (see, e.g., Chapter 4, subsection 4.3.2). This is of interest because, albeit only via anecdotal evidence and conjecture at this point, I suspect that similarities and ambiguities between the federal term ‘custodian’ and provincial term ‘guardian’ were, prior to the ESOGF (BCMoE, 2011), one of the “loopholes under which students who should have been fee-paying international students were attempting to access public funding.” (MR3, personal communication, 06 December 2013).} It is also notable in the IEP administrator’s account that this active concern had only become ‘policy’ in the year prior to the interview (i.e., 2011), and raises questions about whether (and if not, why not) discussions about “the good care” custodians were providing for FIS were initiated by the Pateo District prior to 2011. Finally, in drawing attention in this way to the different practices of the CIC and the Pateo District surrounding the topic of...
custodianship, the IEP administrator orients to differences in purposes, expectations, and needs relevant to the FIS market at different levels of administration.

When I asked a question about whether it was the “agencies overseas” who might be responsible for the high number of situations in which FIS living arrangements were, by reported Pateo School District standards, unsatisfactory (IEP:443-445), the administrator responded as follows:

Extract 5.4 “the main problem” (IEP:449-459)
01 IEP: the main problem is uh parents not- either not making good decisions, or allowing their children to
02 advise them about what they want to do and letting them do it
03 RD: right
04 IEP: for example, uh, students will start out in a good- with a good homestay arrangement
05 RD: yeah
06 IEP: and then about October
07 RD: they move
08 IEP: will sa- so our homestay partner is Queen Charlotte College
09 RD: yes
10 IEP: and so they’ll be in a Queen Charlotte College homestay, and they will have had the custodianship
11 papers signed by their homestay parents
12 RD: yep
13 IEP: and then within a couple of months oh, they’re moving out of Queen Charlotte College homestay into
14 a private arrangement

The administrator’s ascription to FIS “parents” the action of “not making good decisions”, “allowing their children to advise them about what to do”, and “letting them do it” (lines 01-02) distances the International Education Program (and the Pateo District) from answerability for “poor custodial arrangements”. The account that follows (lines 04-13) produces a typified FIS trajectory from “good homestay arrangement” (line 04), which is overseen by the Queen Charlotte College (QCC) “partner” (lines 08-11), to one in which there is no oversight by QCC (“within a couple of months…they’re moving out of [QCC] homestay into a private arrangement”, lines 13-14).

According to the administrator, about half of the district’s then 1300 FIS had been placed with a host family through QCC’s Homestay Program (IEP:489). In the Pateo District, FIS who have applied to live in a homestay while attending district schools are directed to QCC, whose
Homestay Program has operated for over 30 years and is the oldest in the region (QCC, n.d., para. 1). The Pateo School District’s decision to use QCC’s homestay program rather than create their own, resulted from the fact that QCC was one of the first in the city to have international student programs. The IEP administrator reported that QCC’s homestay program had expanded considerably as a result of becoming a “partner” (line 08) with the Pateo District’s International Education Program, noting that they were QCC’s “best customer” (IEP:483). FIS who did not live with a ‘Canadian host family’, arranged through QCC, were described as somewhat problematic:

Extract 5.5 “that’s something we have to live with here” (IEP:491-497)
01 IEP: again because we’re Pateo District uh [the remaining FIS] are living with relatives, friends of the family, or [in] other arrangements
02 RD: yeah
03 IEP: and that’s something we have to live with here
04 RD: yeah
05 IEP: and and uh supervise to the best of our abilities.
06 RD: there’s only so much you can do yeah
07 IEP: there’s only so much we can do, but we’re going to do our due diligence as best we can.

FIS whose living arrangements did not involve QCC were reported to live “with relatives, friends of the family, or [in] other arrangements” (lines 01-02). The administrator presented these non-homestay living arrangements as a challenge (i.e., “that’s something we have to live with here”, line 04) and difficult to supervise (line 06), because unlike QCC’s homestay program, these were established privately by students and thus entirely beyond the supervisory reach of the Pateo School District or QCC. Still, the IEP administrator attributed to the District the will to “do our due diligence as best we can” (IEP:497) to oversee the pastoral care of FIS in the district. In addition to positioning the Pateo School District’s homestay supervision as earnest in its endeavours (e.g., “supervise to the best of our abilities”, line 06; “we’re going to do our due diligence as best we can”, line 08) under circumstances that were beyond their control (“that’s something we have to live with here”, line 04), the IEP administrator’s mention of District, QCC, and FIS interests in the selection and responsibility for homestay arrangements orients to the
polycentric nature of the homestay market. That is, not only are the divergent needs and value-attributions of different stakeholders in the homestay market used to construct this market as difficult to supervise; despite the fact that FIS are minors, these value-attributions are also used as discursive resources to do important kinds of (moral) positioning work in interaction (i.e., “supervise to the best of our abilities”; “do our due diligence the best we can”).

Across the relatively long sequence of interview interaction presented in Extracts 5.3-5.5 above, and in the full interview more generally, FIS residency circumstances were a prominent resource for defining the category of FIS in Pateo District practice. FIS residency was constructed as a point around which the evolution of new ‘custodianship’ rules became a necessary response to the morally questionable, appropriative practices (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011) of overseas education agents and FIS’ parents (e.g., Extract 5.3, lines 06-07, 18-19; Extract 5.4, lines 01-02). Further, FIS residency was used as a resource for positioning the Pateo District in contrast to these appropriative practices; that is, as a morally just entity, concerned for the well-being of students outside of schools but limited by the actions and decisions of FIS, their parents, and overseas agents in the amount of oversight they can exercise.

Despite the Pateo School District’s active recruitment and collection of tuition (and other fees) from these FIS, notably absent from the administrator’s accounts is the attribution of explicit responsibility to the District for ensuring the safety and comfort of FIS residency (homestay) while they are studying in District Schools. The IEP administrator suggested that it was only because of visible lack of motivation (i.e., non-participation/sleeping at school), abysmal academic performance, serial truancy, or obvious emotional instability that FIS pastoral care issues even came to the attention of Pateo District employees (IEP:371-379).

**QHS principal and teachers’ accounts.** In the two cases where FIS living situations became topics of interest in research interviews with QHS teachers and administrators, the accounts addressed some aspect of students’ (typically unsuccessful) performance at school
In describing their own experience with FIS since the mid-1990s, the QHS principal noted that residency and living situations had been oft-drawn upon resources for making sense of uncommon cases in which FIS were having trouble in school: “there’d be some story behind that…this is a student living away from their family in a foreign country…and all that sort of stuff that was behind their lack of academic achievement rather than lack of ability” (QHSPr2:115-117).

As part of an interview sequence in which we had discussed the possibility that international education was a “kind of like reform school” (MrsB2:228) for many of the less-than-successful FIS at QHS, Mrs. Bee reported that she had heard homestay-related excuses from FIS when work was incomplete: “in some of those cases where they’ve told me what seemed to be a pretty sad situation like they weren’t happy about their homestays or they were away from their families” (MrsB2:238-240).

What is fascinating about the portrayal of residency concerns in the accounts of the QHS principal and teachers is the way they are related to FIS students’ academic performance at school. In addition to the link between residency and academic performance, however, is the way that residency was – for both of these members of the QHS staff and in very different interview contexts – a readily available sense-making resource for categorizing FIS students.

**QHS student accounts.** ELL students interviewed for the study routinely described FIS’ living arrangements as markedly different from their own, especially where living situations and parental presence were concerned (e.g., YA:25-38; JR:05-48; 61-105; Who:13-39; YA:25-38). The demographic data generated by the self-report survey of students in both Mr. Whee’s and Ms. Jay’s classes suggested that ELL students’ differentiation of themselves from FIS was evidence-based: in Mr. Whee’s class, only two of 10 participating FIS lived with a parent in BC; in Ms. Jay’s class, only one of nine FIS lived with a parent (see, e.g., Tables 3.1 and 3.2). In student accounts, FIS living arrangements were rarely characterized as ‘poor’ in the senses
implied by the IEP administrator (i.e., Extract 5.3, lines 18-19; though cf. Zeejay’s experience in Chapter 6); neither did students characterize homestay or living arrangements as being directly consequential to (FIS’) academic performance in ways similar to the QHS principal or Mrs. Bee.

Extract 5.6 is from a research interview with Who, a 16 year old male ELL student from mainland China who had lived in BC for nine months at the time of the interview. In addition to having arrived to BC as a permanent resident, Who resided with both of his parents in Canada and was a member of two of the focal classes I observed during my fieldwork.

Extract 5.6 “they must do so many things by themselves” (Who:11-22)

01 RD: one of the things I'm trying to figure out as part of my research
02 WHO: mm hmm
03 RD: is like uh what’s the difference between kind of immigrant ESL and international student ESL
04 WHO: oh okay the fir- the first (is) tha- the difference immigra- immigrant student they- they have parent
05 of their, so they are take care of them like
06 RD: right
07 WHO: cook and wa- wash wash the plates and some househo- houseworks
08 RD: yeah
09 WHO: and i- they can uh do something for them
10 RD: uh but international students don't or
11 WHO: yeah international live a- a- ho- normal(ly) lives at the homestay
12 RD: uh huh
13 WHO: and their- they can j- live the more, mm .tch like mm (.).tch b- by themselves, they ha- they
14 must do so many things by themself

In this extract, Who frames his response to my question about the differences between immigrant and ESL students as a matter that hinges upon the presence or absence of a student’s parents (lines 04-05). This framing is notable specifically because it does not acknowledge the “ESL” portion of the two categories of student put forth in my line 03 question; in other words, Who’s response constructs the categories of “immigrant ESL” and “international ESL” by marshalling a set of descriptions related to students’ living arrangements. While immigrant students “have parents” that can “take care of them” (line 05) – meaning for example that they can “cook”, “wash the plates”, and do “some houseworks” (line 07), Who characterizes FIS as not having parents to take care of them because they “normal(ly) lives at the homestay” (line 11). The
implication is that because their parents are not there to help them, FIS “live the more…by themselves” and that “they must do so many things by themself” (lines 13-14).

Though Who’s account is just one example, it is also important to note that he concluded his account of the differences between FIS and immigrant ESL students (like him) by reporting that being without parents is “better for them [FIS] study and fu- their future” because “they can learn many things from themself” (Who:26-28). Crucially here, though, is Who’s appeal to descriptions that were related to FIS’ living situations, rather than those of the classroom, as a means for distinguishing FIS from other (ELL) students (like him); in fact, apart from pressures induced by FIS fee-paying status (see Extract 5.12 below), Who consistently treated the in-class experiences of FIS and immigrant ELL students as something the two groups of students had in common (e.g., ZJtMrW09Mr12:793-849). Finally, Who’s construction in Extract 5.6, despite the fact that it is an exemplar of how FIS’ living arrangements, homestay, and absent parents were a commonly invoked resource for describing the category of FIS (see also, e.g., YA:25-38; JR:05-48; 61-105), also works up a situated version of FIS homestay situations which is not applicable to all FIS experiences. Some of the focal FIS participating in the study, and in particular those living in homestay situations that had been arranged privately, spoke of how their homestay ‘mothers’ prepared their meals or did their laundry, and that in many cases it was “just like at home” (EllenI3:938; ER30Mr12:63-65; see also, e.g., ZJI1:90-92; ER28Mr12:40-41).

**Summary.** In this subsection I have given examples of how the notion of residency featured in talk about FIS-related practices at different levels of education and across a range of participants (i.e., custodianship [IEP administrator]; academic achievement [QHS principal; Mrs. Bee]; and “houseworks” [Who]). My argument is that the notion of FIS homestay situation or living arrangements, realized as it was in diverse ways across participants and in relation to different FIS-related practices, was a commonly deployed discursive resource for describing (the category of) FIS students. In Section 5.4.3, I examine the notion of funding.
5.3.2 Funding: Timetables, Cash Cows, and Pressure

As with residency, the notion of funding played a foundational role in the construction of the FIS category in the Pateo District and at QHS. In this subsection, I present extracts from research interviews with the IEP administrator, the QHS principal and teachers, and non-focal FIS and ELL students attending QHS. My aim is to demonstrate how the notion of funding, specifically as it relates to FIS’ tuition fees, was also commonly discussed matter across different levels of educational practice. In so doing I highlight how this notion was used to differentiate FIS from their ELL peers.

IEP administrator’s accounts. At the district level, funding (vis-à-vis revenue) was consistently referenced in relation to the FIS presence in, contributions to, and impact on the Pateo School District. In Extract 5.15, the IEP administrator presents a version of how the tuition fees collected from FIS became relevant to both schools and the Pateo District’s “general revenue” (line 09). The account in Extract 5.7 – a coda-of sorts to that presented in Extract 5.1 – was produced at the end of a description of how international education was situated within the Pateo District.

Extract 5.7 “rightly or wrongly that’s how it goes here” (IEP:137-151)
01 IEP: and uh then tch you know over the years it became just a really nice uh, uh thing for the Board to do
02 because it was bringing in extra money that was untagged and so the, what this Board did is uhm with
03 the tuition fees is uh, other than give the receiving schools teacher staffing
04 RD: right
05 IEP: a really nice teacher staffing
06 RD: yeah
07 IEP: for the number of students they took
08 RD: they have yeah
09 IEP: the rest of the funds and it continues to be to this day, goes into general revenue which just means that
10 that the District can uh
11 RD: use it as they-
12 IEP: direct that as they see are priorities in whatever given year
13 RD: right
14 IEP: it is and uh that’s, not all districts do it that way but that’s
15 RD: how it is here
16 IEP: that’s the way it is here

In this extract, the IEP administrator: (a) reports that “over the years” enrolling FIS in Pateo District schools became a source of “extra money that was untagged” (lines 01-02); (b) offers a
general overview of how the tuition fees are made accessible to and beneficial for individual schools (i.e., “a really nice teacher staffing…for the number of students they took”, lines 05-07); (c) portrays the absorption of FIS tuition fees into the District’s “general revenue” stream (line 09) so that it can be used for discretionary “priorities in whatever given year” (line 12); and (d) indexes the uniqueness of the Pateo District’s use of these revenues (i.e., “not all districts do it that way but that’s…the way it is here”, lines 14-16). This multi-layered description provides insight into what FIS tuition dollars make possible for the everyday, local practices of the Pateo District; additionally, by treating these possibilities as now iconic of FIS presence in the district (e.g., “it became just a really nice thing uh uh thing for the [School] Board to do”, line 01), the IEP administrator’s description demonstrates how the notion of funding is indivisibly linked to the category of FIS (e.g., Gal & Irvine, 1995; Irvine, 2005; Irvine & Gal, 2000; Kiesling, 2006).

The administrator also noted during the interview that because the FIS program occasionally relied on the expertise of the Pateo District’s “multicultural liaison workers”, a plurilingual group of professionals hired by the district to serve as “the cultural and linguistic ‘bridges’ for students, families, and schools” (Pateo District, n.d.-a, para.1), that a portion of revenue from FIS tuition fees was also used to fund these and other areas. In describing the wider reach of revenue derived from FIS tuition fees in this way, the IEP administrator positioned the economic impact of FIS presence on the district as significant: “we kind of go on the idea that in each area that we touch we’re not only covering what the international students will need but…. we’ll put more there than what would have existed otherwise” (IEP:193-212).

Further attributed to the FIS program was its role in helping the Pateo District send extra teachers to each of the district’s schools, and how the direct impact of the FIS program was its ability to “create more spaces in courses at our schools” (IEP:267-273). It has been reported that over 450 full-time teaching positions in BC’s K-12 public system are funded through FIS tuition-fee revenues (Kuehn, 2014, p. 2); the IEP administrator described the FIS program’s ability to
serve this function in the Pateo District as “one of the most gratifying things about our program”, but qualified this description with the caveat that at individual schools the teaching positions “end up being used in you know various ways across different content areas according to need and they wouldn’t be there otherwise” (IEP:743-751). What this means is that the teaching positions made possible by FIS at individual schools are, like the FIS tuition revenues described in Extract 5.7 above, untagged and thus at the discretionary use of the administration of each individual school (cf. Wild et al., 2006, who reported a similar situation for the use of supplementary ELL funding in BC schools). In essence, FIS tuition monies also trickle down to increase available resources at each school that has them.

The IEP administrator’s construction of the FIS program as substantively contributing the Pateo District and its schools, vis-à-vis revenues made possible by FIS tuition fees, suggests that the funding they bring is a centrally defining characteristics of this category of student; that is, at the district-level, the category FIS has come to evoke or iconicize (e.g., Irvine & Gal, 2000) ideas of untagged funding, teacher staffing, and a general revenue stream.

**QHS principal and teachers’ accounts.** For teachers and administrators working at QHS, talk about FIS often made explicit mention of the funding they brought to district schools. In fact, on more than one occasion, the expression “cash cows” was used by participating teachers to refer to the desire for, as well as function of, FIS in the school (MsJ:210-219; MrsB2:128-141; also, e.g., QHSPr2:157-159).

Mrs. Bee, for example, reported that when QHS teachers were informed that more FIS would be coming to QHS, “there’s a groan, yeah”, but noted the administrative message that came along with this information was “we [i.e., teachers] better like it because there’s money and then we shut up…I mean they basically say you’re getting more staff because of them [FIS]” (MrsB1: 733-741). When I asked the principal to speak about the benefits and challenges of having FIS students (“these students,” Extract 5.8, line 02) at QHS and how they might be
different from resident (i.e., immigrant or citizen ELL) students, the principal framed the benefits of FIS in explicitly economic terms:

Extract 5.8 “we get a teacher and a block for every twenty students” (QHSPr2:216-225)
01 RD: in your position as uh principal (what are) some of the benefits and challenges of having kind of
02 these students i- in the school, and is that any different from having PR-holding ESL students or
03 citizen ESL students
04 QP: mm hhm well the immediate benefit is that we get enriched staffing and little bit of budget um
05 RD: boost
06 QP: in accordance
07 RD: yep
08 QP: with the numbers of students that we have. in very rough terms you know our staffing gets
09 calculated to four decimal places, but in rough terms
10 RD: ((laughs))
11 QP: um we get one teacher for every twenty five students
12 RD: yeah
13 QP: hhh but for international students we get one teacher for every twenty students
14 RD: right
15 QP: and then actually um we get a little bit more. we get a teacher and a block for every twenty students

The principal’s account of how QHS benefits from FIS – namely “enriched staffing and a little bit of budget” (line 04) – begins with an example which draws on the candidate distinction I have made between FIS and resident students (lines 01-03). The principal contrasts the category “students” (line 11; i.e., resident) with the category of “international students” (line 13; i.e., non-resident) as a means for describing the benefits of FIS in terms of the ratio of teachers-per-student they bring to the school. That is, though for every 25 resident “students” the school receives one full time teacher, for every 20 FIS the school receives one full time teacher “and a block” (line 15). The principal went on to report:

Extract 5.9 “building a timetable and staffing the school” (QHSPr2:237-239)
01 QP: yeah you know so it is beneficial when we’re looking at building a timetable and staffing the school,
02 that those international students do bring that extra staffing and then they bring a a little bit of an
03 extra budget for buying resources
04 RD: so
05 QP: so um schools um would like to have amongst their students some international students because of
06 those benefits

Where teacher staffing was concerned, the principal also explained during the interview that “a block” was equivalent to “one seventh of a teacher” or “point one four two nine” teachers (QHSPr2:229-233). In the context of QHS, “a block” was also the local term used to designate one period of classes during the school day; if students took eight courses per year, for example, each class was treated as ‘a block’ in students’ timetables.
In addition to having constructed FIS via the staffing they bring to the school in Extract 5.8, in Extract 5.9 the QHS principal attributes to FIS a practical relevance related to “building a timetable and staffing the school” (line 01) and “an extra budget for buying resources” (lines 02-03). Not only are these made uniquely possible by FIS, they are by implication contrasted with those of resident students – who are comparatively less “beneficial” (line 01) than FIS. It is for this reason that schools would like to “have amongst their students some international students” (lines 03-04).

In constructing schools as desiring and benefitting from FIS because of the “extra staffing and…a little bit of an extra budget” (Extract, 5.9, lines 02-03, 05-06) they bring, the QHS Principal describes FIS funding in terms of practical administrative concerns. Ms. Jay, on the other hand, described FIS funding in terms of eligibility for BC Ministry of Education supplemental ELL funding (MsJ: 316-323). She went on to attribute dollar amounts to different categories of student:

**Extract 5.10 “I think it’s like five grand extra or something” (MsJ:324-335)**

01 MsJ: yeah ESL funding and it’s- it’s not that much I think it’s about
02 RD: (thirty five)
03 MsJ: it’s like eight hundred [to] a thousand dollars per student anyway. but you number, and QHS we are
04 over a hundred odd
05 RD: ESL
06 MsJ: yeah ESL 1701s [i.e., ELLs, not FIS]
07 RD: right
08 MsJ: so that’s a lot of money there when you think about it so
09 RD: yeah
10 MsJ: but international students we’re a lot less. but again the money is a lot more, again we’re talking
11 about in the thou- thousands I’m not sure so you- you-
12 RD: yeah
13 MsJ: you’re going to have to look into how much
14 RD: no no I don’t how much they pay per year
15 MsJ: I think it’s like five grand extra or something

In Extract 5.10, Ms. Jay uses the notion of funding to distinguish FIS (i.e., non-residents) from ELLs (i.e., resident) students. She describes ELLs (and by proxy to the value of resident students) using the phrases “not that much” (line 01) and “eight hundred [to] a thousand dollars per student” (line 03). In contrast, Ms. Jay’s description of “international students” (line 10) relies on
phrases like “the money is a lot more” (line 10), “we’re talking in the thousands” (line 11), and “I think it’s like five grand extra or something” (line 15). Though she does note that because it has a significant number of designated ELL learners the school (QHS) receives a substantial amount of supplemental funding from the BC Ministry of Education (lines 03-08), the “money” brought in by fewer (“a lot less,” line 10) FIS is positioned in contrast to, and as more lucrative than, supplemental funds brought in by “over a hundred” designated ELLs (lines 03-04).

Part of Ms. Jay’s long response when I asked what she thought of when she heard the term international student was that they were “almost like a cash cow” for the Pateo School District, and, echoing the QHS Principal, went on to say “the money funnels down into the classroom in terms of teaching staff and resources which is a good thing” (MsJ: 219-221). I returned to her point about ‘funneling down’ later in the interview, and asked for an example of how that might work in practice (MsJ: 348-351). Ms. Jay reported two potential scenarios. In the first, the teacher whose position was made possible by 20 FIS could be hired to teach extra blocks of classes that could not be covered by existing staff (MsJ: 353); in the second, she noted how funding from FIS could be used to top-up existing part-time teaching positions at the school:

Extract 5.11 ‘it’s based on the school’s need’ (MsJ: 355-368)

01 MsJ: say someone has less, say there’s a teacher and he or she’s only teaching half time here. they might be able to get a block or two extra
02 RD: right
04 MsJ: with the new FTE (Full-Time Equivalent teacher) that gets released because of international funding
05 RD: right. and so there’s not a direct link then between international funding and programming for
06 MsJ: no
07 RD: international students per se. it goes into a general sort of
08 MsJ: it goes into general yeah
09 RD: okay
10 MsJ: in the school. it sh-, it shouldn’t be but then again international students are all over the place
11 RD: that’s that’s the other thing
12 MsJ: so it’s based on the school’s need
13 RD: right
14 MsJ: like the admin decides well we need to open this chemistry class, so they open it based on the extra
15 FTE
16 RD: right right
The second scenario told of teachers who had been hired part time who, through FIS funding, could now have their teaching load, and job status, increased (lines 01-04). Between lines 05-09, I ask and Ms. Jay confirms that the FIS funding at the school level is, similar to the district level, untagged, that is, isn’t set aside for the provision of courses for FIS or ELL (“it goes into general yeah”, line 08). At line 10, through the utterance “it shouldn’t be”, Ms. Jay displays how she has heard my utterance at lines 05-07; namely, to imply that there should be a link between the funding FIS bring and programming for them. But her response (i.e., “then again”, line 10) functions to create a space for an opposing position: because “international students are all over the place” (line 10), making it difficult to target their needs, how the funding is used is “based on the school’s need” (line 12). She then concludes the account with a final hypothetical example of how “the admin decides we need a chemistry class” (line 14) and the FIS funding allows for that class to be created, regardless of whether there are international students in the class or not.

Of primary interest in Extracts 5.8-5.11 is the work that gets done to construct the FIS category through the notion of funding that FIS bring to schools. The easy availability of, relaxed familiarity with, and clinical ordinariness in these accounts of FIS as a source of ‘untagged’ funding index, I argue, the central role of FIS in discursive and material processes that continue to socialize the Pateo District and its schools. In a discursive sense, their place in discussions of school finance is increasingly ubiquitous; in a material sense, not only are FIS a means for administrators to obtain general purpose funding to use at their discretion (i.e., the funding is ‘untagged’), FIS thus represent a resource for funding the education of ‘regular’ students (i.e., non-ELL) at a reduced enrollment cost (i.e., schools get more funding for fewer students enrolled).

But at the same time that FIS presence has socialized the language and talk of the QHS principal and these teachers, the institutional structure and decision making processes that depend on FIS tuition revenues, realized as extra teachers or a “chemistry class” (Extract 5.11,
line 14) at a ‘reduced’ rate, play both discursive and material roles in constituting FIS as ‘cash cows’. In fact, the ongoing FIS socialization of the Pateo District and its schools, in which FIS are constructed as ‘cash cows’ facilitating the education of non-ELL students, is occurring at the same time that FIS students are “stuck” in ESL courses in which strong L2 English pedagogy continues to be inadequately funded.

Hearable in the school-based accounts, and permeating the FIS-related processes and practices described and made relevant in them, is an educational ideology in which FIS presence is conceptualized as directly consequential for maximizing human and/or material resources for schools; in which high school aged learners, ostensibly recruited to live away from their families, are treated as little more than the means for economizing the day to day operations of public educational institutions. A similar ideology was used to position FIS in the Pateo District’s Sectoral Review (Pateo School District, 2012a) under the heading “Pressures to increase revenue”; in this document, the recruitment of FIS was listed alongside, and thus effectively equated with, “leasing land or space in our schools” as primary means for “offset[ting] reduced funding and increasing revenue” (p. 8).

**QHS student accounts.** Among non-focal students with whom I discussed FIS issues, the notion of funding was treated as a significant difference between immigrants and FIS students (e.g., ThinMan:09-45; Who:42-55; YA:24-43). These students were highly informed about the costs associated with FIS schooling not only during the regular year but also for summer school courses. Drawing again on data from the non-focal immigrant students Who and YA, below I demonstrate how the notion of funding was discussed during different interviews and in response to different questions.

In a recording from March 2012, just prior to the school’s spring break, an informal interview with a non-focal resident student named Who and focal student Zeejay was captured on a lavaliere microphone. In addition to reporting that as an immigrant ESL student he did not
pay tuition fees, Who noted that as an immigrant ESL student he was able to attend summer school courses free of charge, but that his FIS counterparts were not; and finally, that as an immigrant ESL student he was able to earn a part time salary while working at a restaurant, something Zeejay (as an FIS) was not allowed to do (ZJtMrW09Mr12:809-844).

In another interview (see also, e.g., Extract 5.6), I asked Who explicitly whether he thought there were other differences between the way each category of student functioned in the classroom. His response drew on the notion of funding, again through the topic of tuition fees, to produce a version of FIS classroom experience that was qualitatively different from that of immigrant students.

Extract 5.12 “ah I pay the fees” (Who:43-54)

01 RD: is there anything hhh. anything else that's different? like how about in the- in the classroom is
02 there any, do you think there's any difference between kind of how the- you know, how the kind of
03 international and ESL students function
04 WHO: w- I think there's not many contra- contrast (cause) they are we just up to themself. if you want
05 to learn, if you want to be a good student wha- wha- no matter what kind of student you are you
06 have to you will study well. but hhh. I think uh m- maybe the mm, the international student gonna
07 do a better job cause they pay the fees right. everytime (they will say that) when everytime they
08 don't want to study say ah I pay the fees. such a expen-, such a expensive.
09 RD: ah
10 WHO: right have- they have some pressure. and then you- you come here alone and you you got the clear
11 purpose, you- I ca- I came here for studying. but immigrant stu- im- im- immigrant student say
12 maybe I come here maybe for live longer the study
13 RD: right
14 WHO: by the study but international student come here fo- only for studying (yeah)
15 RD: huh uh huh
16 WHO: so they're maybe pay more attention to study

Who begins by responding to the question with “there’s not many contrast” (line 04), and attributes to all students the need to self-regulate (i.e., “we just up to themself”, line 04). This response constructs immigrants and FIS students as similar by treating their residency and status as less important than self-regulated study habits: “if you want to learn if you want to be a good student” – it is your responsibility to “study well” (lines 04-06). Following this initial qualified response, however, Who mentions the role of tuition fees (lines 06-08). He distinguishes the category of FIS by noting that they “maybe” will “do a better job because they pay the fees right” (line 07). Who then uses reported speech (“when everytime they don’t want to study say ah I pay
the fees…such a expensive”, line 08) to work up an ostensibly stereotypical FIS perspective about the role of having paid tuition fees as a motivating factor to “do a better job” (lines 06-07). Having paid fees means FIS “have some pressure”, not only because they “come here alone” and because they “got the clear purpose” (lines 10-11), but because they “come here fo- only for studying (yeah)” (line 14). In contrast, Who works up a description of a generalized immigrant student perspective – i.e., to “come here maybe for live longer the study” (lines 12).

Who’s use of differences in “pressure” attributable to funding, that is, parental money spent on tuition and the anxiety FIS carry about succeeding in their studies as a result, as a means for constructing of FIS as qualitatively different from immigrant students is notable here. Because this contrastive construction occurs sequentially following his claim that there is “not many contrast” (line 04), it could be perceived as occurring specifically as a response to my question about “differences between…how international and ESL students function” (lines 02-03). But regardless of why Who has used “pressure” attributable to tuition fees as a resource to differentiate FIS from immigrant ELL learners, that he knows to use it and that it is possible to use it for this purpose is one further example of how funding is a widely circulating resource for constructing (the category of) FIS.

Another non-focal immigrant ELL student, YA, who had lived in BC and attended QHS for almost two years, also attributed to FIS a “pressure” that she did not attribute to herself. When I asked YA in a research interview what she thought of when she heard the term international student, YA began by describing the situation for FIS as “really hard”. The actions she attributed to FIS to specify why things for them were “really hard” were: traveling to another country without their parents, coming to an unfamiliar city alone, speaking only English with homestay parents, and feeling lonely (YA:27-38). She then went on to discuss “pressure”:

Extract 5.13 “parents spend a lot of money so they maybe also feel the pressures” (YA:43-53)
01 YA: and their parents spend a lot of money so they maybe also feel the pressures
02 RD: right [to kind of
YA: [I have to

RD: about English

YA: yeah. oh also and the most important about ESL. I- a- many friends their most worry about is not their Science, Math or something, they're are just worry about ESL

RD: about-

YA: yeah its because the (1.0) the grades I guess

Summary. In this subsection, I have shown how the notion of funding, specifically as it related to FIS tuition fees, was drawn upon by different participants, and in relation to different practices, to discursively construct the FIS category. At the same time that the analysis is based
on participants’ interview accounts, it presents its own account of the multidirectional socializing role of FIS tuition fees in: (1) everyday district- and school-level operations, and further, (2) in distinguishing FIS from their immigrant peers (e.g., both in terms of what they bring to the Pateo District and QHS [Extracts 5.7-5.11] and in terms of the “pressure” these tuition fees places upon them at school – especially where English language is concerned [Extracts 5.12-5.13]. It is thus to the topic of language that I turn in section 5.3.3.

5.3.3 Language(s): L1 Use vs. ELL

Along with the notions of residency and funding, the notion of language was omnipresent in discussions related to FIS in the Pateo District and at QHS. One way the notion of language was relevant to FIS, as is detailed in the interview extracts presented in this section, was related to perceived similarities in the national and linguistic backgrounds of FIS and immigrant students (e.g., IEP:1329-1333; MsJ:1383-1405; MrW:571-585; QHSPr2:590-596). But the most important way the notion of language was relevant to FIS in practice was via the relationship between FIS and ELL services, teaching, and learning. This relationship is central to subsequent chapters in the dissertation, in which I examine the socializing impact of getting out of ESL for four focal participants (Ellen, Moon, Zeejay, and WoW).

In what follows I demonstrate in varying participants’ interview accounts a palpable tension between FIS’ use of English and their use of their L1 (constructed below as ‘Mandarin’), and a pervasive-yet-officially unacknowledged presumption that FIS were essentially fee-paying ELLs.

**District-level accounts.** At the district level, the IEP administrator’s discussion of shared L1 background was accomplished euphemistically through reference to the high number of “Chinese” (IEP:1048) FIS now attending Pateo District Schools. Because “schools already have many uh landed immigrant students directly from Taiwan and Hong Kong and different parts of mainland China” (IEP:1050), the administrator noted that shared knowledge of an L1 was
advantageous in helping FIS adapt and integrate into the system and structure of BC schools. As such, the administrator noted, it was (and continued to be) an inbuilt form of infrastructure:

Extract 5.14 “we hope for integration as far as possible” (IEP:1329-1333)
01 IEP: we hope for integration as far as possible, and- and
02 RD: right
03 IEP: maybe we have a bit of an easier time with it here because of the fact that there are so many other uh
04 new, new
05 RD: here
06 IEP: students that they can rely on

In this extract, the notion of language is related to the category of FIS through implicature. For example, “integration” (line 01) of FIS into the school system is constructed as “easier” (line 03) in the Pateo District because important information can be circulated via “other new…students they [i.e., FIS] can rely on” (lines 04-06). What goes unmentioned here, but is strongly implied, is that the action of ‘relying on’ attributed to FIS here indexes the circulation of information in and through shared L1s that are other than English. This implicature is important for two reasons: the first is that it positions FIS’ L1s as necessary and important mediators of their ‘integration’; the second, and of greater importance given the ostensive ‘pressure’ FIS feel because of the tuition associated with their studies (e.g., subsection 5.3.2), is that it suggests that FIS students’ English language capabilities may not be sufficient to facilitate successful integration (i.e., that FIS are de facto ELLs). In both cases, the notion of language is an important discursive resource for describing FIS learners, and thus, the category of FIS.

In a different part of my conversation with the IEP administrator, I mentioned that it was difficult for me to understand why, if FIS students were paying close to $1000 per month in homestay fees, and $13000 in yearly tuition fees, their parents did not prefer to send them to a private school (IEP:1178-1180). The administrator’s response was candid: “well one reason is that many private schools don’t have an ESL program” (IEP:1181), and continued by noting that in the Pateo District they do not “screen out” FIS based on English proficiency levels (i.e., “we absolutely don’t we’re welcoming to any E- students in any ESL level” [IEP:1187]). Not only
did this response suggest that FIS frequently required ELL services, it implied that FIS attend public (and not private) schools specifically because they require ELL services. The work done to link ELL learning and teaching to the category of FIS in these accounts was remarkable not only for how it positioned FIS and ELL services within a broader (private vs. public) educational marketplace: the very availability of the link between FIS and ELL programs suggested ELL status as a dominant resource for constructing the category of FIS.

One final example from my interview with the IEP administrator occurred as part of a sequence at the end of the interview in which I was summarizing some of the information that was new to me (IEP:1356-1358). As part of this summary, I had mentioned my surprise at the administrator’s earlier claim that “many of our [Pateo District] teachers don’t know which student is international and which is immigrant and which is you know been here forever or came here last year” (IEP:291). The administrator responded with an account for why teachers didn’t know, and used a contrastive example from a district where “everybody knows who international kids are” (IEP:1359).

Extract 5.15 “they have to you know make up an ESL class” (IEP:1359-1362)
01 IEP: I think in ru- I know in more rural areas it’s quite different, um and so my colleague in [Salish Stream]
02 will talk about well they have to you know make up an ESL class for those kids and everybody knows
03 who international kids are who come
04 RD: yeah so-
05 IEP: so you know it’s quite a different experience for kids there than if they come here

The administrator’s description of what happens in “more rural areas” (line 01) is remarkable in the way it uses ELL classes, or ELL services, as a resource for constructing the experience of FIS (i.e., “those kids”, line 02). In this account, ELL services are described as playing a critical mitigating role in the experience of FIS: whereas in an urban setting like the Pateo District, ELL classes are so ubiquitous and taken for granted that FIS can be placed in existing classes (not to mention go unnoticed by teachers who are unable to distinguish between immigrant ELL and FIS-ELL [e.g., IEP:291]), in rural areas it is necessary to “make up an ESL class for those [i.e.,
FIS] kids” (lines 02-03) because prior to FIS’ arrival ESL classes did not exist.\(^{46}\) Beyond the work the IEP administrator’s account does to situate the existence, or not, of ELL services as a hinge on which “quite a different experience for [FIS] kids” (line 05) can swing, it draws on the ideological orientation to FIS as *de facto* ELL learners as a resource and thus provides insight into the category of FIS in practice. That the swift and unproblematic availability and mobilization of the connection between FIS and ELL can function as an explanatory resource in this way is illuminating of a wider and more pervasive link between the category of FIS and ELL services, teaching, and learning.

In practice, the connection between FIS and ELL also manifested itself in modifications the Pateo District made to its collection of student statistics. Figure 5.1 (next page) displays provincially-mandated, publicly available statistics which displays the total number of *Aboriginal, ELL, French Immersion, and Non-resident* students in the Pateo School District (BCMoE, 2014a). As I have shown in Chapter 4 (subsection 4.2.2), the label *Non-residents* (i.e., FIS) is used in these statistics to enumerate students who are ineligible for state-funding and hence pay fees to attend public school; the label *ELL*, conversely, is reserved for students who identified as requiring of and eligible for additional state-funding for supplemental ELL services.

Of particular interest here is that despite the fact that *Non-residents* (fee-payers) have much in common with *ELL* students (i.e., that “their primary language, or languages, of the home language are other than English” and that they “require additional services to develop their individual potential within [BC’s] school system” [BCMoE, 2009/2013, p. 4]), the two groups are enumerated separately in these district-level student statistics.

\(^{46}\) The QHS Principal drew on a strikingly similar urban/rural contrast as a means for describing FIS experience in BC public high schools, specifically as it related to the ethnic, sociocultural, and linguistic diversity represented in urban versus rural areas (e.g., QHSPr2:131-143).
Given what I had learned at QHS about the proportion of FIS who were receiving ELL services (i.e., that it was between 60-70%; Cfn03N11:50-51; Gfn23O11:42-43; see also Chapter 3, Tables 3.2 and 3.3), I contacted the Pateo School District office to inquire as to whether there was any way to calculate the proportion of FIS were also receiving ELL services at the district level. A field services representative responded to my email as follows, noting that the unit had “a new program code ELL International to track the number of international students who also receive ELL support services” (personal communication, October 2, 2012). Upon learning further from Pateo District representatives that these data were not publicly available, and that “The Ministry [i.e., BCMoE] does not track the number of students with the ELL International program code” (personal communication, March 12, 2014), I requested access to these data from the school district. Table 5.1 shows the number of FIS receiving ELL services in the 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 school years respectively. The row dedicated to the label **Non-Resident**
represents the total number of FIS in the Pateo District during a given year; the row dedicated to the label **ELL International** represents the total number of FIS students who were making use of ELL services during a given year; finally, the bottommost row indicates the **percentage of FIS using ELL services** in a given year.

Table 5.1 FIS as ‘Unaccounted for’ ELL learners in the Pateo School District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2012/2013</th>
<th>2013/2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Resident</strong></td>
<td>1057</td>
<td>1258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELL International</strong></td>
<td>757</td>
<td>917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of FIS using ELL services</strong></td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data collected under the Pateo District’s new ELL International category suggested both that a substantial number of FIS were making use of ELL services, and that this number had increased by a small percentage in the 2013/2014 school year; it also meant that a significant number of ELL learners went publicly unreported in 2012/2013 (i.e., 757 or 71.6%) and 2013/2014 (i.e., 917 or 72.8%), and thus that in material terms FIS was connected to ELL education in a very substantive and consequential way. While in the publicly available version of the Pateo District’s student statistics (Figure 5.1) the link between FIS (*Non-resident*) and ELL was effectively obscured, the establishment of the Pateo District’s locally developed “ELL International” category evidences that in practice they were very aware of, and demonstrably concerned about, the connection between FIS and ELL and the impact of the former on the latter. The development of the category ELL International by the Pateo District is an index of FIS socialization: in one sense, that this construction of FIS-as-ELL was necessary and useful for the Pateo District is discursively telling; in another, more material sense, it alludes to (highly) unreliable provincial accounting regarding the number of English language learners in the Pateo District. Given that in the 2014/2015 school year there were 13,127 ‘Non-resident’ (i.e., FIS) students studying in BC’s K-12 public schools (BCMoE, 2015d), this sort of unreliable
provincial accounting has potentially massive implications for ELL students, teachers, and services.

In a more general sense, the relationship between FIS and ELL in the work being done around student statistics further establishes how the notion of (English) language has a central role in the construction of the category of FIS in practice.

**QHS principal and teachers’ accounts.** In research interviews with the QHS principal and teachers, the notion of language was also discussed both in relation to FIS’ L1s and in relation to their (L2) English proficiency. In both of these cases, ELL services, teaching, and/or learning are strongly connected to the category of FIS.

**QHS principal.** Based on accounts from a focal participant about the difference between the prestige of English classes at QHS versus those at GGHS47 (DaneI2: 877-946; also ER22Mr12:36-39),48 I asked the QHS principal if they felt there was a difference in the prestige of subject areas or grades associated with them for QHS students (QHSPr2:561). After a long narrative which described how changes in the student demographic at QHS over the years had transformed the school’s academic reputation, the principal reported there was an unusually low enrolment for senior English Literature classes the following year; and thus that administratively, they were faced with a difficult decision about whether to offer the courses or not (QHSPr2:562-582). By canceling English Literature classes, QHS would risk losing “kids who really want to take that course” (QHSPr2:584). After a brief comment on the list of 30 students who had confirmed they were “moving to other schools next year” (QHSPr2:588), the principal continued:

---

47 GGHS is an acronym for Great Googly High School, which is a pseudonym for the school Dane referred to in his interview and ER report (see next Footnote).
48 Below are my written question and Dane’s email report response (ER22Mr12:36-39):

**RD** English grades at [GGHS]

In our interview, you started to speak a bit about the differences between grades at [GGHS] and [QHS], but it was difficult to understand what you meant when I listened to the recording. Could I ask you to write a little bit about that so that I can better understand what you meant?

**Dane** - so basically in [GGHS], because most of them are caucasians, they want higher level of english i think, but [QHS], 90% of them are chinese so they are kind of less strict about giving english grades.
Extract 5.16 “not the kind of English immersion environment they thought” (QHSPr2: 590-596)

01 QP: proportionately more native English speakers are leaving the school than non-native. but we’re also hearing from international students that they’re moving to a different school because they find that there’s too much Mandarin spoken here
04 RD: so
05 QP: and so they’re not picking up English the way that they thought they would
06 RD: expected
07 QP: it’s not the kind of English immersion environment
08 RD: right
09 QP: they thought they were coming to. so you get Mandarin speakers leaving here because there’s too much Mandarin spoken

In this extract, the QHS principal notes that in addition to “native English speakers” (line 01), FIS too are “moving to a different school because they find too much Mandarin spoken” (lines 02-03). Attributed to FIS themselves, ostensibly as a concern voiced to the QHS administration (“we’re also hearing from international students”, lines 01-02), is an assessment of the use of Mandarin as an impediment to their English language learning (“there’s too much Mandarin spoken here…so they’re not picking up English the way that they thought they would”, line 05). This voicing of this generalized FIS perspective (i.e., as one which dislikes the extensive use of Mandarin), continues throughout the rest of the extract (e.g., “they”, lines 05, 09) until the principal replaces the pronoun with “Mandarin speakers” (line 09). This replacement functions to produce a generalized description of the current situation with respect to FIS students leaving QHS (i.e., “you get Mandarin speakers [FIS] leaving here because there’s too much Mandarin spoken”, lines 09-10). In this case the use of “Mandarin”, the default L1 ascribed to FIS, is positioned as a detriment to FIS’ (English) educational experience at QHS.

But the principal also connects FIS decisions to move to a different school (lines 02-03) to ELL learning: not only were FIS “not picking up English the way that they thought they would” (line 06-07), QHS was “not the kind of English immersion environment [RD: right] they thought they were coming to” (lines 09-11). Bound up in these descriptions are characterizations of FIS as de facto ELL learners (i.e., their need/desire/struggle to “pick up English”), and similarly of their purpose for coming to BC as being directly linked to English language
education (i.e., their need/desire/struggle to find a suitable “English immersion environment”).

Here again, in the attribution to FIS of L1 Mandarin-speaking status, as well as the direct linkages between Mandarin use and English language learning and the experiences of FIS, the notion of language features as a readily available discursive resource for constructing the category of FIS.

**Mr. Whee.** Mr. Whee also connected the notion of language to the category of FIS through students’ use of L1s and status as ELLs, and framed FIS use of L1 as an impediment to learning a ‘new’ language (i.e., English). When I asked Mr. Whee what he thought were the easiest and hardest things for FIS students to learn (MrW: 538), he reported that students seemed too self-conscious to “take responsibility” for their (English) learning and didn’t show “the courage to say wait I don’t get it stop” (MrW: 539-566). He continued his response in the following exchange:

**Extract 5.17 “you can speak Chinese all day long not my problem” (MrW: 571-585)**

01 MrW: and I think I think the biggest challenge for our kids at this school is the fact that they all just hang out together
02 RD: yeah
03 MrW: they isolate the non-Chinese students
04 RD: students
05 MrW: and they speak Chinese to each other
06 RD: yeah
07 MrW: and they don’t take responsibility for that.
08 RD: it’s a-
09 MrW: you know that one lesson right there
10 RD: is- is huge
11 MrW: they he- you know you can tell them ‘til you’re blue in the face, and I know Mr. Ogib fought
12 with it and Ms. Feu. I said you guys let it go you can’t fight that, you just can’t
13 RD: when there’s a critical mass in your class and they’re going to win every time
14 MrW: every time. I don’t give a shit you can speak Chinese all day long, not my problem. I’m getting paid.
15 RD: yeah
16 MrW: it’s unfortunate you’re not taking advantage of an optimum situation to learn a new language

In line 01, Mr. Whee uses the phrase “our kids” to refer both to the FIS and ELL students at the school and in her classes. To this generalized reference to QHS students, Mr. Whee attributes linguistic (i.e., “they speak Chinese to each other”, line 06) and racialized, culturally-specific practices (i.e., “they all just hang out together…and isolate the non-Chinese students”, line 04).
These attributions, however, are devices for framing what he reports “the biggest challenge” (line 01) for ‘these’ students to be: “they don’t take responsibility for” (line 08) those practices. Mr. Whee then draws on his own experiences (“you can tell them ‘til you’re blue in the face”, line 12), as well as the experiences of other teachers (lines 12-13), to reinforce the position that it is the students’ responsibility – not teachers’ – to adapt, curtail, or control their use of L1 (i.e., “let it go you can’t fight that you just can’t”, line 13). After agreeing with my line 14 summary of his argument (and co-constructed reification of the widely circulating, locally-relevant trope), Mr. Whee again distances himself from the responsibility to alter students’ L1 practices by referring to the fact that he will be paid for his work regardless of what (language) learning occurs in his classes (i.e., “I don’t give a shit you can speak Chinese all day long not my problem I’m getting paid”, line 15). Mr. Whee reported that it was through the practices of ‘speaking in’ Chinese and ‘hanging out with’ Chinese classmates that FIS and ELL students were “not taking advantage of an optimum situation to learn a new language” (line 17).

