REVIEW OF THE FIRST LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Report to the Department for Education and Child Development

Prepared by the
Research Centre for Languages and Cultures at the University of South Australia

Angela Scarino
Timothy Jowan Curnow
Kathleen Heugh
Anthony J. Liddicoat

November 2013

Table of Contents

Introduction

Context

The First Language Maintenance and Development (FLMD) program has been in place in the Department for Education and Child Development (DECD) since 1985 as an initiative which was part of the implementation of two language policy reports: *Voices for the future* (Languages Policy Working Party, 1983) and *Education for a cultural democracy* (Taskforce to Investigate Multiculturalism and Education, 1984). It was intended to support primary schools to provide language learning programs that would respect, maintain and develop home languages and cultures of young learners who came to school as speakers of languages other than English. Over the period of time since its introduction, there have been shifts in migration patterns to South Australia. Equally there have been shifts in the provision of languages education that have led to adjustments to the FLMD program. Given these shifts and the long history of the program a review of the program is timely.

The Department for Education and Child Development commissioned the Research Centre for Languages and Cultures at the University of South Australia to undertake the evaluation.

The evaluation has been undertaken in the context of the current educational policy framework which is captured in such documents as:

> *The Melbourne Declaration*
> *The Shape of the Australian Curriculum: Languages*
> *The DECD Strategic Plan 2012–2016*
> *The DECD Teaching for Effective Learning Framework*

These documents present language learning as a key learning area and set the bases for the recognition in languages education of the diversity of learners and the need for diverse learner pathways to cater for their learning needs. The *Shape of the Australian Curriculum: Languages* (ACARA, 2011), for example, identifies pathways for second language learners (who are learning languages as an additional language), heritage learners[1] (who bring to their language learning at school some knowledge of the language from home) and first language learners (who are learning at school the language of their primary socialisation). The FLMD was designed to cater specifically for the language learning and development of the latter group in mainstream, primary school education.

Despite the recognition of languages as a key learning area in the statements of the national goals of education, over the past three decades, provision for languages education in mainstream primary schools remains fragile. The FLMD was, at the time of its introduction, part of a major policy initiative to increase language learning in primary schools. Since the mid-1990's, however, there has been some erosion in language learning in primary schools (see Lo Bianco, 1995; Liddicoat et al., 2007). The educational policy environment and the fragility of language learning in the primary setting are crucial dimensions of the context of the review of the FLMD program.

---

[1]   There are differences in the use of terminology in different works. In this Review, we will use the term 'heritage language' to emphasise that a language may be in the heritage of a student. In documents associated with the Australian Curriculum, the term 'background learner' is used for this concept.

Aims and scope of the evaluation

The aims and scope of the evaluation were described in the brief prepared by the Department for Education and Child Development.

The purpose of the evaluation was to:

- evaluate the appropriateness of the FLMD programs for contemporary schooling and to ascertain how effective is the FLMD intervention and support process for languages learning;

- assess the operational sustainability of the current arrangements; and

- suggest possible new ways of operating the FLMD program for increased student and family benefit and improved learning outcomes.

It has encompassed the dual dimensions namely, a consideration of (1) the current operational arrangements, and (2) alternative program delivery. Specifically, with regard to current operational arrangements, the brief required consideration of the current policies, guidelines and operational management practices used to implement the programs. As indicated in the brief, these have included:

- an examination of the wellbeing and learning needs of students state-wide who benefit from FLMD programs, particularly addressing matters of equity and inclusion, for example, where there are small cohorts in particular communities (some regional and remote areas);
- an analysis of how current arrangements facilitate the delivery of broad curriculum goals and languages education specifically;
- an analysis of the range of languages being provided under the program;
- an analysis of the qualifications and effectiveness of staff providing FLMD programs in schools;
- an appraisal of the status and utilisation of resources available for Aboriginal languages in the FLMD program;
- the wellbeing and learning outcomes for students participating in programs; and
- the impact of FLMD programs on classroom programs and the school program more generally.

With regard to alternative program delivery, the brief required consideration of:

- evidence from national and international practices that best meet the learning requirements of this particular group of learners in DECD schools;
- links with other languages providers, e.g. School of Languages, Ethnic Schools sector, ESL programs, New Arrivals Programs, Open Access College;
- the synchronicities between the learning of Aboriginal languages in FLMD programs with other programs designed to promote the development of Aboriginal languages, e.g. the Aboriginal Languages Programs Initiatives (ALPI);
- connections between FLMD and other language learning initiatives and strategies, e.g. The School of Language's model of delivery, the current Multilingual Literacy Program, the 2010-11 Languages in Prior to School Settings initiative, and any others deemed to be relevant;
- an analysis of how alternative models of delivery would benefit implementation of the Australian Curriculum and a Learning Design approach to teaching and learning;

- operational requirements and program development strategy for any suggested alternative models of delivery including a consideration of the risks associated with continuing current arrangements and risks accompanying any changes to current arrangements; and
- a workforce recruitment and development strategy to manage any suggested alternative arrangements.

Design and processes of the evaluation

The design of the evaluation acknowledged the fact that many individuals and groups have participated in the history of the FLMD program and would wish to contribute to its evaluation. Accordingly, two fundamental principles were adopted in the design. Firstly, that the evaluation would be sensitive to local contexts and secondly that it would be participatory (see Lynch, 1996, 2003; Kiely & Rea Dickins, 2005).

Four major processes were used in the data gathering process. They are as follows:

(1) Review of the history of the FLMD program
A review of the history of the FLMD program was conducted in terms of requirements, policy settings and management structures for the program. This has enabled us to understand the rationale and context of the original establishment of the program and how it has changed over time. It provides a frame of reference regarding aims, processes and expectations of the program.

(2) Survey and analysis of program data
A survey has been conducted to gather data from all schools on (1) program provision (structure and organization e.g. time, group, space and resource allocations); (2) student participation (number of students and year levels; profile of students e.g. L1 or L2 language background); (3) teacher(s) (e.g. role, qualifications, profile and experience); (4) the program/ curriculum; and (5) learning outcomes (as feasible). The survey instrument is included at Appendix 1. This has enabled us to map current provision.

(3) Interviews and focus group discussions
Interviews and focus group discussions with key stakeholders, including program managers, principals, lead teachers, teachers of specific languages, and providers such as the School of Languages, Ethnic Schools Board, and the Multicultural Education Committee. This has enabled us to (1) canvas perspectives on program offerings; (2) gain a sense of the value and limits of the program offerings and (3) identify issues and alternatives. The interview protocol is included at Appendix 2

(4) School visits and classroom observations
Site visits were conducted with seven schools to observe at each site at least one lesson/class and to meet with the principal, head teacher, and language teacher. These visits have provided insight into the lived experience of the program. The observation protocol for these visits is included at Appendix 3.

Historical context

Origins

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 Smolicz Report (Taskforce to Investigate

Multicuturalism and Education, 1984) on education for a cultural democracy. The later was the immediate catalyst for the development of the program.

Voices for the Future identified first language learning as a significant need for some children in the South Australian education system. It particularly argued that children of recently arrived refugees and children of immigrants whose home language is an immigrant language required specific language support. The report argued that these two groups needed education in their first language to allow initial access to education while they acquired English. The report argued that the needs of such students had not been recognised in educational provision. The report endorsed the idea that initial literacy needs to be developed in children's home languages as a foundation for English language literacy. The report argued 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.

The Smolicz Report identified problems around the extent of education in Australian Aboriginal and immigrant languages in South Australia and proposed a number of recommendations to increase the teaching of those languages that are present in South Australia. The report 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. While the report does not specifically recommend the FLMD program, the program's logic grows out of the report's articulation of language rights and the recognition that the language needs of many students were not met by current educational provision. It particular the report argued that there was a need to develop a program to address the teaching of languages to small groups with specific language needs.

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. As part of the implementation of the policy, 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 and the number of places was intended to accumulate over the following years (Arnold, 1985). The first places were funded in the 1985/1986 budget and these places effectively became the FLMD program. The additional cumulative places for teachers were not subsequently funded and the above allocation allowance remained at 20 FTE salaries.

Structure and operation

The allocation of the original 20 FTE salaries was not initially restricted to first language programs, but rather was designated for teaching languages in primary schools. These salaries were made available to schools on the basis of an application process. Nonetheless, there was a clear perception that these salaries were targeted at first language programs although this was not necessarily the way the first salaries were allocated. Professor JJ Smolicz, then head of the Multicultural Education Co-ordinating Committee (MECC), in criticising the first year's implementation of the funds, commented that "The criteria clearly state that one of the priority areas is mother tongue maintenance for newly arrived groups" (Smolicz, 1986, p. 1) and called for salaries to be allocated predominantly in this area. This was in fact the case in the initial rounds of funding.

The salaries created in *Voices for the Future* were included in 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. The *Languages Development Plan* effectively identified two different types of programs for languages in 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'[2], identified as Japanese, Chinese, Indonesian and Spanish (Heylan, 1988; Parha, 1989).

The *Languages Development Plan* focused on the use of above allocation salaries as the main driver for increasing languages 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)

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 20 salaries allocated in 1986 had therefore effectively become 18 salaries allocated specifically to first language maintenance by 1988.

Although the *Voices for the Future* policy statement had intended that the salaries for languages would be cumulative, this was not in fact the case, and the number of salaries allocated to languages remained static at 20, except in 1987, when only 10 salaries were actually allocated (Parha, 1989, p. 2). The support for first language maintenance and development under the plan therefore consisted only of a share of these 20 salaries and these salaries are the historic starting point of the FLMD program.

The different arrangements for primary school language programs were extensively criticised as the division between community and geopolitical languages taught to two different groups of learners was felt to be divisive, to indicate that community languages had little value for the wider community and to establish different possibilities for having access to language programs for different groups (Garamy, 1988). The distinction was removed in 1990 in the *Curriculum Guarantee* package (Boomer, 1990; Education Department of South Australia, 1989).

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,[3] came in to being as a specific program rather than as a component of above allocation salaries for primary school language teaching and learning.

The FLMD program has continued the original mechanisms for allocation of salaries developed in *Voices for the Future*. FLMD programs are school-based programs for teaching in junior primary and primary schools funded by the South Australian Government. The funding is in addition to the normal allocation of salaries for schools. Programs are funded on the basis of an application process in which schools apply for funding for specific languages each year and estimate the number of students that will be taught in the program. Schools may apply for an FLMD program for more than one language depending on the linguistic profile of the school. Because FLMD funding is allocated based on individual school applications, rather than a measured needs-based assessment, the provision of such programs

---

[2] The term 'geopolitical languages' is taken from the *National Policy of Languages* (Lo Bianco, 1987).

[3] 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.

in schools is dependent on the initiative of individual school leaders in determining that such a program is desired in their particular school. This means that the provision of programs depends on schools' commitment to providing such programs rather than on students' needs and therefore some students may be disadvantaged through lack of initiative on the part of their school leaders (Curriculum Services, 2008).

FDLM is funded on the basis of teacher salaries for delivery of the program. Salaries are allocated on the basis of applications and schools receive a fractional salary for the teaching of a specific language. Although other criteria may be considered in determining the level of funding, the Department has established a salary ratio based on student numbers for determining salary allocations. This ratio has altered over time as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Ratio of salaries to student numbers, selected years. Source: 2001 (DETE, 2002b); 2008 (Curriculum Services, 2008)

2001		2008	
Students	Salary allocation	Students	Salary allocation
11 or fewer	0	10 or fewer	0
12 – 38	0.1	11 – 20	0.05
39 – 75	0.2	21 – 30	0.1
76 – 120	0.3	31 – 40	0.15
120+	0.4	41 – 50	0.2
		51 – 60	0.25
		60+	0.3

The number of students required to attract funding is based largely on these ratios but in reality the threshold levels may vary year by year depending on the number of students identified in application requests and the number of requests.

