Early language education in Australia: Challenges and creative responses

Susana A. Eisenchlas, School of Humanities, Languages and Linguistics, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia, s.eisenchlas@griffith.edu.au

Andrea C. Schalley, Department of Language, Literature and Intercultural Studies, Karlstad University, Karlstad, Sweden, andrea.schalley@kau.se

Abstract

While Australia is a highly linguistically diverse country, its educational policy is strongly dominated by a monolingual mindset, and thus languages other than English find little institutional support. A few selected languages, considered of vital importance to the country, are taught as foreign languages, but there is little provision for heritage or foreign languages at the preschool level.

Using Chua and Baldauf's (2011) model of Language Policy and Planning as the analytical framework, the chapter explores formal and non-formal activities to foster the development of languages in young children at preschool level. These initiatives range from macro-level planning, targeting mostly English-speaking children acquiring a small number of languages, to micro-level planning, aimed at supporting home language maintenance and development. Micro-level initiatives can be parent-initiated, e.g., playgroups for diverse languages, family day care in the relevant languages, or sojourning to the parents' home countries, or include more formal programs, usually developed and run by communities, such as supplementary schooling (e.g., Community Language Schools).

The chapter shows that, despite a societal monolingual orientation, communities can be creative in developing initiatives. Not every community is active in pursuing language maintenance, however, and the overview suggests that some languages are better placed for intergenerational transmission than others.

Keywords

Australia, intergenerational transmission, non-mainstream languages, preschool language education, bilingualism

Contents

1 Introduction

1.1 Australia: A multicultural society

1.2 Non-mainstream language education in the Australian context: A brief historical overview

1.2.1. Setting the stage

1.2.2. National language policies and initiatives

1.3 Early childhood education in Australia

2 Main theoretical concepts: Framing early language education initiatives

3 Major contributions: Formal and non-formal initiatives in Australia's early language education

3.1 Supra-Macro Planning

3.2 Macro Planning

3.3 Micro Planning

3.3.1 Playgroups

3.3.2 Community Language (Pre-)Schools

3.4 Infra-Micro Planning

3.4.1 Recruiting target language speakers

3.4.2 Educational sojourning

3.5 Summary

4 New projects: Treading carefully in the right direction

5 Critical issues: Assimilationism and the mainstream society's monolingual mindset

6 Future research directions: A systematic mapping of early language education initiatives

7 Conclusions

References

1 Introduction

It is a truism that in multilingual societies the role of language(s) is inexorably linked to the history of migration, ethnic relations, and the attitudes and beliefs that influence language policy development. This chapter thus begins by discussing crucial moments in Australian history that impacted on languages in the community. It then examines government policies and prominent initiatives developed at national level in the past 35 years to address matters of language teaching and learning. In line with the handbook's topic, this chapter's focus is restricted to early multilingual education. Current macro-level initiatives targeting a small number of young children in Australia are described. Moreover, as home language maintenance is generally not supported in the formal Australian educational landscape, a select number of micro-level language planning initiatives to promote and support children's home languages are discussed, illustrating how local agents, both at individual and community levels, strive to meet their language education goals.

1.1 Australia: A multicultural society

“Australia is the most successful multicultural society in the world.

We are as old as our First Australians, the oldest continuing human culture on earth, who have cared for this country for more than 50,000 years.

And we are as young as the baby in the arms of her migrant mother who could have come from any nation, any faith, any race in the world.

Australia is an immigration nation. Almost half of our current population was either born overseas or has at least one parent born overseas.”

We begin this chapter by quoting the words of the former Prime Minister of Australia, Malcolm Turnbull, in the foreword of the most recent Australian Government's multicultural

statement, titled “Multicultural Australia – United, Strong, Successful” (Australian Government, Department of Home Affairs, 2017). This statement is relevant to our overview because it unambiguously states that “Australia is an immigration nation” and identifies two populations intent on language maintenance and intergenerational vitality (Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2016), namely, migrants, as immigrants are called in Australia, and indigenous people. In this chapter, however, we restrict discussion to non-Indigenous languages, as the challenges involved in Aboriginal education raise a number of critical issues which cannot be adequately covered here due to length considerations.

Despite the government’s 2017 statement endorsing cultural diversity and inclusiveness quoted above, Australia’s multilingualism has traditionally not been seen as a national asset. It was not until 1973, following the dismantling of the “White Australia Policy”, which was established in the “Immigration Restriction Act” in 1901 and aimed to promote a homogenous population by limiting immigration to mainly northern Europeans (Clark, 1987), that Al Grassby, Minister for Immigration in the Whitlam Government, delivered a reference paper entitled “A multi-cultural society for the future” (Grassby, 1973). The characterisation of Australia as a “multicultural nation” (ib., p.15) received bipartisan support in 1975, i.e. support from both government and opposition parties, indicating that ‘multiculturalism was becoming a major political priority on both sides of politics’ (Australian Government, Department of Home Affairs, n.d. a). Since then, there have been periodic challenges to this concept, and occasional backlashes by those who see multiculturalism as having the potential to weaken social cohesion and erode the “Australian national identity”. Nevertheless, Australia continues to accept substantial numbers of migrants every year. The Migration Program is set annually, with the total places available for 2018-19 capped at a ceiling of 190,000, unchanged from 2017-18 (Australian

Government, Department of Home Affairs, n.d. b). Since 1975, the unparalleled high migrant intake has rapidly changed the demographic composition of the country.

At June 30, 2017, 29% of the population, i.e., 7.1 million residents, was born overseas, in nearly 200 countries (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2018). While migrants from England are still the largest group of overseas-born residents (accounting for 4.1% of Australia's total population), migration from China (2.5%) has for the first time overtaken migration from New Zealand (2.3%). These groups are followed by migrants from India (2.2%), the Philippines (1.1%) and Vietnam (1.0%), revealing a demographic shift from European to Asian migration.

1.2 Non-mainstream language education in the Australian context: A brief historical overview

1.2.1. Setting the stage

With regards to the linguistic landscape, the 2016 Census lists more than 300 distinct languages, with more than one in five Australians (21%) speaking a language besides English at home (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2017). These statistics call into question the reference to the teaching of “foreign” languages in schools and university curricula, as many of these languages are very prominent in the community and are “foreign” only from a monolingual Anglocentric perspective. Moreover, less than half the overseas-born population (42%) spoke only English at home in 2016, while 8.3% spoke Mandarin, 3.5% spoke Cantonese and 3.1% spoke Vietnamese. For those born in Australia, only one in 12 (around 8%) spoke a language other than English at home, the most common being Greek (0.8%), Arabic (0.8%) and Italian (0.7%), which attests to high intergenerational attrition rates of home languages (Clyne, 2001; Lo Bianco, 2003).

Given the linguistic diversity, one would expect that language policy and planning (henceforth, LPP) would have been of great concern since early days. This was not the case. Aboriginal languages were repressed, and most did not survive (Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2016). Of the 250 Aboriginal languages spoken in 1788, the beginning of the British colonisation of what is now Australia, few remain (Clyne, 1991). The history of migrant languages, which were already spoken from the early days of European settlement, provides evidence for an existing tension between English monolingualism as a symbol of identity, and the reality of great ethnolinguistic variation that characterises modern Australia (Arvanitis, Kalantzis, & Cope, 2014; Martin, 2005).

