

**Original citation:**

Liddicoat, Anthony John, Curnow, Timothy Jowan and Scarino, Angela. (2016) The trajectory of a language policy : the First Language Maintenance and Development program in South Australia. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 39 (1). pp. 31-46.

**Permanent WRAP URL:**

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/85421>

**Copyright and reuse:**

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

**Publisher's statement:**

© John Benjamins Publishing. 2016. This article is under copyright, the publisher should be contacted for permission to re-use or reprint the material in any form.

Link to version of record <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/aral.39.1.02lid>

**A note on versions:**

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP URL' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: [wrap@warwick.ac.uk](mailto:wrap@warwick.ac.uk)

# **The trajectory of language policy: The First Language Maintenance and Development program in South Australia**

Anthony J. Liddicoat, Timothy Jowan Curnow, Angela Scarino

## **Abstract**

This paper examines the development of the First Language Maintenance and Development program in South Australia. This program is the main language policy activity that specifically focuses on language maintenance in government primary schools and has existed since 1986. During this time, the program has evolved largely as the result of ad hoc changes, often resulting from decisions made outside the immediate scope of language maintenance provisions. The program was initially introduced as a general reform of language education in primary schools but eventually became a program focused specifically on language maintenance. The paper traces the ways that ad hoc changes have shaped the program and how these have shaped the program over time. As a result of these changes over time, first language maintenance has moved from being an integrated focus within core language policy to being a peripheral language policy activity. As a result, although the FLMD represents an aspect of South Australia's language policy, it does not have either a clear position within that policy nor does it have a clearly developed focus of its own.

## **Introduction**

Lo Bianco (2008) has signalled that rapidity of change of policy frameworks and ideologies. It is therefore unusual in Australia to be able to trace the history of a single policy over a substantial period of time and the history of language policy has usually traced the progression of documents over time (e.g. Clyne, 1991a; Liddicoat, 2010; Liddicoat, 2013; Liddicoat & Curnow, 2009). The First Language Maintenance and Development<sup>1</sup> (FLMD) program in South Australia is unusual as it is a relatively long term program that has been in existence since 1986. While the program has had a long existence, it has nonetheless still been subject to change, but unlike other policies this change has not been one of replacement by new documents and frameworks. Over the course of its existence, the policy has altered many times, however not as the result of explicit policy work focused on language maintenance but rather as a consequence in its policy context. In fact, the entire trajectory of the FLMD can be seen as a series of reactions to policy changes that have impinged on rather than explicitly informed the shaping of language maintenance as a governmental activity. The FLMD is ultimately a policy activity that has no overarching policy statement and this situation is a consequence of its historical evolution. The focus of this paper is an overview of the FLMD program that seeks to trace the processes that have shaped policy on first language maintenance from its inception over an extended period of time to document language policy as a contingent, evolving process.

## **Community language maintenance in Australian language policy**

The introduction of community languages into schools was largely a response to the emergence of an ethnic lobby from the 1960s that sought to have immigrant language represented in school provision as a way of maintaining the home languages of immigrant children (Clyne, 1991b, 1997; Lo Bianco, 1990; Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2009). Language policy for community languages has developed a number of different models for provision of community languages in both mainstream and complementary education.

In 1981, the Australian Government began funding the Ethnic Schools Program to provide language programs for the maintenance of community language in Australia. The Ethnic Schools Program funded community-based schools (ethnic schools) as a form of complementary education provision. In 1992, the program was renamed the Community Languages Element and up to 1997, funding for ethnic schools was identified separately from other Australian Government funding for languages. However, from 1997 ethnic schools' funding was integrated with other Australian Government funding for languages, and the allocation to ethnic schools from this funding was determined by the jurisdictions at State and Territory level (Liddicoat et al., 2007).

The provision of language maintenance programs in community languages through ethnic schools has become the dominant activity in community language education (Baldauf, 2005; Clyne, 1991b; Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2009). Ethnic schools, as defined by Norst, are:

Community based autonomous schools or classes, not run for profit, which conduct regular voluntary part-time courses for learners (generally of school age) outside normal school hours (Norst, 1982: 3).