In a 1990 report (Cocchiaro et al., 1990), it was recommended that 150 minutes per week was the minimum instructional time that was required for language maintenance and development and the report rejected the idea of a 0.1 FTE allocation to a program. As a result it recommended that a 0.3 allocation was the minimum effective allocation. However, this recommendation was not accepted and small allocations of 0.05 to 0.2 FTE have remained common.

Allocation of funds has been done by a Departmental committee. Initially this committee was made up of Departmental staff responsible for areas such as languages education, Aboriginal education and multicultural education, together with a representative of MECC. This committee was replaced in November 2008, by an FLMD Reference Group. The Reference Group had a broader profile than the previous Departmental committee and brought together Departmental representatives and representatives of the Ethnic School Sector, the Multicultural Education Committee, the South Australian Primary Principals Association and the School of Languages (DECS, 2008). The Reference Group also had broader functions than the previous committee and its terms of reference included the provision of advice on current and emergent needs of teachers and learners; providing advice of the allocation of salaries; recommending strategies to review the program; and maintaining a coordinated approach to the delivery of language education.

Once they receive the salaries, the schools are required to find a teacher to deliver the program. Finding teachers sometimes presents a problems for schools and in these cases, the school may need to use the allocated salaries in different ways to find a person to deliver the course. A survey by DETE (2002a) found that the majority of schools were able to find teachers, but in some cases it was necessary to convert salaries to pay people who are not

fully qualified as teachers to deliver the programs, such as Hourly Paid Instructors, Aboriginal Education Workers or Aboriginal Language and Culture Specialists, where schools were unable to find a teacher for a particular language. In some cases, funding has been returned to the Department.

FLMD and articulations with other policies

The FLMD program has formed a part of the overall policy focus for languages in education in South Australia and, although it is a separate program, it has been brought within the focus of broader policy. These policy documents typically include the FLMD program as part of their broader work on languages education, but do not present information relating to the specific nature and scope of the program.

The *Languages other than English Plan* (DETE, 1998b) mentions FLMD programs in the context of "access and choice in Languages other than English education and maintenance and development of South Australia's cultural and linguistic diversity" (p. 5) together with a number of second/foreign language learning activities. The FLMD program continued to be a feature of South Australia's language education policy and is included as an initiative of the *DECS Languages Statement 2007-2011* (DECS, 2007c) and the *Languages Engagement Strategy 2009-2011* (DECS, 2010) as a language learning pathway, again together with second/foreign language learning activities. In these policies, therefore the FLMD program is just one of a range of activities which focus on languages learning and its focus as first language learning is not emphasised in this policy context.

The FLMD program has also been included as part of the Department's activity under the *Multiculturalism in Schooling and Children's Services Policy* (DECS, 1995). Although it is not specifically mentioned in that policy text, the relationship between FLMD and multicultural services is often stated explicitly in texts relating to FLMD. In multicultural policy, FLMD has been seen as a strategy for meeting the policy goal that "curriculum, programs, resource management, organisation and staffing procedures at all levels reflect and respond to the cultural and linguistic diversity of South Australia" (p. 1). This policy also frames maintaining and developing linguistic and cultural heritage as a right for students in South Australian schools.

The FLMD forms a part of the South Australian Government's support for Aboriginal languages in schools and represents only a small part of the educational support given to these languages. In addition to the FLMD, the government has supported Aboriginal languages through:

- Aboriginal Languages Programs Initiatives (ALPI), which aim to develop and support community expertise to deliver relevant Aboriginal languages to students

- Aboriginal Community Languages and Culture Partnerships project (ACLCP), which had as its objective strengthening school-community relationships through languages teaching and learning

This means that, while Aboriginal languages are included in the FLMD program, this program is not the only funding source available for these languages. FLMD supports a greater number of students of immigrant languages and remains for these languages the only government provision as a part of regular schooling.

The FLMD program also articulates with other SA Government approaches in the education of linguistic minorities. For example, FLMD appears to be an element of the government's work with students from refugee backgrounds, which states that:

Through a first language maintenance and development program schools can acknowledge the importance of the first language(s) of students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. The program fosters pride in the diversity of languages and cultures represented in the school and has a positive impact on students' learning of and through English. (DECS, 2007a, p. 54)

The FLMD program is therefore used as a way of acknowledging the linguistic and cultural diversity that exists within schools, developing pride and fostering learning of English for refugee children. The FLMD is also acknowledged in the guidelines for the Premier's Reading Challenge (Government of South Australia, 2012), which specifically acknowledges that free choice readings may be in the languages of those involved in the FLMD program, recognising the importance of literacy in these languages for learners.

The FLMD program intersects with three broad policy areas: languages education, multicultural education and literacy development. The relationships are acknowledged differently in policy texts. The connection with literacy is explicitly acknowledged in some documents relating to the Premier's Literacy Challenge but the FLMD program is not mentioned in texts relating to literacy policy itself. These texts focus exclusively on literacy in English and do not pick up the explicit focus of FLMD in developing literacy in home languages, or that literacy in home languages is important for the acquisition of literacy in English. This means that in the policy context, FLMD is seen as *languages* education rather than as *literacy* education, even though literacy is a specific goal of the program. In multicultural education policy, FLMD is not mentioned, but FLMD is presented as part of the policy work in this field. That is, it is used to exemplify work in multicultural education, but does not have a policy position within multicultural policy. Similarly, in language education policy, FLMD is listed as a type of language education, but its specific focus on education in students' first language rather than on the teaching and learning of an additional language is not emphasised. This means that FLMD is represented only as a pathway towards language acquisition and its specific education focus is not highlighted in policy texts. This means that FLMD does not have a clear policy positioning in SA as no policy fully recognises the role of first language in literacy development or the educational dimensions of first language in schooling. This has meant that the policy role of the FLMD has not been clearly framed as a constituent part of policy and, although the interrelationships with other policies have been acknowledged in some contexts, there is no sustained integration of FLMD into education policy that reflects adequately its particular focus.

Concerns that funding for FLMD positions may be used for purposes other than those strictly related to the goals and objectives of the FLMD program would seem to reflect this ambiguous positioning of the program and possible confusion about the primary educational role of the program – that is of developing early educational opportunities for students for whom English is not a first language. The location of FLMD within the framework of languages education policy means that it may be seem as an adjunct to a policy area that is primarily concerned with the acquisition of additional languages rather than first languages, and this may obscure the educational significance of the program. The FLMD can be seen as an alternative pathway for language learning rather as a program with a specific language focus not addressed elsewhere.

Level of funding support

The level of provision in terms of the numbers of full-time equivalent (FTE) teachers' salaries for the FLMD program has changed since its inception. From 1986-1989, 18 salaries were earmarked for first language programs and from 1990 first language programs were allocated the full 20 FTE salaries created under *Voices for the Future*. From 1997 the salaries funded for FLMD were reduced to 15 FTE as part of an overall cut to above-formula teachers'

positions announced by the Minister in 1996 (DETE, 1999a). Five additional salaries were funded through the National Asian Languages and Studies in Australian Schools (NALSAS) program. These salaries were directed towards Asian languages (DETE, 2002a), in line with the NALSAS focus on four targeted Asian languages (Chinese, Indonesian, Japanese and Korean). Departmental records show that these salaries were largely directed to Chinese and Vietnamese.

When NALSAS funding was wound up, the five places funded under NALSAS were funded in 2003-2004 from the Learning Outcomes and Curriculum budget. Since 2005, these additional salaries have not been funded and the FLMD program has funded only 15 salaries (Curriculum Services, 2008).

Although the number of salaries funded by the program has decreased, this has happened at a time when demand for FLMD programs has increased as a result of increasing and changing linguistic and cultural diversity in schools.

Students and languages

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.

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 were often different and schools tended to contact parents or respond to parents' requests to identify students (DETE, 2002a). 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, 1998b) 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

The place of Vietnamese in this list is complex as 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). In 2008, the Guidelines indicated that Vietnamese was to be considered a category C language and by 2010, Vietnamese was listed as one of the category B languages. This categorisation can have consequences for the provision of funding as 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 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 means that the Languages Statement languages, which included languages of more established communities, such as Greek and Italian, as well as languages of more recently arrived communities, such as Chinese, has disappeared. The result is that languages of more established communities have become less prominent in the FLMD Guidelines and the emphasis has been placed more strongly on the languages of newly arrived communities. This change of emphasis can be seen as reflecting the sociolinguistic realities of immigrant communities in Australia and the likelihood that more established communities will have shifted to English as the normal language of the home, especially after the third generation (Clyne & Kipp, 2006).

Naming and focus

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 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. (Chocchiaro 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 lead to the possibility of using FLMD money for purposes other than educational development of learners through the languages they spoke at home.

In 1998, the name of the program was changed to the First Language Maintenance and Development program. This change came in response to a complaint from a parent that the term 'mother tongue' did not recognise the role of other caregivers in a child's first language development. In changing the name of the program, the Department restated the goals of the program as:

> - to enhance students' understanding and development of their first language;
> - to contribute to literacy development in both English and the target language;
> - to support the development of self-esteem and cultural identity. (DETE, 1998a)

The term 'first language' has a much more specific focus than 'mother tongue' as it implies that the language is the first language known by a person, but there remains evidence that the focus of the program continued to be ambiguous. For example, in the call for applications produced in 1999 for funding in 2000 (DETE, 1999b), 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)

This statement of the purpose for FLMD was used for a number of years after the renaming of the program, implying that FLMD funds could be used for the purposes of more general language education.

Aboriginal languages have come to be framed in different terms from other languages under the FLMD program, reflecting different sociolinguistic situations of immigrant and Aboriginal languages in Australia. For most languages, current guidelines require that students in an FLMD program should use that language at home, but for Aboriginal languages, eligibility is understood in terms of a close relationship with the language to take into account the consequences of the displacement of Aboriginal people. For example, the 2008 funding guidelines (DECS, 2007b) state:

> Students eligible for FLMD support in 2008 are defined as those students *who **use the** target language in their home*s. In the case of Aboriginal languages eligible students are those *who **relate closely** to the particular target language* (DECS, 2007b, p. 1, emphases in original)

Following a discussion paper produced in 2008 (Curriculum Services, 2008), the focus of the program has been 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, continue 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. This is a similar model to ESL support, where additional funding is available to target students with specific needs, rather than provide the English area of learning to all students. (Curriculum Services, 2010)

This statement of purpose has continued to be used since 2010 in the application guidelines.

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 never been a specifically articulated policy in relation to the program. This lack of clear policy 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 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 historical profile: Languages, programs and funding statistics

This section of the report presents some of the basic data available for the FLMD program, together with general statistics for South Australia from the various ABS Census reports from 1986 through to 2011.

Cautions

There are a number of issues around the data presented here which should be kept in mind while reading and evaluating this data. Different data sets have been collected in different years by the Department, and different years' worth of data have been retained on file. In general terms, the more recent data is more extensive, but has been supplemented by other data in order to see the history of the program:

- 2008-2012: this data was provided electronically by the Department
- 2000, 2003: this data was provided in hard copy by the Department
- 1988: this data was extracted from Heylan (1988)

We have attempted to capture here only cases where a language was actually taught, and capture the data in the year it was actually taught. That is, we have left out of the data cases where a language may have been allocated funding, but for whatever reason there were no classes (either because no teacher could be found, or there were too few students). In some of these cases money was held over to another year (in which case we have attempted to report the data in the following year, where that data is available); in some cases the money was returned to the Department (in which case we have left the money out of the figures presented here); in some cases it was rolled into another language program (in which case we have increased the salary fraction for the other language). There were also cases where a school was not allocated any FLMD money, but nonetheless taught an FLMD program to students (usually because they had a funded program the previous year, and often returned to a funded program the following year); we have removed these from our data, particularly because these are only sporadically reported.

