Indigenous and immigrant languages in Australia

Introduction

Australia as a product of setter colonialism and of mass immigration is a society that is characterised by widespread multilingualism, although at the same time, it is also a society characterised by widespread monolingualism in the dominant language, English. It is thus a society in which many heritage language speakers are present but also one in which prevailing beliefs about the desirability and sufficiency of English language monolingualism have influenced how languages are understood and treated (Clyne, 2008). The presence of linguistic diversity and the dominance of English have shaped Australia's educational responses to languages and its language-in-education policies. This chapter will explore how language-in-education policy has addressed the needs of heritage language learners who speak either indigenous or immigrant languages.

Before beginning this discussion, however, there is a need to consider some of the terminological issues that exist in Australia around heritage language learning. The term 'heritage languages' is not actually a widely used term in the Australian context and languages are more usually referred to as 'community languages', meaning immigrant languages, which are contrasted with 'Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander languages', 'Australian languages' or 'indigenous languages'. The term 'community languages' has been preferred in Australia over 'heritage languages' because it does not imply that the languages concerned are being lost or associated with the past and so has a particular discursive resonance. At the same time, this terminology creates a division between speakers of types of languages, which is consequential for how Australia understands minority languages. In Australia the term 'background speaker' is often used to indicate a person who has a heritage connection with a language. This term typically refers to a speaker of an immigrant language and has a rather fluid definition ranging from those who acquire a language other than the dominant English language at home as a first language to those with a family connection to the language but who do not speak it. In this chapter I will use 'immigrant languages' and 'indigenous languages' to refer to the two distinct groups of languages and will break with Australian usage to use heritage languages, when it offers a convenient way to make connections across these categories, which could not be done easily using the more conventional Australian terminology.

This chapter will examine government language-in-education policy for provision of education programs for immigrant and indigenous languages and trace the ways that these policies have evolved over time and how they interact with other aspects of language in education policy.

The Australian context

In 1788, when the first European settlers arrived in Australia, they colonised a continent that had significant levels of linguistic diversity, with an estimated 250 indigenous languages being spoken (Walsh, 1991). The original settlers added to this linguistic diversity not only by bringing English to Australia but also bringing other languages. Linguistic diversity increased from the time of European settlement as immigrants from many different linguistic groups arrived in Australia, especially during the gold rushes of the mid-nineteenth century and as a consequence of mass migration following World War II.

Australia's contemporary multilingualism is complex and since the 1970s Australian censuses have included questions about language spoken at home that reveal the changing profile of linguistic and cultural diversity. The data from the 2011 census (Department of Immigration and Border Protection, 2014) indicate that over 200 immigrant languages and over 160 indigenous languages were spoken in Australia. Tables 1 and 2 present data for the ten

most widely spoken languages and the ten most widely spoken indigenous languages respectively.

Table 1: Ten most frequently spoken languages 2011 (Source: Department of Immigration and Border Protection, 2014)

Language	Number of people	Percentage of population
English only	15,394,700	80.7
Mandarin	336,409	1.6
Italian	299,833	1.4
Arabic	287,175	1.3
Cantonese	263,674	1.2
Greek	252,217	1.2
Vietnamese	233,390	1.1
Spanish	117,498	0.5
Hindi	111,351	0.5
Tagalog	81,457	0.4

Table 2: Ten most frequently spoken indigenous languages 2011 (Source: Department of Immigration and Border Protection, 2014)

Language	Number of people	Percentage of population
Kriol	6,780	0.032%
Yumplatok (Torres Strait Creole)	5,368	0.025%
Pitjantjatjara	3,486	0.016%
Warlpiri	2,554	0.012%
Yolngu Matha	2,446	0.011%
Murrinh Pata	2,411	0.011%
Tiwi	2,210	0.010%
Alyawarr	1,860	0.009%
Kunwinjku	1,645	0.008%
Luritja	1,505	0.007%

From these tables it can be seen that English is by far the dominant language spoken in Australia, while other languages are spoken by relatively small groups and indigenous language groups represent only very small fractions of the Australian population. However, in interpreting these figures a number of caveats must be made. The first is, that the census question asks about if a language other than English is spoken at home and allows for a single language to be reported. This question under-reports the actual use of languages in Australia as it ignores other contexts in which languages are used and also makes the assumption that Australians normally speak only one language (in addition to English) (Clyne & Kipp, 1996). Secondly the number of languages spoken is actually hard to identify as respondents identify languages in different ways with the result that languages can be listed multiple times under different names or languages may be clustered together under regional labels.

Language education policy in Australia is spread over multiple jurisdictions with both the Commonwealth and the State and Territory governments having constitutional responsibility

for education. In effect, Australia has continued the situation that existed prior to federation in 1901 in which each colony had responsibility for education and has overlaid an additional level of administration. The Commonwealth level has no direct control over schools but does have significant control of educational funding, while state and territory governments have direct responsibility for schools but have limited access to funds other than those provided by the Commonwealth government. As a result, in spite of the numerous government jurisdictions that have responsibility for education, much of the recent language policy agenda in Australia has largely been set by the Commonwealth government through allocations of funding, with state and territory policies generally reflecting Commonwealth policies.