In fact, the status of languages other than English seems to have deteriorated in the last decades. Schalley, Guillemain, & Eisenclas, (2015) point to a negative correlation – the more multilingual Australia became, the more assimilationist its education policies and the more monolingual the orientation of the society. Indeed, while the initial years following colonisation were characterised by a *laissez-faire* policy regarding “foreign” languages in education (Clyne, 1991; Ozolins, 1993), the history of Australia’s LPP following Federation in 1901 can be seen as a narrowing of perspective, from accepting or tolerating linguistic diversity towards monolingualism in English, owing to a growing sentiment that linked English monolingualism with loyalty to the Crown or to Australia, and the use of other languages with anti-British Empire or anti-Australian attitudes (Clyne, 1991; Martín, 2005). World War I saw a broadening of exclusionist and xenophobic policies, which led to the banning of languages other than English in the education system and an active policy of assimilation for those residents who were already in the country (Arvanitis et al., 2014). By 1930, even the entry of non-British Europeans was banned unless they had relatives in Australia (Martín, 2005), in the interest of attaining a homogenous national identity.

The dismantling of the White Australia policy in the 1970s saw a great influx of “new Australians” from a diversity of linguistic and cultural backgrounds. The ideology of assimilation was slowly replaced by the concept of integration to the new culture without necessarily abandoning the home culture. The late 1970s saw the establishment of a number of institutions (e.g., the Australian Ethnic Affairs Council, the National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters, Ethnic Community Councils, Community Language Schools) which were instrumental in developing policies to address the needs of migrants and refugees to help them overcome disadvantage, foster social participation, and avoid ethnic conflict. A characteristic of this period is the emphasis on “asserting rights rather than eradicating problems” (Arvanitis et al., 2014).

This period also saw the introduction of bilingual teaching for Indigenous children of the Northern Territory, which eventually expanded into other states (Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2016). With regards to non-Aboriginal home languages, the education system did not follow suit. Lip service was paid to the importance of languages, but no initiatives to promote maintenance and development of home languages were introduced during this period, or – except for very few exceptions – since.

The limited support offered was, and still is, mostly restricted to English as a Second Language (ESL), with the unstated belief that proficiency in the English language is the one-and-only skill these children need to “do well” in their new educational context and to assimilate rapidly and effortlessly into Australian culture (Ozolins, 1993). Non-mainstream languages were thus shoved into the private domains, and their teaching entrusted to the community language schools. The family or community thus became solely responsible for these languages’ maintenance and development, although, as discussed in §3.3.2, some government funding is made available to them.

1.2.2. National language policies and initiatives

Relevant to this chapter and central to the history of minority languages teaching and learning in Australia, the late 1970s were also the years in which a push for a national policy on languages began to be coordinated (Martín, 2005), following years of lobbying by language teachers, linguists, Aboriginal, ethnic, and deaf groups for a coordinated national policy. This resulted in the National Policy on Languages (NPL) (Lo Bianco, 1987), the first comprehensive national policy on languages in an English-speaking country, explicitly endorsing multilingualism as an asset for the wider community (Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2009, p. 16). Furthermore, as Arvanitis et al., (2014, p.16) note, the NPL “legitimised language policy as an issue in its own right, placing it outside ethnic origins.” Language could now be seen as something “for all”.

The NPL was based on four principles:

- (a) English for all (stressing English as a Second Language, rights for migrants and especially migrant children);
- (b) support for the maintenance and revival of Aboriginal languages;
- (c) a language other than English for all; and
- (d) equitable and widespread language services (through, for instance, the provision of interpreters and translators).

While admirable in its goals and aspirations, the NPL’s success was limited through shortcomings in its implementation (Ozolins, 1993). The onus for executing these principles fell on educators, who were responsible for fostering the maintenance of community languages. Programs in community language education at primary schools (which cater for children from 4.5 years of age onwards, i.e., within the scope of the handbook) were

developed, but without additional training teachers were left to their own devices, remaining largely ignorant of the processes involved in language acquisition and maintenance (Clyne, 1991). Similarly, the recommendations for early language education (see section 1.3), which included the provision of appropriate training programs for preschool education personnel, the establishment of language awareness and bilingual programs, and the employment of bilingual aides, were to the best of the authors' knowledge not implemented at a larger scale. Furthermore, support and funding commitments by both federal and state governments were insufficient, which led to the NPL's eventual failure (Ingram, 2004; Arvanitis et al., 2014).

It is noteworthy that the main principle in the NPL that relates to migrant children is the provision of English as a Second Language (ESL, described as "English for all" in the NPL). While language maintenance is explicitly listed as a goal for Aboriginal and community languages, the practical challenges posed by the diversity of community languages in Australia lead the policy maker to be cautious in his proposals in regard to the maintenance of these languages. Although there is recognition that community languages' maintenance is desirable for "important emotional, cultural, intercultural, social and educational reasons" (Lo Bianco, 1987, p.15), the recommendations seem to suggest that, except for the languages of "geopolitical significance" (ibid.) (such as a number of Asian languages), community language schools would suffice to fulfil the task of language maintenance and development (ib., p.126).

Furthermore, as Nicholas (2015, p.171) remarked, "command of English and command of another language are presented as two distinct achievements. There is no explicit reference in these pillars to a notion of bi- or multilingualism and hence to potential or real relationships between command of one language and command of other languages." Nicholas further argued that separating the needs of different groups and addressing them differently "became a mechanism through which universal societal bilingualism was

marginalised. Engagement with more than one language was promoted, but only for some” (ib., pp.171-172) languages and migrant groups, a point we discuss further under “critical issues” in section 5. As we will see later in the chapter, it is the third principle, “a language other than English for all”, that became prevalent in Australia’s language policy. Most programs in place still aim at developing “elite” bilingualism in English-speaking children (de Mejía, 2002), and disregard language maintenance in speakers of non-mainstream languages, which, as mentioned above, is tasked to the community language schools.

Only four years later, the NPL was, however, superseded by a new policy entitled “Australia’s Language: The Australian Language and Literacy Policy (ALLP)” (DEET, 1991), which completely shifted the focus to English as “Australia’s Language”. Further policy documents followed, showing a trend of progressive narrowing of areas and objectives from “languages” (i.e., all languages), to “language” (i.e., English) to “literacy” and “testing” (see Schalley et al., 2015 for a thorough discussion).

The most recent development in the history of languages in Australia was the establishment of the Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA), which started operation in 2009. Its mission was to develop a national curriculum from foundation or “Prep” (a compulsory preparation year before the beginning of primary schooling; see 1.3.) to the end of high school in a wide range of disciplines, one of these being languages. The aim of the national curriculum for language studies is “to enable all students to engage in learning a language in addition to English” (ACARA, 2017). While the scheme targets mostly students beyond the age group targeted in this chapter, it is worth mentioning it because, as we shall see in 3.1, it impacts on an important current scheme targeting young children, Early Learning Languages Australia (ELLA), both in terms of the common aim of instilling an interest in language from an early age, and in the selection of languages to be supported.

ACARA recognises three groups of language learners: “ab initio learners”, i.e., those with no previous knowledge of the language; “background language learners”, with varying degrees of linguistic competence in their home language; and “first language learners”, who attended primary schooling in that language before migrating to Australia. Despite the recognition that learners may have previous knowledge of a language, pathways based on all three groups of learners are provided only for Chinese and Aboriginal languages, and two for Auslan (Australian sign language). For the other 15 languages included in the curriculum, no provisions are made for “background” and “first language learners” to develop these languages further.

To summarise the discussion so far, the brief historical overview clearly shows that the early promises held by the NPL with regards to home languages were not held, as languages other than English were relegated to the private, or ethnic community, domains. Furthermore, there are no discernible initiatives in the different language policies in relation to early language education, despite the centrality of the early years for children’s cognitive development, as well as their sense of identity and belonging. This is the focus of the next section.