Mr. Whee’s use of students’ shared L1 practices to work up an account of the biggest challenge for students is one way the notion of languages was relevant to the category of FIS in practice. Not only are students’ L1 practices treated as a challenge to their achievement of a goal in which he is centrally implicated, that Mr. Whee imputes to this goal gaining proficiency in English language (“being in an optimum situation to learn a new language”, line 17) is again strongly suggestive of how ELL services were relevant to the category of FIS in practice.

Ms. Jay. In response to my interview question about whether FIS could benefit from classroom language policies at QHS, Ms. Jay reported that those kinds of decisions were “up to the individual teacher”; although many teachers told students “you should speak English in the classroom”, she conceded that “there’s just too many people” and that “it’s impossible to enforce that rule literally impossible” (MsJ:1383-1397). At the same time, Ms. Jay also noted that she
empathized with FIS’ desire to use their L1s when it helped with comprehension or when they were fatigued (MsJ:1399-1405).

Where ELL services, teaching, and learning were concerned, Ms. Jay mentioned that one of the difficulties in teaching FIS was their ‘older’ age when they first arrived in Canada (MsJ: 227-231). I followed up by asking why she thought so many FIS arrived at the ages of 15-16 (MsJ:234-236), and she responded as follows:

**Extract 5.18 “to overcome the hurdle of ESL first” (MsJ: 237-243)**

01 RD: any reason why you think that age is so common
02 MsJ: don’t know
03 RD: it’s like mi- beginning of middle school like
04 MsJ: I’m not sure i- and international- I think when when they come there are different reasons, one of the reasons is because uh parents realize maybe they might get a better education in Canada or the United States,
07 RD: right
08 MsJ: North America than they would in their home country. another reason might be they’re not doing well in their home country
09 RD: yeah
10 MsJ: so therefore they send them to Canada because they think, the parents think that it’s an easier route to get into university
13 RD: sure
14 MsJ: but they don’t realize that they have to overcome the hurdle of ESL first

After suggesting that it is parents’ perception that their kids would receive a “better education” in North America “than they would in their home country” (lines 04-08), Ms. Jay offers an additional possibility – that perhaps students “not doing well in their home country” (lines 08-09) are sent to study because “parents think it’s an easier route to get into university” (line 09). Ms. Jay contextualizes the parental expectations in these candidate responses by attributing to FIS students a taken-for-granted status as ELL learners: “but they [parents] don’t realize they [students] have to overcome the hurdle of ESL first” (lines 15-16). This taken-for-granted status as ELL students thus serves as a contrastive means (e.g., “but”, line 14) for qualifying her descriptions of FIS parents’ potential reasons for sending their children abroad.

More generally, the “hurdle of ESL” to which Ms. Jay refers here is doubly pertinent: first because it explicitly connects FIS experiences to English language learning; second,
because the “need to overcome” attributed to FIS here alludes to a key structural issue standing in the way of “a better education” or “an easier route to get into university”, since in BC ELL courses “are not awarded credit towards graduation” (Wild et al., 2006, p. 6).

Again in these two examples from Ms. Jay’s interview talk, the notion of language is very clearly implicated in the construction of the category of FIS. Not only in the form of an L1 that is other than English, but crucially, as it relates to the taken-for-granted relationship between FIS and ELL. Ms. Jay’s suggestion that FIS’ parents “don’t realize that they [students] have to overcome the hurdle of ESL first” offers a further perspective for understanding the funding-related ‘pressure’ attributed to FIS students by ELL students in earlier Extracts 5.12 and 5.13. I discuss this ‘hurdle’, and the ‘pressure’ that results, in detail in Chapters 7, 8, and 9.

**QHS student accounts.** In research interviews with student participants, the notion of language was also discussed both in relation to FIS’ L1s and in relation to their (L2) English proficiency. By proxy, ELL services, teaching, and/or learning here also become relevant to these discussions. In this subsection, I present two extracts from a research interview with a non-focal FIS student named Thin-Man.

**Thin-Man.** A non-focal FIS from mainland China, and unlike many of his FIS and immigrant peers, Thin-Man had begun his studies at QHS in October rather than in September 2011. Thin-Man had transferred to QHS from a different school early in the school year; apparently someone from the District informed him that because there were too many FIS at his first school, he had to transfer to QHS (ThinMan:96-106). When I learned that he had transferred to QHS, I asked if he thought there were any differences in the FIS experience at QHS versus the first school he attended (ThinMan:109). After reporting that a student’s success is dependent on their motivation and their friends (ThinMan:110-122), he continued:

*Extract 5.19 “of course this is bad things” (ThinMan:125-133)*

01 TM: and I prefer the school [where] most of people was the foreigner people not Chinese
02 RD: yeah
Thin-Man’s reported preference for a school where “most people was the foreigner” (line 01), by which he means “not Chinese” (line 01), is here mobilized to stand in contrast to QHS which he describes as having “so many Chinese” (line 05). In lines 07-08, Thin-Man ascribes to Chinese students at QHS the “first choice” of speaking their L1 and “not English”, something they choose to do despite the fact that they are studying with non-Chinese ‘foreigners’. Implied in Thin-Man’s characterisations of the QHS and “so many” Chinese students in attendance who “speak Chinese not English” is that he wishes not to be like them; that is, because he would “prefer the school [where] most of people was the foreigner”, and given that for him using “Chinese not English” is a “bad thing” (line 10), Thin-Man works up a position for himself as someone who aspires to use English more than Chinese at school. When asked if speaking primarily Chinese was “a good thing or a bad thing” (line 09), Thin-Man responds emphatically with “of course this is bad things” (line 10). Thin-Man continued his account by linking the learning of English language with the category of being a FIS:
In the second portion of this extract Thin-Man attributes the activities of learning to “speak the different language” and getting “the different education” to the category FIS (“go abroad for study”, line 04), and similarly the goals associated with being an FIS as being influenced by what “the parents want” (line 06). He does work to further describe how, under ideal conditions, the linguistic and educational capital amassed as an FIS can be converted into economic capital (“a good work a high pay”, line 11) if one returns to China after having studied abroad. The “different language” is English (lines 14, 18), but, as Thin-Man suggests, the process of learning it so that it can be converted into economic capital can be potentially impeded by an FIS using their L1 and not being diligent students (“always stay here to speak Chinese and like you never study”, line 12). In fact, between lines 12 and 18, Thin-Man presents a hypothetical media-based narrative about an FIS who has spoken primarily Chinese rather than studying English (line 12) while abroad and who, because upon returning to China is unable to “speak English very well” or “explain his opinion vividly” in English (lines 14-18) – is forced to account for “what [he was] doing at the foreigner [i.e., while abroad]” (line 18).

There are widely circulating held ideologies of language in play in Thin-Man’s talk, and thus that are bound up in his construction of (the category of) FIS. Not only is English treated as the *de facto* language to be learned as part of study abroad (see e.g., J.S.-Y. Park & Lo, 2012b; J.S.-Y. Park & Wee, 2012), the process of language acquisition is here presented as a cut and dry, straightforward process of ‘acquiring’; similarly, the expectations circulating in Thin-Man’s media narrative suggest a conception of the FIS as an individual who has a kind of absolute agency with which to learn the language, and one which can remain unaffected by contexts like the one at QHS. These things said, the main purpose of showing these data has been to show
how the notion of language – i.e., as students’ L1s, but in particular as L2 English – is bound up in, attributed to, and deployed as a resource to construct the category of FIS.

**Summary.** In the accounts presented in this subsection, FIS L1s (typically designated as ‘Chinese’ or ‘Mandarin’) are deployed in talk to achieve a variety of descriptions of FIS. For example: their ‘easy’ integration into the Pateo District (Extract 5.14); reasons why they were leaving QHS (Extract 5.16); frustration of teachers by extensive use of their L1s during classes (Extract 5.17); and frustration of FIS at the availability of their L1 as a language of/for communication (Extract 5.19).

Further in these accounts has been the role of L2 English in working up descriptions of FIS as ELL learners. For example: in contrasting FIS impact in urban versus rural settings (Extract 5.15); in the Pateo District’s development of the ELL International statistical tracking category (Table 5.1); in attributions to FIS of having had an imagined “English immersion environment” prior to their arrival and the goal of “picking up English” (Extract 5.16); and in the construction of English language learning as a goal and expectation of FIS parents and English proficiency as a measure of FIS’ success after returning to their home country (Extract 5.20). In addition to these descriptions can be added the material demographics of each of the classes I observed at QHS. While in Mr. Whee’s ELL writing class 10 of the 30 students were FIS (see Chapter 3, Table 3.1), in Ms. Jay’s ELL Socials class 12 of the 30 students were FIS (see Chapter 3, Table 3.2).

**5.4 Conclusion: Indexing Socialization Through the Discursive Construction of FIS**

In this chapter I have given a multi-part response to the second research question proposed in the study: *How is the category of fee-paying international student (FIS) constructed in BC education practice?* Specifically, this response has relied on talk (i.e., research interview data) and text (i.e., student statistical data) generated and obtained during fieldwork interactions with administrator, teacher, and student participants. I have demonstrated how, in these accounts and
descriptions, the category of FIS is a relational production that is closely linked to English language learning and immigration, and further, to the recontextualized notions of residency, funding, and English language learning identified in Chapter 4.

Remarkably, the use of the notions of residency, funding, and language as discursive resources to construct the category of FIS occur across the different data sources, in relation to different research interview questions, and in descriptions of educational practices relevant in differently constituted educational markets (i.e., for administrators, for teachers, for students), and at different levels of scale in BC (i.e., at the Pateo School District level; at the school- and classroom level [at QHS]; and at the personal level [for teachers, students, and parents]).

Treating these formulations of the FIS category as iconic of FIS presence in the Pateo School District and at QHS, I wish to argue that taken together these multiple articulations of FIS in practice are indexical of socialization through the use of language and socialization to use language. They suggest that FIS presence and the practices deriving from it, from which the category of FIS comes to be understood for different stakeholders across levels and roles in K-12 education in BC, is indeed having a socializing influence on districts, schools, teaching, and learning.

Taking as the ‘case’ the category of FIS, the larger study’s adoption of a multiple case approach thus examines the category of FIS as an assemblage that occurs across different temporal and spatial scales. The illustration of how similar notions are utilized to construct the category of FIS by more than one participant in different ways and for different purposes, attests to the complex and polycentric nature of the category of FIS, the educational markets and practices through which it is constituted, the forms of capital recognized in these markets and practices by different participants, and the economizing logic (e.g., Bourdieu, 1990) that is centrally implicated in each.
In Chapter 6, I draw again on the notions of residency, funding, and language as an organizational heuristic under which to present four focal FIS’s accounts of their living situations in Canada, their socioeconomic backgrounds, and their previous schooling and English language learning experiences. Following this, in Chapters 7 through 9, I then describe a socializing process central to the school-based experiences of FIS students – i.e., ‘getting out of ESL’ – and narrate each student’s negotiations of the process.
CHAPTER 6: CONSTRUCTING FIS IN PERSONS (FIS PROFILES)

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I provide a partial response to the third research question proposed for the study: *How is the category of fee-paying international student (FIS) constructed in persons?* The term ‘persons’ is used purposively here to suggest that, at the same time that each individual focal student’s reported experiences can be read as occasioned articulations of the category of FIS, so too might these occasioned articulations illustrate how discursive resources relating to three common themes urge a broader, more multidimensional understanding of the category of FIS. Thus, in this chapter I take up and expand on the notions of residency, funding, and language (from Chapters 4 and 5) as an organizational heuristic under which to introduce four of the focal FIS participants in the study.

The chapter begins with a brief description of and justification for the analytic orientation taken up (subsection 6.11), and is followed by biographical sketches of each of the four participants: Ellen, Moon, Zeejay, and WoW (Sections 6.2 through 6.5). In each of these sections, I work up a description of each focal participant’s living situation in Canada (i.e., residency), their socioeconomic backgrounds in relation to their experiences as FIS (i.e., funding), and the role and use of English and other languages prior to and while they lived in Canada (i.e., language).

6.1.1 Analytic Orientation: A Narrative Account of Narrative Accounts

The data with which Ellen, Moon, Zeejay, and WoW’s experiences have been constructed in this chapter were generated across four semi-formal oral interviews, bi-monthly written email reports, and anecdotal information obtained during field work at QHS during the course of the 2011-2012 school year. The analytic orientation to these data is broadly discourse-
analytic (e.g., de Fina, 2009; Drew 2006; Potter & Hepburn 2008; Talmy 2011), and thus has implications for both the status attributed to the data and the analysis.

Though the primary foci of analysis are the narrative accounts (de Fina, 2009) of focal FIS students, I understand these accounts as co-constructed products of a research process and methods, which presuppose certain roles, power relations, and the potential spectrum of relationships that are relevant to their production (i.e., researcher/researched; L1 English user/English as an additional language user) (e.g., Baker & Johnson, 2000; Mishler, 1986; Riessman, 2008). For this reason, the contents of focal students’ interview accounts, arranged and assembled in this chapter for the purpose of animating relevant biographical information, are thus conceptualized as “descriptions, claims, reports, allegations, and assertions” (Potter & Hepburn, 2008, p. 275) about those experiences. In both theoretical and methodological terms, then, the representation of focal students’ experiences in this chapter must also be similarly conceptualized and treated as a narrative account (i.e., rather than a direct report of what ‘really’ happened).

6.2 Ellen

6.2.1 Background

Ellen, the only child and daughter of a teacher and accountant (mother) and businessman (father), was born and grew up in a coastal city in mainland China’s Guangdong province (I1:32-72; I3:247-261). She began her studies at QHS as a 15 year old student in grade ten (I1: 269-272), and at the time of our first interview in late October 2011, she had been in Canada for about two months (I1:75-81). Ellen reported that she and her parents had decided that she would study in Canada because in China the competitive focus on academic success made going to school “so hard”; she was always “so tired and I always study until 11 o’clock pm and then get up 6 o’clock and homework and new day is very bad I don’t want to have school” (I1: 230-232).
In addition to the stresses of schooling, Ellen’s account for why she had come to Canada included a continuing narrative about how she could “have more opportunities” to improve at things other than studying, noting “maybe…I can do well in cooking or the other things” (I3: 919-921; also I1: 212-246).

Ellen’s account of how long she planned to stay in Canada constructed her study abroad as a long term project where her mother had suggested “the best way” was to graduate from a Canadian university, though she also mentioned the possibility that her mother may allow her to complete her tertiary studies in America (I1:172-173). Ellen framed the long term project as a strategy for eventual familial migration. When I asked why graduating from a university in Canada was the best way, Ellen’s response was “you know, Canada is very good for lived so my mom hope that if I get, if I have university in Canada and maybe I can have job in Canada, and then they can come to stay yeah ((smiling))” (I1:177-178); she qualified this response by noting “maybe it’s the imagine” and “it’s just a plan” (I1:180-182).

6.2.2 Residency

I asked Ellen during our first interview if she was staying with a homestay family, and she responded as follows: “it’s actually not the real homestay because they’re my mom’s friend” (I1:132). She went on to describe why it wasn’t a “real” homestay: she and her mom had met her homestay family many years earlier in China, and she had been in the same ballet class with the family’s daughter Jenny (I1:147); though the homestay family had immigrated to Canada ten years earlier (I1:151), the moms (“my mom always phone her”) and daughters (“I always send the message with her daughter”) had kept in touch and because of these regular communications she felt close to them (I1:136). Not only was the daughter also in grade ten at QHS, Ellen reported their relationship was “great just like we are sisters” (I1:142). In addition to having a ‘sister’ at her ‘home’ in Canada, Ellen also framed her relationship with Jenny as helping to
facilitate her entrance into the new school: Jenny helped her make friends right away, find her classes and important offices and administrative contacts, become aware of school time routines, and with her homework (I1:283-294). Ellen also rode public transit for 30 minutes each way getting to and from school, a daily routine she often endured with Jenny, and for which Jenny’s guidance was especially helpful early on in Ellen’s stay (ER30Mr12:67).

In addition to being able to use Mandarin for communication at ‘home’, Ellen’s homestay mother prepared her meals, did her laundry, did the majority of cleaning around the house (I3: 924-931), took her shopping, and encouraged her to help herself to anything in the house (ER30Mr12:23, 26). But despite even going on a road trip with her homestay family during QHS’s spring break, where she had the opportunity to visit San Francisco, Las Vegas, Universal Studios and Disneyland (ER30Mr:36), Ellen reported having gained some perspective on the constraints and affordances of her homestay situation early in January. This occurred when her homestay family returned to China for two weeks to attend a funeral, and while they were away, Ellen reported having stayed at with the homestay family of another good friend, Wanda (I2: 628-632). She described having been impressed by how hard Wanda worked (I2:636) and with some of the differences she noticed between how things went at Wanda’s homestay, and at her own. Not only was the common language at Wanda’s homestay English (I4:167), the family was unknown to Wanda prior to her arrival in Canada, hosted a total of four international students, and was a short walking distance from QHS.

In late April, Ellen and her mother decided that she should live in a different homestay the following school year (I3:208-216). In our third interview, Ellen offered different partial accounts for why this decision was made. In the first, it was related to her mother’s comparisons of her English development and academic achievements with Wanda’s (I3:65-88); in the second, it the second, her mom’s aspirations for her daughter to become more independent in the process of studying overseas were reported as important factor (I3:930-942); in the third, she also
reported that a “problem with [her homestay sister] Jenny…like two friends have some like like argue I- disagree” had carried over into school and caused some difficulties within their mutual group of friends (I3: 833-846). As a result, Ellen decided to live with the same homestay family as Wanda. More broadly, Ellen’s looming change in homestay seemed more an indication of the important and influential role Wanda played in Ellen’s experience at QHS. Though Ellen did have other friends both in and outside of QHS, and continued to value her friendship with Jenny, she considered Wanda to be one of her best, and closest, friends. But equally as important, and perhaps even increasingly so each time Ellen was not promoted out of ESL during the year, was the fact that in her new homestay “I need to like speak English” (I4:167). I discuss this further in the next chapter.

6.2.3 Funding

Across the four research interviews I conducted with her, Ellen implicitly represented her family as financially well established, and thus unencumbered by the costs of her international education. Not only could they afford different forms of shadow education (i.e., private, supplemental English language education; see Bray, 1999, p. 17[49] for her twice weekly at a local after-school school (I2: 476-507) and once per week with a writing tutor (I3:592-611, 1155-1156), she reported that prior to coming to Canada, she had spent a month in England (I1:91-97) and that she had also travelled to Korea, Japan, and Vietnam for short periods of time with her parents in recent years (I1:119-127). During the winter break of the 2011-2012 school year, she mentioned having returned home to China for less than two weeks, and further that she had traveled with her parents to Macau for a short vacation during that time (I2:04-29). Though

---

49 Bray (1999)

...describes private supplementary tutoring as a 'shadow' education system. The metaphor of a shadow is appropriate in several ways. First, private supplementary tutoring only exists because the mainstream education exists; second, as the size and shape of the mainstream system change, so do the size and shape of supplementary tutoring; third, in almost all societies much more public attention focuses on the mainstream than on its shadow; and fourth, the features of the shadow system are much less distinct than those of the mainstream system. (p. 17; see also, e.g., Aurini & Davies, 2013; Burch, 2009).
her parents remained in China during Ellen’s 2011-2012 period of study at QHS, she noted that after a short visit to Miami in July her mother was coming to visit her in Canada (I3: 229-246).

However, despite the family’s travels and Ellen’s description of her parents as both having professional incomes (i.e., her mother as a primary school teacher and accountant [I1: 56-63; I3:247-261] and her father as owner of a successful linens and bedding business in Miami [I1:63-72; I3:251-253]), she noted that although her mom wanted to immigrate it was “too expensive now…before like last year it’s okay my mom can like consider about it but hhh. when the new immigration laws came out…it’s ((smiling)) too expensive for us” (I3:1072-1083). Instead, Ellen reported, “my mom hope[d] that when I graduate” her parents would be able “to have the super visa yeah the super visa is like ten years” (I3:1087-1093; also I1:178).

In addition to the explicitness of Ellen’s account of immigration as too expensive and her mom’s “hope to have the super visa”, were the unmentioned-although-somehow-palpable tinges of funding imbuing Ellen’s accounts of the parental pressure she was under to exit her ELL courses and begin taking courses for credit (e.g., I2:406-420; 438-454; I3:04-36, 65-97; I4: 107-134). And though Ellen consistently framed these pressures in terms of the way they positioned her in relation to her peers (e.g., I3:65-97) or timely graduation (e.g., I4:107-134), my sense as a researcher (and parent) was that the parental pressure was somehow economically motivated as well.

50 The “new immigration laws” Ellen is referring to here are changes in the amount of money a family needed to qualify for Canada’s Immigrant Investor Program. Prior to the fall of 2010, investor class immigrants needed only “a personal net worth of $800,000”, and to “make an investment of $400,000” (CIC, 2014a, para. 7) in order to be guaranteed permanent residency in Canada. However, after the fall of 2010, the amount doubled: “investor class applicant[s] must have a personal net worth of at least CDN $1,600,000” and “are required to make an investment of CDN $800,000, paid to the Receiver General of Canada” (CIC, n.d.). Since Ellen’s family had not applied for permanent residency prior to the fall of 2010, it was now “too expensive” for them (cf. Moon; subsection 6.3.2 and Footnote 53)

51 The CIC (2015c, para. 2-3) describes the super visa Ellen is referring to as follows:

With the parent and grandparent super visa, eligible parents and grandparents can visit family in Canada for up to two years without the need to renew their status.

The Super Visa is a multi-entry visa that provides multiple entries for a period up to 10 years. The key difference is that the Super Visa allows an individual to stay for up to two years on initial entry into Canada, while a 10-year multiple entry visa would only have a status period for each entry of six months only.
6.2.4 Language

**English language learning before and outside QHS.**

**China.** Ellen described her study of English in China as having begun in kindergarten, where she first encountered “the abc’s” with a Chinese speaking English teacher (I1:408-416). She continued learning English in elementary school and “junior school”, where, since “about grade nine for me uh we have English class twice a day”; these classes were taught by the same L1-Chinese speaking teacher, lasted for period of 45 minutes each, and focused on teaching grammar and writing (I4:463-488). When I asked if she had ever studied with a “native-speaker uh like a North American” (I1: 469) while she was in China, Ellen mentioned that she had interacted with “just have a friend I have friend in American Texas” and that they communicated, primarily in writing, using the social media website Facebook (I1: 470-478). She reported that she had also “been to England for one month” (I1:91) but did not frame that experience as having been specifically to study English; she had also done some studying for the Test of English as a Foreign Language (I1: 418-420), though unlike many of her peers, had done this on her own and without help (I4: 521-525).

**Canada.** After arriving in Canada Ellen promptly began participation in extra classes at an after-school school where “the owner it’s my homestay’s friend and so they can like do more to look after me” (I2:487). The classes she attended there were on Wednesdays and Saturdays, and changed in focus from week to week but revolved primarily around the study of “vocabulary and reading and writing” (I2:493). Ellen also met with a private tutor on Saturdays because “I just like I want to improve my writing” (I3:609). She described the work she did in these classes by saying that “like every class we need to write an essay” and that “we have homework to write an essay and then the next class and she will help us to correct” (I3: 603-605).

Like Wanda, with whom she was a close friend, Ellen also spent some of her time participating in extracurricular activities that necessitated the use of conversational English.
Early in the year, this included joining the intramural badminton club at QHS (I1:04-23), and by mid-year she had also become a volunteer at one of the elementary schools in the Pateo District once a month (I3:1157-1165).

**Language use at home in Canada.** Ellen’s primary language of interaction at her homestay was Mandarin, though she noted that she also sometimes heard the youngest child at the homestay use English and occasionally “just for fun” interacted with him in English (I1:154-170). Ellen described her homestay mother as being unable to speak English and able to understand “just a little yeah because her son always speak something so easy like mom I want chocolate yeah I want to watch TV yeah” (I1:327-335).

Given that Ellen and Wanda shared Cantonese as a common language in which they could communicate, I asked whether she thought they would use Cantonese to communicate she moved to Wanda’s homestay. Ellen reported that it was actually Wanda who had brought up the issue of which language they would use while at ‘home’: “she [i.e., Wanda] also say like to in September I will live with her in a same homestay and she said like I will not talk to you in Cantonese I will talk to you in English” (I4:435).

### 6.3 Moon

#### 6.3.1 Background

Moon, the only daughter of a homemaker (Mom) and a construction company owner (Dad) (I1: 19-50), was born in mainland China’s Hubei province but lived in Nanjing, the capital city of Jiangsu province, for the majority of her life before coming to Canada (I1: 243-269). Moon arrived in Canada in July 2011, and began her academic year at QHS as a 15 year old grade ten student (I1: 268, 482), though also reported that she had already taken summer school courses in BC which had scheduling issues when she arrived (I2:760-782; see Chapter 7 for more). Despite her insistence that she imagined herself someday returning to China to work
Moon’s account of her reason for coming to study in Canada was different from other students in that it linked directly to her family’s intention to immigrate to Canada (I1:206-232; I2:585-607; I3:171-189; I4:9-26; ER03-12: 25-26). In our third interview, however, she also presented an extended narrative about how, prior to coming to Canada, her teachers had often been in contact with her mother about her (unacceptable) school behavior (I3:565-722).

When I asked if she thought there was any relationship between her behavior at school in China and her coming to Canada to study, Moon replied “I think i- yeah kind of cause my mom said I’m so active in China ((laughs)) (RD: active) I’m s- way too active in China I’m not suitable for there ((laughing)) so I came here” (I3: 640-643).

Like many of her peers, Moon reported that she planned to stay in Canada for three or four years, and that she would prefer to do her university education in the U.S.; but she also qualified those plans by saying that her family’s as-of-yet-undecided immigration status in Canada would play a role in determining how long she stayed (I1:291-312).

6.3.2 Residency

Although for the majority of the 2011-2012 school year Moon resided with her mother near QHS, she reported that she had lived with a homestay family for the first month she was in Canada (I1:75-110). Although her family had used an education agent to assist with preparing for Moon’s sojourn (I1:113-116), they did not use the Pateo School District endorsed Queen Charlotte College to find a homestay. Instead, Moon described her mother’s membership and participation in “a [Chinese] group on the internet and they’re all in Canada and they’re talking about everything in Canada” (I1:101) – as the means via which her homestay family had been selected (I1:92-110). The family, who Moon met for the first time when they picked her up at the

52 From Chapter 5 (subsection 5.3.1):

According to the [international education] administrator, about half of the district’s then 1300 FIS had been placed with a host family through Queen Charlotte College’s (QCC) Homestay Program (IEP:489). [...] The Pateo School District’s decision to outsource the homestay portion of International Education Program was historical, and further, had to do with the fact that QCC was one of the first international programs in BC to offer homestay coordination (IEP:483).
airport (I1:666-667), consisted of three people (mother, father, 11 year old daughter). Another high-school aged international student from mainland China also resided with the family, and their home was located more than 40 minutes from QHS via bus (I1:142-170).

When I asked Moon about her arrival and the homestay, she responded by saying “well actually the first month is not very good” (I1: 75) and produced an extended account which detailed her experience at the homestay (I1:77-85, 117-176). Although the family provided food for her and the other homestay student and often ate meals together with them, Moon noted that “maybe the food you don’t like it but you still need to eat it” (I1:125-138). She further described the homestay as “not very comfortable” because “they just manage you and in charge of you of everything like what are you going to do this afternoon” and “they don’t allow me to go outside with my friends…I don’t know why” (I1:81-85). Moon’s report of the (unacceptable) situation at her homestay was also supported in part by a narrative about her housemate (also a FIS). According to Moon, her housemate “just talk[ed] on the internet with her friend in China every day and never go out” (I1:146), slept all afternoon after lunch, and for this reason had been forbidden by the homestay parents to take her computer downstairs to her bedroom (in the basement) at night; further, Moon described how her roommate was regularly pressured into spending time with the homestay daughter even though she was “grade eleven and the [homestay] girl is grade six” (I1:148-160). But Moon’s account also foregrounded the absence of her mother: “I just don’t want to stay there it’s I uh:: I don’t know how to say just it’s very hard to live myself or what because yeah…because my mom not here” (I1:120-122).

As a result of her complaints about the homestay to her parents, in August, after just one month of living abroad on her own, Moon’s mother had come to Canada and the two were living in a rented apartment near QHS (I1:89-91). Later in the interview, discussing whether Moon’s own feelings toward studying in Canada had changed now that she was living with her mother, I learned that their apartment rental too was in fact only temporary because Moon’s mother had
actively sought and purchased a townhouse in the same neighborhood as their rental apartment, and they planned to move into the new place in December 2011 (I1:442-448). Moon situated the purchase of the townhouse within the context of the family’s plans to immigrate to Canada, stating that her mother had bought it “so we can we can stay h- so we can stay here (RD: ah) for a long time and I think um this I think I’m going to love Canada” (I1:447-449).

But in spite of her positive outlook, Moon also reported that the transition to living in Canada posed challenges. Though at first her mother “always feel alone or she always have the bad mood and just like that”, Moon suggested that now she was better (I1:453-455). For her own part, Moon suggested that although her relationship with her mother was better in Canada than it had been in China (I3:715-717), when her mother left for a short trip to China she noted that she was happy because it meant that not having to argue when her mother asked her why Moon couldn’t function on her own like other kids her age (I3: 731-749). Upon her return from the short trip to China, Moon described her mother as always being busy: “she almost find her friend to to go out with her everyday it’s really every day just when I got home she was not at home yeah just like that just like that I don’t know” (I4:304-306). Moon hoped things would change when her father arrived in August 2012 (I4:15; I3:304); despite the fact that their immigration papers had been processed and “we will become the official immigrant” (I4:17), she reported being told by Pateo District officials that she would remain an FIS the following year (I4:23).

6.3.3 Funding

Moon reported that her family had applied to immigrate to Canada almost three years prior to her coming to Canada and QHS for her studies, (I1:209-233) through a program in which her family could invest money with the Canadian government in exchange for guaranteed permanent residency status.53 Her family’s ability to apply for immigration through this ‘investor

53 The program was called the Immigrant Investor Program. Though this Program was officially cancelled on February 11th, 2014 and the backlog for applications terminated on June 14th, 2014 (CIC, 2014c), at the time Moon’s
class’ served as a tangible index of her family’s available economic resources and resulting mobility (cf. Ellen’s funding situation, subsection 6.2.3).

But Moon also reported that her family had been waiting “about three years” (I1:216) for a response from the Canadian government with “no answer” (I1:220). That her family had planned their immigration prior to her entering high school in China, and in light of the fact that when they had not received a response “my mom said just come...just go for it” (I1:222), Moon’s account implied that her parents had anticipated that she would attend high school in Canada and suggested strong links between immigration and education. This is relevant to funding because Moon’s categorization as a FIS hinged on the status of her family’s immigration application. Had she begun high school in Canada as a newly landed immigrant student, she would not have had to pay fees; but because the family’s application was still in process during the entire 2011-2012 school year, Moon was a fee-paying student for the duration of the study. Her status as an FIS continued despite the fact that her family’s immigration application was demonstrably all but complete: even though by late February 2012 they had received and completed the physical examination required for PR applicants who have been approved in principle (I2:586-593), because their actual documentation did not arrive after the payment deadline Moon reported having been made to pay international fees for both summer school (I3:171-189) and the following school year (I4:9-26).

But Moon’s mother’s decision to “just go for it” (I1:222) is also relevant to funding in a very different sense – one that supports the interpretation that Moon’s family was very well-resourced (i.e., neither the tuition fees nor expenses associated with living overseas would significantly impact the family’s economic wellbeing). Not only was Moon’s family able to meet

family had applied, prior to the fall of 2010, investor class immigrants were required to have “a personal net worth of $800,000”, and to “make an investment of $400,000” (CIC, 2014a). Unlike Ellen’s family (see subsection 6.2.3, Footnote 50), Moon’s family had applied for permanent residency prior to the doubling of the net worth and investment requirements of the Investor Program.
the requirements to apply for immigration to Canada under the Immigrant Investor Program, they had the means to send Moon to a private, foreign language middle school in China (I1:404-416), for her to receive a wide array of shadow education prior to coming (I1: 379-393, 404-416; I4:55-61) as well as while in Canada (I2:291-304; I3:1139-1145), and for Moon’s mother to move to BC, rent an apartment (I1:89-91), and eventually purchase a home close enough to QHS that allowed Moon to walk to school (I1:442-449).

In addition to her father being the owner of his own construction company (I1: 17-28), a final index of Moon’s family’s socioeconomic positioning is the extent to which both she and her mother travelled during the course of the year. Moon reported traveling back to China with her mother for eleven days during the Christmas break (I2:36-45), that she and her mother had stayed for two days “to learn how to ski” at Whistler-Blackcomb resort and then spent two days in Victoria during the spring break in March (ER03:33-34), and that her mom had travelled back to China for two weeks in April (I3:742-747; I4:302-304).

6.3.4 Language

**English language learning before and outside QHS.**

*China.* Moon began her narrative about her English language study in China prior to arriving in Canada in response to a question about how she felt prior to arriving: “I’m just as usual and nothing and I think have a lot of English class before I came here and just like that not very excited not very sad” (I1: 379-382). She noted that this included having a private tutor every day for a month after school prior to coming (I4:55), and further that “if you want to go abroad so the agents will uh I think they will support all the things for you just like the English teacher” (I1:388-393). In addition to the special reading, writing, SSAT and TOEFL preparation she did with the tutor prior to leaving for Canada, Moon had also studied with previous private English language tutors (I4:57-61). Moon reported that she was well prepared as far as English was concerned “because of my [middle] school uh it’s a foreign language school”, where she had
“two English class[es] a day” in which even her “Chinese teacher says [uses] English in the classroom” (I1:404-416). Also prior to studying at QHS, Moon reported having taken BC Ministry of Education accredited summer school classes; but although these were for-credit, mainstream courses that were documented on her report card, the credits toward graduation she had earned were disputed and caused timetabling problems when she arrived at QHS (I2:755-780; I3:133-156; also see, e.g., Chapter 7). In total, Moon described herself as having studied English for seven or eight years, which she first began in second grade even though “it’s very easy it’s just a little bit” (I1:422-431).

Canada. Though at the time of our first interview Moon reported not having a private English tutor (I1:771-797), by our second interview she reported: (a) having taken English classes during Christmas break (though these were technically in China) (I2:36-43), and (b) having begun meeting with “a writing teacher” twice per week because she had heard from her English teacher that there would be a special writing test in April and “if you write it good or something like that you can out of ESL English” (I2:291-296). Along with practicing basic grammar, the ‘writing’ tutor had her make “word card[s] and tell me how to write the basic structure I already know it but yeah I just want to develop it more” (I2:299-304). During the third interview when I asked Moon about her writing tutor, she noted that she now had a tutor specifically for her Socials course whom she met with once per week (I3:1139-1145).

Language use at home in Canada. Moon’s language use at home in Canada consisted primarily of using Mandarin – first with her roommate and members of her homestay family during her first month in country (I1:74-110) and following that, to communicate with her mother with whom she lived for the remainder of the school year (I1:87, 442-462; I3:708-751; I4:292-319). However, Moon also reported having to serve as a kind of language (and literacy) broker (Harris & Sherwood, 1978; Morales & Hanson, 2005; Ng, 1998; Orellana, Martinez, & Martinez, 2014; Schieffelin & Cochran-Smith, 1984; Tse, 1996) for her mother after she arrived
in BC. When I asked if she had to help her mom at all after she arrived, Moon response was “I have to do all of them because my mom cannot understand English” (I1:367). As examples, she talked about having to translate interactions with the English speaking agent while negotiating their initial apartment rental and associated fees, dealing with elevator booking, movers, and furniture placement, and figuring out and explaining to her mom how different monthly fees (i.e., utilities, maintenance, etc.) worked as well as how and where to pay them (I1:347-376). Moon reported that having to do these things was “okay…because I never do it in China”, and that she felt “proud ((laughs))…oh just a little bit” (I1: 371-373) about having to do this sort of thing to help her mother.

6.4 Zeejay

6.4.1 Background

Zeejay, the only son of an insurance company employee (mother) and police officer (father), was born and lived all of his life in a large coastal city in mainland China’s Guangdong province (I1:124-135). He was fourteen years old when he arrived in Canada – less than two weeks before the start of the school year – and had been attending QHS as a grade ten student for just two months at the time of our first interview (I1: 40-45, 348-352). From our first interview onward, Zeejay worked to present a nuanced narrative about why he had decided to come to Canada. At the same time he reported that he thought “the Canada education is maybe (.) better than Chinese education”, he qualified this type of statement with statements like “but whe- when I get here I find some problem too about this so mm I just want to go to a new new what new new place to (.) exercise myself” (I1: 223-230). Similarly, while Zeejay noted his parents were supportive of the idea of studying in Canada, he insisted that his parents never pushed him to study abroad, that in fact he had persistently asked to go, and that “it’s my choice” (I3: 689-693).
Zeejay responded to my question about how long he planned to stay in Canada by noting that he wanted “to stay in Canada (.) until my finish my finish my secondary school yeah but i- i- I want to try my best to go the American school becau- I’m I think American school maybe much better” (I1: 159-161). He continued by saying that his rationale for wanting to go to America was based on his opinion that it “has the best education yeah some I want to I want to improve myself I don’t just stay in this level I want to give a higher level” (I1: 185-191).

6.4.2 Residency

Zeejay described his living situation in the first interview for almost three minutes, during which time I learned that he had lived with his mother’s older sister from the time he arrived in Canada (I1:75-80). His aunt, uncle, and their daughter were Canadian citizens, having immigrated before he had been born, though their daughter had moved out “to work and have a job”, and now his aunt “just live[d] with [her] husband” (I1:82-88). When I asked if he had known his aunt well before coming to live with her, Zeejay reported he had met “her maybe ten or nine times because [she] will be back to China about two or three years one times” (I1:111-120). Although he noted that he was lucky not to have to cook for himself or prepare his lunches for school, he mentioned that one downside was that it was “so far away from here [QHS]”, which meant “forty five minute in the bus” and five to ten minutes walking (I1:93-110).

During the second interview in February, when I asked about how things were going at his aunt’s place, he responded abruptly with “uh:: not bad just this” and then switched topics almost immediately after (I2:745-752). In March, as part of our email correspondence, he wrote: “All in all, I have a good time with my aunt's family all along” (ER03-2012:35). In our May interview, however, when I asked if he planned to stay at his aunt’s house again the following year Zeejay responded curtly with “I have no choice I have to stay there” (I3:632). Wanting to know more about why, I later asked a question about the status of his relationship with his aunt,
to which he responded “she’s good to me she is nice but- but I do not like her family” (I3:655).

When I asked why, the following interaction occurred:

**Extract 6.1 “I have to live there” (I3: 659-718)**

01 ZJ: no I- because the, the ha- the family are so (. ) are in the turmoil- are in the turmoil
02 RD: turmoil
03 ZJ: yeah just like hi- his husband
04 RD: yeah
05 ZJ: has the other- has another wife
06 RD: ah they’re separated
07 ZJ: yeah not separated, but the son ( . ) he- (. ) uh:: he cultivate with the other wife you know
08 RD: so her
09 ZJ: it’s chaos
10 RD: her husband ma- her husband had an affair with another
11 ZJ: just a lover
12 RD: yeah yeah yeah
13 ZJ: just a lover you know
14 RD: yeah
15 ZJ: a lover and then they (. ) get a son
16 RD: aha
17 ZJ: and the son and the- that woman hh. uh always come to our house to hang around with
18 her father- just like my aunt’s
19 RD: husband ah:
20 ZJ: husband, and the- the relationship between the- my aunts and her husband is so:: s- bad
21 RD: really stressful yeah
22 ZJ: yeah
23 RD: so do you have to hear a lot of that
24 ZJ: so I’m in a dilemma always, always in a dilemma like .tch yeah
25 RD: yeah so
26 ZJ: in a (big) situation, bad situation
27 RD: mm (. ) do you:: are there times when it’s like, uh:: when it- when there’s a lot of turmoil
28 are there times when you: you just don’t want to be there, or like you want to leave or
29 you want to
30 ZJ: I have to live there, so I- I don’t want to stay here after I graduate from high school I: I
31 want to go to university in the USA
32 RD: yeah so do your, do your parents know: about that situation at your aunt’s house
33 ZJ: yeah sure they know they know that
34 RD: they know that and they’re- (. ) they’re
35 ZJ: but I- but in China I’m I persist that I need to go to- I want to go to Canada
36 RD: so it was your kind of insisting
37 ZJ: it’s my choice
38 RD: yeah
39 ZJ: it [they] doesn’t push us, push me
40 RD: so do they pay your aunt for you to stay there
41 ZJ: yeah sure they pay maybe eight thousand dollars per year just for
42 RD: homestay
43 ZJ: just for homestay yeah
44 RD: so how about spending that money to find
45 ZJ: get another
46 RD: a different yeah maybe closer to [QHS]
47 ZJ: it’s much higher
48 RD: is it?
49 ZJ: yeah because
Zeejay’s willingness to share this difficult situation with me suggests both a strength of character and level of trust that I as a researcher did not take lightly. Beyond his articulate description of the situation at his aunt’s home, most striking in Zeejay’s account is framing of situation as a personal “dilemma” (line 24). The resources he uses to construct this frame are that despite his parents knowing about the situation (line 33), he was the one who was ‘persistent’ about studying in Canada and not them (lines 35-39) and the family’s economic situation is such that he is unable to afford a different homestay arrangement (lines 40-55). When I ask about Zeejay’s safety in the homestay (line 56), Zeejay mobilizes a representation of Canada as “a peace place” (line 59) and suggests that there is “no violence” (line 63).

As part of a discussion Zeejay and I were having about differences between the experiences of FIS who lived with their parents and those who did not, he reported that though sometimes it was hard “you learn a lot not- not only in academic you can learn a lot in life (RD: yeah) in be independent” (I4:691-693). As examples he reported not wanting to burden his aunt by asking for help with things like washing clothes or renewing his study permit not only because he was “not familiar with her” (I4: 708) but also because “it’s hard for my aunt I don’t want to push my aunt in a bad situation you know” (I4: 732). As a researcher, however, I was

54 Zeejay and I remained in contact after my fieldwork was completed and continue to communicate regularly – even after his high school graduation and transition to a Canadian university.
concerned both with Zeejay’s safety and the potential impact his living situation would have on his performance at school. Where safety was concerned, he reported that “the bad guy (R: yeah yeah) he’s he’s always in silent but at least he doesn’t uh rebuke me or (RD: doesn’t say anything to you hey) doesn’t say anything just just just know I’m there” (I4:750-754). Where academics were concerned, he insisted that living in the home did not affect his schoolwork, but also reported that since “the situation [in the home] is so embarrassed” (I4: 817) he preferred to interact only with his aunt; he would rather stay in his room or go somewhere else than interact with anyone but her. With his uncle’s son, for example, he noted that sometimes “I just want talk to him something about school about academic”, but despite their similarity in age and the fact that Zeejay had been living in the home “for ten months now [R: yeah yeah yeah] even now I talk to him he doesn’t give me some response” (I4: 839-841).

6.4.3 Funding

Despite the fact that Zeejay’s parents were able to afford school tuition, homestay fees to his aunt, and costs associated with tutors and other forms of shadow education, Zeejay’s portrayed himself as reflexively aware of the economic consequences of his study for them: “my parents have to work hard to make money to support my life in [BC]. They are both not a businessman. Most importantly, they are fifties” (ER15N11:23). It became clear that this issue was of continued relevance to him, and that in both discursive and material ways, it played a role in shaping his practices and academic trajectory over the course of the school year. One early example of his sensitivity to the costs associated with his study abroad was manifest when I asked why he had selected QHS as the school he would like to attend:

Extract 6.2 (I1: 859-863)
01 RD: why QHS like there are lots of schools in Pateo District, how did you choose or why did you choose
02 QHS?
03 ZJ: QHS is the public school
04 RD: well that’s another question why public school so (.) okay answer the you answered that first one yeah
05 ZJ: because I didn’t need to pay too much money
06 RD: for this school
Zeejay’s response at line 03 frames my question in public/private terms, a way of hearing my response confirms I had not expected (“well that’s another question why public school”, line 04). He then states, in a more explicit way, the reason for his framing of my question – “because I didn’t need to pay too much money” (line 05).

In addition to framing his choice to attend a public school in stark economic terms, Zeejay also described issues of funding in relation to a range of experiences. For example, talk of funding was used to:

- Describe his inability to return home for holidays and the probability that he’d not return home until “two years later” (I1:145-150);
- Contextualize the consequences of his inability to quickly be promoted out of ESL classes into mainstream classes (I2:72-76);
- Clarify his having “no choice” (I3:632) but to live “in the turmoil” (I3:659) at his aunt’s house (I3:694-709; e.g., Extract 6.2 above);
- Explain his choice to enroll in online courses rather than take in-class summer school courses (I2:31-42; I3:393-402; I4:358-377);
- Articulate differences between FIS and immigrant ELL students (I4:85-136, 193-207);
- Express his jealousy at Thin-Man, whose parents could afford to pay “s::o much money …two thousand dollar for one course” (I4:502) at BC Ministry of Education-authorized shadow education “organizations” which granted credit for mainstream courses despite one’s ELL status at QHS (I4:484-548); and
- Represent the middle-class socioeconomic circumstances of “a big proportion of [Chinese] international students” in Canada (ELLWr1: @312-@7).

One final example in which Zeejay used economic terms to frame and evaluate his experience as an FIS in Canada came during an interview following the final QHS test which
would determine whether Zeejay was promoted out of ELL classes prior to the start of the 2012-2013 school year. I asked Zeejay to follow up on a written response he had given to a question about “a time [he] felt really good about studying in Canada” (ER04:30-32):

Extract 6.3 (I3: 528-539)

01 RD: and your answer was actually I have never (laughing) felt good about studying in Canada since I get to Pateo District QHS disappointed me a lot. so why has it disappointed you so much?
02 ZJ: just it fucking ESL
03 RD: ((laughs))
04 ZJ: program
05 RD: okay
06 ZJ: hh.
07 RD: so (.) say more- say more
08 ZJ: just you learn nothing and I pay for it, I pay for the government
09 RD: yeah
10 ZJ: thirteen thousand every year but they taught me nothing, almost nothing
11 RD: so:
12 ZJ: I was cheated

In this particular extract, after I have repeated Zeejay’s written response to the prompt (lines 01-02), the rationale he provides implicates the “fucking esl…program” (lines 03-05) and more specifically, that he has “pay for the government…thirteen thousand every year but they taught me nothing almost nothing” (lines 11-13) – as the source of his disappointment. In response to my utterance at line 12 (“so:”), Zeejay provides an evaluation of the overall situation through the more concise and summative utterance “I was cheated” (line 13). Zeejay’s account here implies that he expected to receive a different kind of return (i.e., more language support; immediate progress toward a BC credential) on his parents’ study abroad investment. In Chapter 8, I discuss Zeejay’s increasing awareness of ESL as a hindrance to his study abroad goals during the 2011-2012 school year, and the socializing role this awareness played on his school and classroom based experience.