Early policies towards heritage languages
From the first arrival of Europeans in Australia, indigenous and immigrant languages have been treated differently. For example, prior to the 1870s there was little interference by the colonial governments in language education in immigrant languages (Clyne, 1991; Liddicoat, 1996). As a result early colonial Australia could boast schools that taught in French, Irish, Welsh, Scots Gaelic, Hebrew and other languages (Clyne, 1985, 1991).

Although there are multiple instances of schools using minority languages in Australian schools in the nineteenth century, such schools did not always involve heritage language learning. Clyne (1985) makes the point that different languages were used to educate different groups and with different motivations. Schools teaching in French were usually established as foreign language education programs for girls from the English-speaking elite rather than for French-speaking residents of the colonies. Schools teaching in the Celtic languages of the British Isles, however, aimed at language maintenance and community development. These languages were not used for education in Great Britain and Ireland and were at time prohibited as languages of education (Ó Buachalla, 1984; Rassool, 2008). Thus, government indifference to languages used in schools in the Australian colonies opened possible spaces for heritage language education that were not available elsewhere. German schools were primarily established for religious purposes to service the needs of Lutheran and Templar groups who migrated to Australia, often to escape religious difficulties in their home countries, but also played an important role in language maintenance (Clyne, 1991). German schools in the various colonies adopted different models of education delivery, with Victorian schools usually offering bilingual education in German and English while South Australian schools were typically monolingual German schools (Lodewyckx, 1934). The Victorian schools were theoretically open to those without a German background as the focus was on religious maintenance rather than language per se, but there is little evidence that non-German students enrolled in such schools (Clyne, 1985). The openness to the possibility of teaching to both heritage speakers of German and those who did not speak German is an early example of a blurring between heritage language learning and additional language learning that was to become a hallmark of programs for immigrant languages in Australia.

Early missionaries working with indigenous people often included a focus on education in their evangelising work. Different missions adopted different approaches and language choices were often made on an ad hoc basis. However a small number of mission schools have emerged at different that have used indigenous languages in their programs. For example, In 1838, Lutheran missionaries established a school near Adelaide, South Australia that taught using the local Kaurna language and later began teaching in both Kaurna and English (Amery, 2000). The core aims of such schools were not language and culture maintenance but rather evangelisation and assimilation to the dominant culture. Schools often taught indigenous language literacy with the aim of developing readers of the Bible, and Bible translation was often an aim of missionary groups alongside their educational work. The also aimed to fit indigenous Australians into the economy by preparing them for menial work for white

employers. The ultimate aim of such schools was therefore cultural change rather than cultural continuity (Welch, 1988) and indigenous languages were seen as useful resources for achieving this goal.

Although Australia's tolerance of linguistic diversity enabled immigrant languages to play a role in education, the same was not true in the case of indigenous languages and it was not uncommon for governments to actively discourage and even ban the use of indigenous languages in education. For example, the Kaurna language school established in Adelaide was closed by the colonial governor in 1845 and replaced by an English medium school when the government took over responsibility of education indigenous people (Amery, 2013).

From the 1870s, the Australian colonies began to implement free, compulsory, secular education and this had significant consequences for the faith-based schools that had taught using heritage languages, which were often assimilated into the new secular system. Introduction of compulsory education coincided with an emerging colonial discourse that constructed a more consciously British and thus English-speaking identity (Clyne, 1991; Liddicoat, 1996). The combination of government control of schooling and a more nationalistic, British identity politics had a significant impact on language programs and severely restricted the possibilities for schools using immigrant languages, as well as those using indigenous languages. Although mainstream education increasingly adopted a monolingual English-speaking model, some heritage language programs continued to survive as part-time programs taught outside regular school hours (Clyne, 1985). Thus, language maintenance programs became something additional to basic education that was funded by communities themselves rather than a core feature of education and English became to normal language of instruction in schools.

The identity discourses that emerged prior to Federation in 1901 were not only based on a British, English-speaking identity but also took a racist form, most notably expressed in the 'White Australia' policy on immigration (Jupp, 1995). The rejection of other ethnic identities was further increased with World War I, when languages other than English began to be treated with suspicion and their use in schools, media and other public domains was banned and Australians of German heritage were interned. Although the rejection of these languages was motivated by specific security concerns related to the World War I, many of the policies and laws of this time were not repealed after the war. The post-war period in Australia was one of increasing xenophobia, viewing linguistic and cultural diversity as a threat to Australian identity (Liddicoat, 2013; Ozolins, 1993). As a result, by the 1920s, regular heritage language schools had ceased to be a feature of Australian education and this situation was to last, with few exceptions until the 1970s.