Although Norst's definition dates from the early 1980s, a number of the features of ethnic schools observed at that time are still valid for the twenty-first century. The schools continue to be not-for-profit community organisations, staffed by volunteer teachers offering classes outside normal school hours (Norst, 1982; Scarino, 1995). This gives ethnic schools a character that is quite different from other schooling sectors by framing them as community service organisations, providing language and cultural education for members of community groups. Although ethnic schools are a defined sector of Australian education providing language instruction in the languages of immigrant communities, they are not in fact a coherent sector but rather a loose collection of institutions with different structures, goals, and processes (Liddicoat et al., 2007).

Community languages have also been accorded a position in mainstream schools. Smolicz and Secombe (2003), for example, state that in South Australia, Italian was the first community language introduced into mainstream schools and it became an assessed language for Year 12 completion in 1967, with a number of other languages following suit in the 1960s and 1970s. The inclusion of such languages has generally been done as part of the Languages curriculum area which has not usually recognised the different needs of different populations of learners (Liddicoat, 2013). This means that students with a range of backgrounds in the language have usually taken the same classes and that the curriculum has been developed for new learners of the language. As a result, many programs in community languages do not cater for the development of first language capabilities or have specifically language maintenance goals. However, in some cases, especially where the languages offered are spoken by smaller communities, the majority of learners of community languages have some prior knowledge of the language or an ethnic affiliation to it. In some states, including South Australia, community languages have been provided through programs offered by Schools of Languages and have been taught either in after-hours classes or in distance mode (Liddicoat et al., 2007). These programs are usually similar in design and focus to those offered with other schools and are open to all groups of learners rather than specifically targeting first language maintenance.

There has also been a blended model in which complementary provision and mainstream schooling has collaborated to provide community languages in schools. This model. Known as 'insertion' classes involves a community organisation hiring language teachers and making them available to schools to teach the community language as part of the regular school curriculum. This model has been largely associated with the teaching of Italian, especially in Catholic schools in Victoria where insertion classes have been widely used, but has also been used for other languages and on other states and school jurisdictions (di Biase, Andreoni, &

Dyson, 1994; Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2009). Because insertion classes are offered in mainstream schools they are often made available to all learners in the school and so may not cater specifically for first language maintenance.

Within mainstream schooling, community languages have found a place by being grafted into mainstream languages provision and existing administrative and curriculum structures (Mercurio & Scarino, 2005). These structures in Australia have tended to be generic and are designed in a way that address all languages and most cohorts of learners in identical ways. As a result, there has been little provision in mainstream schooling for the maintenance of community languages as first languages. Few government programs for languages have focused specifically on language maintenance, other than in the area of indigenous languages, and few of these programs have had a long history, making the FLMD unusual.

### **Initial development of the FLMD**

The FLMD program was initiated as a response to two significant policy reports that appeared in the early 1980s, the *Voices for the Future* (Languages Policy Working Party, 1983) report on language policy and the *Education for a Cultural Democracy* (Taskforce to Investigate Multiculturalism and Education, 1984) report on education for a cultural democracy. The simultaneous production of two South Australian government reports with overlapping focus is itself remarkable and grows out of competing agendas in the development of language policy. *Voices for the Future* focused on language learning with a particular emphasis on the new learning of languages by an Australian population that was characterised as largely monolingual. The main emphasis of the report is therefore on additional language learning and there is an emphasis on utilitarian purposes for language learning, especially within the globalising economy. Within this overarching focus, there was also a secondary recognition of a need for first language learning for some children in the South Australian education system, especially for children of recently arrived refugees and children of immigrants whose home language was an immigrant language. The report argued that these two groups needed education in their first language to allow initial access to education while they acquired English and endorsed the idea that initial literacy needs to be developed in children's home languages as a foundation for English language literacy. *Education for a Cultural Democracy* focused on South Australia's internal linguistic diversity and identified problems around the extent of education in Australian Aboriginal and immigrant languages in South Australia. The report also discussed the learning of additional languages and emphasised the need for learning of languages present in the community by speakers of English as a part of its conceptualisation of cultural democracy. Thus one report took a more utilitarian focus on internationally useful languages, but acknowledged that there was an internal need for language learning of community languages for members of those communities, while the other took a citizenship focus and emphasised the maintenance and development of internal linguistic diversity.