1.3 Early childhood education in Australia

The concept of early childhood education in Australia is far from being clearly delimited. While the “Early Years Learning Framework” describes early childhood learning as applying to children “from birth to five years of age, as well as their transition to school” (Australian Government, Department of Education and Training, 2017a), university courses in early childhood education often cover the ages birth to eight, thus not only including childcare settings (ages birth to five) but also the foundation year and the first three years of primary schooling (ages five to eight). In line with the ages covered in this handbook (three to six

years) we understand “preschool” as an umbrella term in this chapter, covering all ages before official schooling.

Early childhood education (ECE), which in Australia is not compulsory, can be formal or non-formal. Formal education is regulated and is conducted away from the child's home. In Australia, preschool providers include long, or occasional, day care, family day care, kindergartens, and supplementary (“community language”) schools. Although the formal ECE system is far from straightforward, we try to summarise a few of its features. In general, daycare centres are considered mostly child minding facilities, while kindergartens have a stronger focus on education through play. Day care centres provide longer hours of care than kindergartens, and therefore are more popular with working parents. In reality however the distinctions between these two types of providers is fuzzier. Firstly, different states and territories use different terms (e.g., Kindergartens in Queensland are called Preschools in Victoria, and Early Learning Centres in the Australian Capital Territory). Moreover, some kindergartens operate as part of day care (preschool programs in long day care centres; some states use all these terms as equivalent). Some kindergartens are standalone or in or near schools. In terms of age, while some child care centres can cater for children from 6 weeks onwards, kindergarten programs are for children who have turned 4 the year before starting school, although some states offer kindergarten for children above 3 years of age. Non-formal care, on the other hand, is non-regulated, can be paid or unpaid, and it either occurs in the child's home or elsewhere. Examples include care provided by grandparents and other relatives, non-related adults (e.g., friends, nannies, au-pairs), or other organisations (e.g., religious institutions, playgroups).

It is important to note that there is considerable variation with regard to the level of state, territory and federal funding available for ECE, as well as in states’ guidelines and regulations regarding how it is provided (Baxter, 2015). Given the great diversity of settings

and contexts, the situation of languages at preschool level is even more heterogeneous than in later stages of schooling. Government documents still pay lip service to the importance of keeping the home languages, but little support has been made available to achieve that end, as compulsory language education is restricted to primary schools onwards, not to ECE. This is unfortunate, as “research has shown that the early childhood years are also an ideal time to foster bilingualism” (Benz, 2015, p.1), as well as crucial to “the development of children’s identity, values, attitudes, awareness, empathy and respect” (ib.), all of which are associated with language learning.

2 Main theoretical concepts: Framing early language education initiatives

This section provides an overview of the theoretical concepts, within which the ensuing discussion will be couched. This chapter adopts Chua and Baldauf’s (2011) analytical framework, which distinguishes between macro-level and micro-level planning activities and is thus particularly suitable to represent the multi-level, multi-actor complexities of LPP in Australia. LPP can start at different levels, and thus result in top-down or bottom-up activities (Chua & Baldauf, 2011) – macro-level activities are initiated top-down and are typically implemented in the formal education system, while micro-level activities are driven bottom-up and often constitute non-formal educational activities.

As Figure 1 illustrates, Chua and Baldauf (2011) further distinguish two stages each within the macro- and the micro-levels. LPP activities are organised across the stages of Supra Macro Planning and Macro Planning (both macro-levels), as well as Micro Planning and Infra Micro Planning (both micro-levels). Each of the four stages involves different actors, who exercise their agency in developing programs and adapting them to the relevant contexts and local conditions. These actors are indicated on different “levels”. Figure 1 adapts Chua and Baldauf’s (2011) model to the Australian context, identifying key actors.

While the levels are exemplary rather than exhaustive, they point to a downscaling continuum of actors from large powerful bodies (e.g. government bodies and international institutions) to families and individuals with limited influence on society. It should be borne in mind though that, although Figure 1 may suggest a linear model, “language planning can start at different levels and may not necessarily occur in a sequential order” (Chua & Baldauf, 2011, p.940). In fact, the chapter will provide ample evidence of the multiple entanglements between the different layers, going beyond the top-down and bottom-up dichotomy.

[INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE]

Figure 1: The stages and levels of macro and micro policy planning (based on Chua & Baldauf, 2011, p.940, with levels adapted to the Australian context)

Planning at the macro-levels “is normally thought of in terms of large-scale, usually national planning, often undertaken by governments and meant to influence, if not change, ways of speaking or literacy practices within a society” (Baldauf, 2006, p.147). The bipartite division of the macro-levels into the Supra Macro Planning and Macro Planning stages seems well fitted to the Australian context, where education is primarily the responsibility of the states and territories (Macro Planning stage), but where the national government “plays an important role in providing national leadership across important policy areas, including quality teaching, boosting literacy and numeracy outcomes, and parental engagement” (Australian Government, Department of Education and Training, 2017b) (Supra Macro Planning stage). This division also allows for the accommodation of initiatives instigated by international actors, or by foreign national actors. As Baldauf (2006) notes, language policies at the macro stages can be formal and overt, expressed in policy statements and educational directives, informal, expressed in discourse, or may be left “unstated” or covert (ib., p.149).

While classical LPP focused on the macro-levels, in recent decades researchers brought the importance of the micro-levels as sites of planning to the fore. Micro-level planning “refers to cases where businesses, institutions, groups or individuals hold agency and create what can be recognised as a language policy and plan to utilise and develop their language resources” (Baldauf, 2006, p.155). Similarly, Liddicoat and Taylor-Leech define micro-level planning as the site where “local actors assume agency in language work and establish processes through which perceived local language needs can be addressed using the resources available in their contexts” (2014, p.237). As the discussion in section 3 will show, the partition into Micro Planning and Infra Micro Planning is again very fitting to the Australian context, as it allows for a distinction between community LPP activities, such as community language preschools, which require a concerted effort of a community of interest (Micro Planning stage), and more individually or family driven LPP activities such as short-term sojourning (Infra Micro Planning stage).

At the same time, the model allows to illustrate interactions between different actors and stages. Importantly, the micro-levels are not just the areas of LPP where macro policies are translated into local practice and implemented. Rather, many policy and planning activities are initiated at this level and can impact on macro-level decisions and thus influence change. As Liddicoat and Taylor Leech (2014) point out, the micro-levels are inherently diverse, and characterised by a range of different actors seeking local responses to their needs. Baldauf (2006) even argues that the macro and the micro are often simultaneously at work. However, in Australia, actors operating at the macro- and the micro-levels often seem to find themselves at odds with one another. When this happens, tensions between macro-level policies and attitudes and micro-level needs and realities become exacerbated. Micro-level planning thus becomes a site of resistance where macro-level policies are subverted or contested (Liddicoat & Taylor-Leech, 2014). To mention just one example: Despite the

frequent mention of the value of home languages in ECE documents, these languages are not supported in the ECE sector (but see section 3.2 for a commendable exception). This void has mobilised parents and community activists into organising playgroups, as discussed in 3.3.1.

The micro-level examples discussed in the following sections illustrate how this lack of institutional support for languages drove parents and communities committed to intergenerational transmission to develop grassroots initiatives that exist in parallel to the mainstream education system. Anticipating the discussion, it will become clear that in Australia most early language education initiatives are instigated and operate at the micro-levels in the context of indifference and neglect of languages other than English by macro policy planners.