The heritage languages and the emergence of multiculturalism

From the 1970s the situation for heritage languages in education began to change in the context of the emerging policy of societal multiculturalism. Australia's multiculturalism grew out of an awareness of the failure of older assimilatory immigration policies of the post-WW2 period (Boese & Phillips, 2011; Castles, 1992). The term 'multiculturalism' gained currency in the early 1970s under the Whitlam Labor government but it was the Fraser government, elected to office in late 1975, which explicitly promoted the policy of multiculturalism. The policy had its basis in the 1978 *Review of Post-Arrival Programmes and Services for Migrants* (Galbally, Polites, Stransky, & Merenda, 1978), commonly known as the Galbally Report. Although the focus of the report was on services, it also discussed broader issues of national identity and social development and asserted that migrants have a right to maintain their cultural identity, provided they do not do so at the expense of the wider society. Australian multiculturalism therefore is a form of cultural pluralism with an associated focus on social cohesion (Castles,

1992). The Galbally report's vision of multiculturalism became Australian government policy in 1978.

Immigrant languages in education

The *Multicultural Education Program* (MEP) (1979-1989) (Committee on Multicultural Education, 1979) was the primary educational framing of early multicultrual policy. The MEP divided multicultural education into two equal components. The first was the teaching of the languages of immigrant groups, while the remainder was devoted to a variety of other programs which focused on cultural sensitization and intercultural studies. The MEP included language education programs for community languages, and argued that language maintenance was an aim for such programs; however these programs did not specifically involve the teaching of languages to immigrant children. Rather language programs under the MEP were often organised as foreign language programs, which taught the language to heritage and other speakers in much the same way. This however varied according to the language involved, with smaller and less prestigious languages often taken only by heritage speakers or those with a family connection to the language. Thus, language learning has been constructed in generic terms, with a focus on mainstream English-speaking learners and not specifically focused on heritage learners as a particular group with particular needs. As Mercurio and Scarino (2005, p. 145) argue "[h]eritage languages gained legitimacy through being grafted onto administrative, curriculum and community structures" rather than through the elaboration of structures that are particular to them.

One strategy adopted in Australia has been to fund provision of heritage language programs in immigrant languages through complementary schooling, usually taking the form of after-hours classes, through Ethnic Schools Program (Ethnic Schools Program), established in 1981, and renamed as the Community Languages Element in 1992 (Baldauf, 2005). The program provides government support to schools run by ethnic communities. The separation of heritage language maintenance for mainstream schooling reflects a model that had come into existence in the nineteenth century as a response to the introduction of compulsory, state funded schooling and so is part of an established tradition of separating basic education from language maintenance. Moreover, although ethnic schools are funded by the government, responsibility for organising and staffing and applying for funding for the school is devolved to communities. This has meant that language maintenance has come to be seen largely as a private, community task rather than one of mainstream schooling. One result of this has been that many immigrant languages have not found a place within Australian schools and are provided through complementary provision, within communities of speakers (Liddicoat, 2013).

The primary object of the Ethnic Schools Program was to maintain the languages and cultures of immigrant students but government policy also indicates that such programs should be open to other learners:

> The Community Languages Element provide assistance to States and Territories and non-governmental school authorities to operate classes in the languages and cultures of ethnic communities for the benefit of both non-English speaking background and other students (Australian Education Council, 1992, p. 197)

Thus, the purposes of the program is the provision of immigrant languages for all learners. This articulation of the policy is one that continues the blurring of boundaries between the teaching of particular languages as heritage languages and their wider teaching as additional languages mentioned above. This blurring appears to have resulted from two main considerations. The first is that children in immigrant communities may not be speakers of their ethnic language, as maintenance rates for many immigrant languages are quite low (Clyne & Kipp, 2006). For such students, learning of immigrant languages may take the form of learning an additional

language, and as programs in many immigrant languages are not widely available in schools access to such learning can only come through community language schools. Thus in order to fulfil the language needs of a diverse range of ethnic community members, language programs may need to cater for both speakers and non-speakers of the language, especially where the language community has a long history of immigration. The second consideration is that, because such programs are funded by the government, they cannot be closed to the wider community as this would be seen as funding ethic particularism. Thus, programs need to be available, at least in theory, to any person wishing to learn the language. By leaving programs open to any learners, heritage language programs have been able to secure a place in a political context that has not always been sympathetic to communities' aspirations for language maintenance.

In some states, heritage languages, usually immigrant languages, are also provided by specialist languages schools such as the Victorian School of Languages, the South Australian School of Languages and the Saturday School of Community Languages in New South Wales (Liddicoat et al., 2007). These schools provide education in heritage languages in different ways which may include classes offered during normal school hours, but normally involve classes taught after school or on weekends. The Victorian School of Languages offers classes in distance mode, but in other states the classes are taught only in face-to-face modes, and this restricts access to larger cities.

A significant contribution of complementary providers such as the ethnic schools and schools of languages is that students from a number of immigrant communities are able to sit examinations for senior secondary school qualifications in their languages, with over 40 languages being available in state-based examinations.