One thing the two reports did have in common is that they both framed first language maintenance within a discourse of linguistic rights. *Voices for the Future* for a right for all South Australians to use and develop their first language and argued that the Education Department had a responsibility to assist them to do so. *Education for a Cultural Democracy* asserted the right of all students to study the language of their home and community and argued that the arrangements made for languages education in South Australian schools should address this right. This rights focused discourse provided a way of unifying the two reports in future language policy development, in spite of the conflicts in overall approach.

These two reports fed into the development of *Voices for the Future: The Policy Statement* (Department of Education of South Australia, 1985), which was released on 7 May 1985. Although the *Voices for the Future* policy does not mention a specific program for first

language maintenance and development, the policy did specifically state “Wherever possible, the Education Department will enable children to have access to opportunities to study their mother tongue as part of their formal education” (Department of Education of South Australia, 1985, p. 3). The development of students’ first languages was therefore a key priority of the policy. Overall, in spite of its name, the document contained significant input from *Education for a Cultural Democracy* and its emphasis on first language maintenance. By incorporating aspects of both of the earlier reports, the 1985 policy sought to reconcile the competing agendas of the two initial starting points in its recommendations for primary school language programs, which had been identified as a key area of need for development. The policy achieved this reconciliation of the two agendas by splitting the field of language learning into two distinct types of activities with different language foci. The *Languages Development Plan 1987-1995* (Education Department of South Australia, 1988), which was designed to lead the implementation of the *Voices for the Future* policy, identified two different types of programs for languages in government-run primary schools: for students of non-English-speaking background (NESB) language programs were to run from Reception to Year 7 and should focus on community languages, while for students of English-speaking backgrounds (ESB), language programs were to run from Year 4 to Year 7 and focus on ‘geopolitical languages’<sup>2</sup>, identified as Japanese, Chinese, Indonesian and Spanish (Heylan, 1988; Parha, 1989). Thus, the policy established a split between community languages, to be learnt by community members, and geopolitical languages to be learnt by English-speakers, but with some overlap for languages such as Spanish and Chinese which were included in both groups.

As part of the implementation of *Voices for the Future*, a strategy was put forward for the allocation of above allocation teacher salaries to primary school languages programs. The initial allocation was to be 20 full time equivalent (FTE) salaries in 1986. These salaries were to be allocated to primary schools in addition to their normal salary allocation in order to fund language programs – not specifically for language maintenance programs. Salaries were allocated on the basis of applications for funding from schools for specific language programs, and this method of allocation was to have consequences for future developments of the program. The number of places was intended to accumulate over the following decade so that over 400 salaries would be funded annually by 1995 (Arnold, 1985). While originally intended as salaries to staff any language programs, these salaries became a language maintenance program as the result of features of the implementation of the policy.

One of the forces that shaped the subsequent future of how these salaries would be used was the initial criteria for allocating salaries. The *Languages Development Plan* focused on the use of the above allocation salaries as the main driver for increasing languages provision and stated that first language development was the main priority of the plan:

The vehicle for change will be the above-formula primary salaries allocated annually by the Minister. These will be used initially to fill the first priority for mother tongue development, and then as that need is met, to progressively expand the teaching of languages of geopolitical significance. (Parha, 1989, p. 2)

That is, community language programs were to be the target for funding in the early years of implementation, with geopolitical language programs being introduced later. In practice this meant that the bulk of the 20 salaries were allocated to first language maintenance with a small proportion reserved for other language programs. For example, in 1988, salaries were allocated primarily to first language development programs “to which 90% or 18.0 FTE salaries were to be allocated” (Heylan, 1988, p. 23), while the remaining languages received only 2.0 FTE salaries.