Student numbers reported in the data are complex. For all years of data from 2000 onward, we always know the number of students that the school anticipated they would have. For some years, the Department collected one set of actual student figures. For some years, the Department collected two sets of actual student figures, usually in terms 1 and 3. While most schools contributed data, in every year there were one or more schools which failed to return one or more sets of data to the Department. In calculating student numbers for each program in each school for each year, we have used the following process:

- if two figures are given for actual student numbers, we have used the average of the two, leading in some cases to 'actual' numbers of half a student (most schools in 2008-09 and 2011-12);
- if only one figure is given for actual student numbers, we have used that figure (2010 for all programs, plus many other cases where schools only reported in one or the other survey); and
- if no actual student numbers are given (2000 and 2003 for all programs, an occasional other missing figure), we have filled in the data with the expected number of students.

For the 1988 data, there are no student figures. There are salary fractions for that year for all programs. For all programs except 'Farsi' we have the number of programs, but this has not

been given for 'Farsi' – we have estimated 5 programs based on the salary fraction (1 FTE), but this could easily be substantially incorrect.

There are cases where what is at least substantially the same language is reported differently by different schools. For example, some schools have reported 'Arabana' while others report 'Arabunna'. Where there were naming conflicts of this sort with Australian Aboriginal languages, we have presented the languages in the data here with the names used in the AIATSIS Pathways Language Thesaurus (in this case Arabana/Arabunna). This is not to suggest that the names used here are of any greater or lesser standing than those reported by the schools, but in order to report consistently, a consistent name was needed. Where only a single spelling was used throughout the data for a language, we have not altered the language name from the version given by the school.

A similar naming issue arises for non-indigenous languages as well. We have taken various decisions around certain languages to group them together. Once again this is not to suggest that one variety or another is of more value than another, but rather we attempted to group together those varieties or languages where what would be taught at primary school in the FLMD program would appear to be substantially identical. The language sets in question here are:

- Kirundi: covers both Kirundi and Kirundi/Swahili

- Filipino/Tagalog: covers both Filipino and Tagalog

- Chinese: covers both Chinese and Mandarin

- Dari/Farsi: covers Dari, Farsi, Persian, Farsi/Dari and Dari/Farsi

- Croatian(/B/S): covers Croatian, Croatian/Serbian and Bosnian

- Serbian(/C/B): covers Serbian, Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian, and Serbian/Bosnian/Croatian

The above accounts for cases where languages are grouped together but separated by a slash (/) in the data. There are other cases in the data presented here where language names are separated by a comma (,). This has occurred where the Departmental records indicate a single set of funding going to a program which is reported using a set of names which in our judgement indicates it is most probably being taught as two or three separate languages (either based on reporting from the program itself, or our understanding of the particular languages). However this is conjecture in some cases, and it is unclear whether the different languages are being taught sequentially (e.g. one in one half of the year, one in the other half); to separate classes of students; or simultaneously in a single class, with differences being indicated during the teaching.

Funding for FLMD languages across the years

In total, 42 languages (or sets of languages) have been funded by the FLMD program during the years for which data is available – it is possible that some other small languages were funded in years for which no data is available, particularly 1989-99. We can look at the way the funding has been used in a number of ways: by full-time equivalent salary for teacher positions, by number of programs (counting each language at a school as a separate program), and by number of students taught. For the first two, it is convenient to take three snapshots for 1988 (beginning of the program), 2000 (twelve years later) and 2012 (twelve years after that). For number of students taught, no data is available for 1988.

Table 2: FTE salary per language in 2012, 2000, 1988

Language	2012 salary	2000 salary	1988 salary
Greek	2.65	3.00	0.70
Italian	2.45	3.10	2.60
Vietnamese	1.65	2.90	5.80
Pitjantjatjara	1.10	1.90	1.60
Khmer	1.05	0.90	1.20
Chinese	0.95	1.40	1.70
Adnyamathanha	0.70	0.40	
Serbian(/C/B)	0.60	0.40	
Ngarrindjeri	0.45	0.90	
Kaurna	0.40	0.40	
Hindi	0.35		
Dari/Farsi	0.30	0.10	1.00
Kirundi	0.30		
Narangga/Narrunga	0.30		
Punjabi	0.30		
Arabic	0.20		
Kaurna,Narangga/Narrunga, Ngarrindjeri	0.20		
Lao	0.20		
Nauo,Barngala,Wirangu	0.20		
Turkish	0.15	0.20	
Auslan	0.10	0.10	
Dinka	0.10		
Pitjantjatjara,Adnyamathanha	0.10		
Urdu	0.10		
Polish		0.50	1.50
Spanish		0.30	0.90
Antikirinya		0.20	
Pitjantjatjara,Wirangu		0.20	
Arabana/Arabunna		0.10	
Filipino/Tagalog		0.10	
Warlpiri		0.10	
Dutch			0.50
Portuguese			0.20
Russian			0.30
Grand Total	**14.90**	**17.20**	**18.00**

The strongest distinctions over time can be seen here in Greek (very low in 1988) and Vietnamese (much reduced over time), as well as in Polish, Spanish, Dutch and Russian.

Table 3: Number of programs for each language (i.e. number of schools in which each language was taught) in 2012, 2000 and 1988

Language	2012 programs	2000 programs	1988 programs
Greek	18	21	4
Italian	16	22	9
Vietnamese	10	19	25
Pitjantjatjara	6	13	5
Chinese	6	10	8
Khmer	5	7	5
Serbian(/C/B)	5	3	
Ngarrindjeri	3	6	
Adnyamathanha	3	4	
Dari/Farsi	3	1	5
Hindi	3		
Kaurna	2	3	
Arabic	2		
Kirundi	2		
Lao	2		
Narangga/Narrunga	2		
Punjabi	2		
Turkish	1	2	
Auslan	1	1	
Dinka	1		
Kaurna,Narangga/Narrunga,Ngarrindjeri	1		
Nauo,Barngala,Wirangu	1		
Pitjantjatjara,Adnyamathanha	1		
Urdu	1		
Polish		3	5
Spanish		3	5
Antikirinya		2	
Arabana/Arabunna		1	
Filipino/Tagalog		1	
Pitjantjatjara,Wirangu		1	
Warlpiri		1	
Dutch			1
Portuguese			1
Russian			1
Grand Total	**97**	**124**	**74**

Table 4: Number of students for each language in 2012 and 2000 (student numbers unknown in 1988)

NB numbers rounded up to nearest 'whole student' where averages were taken, hence the total does not correspond to the sum of the column; note that some languages were not taught in 2012 or 2000.

Language	2012 students	2000 students
Greek	585	723
Italian	575	832
Vietnamese	418	763
Pitjantjatjara	330	513
Chinese	239	312
Adnyamathanha	217	103
Khmer	171	187
Narangga/Narrunga	169	
Kaurna	163	113
Nauo,Barngala,Wirangu	143	
Serbian(/C/B)	102	103
Ngarrindjeri	90	230
Hindi	72	
Kirundi	52	
Dari/Farsi	48	15
Punjabi	43	
Kaurna,Narangga/Narrunga,Ngarrindjeri	39	
Arabic	34	
Lao	24	
Urdu	20	
Auslan	13	12
Turkish	12	35
Dinka	9	
Pitjantjatjara,Adnyamathanha	3	
Antikirinya		144
Polish		84
Spanish		52
Pitjantjatjara,Wirangu		48
Arabana/Arabunna		20
Warlpiri		15
Filipino/Tagalog		9
Dutch		
Portuguese		
Russian		
Grand Total	**3566**	**4313**

Looking just at the top 11 languages for 2012 in each list here, we can see that there is a very strong correspondence (unsurprisingly) between the languages which had the largest salary allocation, the largest number of programs, and the most students.

Table 5: Top programs, salaries and students in 2012

Top 11 salaries	Top 11 no. of programs	Top 11 no. of students
Greek	Greek	Greek
Italian	Italian	Italian
Vietnamese	Vietnamese	Vietnamese
Pitjantjatjara	Pitjantjatjara	Pitjantjatjara
Khmer	Chinese	Chinese
Chinese	Khmer	Adnyamathanha
Adnyamathanha	Serbian(/C/B)	Khmer
Serbian(/C/B)	*Ngarrindjeri*	*Narangga/Narrunga*
Ngarrindjeri	Adnyamathanha	*Kaurna*
Kaurna	*Dari/Farsi*	*Nauo,Barngala,Wirangu*
Hindi	*Hindi*	Serbian(/C/B)

In general, those languages which are not in the top 11 for all categories are close: Ngarrindjeri and Hindi are 12th and 13th in terms of student numbers; Kaurna is equal 12th in terms of number of programs; Dari/Farsi is 12th in salaries and 15th in student numbers; Narangga/Narrunga is 14th in salaries and equal 12th in number of programs. The only oddity is the presence of the Nauo-Barngala-Wirangu cluster; however 2012 was the first year for this program, and for 2013 the school has only predicted 47 students, which suggests something odd may have happened with the figures in 2012.

At various times, the Department has divided languages into different 'categories', with the longest-lasting division that between Aboriginal languages (category A), languages supported by the Languages Plan (category B), and others (category C). Dividing the salary allocation in this way over time we can see that there was a substantial increase between 1988 and 2000 in the percentage of funding going to Aboriginal languages, with the funding coming primarily from the 'Community languages'. More recently, the 'Community languages' have regained ground, at the expense of the Languages Plan languages.

Table 6: Salary allocation to different categories of languages over time

Language category	2012	%	2000	%	1988	%
A (Aboriginal languages)	3.45	23%	4.20	24%	1.60	9%
B (Languages Plan languages)	7.70	52%	10.70	62%	11.70	65%
C (Community languages)	3.75	25%	2.30	13%	4.70	26%
Total	**14.90**		**17.20**		**18.00**	

It is interesting to compare the languages in the FLMD program with the top 24 languages which are reported as being spoken by 5-12 year olds at home in South Australia in the 2011 census (ABS, 2013c); 24 languages being chosen simply to correspond to the number of languages or clusters of languages taught in the FLMD program in 2012. This table includes the original data, but additionally in italics indicates those combinations of languages or language names which would be likely to be jointly taught in the FLMD program.

Table 7: Top 24 languages spoken by 5-12 year olds at home in South Australia in the 2011 Census, and the 2012 FLMD ranking in terms of allocated salaries

NB: Language sets in italics are those which the researchers believe schools would probably teach jointly

Language	Children	Percentage	FLMD ranking
English only or not stated	133,836	88.5%	
Vietnamese	1,828	1.2%	3
Greek	1,631	1.1%	1
Mandarin + Cantonese + Chinese	*1,370*	*0.9%*	*6*
Arabic	917	0.6%	16
Italian	864	0.6%	2
Mandarin	848	0.6%	(6)
Dari + Persian + Hazaraghi	*683*	*0.5%*	*12*
Tagalog + Filipino	*643*	*0.4%*	*no salary 2012*
Cantonese	452	0.3%	(6)
Hindi	433	0.3%	11
Spanish	426	0.3%	no salary 2012
Khmer	396	0.3%	5
Korean	390	0.3%	no salary 2012
Tagalog	347	0.2%	(no salary 2012)
Malayalam	335	0.2%	no salary 2012
Russian	333	0.2%	no salary 2012
Pitjantjatjara	330	0.2%	4
Dinka	325	0.2%	21
Punjabi	324	0.2%	12
Filipino	296	0.2%	(no salary 2012)
Serbian	290	0.2%	8
Dari	289	0.2%	(12)
German	283	0.2%	no salary 2012
Gujarati	259	0.2%	no salary 2012
Persian (excluding Dari)	258	0.2%	(12)
Croatian + Bosnian	*252*	*0.2%*	*no salary 2012*
Afrikaans	244	0.2%	no salary 2012
Polish	241	0.2%	no salary 2012
Total	**151,188**		

Of the languages that were funded in 2012 but are not in the top 24 spoken at home by children, the majority are Australian Aboriginal languages: Adnyamathanha, Ngarrindjeri, Kaurna, Narangga/Narrunga, and the set of Nauo, Barngala, Wirangu. There is also Auslan, which appears on the census list as the 40th language of children (but is taught at Brighton Primary School, which has a specialist hearing impaired program, and consequently a strong concentration of those children with Auslan as a first language). The remaining languages are Kirundi (26th on 2011 census), Lao (50th), Turkish (40th) and Urdu (28th).