Australia's first coherent language policy, the *National Policy on Languages* (NPL) (Lo Bianco, 1987) was produced in 1987. The NPL devotes considerable attention to the maintenance of immigrant languages in the context of developing bilingual abilities. This involves articulating the need to acquire English while at the same time presenting a view of English learning that is not assimilatory. In the text, references to learning English and the immigrant language are usually referred to in parallel. In this way the NPL makes explicit a goal of developing individual bilingualism through education in which both the first language of the learner and English are developed. It argues for bilingualism in terms of the national interest in terms of Australia's overall linguistic capability: "it [bilingualism] also contributes to benefits to the society, by enriching its linguistic resources" (Lo Bianco, 1987, p. 129). A fundamental aim of the policy was the conservation of Australia's existing linguistic resources and in this way heritage language learning became a strong element in the policy's rationale for language education, and this rationale was often taken up in state language policies in the late 1980s. The NPL proposes a model of language education with dual pathways for language learning: one for language maintenance purposes and one for new learning. Thus, there is a commitment in the policy that all languages should be available to all learners, although in different programs.

The NPL was replaced in 1991 by the *Australian Language and Literacy Policy* (ALLP) (DEET, 1991), which was justified by the then Minister for Education John Dawkins because the NPL was too much focused on minority languages (Moore, 1991)., reflecting the difficult political context for minority language programs in Australia. The ALLP placed a stronger focus on additional language learning, although language maintenance was still preserved as an aspiration. Nonetheless the early 1990s represents a movement in language policy away from language maintenance as a core goal. Thus, heritage language learning has been seen to be part of a more general focus on languages in educational provision. The focus on general language learning becomes the sole objective of the National Asian Languages and Studies in Australian Schools strategy (COAG, 1994) and its re-articulation as the National Asian

Languages and Studies in Schools Program (DEEWR, 2009). In these policy documents, there is no mention of maintenance programs in the designated Asian languages, although one of these, Chinese, is the language of a significant community in Australia. Thus, heritage language learning seems to have been accorded a low priority, even when policy aims at achieving high level abilities in a language.

In practice, language learning has been open to all learners but the differentiation into different pathways has not always been followed. Thus, heritage and new learners of the same language may be included in the same class, resulting in one or the other group discontinuing because their needs are not met (Curnow, Kohler, Liddicoat, & Loechel, 2014; Orton, 2008).

The curriculum consequences of the bringing together of different types of language learning have been worked through in the articulation of the learning area Languages Other Than English (LOTE), later renamed as Languages, which has treated all language learning as a unitary phenomenon and developed generic curricula for all languages (Mercurio & Scarino, 2005). These curricula are usually predicated on the new learning of additional language and thus heritage learners are not well recognized as languages learners within such curricula. Australian curricula have been tied closely to the reporting of student achievement and curricula usually consist of standards or levels that students are expected to achieve. This means that, while a teacher may have developed a specific teaching program for heritage learners, their attainment in the language will normally be reported against as set of criteria established for additional language learning.

Until recently, the development of curricula for heritage language learners has been a matter for individual states and territories and some curricula have been developed for some languages, mainly at senior secondary level, in some parts of Australia (Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2009). In New South Wales (NSW) for example there have been separate syllabuses and examinations for heritage speakers of for Chinese, Japanese, Indonesian and Korean. Students take the heritage language program if they have had more than one year of education where the language was the medium of instruction or where students use the language 'in a sustained manner with a person or persons who have a background in using the language' (Board of Studies NSW, 2005, p. 85). The criteria for defining a heritage speaker have therefore focused on education in the language or regular use of the language, and these criteria were similar in other states, although the details varied (Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2009). In Western Australia (WA), where separate courses and examinations have also existed for the same languages as in NSW, the criteria involved education, but this was set at more than seven years of education using the language as the medium of instruction. In WA there has also been a separate category for learners of Chinese who have had more than one year but less than seven years of education through Chinese as the medium of instruction or who have lived for more than three years in China, Taiwan, Hong Kong or Macau. These students must take the Chinese as a Second Language Advanced Examination. The diversity of provisions signal some key issues for heritage language learners in Australia. The first is that the differing criteria mean that a students may be considered heritage learners in one jurisdiction but not in another. It is also the case that the criteria largely focus on heritage learners as recent immigrants because they have either been educated in another country (in the case of NSW and WA) or have been resident outside Australia (WA). In NSW, some form of home language use may also be considered, recognising that some heritage speakers may be Australian born, but this is not the case in WA. Within the group of heritage learners there may be considerable diversity as the criteria specify minimum levels of exposure and do not reflect the diversity of heritage learners' previous language experiences. For example in NSW as student how has studied for two years in a school where the languages was a medium of instruction will follow the same curriculum and sit the same examinations as a student who has studied for five years or for nine years. There also appears to be some naiveté in the criteria in terms of what a heritage speaker may

be as students who have resided in Hong Kong or Macao, which are predominantly Cantonese speaking, will be considered a heritage speaker of Chinese, which in Australia means Mandarin and will be treated in the same way as a student who speaks Mandarin as a first language.