3 Major contributions: Formal and non-formal initiatives in Australia's early language education

This section provides an overview of formal and non-formal initiatives to foster the development of non-mainstream languages at the preschool level. The initiatives discussed in the following sub-sections exemplify a variety of programs developed and implemented by actors at all levels of language planning, ranging from national and foreign governments (Supra-Macro Planning) to state and territories' programs (Macro Planning), to community strategies (Micro Planning), to parents' and small group initiatives (Infra-Micro Planning). The selection of programs and initiatives are not intended to be exhaustive but rather to give a snapshot of early childhood language education in Australia.

3.1 Supra-Macro Planning

At the national level, there is only one example of a recently implemented government initiated and funded program for young learners: Early Learning Languages Australia

(ELLA). It is described in some length here, as this initiative could positively impact on the provision of language instruction in later levels of education. ELLA is a digital, play-based program developed by the Department of Education. The program includes a series of interactive applications (Apps) aimed at exposing preschool children to languages other than English in an engaging way (Australian Government, Department of Education, n.d.). The governments' objective is to increase motivation for further language learning in later years of schooling, as a reaction to the falling enrolments in languages across secondary and tertiary levels of instruction. Note that intergenerational language transmission is not mentioned as an objective, and that, while incidental language acquisition may occur, language awareness and interest in languages are the main focus.

ELLA has been used as a stand-alone language learning resource which young children access independently through an iPad. It became nationally available to eligible preschool services in 2017, following a successful pilot conducted in 2015 which involved 1,868 children in all states and territories, in urban and rural locations, and in a range of settings such as kindergartens and long day care services (Australian Government, Department of Education and Training, 2016). Five languages were included in the trial, namely Mandarin Chinese, Japanese, Indonesian, French and Arabic. According to the ELLA website (Early Learning Languages Australia 2018) approximately 2,500 preschool services decided to implement ELLA in 2018, thus allowing access to the program to over 80,000 children. The languages currently available include Arabic, Mandarin Chinese, French, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Spanish, Modern Greek, and Hindi, but additional funds were made available in the 2018-2019 budget to expand ELLA into additional languages (i.e., Korean, Vietnamese, Turkish, and German). This expansion aimed at aligning this scheme to cover the languages taught in the Australian curriculum and early years of schooling.

While the effectiveness of the program needs to be further investigated (for instance, whether ELLA truly motivates further language studies will only become clearer in years to come), ELLA looks like a promising initiative. It implicitly recognises that languages are worthy of study, and that early language learning can have a positive impact on later schooling. There are plans to extend ELLA into the early years of formal schooling (either as support of language learning or as a stand-alone program, as implemented in early childhood education), which could indicate a shift towards a more concerted language curriculum across all levels of schooling.

It has to be noted that the target audience are children acquiring a select group of “foreign” languages, specifically, the ones included in the school curriculum. There is no indication that the designers had the needs of young home language speakers (both Indigenous and migrant/refugees) in mind when designing the program, and thus the program does not support home language development, although this may still occur incidentally. Furthermore, as it stands, the Apps do not seem to involve interaction between peers, which is critical to language acquisition, particularly at this young age. Nevertheless, if expanded to support home languages widely spoken in the community but not yet included in the school curriculum, ELLA could be an innovative and feasible way to address the wide linguistic diversity that is present in Australian educational institutions. ELLA could bypass the need for additional resources (both human and material) once Apps for the different languages are developed. It should be stressed, however, that research demonstrating that actual language learning can occur via self-regulated processes is still scarce. This has not been conclusively demonstrated for learners at this young age, and in fact early educators argue that language acquisition crucially requires social interaction and scaffolding, and thus cast doubt of the effectiveness of this project. Therefore, while this is a promising program in bringing to the

fore the importance of exposure to additional languages, its effectiveness is yet to be evaluated.

34.3.2 Macro Planning

It is at the Macro Planning stage that national policies are adapted according to Australian states' and territories' needs and capabilities. However, states and territories appear to mostly restrict themselves to providing funding and guidelines, and to regulating accreditation of activities at the Micro Planning stage, such as playgroups and community language schools (see section 3.2).

A notable exception is a very recent initiative by the state of Victoria, the “Early Childhood Language Program”, that is being rolled out from term 1, 2019 (Victoria State Government, Department of Education and Training, 2018). In this Department of Education and Training program, about 5,000 preschool children across the state will benefit from having learning opportunities in a language other than English over a period of four years. There are two strands in this program: the “Learn languages at kindergarten” strand offered to 150 kindergartens, which provides learning opportunities in another language for up to 3 hours per week, and the much smaller “Bilingual kindergartens” strand offered to 10 kindergartens, through which children learn in another language for up to 7.5 hours per week, and hence half of their instructional program. At the moment, language instruction is delivered by a dedicated teacher, who may offer the program at several institutions. The 15 languages of the program include Arabic, Auslan, French, Greek, Hebrew, Italian, Japanese, Mandarin, Punjabi, Spanish, and Aboriginal languages (Mikakos, 2018).

The decision of which languages to include has been guided by communities' needs, kindergartens' interests, and the availability of qualified staff. Importantly, the offered languages are, for the first time, not restricted to the group of “foreign” languages included in

the Australian school curriculum. Instead, they include migrant community languages such as Punjabi, Australian Sign Language, and several Aboriginal languages, which could be seen as a step in supporting intergenerational language transmission. The needs and aspirations of actors from the Micro Planning stage – expressed in a tender process – have thus had an impact on decisions made at the Macro Planning stage, which is a very positive development. As stated by the responsible Minister for Early Childhood Education, this is an “Australian-first initiative” (Mikakos, 2018), and nothing similar has ever, to the best of the authors’ knowledge, been implemented in Australia before. Unfortunately, the scope of the program is restricted to four years and to a small selection of languages spoken in Australia, and only a small percentage of kindergarten services in Victoria (one of eight states and territories in Australia) could be included. Whether there are any plans to roll out a comparable program across the state at a later stage is unclear but would probably depend on a future evaluation of the program.

We recognise that, given Australia’s linguistic diversity, supporting home language maintenance in most if not all of the languages spoken in Australia poses a significant challenge to the formal education system, which, as mentioned above, depends on the states and territories’ willingness to provide funding. For practical reasons, doubts have been cast on the ability of schools to cope with the complex Australian linguistic situation. Moreover, Fishman (1991) recognized that schools alone cannot reverse language shift, and suggested steps for communities to create an environment in which home languages can thrive beyond the classroom. This is where activities at the micro-level have an important role to play, and examples at both the Micro Planning and the Infra-Micro Planning stages are discussed in the following.

34.3.3 Micro Planning

As Figure 1 indicates, the Micro Planning stage includes a diverse range of activities, initiated by a variety of actors. Some of these initiatives clearly started as bottom-up responses to local conditions but took on a life of their own by expanding into the wider migrant communities, eventually receiving government support in terms of accreditation and funding. Examples are non-formal language classes organised by small groups of parents, which were later formalised in Community Language Schools. Some other programs at this level were initiated at the Supra Macro Planning stage of foreign governments and funded foreign agencies as a sort of cultural diplomacy and soft-power building, aiming at international language and culture promotion (Zhao, 2011). These can be seen then as top-down initiatives that are implemented at the local level. Examples include organisations such as the Alliance Française, the Japan Foundation, and others. While these institutions provide paid language tuition open to all consumers, some implement programs that aim at home language maintenance and development. Also included are foreign government funded programs that contribute financially towards language programs, through partnerships with local education authorities and individual private and state schools (e.g., The Italian Study Centre in Australia), or to students learning the language of origin. All of these initiatives, while implemented at and depending on actors from the Micro Planning stage, such as teachers and community leaders, show that there are interactions and interdependencies between the Micro Planning stage and the macro-level stages. Importantly, both interactional directions – bottom-up and top-down – do occur. This is in particular the case for initiatives aiming for more long-term sustainability. In what follows, two activities that operate at the Micro Planning stage are described in detail: playgroups and community language schools and preschools.