6.4.4 Language

English language learning before and outside QHS.

China. Zeejay’s account of how long he had learned English prior to coming to Canada was given mainly in the first interview (I1: 721-746), though he further cultivated this account in
the second interview (I2: 62-93), and in the fourth expressed regret about not having done more to prepare before arriving in Canada (I4: 992-1004). His description in the first interview suggested that he had learned English since third grade, but that “the English [class] is not formal just like just very have the cla- just like a game like a like a- it’s not a class it’s not a formal class…we just learned the abcdefg” (I1:724-726). Zeejay presented the activity of studying English in China as being “for the test”, and English as one of “the most three important subjects” – along with “Chinese and Math” – for students (I1:734-736). Because of its importance where testing regimes for entrance to prestigious high schools and universities was concerned, Zeejay noted that he was no different from many other Chinese students in attending an after-school school specifically to improve his English for testing purposes (I1: 738). Zeejay suggested that the activity of studying English, conceived as it was in China, mean that “all the Chinese people like me- is not good in- at speaking and reading just good at writing (RD: right) and knew- and learned the grammar from the teacher and but our vocabulary is not good” (I1:740-742).

Zeejay situated his English learning in school prior to coming in relation to some of his FIS peers who, despite beginning at QHS at the same time as him, had been promoted out of ESL classes before him (I2:76-90). Unlike these ‘faster’ students, who had attended private “double language school[s]” at which “you need pay much more high- higher but the private school in China uh there English and Chinese are half and half” (I2:82-84), Zeejay suggested that his (qualitatively very different) public school experience – and the socioeconomic position for him that it indexed – meant he was de facto less well-prepared to get out of ESL than were some of his peers (I2:72-76).

Canada. After his first term at QHS, Zeejay was adamant that he, like “all the people”, needed extra English language study – “to paid for some uh some outside uh school to learn
more” – because what he was getting in his ESL classes at QHS was not helping him to get closer to his goal of graduating from high school with a Dogwood diploma (I2:424-458).

As far as his own extra studying outside of school was concerned, Zeejay reported that “some Taiwan people open a a company about the education for the uh for the ESL student” and that he had been studying there on Tuesdays after school and in the evenings (I2: 684-690). In addition to this, his friend (Thin-Man) had also “recommended a teacher” with whom he met on Saturdays and who taught him “some grammar and some writing skills” he had not been taught at QHS (I2:692-700; also ER12-2011b:10). Zeejay described his tutor as a Canadian-born Filipino male, who was slightly older than Zeejay; in addition to grammar and writing, they also sometimes went hiking or to “do some training do some some exercise” (I4:614-625). Not only did the tutor reportedly tease Zeejay for the limited amount he had improved since having arrived in Canada, “he expect me to… speak as well as well as he- his friend…so I’m so glad to hang out with him” (I4:633-643).

Language use at home in Canada. Zeejay reported that when he did interact with his aunt or uncle, his preferred language of interaction was Chinese because both his aunt and uncle spoke English with what he called “a great Chinese accent”, noting that he was worried that “if I talk to them [in English] they maybe they will affect me” (I4:1106-1116). Although he did try to speak English to the uncle’s son, who was apparently fluent in Chinese, English, and French (I4:829-831), in both Chinese and English, “he always just respond me in one or two words in Chinese” (I4:843).

6.5 WoW

6.5.1 Background

WoW, the youngest son of a stay-at-home-mother and law professor father, was born and lived in Germany for a short time but had spent the majority of his pre- and early-teen years in Seoul, South Korea (I1:94-136). He was fifteen years old at the time of our first interview in
October 2011, and had attended QHS – his third place of study in Canada – for a full school year prior to that time (I1: 395-430). WoW reported that because when he had first arrived in Canada at the end of the Korean school year (in early February 2010) “there was no place to go” (i.e., no available seats in schools), he and his brother had been asked to wait “in the [Pateo School District] office and you know like sit around with other guys” (I1:349-353) in a kind of makeshift classroom until May (I2:233). For two months at the end of the 2009-2010 school year, he and his brother attended a ‘real’ high school prior to switching schools again begin the 2010-2011 school year at QHS (I1:337-357; also I2:233-235).

WoW’s account for why he came to Canada was a confluence of different narratives across interviews and email reports. In the first, he and his brother came as dependants while their father held a visiting professorship at a BC university (e.g., I1:12, 296-300; I3:391-400); in the second, he (and his brother) had come because their father said WoW “wasn’t a good student” and that his brother “will be hard to go to college” (I1: 286-290; also I3: 384-390). In the third, WoW suggested that they had come to escape the negative emotional consequences of his and his brother’s educational experiences in Korea; not only had he seen his brother be a victim of continuous bullying (I3: 721-735), WoW described himself as having “hated when [he] was in Korea in the class” both because “school was really hard” and because it caused him to “get angry a lot…by small things” (I3:271-314).

Despite the different narratives WoW mobilized to construct how he had come to study in Canada, he responded to my question about how long he thought he would stay in Canada with “oh I don’t know like until I finish my college” (I1: 173). And though he was originally resistant to the idea of coming to study in Canada when his father informed him of the plan (I1:282, 308-321), he wrote later in the year that after almost two years he was “really enjoying my life in here” (ER04:33-44).
6.5.2 Residency

WoW’s living situation was unique among the focal students participating in the study. To begin with, when he first arrived in Canada, WoW was not classified as a FIS since his father was a visiting professor at a Canadian university and thus was technically employed in Canada (I3:391-400). Thus for his first year of study in Canada, though WoW was classified as a non-resident student, he was exempted from the payment of fees under BC Ministry of Education and Pateo School District policies because his father had a temporary work permit for the year. When his father’s permit expired, and from the beginning of his second full year at QHS, WoW’s status under the same policy changed to FIS, and both he and his brother were required to pay tuition fees (I4:108-121). This also meant that during the first year of his studies in Canada, WoW’s living situation could be described as a *gireogi gajok* (‘goose family’; see, e.g., J. Kim & Deschambault, 2012; H. Lee, 2010; Y.-J. Lee & Koo, 2006; Shin, 2010, 2012; Song, 2010, 2012a, 2012b), a term used in situations where families with pre-tertiary aged children studying (English) abroad arranged for “One parent (typically the mother) [to] accompany[y] the child[ren] while the other (usually the father) remains at home to support the venture” (Abelmann & A. Kang, 2014, p. 1; cf. Moon’s case, subsection 6.3.2). In WoW’s case, the arrangement was unconventional in the sense that he and his brother lived with their father, who was also employed in the country in which they were being educated (see, e.g., Y. Kang, 2012; cf. Abelmann & A. Kang, 2014). WoW reported that his mother had not come with them to Canada because his maternal grandmother had recently become ill and his mother had stayed in Korea to care for her (I1:60-68; I4:838-857). However, he also noted that it was tolerable that his mother had not come because “you know it’s hard yelling so much yelling I mean my father and mother hhh. it’s well when they stay together it’s kind of really hard…I don’t mean they fighting but they’re you know pre- both pretty- I mean…strong” (I3:418-427).
The second reason WoW’s living situation was different from other focal participants was that from the time his father had left to go back to Korea, WoW and his brother “started living with [their] guardian”, the university-aged son of WoW’s father’s “kind of best friend” (I1:21-41). They lived in an apartment that WoW’s parents had rented (I1:29-31) and was within walking distance of QHS (I3:220). When I asked some questions about the guardian, WoW was unable to answer and reported that neither he nor his brother often communicated with the guardian and weren’t that interested: “like we are not usually care or we are not we don’t want to know about each other” (I1:87). Later in the year WoW added that although “we are not usually talk…he is kind…like he used to take us somewhere for food…or s- you know like movie” (I3:683-398). WoW’s anecdotes about meeting with friends and “watching movie[s] until three am” (I3: 177-18) on a school night suggested that the guardian didn’t provide too much oversight or structure, and similarly, that neither WoW nor his brother recognized the guardian as a figure of authority.

WoW’s relationship with his brother was a different matter. From all accounts he gave of their relationship, he appreciated and respected his older brother. WoW reported that his brother helped him with math, difficult vocabulary (I2:43-72), and other school-related issues like registering for summer school and working on his course timetable for the following year (I3:05-30). He described being fortunate to have his brother because he was unlike the older brothers of some of WoW’s other Korean friends; in contrast, those brothers were “so tough so like they always yelling and like those tho- they make [the friends] do something” (I2:53-67). WoW’s obvious concern for his brother, their shared experience as study abroad students previously in Germany (I3:245-264) and now in Canada, and his desire to emulate his brother’s academic progress at QHS provided a stability to WoW’s home life in Canada that might have been absent had he lived with his guardian (or unknown family) by himself.
6.5.3 Funding

As a result of his father’s visiting professorship, WoW began his secondary school experience in Canada as a provincially funded (ELL) student attending QHS and had only become a tuition paying (FIS) as of September 2011 (I1:12-35; I4: 109-124). WoW explicitly topic monetary issues associated with study abroad in a number of contexts across interviews and email reports, as a means to:

- Contrast his own concern with exiting the ESL program at QHS with those of some of his ELL classmates, who, because “they are rich I think they are rich I guess” (I2:425-457), he reported were not concerned with getting out of ESL;
- Frame his uncertainty when asked if he was planning to take summer school classes (e.g., “summer classes are pretty expensive for international students”, ER23Mr12:32-34).
- Respond to a question that asked if the British Columbia Teacher’s Federation “job action affect[s] you as an international student?” (e.g., “Not really, but if we think about the money, that affect a lot to us” [ER23Mr12:52-53]);
- Explain why his father visited him and his brother in Canada (i.e., that it was cheaper than him and his brother flying home [I3:195-210]);
- Give an account of how, after his father’s visiting professorship was done, WoW got “pressure from my [his] father ((laughs)) about money things…to work harder…don’t get sick if you get sick you are going to be absent the school…then the money’s just going to blow off or something” (I4:123-129);
- Relay a story about how he had broken a “like three hundred dollar lamp” at his friends’ apartment building and had hidden the cost of repairing the lamp from his father (e.g., “my father think that broken lamp is fifty dollar ones”, I4:233-269); and
- Describe differences between FIS and immigrant ELL learners (I3:752-754; I4:904-915).
These descriptions of funding issues notwithstanding, WoW’s interview reports also included implicit indications that his family was economically well-resourced as well. Not only was his father a tenured professor at a well-known university in Korea (I1:44-52); WoW’s father was able to visit him and his brother three times between August 2011 and June 2012 (I1:15-25; I2:03-20; I4:821-857), and both boys had been receiving different forms of shadow education since they began their studies at QHS (I1:859-870; I2:1037-1074).

6.5.4 Language

**English language learning before and outside QHS.**

*Korea.* When I asked WoW how long he had learned English prior to coming to Canada, he responded by saying he had only been learning for “a year and a half” (I1:605) – the length of time that he had been studying in Canada. The conversation continued:

*Extract 6.4 (I1: 606-615)*

01 RD: I mean like, like before you came did you
02 WoW: oh I- I didn’t learn any Eng- wait
03 RD: yeah I can’t believe that
04 WoW: what do you mean
05 RD: yeah like middle school or like there must have been some kind of
06 WoW: they were teaching English but in different way
07 RD: yeah yeah
08 WoW: you know just writing and not speaking because they also English teachers are not good at
09 speaking English
10 RD: yeah
11 WoW: sometimes some, like I think some guy from USA came but nobody understand

Again in WoW’s case what it means to have studied English in Korea prior to coming to Canada, and regardless of the circumstances under which this occurred, is treated as a different (and ostensibly less valued and valuable) form of learning English. WoW attributes to the study that occurred prior to coming an almost unmentionable status (line 02). But with some further inquiry, WoW reported learning English in middle school – sometimes even with ‘some guy from USA’ (lines 5-11). He later added to this qualified account having attended an “academy school you know hakweon” (I1:617; see note 1), that he was not invested in learning English (I1:623), and that despite routinely watching *The Simpsons* that he had mainly learned “just
writing and not speaking because they also English teachers are not good at speaking English” (I1:625).

In our fourth interview, WoW described his middle school English curriculum, taught by an L1 Korean-speaking teacher, by noting that “just Korean school’s English subject is really easier than ESL [at QHS] I guess” (I4:524). As part of this description WoW also added that immediately prior to coming to Canada, he had studied grammar, vocabulary, and “just a little bit speaking” with a “tutor” in day-long sessions in a hakweon, but in retrospect felt “that wasn’t really helpful” (I4:507).

**Canada.** While in Canada, WoW had been meeting regularly with the same tutor since he began his studies at QHS. He reported that he had met the tutor through his neighbour, who had recommended her as a “great teacher [to] teach Korean people” (I1:869), that “she helped my math and English” (I1:863), and that they met twice weekly (I1:873). As part of a more extensive description of his tutoring sessions, WoW mentioned in our second interview that the tutoring sessions occurred with his brother, and that they involved both the discussion and use of newspaper articles, “English practicing practice sheets”, and often help with his (or his brother’s) homework (I2:1037-1074).

**Language use at home in Canada.** WoW’s home language while in Canada was almost exclusively Korean, since he interacted mainly with his older brother and only marginally with his guardian, both of whom were L1 users of Korean (I3:682-708).

**6.6 Conclusion**

In this chapter, I have used the notions of residency, funding, and language (from Chapters 4 and 5) as an heuristic structure for introducing four focal FIS participants in the study. Specifically, the resulting narrative account of Ellen, Moon, Zeejay, and WoW’s interview accounts, in addition to offering insights into how the category of FIS is constructed in and through persons, has offered important contextualization of the out-of-school residency, funding,
and language experiences that situate their in-school experiences as students at QHS. As such it has offered a partial response to my third research question: *How is the category of fee-paying international student (FIS) constructed in persons?* That is, at the same time that each individual student’s reported experiences can be read as an occasioned portrayal of the category of FIS, so too can the individual reported experiences be read together as a compositely constructed articulation of a more general category of FIS bound together by ranges of situated experience across three common themes of residency, funding, and language.

6.6.1 Backgrounds

Across each student’s section of the chapter, I have first presented a short biographical sketch of each student, their age of arrival in Canada, reported reasons for having come to BC to study, and accounts of how long they planned to stay in Canada (i.e., subsections 6.2.1, 6.3.1, 6.4.1., and 6.5.1). In addition to the fact that all arrived between the ages of 14 and 15 years old, in descriptions about why they had come to Canada students drew on a range of explanatory resources centred around education; these framed education in their home countries as too competitive (i.e., Ellen, WoW), emotionally too stressful (i.e., Moon, WoW), or as being of lower-quality than secondary education in Canada (i.e., Zeejay) – and hence as partial reasons for their having migrated. Similarly, students’ talk about why they had come also contained allusions to prior, in progress, or imagined future im/migration to Canada (i.e. Ellen, Moon, WoW). Relatedly, students were unanimous in their framing of their study abroad in Canada as a longer-term project (i.e., until they completed high school) – and in some cases one which would potentially (i.e., Ellen) or ideally (i.e., Moon and Zeejay) culminate with tertiary studies occurring in the United States. These suggest that the K-12 international education marketplace is at once constitutive of and constituted by links between more ‘permanent’ forms of residency and public education (e.g., Robertson, 2013; cf. Government of BC, 2012a, 2012b), and further, that ideologies relating to the value of educational credentials (i.e., as desirable forms of capital)
also play an important role in establishing and maintaining these markets as well (e.g., Chew, 2009, 2012; Waters, 2004, 2006b, 2009b, 2015).

6.6.2 Residency

In subsections 6.2.2, 6.3.2, 6.4.2, and 6.5.2, I have described students’ residency and living arrangements. The reported experiences suggest a diverse array of relationships between students and their homestay parents and/or guardians, with different degrees of familiarity (i.e., from real parents [Moon, WoW]; to ‘real’ aunts with whom one was not close [Zeejay]; to surrogate ‘aunts’ whose daughters were like “sisters” [Ellen]; to homestay families who were unknown to them prior to arriving [Moon]) and concomitant fluctuations in these arrangements over time. Alongside these differing degrees of familiarity were the different material (i.e., riding the bus to school [Ellen, Zeejay] or not [Moon, WoW]; doing one’s own laundry [WoW, Zeejay] or not [Ellen, Moon]) and emotional implications of students’ experiences residing in these ‘homes-away-from-home’. In addition to further establishing the utility of ‘living arrangements’ as a discursive resource for distinguishing FIS (see, e.g., Chapter 5), these reported experiences offer a very small sketch of the range of homestay and pastoral experiences of pre-tertiary international students studying in Canadian public schools. Finally, and importantly, they suggest the extent to which these residency concerns are an integral feature of the K-12 international education marketplace, both for FIS themselves and as an economic boon to local economies with large numbers of these students.

6.6.3 Funding

Focal students’ accounts have been used to present a socioeconomic profile relative to their status as FIS in subsections 6.2.3, 6.3.3, 6.4.3, and 6.5.3. Although the payment of tuition and other fees associated with studying in Canada are for the most part treated as unproblematic in participants’ interview talk, a more nuanced sense of how familial socioeconomic statuses were used as resources to describe familial decisions about immigration (i.e., Ellen, Moon),
stresses associated with one’s status as a non-credit receiving ELL student (i.e., WoW, Zeejay; see also Chapters 8 and 9), or to ‘middle’ themselves as FIS as WoW and Zeejay did (i.e., positioning themselves “between the two extremes of [socioeconomic] mobility: the elite and the disenfranchised” (Robertson, 2013, p. 76; see also, e.g., Conradson & Latham, 2005; Yeoh, Willis, & Fakhri, 2003). Where the larger category of FIS is concerned, the situated and relational construction of socioeconomic (SES) standing in both students’ and the research narrative suggests that SES is as much a discursive resource for constructing FIS in study abroad contexts as it is a material resource for enabling pre-tertiary education in the first place.

6.6.4 Language

Finally, subsections 6.2.4, 6.3.4, 6.4.4, and 6.5.4 provide an account of focal FIS’ pre-study abroad English language experiences, their ‘shadow’ or supplemental (English language) educational experiences in addition to their studies at QHS (e.g., Aurini & Davies, 2013; Bray, 1999; Burch, 2009), and their language use in their place of residence in Canada. In addition to giving a sense of how (i.e., public, private, or after-school schools) and how long students had been learning English prior to arriving in Canada (i.e., since kindergarten, beginning in grade three, from middle school), these subsections also draw attention to the ways students’ reports mobilize ideological resources to position or evaluate their pre-sojourn English language learning experiences (i.e., as not a ‘real’ class; as ‘for the test’). Students’ talk also identified a range of shadow education activities, primarily related to English writing, which often included the related study of English grammar and vocabulary and in some cases instruction in students’ L1s. Lastly, in their homes away from home, students’ accounts also suggested that the dominant language used for interaction was a shared L1, and one important case in which a student functioned as a de facto language broker (e.g., Harris & Sherwood, 1978; Morales & Hanson, 2005; Ng, 1998; Orellana, Martinez, & Martinez, 2014; Schieffelin & Cochran-Smith, 1984; Tse, 1996) for their parent (i.e., Moon). As with the notions of residency and funding, these accounts
suggest that language practices and proficiency, specifically relating to English language learning, feature as prominent resources in the construction of FIS experience as both an individual and more general phenomenon.

6.6.5 Summary

Given the larger study’s adoption of a multiple case approach, where multiple has representational implications and the case is the ‘category’ of FIS, in this chapter I have represented the category of FIS as an assemblage that occurs across focal students’ out-of-school experiences relating to residency, funding, and language. The chapter has served the multiple functions of: introducing individual students; demonstrating, through the use of common themes, the diverse and contingent discursive construction of the category of FIS by individual persons; and implying, when these individual reported experiences are read together, a more compositely constructed, complex and polycentric articulation of the category of FIS in persons. Through these functions, the chapter has offered important contextualization of the out-of-school residency, funding, and language experiences that situate focal FIS’ in-school experiences as students at QHS.

In Chapters 7 (Ellen and Moon), 8 (Zeejay), and 9 (WoW), I present a detailed description of each student’s in-school experiences during the 2011-2012 school year at QHS, and specifically, of their socialization into and out of ESL.
CHAPTER 7: CONSTRUCTING FIS IN PERSONS (ELLEN AND MOON)

7.1 Introduction

In Chapter 6, I provided a partial answer to the third research question: *How is the category of fee-paying international student (FIS) constructed in persons?* I did so by demonstrating, through the use of three common themes, the diverse and contingent construction of the category of FIS by individual students and implying, through the comparative presentation of these students’ experiences, a more compositely constructed representation of the category of FIS.

In Chapters 7, 8, and 9, I provide the remainder of my response to this same (third) research question proposed for the study. As with Chapter 6, the phrase ‘constructed in persons’ is meant in each of these chapters to suggest that, at the same time that each individual focal student’s reported experiences can be read as an occasioned articulation of the category of FIS, so too might these occasioned articulations urge a broader, more multidimensional understanding of the category of FIS. Thus, across Chapters 7 (Ellen and Moon), 8 (Zeejay), and 9 (WoW), I sketch four focal students’ negotiations of a process that was central to the experience of each FIS who participated in the study: ‘getting out of ESL’. The sketches highlight the situated, contingent nature of the process of ‘getting out of ESL’ and its import for each student’s “trajectory of socialization” (Wortham, 2005) at QHS.

Given that the analytic orientation in Chapter 7 mirrors that designated in Chapter 6, I begin this chapter with a description of the data sources drawn upon in this chapter (subsection 7.11). This is followed by two sections in which I describe Ellen (Section 7.2) and Moon’s (Section 7.3) socialization into and out of ESL at QHS during the 2011-2012 school year. In Section 7.4, I conclude the chapter with a brief summary.
7.1.1 Data Sources

The data sources drawn upon in this chapter are derived primarily from interviews and email reports (see, e.g., Chapter 3), generated with Ellen and Moon between October 2011 and June 2012. Informing the interrogative architecture of these interviews and email reports is more than a year of engagement ‘in the field’ at QHS and, though less geographically sited than my work in the school, engagement with international education stakeholders from the Pateo School District and BC Ministry of Education, and international-education related documents and issues prior to, during, and following fieldwork at QHS. Thus, the oral and written participant accounts on which the collaboratively achieved (e.g., Duff & Talmy, 2011, p. 101; Talmy, 2008, p. 620) narratives of FIS socialization below are dependent, are themselves nested within a matrix of inquiry that goes well beyond the interviews or email reports themselves.

The nesting of these data within a larger matrix of inquiry is particularly important for Ellen’s case (Section 7.2), where interview and email report data constitute the sole sources data represented in the section. In contrast, Moon’s case (Section 7.3) includes references to data from fieldnotes (i.e., Cfn [Ms. Jay’s class]; Gfn [Mr. Whee’s class]; Tfn [ESL exit tests]), interviews from other focal (i.e., Wanda; WoW; Zeejay; Ellen) and non-focal participants (i.e., QHSPr; MrsB; MsJ), and Moon’s own written work (i.e., Appendix F). As a means for describing the varied aspects of FIS’ socialization into ESL as a centrally relevant process for the construction of the FIS category, Ellen and Moon are representative of focal FIS participants for whom access to classroom-based, participant observation could not be negotiated during fieldwork. In this respect, their trajectories of socialization, and the data through which these trajectories are narrated, are included in an attempt to produce LS-based research that is “transparen[t] about the nature of the context, participants, setting, data, and analysis” (Bronson & Watson-Gegeo, 2008, p. 48). Further, Ellen’s and Moon’s stories have been included here in an attempt to represent the range of research participation for focal students (i.e., Ellen and
Moon are female and were not observed in ESL classrooms [Ch. 7]; Zeejay and WoW are male and were observed on in classrooms [Ch. 8]).

7.2 Getting out of ESL: Ellen

7.2.1 Timetable and “no pression”

Ellen reported that, based on the results of the same test administered both at the Pateo School District reception center and at QHS (ER-12:23; I2:571-583), she had been placed in three ESL classes after her arrival in Canada: ELL Social Studies (Ms. Jay), ELL Writing (Mr. Whee), and ELL English (Mr. Ogib) (Table 7.1). She had one fewer ELL classes than five of the other FIS who participated in the study, since they had been placed in ESL Science as well (e.g., WoW, Moon, Zeejay, Bone, and Bessie). Comparatively, this meant that despite the consequences of her struggle to comprehend “some word that about the science” in testing situations in her regular Science 10 class (i.e., “I’m sure that I’m fail” [I1:388-394]), she was one of the few focal FIS students with a less than 50% ELL course load.

Table 7.1. Ellen’s Timetable at QHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block 1</td>
<td>Block 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TechEd/Health</td>
<td>ELL English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Holding)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ellen was not surprised by her timetable, and reported knowing before she came to Canada that she would be in ESL classes. By December, in response to the question prompt “(3) Before you came to Canada, did you know you would be in ESL classes? What did you expect ESL to be like?” (ER02D11:16), she wrote via email:

Extract 7.1 “there is no pression”55 (ER02D11:25)
01 Before I came to Canada I know that I should be in ESL class. At first I think ESL class is just kind of class that learn something slower than regular class but now I found that was so different! In ESL class I just feel that there is no pression, I don't know the way that I should go. So when I saw my friends that they have many things to do, review many chapter in regular class, I envy it.

55 I interpret Ellen’s spelling here to be an unintended portmanteau of “pressure” and “passion”.
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Ellen’s response presents her understanding of “ESL class” as having changed since when she first arrived (“bут now I found that was so different!”, line 02), which she achieves through the use of specific descriptors. In addition to the exclamation mark with which she has chosen to emphasize the ‘difference’ she is describing (line 02), Ellen refers to the speed at which material is covered (“learn something slower than regular class”, line 02). This reference also implies something further: that her first impression was that the content of ESL and “regular” (line 02; i.e., for-credit) classes would be similar, and she found that this too was different than she had expected. Ellen also describes a difference in the expectations placed upon students in ESL (“there is no pression”, line 03) compared with those placed on students ‘regular’ classes (“they have many things to do”, lines 03-04; “review many chapter”, line 04). Embedded in her written account is a further, ostensibly evaluative comparison of how the expectation of students, ‘pression’, might help guide her learning (i.e., “I don’t know the way that I should go” [line 03] versus “I envy it” [line 04]).

What Ellen didn’t know before she came was that her timetable would be the same for the entire school year. Thus, added to her observed difference in ‘pression’ were the very real material implications of not having passed the November ESL exit test (ER12:23-24; I2:412) or having had the opportunity, in January, to write the special “test in the library” (MoonI2:511; see also subsection 7.3.4); namely, that she would ‘envy’ her friends’ work and status in regular courses for the remainder of the school year.

7.2.2 The Material Implications of Course Planning: “in ESL I didn’t got the credits”

These implications became particularly relevant when, in February, Ellen had to “consider about my my grade eleven because we now have the course planning” (I2:113). Course planning was an institutionally imposed task in which all students had to choose courses in which to enroll for the following school year. Given her failure to exit ESL mid-year, this task became an acute source of stress for Ellen. Her status as ‘ESL’ meant that the only grade-level,
provincially examinable, and for-credit courses she was able to register in were Math and Science; though she also reported being eligible to register in ‘regular’, for-credit Home Economics and Business Education courses – eligibility for these courses did not hinge on having been promoted out of ESL (“it’s not a regular- [class] it’s like all the c- student can take it” [I2:128-149]). Where the remaining high-stakes, provincially examinable, grade-level content courses (i.e., English and Social Studies) were concerned, her status as ‘ESL’ prevented her from accruing credits that were required for her graduation.

Just prior to Extract 7.2, I had asked Ellen if her goal to get out of ESL had changed since our first interview (I2:407-411). She replied “yeah i- I didn’t change my goal but…the fact [is] that I didn’t- I didn’t get out of esl” (I2:412) and, after subtly suggesting that the number of students exiting ESL was related to incoming numbers of students and a brief back and forth as to why that might be (I2:414-435), I returned to the topic:

Extract 7.2 “because in ESL I didn’t got the credits” (I2: 438-451)
01 R: so still to get out but you don’t know when
02 E: yeah I want to as fast as I can, but ((breathily)) ugh::
03 R: so why like I mean
04 E: you mean why I want to?
05 R: yeah
06 E: because like I think I need the credits
07 R: so this
08 E: like
09 R: this is so interesting to me. yeah how can, well (.) sorry I interrupted you
10 E: it’s okay. like because because I- when I gradu: gradu::
11 R: graduate
12 E: yeah graduate I need about eighty eighty cr- credits, but now because in ESL I didn’t got the credits and
13 also we have private, pri-vo exam
14 R: oh the provincial exam
15 E: yeah the provincial exam, like I- as grade ten and grade eleven social, so like u- I I know that I- this is
16 important for me

Ellen’s line 02 utterance, in which she confirms that her most immediate goal was “still to get out [of esl]” (line 01), is remarkable for the discontented exasperation it displays via the emotive expression “ugh::” (see, e.g., Fraser, 1996, p. 176; Strang, 2009, pp. 56-7, 72-73). Her use of this expression, when coupled with the knowledge she displays regarding (a) the number of credits
needed to graduate (lines 06-13) and (b) the importance of exiting ESL so that she can write the required provincial examinations (lines 12-16), suggest both that she is aware of the connections between the linguistic and educational marketplace(s) in which she is situated and also of the (socio-affective, graduation-delays) consequences of not being promoted out of ESL.

But the same time that course planning may have added a kind of urgency to Ellen’s everyday experience as a student at QHS, she also reported having heard that there would be further ESL exit tests before the end of the school year. These tests, if passed, would allow students to begin the 2012-2013 school year in ‘regular’, for-credit classes: “the first we have for all the students that it’s vocabulary test [RD: uh huh] and then if you pass the vocabulary test and you will also need to write and article and essay” (I2:465-467).

7.2.3 Missing the Last Exit: Implementing Change to Maximize Return on Investment

Any solace Ellen may have taken in the prospect of these next ESL exit tests was short-lived. It became apparent, in our third interview in May, that Ellen was now also feeling a qualitatively different type of urgency to exit ESL. The interview, which occurred on the same day the test results were posted in May, began with Ellen suggesting outright that things were not good because “during m- mother’s day I argue with my mom” (I3:04-12). The weekend before, her mother had forbidden her to attend a movie with friends, because her mother felt she “hang out so many times and I didn’t like pay attention to like study” (I3:18). Ellen reported that it was not “until I know- I knew that I didn’t pass the exam I think that she- she was right” (I3:26), and went on to note that she had been under increasing pressure from her mother to get out of ESL (I3:64-97). Importantly, Ellen described the way her mother had used (her friend) Wanda’s quick promotion out of ESL (“she really hope that I can pass like at this time because you know [Wanda Wanda] like…she she like fa- faster than me about half year”, I3:65-67) as a means for applying this pressure (“so my mom always compare me and Wanda with Wanda”,
Despite Ellen’s awareness of differences between their respective educational (i.e., she in public school, Wanda in private school) and English language experiences (i.e., she in mainland China, Wanda in Hong Kong; the fact that Wanda had to use more English at school “she couldn’t speak the Mandarin she just can speak the Cantonese” [I3:705]), the pressure she felt from these comparisons was palpable: “so like after school when I go home I don’t know how to like to tell my mom that like yeah: I don’t know how to tell her that I didn’t pass” (I3:90-92).

In fact, in our subsequent and final interview, Ellen reported that her mother had reacted strongly when she finally did break the news:

**Extract 7.3 “I must get out of ESL” (I4:107-136)**

01 R: the last time we spoke you just you had just found out about the test and you had to tell your parents
02 E: um: yeah
03 R: or you had to say something. and how did that go?
04 E: yeah and my mom after at first, a little bit like upset
05 R: yeah
06 E: and angry
07 R: up- upset like oh:: oh
08 E: like why you didn’t get out of ESL and like yeah and
09 R: mm
10 E: like she just think that I didn’t work hard
11 R: so clearly you told her you did work hard
12 E: uh:: half ((laughs))
13 R: really
14 E: ((laughing)) yeah mm and then and then it’s fine
15 R: so she’s okay with it now
16 E: yeah uh and then she like she warned me that I need- I must get out of ESL, like uh on September
17 R: mm
18 E: yeah
19 R: so::
20 E: ((quietly)) next year
21 R: now how do you feel about that, are you worried? or kind of
22 E: yeah I’m agree
23 R: you agreed to that
24 E: yeah
25 R: and so did she give you a kind of consequence, like like if you don’t do that then you don’t
26 E: no but because I know the result that if I didn’t ((laughing)) get out of ESL, I-
27 R: wha- what is the result
28 E: 1- because in in my ESL ESL now some students they are also like grade eleven hhh. and then they need
29 to like, I think it’s not that feel bad feel good like they’re all grade eight and you are grade eleven and
30 then you learn the ss-
31 R: same stuff mm
32 E: same thing yeah
Ellen’s account here works up a version of her mother that is consistent with her description in the previous interview (i.e., as someone to whom it would be difficult to give news about failing her ESL test). She accomplishes this version of her mother by attributing to her certain emotional states (“a little bit like upset and angry”, lines 04-06), opinions (“she just think I didn’t work hard”, line 10), reported speech in the form of rhetorical questions (“why you didn’t get out out of ESL”, line 08), and demands (“she warned me that I need- I must get out of ESL like uh on September”, line 16). Ellen also signposts these attributions with sequential markers, suggesting that her mother’s emotional reaction (lines 04-06) began with discontent and anger (i.e., “at first”, line 04), was followed by a calmer interlude (“and then it’s fine”, line 14), and culminated with a consequential caution (i.e., “and then she warned me”, line 16). Ellen’s construction of her mother here as someone for whom it is important that she get out of ESL thus becomes a resource for legitimating her claim that she needs to get out of ESL. Implied here is that both to Ellen and (this version of) her mother, speedy exit from ESL (i.e., and into ‘regular’ classes where her coursework would count towards the BC credential and graduation) is important. Further implied here is an underlying economizing of time to graduation; one in which tuition-for-credit (i.e., regular classes) is preferable to tuition-for-nothing (i.e., ELL classes).

This portion of Extract 7.3 is striking for the way it treats this version of Ellen’s mother as a stakeholder or shareholder to whom Ellen is accountable. Beyond being accountable in the sense that she wishes ‘make her mother proud’, subtly in-built into this treatment is a larger issue: the payment of tuition fees. Ellen is accountable to (this version of) her mother for her educational (linguistic) progress because for each ESL course in which she remains enrolled, (this version of) her mother’s potential return on investment is limited. That this economizing permeates Ellen’s narrative of accountability in this way is powerful: both its subtlety, and the fact that that it gets mobilized (and goes unquestioned) as an explanatory resource in the interview – suggest its ideological relevance to Ellen, to me, and for the category of FIS.
A final portion of the extract worthy of mention here is Ellen’s response to my line 25 question. When I ask if her mother gave her “a kind of consequence” for not exiting ESL in September, Ellen’s account shifts from a focus on her mother to a focus on the social implications of not being promoted out of ESL (i.e., “I think it’s not that feel bad feel good like they’re all grade eight and you are grade eleven and then you learn the s- same thing yeah”, lines 29-32). In this particular exchange, Ellen’s response uses age and grade level as additional resources to warrant her claim that she needs to get out of ESL, and by implication, to construct ELL classes as further problematic and worthy of escape. That she is able to draw on age and grade level in this way, suggest that these can be public indices of language proficiency, or conversely, how language proficiency as a means for grade placement has the potential to be a shaming mechanism for high schoolers. Foundational to these social implications, vis-à-vis the multiple layers of meaning associated with ESL, is additional language (learning) and education.

Ellen’s failed attempt to exit ESL in April precluded her from taking for-credit English or Social Studies courses during summer school, and would likely delay her graduation even further. In the wake of these events, Ellen constructed the decision to live at her friend Wanda’s homestay the following year as a beneficial change that could help to mitigate her failure to exit ESL and assist in pre-empting the same result the following year (I3:209-220; see Chapter 6, subsection 6.2.2). To do so, Ellen drew upon differences in dominant languages used at each of these homestays as a means for framing the benefits of the move to Wanda’s. She reported that although at her current homestay (Jenny’s house) “they are all Chinese and they speak Mandarin all the time… in that homestay the [Wanda] that lived I need to like speak English” (I4:164-166). Ellen’s linking of the change in homestays to her own English proficiency, and thus by implication to getting out of ESL, suggests that her economizing of this process was simultaneously orienting to symbolic forms of capital originating in multiple markets: those relevant to family in China; those relating to her academic and social standing locally at QHS;
and those relating to her out-of-school living arrangements as a FIS in BC. That the process of getting out of ESL can be, and indeed is, constituted by and constitutive of links between such polycentric interests and value attributions by Ellen, hints at the degree to which “heterogeneous resources from various scales…become relevant to social identification” (Wortham & Rhodes, 2013, p. 539).

7.2.4 “Everyone should point where’s the invisible line” (I1:860)

Given the consistent framing of ‘Chinese’ language use at QHS by administrators, teachers, and students, as having a negative impact on students’ English language learning (e.g., Chapter 5, subsection 5.3.3; also, e.g., Dane ER22Mr12:36-39, I4:338-348; ; EllenI2:676-692, I3:705-711, 966-975; WandaI2: 955-962; WoW12: 534-539; ZJI1: 363-367), Ellen’s change in homestay was also framed as a way to offset the wide-ranging and ubiquitous use of Mandarin at QHS. Ellen reported that even from early in the year “my mom like (.) actually want to me change another school (R: oh really) yeah because like she said- she’s so worried that like l- my my English improve so slowly” (I3:735-737; also I1:104-115).

When I asked Ellen, as part of our first interview, which of her classes were her favourite, she very quickly answered that there were three – and implicated language in more and less explicit ways (I1: 778-801): Mr. Whee’s ELL Writing class (“he’s a very nice teacher…I think he can really can improve my English writing very well” [I1:787]); her Science 10 class where the teacher was “very good and can solve [language-related\(^{56}\)] problem with my science” (I1:791); and her TechEd (Holding) class, which she liked because they had been given a

\(^{56}\) That her “problem with my science” was language-related is illustrated by the following interaction (I1:388-394):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E:</th>
<th>R:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>the science is like mm some, some, some words that about the science the so like I can’t understand what this means so</td>
<td>and what do you do in that situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>just more practice and so, so like this test I can’t very well understand what the question</td>
<td>what the question means yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>so I’m so slow that I can’t finish the multiple choice</td>
<td>oh no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>so I’m sure that I’m fail ((laughs))</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
challenge to see who could build “the longest bridge with newspaper” and was “so relaxed” (I1:793; i.e., because it was unrelated to English proficiency).

When I asked about which class Ellen liked least (I1:805), she prefaced (Sacks, 1992) the account she offered in response with nervous laughter, saying “don’t tell my teacher” (I1:806). In so doing, Ellen indexed from early on her sensitivity to what it could mean for her (as a student) to be publicly critical of her teacher’s practices; it also prompted me to offer her reassurance as the researcher about confidentiality and anonymity (I1:807-81). She drew on various resources to position ELL English as the class she liked least: in addition to reporting that she didn’t like it because “at first we didn’t study anything he just ask we to read books” (I1:818), Ellen characterized the classroom activities as academically irrelevant (i.e., “I think he’s waste time”, I1:830) and condescending to students (I1:812-860). Embedded within her positioning of ELL English using these discursive resources, and keeping in mind her awareness of the fact that she received neither grades on her transcript nor credits towards her graduation for these courses, Ellen asserted “I always think yeah I don’t want to have ESL so I I- I must leave as quick I can to to get out” (I1:848).

As part of the account in which she named her least favourite class, Ellen also described the multifaceted status of, and attitudes toward, the use of Mandarin language in the class.

**Extract 7.4 “when we speak Mandarin” (I1: 854-860)**

01 E: when we speak Mandarin because all ESL, most of is Chinese and when we speak Mandarin Mr. Ogib ask us to stand outside the room
02 R: no way. so it’s a kind of you get in trouble for
03 E: it’s so cold, and Mr. Ogib ask us to stand outside the room and said, told us that the invisible line here
04 R: oh wow when you come on this side
05 E: yeah you can’t speak. oh alright I know it’s good for us but yeah too cold
06 R: that’s different yeah
07 E: yeah and he asked us to everyone should point where’s the invisible line

Ellen’s report in this extract concerns Mr. Ogib’s responses to students’ prevalent use of their L1 Mandarin in the ELL English class. Not only did he ‘ask’ them “to stand outside the room”
where “it’s so cold” (line 04), she describes him as demarcating the doorway into the classroom as “the invisible line” (lines 04, 08) which, once they had crossed, students’ languages other than English were not to be spoken. Ellen also notes that Mr. Ogib had students physically acknowledge the location of the line (“he asked us to everyone should point where’s the invisible line”, line 08). But although Ellen’s representation of the students in this particular class (i.e., “most of is Chinese”, line 01) mirrored and arguably served to (re-)produced the circulating discursive notions about the school’s demographics in relation to English language proficiency and students’ ethnolinguistic background (e.g., Chapter 5), her framing of Mr. Ogib’s actions as potentially positive for students (i.e., “I know it’s good for us”, line 06) also acknowledges at the complex and tenuous status of Mandarin for FIS within the linguistic marketplace at QHS.

In part, as she reiterated across interviews, email reports, and other data, this complexity and tenuousness were at least partially descriptive of the material circumstances within which she was emplaced at QHS. In spite of Ellen’s repeated assertion that QHS had “too muc- many Chinese people” (I3:969; also, e.g., I1:590, 592; I3:687, 969; ER04:08), she also reported that this demographic situation was “not [QHS’s] fault” (I3:971; also, e.g., I2:594-598) and that it played a very important role in helping FIS like her “not feel lonely when you first come to school” (ER30A2012:08; also, e.g., I3:689). But it also indexed additional ‘invisible lines’ that were consequential for getting out of ESL:

**Extract 7.5 “my English can’t improve” (I1: 682-689)**

01 R: so the size is something that you don’t like, is there anything else?
02 E: too many Asian ((laughs)). it’s not, it’s just kidding
03 R: you can say, it’s oka::y
04 E: because too much Asia is, the good way is that you feel like too very ((laughs)) maybe homesick but
05 better when you saw the
06 R: so many other
07 E: yeah like y- you have the same feeling yeah, that you can communicate so well
08 R: but that also you said it’s also the thing you don’t like so

---

57 Ellen is describing standing outside of a ‘portable’ classroom. Portable classrooms are temporary classrooms used by schools that do not have enough physical space in the main school building as extra classrooms. Students literally must walk outside of the school to access these classrooms. When Ellen says “stand outside the room”, and describes this as “so cold”, she is referring to literally having to stand outside of the portable classroom.
Ellen’s construction of QHS as having ‘too many Asians’ (line 02), despite the ways this demographic circumstance may have been a remedy for feeling ‘homesick’ (lines 04-07), is explicitly linked to the ubiquity of Mandarin at QHS and its role in obstructing her improvement in English (line 09). In casting Mandarin as a kind of impediment toward the learning of English – proficiency in which she viewed as central for exiting ESL and thus for gaining credits toward an educational credential – Ellen implies both that (1) she is not solely culpable for taking time to be promoted out of ESL (i.e., “too many Asians” [line 02] means that she “just speak[s] Mandarin” [line 09]) and (2) that the ideal linguistic and educational market for FIS students is one where, via exposure to and continued use of English, consumers of study abroad can most efficiently obtain a (timely) return on their (tuition-fee) investment.

7.2.5 Summary

The gravity of Ellen’s (un)successful promotion out of QHS’s ESL program was central to her accounts of her experience as an FIS during the 2011-2012 school year at QHS. Contextualized as it was by descriptions of the pressure she described from her mother, the successes of her peers, and the complex status attributed to her L1 Mandarin (in relation to English, Cantonese, and other languages), the consequences of her failure to exit ESL depicts and is established by Ellen orienting to polycentric, arguably stratified markets in which value is attributed according to educational, linguistic, social, and economic indices. These evaluations combined in ways that significantly impacted Ellen’s socialization at QHS during the 2011-2012 school year, ostensibly precipitating two important material changes as a result of her placement in and failure to get out of ESL: in addition to purposefully changing her place of residence to increase the amount of English she had to use on a daily basis (I4:163-177; see also Chapter 6), Ellen actually began the 2012-2013 school year at a completely different high school “because she think the QHS standard is too high” (WandaI4:64-95; also EllenI3:735-745).
Not only do these discursive and material implications further suggest that residency, funding, and language are integral to the experiences of FIS, they locate Ellen’s experiences in (and desire to get out of) ESL as a central feature of her (language) socialization trajectory, and are thus emblematic of the foundational role the process of getting out of ESL plays in the construction of the category of FIS.

7.3 Getting out of ESL: Moon

7.3.1 Timetable and “I got four ESL on my schedule”

Moon’s narrative about the start to her school year at QHS was manifestly different from the other focal participants represented in the study in that she reported having to advocate strongly for changes to her timetable(s). When I asked via email if she knew that she would be in ESL classes prior to coming (ER04D11:20), Moon responded that she thought she would be in ELC:58

Extract 7.6 “(Who knows)” (ER04D11:21)
01 I thought i would be in ELC. And i do got a schedule that i was going to take ELC. But a few days later, the school said they made a mistake. (Who knows) So i got four ESL on my schedule. The other international students they just got two or three, but i got four. I really get mad about this.

Table 7.2 is a reconstructed version of Moon’s timetable that includes the “four ESL” (line 02) classes. In addition to being placed in ESL Socials, Writing, Science, and English – she was also in what was called a “Holding” class (cf. Bone and Ellen [CfnTT:01-116; GfnTT:01-116]).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Block 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TechEd/Health (Holding)</td>
<td>ELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In fact, Moon had good reason to believe she would be in ELC classes. Prior to coming, she had taken and successfully completed non-ELL (i.e., ‘regular’ or mainstream) summer school courses offered by the Pateo District, something which only non-ELL students were permitted to

58 As noted in Chapter 3, English Language Center (ELC) was a non-core, not-for-credit course specifically for ELLs transitioning to ‘regular’ (i.e., mainstream or non-ELL) courses. ELC was described as course intended to support ELL students who were transitioning into ‘regular’ English classes at the grade 8, 9, 10, 11, or 12 levels.
do. I later learned that during the first week of classes, after she had learned about this conflict in her schedule for the term, that Moon had gone to meet with the school counselor, Miss Dorsal (I2:758-780; ER24Mr12:30). At this meeting, despite bringing evidence that she had completed non-ELL (i.e., ‘regular’ or mainstream) summer school courses, she was told “no you are in ESL” (Extract 7.7, line 26).