Based purely on this list, we might expect higher funding for:

- Arabic (5th in 2006 census, 4th in 2011)
- Dari/Farsi (6th in both years)

- Dinka (16th in 2006 census, 15th in 2011)

The rankings here in the two censuses are based on ABS (2013b, 2013c). We might also have expected some funding for

- Filipino/Tagalog (11th in 2006 census, 7th in 2011)
- Spanish (15th in 2006 census, 9th in 2011)
- Korean (17th in 2006 census, 11th in 2011)
- Malayalam (38th in 2006 census, 12th in 2011)
- Russian (14th in 2006 census, 13th in 2011)

Malayalam receives no separate funding, though the language is sometimes combined in an FLMD program with Hindi, with which it has no linguistic connection at all.

Funding does, of course, depend not simply on the statistics across the state, but rather on sufficient concentrations of children in specific areas, a principal and school who apply for funding, and the availability of a teacher. Nonetheless, it is interesting to note that many of the under-represented groups, statistically speaking, are from languages spoken by more recent arrivals, with all being languages that have become stronger in the 5 years from 2006 to 2011. This suggests that, for whatever reason, the allocation of funding is not keeping pace with the changes in first-language demographics. This is also problematic in that the more recently arrived groups are more likely to speak only the traditional language at home (and hence benefit more from a first-language literacy approach), while many of the children speaking a language such as Italian or Greek at home would be growing up in something closer to a bilingual environment with English.

Given that FLMD funding is used not only for first language programs, but also for something much closer to what might be called heritage programs, it is also interesting to compare the FLMD funding in 2012 with the census ancestry data for the 5-12 year olds in South Australia (ABS, 2013a). The census itself allows for attribution of up to two ancestries; here the data is only provided for the first ancestry, which is presumably the more strongly felt link.

Table 8: First ancestry of 5-12 year olds in South Australia compared with the FLMD ranking by salary funding in 2012

NB: in many cases ancestry and language do not align fully, so this is very much an indication, but should not be treated as fully specified

First ancestry	Children	Percentage	FLMD ranking
Australian	52279	34.6%	
English	52007	34.4%	
Not stated	8881	5.9%	
Italian	7052	4.7%	Italian 2
Irish	3978	2.6%	
German	3906	2.6%	
Scottish	2948	1.9%	
Chinese	2254	1.5%	Chinese (Mandarin) 6
Greek	2163	1.4%	Greek 1
Indian	1881	1.2%	Hindi 11, Punjabi 12, Urdu 21
Vietnamese	1542	1.0%	Vietnamese 3
Filipino	979	0.6%	
Australian Aboriginal	802	0.5%	Pitjantjatjara 4, Adnyamathanha 7, Ngarrindjeri 9, Kaura 10, Narangga/Narrunga 12, Nauo,Barngala,Wirangu 16
Korean	493	0.3%	
Dutch	408	0.3%	
South African	403	0.3%	
Khmer (Cambodian)	387	0.3%	Khmer 5
Afghan	374	0.2%	Dari/Farsi 12
Polish	359	0.2%	
Serbian	312	0.2%	Serbian (/C/B) 8
Russian	302	0.2%	
Lebanese	288	0.2%	Arabic 16
African, so described	277	0.2%	Kirundi 12, Arabic 16, Dinka 21
Sudanese	276	0.2%	Dinka 21
Croatian	232	0.2%	
Iranian	206	0.1%	Dari/Farsi 12
Sri Lankan	202	0.1%	
Total	**151,188**		

Looking at the ancestry data in comparison with the FLMD funded languages, we can see that there is some correspondence. The most noticeable high-ancestry groups whose 'traditional' languages are not funded from the FLMD program are northern European languages – Irish, Scottish, German, Dutch (and Afrikaans), Polish and Russian. The interesting additions here with no funding are Filipino (with the 9th highest ancestry, excluding Australian and English) and Korean (11th highest). The national languages of the countries traditionally associated with those ancestries were also noted as frequently spoken at home, as was Russian.

Total FLMD funding across the years

While census data for 5-12 year olds at that point is not available, we can examine the language spoken at home for all South Australians for every census since 1986 up to 2011. What we see in those figures is a constant increase in numbers of people who speak a language other than English at home, although as a percentage of the South Australian population the figures remain relatively stable until the 2011 census, which has a substantial increase in percentage.

Table 9: Number and percentage of South Australians who speak a language other than English at home (data from ABS, 1989, 1993, 2007, 2012)

Year	Number who speak language other than English	Population of SA	% who speak language other than English
1986	159,502	1,248,324	12.80%
1991	170,497	1,302,667	13.10%
1996	172,355	1,427,936	12.10%
2001	172,480	1,467,262	11.80%
2006	183,861	1,509,009	12.30%
2011	228,963	1,593,575	14.50%

In 1988, a total of 18 salaries were dedicated to what was designed to be the first-language component of primary language teaching. While the exact population who spoke a language other than English at home in South Australia is unknown in 1988, we can estimate it at approximately 163,900. Assuming that the number of 5-12 year olds speaking a language other than English has increased at the same rate as the general South Australian population, to cover the population in 2011 would require 25.1 FTE salaries. It is clear that the salary allocation for the FLMD program has not kept up even with the allocation of salaries from the first year of the program, which as noted earlier was intended as a minimum to increase over the years.

The 2013 profile: Survey data

As part of the data gathering for this Review, surveys were sent by the Department to all schools which received FLMD funding in 2013. Of the 60 schools, responses were received from 27. Of the total of 91 language programs funded, information was obtained from 41 programs (or 45% of the total). This is a sufficient number of surveys covering a range of regions, languages and programs to observe patterns in the data; but obviously, it is not necessarily fully representative.

Of those language programs who responded, 7 (or 17%) were from Aboriginal languages, 18 (or 44%) from languages covered by the Languages Plan, and 16 (or 39%) were from 'Community languages'. It is interesting to compare this with the figures given above for the percentages of salary allocation to each of these categories in 2012. It is clear that the Community language programs, in particular, responded much more strongly to the survey, with 39% of the returned surveys from this group, although they received only 25% of the funding.

It is clear from the survey that where the FLMD language is taught in a school, all levels of primary school participate in the program – that is, the program is never restricted to only some years of primary schooling.

Five of the schools do not have a 'mainstream' language program. In the surveys returned it is clear that in all cases where the FLMD program exists together with a mainstream school language or languages, those students who participate in the FLMD program additionally participate in the mainstream school language classes, whether these two sets of classes are for the same language or distinct languages.

Eleven (27%) of the FLMD programs involve teaching the same language that is also taught in mainstream language classes for all students in the school. In almost all of these programs (10, or 24% of overall FLMD programs), students are selected for the program on the basis of 'background' or 'heritage' rather than any necessary ability of the students or their parents to speak the language. That is, 24% of the FLMD programs (in the survey) appear to be heritage programs in a school where the language is additionally taught as a second language (but see the caveat in the following paragraph).

Overall, the majority of programs (63%) have selection criteria which include something similar to students 'identifying' with the language. However it is important to note that it is impossible to tell from the survey data how many students in any program are of what type. That is, while 63% of programs include 'identification' as a selection criterion, it is possible that some or all of the students who elect to enter the FLMD program in fact speak the language at home. The student characteristics in the programs cannot be distinguished from the survey; all that is available is information about who is potentially able to enter the program. In 4 of the programs (10%), all students in the school participate – these were all Aboriginal language programs in areas where the vast majority of students are speakers of the local language. An additional 7 programs (17%) explicitly include as a necessary selection criterion that the students speak the language. A further 2 programs (5%) have criteria explicitly requiring that parents speak the language at home. This suggests that approximately 32% of the programs have criteria meaning they can be taught fully as first language maintenance programs. A further 2 programs (5%) have criteria allowing students to enter the program if their parents are born in a country where the language is spoken; these students may or may not have the language as their first language. The remaining programs, as mentioned above, include students who 'identify' with the language (or similar wording), which means of course that the students have never necessarily even heard the language spoken.

Turning now to the FLMD classes, as portrayed in the survey data. It is almost never the case that students are divided into their individual year level for FLMD classes. Sometimes they are taught with students of an adjacent year level. However much more common is that students in three, four or more different year levels are found together in the same class.

Table 10: Distribution of year levels per class

Year levels	Number of programs	%
Each year level taught in separate class	2	5%
Adjacent year levels together (e.g. 3/4, 5/6)	14	34%
Three or four year levels taught jointly (e.g. R-3, 4-7)	22	54%
All year levels in same class (R-7)	3	7%

The average amount of time dedicated to FLMD classes emerging from the surveys is 74 minutes per week, however this figure is in fact misleading, because it includes a number of Aboriginal schools where substantial time is dedicated to the local language, and appears to include time funded by FLMD and non-FMLD funded classes also. Looking more realistically just at the 34 programs relating to non-Aboriginal languages, the average time is

56 minutes per week, with 29 of these programs (85%) having a single lesson per week, and the remaining 5 (15%) having two lessons per week.

Around three-quarters of the programs have access to at least some commercially produced resource materials, whether produced in Australia (common for Italian and Greek) or overseas (most other languages). Only 2 programs (5%) indicate that they use community-developed resources but no commercial materials, and 9 programs (22%) indicate that all resources have been developed by the teacher.

According to the survey data, most students who undertake the FLMD program are assessed in some way, often in multiple ways. The table below represents the most formal assessment tool which is reported as being used in the survey data.

Table 11: Assessment

Most formal assessment used	Number of programs	%
formal tests	12	29%
formal assessment of written/spoken work	19	46%
informal holistic assessment by teacher	7	17%
no explicit assessment	3	7%

While this table indicates that 93% of programs assess students in some way, it is not clear what is done with this assessment, as only 20 programs (49%) indicate that they report to parents on student learning. Of those programs, only 12 programs (60% of reporting programs, 29% of all programs) use standard grades in this reporting.

The majority of teachers involved in the FLMD program have some form of teaching qualification, most an Australian qualification, with only 17% having no qualification at all.

Table 12: Teacher qualifications

Most relevant qualification	Number of programs	%
Australian teaching qualifications	29	71%
Overseas teaching qualifications	5	12%
No teaching qualifications	7	17%

The majority of those teaching in the FLMD program have an additional role in the school, whether as a mainstream teacher, language teacher, other specialist teacher, or school services officer. However there are still a substantial number of programs, 12 (or 29%), where the FLMD program is the only contact that the teacher has with the school.

Stakeholder perspectives on the FLMD program

Interviews and focus group discussions were held on 31 May 2013 with invited stakeholders and any school principals, coordinators and teachers who wished to meet with the research team. Invited individual interviews were conducted with:

- Lia Tedesco, Principal, School of Languages

- George Panagopoulos and Jeannette Barrachina, representing John Kiosoglous from the Ethnic Schools Board

- Chris Shakes, representing the Multicultural Education Committee

- Inte Rumpe from the Ethnic Schools Association

The principal and senior teaching staff from East Adelaide Primary School also participated in a focus group discussion. Further discussions were held with principals and staff during school visits.

The questions addressed during the interviews and focus group discussions are attached at Appendix 2.

Discussion with interview participants highlighted the fundamental value of the program as well as the recognition of complex issues that require re-consideration.

