Multiculturalism and the National Policy on Languages¹

Joseph Lo Bianco

Introduction

This article addresses the impact of the National Policy on Languages on multicultural programs into the 1990s. To do this it will be necessary to trace, albeit very briefly, a few key themes and phases in the Australian conception of multiculturalism as it applies to education, highlighting in particular the role of language issues in each phase. In doing this I hope to persuade the reader that, although multiculturalism and multilingualism are not synonymous, language issues have always been a salient feature of multicultural education policies and practices. Finally, I will describe the NPL in this context and make some comments about the relationship between this and other aspects of multicultural policy.

Multiculturalism in Australia has been a generalised concept containing both elements of description of society and normative elements which prescribe that, as a consequence of our demographic pluralism matching policies are either necessary or desirable.

In its application to education three outcomes have been advocated from multiculturally oriented analyses of society.

Firstly; programs of intervention targeted at particular groups for equity purposes.

Secondly; programs of intervention targeted at the whole population for enrichment and intercultural purposes.

Thirdly; programs of intervention - targeted at either particular groups or the whole population for reasons of social cohesion through redefinitions of national identity and group identity generally.

Each of these emerged from a different phase in the history of multicultural education in Australia in which a different socio-political discourse has prevailed.

Phases of development

During the early 1970s, as part of a more general movement of renewal and social change, there emerged the issue of equality for migrants. This mirrored somewhat the so-called 'ethnic revival' in the United States. The discourse in Australia was all about equality. In her book *The Migrant Presence in Australia* the late Jean Martin has a graph plotting the number of government reports addressing this issue over several time periods. The graph rises almost vertically in the early 1970s.

These reports overwhelmingly used the 'discourse of disadvantage'. They characterized the migrant situation as having several key and seemingly permanent elements: inequality equalling lack of English, equalling ethnicity, equalling urban inner city life, equalling manufacturing industry. Inequality through linguistic mismatch between the population and the governing and dominant institutions of the society was the overwhelming image communicated about the place of migrants in Australia. The programs which were proposed targeted immigrants or Aborigines only, the means for changing or ameliorating 'the situation' was to be a linguistic one, i.e. the provision of ESL teaching to children and to adults. Of course, there were other elements but these were the dominant ones which sustained the image of inequality and dependence.

---

¹This paper is a modified version of an address given to the Victorian Inter-College Committee on Multicultural Education at its Conference entitled: Mainstreaming Multiculturalism, held at Warrnambool, Victoria on 10 October 1987.

The achievements of this period were the establishment of the Child Migrant Education Program and the Aboriginal transitional bilingual programs in the areas of Commonwealth jurisdiction in education. The text which exemplified the image and approach of this period was the Report into Schools of High Migrant Density.

Evolving out of this by the mid seventies and firmly dominant by the end of the decade was a new discourse. This started by proposing cultural questions as the explanations for the situation of migrant children in schools and ended up by targetting *not* ethnic communities but the whole of society. A key symbolic act of this period was the renaming of 'ethnic' or 'migrant' languages as 'community' languages. This was a device to connote the greater immediacy of these languages to their learners in an age when immediacy and relevance were all important in educational rhetoric.

This is in itself an interesting development. It reveals the strong attachment that groups have to their languages - even when they begin to be dysfunctional in communicative terms they retain and even increase in their symbolic value as emblematic of the group's identity.

Social reasons for widely teaching these languages were put forward. These held that such teaching would lead to intercultural tolerance, to understanding, and these completely unsupported but tenaciously clung-to assertions were added to dogmatic statements about how the teaching of these languages as language maintenance would overcome educational disadvantages experienced by migrant children. Although we could now specify sets of circumstances where these arguments hold true there was then some blithe disregard of the need to qualify many of these assertions.

Many of the groups within ethnic communities (and other groups) which had been part of the equality focus of the previous period (and which derived their policy positions from class-based analyses of the purposes of the migration program) opposed strongly this incipient multiculturalist ideology. The trend to a more culturalist conception of the place of immigrants in Australian society and of the problem and potential of immigrant children in Australian schools was, however, inexorable. By the end of this period this perspective had largely - if not completely - supplanted the previous one. To some extent this was a conscious and deliberate process. Part of the purpose was to depoliticize the 'ethnicity discourse' - to separate it from the ready association which was made with organised labour on the basis of unquestioned assumptions about disadvantage and with the forces for change in education on the same assumptions. The separation from the socio-political advocacy of rights was ultimately effective - it was enshrined in the key text of this period; the Galbally report. This document is the exemplar of the culturalist explanation of the phenomenon of ethnicity in Australia.