Extract 7.7 “you want to get out of ESL you can’t shout or say something bad” (I2:758-780)
01 M: yeah yeah really no at first I just uh cause I have two different schedule right and I went to see him [her]
02 and he [she] just saw and he he [she] just say no we made a mistake you you are taking ESL I said
03 what and then I sat for while silently and then okay then I go you know what? and she go to told Mister
04 Veep that I kind of bully him [her] cause I shout loud to him to to her and then Mister Veep came to
05 find me
06 R: really
07 M: um Moon um you want to get out of ESL you can’t shout or say something an- bad to Miss Dorsal. you
08 should do your own effort or something like that
09 R: really
10 M: I was shocked. hhh. when did I bullied her?
11 R: so what, can you say more? what happened? did you, you went there because I know you had two
12 schedules
13 M: yeah because I already took summer school here, I told you right
14 R: yeah yeah yeah
15 M: I have the report card from that summer school
16 R: from the regular classes
17 M: yeah and I took that, took and the report card from China and and they’re yeah
18 R: when did you do those summer courses
19 M: the summer courses
20 R: this past year
21 M: yeah this past year
22 R: so before this year started yeah
23 M: yeah yeah yeah
24 R: when you first came
25 M: so I bring all this stuffs to went to see Miss Dorsal and I just said to her and I have two different
26 schedules can you check it again or something like that. he [she] just check it no you are in ESL then
27 bye. she don’t give me, she even didn’t give me a chance to, to see my report card or something
28 R: to kind of explain why
29 M: yeah
30 R: mm that’s unfortunate you know cause clearly if you did regular classes before, and you you were
31 successful in the summer classes
32 M: why still in ESL yeah

Moon’s account of her reaction to being told the school “made a mistake” and that, instead of ELC she was “taking ESL” (line 02), minimizes her reaction to this news (“I said what and then I sat for while silently and then okay then I go”, lines 02-03). She references the fact that she was indeed “really mad” (cf. Extract 7.6, line 03; also ER24Mr12:30) about being placed in so many
ESL classes, but does so in a way that embeds her potentially angered response ("I shout out loudly to...her", line 04) in a description of Miss Dorsal’s conduct (lines 03-04). The tension between the reported responses to the news from different characters (i.e., ‘sitting silently’ [line 03] versus ‘shouting out loud’ [line 04]), serves as a contextualizing resource for what follows.

What follows, presented as more salient details, is that because Miss Dorsal has reported Moon to be a “bully” by “shout[ing] out loud” (lines 03-04), that “Mister Veep came to find” Moon following this allegation (lines 04-05). Moon then switches to an approximated version (i.e., “or something like that”, line 08) of reported speech to narrate Mr. Veep’s handling of the situation (“you want to get out of ESL you can’t shout or say something an-bad to Miss [Dorsal] you should do your own effort”, lines 07-08). Remarkable in this ventriloquizing of Mr. Veep’s response are the implicit (moral) implications of Mr. Veep’s reported reprimand: in addition to implying that students who want to get out of ESL need to behave appropriately towards QHS staff members when interacting with them, the onus is placed on students’ to prove they are ready to get out (e.g., “you should do your own effort”, line 08).

My response to Moon’s voicing of Mr. Veep (“really”, line 09) displays a negative assessment of Mr. Veep’s alleged utterance, something which Moon’s line 10 response (“I was shocked hhh.”) suggests she too has heard and wishes to align with (“when did I bullied her”). Between lines 11 and 24, acting as a bridge of sorts, there is a clear shift in which the institutional nature of this interview interaction is made plain (i.e., it is for research purposes). The requests I make during this ‘bridge’ mark my work to manage the “essential tension” (Mazeland & ten Have, 1996; Rapley, 2001) – that is, of having an agenda for generating data on a topic but also a responsibility to Moon as a here-and-now interlocutor in an event in which those data are being generated. Moon’s utterance at line 17, in which she begins to respond to my request to “say more” (i.e., “I took that…and the report card from China”), is further interrupted, but finally continues at line 25.
From lines 25-27, Moon does indeed say more, this time offering a brief recount of the story in which she was not given the opportunity to show her report card from summer school (line 26). Between lines 28-32, Moon and I align and co-produce a different outcome of her interaction with Miss Dorsal and a negative assessment of Mr. Veep’s handling of the situation. However, in addition to her own style of self-advocacy, Moon’s efforts were mediated by institutional factors about which she could not have been aware at that point during her first year at QHS. Though she had signed up for non-ELL summer courses on her own, prior to actually attending QHS, she was not aware (nor was I) of the school’s ‘summer course’ policy: that students who had been in ELL courses during the school year needed both Ms. Jay’s and the QHS principal’s signature to register in ‘regular’ summer school classes (Cfn25Ma12; Cfn31Ma12; QHSPr2:392-414).

The result of Moon’s prefacing of these details, and the details themselves, is an account which presents two sides: Moon, as an ostensible student-consumer, who has come to hold the service provider, represented by Miss Dorsal and Mr. Veep, accountable for a problem with their product (i.e., that she has been given two conflicting timetables of courses). Though the service providers are constructed as taking responsibility for the problem (“we made a mistake”, line 02), they have criteria for accessing the service they are supposed to be offering that goes beyond grades and academics (e.g., “you want to get out of ESL you can’t shout or say something bad”, line 07; “she even didn’t give me a chance to see my report card”, line 27). The result is not the one Moon would prefer, or arguably, the one she is entitled to given her report card; that is, she is “taking ESL” (line 02, 26) rather than for-credit classes in addition to ELC (see, e.g., Extract 7.6; also ER24Mr12:30).

Because Moon’s status as an ESL student is central to her approaching Miss Dorsal in the first place, the relationship between being in, or out, of ESL, is explicit in this account and thus constructed as central to her experience as a FIS. Less explicit in the account, though very much
a feature to Moon’s report of her own, Miss Dorsal’s, and Mr. Veep’s practices around the issue, is the notion that multiple and polycentric markets (e.g., Blommaert, 2010; J. S.-Y. Park & Lo, 2012) are implicated in the process. For example:

- Moon’s efforts to have the BC summer course credentials she earned, substantiated by her “report card from China” (line 17), are rejected by Miss Dorsal and Mr. Veep based on the local QHS policy about which Moon could not have known prior to enrolling in the summer courses. Moon and the QHS staff have a different understanding of how value is attributed to course credential in this local market, a difference which, at least partly, is related to their knowledge about this market accumulated across different lengths of time at the school (i.e., that the market is polycentric and distributed across different timescales).

- Moon’s animated self-advocacy in interaction with Miss Dorsal is reported, and thus ostensibly oriented to by Miss Dorsal and Mr. Veep, as a behavioural (or perhaps administrative) matter rather than as a ‘customer service’ matter. Again here, Moon and the QHS staff are operating with different understandings of how value is attributed – be that to behaviour, to the practice of doing self-advocacy, to who is allowed to advocate for whom, or to doing being student and/or administrator.

Also inexplicit in Moon’s account, though very much central to her report of her own, Miss Dorsal’s, and Mr. Veep’s practices around her status as an FIS in ESL or as an FIS in for-credit classes, is what Bourdieu (1990) has referred to as the economizing logic vis-à-vis which actors are motivated to preserve or alter the ways in which different forms of capital are recognized and distributed.\(^\text{59}\)

\(^{59}\) Also of interest in this extract, though left unanalyzed here, is the possibility that Moon’s self-presentation in the context of the research interview (i.e., as a particular kind of research participant) is also demonstrative of this economizing logic at the level of research participation; that is, she is doing being a ‘good’ research participant by...
7.3.2 From ESL to ‘Regular’ Science: “I need to catch up”

In addition to change in scheduling that had arisen because of her unrecognized summer courses, Moon’s schedule would change again by the end of her second month at QHS. The change resulted from the fact that she had been promoted out of her ELL Science into the ‘regular’ Science 10 classes, and was also moved from Math 10 class into Math 11. During our first interview, which occurred after her move into Math 11, Moon suggested that she thought Math 11 was “easy [and] I even want to move on to [Math] grade 12” (I1:486). I continued on the topic of ‘easy’, noting that in her most recent timetable she was no longer registered in ESL Science.

In Extract 7.8, which occurs following my observation that she is no longer in ESL Science (line 01) and in response to my request for elaboration (line 03), Moon imputes to herself the capacity to “answer the questions” (line 04) as a means for distinguishing herself from the rest of her classmates (“all of them the others don’t know”, line 05). Not only does distinguishing herself in this way position her as ‘beyond’ ESL Science, or her ELL classmates in that particular class, it suggests that distinguishing oneself in this way (i.e., by answering questions in class) is a valuable (and valued) form knowledge display for students to garner their teacher’s attention, and by extension, to facilitate the process of getting out of ESL. Again through the use of the

Extract 7.8 “still wait about two weeks because there weren’t the enough room” (I1:511-520)

01 R: I see I saw from here too that in Science it’s not ESL
02 M: yeah
03 R: so what makes those classes easier
04 M: I already, I’m in ESL Science already but I don’t know just answer the questions on the class and the teacher just all of them, the others don’t know the question and I answered it
06 R: all the time
07 M: the teacher will yeah what grade are you in? how do you know this? just like that and then she- he helps
08 me to move out
09 R: to the, to a regular class
10 M: yeah a regular class
11 R: uh huh so
12 M: but still wait about two weeks because there, there weren’t the enough room

relaying just this kind of story. Elsewhere I have referred to participants’ orientations to the categories under which they were recruited for research purposes as orientations to the research market (e.g., Deschambault, 2013c).
reported speech of her teacher, Moon implies that it was her content knowledge (“what grade are you in how do you know this”, line 07) that resulted in her teacher helping help her “to move out” (line 08). Interestingly, and unlike other focal students (e.g., Ellen1:864-881; ZJ1:478-492) Moon does not suggest here that this type of participation in class was related to English language proficiency.

However, as she relays in line 12, despite being promoted out she “wait[ed] about two weeks because there…weren’t the enough room.” She also reported becoming quickly aware of the fact that she would have to work harder to catch up. Because she had “missed a lot of class” and had not been using the same textbook in her ELL Science class, by the time she had actually transferred to the regular Science 10 class, “they’ve learned about four chapters already and then I can’t- (RD: that’s hard) I need to catch up” (I1:559-561; also ER14N11). When I asked how she was managing that aspect of her transition, Moon said that she was “read[ing] the book at home every day” (I1:564) and that her teachers “ask me to to have the class and he taught me about all the things I missed” (I1:568). Table 7.3 shows Moon’s timetable as it would remain until the end of January (I2:419).

Table 7.3 Moon’s Timetable at QHS (November)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Block 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TechEd/Health (Holding)</td>
<td>ELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL Socials</td>
<td>Math 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moon made it clear that a further result of her move into Math 11 and the subsequent timetable rearrangement that occurred was that she no longer had to take ELL English with Mr. Ogib, and had instead been transferred to Miss Sarg’s class (I1:1002-1047). She reported that this was a welcome change for her, since she believed neither her abilities nor those of classmates were properly recognized in Mr. Ogib’s class (I1:1022; cf. Ellen [subsection 7.2.4, Extract 7.4]). As a means for further welcoming the move to Miss Sarg’s ELL English class, Moon noted that she would no longer be asked (or see other students asked) “strange questions”
(I1:1008) that made her uncomfortable (i.e., “how many money do you have how many money do uh does your parent have…” [I1:1008-1014]; or to bring a recent photo because so that the teacher could “recognize us” [I1:1028])

7.3.3 From “I can’t bear the stuff we that we learned” to “I can’t understand what’s the article is said”

Beyond the complaints about her timetable, Moon voiced considerable frustration about the composition and content of her remaining ELL classes as well. Although Miss Sarg’s ELL English class was known and praised for its group-work activities (e.g., MoonI2:1121-131; WandaI2:172-202; WoW2:536-539), Moon reported feeling frustrated during group work because “just two people are from Brazil…and all the other are from China”; the result, as Moon put it, was that in spite of teacher selected groups: “cause we all the others are from China we all speak Mandarin” (I2:161-171). In addition to her described frustration at the prevalent use Mandarin in class, Moon’s written work in her ELL English class was strong compared with the work of many of her peers (see, e.g., Appendix F). Where ELL Writing was concerned, Moon’s accounts positioned the content she was being asked to learn as both condescending to someone of her age and grade level and in stark contrast to the language and content expectations of ‘regular’ classes (e.g., I1:535-550). In an email report she produced in December 2011, Moon responded to my questions about ELL Writing as follows:

Extract 7.9 “I can’t bear the stuff that we learned.” (ER04D11:02-08)
01 Questions about your ESL Writing Class (with Ms. Hatef)
02 a) Have you had to do any homework or assignments (like essays) in this class? What were they?
03 How about your grades?
04 a) We don’t write essays in the class although it is ESL writing(I don’t know Y). We just do a lot of simple exercise like: she (is), they (are), I (am). And we are training abbreviation recently. Just like: is not= isn’t are not= aren’t will not= won’t and so on. Then use those abbreviations to fit some sentences. Ms. Hatef doesn’t mark those paper.
05 b) What has been the most difficult thing about this class?
06 b) There’s nothing difficult in this class, seriously. But to tell the truth, the most difficult thing for this class is I can’t bear the stuff that we learned. It’s too easy.
In each of these cases, Moon used assessments of the demographic composition of her ELL English class and resulting L1 use (“cause we all the others are from China we all speak Mandarin”), and the content of her ELL Writing class (“I can’t bear the stuff we learned. It’s too easy”, line 10) as resources to distinguish herself in relation to the assignments and other students in her ELL classes; in short, to present herself as the student who, as one of her timetables had suggested, should have been in ELC and for-credit courses, rather than in ELL.

In November 2011, Moon took the ESL Department’s level/exit test. After the school’s winter break, she was called to the office from her ESL English class to be told that she was being moved out of ESL Socials (I2:03-11; also I2:416-424; ER24Mr12:30). Similar to the case when she had been promoted out of ELL Science, Moon described the move from ELL Socials to Socials 10 as “really hard you know un- when I first came into that classroom the teacher…ask us to talk the things from the book ((chuckling)) you know I a- I can’t understand what’s the article is said” (I2:425). Not only did she experience difficulty with new vocabulary, she noted having trouble identifying “the topic” or “the thesis from the passage”; when I asked Moon how she handled that situation, she reported “I just sit there and see the other people what are they doing” (I2:427-431). Although her teacher had given her some extra material and asked her to “catch up”, Moon reiterated that she had to “do it at home [it’s] very hard” (I2:439).

As part of the process of orally piecing together Moon’s third new timetable for the year (Table 7.4), I learned that her success on the November level/exit test did not guarantee she would also be exiting ESL Writing and ESL English and moving to ELC and English 10. Though the data in Extract 7.10 below pertains to ELC, the issue for both ELL English and ELC was related to class size and availability (I2:210-245; also I2:24-25).

**Extract 7.10 “ELC has the no room for the new student” (I2:210-221)**

01 R: then you’re in ELC now as well
02 M: no no no no I didn’t went to ELC
03 R: no you didn’t
04 M: no
R: I thought you did, okay
M: cause they also said ELC has the no room for the new student
R: ((laughs))
M: ((laughs))
R: that is just unbelievable
M: it’s really fool, I don’t understand. you know my just Miss Hatef said um just because the
government is poor, so they didn’t send the Pateo School District money so the School Board didn’t
give the sc- didn’t give QHS the money to create another ELC class, so we- ju- so yo- we can just stay
in ESL
R: that is-
M: she said this in class

Once I learned Moon had been promoted out of ELL Socials, I presumed that she had been
promoted out of ELL English and ELL Writing as well – what I understood to be standard
procedure at the school (I2:17-27). This is the source of my confirmation seeking utterance in
line 01 (“then you’re in ELC now as well”). Moon’s emphatic response (“no no no no”, line 02),
and subsequent explanation for why she was not in ELC (“cause they also said ELC has the no
room for the new student”, line 06), suggest that given her promotion out of ELL Socials and
ELL Science an explanation is necessary here. What follows her account, laughing (lines 07-08)
and my assessment of this news (“that is just unbelievable”, line 09), project a slot for Moon to
comment further, which she does in lines 10-13. Not only does she report her teacher has given
an account for why she (and others) cannot be promoted out of their ELL Writing class to ELC
(i.e., one which implicates education funding at the provincial, school district, and school levels;
lines 10-12), she adds that this has been a public account given by the teacher in front of the
class (line 15).

Moon’s provision of an explanation, and our mutual treatment of the need for an
explanation, is an index of the local expectation concerning ESL at the school: that promotion
out of ELL Socials otherwise should have meant that she would also be moved into ‘regular’
English and ELC. That an account for why this did not happen was given (and/or considered
necessary by the teacher), that it included teacher commentary on education funding, and that it
was given in front of the whole class, hints at the conditions under which students (both FIS and
local ELLs), as well as their teachers, were going about the daily business of classroom learning. That the BCTF teacher’s strike was ongoing during this time, and that a central rationale for the strike related to the underfunding of education by the provincial government, also provides a context in which Miss Hatef’s explanation can be heard.

And within this context and interaction, the polycentric and multiple nature of education market(s) are demonstrably oriented to at different levels of scale. The reference to caps on class size (“there’s no room for the new student”, line 06), reportedly uttered by Miss Hatef, thus orients to an education market that prioritizes working conditions negotiated between teachers, unions, and administrators at the provincial, school district, and school levels (rather than one which prioritizes Moon’s rights to certain learning conditions). Further, though at an arguably different scale level, Miss Hatef’s reported mention of the role of funding in the creation of “another ELC class” (e.g., lines 10-12) orients to a differently constituted market that prioritizes the role of government funding on local conditions (rather than one which prioritizes the role of FIS tuition fees on public education across levels). In one respect, the prioritization of these markets, and their availability and utility as resources to explain why Moon is still in ESL (i.e., from Miss Hatef’s to Moon in the reported interaction; from Moon to me in the context of the research interview); because it further links the category (and experience) of FIS to ESL services, teaching, and learning, the prioritization of these markets can thus be treated as playing a discursively and material role in Moon’s socialization into (and out of) ESL. Implicit in these prioritizations are notions that available funding – and not the status of ELL services in the larger public system – would allow for provision of better services for students like Moon; and further, that FIS tuition monies are irrelevant to the services they receive while attending public schools.
7.3.4 A New Invisible Line: The “test in the library” (I2:511)

Nonetheless, ostensibly because there was “no room for the new student” (Extract 7.10, line 06) in QHS’s English 10 and ELC classes, Moon’s timetable from mid-January 2012 to the end of the school year included two ELL courses (Table 7.4).

Table 7.4 Moon’s Timetable at QHS (mid-January)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Block 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Block 2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socials 10</td>
<td>Holding/Health</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moon also reported that she had only recently discovered that “before I’ve been move from the ESL Social .hhh they have a test in the library” (I2:511). Although she did know she was not among the 12 ELL students (of whom one was FIS) who had been invited to write the test, she did not know that this test was the result of an ongoing disagreement between the ESL and English Departments at the school over who should have the authority to promote ELLs to ‘regular’ English classes (see, e.g., Chapter 3, subsection 3.2.3, Figure 3.1). In fact, the “test in the library” which occurred in January served as the first iteration of what the QHS Principal called “another layer of assessment before students would be approved to go into…the uh English program” (QHSPr2:476-478).

As it turned out, the second iteration of the English Department’s new ‘layer of assessment’ occurred in late May (Tfn23Ma12), a full month after the ESL Department’s third ESL exit test of the 2011-2012 school year (Tfn25A12). Students in ELL courses were required to write the ESL Department’s test; only those who had tested high enough on the ESL Department test were eligible to write the English Department test (Cfn17Ma12:12). Despite reportedly having heard from both her ELL English (Miss Sarg; I2:25-27) and ELL Writing (Miss Hatef; I2:215-219) teachers that the only reason she remained in ELL classes was related to class size and lack of funding – i.e., was not related to her English language proficiency – Moon wrote the ESL Department’s final test of the school year. Following the ESL
Department’s test in April, a school wide bulletin, which listed the names of students who were eligible to write the English Department’s ELL exist test, was posted online and in front of the school’s main office (I3:60-83). Moon reported that she thought she had been ineligible to write the English Department’s test because: “I didn’t see my name on that bulletin so I asked the teacher and they said just let me go just let me to take that test” (I3:61-71).

The results of the English Department’s (May) test, she told me in our third interview, were announced to students orally by Ms. Jay in the ELL Socials classes (I3:03-18; see also, e.g., Cfn31Ma12:14-21, 44-48; Chapter 9, subsection 9.2.5). But since Moon had been promoted out of ELL Socials classes, she did not receive the test results in class and had to seek out the results for herself:

Extract 7.11 “and yet I don’t believe it” (I3:03-18)
01 R: okay so uh what’s going on you just got the results of this:::  
02 M: you mean the:  
03 R: ESL test  
04 M: ESL test yeah. ah you know re- that’s really interesting cause uhm they didn’t tell me the result actually cause I’m not in the ESL Social and cause Missus Jay is the manager of things and so she will announce everyone to do that but I don’t- so sh- she didn’t came to find me. so I just go to office and I ask to Miss Dorsal and Miss Dorsal said Moon you already out of ESL why you take the test bad on you  
08 ((laughs))  
09 R: you’re kjidding me  
10 M: really I was li- that kind of reaction too  
11 R: you spent hhh. if I were you I’d probably be an:gy ((laughs))  
12 M: ((laughs)) yeah, and yet I don’t believe it. so la- uh next day I went to meet uh Miss Sa- Miss Sarg’s class and I ask her again. .tch she gave me the same response  
14 R: this is regular English  
15 M: no no no sh- um she she’s teaching the ESL English I mean but I’m still in ESL English but I- I think  
16 I’m still staying in ESL but mi- Miss Sarg telled me that um I already out of ESL the only reason that I’m still stay in ESL is that they don’t have enough space for me .tch hhh.  
18 R: oh ho ho:: so then then  
19 M: yeah it’s really oh my god  
20 R: then what did you do, then what did you do after that?  
21 M: I did- hhh. nothing, jus-  
22 R: nothing  
23 M: cause cause the reason is there are so many tests quiz you know, it’s a final of the year

Of interest in Moon’s account here is the attribute “manager of things” she ascribes to “Missus Jay” (line 05), the implicit assessment of his ‘managerial skill’ (“she didn’t came to find me”, line 06), and the action Moon describes herself as having had to take as a result (“so I just go to
office and I ask Miss Dorsal”, lines 05-06). Using these attributions and descriptions, Moon positions herself as having taken a comparatively more active interest in the test, its results, and implications than the manager or the administration; at the same time, and despite her agentive efforts, she positions herself as powerless at the center of an intersecting matrix of institutional communication and assessment practices.

Moon again uses reported speech to narrate Miss Dorsal’s response to her inquiry:

“Moon you already out of ESL why you take the test bad on you” (line 07; see also, e.g., Extract 7.7, lines 02, 07-08; Extract 7.8, line 07). But this reported speech serves both interactional and story-related purposes; not only does it allow for an implicit comment on the conduct of Miss Dorsal (i.e., as inappropriate or unfriendly; “why you take the test bad on you”), it foregrounds this comment rather than the possibility that Moon did receive multiple signs that she should not have taken the test (i.e., she had been told she was ‘out of ESL’; her name was not on the bulletin indicating which ESL students should write the English Department’s exit test, etc.).

Following my line 09 assessment of the moral implicature of her story (“you’re kidding me”), Moon aligns with this assessment (“really I was li- that kind of reaction too”, line 10).

Then, in response to my suggestion that this would be grounds for her to express anger about the situation (line 11), Moon extends the narrative to legitimize the account (lines 12-13, 15-17). She does so by reporting that she has sought and received confirmation from Miss Sarg that she need not have written either of the ESL tests. My response to this extended narrative offers a clear alignment with the content and moral implicature of her story (“oh ho ho:: so then then”, line 18), to which she orients (line 19) before claiming that she “did nothing” (line 21) about it because it was the end of the year and she had many other things to do (i.e., provincial exams, final assignments and tests, etc.; line 23).

However, because the placement, testing, and exiting process were unclear, or had become (even more so) that year, for Moon (and other FIS students; see, e.g., WoW’s case in
Chapter 9) different forms of advocacy – which in local, teacher-terms were known as “the lobby” (e.g., MrsB1:180-184, 349-359; MrsB2: 566-570, 608) or a “charm offensive” (MrsB2:586, 907) – became acute sources of stress for school administration and support staff (Tfn25A12). Moon reported that these forms of advocacy had, in fact, been explicitly addressed by Mr. Veep:

**Extract 7.12 “you disturb them working” (I3:1318)**

01 he came to every ESL classroom and tell, tell students that you can’t go to disturb the principal or email them or Miss Dorsal cause that, you disturb them working so if you want to go out of ESL you need 02 to work harder and don’t let your parents disturb them too

Reinforced through these classroom visits by Mr. Veep, and Moon’s account of them, is that action-oriented educational advocacy – whether carried out by students (as in Moon’s case) or their parents (I3:1318; Tfn25A12) – are frowned upon by administration. By implication, ESL students are constructed in this account as lazy (i.e., “you need to work harder”, lines 02-03), as disruptive in seeking explanations and accountability (i.e., “you can’t go to disturb [the principal] or email them or Miss Dorsal”, line 01-02), and as scheming (i.e., that both students and parents prefer to ‘lobby’ or stage a ‘charm offensive’ to get out of ESL rather than to actually work hard at improving). The responsibility for getting out of ESL is constructed as being a student issue, linked with diligence and (by proxy) language proficiency; not only did this construction position students’ and parents’ requests for information about placement, testing, and exiting ESL as initiatives that “disturb [administrators’] working” (line 02), given Mr. Veep’s role as vice principal, it could also have been heard as a threat.

Cumulatively then, at the same time that Mr. Veep’s reported delivery of this message to “every ESL classroom” (line 01) suggests that there were in fact potential issues with the placement, testing, and exiting ESL, it also absolved the administration of being held accountable for those potential issues. These actions indexed, and highlighted, the low-priority

---

60 From fieldnotes taken during the ESL Department’s ELL Exit test: “Mr. Veep also came in after the test had already begun…after wishing all of the students good luck on the test, told them to make sure to tell their parents NOT TO CALL, or TO STOP CALLING, (the Multicultural Liaison worker). He said…(the Multicultural Liaison Worker) has been overwhelmed with calls from parents about ESL marks/grades & DON’T call them: they don’t know” (Tfn25A12:15-16; capitals used in the original fieldnotes).
status of ESL services, teaching, and learning for the administration, and because they worked to further obscure the process, were a key feature of Moon (and other FIS’) socialization into and out of ESL.

7.3.5 Summary

Moon’s experiences in (and proven ability to get out of) ESL classes before and during the school year intersected and overlapped with institutional processes at QHS during the school year in ways that she could not have predicted. Her self-advocacy, and demonstrated success in her ELL courses, she learned, were powerlessly embedded in and secondary to institutional processes. Her noteworthy participation in classes, and successes on exit tests, were constrained and ultimately neutralized by limitations to QHS’s schedule and answerability to the teacher’s union (e.g., Extract 7.8; 7.11). Similarly, her efforts to hold school officials accountable for her achievements as a (fee-paying ESL) student were reframed variously as morally questionable (e.g., Extract 7.7), as issues related to class- and school-size constraints (e.g., Extract 7.11), and/or as the result of educational processes that were beyond the control of QHS teachers and administration (e.g., Extract 7.10).

When transition to ‘regular’ (for-credit) courses did occur, she entered these classes in medias res, and with significant changes to her timetable; Moon’s accounts suggested that in addition to fact that the instruction she had received, and indeed paid for, in her ELL courses had not prepared her for the academic (i.e., linguistic; discursive) demands of these ‘regular’ classes, she also faced the material realities of ‘catching up’. Overall, Moon’s (language) socialization into and out of ESL at QHS during her first year of studies was the product of a complex, and seemingly contingent, amalgamation of personal and institutional agendas at different scales. The resulting allegiances to, or prioritization of, specific stakeholders and values within the educational marketplace impacted her trajectory in ways that highlighted how collective processes at various scales mediated her individual capacity to act (Wortham & Rhodes, 2013;
see also Block, 2015; Miller, forthcoming). Thus, regardless of her performance on these tests, because there had been no space for Moon in the ELC or regular English 10 courses during the year, Moon finished the year in much the same way that she started, except at a greater financial expense. She reported that she would again “take the summer courses you know for international students” (I3:150) and that the cost of these courses more than doubled since the previous summer ("last year...I think it was four or five hundred per class [R: per class] yeah for the summer courses [R: yeah] but this year my mom heard one thousand three hundred ((laughs))” [I3: 152-156]).

Moon’s experiences at QHS during year locates the process of getting out of ESL at the center of her (language) socialization trajectory. Her trajectory, as well as the specific discursive and material implications that result from the links between ELL and FIS that inhere in it, thus serve to widen the scope of our understanding of the category of FIS.

7.4 Conclusion: Getting out of ESL as Socialization into ESL

In this chapter I have sketched Ellen and Moon’s negotiations of the process of ‘getting out of ESL’ as a shared, and central, feature of their socialization into ESL. I have demonstrated how this process was foundational to their (language) socialization trajectories during the school year at QHS, and thus, to their experiences as FIS studying in a public high school. I wish to suggest, based on the in-person reported experiences of Ellen and Moon, that the process of getting out of ESL itself plays a significant role in the construction of the category of FIS; and further, by implication, that FIS socialization in/of public schools more generally hinges on, and has (unaccounted for) discursive and material consequences for, ELL services, teaching, and learning.

Though Ellen and Moon’s experience of the process of getting out of ESL was a differently derived, configured, and reported product of constraining processes and the acts of individuals and groups at various scales (Wortham, 2012; Wortham & Rhodes, 2013),
negotiating the process was a common experience. Also common to the experiences of both Ellen and Moon, in sum, was socialization into the practice of economizing this process as a means for advancing more quickly toward the BC high school credential they were seeking as FIS. That they learned to economize getting out of ESL in this way was perhaps not surprising, especially given the similarly economizing circumstances which precipitated their recruitment to BC, to the Pateo School District, and to QHS in the first place; or, for that matter, the prominence of this economizing orientation in QHS teachers’ and administrators’ management of FIS and ELL related matters (see e.g., Chapters 4 and 5).

In keeping with the multiple case approach adopted in this study, where multiple has representational implications and the case is the ‘category’ of FIS, in this chapter I have represented the category of FIS using the reported, ‘in-person’ experiences of two focal FIS students’ negotiating the process of getting out of ESL. And it is through these experiences that I have offered a second partial response to my third research question: *How is the category of fee-paying international student (FIS) constructed in persons?* That is, Ellen’s and Moon’s experiences are, simultaneously, situated depictions of the category of FIS (cf. intrinsic cases) and constitutive of a more general category of FIS connected by their socialization into getting out of ESL (cf. instrumental cases).

In Chapters 8 (Zeejay), and 9 (WoW), I present further, more in-depth accounts focal students’ in-school experiences during the 2011-2012 school year at QHS, and specifically, of their socialization into and out of ESL.
CHAPTER 8: CONSTRUCTING FIS IN PERSONS (ZEEJAY)

8.1 Introduction

In Chapters 8 and 9, I continue my response to the third research question proposed for the study: How is the category of fee-paying international student (FIS) constructed in persons? While in Chapter 7 I presented an account of Ellen and Moon’s negotiations of the process of ‘getting out of ESL’, in Chapters 8 and 9 I focus on Zeejay and WoW. In addition to sketching the situated, contingent nature of the process as it was constructed across accounts, interactions, and practices, my aim is to narrate how, for both Zeejay and WoW, “a particular set of events became central and how these events were linked together into the trajectory of socialization that actually coalesced” (Wortham, 2005, p. 110).

Given that Chapters 8 and 9 draw on a wider range of data sources than did Chapters 6 or 7, it is necessary to begin with a brief description of which types of data are included (subsection 8.1.1). Because of these differences in data sources, a further brief section which outlines the discourse analytic orientation for Chapters 8 and 9 is also necessary (subsection 8.1.2). Following these introductory sections, I then narrate Zeejay’s negotiation of the process of getting out of ESL (Section 8.2), and close out the chapter with a brief summary (Section 8.3).

8.1.1 Data Sources and Analytic Orientation: Description and Rationale

The data drawn upon in Chapters 8 and 9 are derived from a cross-section of sources. Data sources for the following chapters include: fieldnotes from participant observations conducted in Mr. Whee’s ELL Writing class (i.e., Gfn), Ms. Jay and Mr. Nobli’s ELL Socials class (i.e., Cfn), and ESL Testing days (i.e., Tfn); focal students’ work produced for or in their classrooms (i.e., ZJ:P14; WoW26); four research interviews conducted with each focal student (i.e., I1; I4), in addition to interviews with QHS staff (i.e., QHSPr; MrN) and non-focal students (i.e., Zard-iTelo [Chapter 9]), over the course of the 2011-2012 school year; email reports
completed by each focal student during the year (i.e., ER); audiorecordings of classroom interaction obtained from the general classroom (i.e., mcMsJ), student-worn t-microphones (i.e., WoWtMrW), or binaural earphones worn by me (i.e., RDbiMsJ); and teacher-created classroom handouts, assignments, and materials (i.e., Appendices). These data are treated from a discourse-analytic perspective, meaning simply that: although each data-text affords a perspective meant to sustain and support the accounts of Zeejay and WoW’s trajectories of socialization offered in Chapters 8 and 9, these “different points of view cannot be merged into a single, ‘true’ and ‘certain’ representation” (Silverman, 2006, p. 291) of the process for either of the students. In this respect, the use of such a wide variety of data sources in Chapters 8 and 9 is used to present a layered, multidimensional narrative of ‘getting into and out of ESL’. In so doing, the use of these multiple sources of data contributes “rigor, breadth, complexity, richness, and depth” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 5) to the accounts, and is meant to urge readers to maintain a thoroughgoing awareness of the degree to which Zeejay and WoW’s experiences (and the accounts of them) are “held together by poetic structures of mutual indexical presupposition across signs and event-segments” (Wortham, 2005, p. 110).

8.2 Getting out of ESL: Zeejay

8.2.1 Timetable and “if I cannot get out of ESL it would affect my regular class”.

Prior to his arrival in Canada just two weeks before the start of the 2011-2012 school year, at fourteen years old, Zeejay had lived all of this life in China’s Guangdong province; he had been attending QHS as a grade ten student for just two months at the time of our first interview (I1: 40-45, 124-135, 348-352; see also Chapter 6, section 6.4). Table 8.1 shows Zeejay’s timetable for the entirety of the 2011-2012 school year at QHS. Although Math content courses did not have an ELL option, Zeejay commented at various points throughout the year that the concepts he was learning in Math were not new to him and in fact were equivalent to “almost
grade eight” in China (e.g., I1:618; ER15N11:03), and he gave similar accounts about the content he was being asked to learn in his ELL Science class (e.g., ER15N11:03; I1:478-492). In the case of each of these content areas, Zeejay was adamant that his English language proficiency was inhibiting his ability to demonstrate his level of content mastery knowledge in either subject. Though he had taken the “math challenge test” early in the year in an attempt to ‘skip’ Math 10, he reported feeling that “because at that time my English is not well I didn’t know I didn’t understand what the what the question mean so i- I failed [to get] enough” (I1:623-625); similarly, when speaking of his ELL science class Zeejay suggested that though he had learned the content in previous grades in China, “I must to stay in the ESL science because my English is not good enough so I need to improve my English right now” (I1:486).

Table 8.1 Zeejay’s Timetable at QHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block 1</td>
<td>Block 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>ELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Socials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like other focal FIS, Zeejay reported knowing that he would be placed in ELL classes upon his arrival in Canada. But he learned quickly that this would have material consequences for his academic trajectory. Given that one of his stated goals for coming to study in Canada was to graduate from (a Canadian) high school (e.g., I1:159), in December he expressed written frustration at what he did not know about his (unofficial) ELL status, ELL credentialing, and the ELL curriculum prior to arriving. As he commented in an email report

Extract 8.1 “if I cannot get out of the ESL it would affect my regular class” (ER05D11:13)

01 A;3)I know I would be in ESL classes before I came to Canada. But I don't know if I cannot get out of the ESL, it would affect my regular class. At the same time, I don't know [Pateau School District] would count 03 the credits from grade 10 until I begin my new term in QHS. What's more, I don't know the ESL classes 04 would limit me for 4 blocks. In a word, reality is quite different from ideality. Most ESL grade 10 student are 05 as anxious as me. They all want to exit ESL and consider they learn a little English knowledge from ESL. So 06 almost every ESL students in grade 10 that I know all learn from other places after class.

Zeejay’s email report suggests that he did not know the extent to which not being able to exit ELL classes would “affect [his] regular class” (line 02). Zeejay’s report that “I don’t know
[Pateo School District] would count the credits from grade 10 until I begin my new term in QHS” (lines 02-03) refers to his not knowing that until he is a student in ‘regular’ classes in the “new term” (i.e., the next school year, after exiting the ESL program), he cannot earn required course credits towards his high school credential. Indeed as Table 8.1 illustrates, he was registered in only one required content area course (i.e., Math 10), as well as other seemingly ‘non-academic’, and to Zeejay inconsequential, courses (i.e., Drama 10, Phys. Ed 10, Woodwork). Thus, the corollary of Zeejay’s claim that he didn’t know that “ESL classes would limit [him] for 4 blocks” (lines 03-04) is that he did not know, but had quickly become aware of the fact that, his status as ELL meant he “cannot receive credit for ‘sheltered’ ESL Courses because these are considered as ‘service’ rather than ‘curriculum’ ” (Wild et al., 2006, p. 2).

Zeejay reported being “anxious” (line 05) about the “reality” (line 04) in which he was paying fees for eight courses but could receive credits for only 50% of those, and thus, like other grade 10 students in ESL, “want[ed] to exit ESL” (line 05). Zeejay also suggests here (and would do so more vociferously as the year progressed), that the content of his ELL classes failed to function as a suitable language scaffold to assist with exiting the ESL program. He does so by noting that like him, most students “consider they learn a little English knowledge from ESL” (line 05); the result, implied by his attribution to these students of “learn[ing] from other places after class” (line 06), is that being in ESL thus also necessitates seeking out, paying for, and receiving some form of shadow education (e.g., Aurini & Davies, 2013; Aurini, Davies, & Dierkes, 2013; Bray, 1999).\(^\text{61}\)

\(^{61}\) Shadow education has, in the literature, conventionally been defined as tuition-based, extracurricular education which is supplementary to a student’s (public) school curriculum (e.g., Bray, 1999), and thus not counted towards the credential awarded for completing that curriculum. However, the Pateo District (like other Districts), offers extra-fee based, ‘regular’ (i.e., for-credit) content courses online. And because the District recognizes the credits earned through these courses for credit towards a BC high school credential, as does the BC Ministry of Education, these courses constitute a kind of ‘state-sanctioned shadow education’ from which school districts can profit.

These after-school courses, as Zeejay would report and exemplify, can be taken at the same time students are attending classes at a high school during the calendar school year (e.g., 14:218-236; see also subsection 8.2.5, Extract 8.11). Delivered outside of the physical space of the school classroom, this form of shadow education is
Zeejay’s construction of his early acculturation into ELL at QHS is here focused almost exclusively on the “reality” (line 04) of the institutional implications associated with his unofficial ELL designation. That English language instruction via ELL classes would be necessary was treated as a given by Zeejay; what was unexpected, as far as ELL classes were concerned, was the degree to which the ELL curriculum would be inconsequential to his academic progress at QHS. Not only did these classes prevent the accumulation of credits toward graduation, Zeejay reported that they did not serve as useful preparation for the ESL exit test.

Indeed, given the combination of constraints and necessities (i.e., shadow education) ELL status imposed on his progress, key to Zeejay’s socialization into ESL was learning how to economize the process of getting out of ESL.

### 8.2.2 Early-year ESL Exit Tests

Even in our first interview in October 2011, Zeejay presented himself as well-informed, realistic, and highly motivated about the process of ‘getting out of ESL’. He told me there was “a test about the vocabulary and the grammar uh if you can get the level four both then you can get out” (I1:528; see also Tfn08D11). Despite having received a level four (i.e., the highest level according to the ESL Department’s scoring) on the grammar portion of the placement test he had written upon entry to QHS in September, Zeejay had received a much lower score on the vocabulary portion of the test (i.e., “one point five group level” [I1:532-534]) (Tfn08D11). Zeejay suggested it was unlikely that he would be able to exit ELL classes following the next test in November, and that there was “one more time” he could possibly exit ELL during the current school year (I1:536-544).

---

directly to international education in the sense that resident (i.e., immigrant) students can register in online courses free of charge. This is interesting both in the sense that it can be included under the rubric of what some have called creeping privatization (e.g., Fallon & Poole, 2013; Poole & Fallon, forthcoming), but also in the sense that it is a particularly lucrative area of revenue generation for public school boards which flies under the radar of public awareness. In fact, during my field work, the average cost of an online course for FIS students was $450; by 2015, this cost had increased to $1150. See also Footnote 76.
Despite his motivation and seemingly reflexive awareness of when ELL exit tests occurred during the school year, just prior to the second ELL Exit test of the year in mid-November Zeejay used the adjectives “complicated and wistful” (ER15N11:05) to describe his first few months at QHS. When I requested that he elaborate, he responded in an email as follows:

Extract 8.2 “complicated and wistful” (ER15N11:20,23)
01 The "complicated" means that at that moment I don't know what I need to do. Most influentially, I cannot talk with other guys confidently in English, though there are lots of guys who can speak Chinese. But
03 I want to improve my English through communicate with the people who are native. […]

04 The "wistful" means that a wistful longing for the past which I lived in China. I missed my parents and friends. What's more, my parents have to work hard to make money to support my life in Vancouver. They are both not a businessman. Most importantly, they are fifties.

Zeejay’s response to my request relies on different explanatory resources related to language learning, his residency or living arrangements, and the tuition fees he pays as an FIS. To contextualize his use of ‘complicated’ (“I don’t know what I need to do”, line 01), he contrasts opportunities for improving his “English through communicate with the people who are native” (line 03) learning with the ample opportunities he has to communicate with Mandarin or Cantonese speakers (“there are lots of guys who can speak Chinese,” line 02). In lines 04-06, Zeejay’s elaboration of his use of ‘wistful’ describes emotional states related to his parents in relation to his current living situation (“longing for the past which I lived in China. Missed my parents and friends”, lines 04-05), and tuition fees (“my parents have to work hard to make money to support my life in Vancouver. they are both not a businessman”, lines 05-06).

Though I do not offer a full analysis here, these descriptions exemplify an early (and enduring) articulation of the polycentric nexus of concerns within which Zeejay’s longer-term (i.e., graduating from a Canadian high school [I1:159]) and more immediate (i.e., “to exit ESL”) study abroad goals were embedded. Further, that the explanatory resources Zeejay used to unpack his use of these adjectives in Extract 8.2 index the omnipresent themes of residency (i.e.,
homestay), funding (i.e., his parents’ age and health), and language – suggest again how these are definitive of and consequential for (the category of FIS). Further to this, the chronological timing of Zeejay’s explanations suggests that the pressure to exit ESL, building as the November test drew nearer, was bound up with his “complicated and wistful” mood.

**November test.** Despite reports that he felt very confident about his performance on the grammar and vocabulary portion of the test, Zeejay noted in December that he had not passed the November ELL exit test and gave a detailed account of why, for him, “writing was the most difficult part” (ER05D11:08-09). For the written portion of the test, the class had been shown the movie *Back to the Future*, and in the second class had been given 25 minutes to finish an essay in which they could either “summarize the whole movie or show our opinions about which life mode we prefer…future or past” (ER05D11:08). Though he reported having taken (and continuing to take) great pains to learn and memorize new vocabulary words in English on his own and both during and outside of his scheduled ELL classes at QHS (e.g., I1:57-72, 547-569; 839-846; I2:647-654, 754-810; I3:160-165, 504-523), his difficulty with the written portion of the ESL test had a major impact on the focus of his studies. Following the test, Zeejay noted unequivocally that he had “to advance my writing faculty as soon as possible, otherwise, I cannot move to regular classes in February” (ER05D11:09; also, e.g., I2:296-309; I3:03-27).

The November ESL Exit test was thus a formative experience for Zeejay during the year, and one which seemed to have extensive implications for his school-based (language) socialization. He came away with a very clear conception of (academic) writing as the main hurdle in his pursuit to ‘get out of ESL’, and arguably worked harder than his classmates on assignments until he realized he had missed the opportunity to exit the ESL program by January. It was for this reason that, very soon after receiving the results of the November test, Zeejay began to display observable contempt for the materials, instruction, and overall purpose of his
ELL Writing Class (e.g., Gfn06D11:33-37; Gfn12Ja12:26-29; Gfn01F12:07-09; Gfn04A12:36-37; Gfn24Ma12:45-51; Gfn08Ju12:27).

8.2.3 ELL Writing: Mr. Whee’s Class

Zeejay’s derision of ELL Writing became increasingly visible during the course of the year. Importantly, the in-class behaviour and work ethic through which this was manifest did not go unnoticed by Mr. Whee. In our year-end research interview he described Zeejay as a student who had shown “not a lot of effort”, was “not so motivated”, was “lazy on his assignments”, and consequently that “a lot of his work never made it to completion” (MrW:307-309). Though Mr. Whee reflexively acknowledged that “maybe he didn’t like the assignments”, he also (and in my opinion fairly) constructed Zeejay’s attitude as problematic: “I told the kids that’s not what it’s about you do your best and you know you get it in and take pride in what you’re doing” (MrW:307). In sum, and in many ways not without warrant (see, e.g., Figure 8.5), he narrated Zeejay’s work in his class to have been “totally disappointing” (MrW:311). Over the course of the school year, Zeejay’s increasing disdain for the ELL Writing class and Mr. Whee’s intolerance for his behaviour were mutually reinforcing, and resulted in a recurrent tension between them. In a larger sense, this tension, and the different value-attributions of which it was emblematic, were illustrative of the different markets to which Mr. Whee and Zeejay were orienting in their respective positions as FIS and ELL teacher. With this acknowledgement made, in the subsections that follow I present situated instances from the ELL Writing class that were relevant to the genesis of this tension, while at the same time taking into account how these instances too were situated against the larger context of events during the 2011-2012 school year at QHS.

*Princess Mononoke* and “Life”. Over two classes in early November, students were asked to watch the anime historical fiction film *Princess Mononoke* (*PM*; Miyazaki & Suzuki, 1997) and complete an in-class, two-paragraph essay in response. This was meant to serve as an
early year writing assignment that ‘went on file’ as an indicator of students’ proficiency in written English, and one on which students were given a grade out of 20 (Gfn04N11:23-35; Gfn10N11:14). Though students had produced the writing sample early in the month, they did not receive their grades for the assignment until the end of November (Gfn30N11:41), a few days after the results of the November ESL exit test had been released.

Mr. Whee did in-class work to scaffold students’ writing of the PM paragraph (i.e., providing students with a copy of the evaluation rubric; facilitating whole-class discussion and brainstorming about characters’ names; eliciting a short list of adjectives and adverbs that could potentially be used to describe characters; and circulating to respond to individual students’ requests for assistance [Gfn04N11]). In addition to this, in previous classes Mr. Whee had also used graphic organizers, and other prompts, to encourage students to think more explicitly about the structure of paragraphs and how these related to many of the grading criteria used on the PM paragraph (e.g., ZJ:18,19).

Figure 8.1 displays Zeejay’s PM assignment. The top portion displays Zeejay’s written paragraph and Mr. Whee’s written comments (i.e., “How can you connect these ideas?”). Mr. Whee’s comments correspond to the circled portion of the assessment rubric, at the bottom of the image, for which Zeejay received 0/1 (i.e., “Connection (transition) between paragraph 1 & 2”). The bottom portion of the image also displays Mr. Whee’s overall assessment of Zeejay’s paragraph (i.e., 14.5/20) according to specific features of the written work.