3.3.1 Playgroups

Playgroups have been defined as “community-based, localised groups that bring together preschool-age children, their parents and carers for the purpose of play and social activities”. (Dadich & Spooner, 2008, p.95). They have been an integral part of the landscape of early childhood programs for more than 40 years and are the second largest civil society movement in Australia (Playgroup Australia Website, 2016.). Playgroups Australia, a non-profit organisation, is the national peak body that coordinates state and territory organisations. Collectively, they represent playgroups across 80% of postcodes in Australia, with thousands of families attending every week. Note, however, that not all playgroups are members of the association, and therefore these figures do not provide the whole picture.

The Australian Government supports one model of self-managed, and two models of facilitated playgroups (Department of Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, 2006a, 2006b). The self-managed playgroups (also known as “community” or “mainstream”) are initiated and self-run by groups of parents or caregivers, who meet with the aim of offering recreation and social activities to their children. They are hence Micro Planning stage initiatives that receive support from actors from both the Supra Macro Planning stage (financial Government support) and the Infra Micro Planning stage (volunteer work from parents and caregivers), demonstrating yet again how the different stages interlock. Facilitated playgroups, on the other hand, are implemented by local organisations, but are government-funded and run by paid facilitators with expertise in early childhood education. The two facilitated playgroup models have different aims. Supported Playgroups aim to connect members of particular populations with one another. Intensive Support Playgroups, on the other hand, aim at addressing the needs of populations perceived as vulnerable, such as migrant and refugee families, indigenous families, single or young parents, or families living with disabilities.

Despite migrant and refugee families being identified as participants in Intensive Supported Playgroups, many playgroups targeting specific community languages have been initiated by groups of migrant parents as self-managed programs. What distinguishes these from other self-managed playgroups is the aim of providing children with opportunities to develop social and affective connections with peers of similar linguistic and cultural backgrounds, as well as home language development through structured activities and unstructured play. Unless these groups opt to become members of the association for the practical benefits that membership confers (such as insurance, or information sharing), neither the association nor the public may be aware of their operation. These clear cases of Micro Planning have therefore not been researched to date.

3.3.2 Community Language (Pre-)Schools

Community Language Schools (also called “heritage”, “ethnic”, or “Saturday/Sunday” schools, in operation since 1857) are a community response to the challenge of providing children with opportunities to develop their home language against the backdrop of monolingual educational agendas and wide linguistic diversity. Each State and Territory Department of Education regulates registration and accreditation. Schools receive macro-level support through State funding supplemented by Federal “per capita” funding. The initial steps in establishing such schools, however, usually rest on micro-level actors, groups of community activists willing to offer voluntary work. The Ethnic Schools Association’s website describes them as “after hours language schools that provide mother tongue language teaching and cultural maintenance programs” (Australian Federation of Ethnic Schools Associations, 2012). Australia now has about 1000 community language schools, attended by more than 100,000 school-age children. These schools provide lessons in 72 languages (Lo Bianco, 2009), just over one-third of the languages spoken in Australia. Some of these

schools also add religion and history to instil in-group loyalty. While we could not find any published information about the preschool years, we are aware from personal knowledge and encounters with community members that many of these schools organise preschool classes. These preschools provide instruction to younger children, through fun activities such as dance, martial arts, music, or games. Their aim is to develop a positive attitude towards the language and language learning that will sustain motivation for language learning from a young age.

34.3.4 Infra-Micro Planning

The last decades have seen growing recognition of the crucial role of the family as “the critical endpoint in many language management activities” (Spolsky, 2009, p.22), particularly in contexts where there is little institutional support for languages other than the mainstream. Families thus become the principal language managers, responsible for the linguistic trajectories of their children. Activities at this stage can thus be seen as sites of contestation of macro-level education policies, which in Australia ignore local agents’ needs and aspirations. Through the use of technology and other means, local communities increasingly bypass the national macro-levels, connecting instead transnationally and translocally in their efforts to maintain the home language (Hatoss, forthcoming).

The literature on family language planning provides ample examples of parent-initiated activities, which extend along a continuum of locations and spaces, from the home to the local target diaspora community, and beyond. Reported in the literature have been the control of the home language environment (Spolsky, 2009) though steering language use in the home; the provision of resources such as written paper-based and online materials and games in the home language (Eisenclas, Schalley, & Moyes, 2016; Little, 2018); the use of new media to communicate with community members (Hatoss, 2013); or living in

neighbourhoods with a high demographic concentration of home language speakers (Fishman, 1991).

In the following, two initiatives that parents have implemented in Australia are presented: recruiting target language speakers to extend linguistic input in the target language, and sojourning to the parents' country of origin for educational purposes.

3.4.1 Recruiting target language speakers

One of the most frequent parent-initiated language management activities in the Australian context is the recruitment of target language speakers into the country, as the presence of target language speakers in the family is conducive to home language use and maintenance (see also Pauwels, 2005). These target language speakers are mostly family members, au-pairs or nannies, or Family Day Care (FDC) providers. Family members may take on carer roles (in particular grandparents and other older relatives such as aunts and uncles) or enter the family as overseas visitors. They often have limited English proficiency, thus providing an important source and reinforcement of target language use (Pauwels, 2005).

Anecdotal evidence suggests that target language speaking au-pairs or nannies play an important role in some minority language communities in Australia (e.g. the German-speaking community). Au-pairs and nannies as target language speakers entering the family domain have been discussed in the literature from very early on (Ronjat, 1913; Hoffmann, 1985). In Australia, however, au pairs "are covered by no government regulatory scheme: there is no dedicated visa, no official guidelines governing the terms of placements, nor any official definition of au pairs" (Berg, 2015, p.187). This makes them invisible to macro-level institutions. Partially due to this invisibility, their contribution to language acquisition and maintenance in Australia has not been researched systematically to date.

Family Day Care (FDC) is an approved childcare service, regulated by the National Quality Standard and other state and territories frameworks, that operates from private homes, catering for up to 4 children under school age. Family day care educators have to be accredited and fulfil a number of requirements, including holding an appropriate qualification (or be actively working towards it), clearance for working with children, and are required to maintain and develop skills and knowledge to deliver quality education and care through attendance at meetings and workshops. FDC has been in existence for more than 40 years. As of June 2018, FDC services more than 125,000 children around the country, i.e., 12% of Australia's entire early childhood education and care sector (Care for Kids, 2018). Some parents select carers based on their language background, but to the best of the authors' knowledge there is little, if any, research on this decision and how it impacts on children's language development. As a significant number of migrant women become FDC educators, there is anecdotal evidence of English-speaking children acquiring basic command of the carer's language during these formative years. To the best of our knowledge, though, there is no research on these language interactions and their impact on the English-speaking children's language awareness and development.

3.4.2 Educational sojourning

Sojourning during the Australian school holidays to the parents' homeland to further kindergarten/school-aged children's education is a frequent activity that has hitherto received little attention. Initiated at the family level, this strategy directly engages the target community overseas to offset, at least temporarily, local environmental impediments to promoting home language maintenance and development, and cultural understanding. A study of this phenomenon was recently conducted by Eisenchlas et al. (online first, 2019). Interview data was collected from Taiwanese mothers who regularly engage in this practice.