The major characteristic of this period was the way in which culture became a surrogate concept for socio-economic or class issues in the prevailing discourse. The key achievements of the period in terms of programs were the establishment of the 'self-help' ethos through support for ethnic schools, grants-in-aid for welfare to community groups and the initiation of the multicultural education program designed for 'all students in all schools'.

The third broad phase into which we have merged can be called the national pragmatic self-interest phase. Initially more complex, diffuse, and unclear, this has become a phase in which elements of all the preceding stages, their arguments, rhetoric and programs, have been preserved but transformed into a newly constructed set of principles and a new discourse. The focus for overall activities is the whole population with more specifically targeted sub-programs. During this phase the English as a Second Language (ESL) programs for equity purposes have been given greater prominence than at any time since their establishment in the early 1970s; the teaching of community languages and the pursuit of intercultural and multicultural perspectives in all curricula have been strengthened reflecting the continued attachment many people feel to the objectives and rationales of the culturalist period and, through Australian studies, there have been serious attempts to define 'Australianness' in broad and inclusive ways.

But what is new now is that these objectives, programs and justifications contain a strong functionalist, instrumental, pragmatic element. This verges on national self interest. There is widespread acceptance of the need to reconceptualise multiculturalism as not merely a set of social policies and practices for immigrants, directed at equal opportunity; nor merely as a set of social policies and practices directed at an enrichment of the whole society or for the achievement of goals of intercultural harmony. The new discourse is about economics, about the demonstrable tangible benefits of these policies - the cost of foregoing opportunities. This is a rhetoric constructed on necessity not choice. The following are examples of this more practically oriented appraisal of multicultural issues.

It has become evident to many policy makers that Australia's skills in English are a marketable resource; a commodity for which there is a great demand. It is estimated that the demand for English as a foreign language courses in Australia or offshore, but offered by Australian institutions, is very great indeed. In addition, the demand for specialist English - usually provided as aid to the countries of our region, especially the island states of the Pacific for national development purposes, for accessing technical literature and knowledge, for technology transfer - is enormous. The base from which Australia can both exploit the large revenue generation potential of this demand and provide aid to the developing countries in this same field is Australia's English as a Second Language efforts and practices. Our experience here is strong and we have a solid reputation (itself an important ingredient in the package). To erode ESL for migrant and for Aboriginal children is to deplete our capacity to provide the aid and to market, for full fee paying foreign students, the revenue generating courses in our region. The provision of services and programs for equity also offers economic potential.

The same is true of adult literacy education. How can Australia restructure its economy, exploit the talents of its population and retrain its workforce if it neglects the almost 500,000 adults for whom English proficiency is poor to very poor and the 1,000,000 adults who have significant literacy problems? Such parallels between pragmatic national interest and social justice for particular groups can be found in many areas such as the widespread teaching of economically significant languages such as Asian community languages (Chinese).

This third phase has seen the integration of descriptive multiculturalism with prescriptive multiculturalism and the beginnings of a new set of advocacies based on equitable multiculturalism as an ideology of national gain for Australia.

Language issues in these phases

In each phase language issues have been prominent. In a strong historical sense Australia's conception of multiculturalism has largely been about language - certainly attitudinal and other dimensions such as religion and non-linguistic culture have been present and important but language issues consistently have been to the fore.

In the first of the broad phases identified above the overwhelming stress on language issues was ESL. The teaching of English for the purposes of equality of opportunity in the workplace; in the labour market; in the society; in schooling. Aboriginal transitional bilingual programs were also set up in this phase but their express purpose was the same: they aimed to cause a more successful transition to fully English medium education for non-English speaking Aboriginal children. Similar goals; different means. The target groups were clear in both cases as were the goals and means.

During the second phase the linguistic objectives and the means projected for achieving these changed. First language maintenance came to be advocated both because it led to a strengthening of English acquisition and, also, intrinsically; for its own sake. This was true of both immigrant non-English languages and also Aboriginal non-English languages. This merged into an advocacy of the widespread teaching and learning of these community languages for wider, more social purposes. The target group was the whole population, the means was the acquisition of bilingualism for communicative purposes. The stress was on the functional use of these languages in the student's society - not a foreign society. Although this was often naively believed and advocated it nevertheless prevailed for a long period as the dominant discourse. Language learning came to be seen as part of a cultural enterprise: learning one's own language or the language with which one's family identified for reasons, of securing personal and group identification and learning other languages for reasons of taking steps towards increasing social interaction between different, and linguistically divided, groups in the same society.