Although he reported being “not satisfied with my grade” on the assignment, having failed the November test meant also that Zeejay was acutely aware that his PM score was inconsequential to his unofficial ELL status; thus he was more frustrated by the fact that Mr. Whee “did not write anything that I need to improve” (ER05D11:03). Indeed, when he had handed back the PM assignment, Mr. Whee himself had explicitly addressed this by noting “I only marked for what was on that sheet so I pretty much didn’t mark punctuation I didn’t mark
subject verb agreement… I didn’t mark other things we were only looking for what was on the sheet” (ZjtMrW:30N11 [13:01-13:16]). This difference in orientation to the task between Zeejay and Mr. Whee, with respect to its purpose, function, and value-attribution, is thus an
example of how feedback here is embedded in differently constituted educational markets: for Mr. Whee, as a diagnostic, procedural task in which he had to provide a grade for each student that would go on file and was completed in the context of escalating job action (i.e., teacher’s strike); whereas for Zeejay, especially given the most recent ESL exit test, it was a missed opportunity to better understand how his writing (and grade) could have improved, and thus contributed to his efforts to get out of ESL. In other words, the economizing logic with which Mr. Whee and Zeejay were framing this instance of feedback situated the event within differently arranged complexes of institutional processes (see, e.g., Séror, 2008).

Consequentially for Zeejay, due as homework on the day Mr. Whee handed back the graded PM assignments was a completed introductory paragraph to a longer, multiple-paragraphed essay students had outlined in a previous class (Gfn30N11:42; see Figure 8.2 for Zeejay’s essay outline).

*Figure 8.2 “Life” [Outline] (ZJ: P21)*

Zeejay’s post-November-test motivation to ‘advance his writing faculty as soon as possible’ was, on this particular day, manifest by him coming to class with a near-complete first draft of his “Life” essay. As he walked around checking students’ homework, Mr. Whee’s audible surprise
at this was accomplished with a massive, greeting-interruptive in-breathe: “how’s it going Zeeja-wha-.hhhh” (ZJtMrW30N11:129 [16:33-16:35]). But on that particular day, Zeejay’s motivation and initiative ended up working against him (see Extract 8.3 below), and embedded as it was against the backdrop of the November ESL exit test results and his results on the PM assignment, in many ways represented an important point in Zeejay’s socialization trajectory in the ELL Writing class.

Prior to his circulating to speak with students individually about their homework, Mr. Whee assigned a worksheet which required students to add adjectives to a list of ~20 pre-written sentences – a task of which many students, including Zeejay, made short work (Gfn30N11:46). This quick completion resulted in Zeejay conversing with friends across his three languages, and, while waiting for his opportunity to speak with Mr. Whee, intermittently checking his tablet PC for “famous people’s” (i.e., Extract 8.3, lines 41-43) quotes to include in his essay.

This conversing continued as Mr. Whee consulted with a classmate (myZ) whose seat was immediately next to Zeejay’s.

Extract 8.3. “good to take time. to think. about your life. right” (ZJtMrW30N11:666-700 [44:43-46:01])

01 MrW: ((to myZ)) kay so. we know we’re talking about tanks right
02 myZ: ((to Mr. Whee)) yeah
03 MrW: ((to myZ)) we(‘ve) got tank tank
04 ZJ: ((sound of stretching arms, then makes a noise))=
05 MrW: ((to myZ)) tank. so
06 ZJ: ((to Sumyar, in Cantonese)) nei5 zeok3 deoi3 gam2 joeng5 ge3 haai4 dim2 daa2 bo1
07 MrW: ((to myZ)) let’s try to get rid of some of those
08 Sumyar: ((to ZJ)) (unintelligible Cantonese)=
09 ZJ: ((to Sumyar)) =mm=
10 Sumyar: ((to ZJ)) =(unintelligible Cantonese)
11 MrW: ((reading myZ’s essay)) [(in) world war two there has a type of tank cal:
12 ZJ: ((to Sumyar)) [wai3 h.
13 MrW: d-
14 ZJ: ((to Sumyar)) nei5 z1l dou3 a3-
15 MrW: ((reading myZ’s essay)) [chance for the
16 ZJ: ((to Sumyar)) keoi5 gong2 go2 di1 . keoi5 dou1 teng1
17 MrW: ((reading myZ’s essay)) tiger tank
18 ZJ: ((to Sumyar)) keoi5. keoi5. keoi5 me1je5
19 MrW: ((reading myZ’s essay)) [they were: ((to myZ)) you got that right good

62 Mr. Whee told students the worksheet was meant to help them “revisit adding details to your [their] writing to make it interesting and fun fun for you to write and fun for people to read” (ZJtMrW:30N11 [24:09-24:19]).
Not only was Mr. Whee’s conversation with myZ completely audible to Zeejay (and recorded by the microphone he was wearing), Zeejay’s conversation (in Cantonese, lines 01-22) with Sumyar was also completely audible to Mr. Whee and myZ. The boys’ use of Cantonese continued until, at line 23, Mr. Whee’s interaction with myZ was interrupted by a student who had come to

---

63 I have left the transcribed Cantonese untranslated here for two main reasons. The first is that as analyst I too would have shared the aural perspective of Mr. Whee in this situation; that is, not being able to understand the conversation between Zeejay and Sumyar. While on the one hand this might be argued to background Zeejay and Sumyar’s ‘perspective’ on the situation, on the other it can be argued to honour the moment as they chose to create and experience it (i.e., as a private conversation, since they are the only two Cantonese speakers in the class, and could just have easily chosen Mandarin or English as the code for this exchange). The second reason for representing these data untranslated in the transcript is that they are not explicitly analyzed. I do however, treat their code choice as important for Mr. Whee’s actions and talk, and in this sense his inability to understand is tantamount.

The Cantonese data are transcribed using the Cantonese Pinyin system, with numbers used to denote tones for each of the lexical items (see, e.g., [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cantonese_Pinyin](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cantonese_Pinyin)). A brief gloss of the interaction is that the boys discuss the suitability of basketball shoes and the intelligibility of languages other than English to me (as researcher).
ask to go to the washroom. ?MS’s question at line 23 (“(may I) go to the washroom?”) begins an interlude during which Mr. Whee’s consultation with myZ is interrupted; immediately after Mr. Whee responds to ?MS (line 24), another student (lks2sk8) uses the interlude as a space to let Mr. Whee know he has finished the ‘adding adjectives’ worksheet (“I’m done with this”, line 25). Following his acknowledgement of lks2sk8’s work (“awesome okay good”, line 26), Mr. Whee initiates a return to his consultation with myZ (“hey myZ”, line 26), in which he acknowledges that myZ is engaged in some kind of revision effort (“okay you got it there bro I’ll wait”, line 26), ostensibly one which began during or shortly after the interruption of his work with myZ at line 23. It is at this point that Mr. Whee turns to address Zeejay directly (line 28). That Mr. Whee has chosen to speak to Zeejay here, rather than any of the other students, suggests that he has reason to do so (i.e., that Zeejay’s voice has been the loudest during his consult with myZ, that he is displeased with Zeejay’s use of a language unintelligible to him, or both); that is, Mr. Whee could just as easily have chosen to speak to Thin-Man, Who, WoW, or even Sumyar, all of whom were also sitting close by.

His utterance makes reference to the title and context of the near-completed draft essay on Zeejay’s desk (“h↑ow’s wrīting about līfe going there for you Zeejay”, line 28), but not, notably, the assigned ‘adding adjectives’ worksheet which neither Zeejay nor Sumyar have yet completed. Zeejay initiates a response (“oh yeah i- i-”, line 29), which Mr. Whee interrupts with a speedily delivered, arguably reformulated version of the question (“>are you havíng fuʌn with that?<”, line 30). Mr. Whee’s combination of questions is hearable as rhetorical here; that is, he poses questions for which “straightforward answers are not obtainable and/or not meaningful, since they are unavailable, insignificant, or too obvious” (Maynard, 1995, p. 21; see also Takagi, 1999). Zeejay’s hearing of Mr. Whee’s questions as rhetorical in this way, and orienting to the “disapproving and critical effects these phrases convey in discourse” (Maynard, 1995, p. 21), is indexed in the second-long pause that follows Mr. Whee’s reformulated version (line 31), the
change of state token with elongated vowel and falling intonation (‘oː↓h’, line 32; Heritage, 1984, 2013), and provision of an extended account over many turns (lines 32-49) which begins by explicitly noting that he has not been ‘on-task’ (e.g., “I have some free time”, line 32).

Mr. Whee’s questions can thus be characterized as “convey[ing] reversed polarity assertions, thereby displaying the epistemic stance of the speaker” (Koshik, 2002, p. 1854). In this case, that stance is disapproving of Zeejay’s prior behaviour, and, “rather than as ‘real’ questions” (Koshik, 2002, p. 1851), Mr. Whee’s inquiries embed negative assertions (i.e., that Zeejay is not writing about life; that Zeejay is ‘not having fun’ with assigned class work), and thus are meant to hold Zeejay accountable for speaking in a language other than English. The move to hold Zeejay (and not, for example, Sumyar) accountable here is exemplary of how tensions between Mr. Whee and Zeejay were increasingly manifest in classroom interaction during the year. That this tension was manifest in this way on this particular day, especially given Zeejay’s work to complete so much of his ‘Life’ essay, his frustration and disappointment with the PM assignment, and his recent failure to exit ESL results, functioned as a turning point of sorts.

In positioning Zeejay’s use of Cantonese in the immediate classroom environment as problematic for whatever reason (i.e., it was related neither to the worksheet he had assigned nor his “writing about life” or it was an impediment to his ability to interact with myZ), Mr. Whee’s question is also an index of his own voiced concerns about students’ ubiquitous use of Chinese language(s) at the school; namely, that “they all just hang out together…they isolate the non-Chinese students and they speak Chinese to each other…and they don’t take responsibility for that” (MrW:571-577). This was, incidentally, a widely voiced and much-discussed concern among administrators, teachers, and many students (e.g., EllenI3:980-992; MrsB1:651-659; MrN:162-164; MsJ:1359-1377; QHSPr2:588-596; ThinMan:125-133; YA:03-13; ZeejayI1:741-770). In this respect, the different orientations to the use of Cantonese (by Zeejay, by Mr. Whee)
here are one example of the many sites at which different stakeholders’ ideological understandings of what was happening (for FIS) in ESL were empirically observable. These different understandings further suggest that what ESL was, and what getting out of ESL meant, was situated amongst a matrix of differently economized (market) orientations to language, learning, teaching, and education.

Zeejay’s response to Mr. Whee’s questions occurs across multiple turns (lines 32-49), and in defense of having spoken Cantonese and been ‘off-task’, refers to his near-complete working draft of the essay (rather than just the assigned introductory paragraph): “I finish the first paragraph and...the second paragraph...but not finish all” (lines 32-33, 35, 37); and “I search som:e .tch u:h some famous people’s:- [quoted sayings]” (lines 41-42). That Mr. Whee interrupts Zeejay three times over the course of this extended account (e.g., lines 34, 36, 43) implies that Zeejay’s answers to his questions are not meaningful, and thus further index Mr. Whee’s (negative) epistemic stance.

Mr. Whee’s epistemic stance is further indexed in the interaction in two final ways. First, in response to Zeejay’s claim that he still has work to do (line 37), Mr. Whee responds with comments delivered in a style of speaking resembling foreigner talk (“<it’s good to take time. to think about your life. (.) ri↑ght.>”, line 38; “<it’s worth the time. it’s good t[ime]”, line 40). Not only are these comments uttered with a comparatively slower rate of delivery, they are more clearly articulated, are shorter, include deliberate (arguably exaggerated) pausing, and simplified idiomatic expressions (compare “it’s good time” [line 40] with the more idiomatic “it’s time well spent”; see, e.g., Ferguson, 1971; Brulhart, 1986). Second, in response to Zeejay’s description of his efforts to find quotations from a famous person to include in his ‘Life’ essay, Mr. Whee’s emphatically intoned, and abruptly delivered interruptions (“>rea↑ll↓y<. gre↑at↓.”, line 43; “interesting”, line 45) function to imbue the whole interaction with a sense of sarcastic irony.
The pause at line 46, and Zeejay’s smile-infused response and contextualization of Mr. Whee’s use of ‘interesting’ (“yeah maybe. but-”, line 47) display Zeejay’s orientation to this sarcasm.

Mr. Whee’s final rejoinder at line 50 (“you’re challenged by it I’m glad”) comments on the difficulty Zeejay claims to be having (“it’s hard”, line 48) as he searches for “famous people’s” quotes to include in his essay (line 42). Though in his final draft of the ‘Life’ essay Zeejay did indeed include a “famous people’s:’ quote, this work was unacknowledged as part of the interaction, that class, or the evaluation of his ‘Life’ essay.

Figure 8.3 (see Appendix G for full final draft) shows the first paragraph of Zeejay’s final draft of the ‘Life’ essay, with a black lines indicating the spot in the introduction where he has included a quote from the ‘famous’ Russian author Nikolai Ostrovsky.64

Figure 8.3 “Life” [Nikolai Ostrovsky] (ZJ: P21)

---

64 This quote is taken from the English translation of the Russian novel “How the Steel Was Tempered” (Ostrovsky, 1952/2002, p. 71). It has in fact been copied infelicitously by Zeejay (i.e., “pretty” in Zeejay’s text should read “petty”). Also interesting to note here is Zeejay’s self-translation of the title from Mandarin Chinese to English. Though the English translation from Russian is “How the Steel was Tempered”, Zeejay’s own translation of the Mandarin Chinese title in the text is “The Making of a Hero”. Neither Zeejay’s inclusion of this quote, much less the linguistic and cultural resources needed to locate the book and translate its title, were acknowledged as part of the evaluation for this particular essay assignment.
Adding to the significance of this particular day for Zeejay was the fact that although Zeejay had done more than was expected for homework, Mr. Whee did not consult individually with him about his “Life” essay during the class (Gfn30N11:24). In fact, he whispered the following utterance into the lavaliere microphone just prior to the class ending:

Extract 8.4 “we don’t need to spend so much time on this” (ZJtMrW30N11:851 [54:10-55:10])

Zeejay’s construction of the assigned tasks in the ELL writing class in Extract 8.4 as something he could easily finish (line 02; also “they all finish”, line 05), as “a little boring” (line 03), and because they were “easy” (line 03; also “we can just do something that’s challenge for us all”, line 04), as something which he need not “spend so much time on” (lines 03-04), serves multiple functions. At the same time Zeejay’s utterance here constructs the assigned work in ELL Writing as being of little interest and unchallenging to him (and his classmates), it also displays an attitude that would become progressively more manifest in his framing of classroom work (see, e.g., Extract 8.7 and Figure 8.5 presented below).65

In terms of curriculum, work like the PM assignment, the Life essay (Appendix G), and one final multiple-paragraphed essay (Chinese International Student in Canada; Appendix H), assignments that drew explicit attention to essay writing, structure, and cohesion ceased soon after the November ELL Exit test. In fact, from mid-January to June, assigned work in Mr. Whee’s ELL writing class focused instead on: (1) grammar and vocabulary exercises from a

65 At the same time, Zeejay’s explicit orientation to the recording device and the researcher that are evident in Extract 8.4 are important to acknowledge. A further relevant contextual note here is that this was one of the first ELL writing classes in which interactions were audiorecorded. For further comment on this issue, see Extract 8.7 and Footnote 70.
textbook entitled *Language Power* (Wronka, 1997; e.g., Gfn18Ja12; Gfn15F12; Gfn29Mr12; Gfn26A12; Gfn24Ma12; Gfn08Jn12), (2) a unit on poetry which spanned several months (e.g., Gfn24Ja12; Gfn10F12; Gfn29Mr12; Gfn18A12), and (3) a unit on letter writing which culminated in a class trip to the post-office to send students’ written letters (e.g., Gfn16Ma12; Gfn30Ma12; Gfn08Ju12). This change in focus was not lost on Zeejay, who grew increasingly unreceptive to assigned work in the ELL Writing class (e.g., Gfn06D11:33-37; Gfn12Ja12:26-29; Gfn01F12:07-09; Gfn04A12:36-37; Gfn24Ma12:45-51; Gfn08Ju12:27).

**The “test in the library” (MoonI2:511).** In January 2012, 12 ELL students (one of whom was an FIS) were given the opportunity to get out of ESL by writing a pilot version of a test developed by the English Department. As noted earlier, this test was the result of an ongoing disagreement between the ESL and English Departments at the school over who should have the authority to promote ELLs to ‘regular’ English classes (see, e.g., Chapter 3, subsection 3.2.3, Figure 3.1 and Chapter 7, subsection 7.3.4). Zeejay informed me (via email) that because he was not among the 12 students identified to take the test, that “Unfortunately, I have to wait until Sep.2012 if I want to exit from ESL” (ER23D11:96-97; also, e.g., ER27Ja12:28). As part of the same email, continuing on his extra-curricular mission to improve his writing, he also made the following request: “Because I have some free time, so may you just send me some writing

---

66 A description of this textbook, which first appeared in Mr. Whee’s classroom in January (Gfn06Ja12:04-05, 33) can be found below. Despite the fact that the phrase “Grade 5” is used in the book’s full title, that phrase does not appear on the cover of the textbook.

“Language Power is a series of consumable student books that address key skills in vocabulary, sentence structure, grammar and usage, capitalization, and punctuation. Each book contains very specific lesson strategies to reinforce grammar, writing, and study skills.

**Key Features:**

- Each of the six units addresses a critical skill area by way of reinforcement and practice
- Exercises at the end of each lesson and each unit provide ample practice and the opportunities to apply real-life contexts
- Affordably priced”

themes or topic if possible. I want to find something to write to advancing my writing skill” (ER23D11:95-96).67

In our second interview in February, Zeejay also made it clear that he was aware that Wanda, the only FIS student who had written and passed ‘the test in the library’, had successfully been promoted out of ESL (I2:66). He responded to my question “How did she do that?” (I2:69) by drawing on a range of ideological orientations to position himself in relation to Wanda, and by implication, to position his failure to get out of ESL in relation to the successes Wanda and another FIS (Moon) he believed to be exiting ESL (though cf., however, Chapter 7, section 7.3 for a different account of Moon’s experience with exiting ESL). These orientations came through a series of comparisons that Zeejay used to contextualize Wanda’s and Moon’s success stories. In speaking about Wanda, Zeejay reported “she’s good she’s from Hong Kong you know so i- she’s English level maybe is higher than ours (RD: okay) our mainland China student” (I2: 70-76). He continued by noting that he knew some other FIS students (e.g., Moon) whom he thought had been successful in exiting ESL during their first year. In contrast to his own experience, Zeejay described these students as follows:

Extract 8.5 “you need pay much more high- higher” (I2:76-84)
01 ZJ: …[they are] from China but they are not learn, they are not study at the public school in China
02 RD: right
03 ZJ: they are in some private school in China
04 RD: a private school
05 ZJ: they are- (at) private school uh, you need to pay higher
06 RD: right
07 ZJ: you need pay much more high- higher, but the private school in China uh there English and Chinese
08 are half and half
09 RD: so it’s kind of like English immersion almost?

67 I did indeed send Zeejay a topic for writing. Zeejay’s full-essay response is presented in Appendix I. The question I posed was as follows:
Agree or disagree with the following statement. Use reasons or examples to support your position.
> 
> "It is better for international students to be in ESL rather than in regular classes at [QHS]."
> 
> Please write a kind of essay where you give three reasons you agree or disagree with the above statement, and write a paragraph about each of the reasons (ER23D11:49-53).
Zeejay’s account here draws on specific ideological resources to contextualize the successes of FIS he knows to have exited ESL in the middle of their first year at QHS. Specifically, these resources relate to: the comparative status and legacy of English in Hong Kong versus mainland China (“she’s from Hong Kong you know so i- she’s English level maybe is higher than ours”); the comparative level of access to English language for Chinese students in private versus public schools (“the private school in China uh there English and Chinese are half and half”, lines 02-03); and the comparative socioeconomic statuses of students able to attend private schools (“they are in some private school in China…you need pay much more high-higher”, lines 01-02).

That Zeejay was able to deploy these resources to account for his comparative ‘lack’ of success in exiting ESL relative to the successes of other FIS, suggests that the linguistic, national, and racialized hierarchies implied in Zeejay’s talk are widely available (and utilizable) as sense making resources. Further, in addition to the availability and utility of these hierarchies as discursive resources, their potential material implications for getting out of ESL – especially for students like Zeejay – suggest that the International Education Program in which Zeejay is participating is implicated in the discursive and material reproduction of such hierarchies. Matthews and Sidhu (2005) have argued this point convincingly, finding that “normalizing discourses of nationality, race, and ethnicity permeate international education to reinforce old ethnic and national [and linguistic] affiliations”, and further, that “practices of international education uphold the global spread of hegemonic social practices such as the marketization of education” (Matthews & Sidhu, 2005, p. 50). Zeejay’s recognition and utilisation of such hierarchies in his international education experience, and specifically their relevance to the ability to get out of ESL, served to further cultivate his contempt for ELL Writing assignments not explicitly related to exiting ESL.
The Poetry Project. Following the Christmas break, Zeejay’s negative attitude towards ELL Writing was increasingly manifest in classroom interactions, assigned work, and interview accounts. A crystallization of this negativity is demonstrable with respect to Zeejay’s response to and completion of the Poetry Book (e.g., Gfn24Ja12; Gfn10F12; Gfn29Mr12; Gfn18A12).

Haiku was one of seven required types of poems to be included in students’ completed Poetry Books (also, i.e., Acrostic, Concrete, Cinquain, Rhyme, Diamante, Free Verse). Given the importance of syllable count to Haiku poems, students’ introduction to Haiku in class included a series of worksheets from teacher-targeted websites (Figure 8.4; see also, e.g., Appendix J).

*Figure 8.4 “Syllable Zoo” (Super Teacher Worksheets, 2015) [Gfn09F12:P17]*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syllable Zoo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divide each word by putting a slash (/) symbol between each syllable. On the space provided, write how many syllables each word has. Use a dictionary if you’re not sure where to divide the syllables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>example: a n / i / mal 3 p e n / g u i n 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. elephant ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. zebra ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. lion ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. skunk ______ 5. walrus ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. pelican ______ 7. wolf ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. monkey ______ 9. chimpanzee ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. snake ______ 11. hippo ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. kangaroo ______ 13. bear ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. alligator ______ 15. ostrich ______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. panda ______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of these worksheets, the last students had to complete prior to composing their own Haiku poems, was called “Syllable Zoo” (see Figure 8.4). Mr. Whee introduced the “Syllable Zoo” worksheet in class as follows:

**Extract 8.6 “a fun little sheet” (ZJtMrW:09F12 [29:23-29:47])**

01 Mr. W: ((spoken while he is handing out the worksheets)) so (. ) syllables (. ) are really important in:
02 poetry and they’re really important in haiku poetry (0.5) haiku poetry s↑o↓ first we’re >going
03 to make sure we’ve got< syllables (0.5) so I’ve got a fun little sheet (. ) I picked the syllable
04 zoo. (.08) >so we’re going to work on< animal names >cause I love animals< (2.0) we’re
05 going to work on animal names

Mr. Whee explains the work students are asked to complete on the sheet by noting the relevance of syllabication to poetry in general, but importantly here, “in haiku poetry” (lines 01-02). He frames the exercise as one meant to “make sure” (line 03) students in the ELL Writing class are familiar with how to divide individual words into syllables. While this type of explanation and exercise was a useful (and potentially necessary) scaffold for some of the students in the class, for more proficient students (like Zeejay) it was often treated as irrelevant. However, as Mr. Whee indicated, and as noted in Chapter 3, the range of English proficiency represented in the ELL Writing class was vast. From an instructional perspective then, and quite understandably, facilitating any whole class assignment inevitably meant the inclusion of scaffolds that may have been understood as irrelevant to students whose English was more advanced, or as in other cases not reported here, as too difficult for students who were less proficient in English.

Extract 8.7 displays data from the same class in which ‘Syllable Zoo’ was distributed to students. The recording was obtained from a lavaliere microphone worn by Zeejay during that particular class, and occurred approximately 11 minutes following Mr. Whee’s distribution of the ‘Syllable Zoo’ worksheet (ZJtMrW:09F12). The interaction between Who and Zeejay, which includes the use of both Mandarin and English, is exemplary of the way in which assigned work

---

68 The “Grade Level Estimation” of the worksheet is described on the website from which it was downloaded as being for “1st through 3rd” with the proviso that “Grade level may vary depending on location and school curriculum. The above estimate is for schools in the USA” (Super Teacher Worksheets, 2015). Also of potential relevance with respect to the ‘Syllable Zoo’ worksheet was that it was the only “Free” worksheet available on this particular website (i.e., other worksheets were behind a paywall and were available to members only).
was a regular topic of discussion in the ELL Writing classroom’s underlife (i.e., in “sidebar conversations among students, conducted independently of curricular conversations” [Juzwik & Ives, 2010, p. 40]; see also, e.g., Brooke, 1987; Canagarajah, 2004; Ellwood, 2008; Goffman, 1961; Gutierrez, Rymes, & Larson, 1995). In the episode of classroom underlife depicted in Extract 8.7, what Mr. Whee described to the students as “a fun little sheet” (Extract 8.6, line 03; see Figure 8.4) is treated by Who and Zeejay as ineffectual to their progress, and thus by proxy, to the process of getting out of ESL.

In this interaction both Zeejay and Who, after specific reference to the ‘Syllable Zoo’ worksheet (e.g., “tasks to do from the Internet”, line 02), construct the task using the descriptors “shit” (line

---

Extract 8.7 “oh my god fuck all” (ZJtMrW:09F12[40:40-41:45])

1. (sound of paper rustling)
2. Who: 当时有问题就经常网上就给我们布置一些任务
dangshi you wenti jiu jingchang wangshang gei women buzhi vixie renwu
   at the moment when we had questions (Mr. Whee) would usually just assign us some tasks to do from the Internet
3. ZJ: what shit this=
4. Who: =估计很简单的 easy 任务然后
   =guji hen jiandan de easy renwu ranhou
   =it’s roughly very easy [task]
5. ZJ: [it’s stupid=]
6. Who: =给我们留下很多时间让我们自己该干啥干啥
   =gei women liuxia henduo shijian rang women ziji gai gansha gansha
   =leaves us too much time to do what we are supposed [to do]
7. ZJ: [yeah]
8. Who: 基本上这是最有效方法。我们可以跟她学我赛
   jibenshang zheshi zuiyouxiao de fangfa women keyi gen ta sywewosai
   basically this is the most effective way. we can learn from Mr. Whee oh my god fuck [all]
9. ZJ: [it- it]
10. just waste my time Ryan
11. Who: don’t forget you got a (.) (s-)
12. ZJ: recorder
13. Who: re- re- ((laughs)) recorder
14. ZJ: I know
15. Who: so
16. ZJ: I just want to let him know I’m- I’m- stu- I’m s:tupid in this class

In this interaction both Zeejay and Who, after specific reference to the ‘Syllable Zoo’ worksheet (e.g., “tasks to do from the Internet”, line 02), construct the task using the descriptors “shit” (line

---

69 Though not addressed in this analysis, Who’s use of the phrase “fuck all” (line 08) evidences a multi-party, classroom “underlife” discussion (see e.g., Canagarajah, 2004; Ellwood, 2008; Goffman, 1961; Gutierrez, Rymes, & Larson, 1995) of the same phrase in an earlier segment of talk that occurred at the beginning of class (ZJtMrW09F12 [05:40-08:56]). The full transcript of this earlier interaction is presented in Appendix K.
03), “very easy” (line 04), and “stupid” (line 05). In so doing they work to construct the Syllable Zoo as busy work they are given too much time to complete (“leaves us too much time to do what we are supposed to do”, line 06). Who goes as far as to say the Syllable Zoo worksheet is an “effective way” to learn “fuck all”70 (line 08), to which Zeejay adds that it is a waste of time (line 09-10). Zeejay’s orientation to me as a ratified overhearer (Goffman, 1981), indexed here through the explicit mention of my name (line 10) and arguably also through his choice of code (see footnote 70), suggest the boys’ negative evaluation of the Haiku task is (also) at least partially performative (i.e., they are doing not needing ESL). Though in the context of this interaction the complaint made by the boys pertains to a specific worksheet they have been asked to complete in class, their co-construction of it here as a waste of time (line 09-10) both echoes and reinforced the disdain for classroom work that had begun for Zeejay in November. This same attitude toward the Syllable Zoo, and the relevance of Haiku to getting out of ESL more generally, would play an important impact on Zeejay’s approach to completing the Poetry Project.

In fact, on the same day Mr. Whee had introduced students to Haiku poems (Gfn09F12), Zeejay and I had our second interview. In it he reiterated his frustration with the Haiku tasks, as well as with the overall Poetry Book project – reporting that this type of work was “not enough to handle the ESL test it’s so easy” and because although “he told us the poem- (RD: haiku yeah) poem right but in the ESL test I’m sure that they will not (RD: right) test our poem

70 Also notable in Extract 8.7 are participants’ explicit orientations to both the recording device (lines 11-15) and the researcher (“it just waste my time Ryan”, line 09-10; “I just want to let him know”, line 16). An addition potential point of interest is Zeejay’s use of English throughout the interaction, but particularly his use of English in lines 03, 05, and 07 – since although Who is speaking to him in Mandarin Zeejay’s responses are in English. His choice to use English here is somewhat ambiguous, (cf. Extract 8.3), in the sense that he was indeed wearing the lavaliere microphone for the purpose of research. In this respect, it is important to acknowledge the potentially performative nature of the kind of talk in the classroom. At the same time, it also raises questions about the epistemological status of classroom talk as a form of data – an issue that a colleague and I have addressed elsewhere but is worthy of far greater discussion in studies of classroom interaction (e.g., Deschambault & W. Kim, in preparation; Deschambault & W. Kim, 2013; W. Kim & Deschambault, 2014; Talmi, 2005).
knowledge” (I2:486-494). For this reason, Zeejay invested very little time or effort in his Poetry Booklet, and responded to my question about his completed assignment with “uh: I finish it(.) but not ((smiling)) accurately (R: what do you mean accurately) mean just copy down the words and that’s it (R: and that’s it) I didn’t draw any pictures any f- any colourful things” (I3:366-370).

Figure 8.5 shows a selection of pages from Zeejay’s completed Poetry Booklet (cf. WoW’s completed Poetry Booklet, Chapter 9, Figure 9.1). It displays the haphazardly completed assignment Zeejay described, and is an example of how his contempt for, and economization of, tasks unrelated to the ESL test was manifest in class work (also see, e.g. subsection 8.25 below).

Figure 8.5 “Poetry Booklet” (ZJ: P25)
When I asked if he thought all contents of the ELL Writing class should be related to the ESL exit test, Zeejay quickly replied “not all…but most…sixty percent the majority” (I2:496-502). In fact, on many occasions, assigned work like “Syllable Zoo” was a topic of ridicule in student-student talk constituting the ELL Writing classroom’s underlife (Canagarajah, 2004; Ellwood, 2008; Goffman, 1961; Gutierrez, Rymes, & Larson, 1995). However, as the unconcerned production of his Poetry Book and sub-par work during the letter writing unit (e.g., Gfn30Ma12:39) strongly suggest, Zeejay’s noticing of the relationship between the lack of credits he received for ELL classes and the inapplicability of work assigned in those classes to the ESL Exit test greatly impacted his socialization into (and out of) ESL.
8.2.4 Year-end ESL Exit Tests

ESL Department Test. In fact, the Poetry Book assignment was due for submission on the day following the ESL department’s final ELL Exit test of the school year (Gfn26A12:4-6; Tfn25A12); though Zeejay never mentioned any explicit relationship between these two events, the coincidence of these two dates might offer useful context for interpreting Zeejay’s seeming indifference toward the completed Poetry Book he submitted; that is, he studied for the test rather than worked on his Poetry Book. Zeejay easily passed the ESL Department test, which consisted of 75 multiple choice questions from the CELT-B (Structure and Vocabulary subtests; Canadian Test Centre, n.d.), as well as a choice between two different writing prompts: (a) “If I could change one thing about the world it would be…”, and (b) “Important lessons I’ve learned from my mom/dad/teacher/grandparent (or any other important person in your life)” (Tfn25A12:7-8, 19-31). Passing the ESL Department’s test meant that Zeejay earned the right to take the English Department’s final ELL Exit test of the year.

English Department Test. The English Department’s year-end ELL Exit test (Appendix A), a more publicized version of the previous iteration of the “test in the library” (MoonI2:511) that had occurred in January, consisted of two short stories, each roughly four pages in length (Bagnell, 2000; Yoon, 2000). Students were instructed as follows: “Using two specific examples from each story, show how a person can be torn between two different places.” Please answer this in essay form. It should be roughly two to three pages long, double spaced. You may not use dictionaries.”

The English Department’s ESL exit test, the QHS principal reported, had emerged as the result of a disagreement between teachers over “a couple of students who [had] met the standard

---

71 During the actual sitting of the test, for which I was present, a large number of students raised their hand to ask about the phrase “can be torn between”. This was partly because instructions noted “You may not use dictionaries”, and partly because for some the metaphorical nature of the verb “torn” was not immediately comprehensible (Tfn23Ma12).
to move out of ESL but then when they got into the [regular English] class were not achieving” (QHSPr2:472-478). For their part, FIS (and ELL) students in the school viewed this test simply as another hurdle in their quest to obtain credits toward the their BC high school credential; in addition to not knowing they would have to take it (Cfn17Ma12:12; see also Chapter 9, subsection 9.2.5), they were largely unaware of why this ‘new’ test had been implemented, and received little to no scaffolding to prepare them for the reading or writing demands that were different from those necessary for the ESL Department’s test. Nonetheless, on the day following the test, Zeejay was confident; although he reported that he had had to “reserve more time on writing”, and that his “writing cannot grab the point properly”, he asserted that “the sentence I wrote is good” and as a result that “I think I can move out of ESL” (I3:06-25).

8.2.5 “Just integratiate”

Zeejay’s disparagement of the ELL Writing class was something he himself acknowledged and accounted for during the course of the school year by insisting that his self-study and shadow education pursuits were more consequential for his academic development than were his experiences in ELL classes at QHS (e.g., I2:428-434, 665-672; I3:296-303; I4:218-236, 484-538, 611-627; ER28Mr12:56-61, 63; see also Footnote 61).

In addition to the academic impacts of the testing materials on students (see previous Footnote), on the test day there were practical issues that may also have impacted students’ performance. Here is a short list of some of these issues:

There was a discrepancy between the number of students the English Department had expected to sit the test and the number of students who had been told they could sit the test, resulting in too few desks and chairs for students. The result was that, because more desks and chairs needed to be located and physically moved into the testing space and more copies of the actual test materials needed to be made, that the amount of time allotted for the test was decreased by approximately 15 minutes. This was a result of the fact that the window of time during which the test could be written was non-negotiable; the test had been scheduled prior to regular classes for the day (i.e., the space in which the test was being written was needed for a regularly scheduled class; students sitting the test were required to be present in their regularly scheduled classrooms).

In addition, because the test was scheduled during a curriculum planning meeting, which key members of the English (and ESL) department were required to attend, the test was overseen by a teachers-on-call (substitute teachers), two of whom had not worked at QHS in the past and had little familiarity with students, with ELL issues, the test, or the context. Finally, because those overseeing the test had little preparation on how to respond to student questions, there were clear discrepancies in the amount of information requested and received by individual students about test instructions and the texts they were reading (Tfn23Ma12).

Zeejay very much framed his participation in the research study as yet another opportunity for learning English. In response to my thanking him for completing the written email reports during field work, he responded as follows: “I
In our third interview of the year, after months of economizing his use class time to complete extracurricular studying materials such as TOEFL preparation, study for Academic Placement tests, and work for ‘more important’ classes at QHS (i.e., Math 10 ESL Socials) (e.g., Gfn18Jan12:34-36; Gfn01Feb12:57-60; Gfn09Feb12:40-43; Gfn29Mr12:39; Gfn12A12:41-45; Gfn24Ma12:46-49; Gfn08Ju12:27), I asked Zeejay about this behaviour directly. This was because the concomitant result of this economizing was just-before-class completion of assigned work (i.e., the Poetry Book), or in a number of other cases, an outright refusal to complete homework.

 extract 8.9 “Missus Jay is the boss” (I3:100-107)
01 RD: so but now it seems there’s kind of a change like you
02 ZJ: yeah there’s, it’s useless just because
03 RD: well can y- talk to me about that? why- why is it useless I mean
04 ZJ: no matter how hard you work, as long as you- you cannot uh get a good mark on the test you can’t
05 move out of ESL
06 RD: right
07 ZJ: it’s the truth. and the point is that uh the the Whee? Yeah Mister Whee’s does- j- he doesn’t take
08 charge of our ESLs it’s Missus Jay. Missus Jay is the boss
09 RD: right
10 ZJ: yeah so I- I’m I’m motivated in her class, but I don’t in the Mister Whee’s class

Zeejay presents different forms of evidence to substantiate his construction of the ELL writing class as “useless” (line 02) in this interaction. Not only does he foreground the summative, institutional value of the ESL exit test(s) over whatever “hard work” a student might do to warrant his claim about the uselessness of his ELL Writing class (line 04-05), he augments this warrant with the rejoinder “it’s the truth” (line 07). As an additional measure, in lines 07-08 Zeejay invokes Mr. Whee’s relative status in QHS (i.e., “he doesn’t take charge of our ESLs”) as a means for suggesting that decisions about exiting ESL are made by “the boss”, in this case a term which indexes Ms. Jay’s status as the Head of the ESL Department. ⁷⁴ Thus, the relative

---

⁷⁴ I understand Zeejay’s phrase “he doesn’t take charge of our ESLs” to mean that Mr. Whee is not the Head of the ESL Department; a warrant for this interpretation of Zeejay’s usage here can be found in the contrast with Ms. Jay that is accomplished through Zeejay’s use of the term “the boss” (cf. WoW13:73; also see, e.g., Chapter 9, subsection 9.2.4, Footnote 85).
“uselessness” of ELL Writing is also related to who teaches the course: Ms. Jay’s status as ESL Department head is thus worked up by Zeejay as a *de facto* reason to be “motivated in her class” (line 10). Ultimately, what Zeejay works up is an ‘economized’ description of his ELL Writing class – as having negligible institutional purchase; that is, in addition to being unrelated to the ELL exit test in terms of content, it is further doomed by the fact that Mr. Whee is not “the boss”.

Zeejay’s framing of Ms. Jay’s class as inherently more important than Mr. Whee’s, despite the fact that they were both not-for-credit ELL courses, is yet another means for understanding his socialization at QHS: that “no matter how hard you work as long as you cannot uh get a good mark on the test you can’t move out of ESL” (Extract 8.9, lines 04-05).

Later in that interview, when I asked him directly “how do you get put into ESL and then how do you get out” (I3:484), Zeejay’s response foregrounded Ms. Jay’s status as ESL Head, and his relationship with administrators as hugely significant: “it’s totally because it’s (.) it’s in terms of the (.) Missus Jay the principal the vice principal (RD: yeah) just those three people” (I3:485-487). Similarly, when describing the advice he would give to a future FIS student about how to get out of ESL at QHS, he coined an accidental-yet-impeccably-precise “malamanteau”75 (Xkcd, n.d.) which combined the words ‘integrate’ and ‘ingratiate’:

*Extract 8.10 “just integratiate”* (I3:100-107)

01 RD: they say hey you know older brother how do I get out of ESL quickly. what are you going to say, how  
02 would you answer that question?  
03 ZJ: just integratiate  
04 RD: yeah yeah integrate yeah  
05 ZJ: integratiate with the Missus Jay  
06 RD: ((laughs)) really hey so it’s not related to like improvement or  
07 ZJ: yeah sure you have to goo- good at English this is basic, your foun- foundation  
08 RD: right  
09 ZJ: yeah  
10 RD: but after that  
11 ZJ: but after that ((smiling)) do some jobs to integratiate yourself with the Missus Jay let her like you  
12 RD: what are some, what are some examples like how-  
13 ZJ: I don’t know like just talk to her (.) often  
14 RD: yeah  
15 ZJ: and trying to represent that you- you’re working hard  
16 RD: represent that you’re working hard

75 A term coined to describe what happens when a feasible portmanteau word occurs as, or embeds, a malapropism.  
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In addition the Zeejay’s use of “integratie” in multiple places in this extract (lines 03, 05, 11) as a means to describe how to get out of ESL, Zeejay’s account also provides further parameters to define what ‘integratiating’ actually entails. It is something a student should do in addition to the “basic…foundation” of being “good at English” (line 07); it includes finding a way to “let [Ms. Jay] like you” (line 11), by “talk[ing] to her (. ) often” (line 13) and “trying to represent that you- you’re working hard” (line 15). Through his narrative, Zeejay moves the focus of one’s efforts toward another locally recognized practice into which he had been socialized – a form of student (and sometimes parental) advocacy – known as “the lobby” (e.g., MrsB1:180-184, 349-359; MrsB2: 566-570, 608) or a “charm offensive” (MrsB2:586, 907; see also, e.g., Chapter 7, subsection 7.3.4). Specifically here, Zeejay uses the term “integratie” in a way that connotes the practice of ‘lobbying’ as a necessary addendum to the basic foundation of being good at English if one is to successfully exit ESL.

As his ‘integratiating’ talk suggests, central to Zeejay’s socialization into ESL at QHS was a learned orientation to knowledge about administrative positions and institutional processes as a socioculturally mediated means for promotion out of ESL. For Zeejay, this orientation was in the service of a larger, more immediate and economically consequential goal: to get the BC high school credential he was pursuing (and that his parents’ hard-earned monies were supporting). But in addition to the central role of the ESL exit test, ELL writing, and his understanding of the need to ‘integratiate’ in cultivating this orientation, it was also learned through his experience with administrative inconsistencies and with distributed learning.

**Administrative inconsistencies and distributed learning.** As part of BC’s provincial curriculum, all grade ten students are required to take a four-credit course called Planning 10 (BCMoE, 2015b, pp. 4-5). When Zeejay learned that some FIS students, who were in their first year (i.e., Ellen) and second year (i.e., WoW) of studies in QHS’s ESL program, were somehow
able to take this ‘regular’ (for-credit) class and that he was not, he reported being very frustrated by the situation (I2:587-623). To mollify his frustration, and in an attempt to make up for the time and credits lost in not being able to take Planning 10, Zeejay researched the possibility of taking a ‘shadow education’ version of the Planning 10 course – via the Pateo District’s distributed learning (i.e., online) network. As part of this research, he reported that he had received conflicting accounts. Though he had been told by the Pateo District’s distributed learning clerk that he could enroll in the online version of the Planning 10 course, even while the school year was ongoing (I2:594), when he consulted Miss Dorsal he was told that “because I’m still in the ESL I cannot take the online course”; he described the conflicting accounts as “ridiculous” (I2:596).

During our research interview, the QHS Principal reported that although in the past “if a student wanted to do a summer school course they wanted to do an online course they wanted to do anything outside of the ordinary then they had to have permission from the principal”, things had changed: it was the case that “grade ten eleven and twelve student[s] can – they can sign up for an online course anywhere without asking me” (QHSPr2:394-396). When I inquired as to whether QHS or the Pateo District had any kind of policy in place that would prevent FIS students from registering in an online course (QHSPr2:405-407), the principal reported that “we try to do it through through counselling”; the principal then qualified this response by noting that although their signature was required, “it’s not a permission it’s a notification or an exchange of information …so when we become aware a student either wants to or has signed up for an online course then we we try to do some counselling about that” (QHSPr2:407-414).

Before the end of the school year, Zeejay had already enrolled in and begun two online

---

76 Because the District recognizes the credits earned through these courses for credit towards a BC high school credential, as does the BC Ministry of Education, these courses constitute a kind of ‘state-sanctioned shadow education’ from which school districts can profit. See also Footnote 61.
courses (“I’m taking the Math 11 and Socials 10 online now”, I4:218; also e.g., Gfn08Ju12:15, 25-27). When I asked if he had spoken to the counselor Miss Dorsal about it, Zeejay responded that he had not, and that “they cannot stop it they have not the right stop it stop me and they-they even they don’t have to give me any permission or approval” (I4:226-228). In the same interview, Zeejay reported his frustrations with various aspects of his distributed learning experience in the Pateo District. After framing his experience with the online courses he was taking as “just crap” (I4:271), he began by narrating issues that had arisen as part of his registration experience:

Extract 8.11 “exercise your patience” (I4:522-539)

01 ZJ: you know the first time I came there I hand in the fee and I- I finish all my application form I hand
02 them and they said oh Zeejay good job uh I- I will send the online stuff to your account and then you
03 can learn it tonight, uh maybe half hours later yeah. but after two or three days I don’t get anything
04 RD: really
05 ZJ: so I go to ask them (uh) what’s wrong with my account? is there something wrong with it and they
06 said oh there’s nothing wrong you just need to wait. but I- I told them
07 RD: you said hey wait a minute, yeah
08 ZJ: yeah I’ve wait so many times, but he- but they said oh I’m- I’m exercise, exercise your patience (.) o:h
09 what the bullshit is that

Notable in this extract are Zeejay’s orientation to tuition, educational expectations, and a conflict with respect to these expectations. He reports having physically visited the Pateo District’s distributed learning offices to “hand in the fee” and his “application form” (line 01), and being told that he would have access to the material for learning almost immediately following his registration (“you can learn it tonight maybe half hours later”, lines 02-03). But despite having paid the fee, and what he had been told, Zeejay highlights the fact that days later he had received neither confirmation of enrolment nor access to course materials (“after two or three days I don’t get anything”, line 03). In his reported effort to hold the District accountable, he returned to the office (“I go to ask them what’s wrong with my account”, line 05) and voice his frustration (“but I told them…I’ve wait so many times”, lines 06, 08). The responses he received from District clerks, which suggested both that his educational expectations were unreasonable (“there’s
nothing wrong you just need to wait”, line 06) and that he was impatient (“you need to exercise your patience”, line 08), frustrated him further (“o:h what the bullshit is that”, lines 08-09).

This account is illustrative of the personal, extracurricular, and additional economic lengths to which Zeejay went to accumulate actual credits towards his BC high school credential as a first year FIS in the Pateo District. Hearable in his account is his desire to have the payment of fees be converted into something tangible as quickly as possible, as well as the frustration that despite managing the small victory of having registered for the course he is again faced with administrative inconsistencies beyond his control.77 The different, and arguably economizing, orientations to what the distributed learning service entailed, and how that should be delivered, are central to Zeejay’s account; these are a further illustration of how, in the context of international education, varying attributions of value to linguistic, cultural, and other forms of capital constitute the educational marketplace as fundamentally polycentric (e.g., Blommaert, 2010).

It was experiences like those with distributed learning, and those indexed in the notion of ‘integratiation’, that resulted in Zeejay’s perception of the academic and administrative structure of the public education system he was paying to participate in as a systematically economizing, though seemingly tenuous, enterprise. As a result of this seeming tenuonsness, occurring as it did in conjunction with the absence of an educational experience that was measureable in terms of progress toward his BC high school credential, or even preferred academic forms of socialization, Zeejay reported feeling as though he “was cheated” (I3:539; see also Chapter 6, Subsection 6.4.3, Extract 6.3).

77 Zeejay went on in his account to give a scathing assessment of the quality of online course materials he had received for one of the particular courses he had registered in. Some examples are listed below.