The value of the FLMD program

All interview participants recognised the value of the program in providing for the learning of a range of community languages in primary schools. They expressed the important link between learning languages through the FLMD program and the affirmation of the learners' sense of identity, "where their families have come from, the life of parents and grandparents and learners' connection with them". They believe that learning the language of the home "enhances (children's) identities as Australian; it's not about being Italian". They appreciated that in this context language learning "is not just a subject" but a crucial dimension of learners' development as learners. Interview participants also recognised the importance of maintaining the diversity of languages in the program, linked to the different community groups who migrated to South Australia for different reasons as part of South Australia's migration history. There was a recognition of the fact that communities are evolving, that many languages are represented in school communities and that it is important to provide for "more recently arrived communities". The interview participants also saw the value of the program in terms of "mother tongue maintenance" and the need for these learners to develop bilinguality. They recognised that achieving the goal of bilinguality requires substantial time, much more than that which is made available through the FLMD program. Overall, interview participants reiterated their view that the program is "an incredible resource" that must be maintained.

Issues related to the FLMD program

Many issues were raised in relation to the program. These include:

1. *The fragility of policy settings with regard to languages and multiculturalism/ multilingualism in education*: there was a recognition of a much more complex pattern of linguistic and cultural diversity in primary schools in contemporary times and the absence of a policy that supports the provision for language learning; that the multiculturalism policy has "an ideological loading" in education, was seen as an aspect of the context that adds to the complexity. The increasing emphasis on Asian languages in recent educational policy discourse that is represented as substituting rather than supplementing language learning in general, was also seen as a problem of perceptions and values.

2. *The definition of the target group*: there was a recognition that the 'definition' of learner groups for which the FLMD program needs to cater has changed over time and that a clearer definition of the target groups of learners and the purpose of the program needs to be developed.

3. *The FLMD as the sole form of provision of language learning in some primary schools*: there was a recognition that some primary schools have used the FLMD program as the only form of provision for language learning rather than as an additional program that is intended to cater specifically for the language learning needs of a particular group, notably those who enter primary schools as speakers of

languages other than English; where the FLMD is the sole form of provision, the program is seen as inevitably limited because of the limited time allocation and the lack of integration of the program in the curriculum as a whole.

4. *The withdrawal model of provision*: learners in the FLMD program are removed from classes to participate in their language learning class and it was reported that this is a problem for both the learners and their teachers.

5. *Composite classes*: since the FLMD programs normally span R-7 and classes are generally taught in half a day, classes are necessarily composite ones which means that teachers have a particularly complex task of catering for multiple age, literacy and language levels.

6. *The lack of integration in the school's learning program as a whole*: it was noted that the FLMD programs are often provided "in a vacuum" which impacts on the nature, quality and extent of learning and, in turn, perceptions of value of the program; some interview participants saw real difficulties in "fitting the FLMD program into the school curriculum and placing value on the language without diminishing the value of other specialist areas".

7. *The availability of a qualified teacher and teacher support*: it was noted that in some programs the teacher is not fully qualified as a language teacher; he or she may be a Bilingual School Services Officer (BSSO) or a community member; where teachers are appointed to the FLMD programs on a fractional basis (0.1 or 0.2) and (often) as the sole teacher, it is not feasible to develop a sense of 'belonging' to the community of the school; it was reported that in some contexts teachers do not receive adequate support because coordinators or principals do not know how best to support the program.

8. *Clarity of expectations and outcomes*: interview participants consistently raised questions about the diverse expectations that are held in different schools and the fact that "the amount of time available cannot match the outcomes for L1"; they indicated that an attempt to formalise accountability arrangements through the use of the *SACSA Framework* had been put in place but that it had not been fully implemented; some interview participants noted the "lack of management, liaison and follow up at DECD"; all highlighted the importance of having "realistic expectations".

9. *Lack of curriculum and assessment guidelines*: given the complexity of current provision, interview participants reiterated the need for curriculum and assessment guidelines to support the implementation of FLMD programs; no specific guidance is made available to schools to address this need.

10. *Application process*: some interview participants raised questions about the need for an application process for schools, noting that an allocation could be made on the basis of EDSAS data gathered by DECD, rather than through the current expression of interest process.

Suggested improvements

Interview participants made a number of suggestions for improvement of the FLMD program. These included the need:

- for a clear statement of purpose and aims for the program;

- to clarify the definition of the learner groups, specifically first language learners and background or heritage learners;

- to connect the programs with the National Goals and the Australian Curriculum;

- to improve the quality of teaching and learning;

- to clarify learner achievements;

- for professional learning support for teachers;

- for enhanced promotion of the program through a communication strategy;

- to strengthen the links between the program, the school community and the community of users of the target language;

- for collaboration among program providers, including the FLMD program, the School of Languages and the Ethnic Schools Board, recognising the distinctive collaboration of each program.

Summary
There is strong recognition of the value of the FLMD program and the urgent need to continue to clarify and improve the nature of language learning provision that it supports. At the same time there are important issues that need to be addressed in the complex context of increasing linguistic and cultural diversity in primary schools.

Perspectives from school visits and classroom observations

During May and June 2013, the research team of four senior language education researchers visited seven schools in which the First Language Maintenance and Development (FLMD) program is currently in operation. School principals, senior teaching staff, and language teachers involved in the delivery of FLMD were interviewed and classroom observations were undertaken in order to understand the nature of the FLMD teaching and learning practices in each school site. Two researchers visited each school in order that qualitative data collected during the interview situation and in the form of ethnographic classroom data could be compared and validated where possible. The following table provides a summary of the data collected:

Table 13: Summary of Qualitative Data Collected from School Sites

School	School Language Policy includes	FLMD language provision	Interviews	Classes observed
A	● New Arrivals Program ● Whole School Language Program ● FLMD: 3 languages correspond with 3 languages of whole school program ● Visible emphasis on cultural and linguistic diversity	Italian Greek Pitjantjatjara	Acting principal, 3 language teachers	Italian Greek (Pitjantjatjara for students in the New Arrivals Program)
B	● New Arrivals Program ● FLMD	Ngarrindjeri, Narrunga, Kaurna	Principal, Australian Aboriginal languages teacher	Combined Ngarrindjeri/ Narrunga/ Kaurna, Yrs 2&3

C	● Whole school Language ● FLMD	Italian, Greek	FLMD co-ordinator, and 2 language teachers	Italian, Yr 2
D	● FLMD	Spanish, Vietnamese, Dari/Farsi, Khmer, Lao(tian)	Principal, 1 language teacher	Khmer, Yrs 1-2, 3-7 (2 classes)
E	● Visible emphasis on cultural and linguistic diversity ● FLMD teachers are also mainstream teachers offering L2 language and act as classroom teachers ● Ethnic schools program on site after hours	Vietnamese, Khmer, Greek, Italian	Principal, 1 language teacher	Vietnamese Italian
F	● FLMD ● Whole school language program	Arabic, Dari/Farsi, Hindi/Tamil/Malayalam	Principal, FLMD co-ordinator	Dari/Farsi, Yrs R-2, 3-7 (2 classes) Hindi, Yrs 1-6 (2 classes)
G	● Whole school language program – Greek ● FLMD	Italian, Greek, Turkish, Punjabi	FLMD co-ordinator	Punjabi, Yrs R-3, 4-7 (2 classes) Turkish R-7 Italian R-7
Total	6		14 educators	16

The selected sample of school sites was identified in order to ensure a minimum representation of: low, medium and relatively high socio-economic status (SES) factors; and rural, semi-rural and suburban schools were taken into consideration. Given that in South Australia there is a wide range of community languages arising from the presence of Australian Aboriginal languages as well as migration to the state at different historical periods and from different geographic and linguistic zones, the schools selected are also representative of the different categories of languages for which there is provision in the FLMD program. The FLMD language provision at the selected school sites falls into four categories:

- Australian Aboriginal languages (Pitjantjatjara, Ngarrindjeri, Narrunga and Kaurna);

- languages of migrant communities to South Australia from Europe in the mid-20th century (Italian and Greek);

- languages of migrant communities from South-East Asia in the last quarter of the 20th century (Vietnamese and Khmer); and

- languages of migrant communities from the Greater Middle East and South Asia in the late 20th and early 21st century (Afghanistan, Turkey and India).

Classroom observations

In most schools, provision of FLMD classes amounts to no more than one lesson per week varies in length from 30 minutes in some schools to 50 minutes (in one school). Classes are usually multi-age and multi-grade, with at least two year levels combined, but possibly up to seven year levels combined in one class.

Physical space and resources

The location of the language teaching classroom/s for the languages offered differed. In schools where each language was allocated a particular space, teachers have been able to build an enriching print-rich and artefact-rich language and cultural environment to support the language, culture and history of the target language. In other schools, a teaching and learning space for the FLMD program may be shared among the different language offerings or they may be multi-purpose rooms used for a wide range of different functions. In these spaces, the opportunity to build the linguistically and culturally rich environment, specific to each language, diminishes according to the number of purposes for which the room is used. A consequence is that the learning environment for each target language is less welcoming and may even be somewhat linguistically and culturally sterile depending upon the number of purposes for which the spaces are used. Nevertheless, in some instances, it is clear that these spaces could be used in more creative ways to enhance the visibility of the target languages in print. It seems, however, that teachers are more likely to invest their own creative energies into spaces over which they have a closer sense of 'ownership' and this is an important consideration.

The availability of teaching resources varies from school to school. In some schools teachers have readily available resources: reading materials, and other age appropriate learning resources (e.g. games, dress-up clothes, puppets) as well as an ample supply of appropriate language rich posters (commercial, teacher and student produced). These are particularly evident in schools where a dedicated language space has been set aside. In schools where language teachers share the space with several other teachers or for several purposes, there are few posters, and those which are displayed are sometimes inappropriate or less appropriate for the quality of language teaching required. In one school, although there was a large supply of reading materials for the target language, these were reserved for the Ethnic Schools classes in this language and conducted over weekends. These materials were not used for students in the class, even though there was a clear need for students to have access to reading materials in order to advance their language development. The reason given by the teacher was that these materials were too advanced for the FLMD students.

Beyond the teaching space allocated for languages, the presence of community and heritage languages is often signalled at the front entrance of the school, although in one case the range of languages demonstrated in signage is outdated and does not represent current offerings.

Teaching of Australian Aboriginal languages

Two school sites were visited in which Australian Aboriginal Languages are taught in the FLMD program, however at one site, the team was only able to observe Pitjantjatjara being taught to students in the New Arrivals Program (NAP) and not as a part of the FLMD program. In the second site, learners from at least three different language backgrounds were brought together in one class to be taught by a teacher from an entirely different Australian language background.

It was clear that the teacher at the one site had a dedicated language learning space in which she has collected and developed exceptionally rich resources, has boundless energy, enthusiasm and passion for her teaching and love of the language. Even though it was only

possible to observe a New Arrivals lesson, it is clear that what this teacher would be able to offer Australian Aboriginal students would be valuable language and culturally rich access to their first language. This is the case even though she is not a native speaker of this language.

In the case of the second school site, although the teacher comes from Australian Aboriginal heritage, this is not from within South Australia, and there is a language mismatch between the teacher and the different South Australian languages with which the students associate. This teacher is constrained by how much languages she knows, and also because she has not had the opportunity to have language teacher education, specifically in the target language/s of the school. She recognises this as necessary. The lesson therefore comprises lists of vocabulary (learning of numerals, and two sets of vocabulary items, body parts and animals), a cutting out and sticking in activity, and conversation in English about family and cultural practices. There is little likelihood that children would be exposed to sentence level utterances, reading stories or writing beyond individual lexical items. Most of the language of the classroom is English.