During the present phase, whose characteristics are only now becoming clear, language issues have become more sharply functional and instrumental. The stress is now on society's needs; not really on the needs of particular groups within it. In education the debating task has become one of reconciling society's needs with the linguistic needs of children.

As a distillation of these ideas it can be said that the first phase coincided with and was produced by conditions in society which created a salience for language issues related to equity. The decline of the secondary labour market meant that fewer jobs were available in which proficient standard English and literacy were irrelevant to performance of the work. English became, therefore, a social

question of equity.

The second phase was an ideological corrective to this, asserting less structural justifications for language policies and diversifying the issues away from an equity focus.

The third has seen the emergence of national pragmatic interest - selecting from the other phases those aspects of language policy and practice which suit more tangible macro-economic objectives, such as the language needs for retraining of workers and language skills to facilitate trade and tourism.

The National Policy on Languages

The conceptual basis of the NPL is socio-political language planning. Language planning, broadly, can encompass at one extreme status planning, and, at another, corpus planning. The former is a predominantly socio-political task involving the attribution of status to particular languages or varieties of language in societies where such choices are necessary. Corpus planning is the more technical work, undertaken by linguists usually (or others acting as linguists) and can involve a fairly wide range of technical and detailed work on language such as the standardisation of writing systems and the extension of the vocabularies of particular languages.

In some sense every society, indeed every group of speakers, 'plans' language. Language use always contains a tension between, on the one hand, the need for agreed (often unconsciously) constraint to maximise communication and comprehension and, on the other hand, the inevitability of some divergence because of the different experiences of the users of the language or the desire of some groups of language users to be unconstrained for the social reasons of identifying with some groups and rejecting others, or for artistic and literary reasons. All these acts involve choices or plans which can reveal the intentions of the speakers to other groups or individuals.

Conscious language planning and policy making is usually a response to particular problems to be solved or the corollary of already taken social, economic or political decisions or objectives.

Very briefly, it could be argued that Japan and Sweden do such planning around economic objectives to facilitate their export of products to a world which overwhelmingly does not use their languages. For Sweden, a relatively high cost manufacturer, it is extremely important that it has sophisticated skills in foreign languages to enable it to get the 'intelligence' on the societies whose markets it is targetting so that it can pin-point the niches where its Volvos, for example, will sell despite their being expensive. Knowing well these economies means knowing the sociology, the family patterns, the relative value accorded to 'ideas' like safety and good engineering so that it can overcome, as it does so successfully, its price disadvantages. The Economic Planning Advisory Committee representing Australian unions and employers as well as government, advocates similar 'niche-marketing' for Australia.

Other societies combine both extremes of language planning. Bahasa Indonesia was developed technically through the elaboration of norms for its use but needed to be propagated so that it would be accepted as a 'lingua franca' by people speaking other, and different, native languages. The revival of Hebrew has some parallels and its success is equally evident. Tanzania is seeking to replace English gradually, in its primary schools at least, with Kiswahili and this involves both the application of technical linguistic work and broader community persuasion to gain acceptance of Kiswahili as a language for such uses.

In the USA the existence of both a Bill of Rights and the possibility of class action in the courts has produced a socio-legal form of language planning. In 1974 approximately 1600 Cantonese speaking children in San Francisco successfully took action against Nicholls representing a school district in the famous Lau vs Nicholls case. The case succeeded by showing the children to have been denied equal educational opportunity by monolingual instruction in English. The then Health, Education and Welfare Department mandated the 'Lau Remedies' requiring either bilingual education or ESL according to particular circumstances.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to describe in detail the history of Australia's language planning. As was stated before conscious or deliberate language planning seems only to occur in response to social problems which are of language, or which have a strong language correlate and need to be solved, or when language issues are an indispensable corollary to meeting established or emerging

social, political or economic objectives of the society or of an authority with jurisdiction over such matters. This characteristic can be discerned in the examples provided above.

The absence of such problems makes language invisible as a social issue. It is for this reason that contrast is needed - the needs or demands of linguistically defined minorities contrasted with the dominant sections of society or the contrast between a nation's linguistic resources and the dominant ones in the world. The language of power is inevitably the language of the powerful and for them language is rarely an 'issue'.