- “the material they send to me is so messy like the notes they send to us just some copy from the book just take some pictures from the book” (I4:301)
- “the just proof me some notes uh copied down from the textbook (RD: right) but I don’t know which textbook” (I4:315)
- “he give me some link uh to search some information on the internet and so weird right…so I click some of them it doesn’t work…I have to search it by myself” (I4:319, 321, 323)
8.3 Conclusion: Getting out of ESL as Socialization into ESL

Zeejay’s socialization into ESL was marked by porous interfaces related to the educational, linguistic, social, and institutional discursive and material realities that constituted his year at QHS. These interfaces, which coalesced most influentially in the process of getting out of ESL, thus significantly impacted Zeejay’s socialization trajectory at QHS during the 2011-2012 school year. Like Ellen (Chapter 7), the gravity of unsuccessful promotion out of ESL was made increasingly relevant as the school year progressed. Not only did Zeejay learn, through language(s), to economize his in- and out-of-class study efforts towards tests which would allow how to exit ESL, central to his efforts and rationales for them were ideologies of language learning and use, social class and education, and mobility. Not only did he treat his experience as a series of interactions with different markets, Zeejay learned to barter and trade within them, as a means for maximizing the return on his parents’ investment. He wanted to get what he felt he (and his parents) had paid for: credits toward a BC high school credential.

In this chapter, I have presented a multilayered account of Zeejay’s trajectory of socialization as he negotiated the process of getting out of ESL. The content, breadth, and depth of this account offers an important contrast to those presented in Chapter 7, and further illustrates the extent to which the process of getting out of ESL is a constitutive feature of the category of FIS. Thus, as an account of an individual student’s experience, as well as further constitutive portion of a more general representation of the category of FIS, this chapter has offered a further partial response to my third research question: How is the category of fee-paying international student (FIS) constructed in persons?

In Chapter 9, I present a sketch of WoW’s socialization into ESL across two years, two classes, and the testing regime at QHS. As a means for adding to the multiple case study approach adopted in the study, it offers an account of WoW’s situated, and altogether different trajectory as he negotiated the process of getting out of ESL.
CHAPTER 9: CONSTRUCTING FIS IN PERSONS (WOW)

9.1 Introduction

In Chapter 9, I present a final partial response to the third research question for the study: *How is the category of fee-paying international student (FIS) constructed in persons?* The partial response to this question Chapter 6 served to contextualize of the out-of-school residency, funding, and language experiences that situate focal FIS’ in-school experiences as students at QHS. Chapters 7-9 responded to the question by focusing on focal students’ in-school experiences, and in particular, on their experiences with a process central to each of their trajectories of socialization over the course of the 2011-2012 school year: “getting out of ESL”. In Chapter 7, based mainly on students’ reported experiences in research interviews, I presented an account of Ellen and Moon’s socialization based on this process; in Chapter 8, I drew on a more diverse array of data sources, and a focus on his experiences in one of his classes, to present an account of Zeejay’s socialization in relation to this process. Given that Chapter 8 (subsection 8.1.1) also included a description and rationale for the data sources and analytic orientation utilized both in that chapter and for Chapter 9, in what follows I use a similarly diverse range of data to sketch WoW’s socialization in relation to the process of getting out of ESL across two years, two classes, and the testing regime at QHS.

9.2 Getting out of ESL: WoW

9.2.1 “I’m studying really hard now” and Timetable

Following English language assessments administered by the Pateo School District upon his arrival in February 2010, WoW spent three months doing ESL worksheets in a makeshift classroom at the Pateo School District offices prior to being placed in a ‘real’ school; when he was finally placed, it was for two months only and he again changed schools the following school year (I1:337-357). Though he spent the 2010-2011 school year at QHS with a full ELL course load (i.e., 50% ELL courses), WoW also reported knowing that he would be in ESL
classes prior to his arrival; but he also reported in an email “expecting ESL is the class that we can learn a lot of English but I disappointed in the way that they teaching students because some of ESL class teacher always treat the students as children” (ER04Ja12:41-42).

Because WoW had spent the 2010-2011 school year at QHS as a non-fee paying ESL student, he was unique among the focal participants in the study (see Chapter 6, section 6.5). The 2011-2012 school year his second year at QHS, and, though he retained his full ELL course load, was now enrolled in those courses as a fee-paying international student. In our first interview in October, after learning that this was his second year in ESL, I asked WoW how he felt about his own English ability (I1:492).

Extract 9.1 “I’m studying really hard now” (I1:492-515)

01 RD: how do you, at this point how do you feel about your English ability?
02 WoW: hmm (. ) I think it’s bad.
03 RD: really
04 WoW: yeah because you know like, I don’t know not much of words and you know I’m really not good
05 at writing
06 RD: yeah
07 WoW: just normal I guess. but I’m still in ESL
08 RD: yeah
09 WoW: because I didn’t do my homework last year
10 RD: (laughing) h- wh:y
11 WoW: because I was enough to go out, because I got level four and high score in the class
12 RD: yeah
13 WoW: and even I was I was way more good at English
14 RD: yeah
15 WoW: better than my brother
16 RD: yeah
17 WoW: but my Missus Jay said hhh. you didn’t show me, you didn’t prove how you work hard or like I think you are kind of lazy so hhh. you have to, I think you have to stay a little bit more
18 RD: oh really
19 RD: yeah so I’m staying in here this year
20 RD: oh huh
21 WoW: I think I can get out of here
22 RD: this year
23 WoW: yeah this year. I want to.
24 RD: yeah
25 WoW: I’m studying really hard now

WoW’s mitigated (i.e., “hmm (. ) I think”, line 02) initial characterization of his English ability as “bad” (line 02) is modified by descriptors that present this ability in relation to vocabulary knowledge (“I don’t know not much of words”, line 04) and (academic) writing (“I’m really not
good at writing”, lines 04-05), and concludes with an upgraded assessment of his overall ability (“just normal I guess”, line 07). He follows this response by noting that despite having ‘just normal’ English ability, after a full year in the ESL program at QHS (I1:337-357) he is “still in ESL” (line 07).

Then, between lines 09-26, WoW treats his ESL status as accountable; he does so by offering a multi-turn explanation for why he is ‘still in ESL’. This account begins with WoW’s quip that it was “because I didn’t do my homework last year” (line 09), which I treat as an attempt at being humorous (line 10). WoW responds to my laughter by suggesting that he “was enough to go out” of ESL last year (line 11), and then provides a rationale for this. Not only did he score highly on the ESL exit test in the previous year (“I got level four”, line 11), he reports having had the “high score in the class” (line 11) on the exam. WoW then claims that he “was way more good at English…better than my brother” (lines 13-15) – who I later learned had been promoted out of ESL after just one year of study at QHS (I1: 519-551; 967-980; also I2:130-150). He then contrasts his description of things he did well in the ESL class with a summative statement, uttered as the reported speech of Ms. Jay, the ESL Department Head: “Missus Jay said you didn’t show me you didn’t prove how you work hard or like I think you are kind of lazy so you have to I think you have to stay a little bit more” (lines 17-18).

Importantly, WoW’s explanation for why he was ‘still in ESL’ implied that beyond positive results on the ESL test, or good grades in class, centrally implicated in his future promotion out of ESL was his ability to “prove” (line 17) to his teachers, and specifically to Ms. Jay, that he was a diligent and attentive student. In fact, Ms. Jay corroborated WoW’s version of events in an interview, reporting that she had “taught WoW for two years (RD: yeah) he’s made a lot of progress an- his brother actually moved out after the end of first year (RD: yeah) and WoW could have except for he had very poor work habits” (MsJ:426-430).
But importantly, and perhaps especially given this description of his early socialization into (and how to get out of) ELL classes at QHS, WoW ended the account with displayed optimism. Not only did he “think” he could exit the ESL program that year (line 22), he concluded the account by suggesting that because he wanted to exit ESL that he was “studying really hard now” (lines 24, 26). His response had thus articulated, I would come to recognize as the year progressed, an orientation to his ELL courses that remained consistent throughout the year and would be noted by his teachers (Table 9.1).

Table 9.1 WoW’s Timetable at QHS (2011-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Block 1</td>
<td>Block 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2.2 Early-year ESL Exit Tests

September and November tests. Even though WoW’s September course timetable was non-negotiable, like all ELL students (oldtimers or newcomers) identified by QHS or the Pateo School District, WoW was required to sit the September ELL Test (Tfn08D11). He also sat QHS’s November test, and although he reported being “sure I think I did pretty well” on the overall test, he also noted that “the hardest part of the test was essay”; he had written as much as he could (“just one page”) in the allotted time, but the main difficulty was that “the topic was about the movie we watched in writing class. I couldn’t remember the story of the movie but plot” (ER04Ja12:34-40).

School testing records showed that he was just below the cut-off level for promotion out of his ESL (Tfn08D11), although as part of his December email report WoW wrote that he was unable to say whether he was satisfied with his November ELL test grade because “they didn’t give me back the result” (ER04Ja12:40). Given that other focal participants knew by the winter break whether they had passed the test or not (i.e., Ellen [ER02D11:23-24] and Zeejay...
WoW’s not knowing the result may simply have been the result of his own (admitted) reticence with respect to self-advocacy or lobbying where ELL testing and exiting ELL were concerned (e.g., I1:936-943; I2: 62-689; I4:49-65). When I asked if he had ever approached Ms. Jay about these topics, WoW responded with “what do you mean for like let me get out of ESL…mm I think like lots of people do that to them…do that to her…or like Mr. Whee () no she said like ((chuckling)) don’t bother us” (I1:936-943).

The “test in the library”. In our second interview in February, WoW reported that he had heard about “test in the library” (MoonI2:511), but was puzzled because he had not been invited to write the test (I2:172). In response to me asking why he thought he may have been excluded from that group of eligible students, WoW stated that he didn’t know but “I was really thinking a lot about that d- deeply like why- yeah what is wrong with me or (RD: it’s not you) something not enough to me” (I2:174-178). In light of his not having been asked to sit the test in the library, I asked later in the interview what his goals were “for the rest of the year” (I2:368):

Extract 9.2 “I didn’t do well for like two years” (I2:370-380)
01 WoW: that’s pretty obvious
02 RD: yeah yeah right s-
03 WoW: get out of ESL and like graduate in the school
04 RD: do you have, do you have pressure from your parents to kind of get out
05 WoW: um
06 RD: or get out of ESL?
07 WoW: not really but uh I’m thinking deeply about myself like
08 RD: yeah
09 WoW: should I like go back to Korea sometimes because I didn’t do well for like two years
10 RD: yeah
11 WoW: but like sometimes I should study much harder to get out of ESL.

Of particular analytic interest here, embedded both in the “go back to Korea” (line 09) and “study much harder” (line 09) scenarios he narrates, is WoW’s repeated move to self-blame and construct the onus for exiting ESL to be on himself as a student (“I’m thinking deeply about

78 The concept of “lobbying” is a term that was introduced by Mrs. Bee (MrsB1:180-184, 349-359; MrsB2: 566-570, 608), and is also discussed in Chapters 7 (with respect to Moon) and 8 (with respect to Zeejay).
79 Each of the elisions in the quoted narrative have been used to replace my own turns, and specifically the backchannel “yeah”. I have chosen to represent the quote in this way for formatting and stylistic reasons only.
myself”, line 07; “because I didn’t do well for like two years”, lines 09; “I should study much harder”, line 11).

Unbeknownst to him, WoW’s taciturn approach to self-advocacy would be offset by a different sort of advocacy mobilized on his behalf toward the end of the school year (see, e.g., subsection 9.1.5, “Rallying around WoW” below). Importantly, this advocacy on his behalf had largely to do with WoW’s efforts beyond and alongside early- and late-year ESL exit tests, where he worked to demonstrate that he no longer had “very poor work habits” (MsJ:430) and could indeed “study much harder to get out of ESL” (line 11).

9.2.3 ELL Writing: Mr. Whee’s Class

WoW’s efforts at showing he was a devoted and diligent student were noticeable to me throughout the year in his ELL writing class (e.g., Gfn10N11:07; Gfn30N11:17-18; Gfn18Ja12:29-30; Gfn09F12:35-36; Gfn01Mr12:32; Gfn29Mr12:33; Gfn04A12: 30-31; Gfn12A12: 33-34; Gfn16Ma12:26; Gfn30Ma12:34; Gfn08Ju12:25), and were described by Mr. Whee in the following way: “this year it was just like something flipped in that kid (RD: yeah) and he got all his assignments in he worked hard he paid attention in class” (MrW:285-287). WoW made these efforts in spite of the fact that: (1) he had completed many of the same assignments and in-class tasks in the same ELL Writing class with Mr. Whee the previous year (e.g., Gfn16N11:23; Gfn01F12:35, 52; RDbMrW:16N11 [36:00-36:16]; RDbMrW:01F12 [43:57-44:28]; MrW:279; I4:315-344), and (2) that he received neither grades on his transcript nor course credit for the work he did in the class.

Negotiating Princess Mononoke. The Princess Mononoke (PM; Miyazaki & Suzuki, 1997) assignment was an in-class, two-paragraph essay that all students needed to complete and that served as sample of students’ writing that went on file (Gfn04N11:23-35; Gfn10N11:14; see also Chapter 8, section 8.2.3). Graded out of 20 with marks allocated specifically to each of the two required paragraphs, students received their graded assignments just days after they had
learned the results of the November ELL Exit test (see, e.g., Chapter 8, Figure 8.1 for an image of the PM grading rubric).

Mr. Whee had graded WoW’s submitted assignment as a single-paragraphed essay, and, had given a zero for the portion of the grade allocated specifically for the second paragraph. For WoW, this meant receiving a grade that was markedly lower than that of his peers (ZJtMrW30N11:192-212 [17:52-18:12]). After Mr. Whee returned his graded paper in the class (Gfn30N11:41), WoW sought both an explanation for this low grade and in the process, successfully negotiated a higher grade for himself. Extract 9.3 occurred as Mr. Whee was checking students’ homework, and after students’ graded PM assignments had been handed back by three of their student-peers (JR, RAD, and Zard [Gfn30N11:2, 41-42]). WoW had managed to get Mr. Whee’s attention as he was walking away from WoW’s area during the homework checks; Mr. Whee can be heard coming back toward the area where WoW is sitting, and given his first utterance in the interaction below (“oh so it’s two paragraphs”, line 01), is orienting to WoW’s request as one which is seeking an account for his (low) grade. An important contextual note is that there are two conversations that parallel each other in this transcript: the first is between Mr. Whee and WoW, and the second is between myZ (immigrant ELL) and MJ (FIS), both non-focal participants in the study. Mr. Whee and WoW’s conversation, the focus of analysis below, is represented using a darker text colour in Extract 9.3; the conversation between myZ and MJ is still represented, though appears in a lighter text colour.

Extract 9.3 “okay so then we can change it” (ZJtMrW30N11:140-180 [16:53-17:30])

01 MrW: (to WoW) oh so it’s two [paragraphs right?
02 myZ: ((to MJ)) [here
03 WoW: (to MrW) yea[h

---

80 Immediately following Extract 9.3, in which WoW negotiates a higher grade on his Princess Mononoke assignment, WoW asked Zeejay what grade he received (“what did you get?”, line 198). Then, when after some purposeful circumlocution Zeejay tells him (“one four point five”, lines 206, 208), WoW responds with “fuck you” (line 211). The main point of interest here is that WoW was concerned about his lower grade, and made this visible both to Mr. Whee and to Zeejay.

81 The recorded interaction in Extract 9.3 was captured while Zeejay was wearing the lavaliere microphone, and for this reason, the interaction between Mr. Whee and WoW occurs in the ‘background’ of the audio recording.
Mr. Whee’s question at line one, in which ‘two’ is emphasized, refers to the grading rubric for the assignment as a means to provide an account for WoW’s (low) grade (e.g., “oh so it’s [supposed to be] two paragraphs right?”, line 01), which WoW acknowledges at line 03 (“yeah”). Mr. Whee’s turn across lines 04 and 06 which follows is cut short, divided between a response to WoW (“kay but here-”) and an admonishment of Zeejay and others for ‘listening in’ on his interaction with WoW (“hey!...it’s private”, lines 04, 06). This treats their conversation as a private matter between Mr. Whee and WoW, but also suggests that WoW’s classmates have – for whatever reason – taken interest in this particular interaction; this interpretation is supported...
by the fact that from line 07 forward in the extract, there is an audible decrease in volume of Mr. Whee’s and WoW’s recorded voices.82

Mr. Whee restarts the interrupted account again in line 07, explaining to WoW that what he submitted was one, rather than two, paragraphs (“kay but here it’s just one paragraph”). Mr. Whee refers to a point in WoW’s paragraph and suggests that he is “wondering” if it is where a second paragraph might otherwise have started, and begins an explanation about why he is wondering this (“so I’m wondering is this where the new paragraph starts (cause you can be-)”, line 09). The timing of WoW’s overlapping utterance here, interrupts Mr. Whee and affirms that his suggested point in the text is the beginning of a “new paragraph” (line 10). But what remains difficult to gauge from this portion of the interaction is whether the starting point of the new paragraph was something WoW had somehow signalled in his text, or whether that point has been simply nominated by Mr. Whee (line 09) and then oriented to by WoW as a means for capitalizing on this opportunity to negotiate his grade (line 10). That Mr. Whee has explicitly marked this place in WoW’s paragraph as part of his initial evaluation (“oh I wondered about that…so I put a little star”, lines 13, 16), especially given his initial treatment of WoW’s assignment as consisting of just one paragraph (line 07), suggests here that he may have marked it as a means to signal for WoW an otherwise appropriate place in the text to begin a new paragraph; and thus his mention of “the star”, and “wondering”, can be heard as orienting to the other boys who have taken a demonstrable interest in his interaction with Zeejay (cf. lines 04, 06). Regardless of who he is orienting to, however, Mr. Whee here displays that he is open to the prospect of viewing WoW’s essay as having two paragraphs (“I just wasn’t sure”, line 21; “it’s two”, line 25), and further, that he is open to rethinking the grade he has awarded (“okay great you know what then let me (give) (marks) (for) this”, line 18).

82 This decrease suggests that Mr. Whee has turned to position himself with his back to Zeejay and others, has obstructed their view of WoW’s assignment and desk, and thus is speaking away from the lavalier microphone Zeejay is wearing.
I argue that the talk and circumstances around this change evidence an instance of Mr. Whee’s generosity to WoW during the school year, something which WoW’s “thank you” (line 27) can also be heard to recognize and even tacitly acknowledge. WoW’s question about whether he needs to rewrite the essay (line 29) is not responded to directly by Mr. Whee, who instead asks “Did you read my comments” (line 31). After WoW’s yes response (line 34), Mr. Whee repeats the acknowledgement token “okay” as a means for prefacing a fuller re-assertion that he has agreed to change his grade (“so then we can change it”, line 35; e.g., Beach, 1993). Importantly, in addition to co-constructing a reassessment of WoW’s essay and an agreement to increase his grade, the interaction also offers insight into Mr. Whee’s role in the production of WoW as a diligent student who is concerned about the quality of his work. That Mr. Whee has arguably played a prominent role in this localized production early in the school year was, as I show below (see, e.g., subsection 9.1.5, “Rallying around WoW” below), a preface for continued advocacy on WoW’s behalf throughout the year.

**Negotiating a ‘diligent self’ with peers.** In added spite of the fact that his grades in the ELL Writing class neither counted nor were displayed on his report card, WoW’s work to be seen as a student who was concerned with the quality of his work was also evident in interactions with his peers. One of many examples of this, Extract 9.4 comes from an in-class recording from May 2012 (ZJtMrW02Ma12). In it, WoW and Zeejay are discussing a homework assignment they have been asked to complete for their ELL English class.

**Extract 9.4 “I finished it” (ZJtMrW02Ma12 [62:01-62:29])**

01 WoW: do we have to finish our: speech today?
02 JZ: no we don’t have to=
03 WoW: =I- I finished it f[i]n-
04 ZJ: [you finished today?
05 WoW: yeah I thought today[ is due
06 ZJ: [you write it down
07 WoW: ye-I wrote it do[w
08 ZJ: [can you show me
09 WoW: uh: later. like at the- at the: ESL English
10 ZJ: I do nothing
11 WoW: really
In this extract, WoW initiates the exchange with Zeejay by topicalizing a task they have been assigned in common for their ELL English class. That WoW does this is of note because he introduces the topic in the form of a yes/no question to Zeejay (“Do we have to finish our speech today”, line 01) for which he already has a kind of comment (“I- I finished it fin-“, line 03). In this context, given the speed (i.e., through the latched turns at lines 02-03), and especially given Zeejay’s unambiguous response (“no we don’t have to”, line 02), I argue that WoW’s line 01 utterance is hearable as a reversed polarity (Koshik, 2002), known-answer question (Mehan, 1979a, 1979b).

In other words, Zeejay’s “no” response at line 02 is given without mitigation, pausing, repair, or circumlocution, which displays his orientation to the assertion conveyed in WoW’s question and that “no” is the preferred answer here. In fact, WoW has used this known-answer question (Mehan, 1979a, 1979b) as a resource to display his early completion of homework to Zeejay, and as a means to position himself as a diligent and concerned student.

In response to WoW’s line 04 claim to being done, Zeejay’s inquiry (“you finished today?”, line 04) projects a slot for WoW to accomplish the dual action of accounting for why he’s already finished (“yeah I though today is due”, line 05) and through that account creating a context for the relevance of his initial question. Following Zeejay’s request to see WoW’s written work (line 08), the elongations and prosodic features of WoW’s refusal (“uh: later. like at the- at the: ESL English”, lines 09) are met with Zeejay’s abrupt claim “I do nothing” (line 10).
WoW’s treatment of Zeejay’s claim to have done nothing is nonchalant (">whatever< it’s okay like-"), and for this reason comes across as a means for reinforcing his position as a diligent and concerned student. Zeejay orients to WoW’s nonchalance by asking if the ESL English class “will we go to the library today” (line 14), and in so doing introduces a potential challenge to WoW’s claim to diligence vis-à-vis the suggestion that they will be given time in class to work on the speech. At line 17, WoW frames the class’ schedule time in the library not as a time to produce the speech itself but rather as a time to refine what he has already drafted (“I have to fix the ending so yeah it’s just a rough copy”, line 17), and thus continues to (reflexively) support his display of early completion and positioning work as a conscientious student.

Beyond the local positioning work in this interaction that was otherwise emblematic and indexical of Mr. Whee’s end-of-the-year evaluation of each of the boys (i.e., “I finish it” [WoW]; “I do nothing” [Zeejay]), or the veracity of WoW’s claim to being done his speech, the timing of this recorded interaction during the school year is also of particular interest. As far as WoW was concerned, he had written the final ESL Exit test of the school year at the end of April (Tfn25A12; i.e., the ESL Department’s Test), and, as he waited for the results, had a vested interest in demonstrating his work ethic, concern for quality, and willingness to ‘study hard’.83

The Poetry Project. This work ethic also extended to the Poetry Project, which WoW had also been required to hand in at the end of April (Gfn26A12:4). As discussed in Chapter 8 with respect to Zeejay (Chapter 8, section 8.2.3; see also Figure 8.5), the poetry project was an assignment Mr. Whee asked students to complete over several months following the winter break (e.g., Gfn24Ja12; Gfn10F12; Gfn29Mr12; Gfn26A12). In our final interview of the year,

83 In contrast to WoW, by that (late) point in the school year, Zeejay had decidedly economized his time and efforts away from ungraded in-class work towards preparation for the lexical, grammatical, and written demands of the ELL Exit test, and spent his in-class time working on these types of pursuits that he felt would better position him to pass the test (see Chapter 8, Section 8.2).
WoW described the project as “annoying yeah it was kind of hard”; when I asked him to elaborate, he noted:

it was okay to write the poem but I supposed to draw something else that was kind of hard it took me more than like three hours (RD: really) yeah it’s hard to think about something draw something to draw in the in that (RD: to represent it) behind the poems (I4:354-362)

But it was also through the Poetry Project that WoW’s interest in the arts, and in visual design – both of which he had mentioned at various points throughout the year (e.g., I1:186-195; ZJtMrW30N11:1013-1033; WoWtMrW01Mr12:770-805), were made visible. Similarly, his focus, perfect record of completion for project-related homework, and in-class efforts related specifically to the project are represented across a wide variety of data (e.g., Gfn01F12:55; WoWtMrW01Mr12:1308-1347 [55:21-57:12]; Gfn04A12: 20-21, 30-31; Gfn26A12:4-5; WoW126). Mr. Whee’s appreciation of the seriousness with which WoW completed the project, and the clear effort he had put into it was displayed in his feedback on WoW’s assignment (“WoW, this is EXCELLENT work, I’m so proud of you!!” [WoW126]). Figure 9.1 (next page) displays the pages from WoW’s Poetry Project, and includes the “Poetry Collection” assessment rubric Mr. Whee distributed to students before and after the project.84

---

84 The “Poetry Collection” assessment group does not include a grade for “Pride” on the “Teacher’s” side (right column). This is because Mr. Whee used whatever grade students had given to themselves in its place. Also noticeable here, is Mr. Whee’s correction of his own grading, from 45 to 44.
Figure 9.1 “Poetry Booklet” (WoW: P26)
9.2.4 ELL Socials: Ms. Jay and Mr. Nobli’s Class

**Ms. Jay.** In Ms. Jay’s class, the daily class schedule revolved around a permutable-yet-consistent set of activities that always began with twenty minutes of silent reading (e.g., Cfn03N11:31-32; Cfn07D11: 9, 19, 25; Cfn05Ja12:33 ; Cfn17Ma12:4, 7, 10, 56-57 ; Cfn14Ju12:8-12, 18). On days when vocabulary, spelling, or unit (i.e., short answer) tests were scheduled, this ‘silent reading’ time could be used to study for the test that began the class. Following the silent period at the beginning of every class, and routine checks for completed homework, students were asked either to: copy down projected lists of vocabulary words and definitions, or comprehension questions, which Ms. Jay had selected or developed from the textbook (e.g., Cfn07D11:31; Cfn25Ma12:55); read aloud, either from their texts or as part of a whole-class review of their answers for comprehension questions that had been completed for homework (e.g., Cfn13Ja12:15-20; Cfn31Ma12:24, 26); use their textbooks to find answers for the comprehension questions or complete crossword and other worksheets related to textbook vocabulary and content that Ms. Jay had assigned (e.g., Cfn05Ja12:36; Cfn25Ma12:22, 54-55; see Appendix L).

**Is that the loudest you can speak?** In our interview in February, WoW described Ms. Jay as “tough teacher”, whose “really original style” of teaching could be summarized as “strict and just teaching and no joke” (I2:341-351). For this reason, and perhaps also because WoW demonstrated his awareness of Ms. Jay’s gatekeeping role (i.e., “Ms. Jay is the only one who like care about the ESL things” [I3:73])\(^{85}\), WoW reported that if given his choice of teachers he would choose Ms. Jay because she staunchly policed the use of Mandarin in class, and because she “teaches what’s useful” (I3:772-786). WoW’s reported preference was given in spite of

---

\(^{85}\) Important to note here is the similar positioning of Ms. Jay as the caretaker, and arbiter, of matters relating to ESL issues at QHS by Zeejay (see, e.g., Chapter 8, subsection 8.2.5, Extract. 8.9; also Chapter 8, Footnote 74). Her being positioned this way by ESL and FIS students at QHS is not necessarily surprising, since she was the head of the ESL Department.
numerous instances in which Ms. Jay’s ‘tough’ or ‘strict’ style was audibly manifest in talk to, with, or about WoW during the ELL Socials class (e.g., Cfn25N11:17; mcMsJ07D11:49-61 [30:54-31:09]; Cfn05Jan12:18-20; mcMsJ13Ja12:206 [34:07-34:22]; mcMsJ23Ja12:25 [07:28-08:21]; Cfn31Ma12:30).

Extract 9.5 presents one example of being what WoW would describe as ‘tough’ or ‘strict’, and is drawn from a read-aloud episode during which Ms. Jay selectively called on students to read from the textbook.

Extract 9.5 “is that the loudest you can speak” (mcMsJ05Ja12:90-119 [36:35-38:14])

01 MsJ: how about uh: m WoW  
02 (1.8)  
03 WoW: uh s- (. ) where am I  
04 (1.5)  
05 WoW: uh so[me tribes  
06 MsJ: [well you should be listening first of all WoW  
07 WoW: ((diminutively)) okay (. ) ((reading)) some tribes decided that (fur) should be used to protect their interests (. ) along the entire frontier (Indians). Indians attacked first in ( - - - ) during the summer of seventeen sixty three (. ) at fort Detroit. Indians were led by a strong and forceful leader (. )  
10 Pontiac  
11 MsJ: good. okay >can you read a little louder though<  
12 WoW: oh okay  
13 MsJ: louder  
14 (1.5)  
15 MsJ: [what  
16 WoW: [i-  
17 WoW: ((a bit louder)) oh I will  
18 MsJ: I can’t hear you  
19 WoW: i. will.  
20 MsJ: o- I can’t hear [you  
21 ?MS: [(makes noise)) (tfct)  
22 (1.0)  
23 WoW: ((louder)) i. will.  
24 MsJ: >is that the loudest< you can speak  
25 ?MS: ((makes noise)) (kch.)  
26 WoW: ((louder still, voice shaking)) i. will.  
27 MsJ: louder  
28 ?MS: ((nervous scoff [laugh])  
29 WoW: [I will.  
30 MsJ: okay loud en- that’s good now keep it at that uh-  
31 Ss: (laughter)  
32 WoW: ((response-laugh at laughing Ss)) heh  
33 Ss: [[[laughing]]  
34 MsJ: [((smiling)) that loudness go ahead  
35 (1.8)  
36 MsJ: ((loudly)) HE WAS CHIEF-  
37 (1.0)  
38 MsJ: HE WAS CHIEF of the Pontia – of the Ottawas
WoW: he was chief of the Ottawas who had joined force with the French unsuspecting British troops were easily tricked by (. ) Pontiac’s carefully planned raids (. ) for example the Indians staged a lacrosse game in front of the gates of fort (. ) Michi- li- mack- inac MsJ: lacrosse MsJ: [good Fort Michilimackinac very good stop- we’ll stop there how about (student’s name) MsJ: ((laughing)) MsJ: ((begins reading)) the young officers and men ((stops reading, to WoW)) and that was actually quite well read and loud enough

Ms. Jay nominates WoW as the next student to read from the text (line 01), and in response to the lengthy pauses at (lines 02, 04) which sandwich WoW’s line 03 utterance (“where am I”) and eventual reading aloud (line 05), ends this prefacing interaction (lines 01-06) with the overlapping soft reprimand (“well you should be listening first of all WoW”, line 06). Following his acknowledgement of this reprimand (“okay”, line 07), WoW reads from the text between lines 07 and 10.

At line 11, after acknowledging that WoW has read the text fluently and comprehensibly for classmates (“good”), Ms. Jay’s doing being ‘tough’ or ‘strict’ begins with a seemingly innocuous question (“can you read a little louder though”, line 11). WoW agrees (line 12), only to be told that his speaking volume is not loud enough (line 13). Ms. Jay’s “what” (line 15), despite WoW’s overlapping false start (line 16), suggests that she has heard the pause at line 14 as somehow problematic. Ms. Jay’s line 18 utterance (“I can’t hear you”) confirms that she has, since it treats even WoW’s agreement to reading louder (“oh I will”, line 17) as insufficient.

WoW’s prosodic delivery of “i. will” at line 19 displays a noticeable retort to Ms. Jay’s toughness; Ms. Jay’s response (e.g., her false start [“o-”] and repetition of her previous utterance, line 20), along with ?MS’s noise at line 21 and the ensuing pause (line 22), all frame the interaction as having shifted demonstrably. What happens between lines 23-34 further confirms this: WoW’s louder repetition (“i will”); Ms. Jay’s challenge (“is that the loudest you can speak”); WoW’s further, hearably agitated repetition (“i. will.”, line 26); Ms. Jay’s further goading (“louder”, line 27); WoW’s final “I. will.” (line 29); the reactions of other students
which frame the interaction between them (“kch.”, line 25; laughter at lines 28, 31, and 33) and response to these reactions by WoW (“heh”, line 32). Ms. Jay’s construction of herself as ‘tough’ or ‘strict’ here is hearably acknowledged and co-produced by WoW’s retort and subsequent agitation, as well as by the reactions of other students in the class.

Finally, at line 34, Ms. Jay relents (“that loudness go ahead”). I argue that the pause that follows (line 35) confirms that WoW has indeed heard Ms. Jay’s talk, and his classmates’ responses to the interaction, as discomfiting. This interpretation is supported by the fact that Ms. Jay has to prompt WoW to begin reading two times (lines 36-38), and that WoW’s eventual acquiescence does not occur at a louder volume for the duration of his turn (lines 39-41). Despite his classmates further laughter at WoW’s pronunciation of “Michi- li- mack- inac” (lines 43-44), WoW’s turn at reading ends with Ms. Jay commenting that WoW’s reading has been “very good,” and “that was actually quite well read and loud enough” (lines 45-47).

In this interaction, more important than insights into how Ms. Jay achieved being ‘tough’ or ‘strict’ is the way in which WoW has demonstrated his ability to position himself in relation to such toughness or strictness. Such positioning on WoW’s behalf evidences important socializing work; indeed, notwithstanding – and likely resultant from – instances like the one displayed in Extract 9.5, Ms. Jay noted in our year-end interview that WoW regularly demonstrated his work ethic by completed homework, doing well on tests, taking care with required assignments, and overall showed “huge progressions in his English and his ability” (MsJ:424-440). One such example of WoW’s demonstrating such progressions occurred during the Famous Canadian project.

*Famous Canadian project.* Although the permutable-yet-consistent set of activities between September and December did not once include group-work or group-based problem
solving activities during class time, in January Ms. Jay assigned what was called the “Famous Canadian Biography Project”. This project required that students worked in pairs over two class sessions to select, research, and report on one of 15 ‘Famous Canadians’ that Ms. Jay had pre-identified (Cfn13J12:51-52; Cfn19J12:21-22; Cfn23J12; see Appendix M for assignment instructions). WoW worked with his seat-mate MJ (an L1 Korean speaking FIS) on the project; despite their attempts to select Jim Carrey (a well-known comedian and Hollywood actor) as their ‘Famous Canadian’, the boys ended having to settle for Bryan Adams (a well-known musician and photographer; see Appendix N for the written version of their final assignment).  

Just prior to line 01 below, WoW had begun their oral presentation by asking classmates if they knew about Bryan Adams and playing about 20 seconds of *Straight from the Heart* (Adams & Kagna, 1983; mcMsJ23Ja12:226-244). When the audio clip of the song had finished, he continued as follows:

**Extract 9.6 “it’s pretty famous. okay go ahead” (mcMsJ23Ja12:247-255 [36:38-37:01])**

01 WoW: uh so this is the most famous song of (...) Bryan Adams als- uh [Bryan Adams
02 MsJ: [one of his most famous songs
03 WoW: ((confidently)) it's most famous song
04 MsJ: really I think everything I do I do for you is more fa[mous
05 WoW: [((sharply)) yeah I know but it’s pretty famous
06 MsJ: it's ((smiling)) pretty famous. okay go ahead
07 (0.5)
08 WoW: Bryan Adams is the most famous Canadian singer in the world. he's also a guitarist, bassist,
09 producer, actor, and photographer

Before WoW can even complete his framing of the song he and MJ have played as “the most famous song of (...) Bryan Adams” (line 01), Ms. Jay’s overlap demonstrably casts this

---

86 In fact, the first instance of recorded pair/group work in my field notes is from January 2012 (e.g., Cfn19Ja12), the first of two research days during which students worked in pairs/groups in the QHS library. On the second of these days, I recorded the following as part of my fieldnotes: “Why did I think there would be more group-work in these classes? It’s kind of a finding already in the sense that most of the interaction in the class is highly controlled and is teacher-fronted” (Cfn23Ja12:04).

87 WoW and his partner MJ were awarded a grade of 13/15 on their Famous Canadian Project: “9 out of 10 in reading, and 4 out of 5 in visual aid” (ER27Ja12:21-22; see Appendix N for the boys’ assignment).

88 WoW and MJ ‘had to settle’ for Bryan Adams because Ms. Jay changed her original instructions on how groups would choose the Famous Canadian they were interested in. Though at first Ms. Jay had said students should come to tell her when they had decided which Canadian they chose, and WoW and MJ had gone up to see her about Jim Carrey, she changed her mind after being overwhelmed by students shouting preferences at her. She asked for selections to occur by row, front to back of the classroom. Because WoW and MJ were at the far back left of the class, they were forced to choose last and thus had to ‘settle for’ Bryan Adams (Cfn13Ja12:51).
characterization as problematic (line 02). After WoW has assertively rejected his problematization (line 03), Ms. Jay utters by name a song that she considers to be “more famous” (line 04). This time WoW interjects sharply, and after legitimizing Ms. Jay’ suggestion (“yeah I know”), downgrades his characterization of Straight from the Heart from “the most famous” (line 01) to “pretty famous” (line 05). The action WoW’s line 05 utterance achieves here is pivotal; not only does it effectively neutralize Ms. Jay’s critique, it garners a kind of acknowledgement from Ms. Jay of WoW’s pragmatic handling of the situation. Ms. Jay’s smiling, repetition of WoW’s utterance (“pretty famous”), and agreement to let WoW and MJ’s presentation proceed (“okay go ahead”) in line 06, treat the assertive nature of WoW’s defense of this characterization (lines 03, 05) utterances as admirable. In this sense, Extract 9.6 presents a further instance of Ms. Jay doing ‘tough’ or ‘strict’ but again more importantly, an example of how WoW oriented to and managed that ‘toughness’ in classroom interaction.

Mr. Nobli. From February until mid-May 2012, Mr. Nobli – a teacher in training – carried out his practicum work in Ms. Jay’s classes (e.g., Cfn02Feb12; Cfn07Ma12). For students, this meant that they needed to adjust to a new teacher; not only was the content of Mr. Nobli’s lessons different from the Canadian historical geography they had been learning (i.e., his lessons focused very broadly on world religions and more specifically those intersecting with the history and geography of India), his teaching experience, approach to teaching, presentation of materials, and classroom management differed a great deal from that of Ms. Jay. In February, WoW reported that “he’s just teachin- he’s much more nice [than Ms. Jay] I feel that’s so different (RD: what do you mean by nice) I mean he never yell to the other student like talk- give any a hard time” (I2:355-357); following his practicum, in our third interview in late May, 89 Further differences were that in contrast to Ms. Jay’s use of marker-based handwritten notes projected via an overhead projector (e.g., Cfn03N11:03), Mr. Nobli presented information and material using computer-based presentation software (i.e., Prezi or Powerpoint) and always began with an agenda for the day made visible for students (e.g., Cfn10F12:38; Cfn02Mr12:18-19; Cfn11A12:51; Cfn07Ma12:4-6).
WoW gave a different version, reporting that Mr. Nobli “was too easy I guess” and further that “he never talk about guys speaking in Chinese or like other language he like not cared about it but Ms. Jay always care” (I3:775-777).  

Like Ms. Jay, Mr. Nobli’s class also consisted of a permutable-yet-consistent array of tasks and activities. Unlike Ms. Jay, aside from testing students on vocabulary and spelling, Mr. Nobli began his classes by checking students’ homework, and then proceeding to ask students to: take notes on a teacher-created sheet of paper while listening to a mini-lecture on a specific topic (e.g., Appendix O); participate in an activity, either pre- or post-lecture, related to the content of the mini-lecture (e.g., Appendix P); copy down vocabulary words or comprehension questions to be completed as homework (e.g., Appendix Q).

**Group work.** One key area of difference between Mr. Nobli and Ms. Jay’s teaching, and one which was immensely salient for WoW in the ELL Socials class, related specifically to the use of group-based learning. Group work was difficult for WoW because although he had been able to work with his (L1 Korean speaking) seat-mate MJ for the Famous Canadian Project (Cfn13J12:51-52; Cfn19J12:21-22; Cfn23J12), MJ had returned to Korea at the end of January 2012 and thus was unavailable as a partner for the remainder of the school year (e.g., Cfn10F12:09; I2:871-883). Mr. Nobli staged lessons around group-based tasks and activities frequently during the early parts of his practicum (e.g., Cfn02F12:15-17, 18-19; Cfn10F12:12-17). Though he did not enjoy these types of activities, WoW managed his completion of group-based tasks and assignments by requesting to work alone (e.g., Extract 9.7), assuming a ‘leadership’ role (e.g., Cfn10F12:15-16, 28; Extract 9.8), and in cases when Mr. Nobli allowed

---

90 Perhaps because she was more experienced, Ms. Jay’s demeanor was more watchful, direct, and strict towards students, especially with respect to and focused on (their) English proficiency (Cfn25N11:11; Cfn13J12:10-12). In contrast, perhaps because he was a teacher in training, Mr. Nobli’s early interactions with students were comparatively less direct and more moderate, as though he were focused less explicitly on language and more on engagement with content through language (Cfn02F12:07; Cfn08Mr12:17-18); nonetheless, as he gained experience and feedback from Ms. Jay and his Program Advisor throughout his practicum, Mr. Nobli implemented stricter policies, a more direct delivery and demeanour in class, and used more teacher-teacher-fronted activities (e.g., Cfn23F12:15-17; Cfn02Mr12:10; Cfn11A12:14-16).
for self-selected groups, by approaching non-Mandarin speaking students he knew from other
classes or who shared his L1 (e.g., Cfn19A12:29; I3:62-75). His management of groups thus also
became a site at which WoW displayed he was a conscientious (i.e., “not lazy”) student; that to
get out of ESL he needed to do more than display his English competence through test scores
and high grades in class.

Extract 9.7 is taken from a class in which Mr. Nobli had asked pairs of students to
complete a Venn diagram in which they compared British Columbia and India, with specific
reference to mountains as a geographic similarity. This was part of lesson in which he had
introduced the Himalayas, and presented information on the geographical significance of these
mountains to India (Cfn20F12:60-69). Just prior to line 01, Mr. Nobli has explained what Venn
diagrams are, introduced the task, and has been assisting students in selecting partners to work
with.

**Extract 9.7 “can I do it on my own” (mcMrN02F12:264-290 [22:35-23:11])**

01 ((sound of Mr. N’s footsteps coming toward WoW))
02 MrN: can you go um: work with lk2sk8 is that okay?
03 WoW: what?
04 MrN: we're going to do partner work so can you go sit with lk2sk8?
05 (.)
06 WoW: ok[ay
07 MrN: [or is that lk2sk8 ((to CK)) >oh sorry that's not lk2sk8< ((to lk2sk8)) you're lk2sk8
08 (.)
09 MrN: ((to lk2sk8, turned away)) lk2sk8 okay so you're going to work with a partner okay
10 ((mixture of classroom noises: student voices, moving desks, binder rings opening and closing))
11 (2.2)
12 lk2sk8: no no I will do it-
13 MrN: oh:=
14 Lk2sk8: =with CK=
15 MrN: =okay. you can work with CK
16 (0.5)
17 MrN: ((to like2sk8 and CK)) can you do a ((high pitched)) th[ree person group then?
18 WoW: [i nee- [can-
19 (.)
20 WoW: can i do it on my own?
21 MrN: yeah you can do it o-. are you sure?
22 WoW: yeah
23 MrN: okay if you want to do it on your own
24 WoW: thank you
25 MrN: okay
In his attempt to get students to work together, over multiple turns Mr. Nobli requests that WoW “go um: work with lk2sk8”, by which he means physically move to sit beside lk2sk8 – whose seat-mate was absent that day (lines 02, 04). WoW agrees to this (line 06), and then after some confusion on Mr. Nobli’s part about students’ names (line 07)\(^9\), Mr. Nobli tells lk2sk8 that he is going to work with a partner (line 09). The long pause at line 11 foreshadows the outcome of Mr. Nobli’s efforts to have lk2sk8 and WoW work together; that is, lk2sk8 surprises Mr. Nobli (i.e., “oh:”) by noting that he is working with CK – who was seated directly in front of him and whose seat-mate was also absent that day (lines 12-14). After agreeing that lk2sk8 can work with CK (line 15), Mr. Nobli appeals to lk2sk8 and CK by asking “can you do a three person group then?” (line 17). For his part, WoW’s attempt to interrupt Mr. Nobli’s second appeal (line 18), and his eventual request to work alone (line 20), suggest that he has heard lk2sk8’s mention of working with CK as a refusal to work with him.

WoW’s request to complete his work alone was one form of managing of group work. Another was to take a leadership role despite being uncomfortable with group members. The following week, Mr. Nobli required students to complete a short ‘Graffiti’ task in groups (N=5) he had pre-selected; the task was to summarize, in street art (i.e., ‘graffiti’) form and through the use of keywords and visuals, information about different castes in India (Cfn10F12:43). As was the case on multiple similar occasions, WoW’s strategy to mitigate being the only non-Mandarin speaking student in his group was to be very actively engaged. Though there was very little explicit talk in English between members of WoW’s group, he retrieved and allowed use of his handwritten class-notes as a means for helping to complete the task, and further facilitated the

---

\(^9\) This was Mr. Nobli’s second week at QHS, and assigned very-near the maximum number of course-hours he was permitted to teach. He first thought he had gotten lk2sk8’s name wrong, and thought CK was in fact lk2sk8 (“or is that lk2sk8”), realized he was wrong (“oh sorry that’s not lk2sk8”), and reconfirmed that he was right in the first place (“you’re lk2sk8”).
group’s completion of the task by making sure each member had contributed to the group’s completed piece of graffiti in some way (Cfn10F12:15-16).

In our second interview, I asked WoW about his role as the group’s leader and only non-Mandarin speaker (I2:540-542). He responded with “oh. my. god. I understand- I understood like what they saying (RD: yeah) like they said some kind of racist thing to me” (I2:543-545); he went on to explain that members of the group, who had used primarily Mandarin to interact, had used the word “han ge” – and that he had felt uncomfortable because he knew “like that mean Korean people (RD: really) like they spoke about Korean” (I2:547-551). WoW reported that despite the fact that he had “tried to complain to him [Mr.N] about it (RD: yeah) like we should shuffle” (I2:557-559), he endured:

Extract 9.8 “not this again” (I2:565-571)
01 Wow: I was like oh my god not this again and so I did my- like I did my work
02 RD: yeah that’s- but that’s kind of what I mean. so i- in many ways you were kind of leading uh them
03 even though they were speaking mostly in Mandarin
04 WoW: yeah like I was trying to helping- help them like about like, you know they- what they did
05 RD: yeah
06 WoW: was kind of like slow
07 RD: yeah
08 WoW: so I did most of the work and ((laughing)) they said- they said some racist thing

WoW’s recount works to display his diligence as student (e.g., “like I did my work”, line 01), not mention his willingness and ability to take on a leadership role in that context (e.g., “I was trying to helping- help them”, line 04; “what they did was kind of slow”, lines 04, 06; “I did most of the work”, line 08). WoW further distinguishes himself from by noting that he is an outsider to the group (i.e., “oh my god not this again”, line 01; “they said some racist thing”, line 08). Especially given his dislike for working in groups, what was striking was the extent to which WoW took on a leadership role, something which was not lost on Mr. Nobli – who nominated him to be the group’s representative when it was time to present their completed activity to the class (Cfn10F12:28).
One final example of WoW’s management of his group work occurred in relation to the final “poster project” – the aim of which was to have self-selected groups of students use texts and images to present a summary and extension of their understanding of the “origins and main beliefs” of one of the major religions Mr. Nobli covered during his practicum (Cfn19A12:11-13).² For this particular project, WoW approached an already-formed student group comprised of RAD (a non-focal participating female student who he knew from Mr. Whee’s class) and another student who shared his first language (Cfn19A12:29). In our third interview, I asked WoW if there was any reason he had chosen to work with those particular students (I3:459); his response hinged on a kind of economizing logic that relied on ethnolinguistic and interpersonal categories (“she’s [the] only Korean and friendly” [I3:460]) and stake-inoculated, racialized constructions of diligence and competence (“I have been working with Chinese guys before and they barely didn’t do work rarely do work rarely…I think they didn’t even understand…what we were doing” [I3:62-66]; “I’m not being a racist… I’m just trying to pick someone who is really cooperative” [I3:73-75]).