One reason for the complexity of the criteria for determining heritage learners is that the motivation for such programs has been not so much to ensure appropriate language learning for heritage learners, although this is indeed an outcome, but to exclude heritage students from mainstream language programs. These exclusion criteria are considered necessary because there is a perception that heritage learners of a language are 'unfairly advantaged' by their prior knowledge of the language (Clyne, 2001; Elder, 2000). In some cases, where specific curricula do not exist for heritage speakers of a language, they may be excluded for other language classes and offered no opportunities for continued learning of their heritage language in school programs or they may be allowed to study with beginner learners covering the same material at the same pace.

Recently, the various Australian governments have agreed a national curriculum for languages and the new *Australian Curriculum: Languages* (ACARA, 2011) has identified three learning pathways for languages: second language learners, background language learners, and first language learners. While the three pathways theoretically can be used for any language, to date only Chinese has curricula for all three pathways and most curricula exist only as second language curricula. In the overarching documents of the curriculum, these pathways have not, however, been defined and it is not clear what constitutes a background speaker of a language. The Chinese curriculum defines background and first language speakers as follows:

> The Background Language Learner Pathway has been developed for students who have exposure to Chinese language and culture, and who may engage in some active but predominantly receptive use of Chinese at home. The First Language Learner Pathway caters for students who have had their primary socialisation as well as initial literacy development and primary schooling in Chinese, and who use Chinese at home (ACARA, 2015).

In this description heritage learners are defined either as those with receptive abilities in the language or those who have initial literacy in the language, with other heritage learners not fully taken into consideration. Background learners are defined in similar ways in other curricula designed for this pathway.

The situation for immigrant languages is then one in which many immigrant languages are present is schools but have become present as the result of being mapped onto policy designed for the learning of additional languages rather than for language maintenance. Thus, heritage learners may be marginalised in the learning of their heritage language. Where bilingual programs exist in immigrant languages, these programs have been established as forms of elite education that target those who do not speak the language and heritage learners may not be able to get access to such programs because of their prior knowledge of the language. Although bilingual education has often been proposed as a way of promoting the learning of immigrant languages by heritage speakers (e.g. Clyne, 1983), the model remains infrequently used in Australia's education systems. Heritage language learning for immigrant languages has largely been moved outside mainstream educational provision.

Indigenous languages in education
As discussed above, mission schools sometimes established educational programs in indigenous languages from the beginning of missionary work with Aboriginal people. By the twentieth century however few of these programs were still in existence, with the Hermannsburg mission in the Northern Territory being one of the few to continue from the nineteenth century, along with a bilingual Pitjantjatjara-English school, which had been

established at Ernabella in South Australia in the 1940s. These mission schools were outside mainstream government schools and no real initiatives existed in government schools in any jurisdiction to teach indigenous Australian languages.

The first significant change was the introduction in 1972 of government funded bilingual programs in indigenous languages in the Northern Territory (Nicholls, 2005). These programs were established by the Commonwealth government, which at that time had responsibility for school education in Australia's territories. The introduction of bilingual programs was designed to address the school needs of students who spoke an indigenous language at home and were acquiring English as an additional language in the school system. These programs represent the first government initiative to develop bilingual education in Australia. Bilingual education for indigenous people in Australia in other States and Territories has been limited, with few programs ever having been established in government schools.

The period 1973-1996 was a relatively stable one for bilingual education policy, although the overt policy became less well supported over time as the result of continuing budgetary cuts for bilingual provision (Nicholls, 2005). From the late 1990s, the commitment to bilingual education in the Northern Territory weakened and since 1998, there have been two significant policy changes relating to bilingual programs.

In 1998, the Northern Territory government announced the closure of bilingual education programs and legislated to disband bilingual programs in government schools. The 1998 policy change (Adamson, 1998) was based on a rationale that change was necessary to develop the English language abilities of indigenous children and that time spent learning indigenous languages was problematic for children's English language development. This focus on English resulted from the fact that indigenous children's levels of literacy were considerably lower than those of the rest of the population (Devlin, 2009). The reasons for the difference in outcomes in education for indigenous children and other children are complex and relate to issues of marginalisation and the consequences of colonisation (Bradley, Draca, Green, & Leeves, 2007). However, the ideological framing of the policy change attributed the differences in educational levels to the types of programs delivered to indigenous children and bilingual programs were particularly singled out as problematic based on what Ferris and Politzer (1981) call a 'common sense' view of language acquisition: that more time spent on the target language automatically equates with better literacy in the target language. The new policy was described as a removal of "bilingualism" to focus on English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction: "the bilingual program will progressively make way for the development of ESL programs" (Adamson, 1998). It therefore established the relationship between indigenous languages and English in bilingual programs as one of conflict, with the indigenous language undermining or threatening the place of the dominant language in the educational context. The teaching of the languages of indigenous people in school was constructed as a deviation from the real purpose of education, preparing students for participation in the English-speaking market economy (Liddicoat, in press). The move was controversial and there was much opposition to the proposed policy change from indigenous communities, human rights groups and academics. The support from indigenous communities for the continuation of bilingual programs was particularly strong the programs were seen as having a strong relationship to maintenance of indigenous cultures and identity. In the end, the policy was not fully enforced with 11 programs remaining open (Devlin, 2009) and the government continued bilingual education for some indigenous people, under the name of 'two-ways schooling'.

