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Welcome to Babel! Volume 54-3, the final issue for 2019. As the year concludes it is worth looking back at some of the key events of the year at a national level. It was of course the International Year of Indigenous Languages, with a number of important events and significant coverage on ABC Radio National, and ABC and SBS television across the year.

For AFMLTA, the International Year of Indigenous Languages was celebrated with the presentation of the Horwood Memorial Lecture by Professor Jane Simpson, Chair of Indigenous Linguistics and Deputy Director of the Australian Research Council from the Centre of Excellence for the Dynamics of Language (CoEDL) at the Australian National University at the 22nd AFMLTA International Languages Conference in Hobart in July. The conference program also included an Indigenous languages strand with many presentations on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander languages education and language renewal in Australia, including in Tasmania, as the site of the conference, where work on palawa kani is being undertaken by the Indigenous peoples. At the conference we also hosted the presentation of the CoEDL (in partnership with AFMLTA and LCNAU) Patji Dawes Award for Languages Teaching, which recognises outstanding teachers of all languages. This year the award was won by two teachers of Indigenous languages, Brother Steve Morelli for his teaching of Gumbaynggirr on the mid-north coast of NSW, and Sophia Muny, who teaches her mother tongue, Gija, in the Kimberley.

Professor Simpson’s Horwood address is the lead article in this volume. As part of the AFMLTA’s contribution to the International Year of Indigenous Languages we were proud to publish the special double issue of Babel on the teaching and Learning of Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Languages (Volume 54-1/2). The double issue has received positive feedback from members across Australia, from academics involved in teaching, researching and promoting Indigenous languages in Australia, as well as from colleagues overseas.

A second significant event was in fact the AFMLTA International Languages Conference itself, with keynote addresses from Prof Rafael Núñez (University of California, San Diego), Prof John Hajek, and Prof Joe Lo Bianco (both from The University of Melbourne) and some 80 presentations by teachers and academics from Australia, New Zealand and a range of other countries. It is anticipated a special volume dedicated to keynote addresses and selected papers presented at the conference will be published by Babel in 2020.

Other significant moments included the announcement in early August 2019 by the Australian Government Minister for Education, the Honourable Dan Tehan, that the government will support a project to develop a national languages plan and strategy to support languages learning and teaching in Australia. This is a momentous and long sought-after initiative that will hopefully guide languages education in a nationally coordinated manner into the future. More recently of course the new declaration of national goals for schooling in Australia, the Alice Springs (Mparntwe) Education Declaration was released. Within the new declaration, Languages remains one of the eight key content and learning areas, with an emphasis on partnerships, engagement with the world and celebration of the diversity of cultures and languages. The project to develop a national plan and strategy for languages education will no doubt assist in achieving the goals of the Alice Springs (Mparntwe) Education Declaration.

And so to this issue of Babel to conclude the year.

In the first article, a transcript of the Horwood Memorial Lecture presented in Hobart at the AMLTA conference, Prof. Simpson discusses the importance and current state of Indigenous (or First Nations) languages in Australia. She explores their ecologies and linguistic landscapes in both communities and in our classrooms and other sites of learning, and talks about sharing these resources so important to cultural maintenance and personal identity of Indigenous Australians, and as languages and cultures of importance to the wider Australian community, as we continue to learn about and build understanding of and respect for the original languages and cultures of the country we too call ‘home’. Prof. Simpson provides us with a most interesting journey through the diverse contexts and conditions of the many and varied languages that continue to survive or which communities endeavor to renew, including in the Tasmanian context.

In their article on distance education for languages, Yvette Slaughter and her colleagues explore the knowledge – and support – teachers need to engage successfully with digital modes of language teaching and learning to learners in regional and remote areas. Using the TPACK framework, they explore the relationship between the three key areas of teacher knowledge: content (including language), pedagogy, and technology, highlighting the critical role in infrastructure planning to the success of such ventures in bringing language learning opportunities to children who may otherwise miss out on this important element of a complete educational experience.