The crucial consideration in understanding the trajectory of the FLMD program was that the additional salaries projected beyond 1986 were never actually funded and the progressive

strategy foreshadowed in the implementation of the policy was therefore meaningless. Moreover, as the salaries had been allocated initially to first language maintenance programs, they could not be withdrawn from these activities without rendering those programs unviable. The 20 salaries allocated in 1986 had therefore effectively become 18 salaries allocated specifically to first language maintenance by 1988, although the idea of progressive development had not been officially abandoned.

### **Establishment of the FLMD**

The salary allocations under *Voices for the Future* had become de facto funding for first language maintenance programs as a result of the cessation of additional funding and the retention of the initial criteria. Subsequent developments led to this de facto arrangement becoming entrenched as government policy. These developments were triggered by *Voices for the Futures*' division of primary school language programs into community and geopolitical languages with different target learners and different forms of provision. These different arrangements were extensively criticised for a number of reasons (for example by Garamy, 1988). The separate provision of language programs for students based on their ethnic affiliation was felt to be divisive as it reified ethnic distinctiveness. Further, the idea that community languages were only to be available for members of ethnic groups was taken as an indication that these languages were seen as having little value for the wider community and that value was only associated with language use in international contexts. The different arrangements were also criticised as constraining language choices – English-speaking students could not choose to study a community language while members of ethnic communities could not choose to study a geopolitical language. Students were thus deprived of particular opportunities because of their ethnic/linguistic affiliation.

The distinction was removed in 1990 in the *Curriculum Guarantee* package (Education Department of South Australia, 1989). The *Curriculum Guarantee* also officially ended the idea that primary school language programs would be funded from above allocation salaries by proposing that languages be taught during classroom teachers' 'non-instruction time'<sup>3</sup> and thus within the normal funding allocation. This change had multiple implications for language maintenance programs. Firstly, language maintenance programs were no longer a specific policy priority – as the distinction between program types was no longer a relevant one in policy terms, there could be no allocation of priority to such programs within the policy. Secondly, because language programs were to be funded from normal staffing allocations, the idea of progressive implementation of programs supported by additional government funding was also no longer relevant. At the same time, the 20 salaries allocated in 1986 continued to be allocated in this new environment and because of the criteria that had been established for their allocation, they became salaries allocated to language programs that were in some sense additional to normal school languages provision. From this time, the 20 salaries were reserved specifically for first language teaching and learning and the FLMD program, then known as the Mother Tongue Development program, came in to being as a specific program rather than as a component of above allocation salaries for primary school language teaching and learning.

This situation was not altered in subsequent language policy documents in South Australia in which the FLMD program has been given at best only marginal acknowledgement. For example, in the review report that evaluated a decade of South Australia's language policy (Lo Bianco, 1998), the FLMD receives only one mention and is not addressed as a program under the policy.

## Students and languages

The focus of the FLMD program has changed over time as the migration history of South Australia has evolved. One factor influencing this is the application process. Since its inception, the salaries for first language maintenance have been allocated according to applications by schools. This was the case when the salaries were first allocated in 1986 and it has continued to operate in the same way. In order to apply for funding schools need to identify students who are eligible for the program and who could be included in a funding application. From 2006 schools were requested to include in the numbers they reported only students who used the target language in their homes, while in the case of Aboriginal languages, eligible students were defined as those who relate closely to the particular target language (Curriculum Services, 2008). In spite of this requirement, schools use a range of different approaches to identify students. It appears that in determining whether students may be eligible for an FLMD program, most schools use demographic data supplied by the Department, rather than sociolinguistic data relating to the student's home language. The 2008 discussion paper (Curriculum Services, 2008) reported for example that most schools reported using Departmental criteria to identify students who would participate in FLMD programs. This was often based on data provided through Education Department School Administrative System (EDSAS) about the place of birth of students or their parents, rather than anything about the language(s) spoken by students at home.