Although the parents' stated aim was to facilitate the development of children's linguistic skills, in particular, literacy, the interview data showed that attending (pre-)school in Taiwan was considered by parents as an opportunity to further develop basic interpersonal communicative skills (BICS) through authentic interactions with native speaking peers, rather than cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) (see Cummins, 1979 for a discussion of these concepts). While the stated focus on literacy suggests that this language management activity is particularly suitable for primary school aged children, the interviewed mothers recommended piloting it in kindergarten to see how the children adapt to a different environment, before enrolling children in primary school.

Another frequently mentioned reason for the sojourn activity was to develop closer bonds with the extended family in Taiwan, which again points to the importance of the family, both nuclear and extended, in enhancing children's language skills, thus improving children's self-confidence and motivation to continue learning and using the language upon returning to Australia. Both self-confidence and motivation are affective factors considered conducive for intergenerational transmission (Kopeliovich, 2013).

While this activity is clearly family-initiated and managed, interview data discussed in Eisenclas et al. (online first, 2019) indicate that rather than being an individual management activity, the success of sojourning rests on participants' abilities to establish partnerships with spouses, schools, preschools and teachers at both ends of the sojourning, and the extended family and community abroad, without whose collaboration this experience could not be attained. There is thus a considerable planning and investment of time, cost, and effort involved in managing this activity, and other micro-level actors from both the Micro Planning and Infra Micro Planning stages need to be involved in order for these activities to be successful.

34.3.5 Summary

This section has provided an overview of formal (e.g. Early Childhood Language Program) and non-formal (e.g. au pairs as target language speakers) initiatives towards early language education in Australia. Initiatives from all four stages of policy planning as suggested by Chua and Baldauf (2011) were discussed (see Figure 1). Interestingly, both macro-level initiatives presented herein are very recent developments and not rolled out across the country, so only a limited number of children has so far had access to them. The noted lack of institutional support for early language education has instead generated a number of micro-level grass-roots initiatives, the effectiveness of which has, however, not been evaluated to date. Moreover, no systematic mapping or overview of which initiatives are driven by the different actors from the different stages is available to date, leaving us with many open questions about the actual state of early language education in Australia. What can be said, however, is that the different stages appear rather interlocked, and actors from the different stages interact flexibly to support early language education.

4 New projects: Treading carefully in the right direction

As just mentioned, both the national program ELLA (Supra-Macro Planning) and the Victorian Early Childhood Language Program (Macro Planning) are very recent early language education projects that can be considered as tentative steps “in the right direction”, although they are as yet merely reaching a limited number of potential beneficiaries. They are, however, the only two Australian macro-level initiatives targeting early language education, indicating a clear need for more initiatives, at both macro-level planning stages (Supra-Macro and Macro). Given that these initiatives are so recent, they are yet to be evaluated. Their evaluation will pose significant logistical challenges. On the one hand, a

longitudinal approach would be required, which would involve tracking participants for a considerable period of time. On the other hand, many confounding factors would need to be disentangled, as language acquisition and development is a multidimensional process involving a wide range of social, affective, and cognitive factors. It remains to be seen which stance political actors and education policy planners might take in the coming years after these initiatives have concluded.

At the micro-levels, it is difficult to identify sustainable initiatives that do not benefit from macro-level support. However, what can be expected is that actors at the two micro-level planning stages (Micro and Infra-Micro) will extend current initiatives, using e.g. technology to connect with one another beyond existing geographical limitations. For instance, recruiting target language speakers into the families is increasingly facilitated by recent technological developments. Hatoss (2013) has coined the blend “cyberspora” to refer to communities of practice that extend beyond existing geographical limitations by entering and making use of virtual spaces.

5 Critical issues: Assimilationism and the mainstream society’s monolingual mindset

As the discussion in sections 3 and 4 has shown, languages and their acquisition have to date not received much macro-level support in Australia. This became evident even in the newest initiative, the Victorian Early Childhood Language Program, when the Minister for Early Childhood Education, Jenny Mikakos (2018), explicitly justifies the program by stating that “learning another language has great rewards – it’s fun, it improves brain function and actually helps kids learn English better.” Neither the mastery of a language per se nor, for background speakers, questions of identity and belonging appeared to play a role in the minister’s view. The two reasons shining through in the quote are cognitive benefits

(“improves brain function”) and enhancing the acquisition of the mainstream language English (“helps kids learn English better”). This stress on cognitive benefits is extremely narrow and shows a clear discrepancy between Australia’s official approach to languages and the one displayed by, e.g., the European Commission, which claims that early language learning has enormous potential for the development of children’s identity, values, empathy, and respect, all in addition to learning a second language:

Opening children’s minds to multilingualism and different cultures is a valuable exercise in itself that enhances individual and social development and increases their capacity to empathize with others. [...] As young children also become aware of their own identity and cultural values, ELL [Early Language Learning] can shape the way they develop their attitudes towards other languages and cultures by raising awareness of diversity and of cultural variety, hence fostering understanding and respect.

(European Commission, 2011, p. 7).

This significant difference raises the question why languages are so underrated in Australia, where 21% of the population speak a language other than English at home. Despite lip service being paid to cultural and linguistic diversity, a monolingual mindset (Clyne, 2005) still operates in mainstream society, stemming from a persistent Anglocentrism and an assimilationist rather than integrationist perspective on migration (Martín, 2005). English is the de facto official language and is seen as a marker of Australian identity and as fostering social cohesion. Thus, the majority of Anglo-Australians are staunchly monolingual and see little value in adding languages to the curriculum (Bense, 2014), as attested by frequent letters to newspaper editors bemoaning the time “wasted” in learning foreign languages, and the persistently low enrolments in languages courses at all levels of instruction, characterised by Clyne, Pauwels and Sussex (2007) as a “national tragedy and an international embarrassment”. Indeed, according to Tim Mansfield, the executive director of the Asia

Education Foundation, in the 1960s, roughly 40 per cent of high school students graduated with a second language. This figure is currently down to 10 per cent (Theodosiou, 2017), which places Australia almost at the bottom of the OECD rankings (Clyne et al., 2007).

Ruiz' (1984) three language policy perspectives of "language as a right", "language as a problem", and "language as a resource" are relevant to the Australian context, where only a few prestigious languages are seen as resources on the basis of economic (e.g., Chinese, Japanese), geopolitical (e.g., Indonesian) or cultural rationales (e.g., French, German) and thus find a place in the curriculum. These "priority" languages are distinguished from indigenous, migrant and community languages that are seen as problems (Lo Bianco, 2003; Schalley, Guillemin, & Eisenchlas, 2015). The "problem languages" are thus neglected and relegated to the private sphere, or shoved into an alternative, supplementary educational setting. It is only the languages seen as resources that are considered worthy of study. A welcome exception to this observation is the new Victorian Early Childhood Language Program; this initiative, however, is nonetheless justified in line with the mainstream society's monolingual mindset and a resulting focus on the children's English and general cognitive benefits. Overall, no attempts are made to invest in meaningful bilingual education that would enable bilingual children to achieve high levels of proficiency in their home language(s) (Piller, 2013). A clear distinction is thus made between *being* bilingual in community languages and *becoming* bilingual in priority languages. Only the latter is considered an achievement, while the former is "judged as a social remediation or disadvantage" (Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2016, p.11).