Teaching of Italian and Greek

Mostly, the language classes in which Italian and Greek are taught are characterised by a richer supply of resources and artefacts. There has been a longer history of the provision of these languages and these are regarded as established in the South Australian community. Most of these children have either of these languages as a heritage language and at least someone in their family speaks the language – although this may be a grandparent rather than a parent. In other words, these children are third or fourth generation heritage language learners. This means that they are effectively second language learners rather than first language learners. This has an impact on the level of language which may be offered in the classroom. Teachers for these languages tend to be trained, part of the regular teaching staff of the school, and therefore have pedagogical practices which match those of contemporary and age appropriate language teaching. They are able to employ a range of activities to keep the children busy, attentive and interested for the duration of the class. The activities include song, clapping, sometimes dance, sitting on the carpet in a circle, using artefacts (e.g. puppets), cutting out, pasting in, and limited reading and writing tasks. The differences between teachers who may be characterised as highly successful and those who might be less successful depends largely upon the degree of passion for the language and the degree to which the teacher places more emphasis on developing reading and writing than on speaking skills. One or two teachers seemed to be more interested in filming cultural activities than focussing on language intensive activities. In some schools it is not clear how many additional language intensive opportunities would be available in the FLMD class compared with those available in the L2 language class in the same language and offered to other school students. What may be said about the learners in all Italian and Greek classes observed is that the students appeared to enjoy the classes and the special time allocated to them, although a few indicated anxiety about missing out on lessons in the mainstream classes owing to the 'pull-out' or withdrawal system. Year 6 and 7 students who engaged in conversation with the researchers indicated that FLMD makes them proud of and respect their linguistic heritage.

Teaching of Vietnamese and Khmer

The classes observed in these languages were taught by staff that does not have formal teacher education training. The range of language learning activities in these classes tended to be limited in comparison with those for Italian and Greek. Although one classroom was well-stocked with materials, there was little evidence that these were or would be used. In the other class, limited materials were available. Both teachers focussed on writing tasks confined either to the alphabet or to single words. Although the Khmer learners had exercise

books and pasted small exercise sheets into these, there was no evidence of exercise books including collected work in Vietnamese for the year. Students worked with worksheets which did not seem to have a home. The teacher worked from English to Vietnamese as if English were the L1 and Vietnamese were the L2. In both classes the teachers used English as the language for classroom management and missed opportunities to provide a language rich environment for the learners. Even little comments, such as: 'Well done' could easily be made in the target language, yet neither of these seemed to recognise that such utterances would enrich classroom language learning. Time on task was an issue in the teaching of both languages. In the Vietnamese class, of the 30 minutes class period, students had approximately 15 minutes of language teaching and learning activities. In both settings students arrived late to class or arrived in dribs and drabs rather than at the beginning of the lesson. Neither teacher believed that there were suitable reading materials for students of these languages in Australia.

Teaching of Dari/Farsi, Turkish and languages of South Asia (India)

Owing to the number and variation of languages from South Asia, in one of the schools visited, if students 'appear to be of Indian origin' they tend to be placed in classes in which there are two or more language communities represented. In this school, students from three languages (Hindi, Tamil and Gujarati) were grouped together in one class, and students from two languages (Telugu and Tamil) were grouped together in another class. In both cases they are taught Hindi which is not the first language of many of these students. In another school, Punjabi speakers are taught Punjabi, with the teacher using Punjabi for classroom management for younger students and mainly English for older students. Most of the teaching time is spent on learning to write the alphabet and single lexical items in each school. In one case, a newly arrived Year 7 student who has high level literacy skills was given an essay to write.

The teaching of Dari/Farsi seems to be focussed on learning to write / draw letter shapes linked to the alphabet for the Years R-2, and this extends to full letters and is intended to reach sentence level by Year 7. Students have little opportunity to practice oral language and the teacher uses a mix of Dari and (mostly) English.

One of the most successful and language rich lessons observed was a Turkish class. In this class the teacher used Turkish while involving the children in making food. Almost the entire lesson was conducted in Turkish with the children speaking Turkish.

Literacy in the FLMD program

One of the aims of the FLMD program is to develop literacy in the first language of students. In the observations a number of issues emerged in relation to this aim.

In many cases, students were either not speakers of the FLMD language, or had a greater capability in English than in the FLMD language. In this case, the focus of FLMD classes is on the initial acquisition of the language and little specific attention is given to literacy development, especially in those languages that share the same script and print conventions as English.

In cases where students have a strong knowledge of the FLMD language and the language uses the same script as English, students may develop a reasonably sophisticated literacy practices in the FLMD language. For these students, the acquisition of literacy in English and the FLMD language seems to have supported literacy development for those students in both languages.

In the case of languages that do not use the Latin script, literacy is often constructed as the learning of the alphabet. In some of the classes observed, students spent their time on tasks involving learning of grapheme shapes and sound-symbol correspondences and writing

isolated words using known symbols. Teachers reported in some classes that it was only by Year 7 that students had learnt the entire script and the more advanced students had begun to write full sentences. The focus of literacy in such programs was therefore on the acquisition of script conventions rather than broader literacy goals.

This focus on the learning of script literacy appears to be the result of a number of different factors present in the FLMD program. The first of these is that conceptualisations of literacy are cultural constructs and different cultural groups understand the nature of literate practice in different ways. Many of the teachers have developed their understandings of literacy in their home cultures and have based their teaching on these understandings.

While such conceptualisations of literacy are legitimate and can function effectively in school systems where such conceptualisations are widely shared, they may be problematic in contexts where different cultures of schooling co-exist, and especially where schooling is dominated by a different conceptualisation of literate practice. This appears to be the case with the FLMD program, where conceptualisations of language within the FLMD class are significantly different from those in the rest of the school and there is little space available for the two to be brought into dialogue so that each body of literate practice can support and reinforce the other.

Moreover, in cultures where autonomous models of literacy predominate and literate practice is equated with the acquisition of the writing system, such acquisition is not the only form of literate practice used in the school. Rather, students use their knowledge of writing systems for other, more extended literacy, communication and learning tasks in school and potentially in the wider community. Because the language of the FLMD program is not integrated into wider schooling, these opportunities are not available to learners and their exposure to literate practice is limited to the acquisition of the script in their FLMD class.

Ultimately, literacy practice in FLMD programs is affected by the allocation of curriculum time to the teaching and learning of the language. When classes are only offered for 40 minutes a week, or even less, there are few opportunities for teachers to extend students' literate practices beyond very basic skills such as script recognition and reproduction and to move students to more sophisticated language and literacy activities. This is it is often not feasible for teachers to do much more than teach the script, and where literacy itself is conceptualised as knowledge of script, there is little expectation that teachers do need to do more than just teach the script.

One consequence of the conceptualisation of literacy in FLMD classes is that it is very unlikely that literacy development in the students' home language will support literacy development in English. Instead, literacy development in the home language lags far behind literacy development in English, even with students for whom English is the weaker language. The result is that literacy in English supports the literacy development of students in their home language.

Overview of language teaching and learning observations

Currently, in those schools where teachers are trained as language teachers and are comfortable with using a range of different learning activities, carefully organised to build on the language learning objective of the class, there is more likelihood that learners will learn more. With the exception of the Turkish class, in those classes where teachers are operating with a limited range of teaching expertise, there appears to be: reduced time on task, limited use of the target language, and activities are restricted to minimal literacy skills. This will have a direct impact on how much language learning is possible within a single period of teaching per week. There is a coincidence of formal language teaching expertise with certain languages (Italian and Greek) and a coincidence of less formal language teaching expertise in languages of communities which have come to Australia over the last three to four decades.

Resources available for the training of teachers in Australian Aboriginal languages may result in less formal teacher education in these languages.

Where children are of third or fourth generation heritage language background, they are unlikely to be L1 speakers of the target language and they would be more realistically regarded as L2 learners. Even where learners are second generation (e.g. from the Vietnamese and Khmer communities) they are likely to have a higher proficiency in English than in their home or heritage language. Speakers of more recently arrived communities, such as those from Afghanistan and India, are likely to be L1 speakers. However, the kind of language learning offered these children is a serious underestimation of their needs and capabilities. The language teaching provided does not or barely meets language maintenance needs.

In most cases, the default to English even for classroom management discourse is a poor waste of the teachers' own language resources, except in those instances where the teachers cannot themselves converse fluently in the language. Where timetabling is organised in such a way that students are withdrawn from mainstream curricular activities, the FLMD program is compromised. Every time an event which is regarded as more important clashes with the FLMD class, participation in the class gives way to the other activity. This further reduces opportunities to maximise the benefit of language learning opportunities.

Findings

The focus of the FLMD program

The language teaching and learning programs funded through the FLMD program have a range of different foci. The programs offered appear to cater to three broad categories of students.

The first category is students who speak the language at home as the normal language of communication. In the FLMD program, these students are usually those who were born outside Australia or are the children of recent immigrants to Australia. Children who speak an Australian Aboriginal language as their normal language of communication are often catered for under other programs, but may also potentially be included in FLMD programs. In reality recently arrived immigrant students appear to be a minority in the FLMD program as few languages of recently arrived immigrant groups are represented in the program and these languages as a whole are under-represented in requests for funding. It is difficult to determine why this is the case. It may be that newly arrived groups do not constitute a large enough population in schools to meet the threshold level for funding. It may also be the case that such students have fallen victim to a monolingual orientation in schools that focuses on their need to learn English in isolation from their other language needs and resources. In particular, it may be the case that schools do not appreciate the importance of development in a students' first language for the acquisition of an additional language and of the benefits that students have in being educated in a language that they understand while learning a new language. If schools see the acquisition of English in isolation from the rest of the students developing linguistic repertoire, it may be the case that schools believe that students need more time of English and that such students are deprived of first language support to make time for development of English. These students may be receiving an impoverished education because their language needs are not appropriately recognised by schools. Whether the reason for the under-representation of first language speakers in the FLMD school programs is the result of a lack of sufficient numbers of students or of a misrecognition of their learning needs, their absence from the program is a particular concern.

The second category is students with a heritage connection to the language, who do not speak the language as their normal language of communication but who do have some knowledge of the language. In the FLMD program, these students are often Aboriginal children or children of relatively recent immigrants, often born in Australia. Programs for these students play an important role in develop an existing linguistic resource and at the same time contribute to the cultural and linguistic development of the learners. They also can play an important result in promoting family cohesion by facilitating intergeneration communication and communication with family members in their country of origin. These students have different learning needs from other learners and the FLMD provides opportunities to different forms of learning to address the specific needs of these students.

The third category is students with a heritage connection with the language and who do not speak the language. In the FLMD program, these students are often Aboriginal students whose language has ceased to be used actively in the community or the third or fourth generation descendants of immigrants who arrived in Australia a considerable time ago. For these students the FLMD program provides opportunities for new language learning in programs that are similar to other language programs offered in Australian schools and the only difference between these learners and other learners of the language is their identification with the language as part of their heritage. These programs play a significant role in developing students' linguistic and cultural identity and promote recognition of students and their identities in the school context. The FLMD program has a particular role for many of these students in providing a language program that would not otherwise be offered in the school and so contributes the diversity of learning opportunities.

In reality, FLMD programs in schools may have to cater for a range of student types and it may be the case that all three types of learners are present in the same class.

All of these students have significant language learning needs but the presence of so many different types of students in the program means that there is little clear focus in the program. The main reason for this appears to be the fact that there is a lack of educational policy in South Australia for dealing with the learning needs of any of these groups. The FLMD program has therefore been used to fill a policy vacuum in which the complex learning needs of many groups. The FLMD program represents an inadequate provision for the diverse learning needs of South Australia students and the diversity of programs funded means that the limited number of salaries available has been stretched too far to adequately address students' needs.

The importance of the presence of FLMD languages in schools

One significant contribution of the FLMD program is that it gives space in the school curriculum for some of the diverse languages and cultures of the student population of those schools. The program therefore enhances the visibility of linguistic and cultural diversity as a feature of the school and recognises the value and relevance of the languages and cultures of students for the school. This recognition is important both for the students whose languages and cultures are recognised and for the school community more broadly. For the students who participate in the FLMD program, the presence of their language in the school curriculum expresses the schools' respect for their identities and validates these identities as legitimate within the school. It therefore plays in an important role in modelling and promoting respect for diverse languages and cultures as values of the school. For students who do not participate in the program, it provides opportunities for students to experience the reality of linguistic and cultural diversity and to engage in meaningful way with diverse others.