In Australia's case these needs, problems or objectives are serious and strong. Together they might have produced the impetus for an overall policy but it is unlikely that these alone brought it about. What did occur was that a broad constituency of interest emerged which was able to crystalize and generalise, aided by catalysts and activists, 'language-general' issues from their own 'language-specific' problems.

By generalising beyond their own issues, due to being in constant touch with language specific problems different from their own advocated by other groups and needing therefore to evolve alliances based on a discourse which would unite their cases to maximise their strength, there was produced a natural impetus to a broadly based language constituency. Policy makers must either create such unity or utilise it if it exists already. This coalition of interests each making a concession to the interests, needs and rights of the others for the longer term common goal is an essential reason why Australia has a national policy on languages. These 'language specific' lobbies derive from the following sorts of 'problems-actual' and 'potentials-foregone' of language in Australia today:

- Almost 1,000,000 Australian adults have problems with English literacy. The most quoted survey was done by Judith Goyen in Sydney about 12 years ago. It found that 3.7% of the adult English speaking population could be considered functionally illiterate. The Victorian Adult Literacy and Basic Education Council from its recent study in Victoria calculated about 430,000 adults - migrants and non - require literacy help but only 4,000 receive literacy tuition. As can be appreciated from these figures, in addition to being an issue of individual social justice adult illiteracy also carries significant economic and social costs to the country. In Victoria well over 80% of adult literacy students who work are employed in unskilled and semi-skilled jobs. Such jobs account for only 33% of all jobs - a proportion which is declining (VALBEC, 1987).
- There are serious gaps in both the adequacy and appropriacy of much of the ESL provision for non-English speaking Australian students. The most comprehensive studies undertaken of ESL provision in schools, the Campbell reports, attest to a serious inadequacy in the level of provision estimating that an increase of up to 30% of resources *is* justified and that there exist serious deficiencies in the appropriateness of much of the ESL effort. Since the Campbell calculations the ESL program was cut sharply in the 1986 budget further damaging the level of provision and prejudicing the outcomes for many students.
- Although in the USA deaf people can study to Ph.D. level in American Sign Language, it is almost impossible for deaf Australians to study and attain qualifications in Australian higher education institutions in Australian Sign Language
- Although the impact of modern communications technologies and information technologies will be vast on all aspects of our lives very little serious work has been done on the educational, particularly the literacy, effects of this nor on the effects it will all have on minority languages and on multilingualism generally. Voice instructed computers are already prominent in Japan and in the USA.
- There is now an unprecedented crisis in school second language education, despite the efforts that have been made and the not insignificant successes in having community, bilingual, and immersion second language programs introduced into primary schools (especially successfully in Victoria). The proportion of matriculants graduating with a second language is down from over 44.4% in 1967 to a national average of 10.5%
- The rate of extinction of Aboriginal languages is over one per year and only a handful of the over fifty which are still spoken by children may be spoken by children in the year 2000.
- There is a consistent pattern of language shift away from their mother-tongue among immigrant

background Australians who learn a non-English language at home to using only English. Despite this the government and business leaders keep berating us for being ill prepared linguistically for economic and political-diplomatic representation overseas - invariably in languages which have large speech communities in this country.

- Interpreting and translating provisions are inadequate and stretched and although in recent years community interpreting has been the main emphasis in planning the provisions of interpreters and translators, these are inadequately and poorly used. There is virtually no high level accreditation (levels 4 and 5 of the National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters) in languages of key economic significance; there is poor provisions for Aborigines and the deaf.

The National Policy on Languages tries to stress the 'interconnectedness' of language issues. This means regarding literacy and first language education as linked pedagogically and linguistically; it means building on the linguistic resources of the community to provide economic and external benefits to Australia.

The Policy is constrained by the federal nature of Australia. It elaborates principles and deduces programs from these. At each level closer to their delivery as either teaching or services these are further developed into more specific implementation plans. They are as follows:

STATUS

Recognition of the status of Australian English as the national, convenient and shared language of Australia and its major official institutions.

Recognition of the rights of use and continued use of community languages other than English; including the languages and language systems of the deaf.

Recognition of the rights of use; indigenous and unique nature of Aboriginal languages, Torres Strait Islander languages and Australian creoles.

TEACHING AND LEARNING

ENGLISH FOR ALL => specified as =>

- English mother tongue education for English speaking Australians
- ESL and English as a Second Dialect education where this is required
- Internal and external provisions of English as a foreign language teaching where this is required.