Doing diligence. Beyond WoW’s noticeably productive management of group work, he also was a proactive participant in the class: consistently volunteering to speak when Mr. Nobli solicited students’ responses to questions (e.g., mcMrN02F12:218-221, 235-238; mcMrN02Mr12 [27:22-28:12]; Cfn08Mr12:24; Cfn05A12:28), and receiving positive comments from Mr. Nobli on his work completed for and during class (e.g., Cfn23F12:35-41; Cfn30Mr12:33, 35; Cfn05A12:25-26, 29; Cfn11A12:35-36; Cfn01Ma12:23-24). Indeed, in late March, Mr. Nobli commented in passing that he felt WoW’s efforts to engage with the content and to participate in as uninhibited a way as he was able – were a good sign that he would be promoted out of ESL (“I think he’ll be out of here this year”, RDbiMrN30Mr12[88:50-88:52]).

---

² WoW reported that the group, whose poster focused on Hinduism, had been awarded an “A” grade (I3:370-374).
9.2.5 Year-End ESL Exit Tests

ESL Department test.

Test. The morning of the year-end ESL Department test it was raining, and WoW (along with many other students) had arrived about ten minutes prior to the official time for which the test had been scheduled; he had to wait until Ms. Jay arrived – three minutes late – to be let into the portable (Tfn25A12:10-12). The vice-principal Mr. Veep came into the room after students had formally begun the test, which he interrupted to remind them to “make sure to tell their parents not to call, or to STOP calling” the Pateo District’s Multicultural Liaison Worker “about ESL marks, grades, and promotion to regular classes; don’t call her – she doesn’t know” (Tfn25A12:15-16). For his part, and because a parental lobby (see Footnote 78) was not an option for him, WoW had pre-empted the ESL Department’s year-end test with a silent lobby of sorts: without consulting Miss Dorsal prior to the submission of his timetable, WoW had hedged his bets by registering himself in only regular, for credit classes for the 2012-2013 school year (I2:682-689).

Results. A full three weeks following the test, WoW learned in ELL Socials class that he had just passed the multiple choice (“I just passed it’s so close”) and got the highest possible grade (“I got four out of four”) on the written portion of the test (RDbiMsJ17Ma12[85:43-86:16]). Though following the test he had spoken openly about how stressed he was about his performance (Cfn25A12:15), he managed to keep up his performance in other classes. His completed Poetry Book, for example, was submitted in Mr. Whee’s ELL Writing class on the day following the test (Gfn26A12:4-6).

---

93 It is important to note that the marked increase in calls to the district Multicultural Liaison Worker by ESL students’ parents regarding students’ statuses as ESL was at least partially an artefact of the escalated job action being undertaken by the BC Teacher’s Federation and consequential changes to the testing regime at QHS. That is, a large majority of teachers had ceased communicating with students’ parents about academic matters, and additionally, intra-QHS politics had resulted in a marked change to the ESL testing regime.
Interestingly, on the same day the students received their results for the ESL Department’s exit test, they learned – many of them for the first time – that if they had passed they were required to write another test (i.e., the English Department’s year-end ESL exit test) the following week (Cfn17Ma12:12; mcMsJ17Ma12[21:32-22:00]). Further, grade ten students were informed that if they passed the English Department’s test the following week, they would receive a letter from the QHS Principal saying that they had permission to register in regular, for-credit courses during summer school (mcMsJ17Ma12[25:27-25:51]). But following the class, WoW was unclear about whether if he passed the English Department’s test he would be able to register in regular, for-credit science courses during the summer (Cfn17Ma12:35). Because WoW would technically be a grade 11 student in September, if he was unable to take for-credit courses until the following September (and after passing yet another test), this would make it “really hard to graduate…then I might be late then (RD: how late) one years almost” (I2:380-388).

Problematically, registration for these summer courses was scheduled to open on the same day that the English Department’s test was being written (Cfn17Ma12:34-36), and students would be unable to register for the fast-filling classes (see Extract 9.9, line 49) knowing whether they had passed the English Department’s exit-test or not. WoW approached Ms. Jay after class to ask about this. Given that there were multiple conversations occurring simultaneously on the audio file, I have used a darker font to represent the one which involved WoW, Ms. Jay, and me.

**Extract 9.9 “it’s just money” (RDbiMsJ17Ma12:548-574[87:54-89:10])**

01 WoW: Missus Jay (.) I want to ask you about like if I get a (high score)

---

94 An additional issue that arose during that particular class was the discrepancy in the process by which grade 10 versus grade 11/12 students could obtain a letter from the QHS principal. Ms. Jay noted specifically that in order to register for regular, summer school courses “you need the letter from [QHS Principal] if you’re grade ten do you understand you need that letter because you’re in ESL right now (1.5) so they [summer school teachers] need to know that you have permission to leave ESL and take uh:m summer school (1.0) anyone in grade eleven or twelve? (.) eleven [student name] and twelve okay so eleven and twelve automatically [here speaking as head of ESL Department] I’ll give you a letter (.) but still (.) try to do your best for this test (.) if you don’t pass it I will still nee- I will still give you that opportunity okay so:” (mcMsJ17Ma12[25:32-26:08]).
In addition to being indexed through his initiation of this interaction with Ms. Jay when the class had finished, WoW’s orientation to the importance of for-credit summer school courses is displayed throughout the extract (e.g., “if I get a (high score)…will I get in (regular courses)”,
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The issue of being able to register for these courses (or not), which is contingent on WoW’s status as an ESL, also then allows for the cost of summer school courses for FIS to be introduced as a source of noteworthy concern (lines 13-31).

Not only does it result in the only instance of classroom recorded data where the category of international students was explicitly mentioned or relevant by a teacher (“are you an international student?”, line 13), it illustrates Ms. Jay’s repeated work to distance herself from responsibility for any financial losses that might be incurred if WoW registered for ‘regular’ summer school courses and then failed to pass the final ESL exit test (e.g., “I don’t know what to say”, line 15; “I wouldn’t register until you (for sure know)”, line 25; “yeah I wouldn’t”, line 19; “it’s not my responsibility”, line 25; “well then you take that risk right”, line 43). As part of her work to distance herself from financial culpability, also notable here is the precarity ascribed to WoW’s position as a (FIS) student for whom getting out of ESL is immensely important. Ms. Jay confirms here that the disagreement between the ESL and English Departments at QHS has resulted in a different institutional weight being given to each department’s test; that is, by ESL Department standards and testing procedures WoW has “permission to leave” but that this permission is contingent on the results of the not-yet-written English Department’s test (“you have permission to leave- [from the ESL Department] but what if you don’t. ((breathy laughing)) have ((breathy chuckle)) permission to leave at the end like what if- you don’t [pass the English Department’s test]”, lines 38-40). In spite of WoW’s confidence that he will pass the English Department’s exit test (e.g., “impossible”, line 41) and downgrading the relevance of money as the issue (e.g., “it’s just money”, line 44), Ms. Jay situates the precariousness of WoW’s circumstances in the context of the “funny” (line 45) and “slow” (line 46) school year – both of which imply these circumstances are a result of the teacher’s strike and the institutional disagreement between the ESL and English Departments.
So in this Extract, in addition to his doing ‘good diligent student’ by showing that he was concerned about his results and the impact of these on his ability to register for and economize his timetable in summer school classes, WoW also demonstrated his knowledge of and concern for institutional dates and processes through the very act of approaching Ms. Jay about this issue after class. Finally, and significantly, the explicit link here – made by Ms. Jay – between (WoW’s) FIS status and the potential economic consequences (i.e., being unable to recoup the roughly $1000/course) if he failed to get out of ESL, evidences her awareness of the very key role of English language learning and ESL services in the construction of the category of FIS. That these consequences, and the import of ESL for the FIS they affected, were further situated in a precarity that resulted from conflicting processes within the local educational contexts over which WoW (or other FIS) neither control nor awareness, is yet another example of the scalar and polycentric nature of the local educational marketplace in which FIS are learning.

**English Department test.**

*Test.* For the English Department’s year-end ESL exit test (see, e.g., Appendix A; Chapter 3, subsection 3.2.3; and Chapter 8, subsection 8.2.4, Footnotes 71 and 72), WoW was required to read two short stories and then use specific examples from each to respond to a question in essay form. Although he had written the test six days prior to our third interview (Tfn23Ma12), he reported then that he had yet to learn the results; more importantly, he had taken the initiative to register for summer courses noting, without being certain, that “I can get a refund I guess” of the tuition fees he had paid for ‘regular’ courses (I3:05-19). In the same interview WoW described the test as “pretty hard”, but noted that “it was hard for everyone because they gave like kind of complicated story” (I3:131-133). He went on to report that as a result most of the students spent the majority of their time “reading reading reading and not writing or something”, and described the amount of time they were given to write the test (i.e., one hour) as “kind of unfair” (I3:135-148; see also, e.g., Gfn30Ma12:39).
**Results.** WoW received the results for the English Department’s year-end test in Ms. Jay’s class on the last day of May 2012; Ms. Jay delivered these results orally, noting that the results of this test would trump students’ performance on the previous year-end test – meaning that, to their shock, students who had passed the ESL Department’s year-end test would not be completely promoted out of the ESL program (Cfn31May12:14-15, 19). And then, rather than telling students individually how they had fared on the test (i.e., results or grades) or providing some account of the assessment procedure, Ms. Jay simply read aloud the names of the students who had passed the English Department’s test; this was visibly upsetting for students who did not pass, including WoW (Cfn31Ma12:16; WoW14:152-165; also, e.g., Zard-iTelo [16:20-20:20]). In fact, my fieldnotes from that day described a shift in WoW’s demeanour after he received “the news about the ESL results – from that point on he has difficulty concentrating” (Cfn31Ma12:44). I wrote that it was like watching him realize, in that instant, the possibility that all the work he had done that year to be “not lazy”, to display his diligence and cooperativeness, had been in vain; I noted that he kept looking at me “sheepishly and with such a look of confusion on his face – as if to say ‘what just happened, and how is that possible?’”; that he stared at Ms. Jay “without blinking/bold-faced, as though he is on the verge of freaking out”; and finally, how he intermittently buried his face in his hand and appeared to be “holding in so many emotions” (Cfn31Ma12:46-48).

In our final interview of the year, WoW and I revisited the day he had received the results: “I was so pissed off (RD: yeah like you couldn’t even focus) oh did you see that (RD: yeah yeah it was clear)” (I4:152-156). He went on to narrate that he had felt “chaos like confused worry”, or like he had “just blacked out” – and that this was “because you know I’ve been here for two years and I failed again and it’s hard to graduate” (I4:160-165).

**Rallying around WoW.** In early June, an elated WoW approached me to let me know that he had been promoted out of ESL and had learned, after the fact, that he had indeed passed
the test (Cfn04Ju12:8). Having spent the year getting to know how QHS’s ESL program worked, the important people working in it, and the difficult politics surrounding it, upon hearing this news I was confused: “something weird is going on at the school and I am not sure how to process it all, or even to approach it with the teachers who are involved – since it is a very sensitive topic” (Cfn04Ju12:8). During our final interview later that month, I asked WoW how he had learned of the change in his status, and of his successful promotion out of ESL (I4:49). He reported that Miss Sarg, his ELL English teacher, had told him (I4:50). But in addition to giving him the good news, Miss Sarg also voiced her suspicion about his suddenly being on the list of students who had passed: “she asked me like who- who did you talk to like QHS Principal or Mr. Veep (RD: really) did you talk to Mr. Veep or did you talk to QHS Principal but I s- I said I didn’t” (I4:54-58).

Regardless of having felt “numb” and “surprised” at the prospect of taking regular, for-credit classes, WoW reported that he “just didn’t understand the situation” (I4:84-93). He conjectured that although he had written the test, perhaps his own student number wasn’t on the list of successful students or alternatively that “they mischecked it I guess” (I4:09-17). What WoW did not know was that his name was very clearly listed as “ESL” on the English Department’s test results sheet (Tfn04Ju12:P4). Further, and crucially, neither did WoW know that his ESL Department teachers (namely Mr. Whee, Ms. Jay, and Mr. Nobli) had petitioned the QHS Principal on his (and five other students’) behalf (QHSPr2:484-90); in addition to WoW’s demonstrated work ethic during the year and having passed the previous (and only) ESL Department exit-test, Mr. Whee noted:

**Extract 9.10 “separating the a’s from the c’s” (MrW:953-955)**
as Ms. Jay and I have said, when you’re working with these kids every day and you know them on a personal level, and you know where their strengths lie and where their weaknesses lie, to throw them into that [English Department] test seemed more to be separating the a’s from the c’s (MrW:953-955).
In our year end interview, the QHS Principal reported that although the change to the testing regime had begun as a disagreement between the ESL and English Departments over how students were promoted out of ESL, in the context of the school year it had also been manifest in differences of opinion between teachers regarding the abilities of individual students (QHSPr2:435-440). Thus, after being approached by WoW’s teachers, the principal reported that they “had a look over some of the decisions that were made and I questioned some of them and in some of those cases that I questioned another look was taken and then those students were allowed to move on” (QHSPr2:480). The principal reflexively acknowledged how the disagreements between Departments and individuals, and the concomitant changes to the ESL testing regime, may have caused students to “feel like they were dealing with double and triple jeopardy” (QHSPr2:484). They continued:

Extract 9.11 “let a few more students through” (QHSPr2:486-490)
01 …but in actual fact what they were dealing with was…multiple options to actually move forward. cause
02 there was a (.) .tch a first cut that students didn’t make, but then there was another cut that you know…you
03 know basically let a few more students through. and then even beyond that students who weren’t approved
04 um to move into the regular program next year, some of them were approved to take a summer school
05 course

The accounts of Mr. Whee and the QHS principal here index how orientations to personal, academic, administrative, and arguably consumer-conscious (i.e., “multiple options to actually move forward”; “some of them were approved to take a summer course”, QHSPr2 [lines 01, 04-05]) features of the educational marketplace became resources for describing the experience and contextualizing actions that had been taken.

Luckily for WoW, he was one of the students at whose case the QHS principal had agreed to take ‘another look’, and who had then been ‘allowed to move forward’. I told WoW what I had learned as part of our fourth interview: that he had not passed; that his teachers (namely Mr. Whee, Ms. Jay, and Mr. Nobli) had advocated to the QHS principal on his behalf; and that, after taking a second look at his test (and the tests of other students), the QHS principal
had overridden the initial outcome (I4:20-30). WoW’s response was immediate: “oh my god i love you QHS principal” (I4:31).

9.3 Conclusion: Getting out of ESL as Socialization into ESL

WoW’s socialization into ESL was unique in that he was the longest-term English language learner among focal participants, and further, his status when he ‘got into’ ESL during his first year at QHS was as a non-fee-paying student. Like Ellen, Moon, and Zeejay, WoW’s negotiation of the central process of getting out of ESL was triangulated by and coalesced around more and less expected institutional events during the school year. WoW’s efforts to economize the process of getting out ESL, he reported, were a calculated response to his failure to exit ESL the previous year, and included his undertaking “study really hard” and demonstrate his concern for quality work. In short, WoW’s socialization into ESL was massively influenced, and indeed largely constituted by, his efforts to get out of ESL.

As a result, and first and foremost for the purpose of getting out of ESL, these efforts materialized both as well-completed assignments and good grades that that had no educational purchase; but more importantly, these efforts became a kind of discursively mobilized symbolic capital which (unbeknownst to him) would prove important for his purpose. At the same time, the disagreement between the ESL and English Departments, and specifically the year-end English Department Test, effectively altered the process of getting out of ESL in a way that WoW could not have predicted. Despite that he had, to that point, economized his own approach to school work based on an understanding of the process of getting out of ESL that changed for reasons that were far beyond his control, awareness, or influence. Thus WoW’s socialization into and out of ESL relied upon, and was the product of, a contingent process comprised of educational and linguistic, as well as social and institutional, understandings that were mobilized and economized in different ways and by different actors (e.g., Wortham, 2012; Wortham & Rhodes, 2013). Not only did this shared economizing attitude index participants’ variable
evaluative orientations toward (specific aspects of) the process of getting out of ESL, this variation highlighted the complex and polycentric nature of the linguistic and educational markets (e.g., Blommaert, 2010; J. S.-Y. Park & Lo, 2012b; J. S.-Y. Park & Wee, 2012) in which the process itself was embedded.

In this chapter I have presented an account of WoW’s socialization as he negotiated the process of getting out of ESL. The focus on these negotiations across two ELL classrooms offers an important contrast to the accounts presented in Chapters 7 and 8, and further illustrates the extent to which the process of getting out of ESL is a constitutive feature of the category of FIS. In Chapter 10, I discuss the analyses in Chapters 4-9 in greater detail and consider implications of the study.
CHAPTER 10: CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

B.C.’s education system is among the world’s best and, while we’ve always counted on it to prepare our children and youth for the future, we’ve barely begun to tap its potential to support our economic growth. With rapid economic expansion in Asia Pacific countries, more parents than ever before want their children to receive an English-language education – and we have growing opportunities to attract and retain a much higher number of international students. (Government of BC, 2012b, p. 14)

10.1 Introduction

This final chapter is organized around six main goals. The first is to present a summary of the research process and, with some further discussion, a recapitulation of the principal findings of this study (Section 10.2). This is followed by considerations of both the main theoretical and methodological contributions to the study, as well as its relevance to the fields of applied linguistics and (language and literacy) education (Section 10.3). I then outline potential implications practical uses of knowledge gained through the study for FIS education in BC (Section 10.4), discuss qualities and limitations of the study (Section 10.5), and highlight areas and issues for future research related to international education in BC, Canada, and elsewhere (Section 10.6). I conclude the chapter with a brief reflection on the phenomenon of FIS in relation to understandings of public education (Section 10.7).

10.2 Summary and Recapitulation of Principal Findings

In addition to an interest in the topic gained through my experiences working with K-12 aged FIS and their parents as a private tutor during the completion of my master’s degree, this study resulted from a desire to gain a more thorough understanding of the context in which FIS education was being played out in BC schools. In particular, these experiences have alerted me to the multiple rationales, investments, and sacrifices made by students and their parents in order to make their international education experiences possible. Framed in terms of global (i.e., vis-à-vis dominant ideologies relating to the ‘value’ of western credentials or English language [J. S.-Y. Park & Lo, 2012; J. S.-Y. Park & Wee, 2012; Waters, 2004, 2006b, 2009b]), more personal
(e.g., Chapter 6, subsections 6.2.1, 6.3.1, 6.4.1, 6.5.1), or other reasons, I was interested to know
the extent to which students’ diverse circumstances were understood or recognized in the
educational contexts to which they were migrating and contributing.

My desire to better understand the context in which FIS education was taking place was
also motivated by a number of other factors specific to the K-12 public education context in BC.

First among these factors was that between the introduction of the BC Ministry of
Education’s first International Student Policy (BCMoE, 2001b) and the year I conducted
fieldwork (2011-2012), there was a 127% increase in FIS students in the province (Kuehn, 2014,
p. 4). Measured to the current year, 2015, this increase has grown even further since 2001 – to
315% (BCMoE, 2015d), making international education a key source of revenue not only for
educational institutions, but also for the various other sectors which benefit from the presence of
international students in BC (see Section 10.6 for more on this).

A second factor which motivated the study was a desire to better understand how the
increase in the presence of FIS students in BC followed from the implementation of The School
Amendment Act (Bill-34, 2002). The dominant narrative, particularly among published work on
the topic, has been that the BC Government’s (and hence Ministry of Education’s) promotion of
a more fiscally and academically accountable public school system pressured K-12 districts to
seek creative sources of revenue (e.g., Fallon & Pancucci, 2003; Kuehn, 2002). In fact, in line
with the general increase in FIS numbers in BC over the last decade (see previous paragraph),
during the year fieldwork was conducted FIS were a ‘creative source of revenue’ that garnered
almost $139 million in revenue; when measured to the current year, 2015, a conservative
estimate of revenue based on tuition fees alone would be about $250 million dollars.95

95 This estimated is calculated by multiplying the average tuition fee in BC by the number of FIS reported to be
studying in BC in 2015 (BCMoE, 2015d). The estimate is does not include further revenue-based gains to the
greater BC economy based on students’ living, travel, and other study-abroad related expenses.
The final, and most urgent, factor which motivated the current study was that despite the economic contributions FIS make to BC education at the provincial, district, school, and classroom levels, even in 2011 no in-depth, longitudinal research had focused explicitly on the FIS phenomenon in educational contexts or the experiences of FIS students in actual school contexts.

Formal data generation for the study began at Quondam High School in September 2011, though also included the researcher’s physical presence at different educational sites (i.e., at the Pateo School District Offices, at BC Ministry of Education Offices, and at a BC Ministry of Education sponsored entitled “International Education Regional Roundtable” [see, e.g., BCMoE, 2013a]). In sum, and in addition to a wide range of policy documents, the study involved a total of: eight focal student participants (only four of whose experiences have been reported in this dissertation); 43 non-focal student participants in two ELL classes; five non-focal teacher participants as well as the QHS principal; the director of the International Education Program, as well as the Field Services Representative, from the Pateo School; three representatives from the BC Ministry of Education; and one representative from the Canadian Association for Public Schools International. Whereas data generated with focal participants included multiple semi-structured and ethnographic interviews, email reports, gathering of artefacts they had produced at or for school, and classroom-based observations and audiorecordings, non-focal participant data was limited to semi-structured interviews (12 QHS students; nine adult-stakeholders), email and telephone correspondence, and classroom-based observations and audiorecordings. These data were compiled for both cross-site as well as individual focal case-based analysis using an eclectic combination of analytic resources under a “lower-case” (Talmy, 2010a, p. 131) critical discourse analytic approach within a social constructionist epistemological framework.

The findings of the study have presented a multi-level account of the complexity that characterizes FIS socialization in K-12 public educational contexts. This account was realized
through research questions focused on the construction of the FIS category across different sites and narratives – in policies (Chapter 4), in practices (Chapter 5), and in persons (Chapters 6-9) – and the attendant socialization processes that inhered, were indexed, or made relevant in and through these constructions.

In Chapter 4, the analysis showed how in policy-related language practices, the euphemistic construction of FIS was achieved intertextually and interdiscursively – across policy documents and in relation to the themes of residency status, (in-)eligibility for state funding, and English language competency. Crucially, the analysis demonstrated how these euphemistic linguistic practices inflected the category of “international student” to mean fee-paying international student, and most crucially, that an essential part of this inflected definition was its distinctiveness as unrecognized, unfunded, and unofficial subset of the BCMoE category of English language learner. The second part of Chapter 4 examined the rearticulation of the BCMoE’s *International Student Policy* (BCMoE, 2001b) as the *Eligibility of Students for Operating Grant Funding* (BCMoE, 2011/2013); treating the changes in the BCMoE’s articulation of international student policy as indexical of socialization through the use of (policy) language and socialization to use (policy) language, I have demonstrated how these changes were bidirectional – the co-constructed outcome of an interaction between motivated or interested consumers (i.e., would be international students) and producers (i.e., the BCMoE) of these policies.

The analysis in Chapter 5 focused on the discursive and material construction of FIS in practice, using data generated both in research interviews across all levels of the educational system and attendant statistical and demographic data related to the everyday education of FIS students. It demonstrated how, across a range of research-based, administrator, teacher, and student narratives, the category of FIS is a relational production that is closely linked to English language learning and immigration, and further, to the themes of residency, funding, and English
language competency identified in Chapter 4. Treating the formulations of the FIS category as iconic of FIS presence in the Pateo School District and at QHS, I argued that taken together these articulations of FIS in practice are indexical of socialization through the use of language and socialization to use language; in short, that these formulations evidence linguistically mediated processes of FIS socialization in educational practice.

Chapters 6 through 9 focused on the construction of FIS in persons, and did so by presenting a multi-part account of four focal students’ lived experiences as FIS (i.e., Ellen, Moon, Zeejay, and WoW). In Chapter 6, the first part of this account expanded on the recurrent notions of residency (i.e., as students’ living situations in Canada), funding (i.e., as students’ socioeconomic backgrounds in relation to their fee-paying status), and language (i.e., as students’ experiences learning and using English and other languages) as a means for contextualizing out-of-school details central to each students’ experience as FIS (i.e., Ellen, Moon, Zeejay, and WoW. The aim of these descriptions was to present, through the structural framework, “an explicitly comparative perspective” (Vavrus & Bartlett, 2014b, p. 139) that drew on the emergent analyses undertaken in Chapters 4 and 5.

Chapters 7 through 9 described students’ school-based socialization as they navigated a cultural process that was foundational to their experiences as FIS: ‘getting out of ESL’. These chapters drew attention to the situated, contingent nature of ‘getting out of ESL’ as it was reported, described, and constructed across relevant practices and interactions. The accounts highlighted how students’ logics for ‘getting out of ESL’ were (im-)mobilized within assemblages of events, some of which superseded students’ own “socioculturally mediated capacity to act” (Ahearn, 2001, p. 12), perform, or economize their orientations to authority forces they believed to be relevant for getting out of ESL (see, e.g., Block, 2015; Miller, forthcoming). Most importantly, however, these chapters demonstrated how the process of
‘getting out of ESL’ was central to students’ learning, to their varied socialization trajectories, and thus to their individual narratives as constitutive constituents of a more composite category of FIS.

In the first part of Chapter 7, interview narratives and email reports were used to demonstrate Ellen’s reported orientations to pressure from her mother, the successes of her peers, and the complex status of her L1 Mandarin in relation to English, and the role these played in shaping her efforts to economize and explain her (unsuccessful) attempts to ‘get out of ESL’. Not only did her reported orientations index the utility of these explanatory resources as a means for articulating FIS experience, they constructed Ellen’s experiences in (and aspiration to get out of) ESL as centrally constitutive of the category of FIS. In the second part of Chapter 7, using a wider array of data sources, I described how Moon’s trajectory of socialization as she reported navigating ‘getting out of ESL’ coalesced in an entirely different way than did Ellen’s. In spite of Moon’s undisputed material success in economizing her exit from ESL in terms of required English language proficiency, her agentive efforts to have these successes recognized were effectively neutralized by larger institutional processes – i.e., scheduling limitations, expectations of ‘good’ behaviour, disconnects between the ELL curriculum and the academic demands of ‘regular’ classes – that were completely beyond her control. What Moon’s school-based socialization had in common with Ellen’s, was her efforts to understand how to (economize) getting out of ESL; what distinguished it from Ellen’s were her reported difficulties in navigating the institutional emplacement of ESL within the larger structure of the school.

In addition to student interviews and email reports, Chapters 8 and 9 drew on fieldnotes and classroom observations, classroom audiorecordings, as well as student-created artifacts and classroom handouts, to describe Zeejay and WoW’s negotiations of getting out of ESL in greater detail than those of Ellen and Moon in Chapter 7.
Chapter 8 traced Zeejay’s emergent indifference toward Mr. Whee’s ELL Writing class, and demonstrated how this indifference was a situated product of Zeejay’s comparative attributions of value to the types of writing assigned in ELL Writing versus the types of writing required to pass the ESL exit test, and further, to the relative ineffectualness of the ELL writing class to his academic progress (i.e., there would be no record of it on his transcript). It presents an account of Zeejay’s economizing actions, toward the goal of exiting ESL, as engendering the prioritization of shadow education and his own forms of writing practice over those of the school – effectively taking responsibility for his own promotion out of ESL. The ‘extra-layer’ of ESL testing at the school, which resulted from processes occurring at a timescale over which Zeejay had no influence, actually added value to Zeejay’s economizing actions in a way he could not have predicted – and resulted in his successful promotion out of ESL by the end of the school year.

Chapter 9 presents an account of WoW’s efforts to economize getting out of ESL by displaying, as he had been told was necessary for students wishing to move to ‘regular’ classes, that he was a diligent, “not lazy” student in both Mr. Whee’s ELL Writing and Ms. Jay’s ELL Socials classes. Despite WoW’s recognized efforts to painstakingly complete work which he knew was of little institutional purchase, and his relative success on ESL Department exit tests, neither prepared him for the (surprise) demands to the English Department’s ‘extra layer’ of testing. But if the ‘extra layer’ of testing was not sufficient to render WoW’s concerted efforts to (do what he had been told) to get out of ESL futile, and thus the coalescence of WoW’s trajectory of socialization as unpredictable, that his economizing choices and earnest efforts in class would be converted by teachers into advocacy on WoW’s behalf – is evidence that his process of getting out of ESL was constituted by institutional, social, and educational centers of authority operating in markets and at scale-levels to which he had neither access nor awareness.
In a similar way, by examining the construction of the category of FIS across the educational spaces of policy, practice, and persons – the attendant socialization processes that inhere, are indexed, or are made relevant in these multi-leveled constructions also allow a multifaceted representation of how the contingent phenomenon of FIS socialization is variously constituted in situated configurations of space, time, processes, and appropriative practices of actors (see Figure 10.1 below). Indeed, in addition to the socialization of, and very real material consequences for, individual FIS students, FIS socialization must be understood to include the ways the impacts of their presence, and crucially, the increasing necessity for their presence, plays a socializing role in classrooms, schools, and the public education system more generally. But permeating this understanding is a further, more crucial insight: in both real and metaphorical senses, fundamental to FIS socialization is a logic that prioritizes different ways of economizing English language learning, teaching, and education.

**Figure 10.1 FIS Socialization in Policy, Practices, and Persons**

That is, as the epigram at the beginning of this chapter reminds us, there are indisputable links between the internationalization of K-12 public education in BC and conditions under which
English as an additional language services, teaching, and learning occur. FIS socialization, as a multidirectional phenomenon distributed across actors, processes, sites, and dimensions of the public education system, is constitutive of and dependent upon the treatment of FIS students as unofficial, unaccounted for, and unfunded English language learners.

10.3 Contributions to Theory, Methods, and the Literature

The study has made modest contributions to theory and methodology that deserve some remark here. Though the (second) language socialization framework has often been coupled with a community of practice perspective (e.g., Duff, 2008b, 2012; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Ochs & Schieffelin, 1984; Schieffelin & Ochs, 1986; Wenger, 1998), very few researchers – especially those working with high school-aged migrant language learners – have fused a (second) language socialization perspective with a market-based theorization of education and (English) language learning. Given the burgeoning recruitment of FIS as a means for offsetting decreases in both domestic enrolment and state-funding for public education in North America (see Chapter 1) and elsewhere (e.g., Arber, 2009; Matthews & Sidhu, 2005), not to mention the links between FIS presence and ELL services, teaching, and learning identified in this study, an approach which theorizes how value-attributions and exchange modulate emergent socialization processes around the recruitment, treatment, and impact of FIS on K-12 education is practical, efficacious, and essential.

An additional contribution of the study is investigation and analysis of educational policy from a (second) language socialization perspective. The treatment of the construction of the category of FIS as indexical of socialization through the use of (policy) language and socialization to use (policy) language, is to my knowledge the first to link policy analysis with language socialization. Both in this specific endeavour, and in tracing the discursive shift in policy language directly related to the presence and impact of FIS in BC’s K-12 educational institutions, the study has responded to Baquedano-Lopez and Mangual Figueroa’s (2011) call to
“expand the socialization sites studied to include events across the multiple sites of cultural and linguistic contact” (p. 555). An approach which treats policy (language) as a viable site of cultural and linguistic contact, in and through which bi- and multidirectional socialization processes are indexed and become perceptible, has the potential to open new areas of study both for language socialization researchers and those interested in education- and language-related policy. Given the links between language learning and migration in superdiverse times, and the increasing likelihood these will impact local, provincial, and even national (education) policies, (L2) LS is particularly well-suited to examine policy shifts as sites of ideological struggle and shift.

Perhaps in response to Blommaert and Rampton’s (2011) suggestion, there is an emergent literature which has combined (second) language socialization with Vertovec’s (2007) notion of superdiversity (e.g., Karrebaek, 2013; Talmy, 2015) to which this study can potentially contribute. The study’s ethnographic focus on the category of FIS, realized across multiple actors, sites, and dimensions of the public education system, has articulated FIS socialization as constituted across a “multiplicity of [educational] and sociolinguistic economies”, and whose “‘scaled polycentricity’ [is] made up of communicative markets that vary in their reach, value and (partial) relations of sub- and super-ordination” (Blommaert & Rampton, 2011, p. 14). In this study, this combination has been particularly productive and instructive in its work to characterize the “dynamic interplay of variables” realized in the day to day realities of in- and out-of-school spaces to which FIS, as (educational) migrants, arrive and are received; that these variables include and extend beyond ethnicity, first language, and country of origin to have “mutually conditioning effects” on the experience of migration for people, institutions, and states; and that vital among these variables are students’ “differential immigration statuses and their concomitant entitlements and restrictions of rights” (Vertovec, 2007, p. 1025). This dynamic interplay of variables is represented in the situated, relational construction of FIS as a new form
of (migrant) learner, a new form of English language learner, and as a new symbol of revenue for educational institutions and governments.

In a very much related way, these insights into the FIS category and its attendant socialization processes have been made empirically possible by a methodological orientation which foregrounds ethnographic and broadly discourse analytic approaches. Common to many studies drawing on a (second) language socialization framework (e.g., Bronson & Watson-Gegeo, 2008; Duff & Talmy, 2011; Garrett, 2008; Kulick & Schieffelin, 2004), this approach has also been described in work on superdiversity and linguistic ethnography (e.g., Blommaert & Rampton, 2011; Creese, 2008; Rampton et al., 2004). In short, shared among these streams of work is an agreement that

i) the contexts for communication should be investigated rather than assumed. Meaning takes shape within specific social relations, interactional histories and institutional regimes, produced and construed by agents with expectations and repertoires that have to be grasped ethnographically;

ii) analysis of the internal organisation of verbal (and other kinds of semiotic) data is essential to understanding its significance and position in the world. Meaning is far more than just the ‘expression of ideas’, and biography, identifications, stance and nuance are extensively signalled in the linguistic and textual fine-grain.

(Rampton, Maybin, & Roberts, 2014, p. 4)

In adopting this approach to the study of FIS within a social constructionist epistemological framework (Crotty, 1998; Gergen, 1994; Schwandt, 1998), this study has distinguished itself, in both theoretical and methodological ways, from previous work in Canada and elsewhere that has focused on FIS students in some way (e.g., Arber, 2009; Arnott, 2012; Matthews, 2002; Matthews & Sidhu, 2005; Popadiuk, 1998; Popadiuk & Marshall, 2011; Qian, 2012; Shin, 2010b, 2015). Drawing on a broadly conceived, and variously realized version of critical discourse
analysis (see Chapter 3, subsection 3.2.7), the study has presented a comparatively rigorous, transparent, and reflexive approach for the identification, analysis, description, and representation of issues relevant to FIS students and international education in superdiverse K-12 education contexts.

Indeed, adopting this shared approach to understanding FIS socialization in education policy, practices, and persons has also been productive in that it has necessitated a methodological (re-)articulation of the conventional notion of ‘multiple case study’. Drawing on the work of Bartlett and Vavrus (2014a, 2014b), and in keeping with the linguistic ethnographic orientation preferable for (second) language socialization research, I have demonstrated that through a focus on the category of FIS as it is assembled in discursive and material formations across time, educational spaces, and experiences of various informants – how researchers can “incorporate an explicitly comparative perspective, urging attention across locations (the horizontal axis) and micro-, meso, and macro-levels (the vertical axis) in ways that move beyond the traditional multiple case study” (Bartlett & Vavrus, 2014b, p. 139). Such a “vertical” approach to case study (e.g., Bartlett & Vavrus, 2014a, 2014b) not only recognizes the utility in de-emphasizing the need for strict boundaries around the case and field site; in treating the conventional notion of ‘multiple’ as a representational issue, it aims to “develop a thorough understanding of the particular at each level and to analyze how these understandings produce similar and different interpretations of the…phenomenon under study” (Vavrus & Bartlett, 2006, p. 99). Not only does this approach to category as case offer a potentially new methodological approach to studying linguistically mediated social phenomena in superdiverse contexts, in its implicit recognition that the research narrative is yet another site where the category under investigation is constructed, this approach remains reflexively oriented to “the situated and dialogical character of ethnographic knowledge itself” (Blommaert, 2007, p. 682).
Inseparable from this orientation to category as case, then, has also been the attempt to provide an account of FIS socialization as a multiscalar and multidirectional phenomenon. This has meant attempting to show how, in policy, practice, and in persons, “subset[s] of resources from various scales become relevant to social identification” (Wortham & Rhodes, 2013, p. 539). In this way, the examination of the category of FIS, treated here as a discursively and materially constituted emblem in relation to which trajectories of FIS socialization “emerge from interconnections among heterogeneous resources drawn from disparate scales” (Wortham, 2012, p. 133) – offers a potentially productive methodological point of departure for the examination of socialization processes and phenomena.

Given that there is so little research which has focused explicitly on the presence or impact of FIS in classrooms, schools, and larger educational jurisdictions, the breadth, depth, and multiscalar nature of the current study makes a critical contribution to existing literature. In addition to its work to address the scarcity of applied linguistics and educational research on and with migrant students who willingly pay fees to attend public schools in English dominant countries (see, e.g. Duff, 2015), and to situate this form of international education at the intersection of educational and linguistic markets, by focusing on students and school-based experiences the study has added an important perspective to streams of research in applied linguistic, education, and geography that have focused on the educational migration of children. The study’s in-depth focus on focal students’ socialization as FIS addresses what Waters (2015) has called the “most significant” issue in research on educational migration; that is, “that far too little research has been done on [read: with] the children themselves – where they are placed at the forefront” (p. 291). Also timely in this regard is the study’s focus on students’ living arrangements, and the relationship these have with their socioeconomic circumstances, as well as language learning preferences and backgrounds. As Burke’s (2015) comparison of the “housing markets” for international students has recently noted:
there is no information about the secondary school context as most other countries have very few international students in their school systems. Moreover, as they tend to stay with relatives or in homestay (a little recorded or researched sector), it is difficult to research the housing implications at the secondary level. (p. 3)

A further important contribution to the existing literature is the systematic attention given to the FIS category itself in the study. In particular, the ethnomethodologically-driven examination of resources used to construct the FIS category in this study – specifically those relating to the implications of residency status and eligibility for State funding – have provided a uniquely emic perspective on this category of student. In this respect, the study contrasts starkly with previous studies conducted in Canada which have focused on international students (i.e., ‘visa students’ [e.g., Shin, 2010b]) as an etically derived, researcher category that is not always technically applicable in students’ actual school contexts. This raises interesting questions about the role of student categories in research on educational migrants or transnational learners – specifically for those which make claims about the educational institutions in which the students participate. Whose definitions (i.e., institutional/researcher) of the category should be used, and what kinds of claims about school experiences are possible based on the choice of definition?

10.4 Implications for FIS at QHS, the Pateo District, and (Potentially) Beyond

Finally, and most significantly, the examination of FIS socialization in this dissertation has shown how, across educational spaces, participant talk, and educational texts, there is an inextricable relationship between international education, broadly conceived, and English language learning (ELL) services, teaching, and learning – a relationship I have referred to elsewhere as ‘ESL all the way down’ (e.g., Deschambault, 2014). Analyses in Chapters 4, 5, and especially 7-9, have demonstrated how the connection between FIS and ELL education is widely recognized and manifest in discursive and material ways.

96 See Chapter 2 (subsection 2.2.2) for a fuller discussion of these categories in Shin’s (2010b) study.
What stands out among the discursive manifestations of this connection is their taken-for-granted and implicit nature across the different examples; that is, the recurrent and easy availability of the FIS-ELL connection as a resource for organizing and producing discourse is an index of its normative status and widespread circulation. In the BC K-12 context, and by multiple stakeholders, the seeming ubiquity of the connection strongly suggests that international (or FIS) education is variously subsumed, equated, or strategically conflated with ELL education. Where material manifestations of this connection are concerned, an issue of immediate concern relates to the fact that (the growing number of) FIS are excluded from school-, district-, and provincial-level statistics reporting ELL enrolment. That FIS students are considered distinct from ELL students in educational statistics is potentially problematic – especially given that the ELL designation is used to fund specialist teacher staffing and to determine the allocation of supplemental funding for ELL programming and services. It is remarkable that the Pateo School District, separate from the BCMoE or provincial government, has made its own effort to document how many of the FIS students it enrolls are making use of ELL programming and services; still more remarkably, FIS numbers from both Mr. Whee’s (i.e., 10/30, or 30%) and Ms. Jay’s (i.e., 12/30, or 40%) ELL classes convey a sense of how, in the very specific case of these classes at QHS, FIS constituted a significant proportion of the students in these ELL classes. In short, these ELL classes are sites of competition between state-funded (i.e., domestic) ELL learners and FIS for the school- and teacher-support necessary to be promoted out of ELL and into classes for which they would actually receive credit towards their high school diploma.

These discursive and material manifestations of the FIS-ELL connection offer substantive, suggestive, and incontrovertible empirical evidence to support the claim that in policy, in practices, and in persons, ELL education is a very real site of FIS socialization and impact. The ubiquity of the FIS-ELL connection, and its officially unaccounted for impact on ELL services, teaching, and learning are, in fact, cause for serious concern given the funding
situation in contemporary K-12 public education in BC. Overwhelmed as school districts are with “cumulative structural shortfalls…that have resulted in school closures, larger, classes, and the loss of educational programs” (White, 2012, p. 2), ELL services at the provincial level have not gone unscathed. For example, despite an increase in the number (+2737) and total percentage of public school students identified as ELL learners between 2001 (9.4%) and 2012 (10.9%) (British Columbia Teacher’s Federation [BCTF], 2012, p. 11), there has been a loss of 342 ELL specialist teachers during the same period of time (BCTF, 2013, p. 7). Including FIS numbers to these reported increases would illustrate a very different picture over the last decade, and may give a greater sense of urgency to the BCTF’s (2013) reported decrease in ELL specialist teachers.

And yet, as Ellen, Moon, Zeejay, and WoW’s narratives of educational migration suggest, they too in many ways subsume, equate, or strategically conflate their pursuit of ‘western’ educational credentials with English language learning. Not only are there a wide range of potential reasons students reported for coming to study in Canada (i.e., escape from the onerous demands of schooling in their home countries; as a means for acquiring linguistic and educational capital whose value surpassed the value of what they might be able to acquire at ‘home’; etc.), in the case of each of these participants the pursuit of educational credentials and English language proficiency were envisaged as a means to an end; that is, participants were unanimous in their treatment of their eventual BC high school credential as a form of capital that could further be used to gain access to ‘western’ tertiary education – public secondary education in Canada was a ‘pathway’. Of the four focal FIS students whose narratives are represented in this dissertation, I am aware of at least three that successfully went on to tertiary studies (i.e., Moon [Sciences at a Canadian University], Zeejay [Film Studies at a Canadian University], and WoW [Computer graphics and design at a Canadian Art and Design College]).
In this way, the multifaceted narratives informing focal FIS students’ educational migrations (i.e., as variously constituted outgrowths of competition they may have experienced in educational markets back ‘home’), and the resultant trajectories of socialization that coalesced in their experiences and impact in and out of school in Canada, are demonstrative of the mutually constitutive nature of educational and linguistic markets on a global scale. Indeed, when considered in parallel with the educational context in BC out of which the aggressive recruitment of FIS students has emerged, both (focal) FIS students’ educational migration and the need to recruit them are very much emblematic of “the irony that educational strategies that are most saliently global may in fact be deeply grounded in and shaped by local markets” (J. S.-Y. Park & Lo, 2012b, p. 154-155).

10.5 Qualities and Limitations

This study has examined constructions of the FIS category across different educational sites and narratives, and the attendant socialization processes that inhered, were indexed, or made relevant in and through these constructions. The qualitative research paradigm that has been adopted for the study, in conjunction with a broadly conceived ‘critical’ discourse analytic perspective within a constructionist methodological orientation, has permitted extensive variability in and indeed multiscalar representation of both the category of FIS and different socialization processes to which it is linked.

Given these paradigmatic and methodological orientations, extrapolating insights gained from focal FIS or QHS to other individual or school-based contexts is neither desirable nor possible. However, given the significant similarities of some of the discursive resources and larger ideological orientations that have been identified in the examinations of talk and text in the study, these might be said to be useful for understanding the contours of the larger context of FIS education in BC (i.e., residency, funding, and language as key sense making resources for understanding FIS or FIS socialization).
The scope of the study, despite the fact that it involved a large number of participants, was limited in efforts to chronicle the school-based experiences of FIS students. For instance, because the teachers at QHS (and throughout BC) in the midst of job action, processes of gaining access to classes, recruiting participants, and maintaining rapport with key gatekeepers became increasingly difficult as the standoff between the BC Ministry of Education and the BCTF escalated during the course of fieldwork in 2011-2012. In fact, as a result of this larger context, relations between teachers, departments, and administrators – especially in cases where there were differences of opinion about the BCTF’s participation in job action – were visibly strained to greater and lesser degrees during the school year, and, without question, had an impact on FIS (and other) students’ learning environments during the year. Similarly, although I had initially hoped to observe FIS students in their for-credit, ‘regular’ classes (i.e., who had successfully gotten out of ESL), there were only a few international students in for-credit classes during the 2011-2012 school year. In addition to this, perhaps given the larger context of the BCTF strike or the intrusiveness of classroom observation, many teachers in these for-credit, ‘regular’ classes chose not to participate in the study when approached or did not respond to my requests to meet. Finally, given suggestions from administrative level participants that what I had observed in the Pateo District and at QHS with respect to FIS socialization would be *markedly different* from that of FIS students attending schools in rural districts in the province (e.g., IEP:1359-1362; QHSP2: 187-189), another potential limitation was the situatedness of the study in a large, urban school district, and further, at Quondam High School.

**10.6 Directions for future research**

Noting the “comparative dearth of K-12 ESL research in applied linguistics”, Talmy (2015, p. 365) has made the following case:

As public school enrollments decline across North America, the ESL population continues its exponential growth, just as ESL drop-out, push-out, and ‘disappearance’
rates (Gunderson, 2007) skyrocket as well. More and better investigations are needed that concern the growing complexities of ESL learning in superdiverse public school settings. Indeed, by tracing and identifying FIS – a new, unofficial, unfunded, and unaccounted for sub-category of ESL learner, and in turn the socialization processes that coalesce as it circulates across educational sites, practices, and narratives – the study reported in this dissertation has offered a modest contribution to better understanding the “complexities of ESL learning in superdiverse public school settings”. Especially given public education’s increasingly prominent recruitment of and reliance on FIS to offset decreasing domestic enrolment and austerely funded state schools, studies which expand the geographical scope of findings reported here – to rural districts in BC, to other provinces in Canada, and to educational jurisdictions in the United States – are both necessary and desirable.