Expectations

The theme of expectations about students' learning and achievements emerged strongly throughout the evaluation process. The lack of clarity about expectations is related to the lack of clarity about learner groups for whom the program is intended to cater and the related issue of the focus of the FLMD program (see discussion above). The nature, scope and level of language learning of students who speak the language at home as the normal language of communication will necessarily be different from those students who have a heritage affiliation with some knowledge and use of the language or those who have a heritage affiliation and who do not speak the language.

Expectations, though most frequently referenced in relation to learning outcomes, need to be understood in terms of both learning and assessment. If the learner group(s) for which the FLMD program is designed is highly diverse in terms of the degree to which students actively use the language, there will be difficulties in establishing and sustaining differentiated learning content and experiences for the range of language proficiencies that learners bring to their learning. Added to this is the complexity of differences in age (since most classes are composite) and therefore the diverse experiential and literacy base that students bring to their learning. Furthermore, programs that typically consist of 1 x 40-50 minutes per week do not provide sufficient time-on-task and frequency of learning to allow for sustained language learning. Time-on-task is a major factor that determines the nature, scope and level of learning and the achievements that students actually accomplish. Over time, the experience of everyday practice in the context of particular programs influences expectations about both the nature, scope and level of learning and the nature and level of achievement.

It is also important to note that there are no FLMD program-specific guidelines that describe expectations in terms of the nature, scope and level of learning and the nature and level of achievement at different phases of schooling. Throughout the history of the FLMD program, the only resource that has been cited in relation to the program is the SACSA Framework. This framework does not specifically cater for the diverse learner groups described above. Thus, no guidance is provided to teachers about the differentiated learning and achievement that is to be expected for the diverse learner groups. In the absence of such guidance, there is no option for teachers but to fall back on their own individual, local experience.

In the *Shape of the Australian Curriculum: Languages* (ACARA 2011) and the associated language-specific curricula that are currently under development some provision is made in the curriculum design for three learner groups: first language learners, heritage language learners (referred to by ACARA as background language learners), and second language learners. At the present stage of development of language-specific curricula, however, differentiated curricula for all three groups are being developed only for Chinese. In all other languages only one curriculum is being developed for the group considered to be the dominant one for the particular language (for example, second language learners for Italian; heritage learners for Vietnamese).

Finally, expectations held by teachers have the power to shape learning and the perceived value of learning. If the conditions are fragile, it is not surprising that teachers will hold low expectations in terms of learning and achievement. If there are no FLMD-specific guidelines that address the question of expectations, there is no common reference point for teachers to use to compare the expectations that they have come to hold. If expectations are low, the actual learning and achievements of learners are likely to be low, and where this is the case, the perceived value of the program in the context of the school risks being undermined. This cycle of expectations and consequences needs to be interrupted.

Conditions under which the FLMD program works well and less well

There is no doubt that exemplary situations occur in South Australian schools. In schools where the principal and school leadership are enthusiastic and give prominence to linguistic and cultural diversity as a defining characteristic of the school ethos, there is a vibrancy and obvious engagement in which participation in language learning is valued. The coincidence of whole school language programs with FLMD has the potential for multiplying the benefits of language learning across the school.

Creative timetabling at one school ensures that students do participate consistently in their language classes and thus the integrity of the program is maintained. For example, Year 6 and 7 students are included in a 'World Studies' program while those involved in the FLMD program are engaged in language learning activities.

However, in most schools, teachers complained that one of the most significant issues to undermine what little language teaching provision was available, was the timetabling of FLMD as a withdrawal program, and considered to be optional whenever there were competing demands placed on learners.

Where language teachers have undergone formal teacher education programs, the classroom pedagogies tend to be more coherent and structured systematically towards learning, although one of the most successful classes was conducted by a teacher who had not undergone formal teacher education. Another consideration is that where teachers have not participated in teacher education in countries in which contemporary communicative language teaching practices or where contemporary and broad perspectives of literacy are employed in education, teachers inevitably fall back on the practices with which they were familiar as school pupils themselves. This matter requires careful unpacking in terms of implications for teaching in the Australian context. Because in such cases, the teachers may have been in very different language contexts, e.g. in Cambodia, Vietnam or India, and where the entire school curriculum would have been delivered by native speakers of the target language and, or, the learners would have been living in the target language environment. Thus the likelihood is that teaching practices replicated from those contexts cannot function well in the current Australian environment, and teachers simply require far more support.

The teaching and provision of Australian Aboriginal languages requires particular consideration. Unless teachers are adequately trained or have access to the kind of expertise and resources that are necessary for competent teaching and efficient learning of Australian Aboriginal languages, the FLMD provision is in serious danger of delivering what can only be described as the lowest common denominator imaginable for the most vulnerable children in the system. Unless adequate language teaching and learning is implemented, these children will continue to find themselves diminished in the NAPLAN assessments and this has long-term consequences for their self-esteem and anticipation of the future.

Recommendations

Based on the findings the recommendations are as follows:

At government level

1. That a system-level language policy be developed that clarifies the different provision for language learning that is needed for diverse learner groups.

    Rationale: Greater clarity is needed in South Australian Government policy on languages about the diverse groups of learners and their diverse needs in learning languages. Provision through the FLMD program has been stretched as the DECD has sought to cater for an increasingly wide span of needs.

At system level

2. That the FLMD program be continued and expanded as a program in mainstream schools.

    Rationale: The FLMD program is the only program available in mainstream schools that supports the learning of home languages in a visible way. The current total salary allocation of 15 FTEs is not sufficient to meet the needs of all learners who would benefit from such a program.

3. That the purpose of the FLMD program be clarified in relation to the needs of particular groups of learners, specifically (1) first language learners, and (2) learners with a heritage (background) in the language who do not speak the language as their normal language of communication but have some knowledge of the language. The third group of learners, that is, learners with a heritage in the language but who do not speak the language should be catered for through regular programs for second language learners.

    Rationale: These two groups of students have distinctive learning needs and require dedicated programs that cater specifically for their language learning needs.

4. That for learners with a heritage connection with the language who do not speak the language, provision be made within the FLMD program only if the school does not offer a program in that particular language as the school's language program.

    Rationale: This recommendation recognises the distinctive needs of this group of learners that comes from their affiliation with the language. It also recognises that the needs of these learners are close to those of second language learners and for this reason, if the school offers the language as a mainstream second language program, the needs of these students would be catered for within that program.

5. That the criteria for providing schools with funding for a FLMD program be adjusted to reflect the diverse needs of different learner groups as indicated in Recommendations 3 and 4.

    Rationale: This recommendation is a consequence of Recommendations 3 and 4.

6. That consideration be given consolidating funding for Australian Aboriginal languages through a single funding program.

    Rationale: Currently schools access funding for Australian Aboriginal languages through the FLMD program and through the Aboriginal Languages Programs Initiatives (ALPI). It would be more manageable for schools to apply for a single funding allocation for the same group of learners.

7. That consideration be given to further supporting languages of more recently arrived groups such as Arabic, Dari/Farsi, and Dinka, and that consideration be given to developing a process using census and other demographic data for targeting schools which are known to have large numbers of recently arrived first language learners and that the set of criteria used for the allocation of salaried be reviewed on a five year cycle.

    Rationale: This is based on the difference between the list of languages in the FLMD program with the highest number of students and the top languages that are spoken by 5-12 year olds at home in South Australia. Without a process of targeting, long-standing patterns of provision within the FLMD program will prevail. The five year cycle represents a means for reviewing the changing information from the census.

8. That provision be made within the New Arrivals Program to recognise that literacy in learners' first language (in the language of their primary socialisation) is integral to the development of literacy in English.

    Rationale: There needs to be strong support to meet the needs of the most recently arrived students as they need to continue their cognitive development through their home language as they begin to acquire English.

9. That guidelines be developed and made available to schools that describe the integration of the FLMD program into a whole-of-school approach to literacy and language learning that includes, as applicable, English language, literacy, Aboriginal languages, world languages, the FLMD program, and the New Arrivals Program; a statement about the school's approach to language and learning should be requested at the point of application.

    Rationale: The relationship between language, literacy and learning provides the fundamental rationale for the FLMD program. Where such a whole-of-school approach to language, literacy and learning is in place, the program appears to be stronger than where it is not.

10. That guidelines for teaching, learning and assessment be developed specifically for the FLMD program that provide clarification about expectations in relation to both the scope of learning and achievements. These could be based on the Australian Curriculum (for languages where differentiated curricula are being or will be developed) and on the TEFL Framework (as adapted to the learning of languages); these guidelines should also include advice on:

- program planning and design for specific groups of learners
- assessment and reporting
- contemporary pedagogical practices
- the selection, adaptation and development of learning resources and encouragement for the sharing of resources.

Rationale: Expectations and local practices are highly varied as teachers seek to meet the learning needs of vastly diverse language learners.

11. That the FLMD programs be taught wherever possible by qualified teachers of particular languages and that ongoing teacher development be provided to teachers working in FLMD programs; where such teachers are not available, strategies be put in place to provide professional learning and pathways towards qualification for those who are teaching the program.

Rationale: A qualified teacher is a minimum requirement for a successful program. It is recognised that in some languages, especially those of more recently arrived groups, it may be difficult to engage a qualified teacher and that in these circumstances instructors be provided with professional development and the genuine possibility of gaining a qualification. All teachers in FLMD programs require ongoing professional development; in the current context many do not have access to professional development because they are not fully qualified or they are not full-time employees.

12. That consideration be given to the establishment of a web resource to support teacher learning and for the sharing within and across schools of banks of teaching and learning resources specifically developed for the teaching of FLMD programs.

Rationale: This site would provide a valuable opportunity for networking, mentoring and sharing practices and resources.

13. That materials in a range of languages offered through the FLMD program be developed and made available to schools.

Rationale: Many teachers rely on 'home-made' resources. This is because of the fact that the learning materials available from the target country or countries are not suitable in the context of use in South Australian schools and no materials for the teaching of languages offered through the FLMD program are made available through DECD.

14. That as the DECD moves towards a system of clusters and partnerships, provision for FLMD programs should be considered in relation to established clusters.

Rationale: The cluster arrangements may encourage greater collaboration across schools.

At school level

15. That, in line with the whole-of-school approach that includes the FLMD program as described in Recommendation 9, the practical use of all languages in the school curriculum be strengthened through a range of strategies that include:

    a. timetabling languages securely into the mainstream component of the curriculum such that they are not part of a suite of options which are susceptible to alternative commitments;

    b. considering the maximising of opportunities for community/parental involvement through volunteerism in order to increase the languages and cultural footprints in the school;

    c. increasing the visibility of all languages in school learning on the walls in the front office, corridors and open spaces in order to normalise print diversity and increase multi-literacy at all levels throughout the school;

    d. encouraging language teacher mentorship within the school and across institutions in order to share expertise across the languages of the school; and

    e. maximising the use of the whole school language by teachers across the school, such that where teachers are both a language teacher and a teacher of another subject/learning area or participate in other school activities, the school language is used for classroom management, instructions in the school yard, and on sports fields;

    f. facilitating collaborative development in clusters through Cluster Languages Provider Teams.

    Rationale: The FLMD programs reviewed here were most successful where they were well integrated in the school and its program as a whole.

At classroom level

16. That opportunities for language learning in the FLMD programs be increased by:

    a. maximising the use of actual teaching time, including the efficiency of arrival and departure of students to class;

    b. maximising language use, practice and learning opportunities in the language (e.g. ensure that classroom management instructions and acknowledgement of learners' behaviours, and so on, are in the target language, not English);

    c. ensuring the systematic use of a range of learning activities and processes, both inside the classroom and beyond that expand the use of language in increasingly sophisticated ways; and

    d. ensuring that greater emphasis be placed on developing high level reading and writing skills through increasingly extended texts.

    Rationale: The FLMD programs tend to be seen as 'enrichment' programs rather than programs that develop high level language and literacy skills; they need to provide for strong conceptual learning that will extend learners' capability for language use.