SUPPORT FOR => specified as =>

ABORIGINAL AND

TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER LANGUAGES

- Bilingual/Bicultural education for native speakers
- Language awareness and language learning for non speakers
- Technical language work: recording, restoration and salvage work.

A LANGUAGE => specified as =>
OTHER THAN
ENGLISH FOR ALL

- Community languages as mother tongue maintenance
- Community languages as second languages
- Teaching languages of geopolitical and economic importance
- 'Enrichment' second languages.

LANGUAGE SERVICES

EQUITABLE AND => specified as =>
WIDESPREAD
LANGUAGE SERVICES

- Library provisions for ESL/ESD; LOTE teaching for recreation/information; services for the communication disabled etc.
- Interpreting/Translating. Domestic provisions: for the deaf; for immigrants and Aborigines. External provisions: needs for trade and diplomacy.
- Media: support. for the maintenance, learning and diffusion of all languages especially responding to the needs of the communication disabled; the geographically isolated and speakers of small or widely dispersed languages.
- Testing: adequate, appropriate, fair and simple testing of languages for educational, vocational and other purposes.

The Policy was completed at the end of November 1986, and distributed to the States and Territories most of which supported and welcomed it and stated that they would cooperate in its implementation. This represents a national consensus on language issues although the opposition to some aspects of language policy in the community should not be underestimated.

The Prime Minister announced the government's endorsement of the Policy on 26 April 1987. It was released and tabled in the Senate on 4 May at which time it received substantial support from the Opposition. On 5 June Cabinet voted a budget towards its implementation which was announced by the Prime Minister and the then Minister for Education Senator Ryan on 18 June. The Governor-General mentioned it as part of his outline of the new government's plans for its renewed term of office and the Treasurer formalized this by confirming the government's allocation towards its implementation in his 1987 budget speech. On 15 December 1987 the government reaffirmed its funding of the Policy and its endorsement of it, as well as announcing the composition of the Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education which will oversee its implementation. The amounts are \$15.7m in 1987-88 rising to \$28m in 1988-89. (Two further amounts of \$27m for 1989-90 and \$23m for 1990-91 have been allocated notionally, comprising a four year implementation plan).

Specifically the programs comprise:

- *Expansion of ESL New Arrivals Component* The English as a second language program has been expanded so that eligible students are able to participate for up to 12 months in intensive English courses both in language centres and in schools. The net additional ongoing full year program cost is \$13.2m in 1988.
- *Australian Second Language Learning Program* This is a program to provide funding to State, Territory and non-government school authorities for innovative and high quality projects of national relevance in languages other than English, reflecting a balance between all languages; community languages and languages of economic and geo-political importance. The net additional full-year program cost is of \$7.44m for each of three years. A national component for this program has also been funded.
- *Adult Literacy Action Campaign* The implementation through the Commonwealth authorities

of a two-year campaign to improve levels of adult literacy. This would include publicity on the need for literacy, the existence of courses, curriculum and materials development, research and, of course, teaching. The total program cost is \$3.93m but other funds of approximately \$2m may be diverted to this activity enabling a concerted attack on the problem.

- *Asian Languages Teaching* A program to boost Asian studies in Australia, including, for example, initiatives to develop curriculum materials, the possibility of key centres in tertiary institutions and tagged funding to Asian languages of major importance to Australia. The net additional full-year ongoing program costs would be \$1.95m per annum.
- *Multicultural and Cross-Cultural Supplementation Programs* A program to be introduced to boost multicultural and intercultural studies in tertiary education institutions, tagged funds for offering or extending courses in cross-cultural attitudinal training and community languages, and development of curriculum materials for teaching and other professional and para-professional courses. The program would provide a foundation for the development of cross-cultural training within professional and para-professional courses, the provision of in-service courses for teachers, and multicultural education. The net additional full-year ongoing program cost would be \$1.5m.
- *National Aboriginal Languages Project* A program to provide supplementary funding to State, Territory and non-government authorities for initiatives in Aboriginal languages, including bilingual education programs, language maintenance and language awareness programs. The net additional full-year program cost is \$0.5m in first year and \$1.0m in the following years.
- *Language Testing Unit* Although it had been decided to set up such a unit, this is being reviewed. The unit would attend to the coordination and development of Australian tests of English for academic, occupational and other purposes; to rationalise existing language testing functions of various departments and the Council on Overseas Professional Qualifications. Funding beyond 1988-89 is to be subject to the Unit achieving full cost recovery. The net additional full-year program cost is \$0.25m per annum. The review of this item will delay any implementation for the time being.
- *Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education* To monitor the growth, development and implementation of the National Policy on Languages; to further develop it and to address language and multicultural issues generally.