In 2008, the Northern Territory government sought to restrict the amount of time spent on teaching and learning the indigenous language in those bilingual programs that remained. The proposed changes did not specifically address bilingual schools, but rather was expressed as a requirement for all schools: "the first four hours of education in all Northern Territory schools will be conducted in English to improve attendance rates and lift the literacy and

numeracy results in our remote Indigenous schools" (Scrymgour, 2008).   Although the provision is addressed to schools in general, it has relevance only for bilingual programs as these were the only programs which did not teaching entirely in English. For a bilingual program, the four hour requirement means that there remains around 60 minutes of the school day during which the indigenous language may be taught (Liddicoat, in press). This policy change, like the 1998 change, focused on increasing exposure to English for indigenous students who spoke an indigenous language at home, by restricting the space available for indigenous languages in schooling. As in 1998, the motivation for the policy change was the poor performance of indigenous children in literacy.

Other than in cases of bilingual education, indigenous languages receive very little attention in policies about the education of indigenous people in Australia and in some policies may not be mentioned at all. Usually when they are mentioned it is in the context of indigenous children's limited English language capabilities (Liddicoat, 2013). They are however included in language policies; that is policies that relate to the learning of additional languages. This places such languages in an unusual position as very few non-indigenous Australians learn indigenous languages. The inclusion of indigenous languages within the framework of additional language learning replicates the problems that exist for immigrant languages, although the discourse of unfair advantage is not applied to these languages as indigenous students are not seen as being in competition with the dominant mainstream in these languages.

A specific curriculum was developed for indigenous languages in the 1990s for use at senior secondary level, the Australian Indigenous Language Framework (AILF) (SSABSA, 1996). The curriculum was constructed as a generic document that can be applied to a number of different language learning contexts ranging from contexts where the language is widely used as a first language to language revival programs. The framework was organised into two components: a target language(s) component within which students learnt to use or learnt about a specific language or cluster of languages belonging to a region and an Australian languages component within which students learnt about the range of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander languages and their role within society. The Australian languages component is common to all indigenous language programs; however, the target language component varies according to the sociolinguistic profile of the language being studied. All program types envisage some learning of a particular language, but also involve additional learning about other languages spoken in Australia. The curriculum structure of the AILF was designed to provide a single common framework for all indigenous languages regardless of the sociolinguistic position of the language (Amery, 2002). This meant that the curriculum had to be equally relevant to languages that were spoken as first languages and to those that were part of language revival programs. The relative propositions of the two components could vary but at most 50 percent of the curriculum was addressed to the leaning of a language. The structuring of the framework into two components also allow more readily for external assessment across a range of languages as only the language acquisition component was assessed in the indigenous language and all other assessment was in English and so did not require specific language expertise.

Indigenous language are also recognised in the new national curriculum for languages but this does not provide language specific curricula for indigenous language but instead contains a 'framework' for developing language curricula (ACARA, 2011). At the time of writing this framework had not been finalised, but it is envisaged that it will provide for a number of pathways for indigenous languages ranging from first language programs to language revival programs.

The provision of indigenous language in Australia has largely focused on heritage learners but has been the subject of both separate policy and also of generic language-in-education policy, which may be in tension in terms of aims and approaches. The learning of

indigenous languages has, however, come to be constructed as an impediment to the acquisition of English, which is ideologically understood as the primary aim of education.

Concluding comments

From the discussion in the chapter it can be seen that language-in-education policy for heritage language learners differs significantly for learners from indigenous and immigrant groups and that the distinction in the ways these groups are educated has a significant history in Australia. In some contexts, such as during the early colonial period heritage learners of immigrant backgrounds received more advantageous treatment than learners of indigenous backgrounds as governments were more accepting of the languages of immigrant groups, which were usually the languages of white groups largely of British and Irish origin or of culturally or politically significant European nations. These languages were largely left free to organise their own language education through community based schools. Indigenous languages, however, were less likely to receive such toleration and were actively rejected as languages of education. More recently, however, heritage learners of indigenous languages, at least in parts of Australia have received more advantageous treatment as a policy of bilingual education has been actively followed for such learners, but has not been applied in the same way to immigrant learners. At the same time, it needs to be acknowledged that such bilingual programs have never been particularly numerous or widespread in Australia.