References

ABS. (1989). *Census 86: Summary characteristics of persons and dwellings, South Australia*. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics. Retrieved from http://www.abs.gov.au/

ABS. (1993). *Census characteristics of South Australia, 1991 census of population and housing*. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics. Retrieved from http://www.abs.gov.au/

ABS. (2007). *Time series profile – South Australia, 2006 census of population and housing* (Catalogue No. 2003.0). Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics. Retrieved from http://www.censusdata.abs.gov.au/

ABS. (2012). *Time series profile, South Australia, 2011 census of population and housing* (Catalogue no. 2003.0). Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics. Retrieved from http://www.censusdata.abs.gov.au/

ABS. (2013a). *First ancestry, ages 5-12, South Australia, 2011 census data*. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

ABS. (2013b). *Language spoken at home, ages 5-12, South Australia, 2006 census data*. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

ABS. (2013c). *Language spoken at home, ages 5-12, South Australia, 2011 census data*. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

ACARA. (2011). *The Shape of the Australian Curriculum: Languages*. Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. Retrieved 25 February 2013 from http://www.acara.edu.au/languages.html

Arnold, L. (1985). *Government Action in Multicultural Education*. Adelaide: Department of Education.

Boomer, G. (1990). *Provision on Languages other than English (LOTE) in junior primary schools*. Adelaide: Department of Education.

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

Cocchiaro, T., Gargosky, M., Moellner, B., Rubichi, R., Rumpe, I., Theav, S., & Wetheral, I. (1990). *Mother Tongue Development in Primary Schools: Report and Recommendations to the LOTE Task Group*. Adelaide: Department of Education, Training and Employment.

Curriculum Services. (2008). *First Language Maintenance and Development: Discussion Paper 2008*. Adelaide: Department of Education and Children's Services.

Curriculum Services. (2010). *First Language Maintenance and Development; Program Guidelines 2010*. Adelaide: Department for Education and Children's Services.

Curriculum Services. (2013). *First Language Maintenance and Development; Program Guidelines 2013*. Adelaide: Department for Education and Children's Services.

DECS. (1995). *Multiculturalism in Schooling and Children's Services*. Adelaide: Department for Education and Children's Services.

DECS. (2007a). *Count me in! A resource to support ESL students with refugee experience in schools*.

DECS. (2007b). *Guidelines for 2008 FLMD funding applications*. Adelaide: Department for Education and Children's Services.

DECS. (2007c). *Languages Statement 2007-2011*. Adelaide: Department of Education and Children's Services, South Australia.

DECS. (2008). *DECS first language maintenance and development reference group* Adelaide: Department for Education and Children's Services.

DECS. (2010). *Languages Engagement Strategy 2009-2011: Inquire, Plan, Achieve - Quality Languages Education*. Adelaide: Government of South Australia.

Department of Education of South Australia. (1985). *Voices for the Future: The Policy Statement*. Adelaide: Department of Education.

DETE. (1991). *Mainstreaming mother tongue programs in primary schools: Draft report and recommendations*. Adelaide: Department of Education, Training and Employment.

DETE. (1998a). *Change of name from mother tongue maintenance and development programs to first language maintenance and development programs*. Adelaide: Department of Education, Training and Employment.

DETE. (1998b). *The Languages other than English Plan 2000-2007*. Adelaide: Department of Education, Training and Employment.

DETE. (1999a). *The distribution of 20 Tier 2 salaries for first language maintenance and development programs for 2000*. Adelaide: Department of Education, Training and Employment.

DETE. (1999b). *Distribution of tier 2 salaries for first language maintenance and development programs for 2000*. Adelaide: Department of Education, Training and Employment.

DETE. (2002a). *First language maintenance and development funding*. Adelaide: Department of Education, Training and Employment.

DETE. (2002b). *Review of the First Language Maintenance and Development Program: Report*. Adelaide: Department of Education, Training and Employment.

Education Department of South Australia. (1988). *Languages other than English Development Plan*. Adelaide: Education Department of South Australia.

Education Department of South Australia. (1989). *Curriculum Guarantee for Primary School Students*. Adelaide: Education Department of South Australia.

Garamy, J. (1988). *Letter to The Hon Greg Crafter dated 23 March*.

Government of South Australia. (2012). *Premier's Reading Challenge Guidelines*. Retrieved 6 April, 2013, from http://www.premiersreadingchallenge.sa.edu.au/prc/pages/books/ prcguidelines/?reFlag=1

Heylan, J. (1988). LOTE salary distribution for 1988. *LOTE Newsletter, 1*(March), 23-24.

Kiely, R. & Rea-Dickins, P. (2005). *Program Evaluation in Language Education*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Languages Policy Working Party. (1983). *Voices for the Future: A Languages Policy for South Australian Schools*. Adelaide: South Australian Education Department.

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*. Adelaide: Research Centre for Languages and Cultures Education, University of South Australia.

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

Lo Bianco, J. (1995). *Consolidating Gains, Recovering Ground: Languages in South Australia* (Review of the Teaching of Languages in the South Australian Department for Education and Children's Services). Belconnen, ACT: National Languages & Literacy Institute of Australia.

Lynch, B.K. (1996). *Language Program Evaluation: Theory and Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lynch, B.K. (2003). *Language Assessment and Program Evaluation*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Parha, P. (1989). *Summary of Languages Development Plan*. Adelaide: Education Department of South Australia.

Smolicz, J. J. (1986). *Letter to The Hon Greg Crafter dated 7 November*.

Taskforce to Investigate Multicuturalism and Education. (1984). *Education for a cultural democracy*. Adelaide: Education Department.

Appendix 1: Survey for FLMD project

If your school has more than one language involved in the FLMD program, please answer a separate survey form for each language.

Name of person completing survey:

Position in school:

Email address:

Phone number:

If you have any queries about any questions on this survey, please contact Tim.Curnow@unisa.edu.au

About your school

School name:

Year levels taught at the school (not just FLMD program): From _____ to _____.

School language (other than FLMD languages):

Profile of the FLMD program at your school

Which language(s) is involved in the FLMD program at your school?

If more than one FLMD language program is operating at your school, please fill out a separate survey for each language.

Is the FLMD program offered in all school years?

	Yes	No

If not, which are the specific years

Is each year level taught separately in the FLMD program?

	Yes	No

If not, what are the year clusters?

How many contact hours per week of FLMD are there for each year level (or cluster of levels)?

How many students are there in the FLMD program in each year level (or cluster of levels)?

FLMD students

How are students selected for the FLMD program? (e.g. parents are asked to apply, teachers select students, school uses student demographic data to assign to program, …)

What student backgrounds are considered appropriate for entry into the FLMD program? (e.g. parents speak the language at home, parents born in country using the language, students identify with the relevant community, …)

Do students who participate in the FLMD program also participate in the mainstream language classes (where these exist)?

Yes   No

FLMD structure at your school

Does the school have a mainstream language program?

Yes   No

If so, for which language(s)?

Is the FLMD program:

(a)   structured together with the mainstream language program
(b)   structured together with another area
(c)   structured as an area on its own
(d)   other

If other, please comment:

Curriculum, teaching and learning, and assessment

What types of teaching materials are used in the FLMD program? (select all that apply)
(a)   commercial textbook produced in Australia
(b)   commercial textbook produced overseas
(c)   non-commercial textbook produced by teachers
(d)   non-commercial textbook produced by local community
(e)   language modules produced in Australia
(f)   language modules produced overseas
(g)   language modules produced by teachers
(h)   worksheets and handouts produced commercially in Australia
(i)   worksheets and handouts produced commercially overseas
(j)   worksheets and handouts produced by teachers
(k)   commercial computer-based resources produced in Australia
(l)   commercial computer-based resources produced overseas
(m)   non-commercial computer-based resources produced in Australia
(n)   non-commercial computer-based resources produced in Australia
(o)   computer-based resources by the teacher
(p)   other

If Other, please comment:

Does the school make resources available specifically for the FLMD program beyond the teacher?

Yes   No

If yes, please select all that apply:
(a)   a dedicated room
(b)   a dedicated budget for resources
(c)   dedicated IT equipment
(d)   dedicated library resources
(e)   other

If Other, please comment:

How is student learning assessed in the FLMD program? (select all that apply)
(a)   formal tests
(b)   formal assessment of written/spoken work
(c)   informal holistic assessment by teacher
(d)   no explicit assessment
(e)   other

If Other, please comment:

Is student learning in the FLMD program:
- explicitly reported to parents?

                              Yes   No

- when reported, is this through standard grades

                              Yes   No

- when reported, is this referenced to SACSA levels?

                              Yes   No

Teachers

How many teachers are involved in the FLMD program in the school, and what fraction of full-time are each of those teachers within the program?

Are the teachers in the FLMD program employed in the school only for that program?
                              Yes   No

How many years of teaching experience do the teachers have?

Do the teachers have (select all that apply):
(a)   Australian teaching qualifications
(b)   overseas teaching qualifications
(c)   no teaching qualifications
(d)   other

If Other, please comment:

Community involvement

In what ways are community members involved in the FLMD program? (select any that apply)
(a)   contribute to resources
(b)   contribute to events
(c)   as teachers
(d)   as teaching assistants
(e)   as occasional guest speakers
(f)   other

If Other, please comment:

Appendix 2: Questions for interviews/focus group discussion

1. Purpose
   How do you understand the purpose of the FLMD program (in general) and/or as it operates in your school? To what extent is the purpose of the program achieved?

2. History
   The program has run for some time. Describe any changes that have been made and their impact.

3. Access/participation
   Are the criteria for accessing the FLMD appropriate for students/for schools? Do you recommend any changes? If you were to recommend any changes, please explain these.

4. Management
   The program is currently managed centrally through DECD. To what extent is this an appropriate management arrangement? What alternative arrangements might be considered?

5. Resourcing
   (a) Staffing: What is your experience of the staffing of these programs? Are the time allocations appropriate in order to offer optimal opportunities for the learners? Are the working conditions appropriate? Are teachers teaching in these programs adequately trained and adequately supported in terms of professional development?

   (b) School resourcing: How are the programs resourced in terms of space, facilities, teaching materials?

6. Curriculum, teaching, learning and assessment
   (a) In what ways is the current curriculum framework/curriculum appropriate for the needs of learners in FLMD programs?

   (b) How would you describe the teaching and learning processes in these programs? In what ways are they distinctive?

   (c) What are the student learning outcomes that result from these programs? Are they adequate in relation to student needs and the purpose of the program? How does the school monitor community satisfaction with the program/s? To what extent is the/are the language communities involved in the language program/s offered at this school?

7. General/summary
   What are three strengths of the program (in general) and/or as it operates in your school? What are three areas that need improvement?

Appendix 3: Classroom observation schedule

Sample
To visit ideally two class per selected school. Where possible, at least one class should be in the junior primary section and one in the upper primary section. Researchers will visit between 5 and 10 school sites in order to conduct classroom observations.

Duration of observations
One full class (usually 30-40 minutes)

Qualitative data collection in classroom protocol

Researchers will take detailed field notes in which they record information prompted by the following questions and considerations:

1. Is the lesson observed part of a first language (L1) program or not?
2. Does the class comprise both L1 and additional language speakers in the class (and if so is it possible to gauge proportions of each language cohort)?
3. How does the teacher manage the teaching and learning context where there are both L1 and L2 speakers in the same classroom?
4. Is it possible to determine whether or not the students are able to speak the target language?
5. If so, is it possible to describe/identify the kind of spoken utterances? (Single word, 'safe talk', sentences etc.)
6. Describe teacher-learner interactions (including the amount of time spent on 'teacher-talk' and classroom management vs. language teaching activities)?
7. Describe learner-learner interaction and time spent on student-centred activities.
8. If the language is taught at more than one class/year level, to what extent does the language lesson alter accordingly?
9. What kind of relevant resources and learner materials, including workbooks, are present or used in the classroom?
10. If possible, request sight of the Teaching and Learning Program.
11. Researchers will request permission to photograph any language learning artefacts produced by students (written or other materials in the classroom).