The original criteria for access to funds were not specific and there were few guidelines as to what constituted an eligible student for inclusion in an FLMD program. From 2008, schools could only enter students as participating in FLMD programs if they fell into one of three EDSAS categories (Curriculum Services, 2008):

- A (Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander);
- P1 (Permanent resident students born overseas with at least one parent/guardian from a non-English speaking background); or
- P2 (Permanent resident students born in Australia with at least one parent/guardian born overseas and from a non-English speaking background).

In such assessments of eligibility, ethnicity and/or location of parents' birth is used as a proxy for language use. This is problematic as an assessment of eligibility because location of parents' birth is a very poor predictor of language use, especially where only one parent is born overseas. For Aboriginal languages, the procedures are often different and schools tended to contact parents or respond to parents' requests to identify students (DETE, 2002). This difference may lead to schools identifying students on the basis of language use, but it is more likely that such ways of identifying students relate more to operationalising the idea of a close relationship with the language as a criterion for eligibility.

The FLMD's funding strategy has not specially identified languages for eligibility for funding support, however some identifying work has been built in to the structures and processes. Initially the program was open in terms of languages and both immigrant and Aboriginal programs received funding, although immigrant language programs predominated. For example, in 1988 only one Aboriginal language, Pitjantjatjara received funding (1.6 FTE for 5 programs) (Heylan, 1988), while immigrant language programs received the balance (17.4 FTE for 65 programs). From the introduction of the *Languages other than English Plan* (DETE, 1998) in 2000, the FLMD program operated under a three tier system of languages:

### A. Aboriginal languages

- B. Languages supported by the Languages Plan 2007-2011 (Chinese, French, German, Greek, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese and Spanish)
- C. Community languages: languages of more recently arrived communities

Category B in this list links the FLMD program to wider language-in-education policy by introducing that policy into the FLMD context. It is not necessarily the case that the languages included in category B are languages in particular need of first language maintenance programs, but rather that these have been identified as key languages for development in South Australia more generally. Thus, the shape of the FLMD program has been influenced by a language-in-education policy document that is not specifically focused on language maintenance and the program has been co-opted into work to address other policy objectives. The incorporation of language maintenance into language education policies with primary objectives other than language maintenance has created difficulties for some languages that do not nearly fit this framing. For example, Vietnamese has switched between Category C and B<sup>4</sup> over time reflecting a problem of fit in the categories: it is not a language of a recently arrived community, but Vietnamese families have had a strong record of home languages maintenance (Clyne & Kipp, 2006).

The categorisation of languages can have consequences for the provision of funding, as at times notional proportions of salaries have been allocated to particular categories. For example, in 2008 the distribution of allocations of the total 15 FTE salaries available were identified for each of the tier levels as:

• Aboriginal languages (Category A)	4.5 FTE
• Languages Plan languages (Category B)	5.5 FTE
• Community languages (Category C)	5.0 FTE

The categories established for allocating funding have played a role in ensuring that languages continue to be included within the program even though children in the communities represented are no longer typically first language speakers of the languages involved. The largest proportion of funding has been reserved for languages that either relate to ethnic groups with older migration histories and consequently substantial shift to English as the home languages as they are now in their third or fourth generation after migration (e.g. German, Greek, Italian) or those which have few first language speakers in South Australia (e.g. Indonesian, Japanese). This latter grouping reflects the impact of Commonwealth level policy relating to Asian languages in the form of NALSAS and NALSSP and the blending of first language maintenance with other, unrelated, policy objectives. The categorisation of language developed and the allocation of resources to these categories mean that the FLMD program includes school programs providing new learning of community languages by learners affiliated with those communities as well as programs with genuine first language speakers, and in at least some cases both. The classification into three tiers was ended in the call for applications for 2013 and, in the 2013 Guidelines (Curriculum Services, 2013), there are only two tiers of languages:

- A. Aboriginal languages
- B. All other languages with preference for the languages of more recently arrived communities

This change stems from the lapsing of the Languages Plan and thus of the relevance of “languages supported by the Languages Plan” as a category. That is, it was not motivated by considerations internal to the FLMD program any more than was the original inclusion of this category in the first place.