A significant challenge for heritage language programs in Australia's language-in-education policy has been their location with the framing of LOTE/Languages as a learning area and the generic approach to languages curricula that has characterised it. As the LOTE/Languages area has been framed in terms of the learning of additional languages by speakers of English, curricula, pedagogy and assessment practices have rarely addressed the specific needs of heritage learners, especially those who speak the languages as first languages. Such learners have often been taught and assessed in ways that modify additional language curricula in ad hoc ways or, in some cases have been explicitly excluded from opportunities to learn their languages in schools. In reality, however, what actually happens to heritage learners in school language programs depends on the languages being taught; languages that are in high demand in the general population tend to be taught in programs addressed to the needs of those who learn the languages as new languages and heritage learners are accommodated around these learners in whatever ways individual schools decide (Clyne, 1997). If the languages are not in demand, because of perceptions of lack of utility or prestige, the population of language learners may be almost exclusively made up of heritage learners and different possibilities can be realised for such groups. In this way, it appears that the attitudes of the English-speaking mainstream to the learning of particular languages may open up or constrain spaces for heritage learners. This dynamic may have had a particular impact on the way indigenous language programs function as most such programs are taught in areas in which indigenous people predominate and they are not widely learned by non-indigenous people, as these languages do not enter into dominant narratives of the utility of languages.

One consequence of the focus on LOTE/Languages in schools has been that heritage language learning for immigrant groups has come to be focused primarily in complementary schooling and seen as something additional to basic education rather than a part of it. In fact, schools rarely know if their learners are engaged in heritage language programs and students' achievement in these languages is not recognised by, or reported to, schools as part of students' overall learning (Liddicoat et al., 2007). Thus, while complementary schooling may open spaces for heritage learners, these spaces remain firmly on the margins. In reality, for immigrant language groups, language maintenance and development has been represented in Australia's language-in-education policy as a community responsibility, which has either been impeded or assisted by government. The learning of indigenous languages has not become a

focus of complementary schooling and where programs exist in indigenous languages, they have normally be located within schools. These programs have thus been given a less marginal place than immigrant languages because of their inclusion as a part of mainstream education. Nonetheless, these language too remain on the margins and have proved to be vulnerable to discourses of crisis around the lower level of English language capabilities among indigenous students.

References
ACARA. (2011). *The shape of the Australian curriculum: Languages*. Sydney: ACARA.
ACARA. (2015). Context statement. Retrieved from http://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/languages/chinese/context-statement
Adamson, P. (1998). English a high priority in bush schools [Press release]
Amery, R. (2000). *Warrabarna Kaurna! Reclaiming an Australian Language*. Lisse: Swets & Zeitlinger.
Amery, R. (2002). *Indigenous language programs in South Australian schools: Issues, dilemmas and solutions*. Retrieved from
Amery, R. (2013). A matter of interpretation: Language planning for a sleeping language, Kaurna, the language of the Adelaide Plains, South Australia. *Language Problems & Language Planning, 37*(2), 101-124. doi:10.1075/lplp.37.2.01ame
Australian Education Council. (1992). *National Report on Schooling in Australia, 1991*. Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation.
Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (2005). Coordinating government and community support for community language teaching in Australia: Overview with special attention to New South Wales. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 8*(2-3), 132-144.
Board of Studies NSW. (2005). *Assessment certification and examination manual*. Sydney: Board of Studies NSW.
Boese, M., & Phillips, M. (2011). Multiculturalism and social inclusion in Australia,. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 32*(2), 189-197. doi:0.1080/07256868.2011.547176
Bradley, S., Draca, M., Green, C., & Leeves, G. (2007). The magnitude of educational disadvantage of indigenous minority groups in Australia. *Journal of Population Economics, 20*(3), 547-569. doi:10.1007/s00148-006-0076-9
Castles, S. (1992). The Australian model of immigration and multiculturalism: Is it applicable to Europe? *InternationalMmigration Review, 26*(2), 549-567.
Clyne, M. (1983). Bilingual education as a model for community languages in primary schools. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 4*(2), 23-36. doi:10.1080/07256868.1983.9963230
Clyne, M. (1985). Multilingual Melbourne nineteenth century style. *Journal of Australian Studies, 9*(17), 69-81. doi:10.1080/14443058509386914
Clyne, M. (1991). *Community Languages: The Australian Experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
Clyne, M. (1997). Managing language diversity and second language programmes in Australia. *Current Issues In Language and Society, 4*(2), 94-119. doi:10.1080/13520529709615486
Clyne, M. (2001). Can the shift from immigrant languages be reversed in Australia? In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift: A 21st century perspective* (pp. 364-389). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
Clyne, M. (2008). The monolingual mindset as an impediment to the development of plurilingual potential in Australia. *Sociolinguistic Studies, 2*(3), 347-366.
Clyne, M., & Kipp, S. (1996). Language maintenance and language shift: community languages in Australia. *People and Place, 5*(4), 19-27.

Clyne, M., & Kipp, S. (2006). Australia's community languages. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 180*, 7-21.