The critical issues in relation to language education in the Australian context (early and otherwise) thus appear to be the mainstream society's monolingual mindset as well as the assimilationist orientation of language-related policies. Both affect language education adversely. As Clyne (2005) argued, it is imperative that Australia overcomes the monolingual

mindset. This would allow Australians “to develop our language potential to the fullest, giving monolinguals a measure of plurilingualism and developing all the languages of plurilinguals to the highest possible level and providing the opportunity to build competence in further languages” (p. 64). This change of perspective would require educating mainstream Australians on the importance of languages for the wellbeing of all families and communities, and increase awareness about the benefits of bilingualism, which extend well beyond their economic applications. Ethnic organisations and researchers have a role to play in this process, by increasing advocacy efforts as a way to combat the worrying trend against languages in the education system and wider community.

6 Future research directions: A systematic mapping of early language education initiatives

The discussion in this chapter has highlighted a number of early language education initiatives that have not been investigated at all or have been underresearched to date, and hence more systematic research is needed. In addition to evaluations of macro-level initiatives (see section 4), these include, amongst others, investigating the long-term benefits of micro-level initiatives such as bringing target language speaking au pairs or nannies into the family, children’s short-term educational sojourning to the parents’ homeland, and the provision of Family Day Care in languages other than English.

Generally speaking, a systematic mapping and description of early language education in Australia and the effectiveness of its initiatives would be a highly desirable addition to the body of research on language maintenance and development. A mapping like this could be based on Chua and Baldauf (2011)’s model (section 2), and ask (i) which actors within which stages of the model instigate or implement initiatives, (ii) which actors at

different levels (and stages) in the model interact to achieve joint outcomes, and how they do this, (iii) which aims, methods, activities and outcomes guide these initiatives, and (iv) which potential initiatives are not being implemented, and why not (i.e., what are the roadblocks?).

Furthermore, the discussion has shown that, at least at the macro-level and hence in formal education, no serious distinction is made between background speakers and second language learners. In the current programs, these different groups are conflated (although they are nominally recognised by ACARA in the national curriculum). What are the effects of this conflation on (i) language learning outcomes, (ii) students' motivation, and (iii) teachers' approaches to and perspectives on teaching?

In relation to micro-level/non-formal education, questions that have been raised include what affordances technology might have on offer for language learning, and whether actual language learning can occur via self-regulated processes. In particular long-term effects appear to be of special interest, and hence there is a need for longitudinal studies. While these questions are raised with regard to the Australian educational context, the issues are pertinent to other educational environments, in particular where a diversity of actors operate at different levels to address communities' language needs. Thus, the framework adopted in this chapter can provide the basis for a taxonomy of initiatives and allow for the systematic comparison across and within countries.

7 Conclusions

The chapter has shown that, despite societal monolingual orientation, communities can be creative in implementing initiatives. Not every community is active in pursuing linguistic development, however, and the overview suggests that some languages are better placed for intergenerational transmission than others. The chapter ends with a call to start shifting the

paradigm from thinking about heritage language activities as complementary to educational practices to advocating for a concerted approach to language education (Lo Bianco, 2018). This would apply at all levels, but crucially start in early childhood, given the centrality of the formative years to the intellectual, emotional and social development of the individual.

References

- Arvanitis, E., Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (2014). Heritage Language Policies in the Context of Australian Cultural Diversity. In P. P. Trifonas & T. Aravossitas (Eds). *Rethinking Heritage Language Education* (pp. 115–140). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2017). 2024.0 - Census of Population and Housing: Australia Revealed, 2016 . Retrieved October 29, 2018, from <https://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Latestproducts/2024.0Main%20Features22016>
- Australian Bureau of Statistics (2018). Migration, Australia, 2016-17. Retrieved October 29, 2018, from [http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Latestproducts/3412.0Main%20Features32016-17?opendocument&tabname=Summary&prodno=3412.0&issue=2016-17&num=&view=.](http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Latestproducts/3412.0Main%20Features32016-17?opendocument&tabname=Summary&prodno=3412.0&issue=2016-17&num=&view=)
- Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA). (2017). Australian Curriculum: Languages. Retrieved November 2, 2018, from http://www.acara.edu.au/docs/default-source/curriculum/20170118-australian_curriculum_languages_info_sheet.pdf?sfvrsn=2.
- Australian Federation of Ethnic Schools Associations. (2012). Community Languages Australia. Retrieved September 18, 2018, from <http://www.communitylanguagesaustralia.org.au/aboutus/>.

Australian Government, Department of Education and Training. (n.d.). Early Learning Languages Australia (ELLA). Retrieved November 5, 2018, from <https://www.education.gov.au/early-learning-languages-australia>.

Australian Government, Department of Education and Training. (2016). Evaluation of the Early Learning Languages Australia. Retrieved November 5, 2018, from <https://docs.education.gov.au/documents/evaluation-early-learning-languages-australia-trial-final-report>.

Australian Government, Department of Education and Training. (2017a). Early Years Learning Framework. Retrieved December 21, 2018, from <https://www.education.gov.au/early-years-learning-framework-0>.

Australian Government, Department of Education and Training. (2017b). Schooling. Retrieved December 6, 2018, from <https://www.education.gov.au/schooling-0>.

Australian Government, Department of Home Affairs. (2017). Multicultural Australia – United, Strong, Successful. Australia’s Multicultural Statement. Retrieved December 20, 2018, from <https://www.homeaffairs.gov.au/mca/Statements/english-multicultural-statement.pdf>.

Australian Government, Department of Home Affairs. (n.d. a). Australia’s multicultural policy history. Retrieved December 20, 2018, from <https://www.homeaffairs.gov.au/about-us/our-portfolios/multicultural-affairs/about-multicultural-affairs/our-policy-history>.

Australian Government, Department of Home Affairs (n.d. b) Fact Sheet: 2018-19 Migration Program planning levels. Retrieved December 20, 2018, from <https://www.homeaffairs.gov.au/about/corporate/information/fact-sheets/20planning>.

- Baldauf, R. B., Jr. (2006). Rearticulating the Case for Micro Language Planning in a Language Ecology Context. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 7(2–3), 147–170. <https://doi.org/10.2167/cilp092.0>
- Baxter, J. A. (2015). Child care and early childhood education in Australia (Facts Sheet 2015). Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies. Retrieved November 7, 2018, from <https://aifs.gov.au/publications/child-care-and-early-childhood-education-australia>.
- Bense, K. (2014). “Languages aren’t as important here”: German migrant teachers’ experiences in Australian language classes. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 41(4), 485–497. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-014-0143-2>
- Benz, V. (2015). *Dynamics of bilingual early childhood education: Parental attitudes and institutional realisation*. Doctoral Dissertation, Macquarie University. Retrieved from <https://www.languageonthemove.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/CORRECTED-PhD-Thesis-Victoria-Benz-DIGITAL-COPY.pdf>.
- Berg, L. (2015). Hiding in plain sight — au pairs in Australia. In R. Cox (Ed.), *Au pairs’ lives in global context – sisters or servants?* (pp. 187–202). London, United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Care for Kids. (2018). An overview of family day care. Retrieved November 10, 2018, from <https://www.careforkids.com.au/child-care-articles/article/55/an-overview-of-family-day-care>.
- Chua, C. S. K. & Baldauf, R. B. (2011). Micro language planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 936–951). New York, USA: Routledge.

Clark, M. (1987). *A Short History of Australia*. Penguin, Ringwood.

Clyne, M. (2001). Can the shift from immigrant languages be reversed in Australia? In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), *Can threatened languages be saved? Reversing language shift revisited: A 21st century perspective* (pp. 364–391). Clevedon, Avon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.

Clyne M., (2005). *Australia's Language Potential*. Sydney, Australia: University of New South Wales Press.