Other, smaller, initiatives have been funded and each program has been allocated separate administrative support. All the operating arrangements have been subject to a long, haggling, devising, proposing, rebutting, compromising, debilitating, finickity, drawn out process of decision making, which demonstrates how contested language questions are.

Three imperatives drive the NPL in the teaching/learning area:

Firstly; goals of educational equity leading to programs in community languages for language maintenance and intercultural goals leading to programs in community languages as second languages.

Secondly; the demonstrable relationship between the language needs of the society and its present economic directions leading to programs in the teaching of languages of economic and geo-political significance.

Thirdly; the general educational value of languages, deriving from the traditional cultural and intellectual goals of second language learning and leading to a general justification for widespread learning of any second language.

These three imperatives are expressed as four E's in the Policy: Enrichment; Equality; Economics and External.

In each phase of multiculturalism in Australia the debate has essentially been about the justification of intervention by public authorities. It has rarely been about planning or about program description. From each of the phases outlined earlier a particular stress is reflected in the Policy. From the first phase which was characterized by the advocacy of programs for equity and equal opportunity the NPL draws the focus on ESL, on adult literacy, on Aboriginal programs, on language services for the disabled, on tertiary access for them. From the second phase which contributed a perspective of

enrichment for all and a stress on cultural dissonance as the explanatory concept for immigrants' position in society and arguments about intercultural tolerance, the NPL draws its focus on the widespread teaching and learning of languages for the traditional purposes of such education, the enrichment this would offer, the horizons it broadens, the backgrounds it validates. From the third phase in which there has emerged a coincidence between manifest national and pragmatic needs with linguistics the NPL draws its stress on economically and geopolitically significant languages, on high level specialized interpreting/translating, on the marketing of English as a foreign language courses and English medium education to full-fee paying foreign students.

The first is about *equality*; the second about *culture*; the third about *economics*.

The national policy on languages is not however a language education policy alone. Its statements about the status of languages, the principles which underlie the policy, are stated explicitly and the language services sections deal with areas well beyond formal education. It is true that the government's response has been primarily to the language education components but the Advisory Council has a broad brief.

Multiculturalism is moving rapidly away from advocating its case on the basis of moral imperatives. The new prevailing - or perhaps as yet only emergent - ideology is inextricably linked with more pragmatic questions. It is functionalist and instrumental. It no longer says 'government you *must* do this because it is our/their right' as it stridently demands intervention. Nor does it say 'government *please* do this, can't you *feel* the *needs*' as it pleads for intervention. Now it says 'government, let's deal; you want to restructure; *sell* overseas; retrain the workforce; unleash the locked up unrecognised qualities talents and skills? Then this will have to be done first and then ... ' as it bargains the nature of the intervention.

This has been brought about, or is being brought about, by a combination of an active and articulate constituency for language issues uniting otherwise disparate groups for whom language is a key issue and who are sophisticated enough to see connections and concede some sectoral benefit for overall progress.

For the 1990s at least the language elements of multiculturalism are not at the periphery of concerns for only 'ethnics' and only for atavistic reasons, but a more complex discourse is underway, locating language issues at the centre and for all, combining culture, economics and equality. For it to bear real fruit will require solid and continuing adherence to all its strands.

Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education, Canberra

References

- Campbell, W. J., Bunett, J., Joy, B. (1984), *A Review of the Commonwealth ESL Program*, Commonwealth Schools Commission, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.
- Campbell, W. J. and McMeniman, M. (1985), *Bridging the Language Gap: Ideals and Realities Pertaining to Learning ESL*, Commonwealth Schools Commission, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.
- Commonwealth of Australia, Senate *Hansard*, 4 May 1987, p 2240. Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra.
- Martin, J. (1978), *The Migrant Presence*, George Allen and Unwin, Sydney. VALBEC (1988), *Literacy Matters*, Council of Adult Education, Melbourne.

Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Bianco, JL

Title:

Multiculturalism and the national policy on languages#

Date:

1988-01

Citation:

Bianco, J. L. (1988). Multiculturalism and the national policy on languages#. Journal of Intercultural Studies, 9 (1), pp.25-38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07256868.1988.9963326>.

Persistent Link:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11343/112284>