COAG. (1994). *Asian Languages and Australia's Economic Future*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Curnow, T. J., Kohler, M., Liddicoat, A. J., & Loechel, K. (2014). *Review of languages retention from the middle years to the senior years of schooling*. Adelaide: Research Centre for Languages and Cultures, University of South Australia.

DEET. (1991). *Australia's language. An Australian language and literacy policy* (Vol. 1). Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

DEEWR. (2009). *National Asian Languages and Studies in Schools Program: Program Guidelines 2009–2012* Retrieved from http://www.deewr.gov.au/Schooling/NALSSP/Documents/NALSSP_ProgramGuidelines_June2009.pdf

Department of Immigration and Border Protection. (2014). *The people of Australia: Statistics from the 2011 census* Retrieved from https://www.border.gov.au/ReportsandPublications/Documents/research/people-australia-2013-statistics.pdf

Devlin, B. (2009). *Bilingual education in the Northern Territory and the continuing debate over its effectiveness and value*. Paper presented at the AIATSIS Research Symposium, "Bilingual education in the Northern Territory: Principles, policy and practice", Canberra. http://www.abc.net.au/4corners/special_eds/20090914/language/docs/Devlin_paper.pdf

Elder, C. (2000). Outing the native speaker: The problem of diverse learner backgrounds in 'foreign' language classrooms - an Australian case study. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 13*(1), 86-108. doi:10.1080/07908310008666591

Ferris, R. M., & Politzer, R. L. (1981). Effects of early and delayed second language acquisition: English comprehension skills of Spanish-speaking kunior high school students. *TESOL Quarterly, 15*(3), 265-274.

Galbally, F., Polites, N., Stransky, c., & Merenda, F. (1978). *Migrant Services and Programs: Report of the Committee of the Review of Post-arrival Programs and Services for Migrants*. Canberra: Australian Government Printing Service.

Jupp, J. (1995). From 'White Australia' to 'part of Asia': Recent shifts in Australian immigration policy towards the region. *International Migration Review, 29*(1), 207-228.

Liddicoat, A. J. (1996). The narrowing focus – Australia's changing language policy. *Babel, 31*(1), 1-6, 24.

Liddicoat, A. J. (2013). *Language-in-education policies: The discursive construction of intercultural relations*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Liddicoat, A. J. (in press). Ideologies of value and the place of Australian indigenous languages in education. In D. Chan, D. Negga, & M. Szirmai (Eds.), *Policy and ideology in language learning and teaching - Actors and discourses*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Liddicoat, A. J., Scarino, A., Curnow, T. J., Kohler, M., Scrimgeour, A., & Morgan, A.-M. (2007). *An investigation of the state and nature of languages in Australian schools*. Retrieved from Canberra: http://www.endeavour.deewr.gov.au/international_applicants/postgraduate_awards.htm

Lo Bianco, J. (1987). *National Policy on Languages*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Lo Bianco, J., & Slaughter, Y. (2009). *Second languages and Australian schooling*. Camberwell, Vic: Australian Council for Educational Research.

Lodewyckx, A. (1934). *Das Deutschtum in Victoria: Festschrifft zum hundertjahrerigen Jubilaeum des Staates Victoria, 1834-1934*. Melbourne: s.n.

Mercurio, A., & Scarino, A. (2005). Heritage languages at upper secondary level in South Australia: A struggle for legitimacy. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 8*(2-3), 145-159.

Moore, H. (1991). Enchantments and displacements: Multiculturalism, language policy and Dawkins-speak. *Melbourne Studies in Education, 32*, 45-85.

Nicholls, C. (2005). Death by a thousand cuts: Indigenous language bilingual education programmes in the Northern Territory of Australia, 1972–1998. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 8*(2-3), 160-177. doi:10.1080/13670050508668604

Ó Buachalla, S. (1984). Educational policy and the role of the Irish language from 1831 to 1981. *European Journal of Education, 19*(1), 75-92.

Orton, J. (2008). *Chinese language education in Australian schools*. Carlton South: Education Services Australia.

Ozolins, U. (1993). *The politics of language in Australia*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rassool, N. (2008). Language policy and education in Britain. In S. May & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Ency clopedia of language and education* (2nd ed., Vol. 1. *Language policy and political issues in education*, pp. 267-284). Boston: Springer.

Scrymgour, M. (2008). Education restructure includes greater emphasis on English [Press release]. Retrieved from http://newsroom.nt.gov.au/adminmedia/mailouts/4599/attachments/081014%20restructure%20and%20language.pdf.

SSABSA. (1996). *Australia's Indigenous Languages Framework*. Wayville, SA: : Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia.

Walsh, M. (1991). Overview of indigenous languages of Australia. In S. Romaine (Ed.), *Language in Australia* (pp. 27-48). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Welch, A. R. (1988). Aboriginal education as internal colonialism: The schooling of an indigenous minority in Australia. *Comparative Education, 24*(2), 203-215.