But beyond the limitations of the current study, future questions for research related to the topic of fee-paying international students in K-12 public schools remain. While there are any number of conceivable variations on the constitution of the group of FIS learners, the contexts in which these groups are investigated, the educational stakeholders with whom they interact, or the methodological or analytic approaches used for inquiry, the dissertation reported here has suggested four promising and urgent areas for future research.

The first relates to investigations of FIS students’ living situations and pastoral arrangements, the contexts out of which these are negotiated (i.e., with family, agents, or school district programs), and how students fare within them. Given the experiences of students like Moon, Zeejay, and Wanda (though her story is not reported in this dissertation), a fuller understanding of how homestays or pastoral arrangements are accomplished, both by students, the families or relatives with whom they are staying, and the school districts in which they are studying, would fill a massive gap in understanding the experiences of FIS students (see, e.g., Burke, 2015). Not only would this focus align with the BC Ministry of Education’s (2013)
recognition that pastoral care is a priority where ‘quality assurance’ is concerned, it would offer yet another extracurricular context in which to understand FIS students’ language practices.

The second has to do, very simply, with understanding FIS as a more widespread phenomenon in North America. This means both comparative understandings of how, economically, socially, and institutionally, the phenomena and presence of FIS is socializing public education across Canada and (increasingly so in) the United States, and beyond (i.e. Australia, New Zealand, the United Kingdom). Most importantly, given the marginalized status of ESL learning, teaching, funding, in concert with increasing numbers of culturally and linguistically diverse students in public schools, there is a need to understand how FIS students are impacting ESL programs at policy, practice, and personal levels.

The third is related specifically to the variety of ways in which K-12 international education is framed, by both FIS students and the institutions recruiting them, in terms of ‘pathways’ to university. Student and teacher narratives, some of which are reported in the study, have described a wide range of challenges – academic, linguistic, and sociocultural – that are central to facilitating international students’ transitions to tertiary studies. This is a tremendously promising and capacious area for future inquiry, but not an optimistic one, since ELL research has been making the same appeal for some time. Regardless, and as long as research with this focus was done with and for FIS and ELL students alike, this type of research promotes engagement between content and language teachers in schools, between schools and universities, and crucially – between students and their teachers. In short, it is teeming with opportunities for collaboration and development in areas of policy and practice that would be of direct relevance to the internationalization goals of all stakeholders.

A final area has to do with educational initiatives that are closely linked to, or have resulted from, the increasing number of international students in K-12 public education sector. Sites, or potential foci of research could include, for example, Ministry of Education-approved
‘shadow education’ initiatives such as the Pateo District’s distributed learning course offerings (e.g., Chapter 8, subsection 8.2.5), actual schools operating in large urban centers which offer BC curriculum and course credits through co-instruction in English and students’ L1s (e.g., ZJI4:482-566; also see, e.g., Steffenhagen, 2012b, 2012c), or even BC’s offshore schools (e.g., BCMoE, 2015a; Steffenhagen, 2013d). In the case of offshore schools, not only do these provide job opportunities for newly certified BC teachers unable to find work in highly competitive public school market in BC, it is hoped that these schools will create a competitive advantage for the school districts that own, operate, or align with them in recruiting and preparing future international students: “The Chinese students benefit from a higher standard of English instruction from the…teachers, and in time,…the district will benefit from international students with a better grasp of English” (Carman, 2014, para. 07). Investigations of issues relevant to students, teachers and administrators, or institutions and policies in any of these areas would offer a fuller understanding of how FIS, and international education more generally, are contributing to larger changes in public education and the preparation of teachers for the public education system.

10.7 Concluding Questions

The general public is trapped in a social imaginary […] that legitimizes the application of market principles to the understanding and operation of public schooling. Work is needed to develop a new imaginary that places equity at the center of our understanding of public education.

(Fallon & Poole, 2013, p. 17).

Policy researchers have done much work to frame the impact of FIS on BC schools vis-à-vis the economic and educational disparities it creates among school districts. Specifically these researchers have argued that school districts’ competition for FIS tuition revenues, exhorted by a government induced ‘neoliberal’ policy environment and reliance on salable educational commodities in internationalized educational marketplaces, is resulting in increasingly inequitable funding situations for the provision of educational services in BC. Put simply,
smaller, less-urban districts are comparatively unable to recruit and retain, and thus benefit, from FIS tuition monies (e.g., Fallon & Poole, 2013; Poole & Fallon, forthcoming).

Especially given its material implications, this argument is an important one and for practical purposes needs to be taken seriously. The unmistakably “anorexic funding policies” (Kenway et al., 1994, p. 318) that have prompted the aggressive marketing of K-12 public education and concomitant recruitment of international students, have had significant effects not only ‘our’ children’s school experiences but also on what Fallon and Poole (2013; see quote above) refer to as “our understanding of public education”. But this line of thinking runs the risk of treating ‘our understanding of public education’, and the specific forms of linguistic and educational capital that it enjoys, as removed from and unaccountable to more global processes from which its privilege is relationally derived.

Reflecting back on fieldwork, interactions with students, teachers, administrators, and policy makers, now more than ever before it is difficult for me to imagine ‘public education’ in BC or Canada as an entity disconnected from larger global (linguistic, educational, or even economic) processes. Rather than treat it, as many researchers in the fields of applied linguistics and education do, as an uncontested entity that has been corrupted either by neoliberalism as a form of Foucauldian governmentality or neoliberalism as a hegemonic ideology (or worse, both at the same time) – Gerrard (2015, p. 1) has suggested that

it is important to avoid mobilising a memory of public educational pasts that do not account for their failings and inequalities. Turning to a historical engagement with the emergence of neoliberal politics, [it is important to explore] how challenges and contestations surrounding ‘the public’ from multiple standpoints converged in the rise of neoliberalism. Recognition of these convergences and contestations […] assists to provide a more nuanced account of the relationship between neoliberal reform and the
welfare state, and thus of the complex task of imagining, claiming and working towards a
just and equitable public education.

It is important to locate public education, like neoliberalization, or the category of FIS, as a
material and discursive formation in the midst of ongoing socio-spatial change. In this respect,
the study has incited me to reflect on how K-12 ‘public’ education in BC – now socialized to
include and desire, as well as to accommodate ‘overseas’ demands for, FIS presence in K-12
public schools – might also be in the midst of ongoing socio-spatial change. What is a ‘just and
equitable public education’ in times of transnational linguistic, cultural, and economic capitals
and superdiversity? And how might we (equitably) manage “the complex task of imagining,
claiming, and working towards” such a form of public education?
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English Placement test.

1. Please WRITE YOUR STUDENT NUMBER AT THE LEFT HAND CORNER OF EACH PAGE YOU WILL BE WRITING ON- NOT YOUR NAME.

2. Please read the two selections- ‘The Conversation of Birds’ by Jean Yoon and ‘But Where is the Heart’ by Kenneth Bagnell.

3. Answer the following essay question-

"Using two specific examples from each story, show how a person can be torn between two different places."

Please answer this in essay form. It should be roughly two to three pages long, double spaced. You may not use dictionaries.

You have one hour to write the test. Essays will be collected at 9:30
The image displaying Kenneth Bagnell’s short story “But Where is the Heart” has been removed due to copyright restrictions. It was an image that displayed the full text of Bagnell’s short story, and appeared in Appendix A to document its use in the English Department’s ELL Exit Test.

Original source:

The image displaying Jean Yoon’s short story “The Conversation of Birds” has been removed due to copyright restrictions. It was an image that displayed the full text of Yoon’s short story, and appeared in Appendix A to document its use in the English Department’s ELL Exit Test.

Original source:

APPENDIX B
Detailed Summary of Focal FIS Student Data

The table below presents a summary of focal participant data sources. The summary includes the number, date, and lengths of formal research interviews; the date and number of written words received as email reports; the source (i.e., class) and number of pages of student work submitted; and the number of classroom observations/visits and instances where a focal participant wore a T-microphone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Formal Interviews (Length in mins)</th>
<th>Email reports (# words)</th>
<th>Documents from Classes (# p)</th>
<th>Class obs. &amp; Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellen</td>
<td>20 Oct 2011 (72) 08 Feb 2012 (58) 16 May 2012 (63) 19 June 2012 (35)</td>
<td>08 Nov 2011 (123) 02 Dec 2011 (261) 28 Jan 2012 (186) 30 Mar 2012 (377) 30 April 2012 (184)</td>
<td>None submitted</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanda</td>
<td>24 Oct 2011 (67) 13 Feb 2012 (82) 01 Jun 2012 (80) 10 Jul 2012 (59)</td>
<td>13 Nov 2011 (298) 18 Dec 2011 (517) 31 Jan 2012 (426) 29 Mar 2012 (439) 30 Apr 2012 (435)</td>
<td>ELC (10)</td>
<td>ELL Writing Nov 2011(x5); Dec 2011(x1); Jan 2012(x3) [x1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane</td>
<td>28 Oct 2011 (84) 28 Feb 2012 (71) 28 May 2012 (69) 18 June 2012 (63)</td>
<td>21 Nov 2011 (219) 05 Dec 2011 (140) 30 Jan 2012 (234) 22 Mar 2012 (266) 15 May 2012 (198)</td>
<td>English 8 (2) Socials 8 (5)</td>
<td>ELC Nov 2011 (x2); Dec 2011 (x1); Jan 2012 (x1); Feb 2012 (x1); Mar 2012 (x1); Apr 2012(x1); May 2012 (x1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeejay</td>
<td>26 Oct 2011 (67) 09 Feb 2012 (60) 24 May 2012 (51) 28 June 2012 (70)</td>
<td>16 Nov 2011 (380) 05 Dec 2011 (626) 27 Jan 2012 (370) 28 Mar 2012 (441) 04 May 2013 (173)</td>
<td>ELL Writing (13)</td>
<td>ELL Writing Nov 2011 (x5) [x1]; Dec 2011 (x1); Jan 2012(x3); Feb 2012 (x4) [x2]; Mar 2012 (x3) [x1]; Apr 2012 (x4); May 2012 (x4) [x1]; Jun 2012(x2) [x1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bessie</td>
<td>17 Oct 2011 (54) 20 Feb 2012 (69) 30 May 2012 (73)</td>
<td>08 Nov 2011 (35) 19 Jan 2012 (126) 23 Mar 2012 (135) 25 June 2012 (37; in lieu of interview)</td>
<td>ELL Writing (2)</td>
<td>ELL Writing Nov 2011 (x5); Dec 2011 (x1); Jan 2012 (x3); Feb 2012 (x4) [x1]; Mar 2012 (x3) [x1]; Apr 2012 (x4);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Formal Interviews (Length in mins)</td>
<td>Email reports (# words)</td>
<td>Documents from Classes (# p)</td>
<td>Class obs. &amp; Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bessie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May 2012 (x4);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2012 (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ELL Socials</td>
<td>Nov 2011 (x2);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec 2011 (x1);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 2012 (x5);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 2012 (x4);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 2012 (x3) [x1];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr 2012 (x5) [x1];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May 2012 (x5);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2012 (x1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>18 Oct 2011 (55)</td>
<td>09 Nov 2011 (40)</td>
<td>ELL English (1)</td>
<td>ELL Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 Feb 2012 (69)</td>
<td>13 Jan 2012 (176)</td>
<td>ELL Science (1)</td>
<td>Nov 2011 (x5);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 May 2012 (73)</td>
<td>30 Jan 2012 (130)</td>
<td>ELL Socials (1)</td>
<td>Dec 2011 (x1);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 June 2012 (61)</td>
<td>12 April 2012 (168)</td>
<td>ELL Writing (4)</td>
<td>Jan 2012 (x3);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18 April 2012 (219)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 2012 (x4);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ELL Socials</td>
<td>Mar 2012 (x3);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr 2012 (x4) [x1];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May 2012 (x4);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2012 (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ELL Socials</td>
<td>Nov 2011 (x2);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec 2011 (x1);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 2012 (x5) [x1];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 2012 (x4) [x1];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 2012 (x3) [x2];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr 2012 (x4) [x1];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May 2012 (x4) [x3];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2012 (x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ELL Socials</td>
<td>Nov 2011 (x2);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec 2011 (x1);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 2012 (x5) [x1];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 2012 (x4) [x1];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 2012 (x3) [x1];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr 2012 (x5) [x2];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May 2012 (x5) [x1];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2012 (x1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WoW</td>
<td>19 Oct 2011 (55)</td>
<td>07 Nov 2011 (59)</td>
<td>ELL English (6)</td>
<td>ELL Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 Feb 2012 (57)</td>
<td>04 Jan 2012 (228)</td>
<td>ELL Writing (1)</td>
<td>Nov 2011 (x5);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 May 2012 (71)</td>
<td>27 Jan 2012 (136)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec 2011 (x1);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 June 2012 (58)</td>
<td>23 March 2012 (205)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan 2012 (x3) [x1];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 April 2012 (163)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 2012 (x4) [x1];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 2012 (x3) [x2];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apr 2012 (x4) [x1];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May 2012 (x4) [x3];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2012 (x2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
Questionnaire for Non-focal Student Participants

Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions:

1) Name: ______________________________

2) Age: ____

3) Grade: ____

4) I was born in _______________(country)

5) I am a citizen or permanent resident in Canada ( Y / N )

6) In addition to English, I speak __________________________ (list other languages)

7) I have gone to school in Canada for ______ months / year(s)

8) I have been in ESL for _______ months / year(s)

9) I live with my parents ( Y / N )

10) I live with a guardian / homestay family ( Y / N )

11) I am an international student ( Y / N )

12) I have a parent who works or studies in Canada ( Y / N )

13) I am willing to be interviewed for this study ( Y / N )

⇒ If yes, please write your email address (clearly!) ______________________________
APPENDIX D
International Student Policy (BCMoE, 2001b)

Policy Site: International Students - B.C. Ministry of Education - Province of B.C.

Search the Ministry of Education site:

Search Advanced Search Help with searching

B.C. Home Education Policy International Students

Ministry Policy Site

Policy Document: International Students

Replaces Policy Circular 97-06, issued on August 28, 1997. This policy is under review.

This page sets forth the Ministry policy entitled "International Students".

POLICY STATEMENT

International students are not eligible for a provincially funded education, as they do not meet residency requirements. This policy outlines the limited exceptions to this rule for international students who wish to attend public school.

RATIONALE

The Ministry of Education provides resident children, as defined below, a free education. Due to a variety of circumstances, some international students could be regarded as "ordinarily resident." This policy provides Boards of Education with detailed information as to what circumstances would qualify an international student for a provincially funded education.

LEGISLATION/ REGULATIONS

See the School Act, Section 82 (1) and (2).

Additional sources of authority include: the Family Relations Act, the Infants Act, the Divorce Act and the Child, Family and Community Service Act.

POLICY
The purpose of this policy is to provide Boards of Education with guidance on:
1. provincial funding of international students;
2. international students who do not have student authorizations and who wish to enroll in a school district; and
3. protecting the welfare of international students who are living without parental, guardian or other adult supervision.

PROCEDURES

If a student is determined to be an international student, as per Section 82 of the School Act and the sections contained in this policy, Boards of Education must apply the following rules:

International Students with Student Authorizations

1. Generally, all international students who have Citizenship and Immigration Canada (CIC) student authorizations should be identified as international students on Form 1701. Provincial education funding will not be available for these students. If a Board of Education has claimed these students for funding purposes, the board must reimburse the Ministry. The board may choose to charge tuition fees to these students.

2. Exceptions are listed below. Provincial education funding will be provided for these students, even though they have student authorizations:

An International student who:

- is a refugee claimant with an acknowledgement letter from the Immigration and Refugee Board;
- is a Convention Refugee and can present a letter from CIC confirming this;
- has been admitted to Canada under a letter of permission or permit issued by CIC;
- is in the custody of the Minister for Children and Family Development; or
- is attending school on a reciprocal and equal exchange. This exchange must be one in/one out of the same district for the same length of time, with the exchange completed within two years.

An International student whose guardian(s):

- has been admitted to Canada for permanent residence (i.e., landed immigrant) or has applied for permanent residence from within Canada and
can substantiate this with documentation from CIC;
• has been admitted for temporary residence in Canada for a term of one year or more and holds a student authorization or employment authorization from CIC;
• has been admitted under a teacher exchange program;
• is carrying out official duties as a diplomatic or consular official and is able to substantiate this with a Foreign Representative Acceptance Counterfoil in the guardian’s passport; or
• is a person who is a resident of the province on a cyclical (continuing part-time) basis, as determined through consultation with the Ministry of Education and with CIC.

International Students without Student Authorizations

1. International students without student authorizations who wish to enroll, or are enrolled, with a Board of Education should be referred to Citizenship and Immigration Canada (Telephone: 1-888-242-2100 or Web site: CIC Canada).

2. These students are not eligible for provincial funding. If a Board of Education has claimed these students for funding purposes, the board must reimburse the Ministry.

International Students Living without Parental, Guardian or Adult Supervision

1. Schools boards need to be vigilant with regards to the welfare of international students, especially in the case where students are living without parental, guardian or adult care and supervision.

2. Section 14 of the Child, Family and Community Service Act, requires every person to report promptly to a child protection social worker when they have reason to believe a child needs protection as set out in the following circumstances: a child that has been, or is likely to be physically harmed, sexually exploited or abused, neglected, emotionally harmed, or deprived of necessary health care or medical treatment. Section 13 of the Act enumerates all instances when protection is required.

3. For further information visit BC Handbook For Action on Child Abuse and Neglect.
CUSTODIANSHIP DECLARATION - CUSTODIAN FOR MINORS STUDYING IN CANADA

STUDENT INFORMATION

- Student's full name
- Citizenship
- Date of birth
- Sex
  - Male
  - Female

Name and address of school in Canada

Address where student will reside in Canada

PARENTS/GUARDIANS INFORMATION (Preferably from both parents/guardians)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Guardian 1</th>
<th>Parent/Guardian 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CUSTODIAN INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custodian</th>
<th>Status in Canada</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canadian citizen or permanent resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The application of the official seal below confirms that the notary public has received evidence that the custodian is a Canadian citizen or a permanent resident, is over 19 years of age, and currently resides at the home address stated above.

I, [name of custodian], hereby solemnly declare that I will undertake the full custodianship for the said student, [name of student], during his/her stay in Canada, while under the age of majority in the province in which he/she resides. As a custodian, I have made the necessary arrangements for the care and support of the said student in place of the parents as appropriate by signing this custodianship agreement. I certify that I reside within a reasonable distance of the student's intended residence and school and will be able to fulfill my obligations as a custodian in the event of an emergency.

[Signature of custodian]

DATE

Oworn before me at: [city], in the province of [province/territory], [country] on [day], [month], [year] by [signature of notary], [official seal of notary public].

[Signature of notary]

IMM 5646 (10-2010) E

(AUSSI DISPONIBLE EN FRANÇAIS : IMM 5646 F)

ALSO AVAILABLE ON CIC WEB SITE AT : http://www.cic.gc.ca
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CUSTODIANSHIP DECLARATION - PARENTS/GUARDIANS FOR MINORS STUDYING IN CANADA

STUDENT INFORMATION

Student's full name
Citizenship
Date of birth
Sex
Male
Female

Name and address of school in Canada

Address where student will reside in Canada

PARENTS/GUARDIANS INFORMATION (Preferably from both parents/guardians)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent/Guardian 1</th>
<th>Parent/Guardian 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full name</td>
<td>Full name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of birth</td>
<td>Date of birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home address</td>
<td>Home address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number</td>
<td>Telephone number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CUSTODIAN INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full name</th>
<th>Status in Canada</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canadian citizen</td>
<td>Y M D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current residential address

Telephone number

My/Our child will reside: ☐ with the appointed custodian, ☐ in the school dormitory, or ☐ with another person: ____________________________ (please provide name and indicate relationship).

(We, ____________ and ____________, names of parent/guardians), the parent/guardians of the said student, ____________, (name of student), hereby grant full custodianship to ____________, (name of custodian), during the student's stay in Canada, while he/she is under the age of majority in the province in which he/she resides. I/We have made the necessary arrangements for the care and support of the said student such that the custodian should act in the place of parents. By signing the custodian agreement, I/We affirm that I/We have satisfied the above-mentioned custodian resides within a reasonable distance of my/our child's intended residence and school and will be able to fulfill his/her obligations as a custodian in the event of an emergency.

Signature of parent/guardian (1)

Oath of residenc(2)

Signature of parent/guardian (2)

Sworn before me: ____________, (city), in the province of ____________, (province/territory), ____________, (country), if applicable,

This ____________, day of ____________, (month), ____________, (year).

Signature of notary

OFFICIAL SEAL OF NOTARY PUBLIC

(AUSSI DISPONIBLE EN FRANÇAIS - IMM 5646 F)

ALSO AVAILABLE ON DICO WEBSITE AT: http://www.dico.gc.ca

IMM 5646 (10-2010) E

377
APPENDIX F
Moon: ELL English Essay

The Tuck’s family in the book is quite different from other families. They drank some special spring accidentally and then became immortal. This accident makes them have an unusual life. As the description from the book, they can’t be called a normal family.

They can’t live in one place for so long, or people will recognize something. They can’t do some high-paid formal jobs, the sons only do the basic physical works to get enough money for minimum supplies. When they recognized something mystically was changing their bodies, they knew that they would have a new life. They organized a new idea of the world because they’ve seen birth and death too much. They think everything has a wheel, people just keep going with the same thing in the same way. Their friends began getting away from them, Jesse’s older brother lost her wife and children, and then they became alone. They won’t have a normal life as the other families.

On the other hand, they have a lot of similarity to the other families. Just compared with Winnie’s family, the Tucks have full family members, and they all love each other. They care everything happens in their family and devote themselves to help the others. Like Winnie’s parents and...
emotion as the other normal family. They live in harmony and that's what the normal families want.

The abnormal things just happen in a normal way. The Tuck's have harmonious relation with each other while they are everlasting. So, as I said, the Tuck's is kind of a normal family, but the abnormal feature just exist as it always there. \checkmark  great ending

Very well written Moon. You still have some problems with sentence structure and word choice, but your organization/understanding are good

\[ \frac{9}{10} \]
APPENDIX G
Zeejay: “Life” Essay

The God is fair. He made the person, but everyone just can own their life for one time. So everybody understand that life is valuable. What’s a significant life? Maybe different people have different points of views. In my opinion, the famous Russian writer who was called Nikolay Ostrovsky, the author of the book “The making of a hero”, had given a specific definition of life: “Man’s dearest possession is life. It is given to him but once, and he must live it so as to feel no torturing regrets for wasted years, never know the burning shame of a mean and pretty past.” How can we do as like as what he said? I think we can divide the life into four most important parts: Career, family, friends, belief. However, as long as we can manage the relationship among these four stuff, we will have a good life probably.

Firstly, what’s belief? Many people will think about “religion” in a second. But belief is not only relates with religion, it consists in all life aspects. For example, everybody’s moral belief, traditional belief affect our life mode and behavior. So everybody need beliefs to support their manner, decision, etc. Otherwise, you just like a man who lose his soul and live in negative attitude. However, if you want to own a successful
Most of the people want to have a job and that make a fortune. Then his or her family can live in a comfortable place, enjoy their leisure. But unfortunately, a small proportion of the people can get to the climax of their trade. I figure that the reason why they get succeed depend on two important factors: industry and chance. Lots of people know that how important to work-hard and hold the chance. But just a few of people are able to put what they think into their action. At the same time, family and friend are both a essential support when you confront the difficulty that seem impossible to overcome. They can provide courage and hope for you when you get into trouble.

Furthermore, if a person live in Earth, but no-one shares the happiness and sadness with him. He is such a poor guy. And when he fall into a dilemma, none of people come to give him a hand. He has to manage all the problem by his own. What a miserable guy he is. So friends also a vital part of our life.
Finally, family is as important as every aspect of our life. No matter how unfortunately and bad when we work inside, family is a safe harbour to shelter forever. The love from family it must be most pure and nature. Even though every person is possible to hurt you and strikes you, your parents are always stay with you. So no matter what happen, you home and family are your powerful backing.

I still distinctly remember a famous person once said that: life is incredible!" I fully accept that. Despite we cannot know what happen in next second, we are able to try our best to cherish the time which we own today. Forget yesterday, concentrate today.
# APPENDIX H

**Zeejay: “Chinese International Student in Canada” Essay**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mind Map/Web</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Introduction (with a hook)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Body</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Paragraph transitions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Closure to essay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Coherence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Creativity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Neatness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Editing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>/40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chinese International Student in Canada.

As a new Chinese international student in Canada, I deem I have the responsibility to let more and more people pay attention to later international students, no matter where they come from. I have already lived in Vancouver for 4 months. Though I am not accustomed to the Canadian life up to now, I learned a lot and received some help from the native people. Their amiable and helpful people overcome plenty of problems. At the same time, new circumstances and unfamiliar culture still baffled and confused us constantly.

I think four things that influence us most are money, language, homesickness, and independence.

Many foreign people esteem that the person who is able to go abroad for studying is rich probably. In fact, rich people are only a minority. A big proportion of international students have to tighten their belt. Otherwise, their parents cannot afford the high fee, so as to send them back to China. This is a realistic issue, almost every ordinary international student must confront it and figure it out. For instance, as an international student, if we need to take the online course, we have to pay $450. $450 dollars for a common Chinese family is
a big figure. One of my friends in China, he is both a
international student in Canada. He's going to university originally. Unfortunately
his family didn't have enough money to support his university tuition. So he
suspended his original plan and looked for job here to there. Hopefully before
next year, he is able to accumulate all the tuition...

Besides money, language is a big challenge for all the new
students, no matter you are a new immigrant or an international student
as long as your first language is not English. We should work hard and
get out of ESL as soon as possible. But the expectation is quite different
from the reality. We always overrate our faculty so that as if all the things
in this world disappointed us all the time. Therefore, we have to be strong
and estimate our ability exactly.

For

In a vast majority of international students, who are first time to leave
their parents for such long time. Homesickness is a severe problem
that afflicted them since they came to Vancouver solely. An inter
national student who has not came back home for 3 years, missed his
parents and friends very much. Along with the technique of communication
advanced gradually, now by way of Skype he can see his parents and friends on the Internet easily. Furthermore, nobody would take care of him except himself. So be independent is another significant skills that we have to learn.

I always ask myself a question: what is independent? Up to now, I don't have a specific answer that can convince myself, maybe it's not a simple question that we could solve in a short time. But I still insist that independence means that work out the problem on his own, takes care oneself on his own, and ponders the problem on his own. There are the fundamental demands to the independence.

I know some guys are living in the home-stay. No matter how cold the morning is, they have to get up early to make their breakfast on their own. And they conquer their laziness and tiredness with fortitude. I think they deserve to be learned by our this kind people who always live in comfort.

The above content that I written are according to some my experience. I hope that every international students own a good future by his hard working and strong convictions.
APPENDIX I

Hi, Ryan

As a Chinese international student, I think this kind of ESL classes are not effective to our these Chinese students. Further more, there is a vast majority of students who studies at [QHS] ESL class are Chinese. So I anticipate that our school could transform something for us.

Firstly, the ESL classes are too easy for us, so as to some pupils are bored and lose the passion to study. Most of the students in grade 10 deem that they just learn a little from the ESL English and ESL writing. Even I think that the ESL classes are wasting our time. So we yearn to get out of the ESL as soon as possible. I don't know whether Mr. [Veep] understand our situation or not.

Secondly, due to the quantities of ESL students are much less than other schools. So no matter the students who are level one or level four, study in the same lesson together. The teachers are hard to teach the students in different levels, meanwhile, the students are feel uncomfortable about that. Unluckily, this situation cannot be change in a short time.

Thirdly, except that regular classes can get the credit but ESL classes are not. We have not sufficient opportunities to talk in English in ESL classes. For instance, in our social study class, all my classmates are Chinese except three students. However, the students who sit around me all are Chinese. Maybe I could talk with my Chinese friends in English, but actually it's so weird. We cannot do that from morning to evening. Sometimes we can't help in Chinese again. But when we are in regular class, more students that speak English. We have a good chance to practice spoken English.

On the other hand, I think something that is a little unfair. For example, the knowledge in ESL science which we learnt last term are as difficult as the regular class, but we cannot get the credit unless we study at regular class. However, now if we want to get out of the ESL science class, we have to pass not only one text. At the end of last term, our science teacher told me that if we want to exit ESL we have to learn some chapters that regular class which learn last whole term by ourself (maybe that sentence's grammar is wrong). And we will have a text at the beginning of this term. I know some guys they are also first year's ESL students as same as me. But they can take the regular science 10 course directly in first term. No text and no questions. Even though we know that is unfair, what can we do?

PS. If you have free time, you can send me the new theme as soon as you detect my Email

Thank you

[Zeejay]
APPENDIX J
Haiku Worksheet (ELL Writing)

Name: __________________________

A syllable is a part of a word pronounced as a unit. It is usually made up of a vowel alone or a vowel with one or more consonants. The word "syllable" has three syllables: syl-la-ble.

"Haiku" is a traditional form of Japanese poetry. Haiku poems consist of 3 lines. Here is an example of Haiku poetry.

Green and speckled legs,  
Hep on logs and lily pads  
Splash in cool water.

How many syllables are in the each line of the example? Use a / to separate each syllable.

Green and speckled legs,  syllables: ______
Hep on logs and lily pads  syllables: ______
Splash in cool water.   syllables: ______

What animal do you think the Haiku is describing?
________________________

The first and last lines of a Haiku have 5 syllables and the middle line has 7 syllables. Here is a Haiku to help you remember.

I am first with five  
Then seven in the middle --  
Five again to end.
APPENDIX K
Underlife in ELL Writing: “Fuck all” [ZJtMrW09F12 (05:40-08:56)]

01 MrW: kay great [Thin Man] where’s your poem
02 (.)
03 T-M: (I leave it home)
04 MrW: ((to T-M)) no good no good! go outside we need to talk=
05 Who: |(untranslated Mandarin)
06 MrW: = ((to ?)) >=>(good job)< =
07 ZJ: |[(T-M) is the stupid guy=
08 MrW: =((to ?)) great (.) >can you g|ive me your homework please<
09 ZJ: |he’s a stupid guy
10 MrW: ((to ?)) ok[ay
11 ZJ: |he’s a fool
12 Who: (he’s a fool)
13 (2.0)
14 ?FS: what
15 MrW: okay so grab your books (1.0) for silent reading I’ll be right back
16 (1.0)
17 ZJ: hhh.
18 MrW: I think it’s haiku day
19 Who: haiku[u wha-
20 myZ: ]|waah:::
21 MrW: ye{s:::
22 Who: |[wha- what is that
23 ZJ: what is [haiku day
24 MrW: |[haiku day::
25 iTelo: |[is it - -)
26 myZ: |[what is hark ‘a (untranslated Mandarin)
27 MrW: it’s not hark ‘a we’re not going hark ‘a ing
28 Who: hək ‘a
29 (.4)
30 MrW: alright the haiku
31 (.)
32 myZ: ((to MrW)) (oh what is it[ mean?)
33 ZJ: |[o:h jeezus:
34 MrW: |[(to myZ)) okay I’ll tell you the name is
35 Who: |(untranslated Mandarin)
36 MrW: ((to myZ)) it’s Ja[panese
37 ZJ: |[(to Who)) I hate it
38 ?MS: |(makes noise))
39 ZJ: Why why you are stupid
40 (2.2)
41 Who: I always stupid I have been stupid but.
42 (.)
43 ZJ: now you ar[e-
44 Who: |[I ha- I have [been stu-
45 ZJ: |[much more stupid
46 Who: I have been stupid for just years but (.) until someday I- I realize that
47 (.) there nothing at all (.) I get a fuck all
48 ZJ: you [fuck off (.) why you fuck off
49 Who: |[if- if-
50 ()
51 ZJ: you [fuck off to where
52 Who: |[if- if- I
53 ZJ: where you fuck off
54 Who: like let me go alon- go alone (the) without any help- with(out) any
55 helping and- I just hav- I just got the fuck all
56 ()
57 Who: I cannot do some[thing to make uh- making me alive you know

389
myZ: ((to ?)) (untranslated Mandarin)

ZJ: I don’t know (.I- I just mean fuck off is mean go away

Who: fu- I mean fuck all

ZJ: fuck off yeah

Who: fuck all. fuck all. it means nothing at all ((chuckles))

ZJ: [nothing at all]

Who: [I got a [I got fuck all (it) means I got nothing at all (.I but it-

that’s a- but (the) fuck all is a (.I) (curse) way to desc[ribe (that)

ZJ: ((to WoW)) do you know what (.I mean(ing/it) fuck off

WoW: [go away

Who: you [shouldn’t-

Who: [fuck-

WoW: you shouldn’t saying that in front of the recording things

ZJ: it’s okay

?MS: (what’s up)

WoW: ((attempting Mandarin)) (-- -- --)

Who: he’s asking you the[(n-]

WoW: [((Mandarin)) (guan gar)

Who: ((to self)) (°guan°)

(1.0)

Who: gu'n gar

ZJ: [goj gar

WoW: yeah

Who: gu'n gar

(1.4)

ZJ: no no I- I don’t know- I do not mean in Korean I [jus-

WoW: [it’s- >it’s n- not

Korean< it’s Chinese

ZJ: no. you can’t- (.I what it mean fuck off in English

Sumyar:(untranslated Cantonese)=

WoW: =um:

Sumyar: ((to ZJ)) (translate in English)

WoW: saying somebody [to:

Sumyar: [untranslated Cantonese)

ZJ: go a[way

100 WoW: [go away=

101 ZJ: =yeah=

102 WoW: =but it’s a strong language (.I like I mean swear

103 (1.0)

104 ZJ: swear

105 (.I

106 WoW: yeah swear

107 ZJ: swear I [swear to go[d

108 WoW: [fuck- [fuck is swear (.I bad word

109 ZJ: I swear to god

110 (0.6)

111 WoW: what

112 ZJ: I s:wear to god this swe[ar

113 WoW: [I mean not that swear swear mean bad word

114 ZJ: okay. I got it.

(1.0)
ZJ: ((to Who)) fuck off is not mean not get all
Who: ((to WoW)) hey do you know fuck. all. all. fuck all
WoW: fuck all
Who: yeah fuck all all all fuck all
WoW: there’s no fuck all
Who: y- there ((referring to electronic dictionary)) has fuck all fuck all
means nothing at all yes
ZJ: stupid (.) what (do) you mean
Who: (let me) see ((taking electronic dictionary))
(2.2)
ZJ: see what?
Who: t- fuck all 看，丝毫没有 (chuckles)
Kan, zu hao mei yu look, not at all (chuckles)
ZJ: oh[:s my gAWd
Who: [i- i- i- would like
Who: I would like to translate it to this w- this sentence 媽的絲毫沒有.
ma te zu hao mei[yu ain’t done fuck all
ZJ: [t-
Who: no Chinglish n- see 英汉(高级词典
Engl[ish-Chinese Advanced Dictionary
ZJ: [I hate his style
Who: fuck (all?) 這句例句你看
[che chu li chu ni kan
[look at this example sentence
ZJ: [I hate his stupid style
Who: you (ain’t) done fuck all today 你他媽的絲毫沒有幹啥
ni ta ma te zu hao mei yuk kan sha (()laughs)
you ain’t done fuck all today (()laughs)
ZJ: ((breathy laughing))
Who: ((laughing)) these instructions make fuck all sense to me
ZJ: ((breathy laugh))
Who: (it) make fuck all sense that that- how use this is use(d) for
Who: you can use it like that?
Who: you could use it
APPENDIX L
Examples of Teacher Created Handouts (Ms. Jay)

Exploration Canada-
Chapter 19 Part B

Vocabulary p.181-186

1. interior
2. denied
3. invisible
4. barrier
5. bothered
6. challenged
7. methods
8. rely
9. loyal
10. consulted
11. solution
12. existence
13. recognize
14. permanent
15. investors
16. competed
17. advisors
18. control
19. considered
20. union
21. eager
22. affairs
23. persuaded
24. enthusiasm
25. influence
26. quarrels
27. obtain
28. stable
29. tithes
30. privileges
Across
1. George III had to find new _____ and more officials to govern the territory won through war.
5. Involvement with the government would make them _____ to their new king.
7. These men influenced George III and his _____ in the plans for Quebec.
9. _____ French support, Carleton allied himself with the seigneurs and priests.
11. The seigneurs believed that they would keep their lands and _____ if they allied themselves with the government.
14. All of these things had to be _____ in planning how to govern the new colony.
17. They would be willing to support his decisions when they saw that they were _____ on local affairs.
19. These leaders of the French community wanted a _____ society in which people knew their place, and did not want to change the order of things.
20. Many settlers in the Thirteen Colonies were angry to learn that they were forbidden to enter the _____
22. They felt it denied all they had fought for in the long war against the French.
23. When the colonists looked more closely at the fine print of the proclamation, they saw two things that _____ them very much.

Down
2. This was an important _____ to the problem that faced George III: how to get the local people, who were French Catholic, to obey an English Protestant king.
3. The rights of the Catholic Church were not to be _____
4. The Proclamation Line stood as an invisible _____ to the restless people who wanted to cross the Appalachians and seek riches on the other side.
6. British _____ looked to Quebec for profits from banking, insurance and trade.
8. It was finally decided that Quebec would be ruled by a _____ of several English merchants, the large landowners still living on their seigneuries, and the Quebec Catholic Church.
10. The habitants had to pay the required taxes and _____ to the Roman Catholic Church.
12. In turn, the people of Quebec would have to _____ that the new government was permanent.
13. The French population must be persuaded to support the government with _____ and loyalty.
15. Carleton feared that the Thirteen Colonies to the south might influence the French to join them in their _____ with the London officials.
16. George III and his advisors believed that it was important to _____ the local people in Quebec for government service.
18. George III decided that cooperation between French and the English was the only reasonable way for peaceful, orderly _____
21. The British merchants, for bigger profits, would find their allies in the landowners.
**Exploration Canada-Chapter 18 Part C Vocab**

Use your list words to fill in the blank with the corresponding meanings.

1. skirmishes  
   - Fight between small bodies of soldiers

2. constant  
   - Continuing without a pause

3. fate  
   - Something that unavoidably befalls a person.

4. ruined  
   - Destroyed

5. remarkable  
   - Extraordinary. Worthy of notice or attention

6. militia  
   - Part-time soldiers. Soldiers called into action in time of need

7. duty  
   - something that one is expected or required to do by right or wrong
   - moral or legal obligation

8. rheumatism  
   - A pain or disorder characterized by stiffness or pain

9. reality  
   - The state of being real. Opposite of imaginary

10. exile  
    - Expulsion from one's native land

11. wilderness  
    - Land that has not been occupied. The forests

12. overshadow  
    - To be more important by comparison

13. hardship  
    - To face difficulty and challenges

14. suffer  
    - To feel pain or distress

15. glance  
    - To look at quickly
APPENDIX M
Famous Canadian Biography Project (Instructions)

Name: ___________________________ Block: ___________ Date: ___________________________

ESLSS – Famous Canadians Biography Project

You and your partner are to present to the class a biography based on one of the following famous Canadians:

Celine Dion
Emily Carr
Kurt Browning
Wayne Gretzky
James Naismith
Jim Carrey
Michael J. Fox
Lucy Maud Montgomery
Alex Trebek
Norman Bethune
Bryan Adams
Paul Anka
Anne Murray
Shania Twain
Farley Mowat

You will need to research the famous Canadian in the library and at home. You must provide a works cited section with all the books and websites you used to research your biography. If you can, you should not only tell about the person’s life, but also what impact that person had both in Canada and around the world. How well known is this person outside of Canada? When you have finished researching your famous Canadian, you will then need to start writing about him/her. Lastly, you will create 4-6 pages on Microsoft Word that will be used as visual aids for your presentation.

Length of the presentation: approximately 4-5 minutes long

Marks:  
10 marks for speaking/reading fluency
5 marks for the visuals on Microsoft Word
5 marks for self and peer evaluation

20 marks total

Presentation Date: ___________________________
BRYAN ADAMS

Bryan Adams is the most famous Canadian singer in the world. He is also a guitarist, bassist, producer, actor and photographer. Adam won many awards and nominations. 20 Juno Awards among 56 nominations, 15 Grammy Award nominations including a win for Best Song Written Specifically for a Motion Picture or Television in 1992. He also won MTV, ASCAP, and American Music Awards.

Adams’ self-titled debut album was released in February 1980. It was composed and wrote the words with Jim Valance. Every songs except “Remember”, his first debut song and “Wasting Time”, were recorded in Manta Studios in Toronto.
His second album, "You Want it You Got it", was recorded in New York City in two weeks and it marked Adams' first album co-produced by Bob Clearmountain. It was released in 1981 and contained the FM radio hit "Lonely Nights" but it wasn't that popular.

His third album was a great hit. "Straight from the Heart" was the most successful song, reaching number ten on the Billboard Hot 100. Another single, "Cuts Like a Knife" charted at number 15. "This Time" also placed on the Hot 100. Music videos were released for four of the singles from the album. "Cuts Like a Knife" arguably became Adams' most recognizable and popular song from the album.
His bestselling album "Reckless" peaked at number one on the Billboard 200. It was released in November 1984 and featured the singles. "Run to You", "Summer of '69", "Heaven", "One Night Love Affair", "Somebody", and "It's Only Love", a duet with Tina Turner. Music videos of these songs all chatted on the Billboard Hot 100. "It's Only Love" was nominated for a Grammy Award for Best Rock Vocal Performance by a Duo or Group. In 1986, the song won an MTV award for Best Stage Performance. After the release of the album, Adams was nominated for Best Male Rock Performance. The album is Adams' best-selling album in the United States and was certified five times platinum.

His next album, Waking up the Neighbours is release in 1991. One of its song I Do It For You became theme of movie Robin Hood and became first on the chart in the whole world. Adams won the Grammy awards by that song.
In November 1993 Adams released a compilation album entitled So Far So Good, that again topped the Charts in numerous countries such as the UK, Germany and Australia. It included a brand new song called "Please Forgive Me", that became another number 1 single in Australia as well as reaching the Top 3 in the US, the UK and Germany. He released many other famous albums like MTV unplugged. On a day like today and Sprit: Stallion of Cimmaron.
Other activities

He made his own foundation, "The Bryan Adams Foundation", which aims to advance education and learning opportunities for children and young people worldwide. The foundation is mostly funded by his photographic activities. He participated in concert to help raise money with the other famous singers such as Sting, U2. Adams helped commemorate the fall of the Berlin Wall when, in 1990, and he joined many other guests.

During his tours of 1992-1994, Adams successfully campaigned for the Southern Ocean Whale Sanctuary with Greenpeace Chairman David McTaggart. The two of them distributed over 500,000 postcards at concerts around the world encouraging people to write to politicians of countries blocking the vote, encouraging them to vote yes for the creation of the sanctuary at the meetings of the International Whaling Commission. IWC officially created the sanctuary on 26 May 1994.

He also supports the animal rights group PETA by shooting photos for them and writing letters. He asked to the CEO of KFC restaurants in Canada in November 2007. He asked them to become leaders in using more modern and more humane methods of killing chickens. Adams is a vegan since 1989, and he nominated for PETA’s “Sexiest Vegetarians of the Year”.

As a photographer, his photographs published in Zoo magazine, the fashion/art magazine based in Berlin, Germany which he shoots for regularly.

Adams is currently Editor at Large and regular photographer for Zoomer Magazine. Also Adams has worked with a lot of singers such as Arcade Fire, Billy Idol, and Amy Winehouse. In 2002, Adams was invited, along with other photographers to photograph Queen Elizabeth II. On 1 June 2005, he published his first book of photos in the United States with Calvin Klein called American Women, proceeds from this book go to breast cancer research for program the Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer center in New York City.
## THE MAURYAN EMPIRE:

**Vocabulary words:**

1. 

2. 

3. 

4. 

**3 main points about the broken kingdoms:**

1. 

2. 

3. 

**The Southern Kingdom:**

1. 

**The Northern Empire:**

1. 

2. 

**5 main points of Chandra Gupta:**

1. 

2. 

3. 

4. 

5. 
YOUR KINGDOM!

- Imagine you have just become king or queen of an empire. Please draw a version of what your kingdom would look like. Use the pictures that we looked at in the beginning as a reference!
  - Is there a castle? Palace?
  - Who lives there?
  - Is it extravagant?

HOW WOULD YOU RUN YOUR KINGDOM?

- If you were king or queen of an empire, how would you run your kingdom? Would you be just? Mean? Would you offer things such as free medical care?
  - Please complete in full sentences.
  - Should be at least a paragraph long (5-6 sentences)
APPENDIX Q
Vocabulary List / Comprehension Question Examples (Mr. Nobli)

**VOCABULARY WORDS:**

- **Rival:** a person or thing in competition
- **Vulnerable:** open to attack
- **Hinduism:** A major religion in India. Hinduism was brought to India with the Aryans and developed through contact with the Dravidians.
- **Subdue:** to suppress, conquer, control

**HOMEWORK QUESTIONS:**

- 1) What did India look after the Aryans invaded?
- 2) What was the name of the new capital established by Chandragupta?
- 3) Describe how Chandragupta ruled. What was his schedule like?
- 4) Provide one reason why the Mauryan dynasty was so prosperous.
- 5) How did Chandragupta die?
# APPENDIX R

## Transcription conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Indicates sentence-final falling intonation (Schiffrin, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>,</td>
<td>Comma</td>
<td>Indicates clause-final intonation (“more to come”) (Schiffrin, 2006, p. 341)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Question mark</td>
<td>Indicates (final) rising intonation (i.e., question)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>Equal sign</td>
<td>Indicates contiguous, latched utterances that do not overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[text]</td>
<td>Square brackets</td>
<td>Square brackets aligned across adjacent lines denote the start of overlapping talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[text]</td>
<td>Square brackets</td>
<td>Square brackets in one transcript line denote an insertion by the researcher meant to clarify the meaning of an utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>Timed Pause</td>
<td>A number in parentheses indicates the time, in seconds, of a pause in speech (0.5 seconds and over).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>Micropause</td>
<td>Anything under 0.5 seconds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Hyphen</td>
<td>Indicates an abrupt halt or interruption in utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(text)</td>
<td>Parentheses</td>
<td>Speech that is unclear or in doubt in the transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>text</td>
<td>Underlined text</td>
<td>Indicates the speaker is emphasizing or stressing that portion of the utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT</td>
<td>Capitalized text</td>
<td>Indicates the speaker is speaking more loudly than in surrounding talk or utterances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>:</td>
<td>Colon</td>
<td>Indicates prolongation of an utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.hh</td>
<td>Dot “h”</td>
<td>Audible inhalation or in-breath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hh.</td>
<td>“h” dot</td>
<td>Audible exhalation or out-breath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(((text)))</td>
<td>Double parentheses</td>
<td>Transcriber’s annotation or description of non-verbal activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;text&lt;</td>
<td>Inward-facing chevrons</td>
<td>Audible increase in speed of utterance or portion of utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;text&gt;</td>
<td>Outward-facing chevrons</td>
<td>Audible decrease in speed of utterance or portion of utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Down arrow</td>
<td>Indicates falling pitch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>Up arrow</td>
<td>Indicates rising pitch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.tch</td>
<td>Dot “tch”</td>
<td>Indicates a tongue click.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>