The provision of different types of programs reflects the way that the FLMD as evolved over time and a lack of consistency in what terms such as ‘mother tongue’ or ‘first language’ mean in policy terms. In policy documents relating to the FLMD, the term ‘mother tongue’ has been subject to various interpretations since the establishment of the program with understandings of the term ranging between languages actively spoken by students to languages with which students have a heritage connection but which they do not know. For example, a report in 1990 identified mother tongue programs as extending from programs in which students knew the language and used the L1 as the medium of instruction to teach about language and culture through to programs in which learners had little or no knowledge of the language. The report argued that ‘mother tongue’ programs should be offered to all:

In a cultural democracy languages should not be exclusive to any group. Ideally any language should be available to any student whether he/she:

- is a fluent mother tongue speaker
- has a passive knowledge of and background in the language and culture
- is a L2 learner. (Cocchiaro et al., 1990, p. 3)

This report therefore identified ‘mother tongue’ very generally and did not include speaking the language as a pre-requisite for participating in a program. Another report at around the same time (DETE, 1991) argued for a very different understanding of mother tongue that emphasised that the language was the language spoken by children as a home language. It argued that mother tongue programs were those that taught students who speak a language using that language: “In mother tongue programs the medium of instruction is the target language” (p. 3). It viewed FLMD programs as a very specific form of language education and argued that the low level of provision of languages generally had had a negative impact on FLMD programs in mainstream schools because schools did not generally teach languages. It found that schools were using FLMD money to offer the home language of some students as a school-wide language program and criticised this practice as inequitable because it ignored the language development of children who spoke languages that were not offered in this way. There is evidence from such early reports that the focus of FLMD programs was not well understood or consistently interpreted because ‘mother tongue’ had such wide possible interpretations. This led to the possibility of using FLMD money for purposes other than educational development of learners through the languages they spoke at home. For example, in the call for applications produced in 1999 for funding in 2000 (DETE, 1999), the use of funds was not tied specifically to first language development, but also included wider teaching of the language:

The purpose of the salaries is to provide additional support for students from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds and to encourage the teaching of those languages to all students. (p. 1)

Following a discussion paper produced in 2008 (Curriculum Services, 2008), the focus of the program was unambiguously placed on the need to develop educational provision in a range of languages for students who speak those languages at home – that is the aim is to foster further development of the home language of the learners. Aboriginal languages, however, continued to be framed in terms of a close relationship with the language implying the possibility of learning a language that students do not currently speak, but with which they have some connection. There has however been concern that funds are used for other purposes and that the students receiving language programs funded under FLMD may not be first language speakers of the language. The focus on the provision of teaching in students’ first languages

has become more specific in the application process and in 2010, the FLMD Guidelines stated that:

The purpose of the FLMD program salaries is to provide additional support for students from non-English speaking backgrounds to maintain and develop languages spoken at home; as well as to facilitate the resultant benefits to these students' well-being and literacy skills (Curriculum Services, 2008).

This statement of purpose has continued to be used since 2010 in the application guidelines. Nonetheless it is till the case that FLMD programs are likely to include students who do not speak the language as home but rather are acquiring the language either as a new language or are developing the language from a limited base – that is they are heritage learners rather than first language learners. The reason for this appears to be historical. Schools have established FLMD programs and have continued to apply for funding for these programs over many years. As the community around the school has changed, the nature of the program has changed to cater for different cohorts of learners but has remained dependent on above allocation salaries. Such program have continued to be funded as the result of a certain level of inertia in the system – schools have become accustomed to applying for funding and have become dependent on this funding for their programs. Stopping funding would mean dismantling programs for heritage language learners as no funding exists for such activities.