Clyne, M., Pauwels, A., & R. Sussex. (2007). The state of languages education in Australia: A national tragedy and an international embarrassment. *Curriculum Leadership Journal* 5: 19. Retrieved November 7, 2018, from

http://cmslive.curriculum.edu.au/leader/the_state_of_languages_education_in_australia,19754.html?issueID=10810.

Council of Australian Governments. (2008). National Partnership Agreement on Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN). Retrieved from http://www.federalfinancialrelations.gov.au/content/npa/education/smarter_schools/literacy_numeracy/national_partnership.pdf.

Cummins, J. (1979). Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question and some other matters. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 19: 121-129.

Dadich, A, & Spooner, C. (2008). Evaluating playgroups: An examination of issues and options. *The Australian Community Psychologist*, 20(1): 95-104. Retrieved from [http://www.groups.psychology.org.au/Assets/Files/20\(1\)-08-Dadich-Spooner.pdf](http://www.groups.psychology.org.au/Assets/Files/20(1)-08-Dadich-Spooner.pdf).

de Mejia, A. (2002). *Power, Prestige and Bilingualism: International Perspectives on Elite Bilingual Education* (Vol. 35). Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.

Department of Employment, Education and Training. (1991). Australia's language: The Australian language and literacy policy. 2 vols: Vol. 1: Policy information paper (White Paper); Vol. 2: Companion volume to the policy paper. Canberra, ACT: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs. (1998). Literacy for all: The challenge for Australian schools. Commonwealth literacy policies for Australian schools. Australian schooling monograph series. Canberra, ACT.

Department of Education, Science and Training. (2005). Teaching reading: Report and recommendations of the national inquiry into the teaching of literacy. Canberra, ACT.

Department of Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs. (2006a). Playgroup Program: Community Playgroups Supported Playgroups: Program guidelines. Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra, ACT.

Department of Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (2006b) Playgroup Program: Intensive Support Playgroups: Program guidelines. Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra, ACT.

Early Learning Languages Australia (2018) Retrieved December 19, 2018, from <https://www.ella.edu.au/>.

Eisenclas, S. A., Schalley, A. C., & Guillemin, D. (2015). Multilingualism and literacy: attitudes and policies. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 12(2), 151–161.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2015.1009371>

- Eisenclas, S. A., Schalley, A. C., & Moyes, G. (2015). Play to learn: self-directed home language literacy acquisition through online games. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 19(2), 136–152.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2015.1037715>
- Eisenclas, S. A., Schalley, A. C., Qi, G.Y., & Tsai, P. S. (online first, 2019) Home and away: Implications of short-term sojourning of young Australian bilinguals.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2019.02.007>
- Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Threatened Languages*. Clevedon, United Kingdom: Multilingual Matters.
- Grassby, A. J. (1973). *A Multi-cultural Society for the Future*. Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra. Retrieved December 20, 2018, from http://www.multiculturalaustralia.edu.au/doc/grassby_1.pdf.
- Hatoss, A. (2013). *Displacement, language maintenance and identity: Sudanese refugees in Australia*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Hatoss, A. (forthcoming). Space, autonomy and equity in grassroot language planning: Crossing national boundaries through the Internet. In A. C. Schalley & S. A. Eisenclas (Eds.). *Handbook of social and affective factors in home language maintenance*. New York/Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hoffmann, C. (1985). Language acquisition in two trilingual children. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 6(6), 479–495.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.1985.9994222>
- Ingram, D. E. (2004). English language policy in Australia. *English Teaching* 59(2):373–398.

- Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (2012). *New Learning: Elements of a Science of Education* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Kopeliovich, S. (2013). Happylingual: A family project for enhancing and balancing multilingual development. In M. Schwartz & A. Verschik (Eds.), *Successful Family Language Policy: Parents, Children and Educators in Interaction* (pp. 249–276). New York/London, USA/United Kingdom: Springer.
- Liddicoat, A. J., & Taylor-Leech, K. (2014). Micro language planning for multilingual education: agency in local contexts. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 15(3), 237–244. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2014.915454>
- Little, S. (2018). ‘Is there an app for that?’ Exploring games and apps among heritage language families. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 40(3), 218–229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2018.1502776>
- Lo Bianco, J. (1987). *National Policy on Languages*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2009). Second languages and Australian schooling. *Australian Education Review* 54. Camberwell, Victoria: ACER Press.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2018). Moving from ‘complementary’ to ‘integrated’: A future aspiration and plan for community Languages in Australia. Presented at the 15th National Community Languages Schools Conference, Brisbane, Australia.
- Lo Bianco, J. & Slaughter, Y. (2016). Bilingual education in Australia. In O. Garcia, A. Lin, & S. May (Eds.) *Bilingual and Multilingual Education. Encyclopedia of Language and Education* (3rd edn., pp. 1–14). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

- Martin, M. D. (2005). Permanent Crisis, Tenuous Persistence: Foreign languages in Australian universities. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 4(1), 53–75.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022205048758>
- Mikakos J. (2018). Learning Languages for Little Victorians At Kinder. Media Release, Minister for Families and Children, Early Childhood Education, and Youth Affairs. Retrieve December 21, 2018 from <https://www.premier.vic.gov.au/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/181018-Learning-Languages-For-Little-Victorians-At-Kinder.pdf>.
- Nicholas, H. (2015). Losing bilingualism while promoting second language acquisition in Australian language policy. In J. Hajek & Y. Slaughter (Eds.) *Challenging the monolingual mindset* (pp. 165-181). Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Ozolins, U. (1993). *The Politics of Language in Australia*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Pauwels, A. (2005). Maintaining the Community Language in Australia: Challenges and Roles for Families. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 8(2–3), 124–131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050508668601>
- Piller, I. (2013). Monolingualism is bad for the economy. *Language on the Move*.
<http://www.languageonthemove.com/monolingualism-is-bad-for-the-economy/>
- Playgroup Australia (2016). Retrieved November 7, 2018, from <https://playgroupaustralia.org.au/>.
- Ronjat, J. (1913). *Le Développement du Langage Observé chez un Enfant Bilingue*. Paris : Champion.
- Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *NABE Journal* 8:15–34.

- Schalley, A. C., Guillemin, D., & Eisenclas, S. A. (2015). Multilingualism and assimilationism in Australia's literacy-related educational policies. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 12(2), 162–177.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2015.1009372>
- Spolsky, B. (2009). *Language Management*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Theodosiou, P. (2017). Census 2016: Second-language learning in Australia 'needs urgent attention'. Retrieved November 11, 2018, from <https://www.sbs.com.au/news/census-2016-second-language-learning-in-australia-needs-urgent-attention>.
- Victoria State Government, Department of Education and Training (2018) Early childhood language program. Giving preschool children the opportunity to learn in another language. Retrieved December 21, 2018, from <https://www.education.vic.gov.au/about/programs/Pages/eclanguageprograms.aspx>.
Also see
<https://www.education.vic.gov.au/childhood/providers/funding/Pages/languagefunding.aspx>.
- Zhao, S. H. (2011). Actors in language planning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (Vol. 2, pp. 905–923). New York, USA: Routledge.

Supra Macro Planning

Level 1: Government (e.g. ministries)

Level 2: International institutions / organisations (e.g. cultural associations)

Macro Planning

Level 3: States (e.g. state government departments)

Level 4: Regions / councils (e.g. regional or council service providers)

Micro Planning

Level 5: Local institutions (e.g. preschools, schools)

Level 6: Organised communities (e.g. religious or organised ethnic groups)

Infra Micro Planning

Level 7: Flexible communities (e.g. playgroups)

Level 8: Tight-knit social units (e.g. families)

Level 9: Individuals (e.g. children, educators)