### **Concluding comments**

The review of the historical development of the FLMD program shows that the program grew out of policy that was designed for other purposes and that there has not been a specifically articulated policy in relation to the program. Rather policy for language maintenance in South Australia has been developed through ad hoc responses to changing contexts such as the lapse of *Voices for the Future*, the advent of national policies on languages, including Asian focused policy and changes in the demographics of immigrant communities. In particular, first language maintenance has moved from being an integrated focus within core language policy to being a peripheral language policy activity as the focus of core language policy changed. As a result, although the FLMD represents an element of South Australia's language policy, it does not have either a clear position within that policy nor does it have a clearly developed focus of its own.

This lack of clear policy for first language maintenance has meant that the aims and objectives of the program have been articulated in different ways at different times and that the focus of the program has not always been clear. Even when the Department has tried to clarify the aims and objectives of the program, there is evidence that these have not been implemented in the funding arrangements. One reason for this appears to be historical inertia; there is evidence that that programs that have been funded for an extended period of time tend to continue to receive funding although the nature of students involved and the focus of the program have changed. For this reason, language programs funded under the FLMD program may not be strictly first language programs but serve a much wider range of learning needs. The FLMD program is expected to play a wide range of roles in South Australian schools as it is now the only in-school activity funded by the government that addresses needs for a range of language program types (first language, heritage language, etc.). For this reason, the lack of clarity and consistency of interpretation is both a problem and a resource, in that it has allowed the government to address to some extent the needs of a range of different communities that would otherwise not be addressed.

The FLMD program shows how even explicitly articulated policies about the place of languages in education can become ad hoc policies over time. This occurs when language

education activities become separated from their original policy context due to changes in policy over time and as a result lack a clear focus and direction. Such changes in policy can introduce fragmentation into the overall policy contexts as aspects are introduced, shelved and separated out. In this case, the move has been from a policy that was not specifically about language maintenance to a program that was, as the result of piecemeal changes in policy that have stranded a particular activity outside of a coherent policy frame. That is, the evolution of policy can represent an aspect of ‘unplanned language planning’ (Baldauf, 1994; Eggington, 2002) where incremental changes alter the policies trajectory in unplanned and unconsidered ways. The trajectory of FLMD is unplanned in the sense that each phase in its development has not been the result of a decision-making process that has specifically focused on the provision of language maintenance programs in schools but rather has been consequential upon decisions taken in relation to other issues.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> For consistency, this report will use the term ‘First Language Maintenance and Development’ rather than ‘Mother Tongue Development’ except when directly quoting from other documents, although the program itself changed names and has only been known as the FLMD since 1998.
- <sup>2</sup> The term ‘geopolitical languages’ was taken from the *National Policy of Languages* (Lo Bianco, 1987), although the actual selection of languages designated as geopolitical is particular to South Australia.
- <sup>3</sup> Non-instruction time refers to time during the school week when primary school teachers are released from teaching in order to be able to complete other tasks such as preparation of lessons, assessment, report writing and curriculum development, etc.
- <sup>4</sup> Although Vietnamese has been included as a category B languages for FLDM funding, it has not been a language identified for support in the Language Plan. The moving between categories has been an attempt to make the fusion of two unrelated policies bureaucratically manageable and to ensure that Vietnamese did have a legitimate space in the program.

## References

- Arnold, L. (1985). *Government Action in Multicultural Education*. Department of Education. Adelaide.
- Baldauf, R. B. (1994). "Unplanned" language policy and planning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 14, 82-88.
- Baldauf, R. B. (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.
- Clyne, M. (1991a). Australia's language policies: Are we going backwards? In A. J. Liddicoat (Ed.), *Language Planning and Language Policy in Australia* (pp. 3-22). Melbourne: ALAA.
- Clyne, M. (1991b). *Community Languages: The Australian Experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Clyne, M. (1997). Language policy in Australia - achievements, disappointments, prospects. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 18(1), 63-71.
- Clyne, M., & Kipp, S. (2006). Australia's community languages. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 180, 7-21.
- Curriculum Services. (2008). *First Language Maintenance and Development: Discussion Paper 2008*. Department of Education and Children's Services. Adelaide.

- Department of Education of South Australia. (1985). *Voices of the Future: The Policy Statement*. Adelaide: Department of Education.
- DETE. (1991). *Mainstreaming mother tongue programs in primary schools: Draft report and recommendations*. Department of Education, Training and Employment. Adelaide.
- DETE. (1998). *The Languages other than English Plan 2000-2007*. Adelaide: Department of Education, Training and Employment.
- DETE. (1999). *Distribution of tier 2 salaries for first language maintenance and development programs for 2000*. Department of Education, Training and Employment. Adelaide.
- DETE. (2002). *Review of the First Language Maintenance and Development Program: Report*. Adelaide: Department of Education, Training and Employment.
- di Biase, B. A., Giovanni, Andreoni, H., & Dyson, B. (1994). *Unlocking Australia's language potential. Profiles of 9 key languages in Australia: Italian*. Deakin, ACT: NLLIA.
- Education Department of South Australia. (1988). *Languages other than English Development Plan*. Education Department of South Australia. Adelaide.
- Education Department of South Australia. (1989). *Curriculum Guarantee for Primary School Students*. Education Department of South Australia. Adelaide
- Egginton, W. G. (2002). Unplanned language planning. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *Handbook of Applied Linguistics* (pp. 404-415). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Garamy, J. (1988). *Letter to The Hon Greg Crafter dated 23 March*.
- Heylan, J. (1988). LOTE salary distribution for 1988. *LOTE Newsletter*, 1(March), 23-24.
- Languages Policy Working Party. (1983). *Voices for the Future: A Languages Policy for South Australian Schools*. Adelaide: South Australian Education Department.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2010). Policy change and educational inertia: Language policy and language education in Australian schooling. In A. J. Liddicoat & A. Scarino (Eds.), *Languages in Australian Education: Problems, Prospects and Future Directions* (pp. 11-24). Newcastle-on-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2013). *Language-in-education policies: The discursive construction of intercultural relations*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Liddicoat, A. J., & Curnow, T. J. (2009). The place of languages in the school curriculum: Policy and practice in Australian schools. In A. Mahboob & C. Lipovsky (Eds.), *Studies in Applied Linguistics and Language Learning* (pp. 124-138). Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars.
- 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*. Canberra: Department of Education, Science and Training.
- Lo Bianco, J. (1987). *National Policy on Languages*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Lo Bianco, J. (1990). Making language policy: Australia's experience. In R. B. Baldauf, Jr & A. Luke (Eds.), *Language Planning and Education in Australasia and the South Pacific* (pp. 47-79). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Lo Bianco, J. (1998). *Consolidating gains, recovering ground: Languages in South Australia*. Belconnen ACT: NLLIA.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2008). Language policy and education in Australia. In S. May & N. H. Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (Vol. 4, *Language policy and political issues in education*, pp. 343-353). Springer: New York.
- Lo Bianco, J., & Slaughter, Y. (2009). *Second languages in Australian Schooling*. Camberwell, Vic: ACER.
- 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.

- Norst, M. (1982). National ethnic school survey: National Schools Commission.
- Parha, P. (1989). *Summary of Languages Development Plan*. Education Department of South Australia. Adelaide.
- Scarino, A. (1995). A definition of 'ethnic schools' and their role as complementary providers: Ethnic Schools Board of South Australia.
- Smolicz, J. J., & Secombe, M. J. (2003). Assimilation or pluralism? Changing policies for minority languages education in Australia. *Language Policy*, 2(1), 3-25.
- Taskforce to Investigate Multiculturalism and Education. (1984). *Education for a cultural democracy*. Adelaide: Education Department.