The third article reports on the findings of the member survey undertaken by the AFMLTA in 2018. The survey sought to understand members’ interests and concerns and what they want from the AFMLTA in terms of information dissemination and professional learning opportunities in particular. The findings highlight the valuable role of the AFMLTA communications strategies, including through Babel, in keeping members informed and providing a medium for sharing research and innovation in the Languages education field. The survey also drew attention to the interesting interrelationships between national, state and language specific professional associations in meeting the members’ professional learning needs. In particular, the data reinforces the role of the AFMLTA as a provider of choice for research-informed, classroom-relevant professional learning that provides a broader national perspective than that which may be available at a local level. The important roles that local MLTA/LTAs and Language Specific Associations play in providing locally contextualised and language-specific professional learning was also reinforced.

The final article reviews a recent edited volume, Talking north: The journey of Australia’s first Asian language (Thomas [ed], 2019). As Morgan states in her review, the book provides a nostalgic retrospective on what the Indonesian-Australian relationship has been, and what it has meant to those who have engaged with Indonesia and the teaching of its languages and cultures in Australia since the establishment of the modern Indonesian state in the mid-1940s. The book, with multiple perspectives from a wide range of academics, reminds us of the challenges faced in sustaining national interest in the teaching and learning of the languages, cultures and societies of even our most immediate neighbours, when there are events and media narratives that appear to push back against what for most of us appears a most self-evident fact that knowing and respecting one’s neighbour is the best way to build positive relationships. Looking forward, Morgan’s review reinforces the critical imperative to continue to engage with our neighbor, its diversities and dynamics, its people and their languages, to help overcome misconceptions and fully appreciate what it means to be Indonesian in this increasingly mobile and interconnected region, and in the world more generally.

This issue of Babel concludes with the citation celebrating the FIPLV International Award for contributions to the field of languages education awarded to Prof John Hajek, following the successful AFMLTA nomination, and publicly presented to him at the recent LCNAU conference in Perth, among many of his colleagues from schools and universities. The AFMLTA was pleased to be able to nominate John, whose support for and contributions to the AFMLTA have been and continue to be significant.

Finally, to the membership of the AFMLTA and the Babel readership, we wish you a safe and restful summer break, and a positive and invigorated start to the new academic year in 2020. A Happy Year of the Rat to you all.

Andrew Scrimgeour
University of South Australia
View from npaluna (Hobart) lo kunanyi (Mt Wellington)
Jane Simpson Australian National University, ARC Centre of Excellence for the Dynamics of Language

THE HORWOOD MEMORIAL LECTURE:
Learning and speaking First Nations Languages in Australia

Jane Simpson with AFMLTA President Amanda Pentti.

The following article is adapted from the Horwood Lecture presented on the evening of 6 July 2019, at the AFMLTA International Conference, in Hobart, Tasmania.

INTRODUCTION
(Anne-Marie Morgan, UNE, AFMLTA)

The Horwood Memorial Lecture honours a founding member of the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations (AFMLTA); Keith Horwood. Keith was a founder of the precursor to AFMLTA in Victoria, the Modern Language Teachers Association of Victoria (MLTAV), and, as David Ingram recalls in his history of the AFMLTA, was minuted in 1954 promoting a national body of languages teachers, and calling for a constitution to be developed for a national association. In 1962, the AFMLTA was finally formed, with Keith one of the founding members.

Keith was also behind the transformation of the MLTAV Newsletter to the journal Babel, in 1956, which remains the academic journal of the AFMLTA to this day, having celebrated 63 years of publication. He also supported the inception of a national conference, but it was not until 1976 that this occurred, in Brisbane, just two years after his death. We are now all attending the 22nd AFMLTA conference, in Hobart, as part of the regular rotation of conference locations around the states and territories of Australia, hosted jointly by the AFMLTA and the state or territory languages teachers association, in this instance, the Modern Language Teachers Association of Tasmania (MLTAT).

So Keith Horwood was instrumental to the beginnings of AFMLTA, Babel and AFMLTA national, and now international conferences. It was fitting, then, that after his death his family instituted a Keith Horwood Memorial Scholarship, which in turn became the financial support for the Horwood Lecture speaker. His family has continued to support the AFMLTA with additional funds to this scholarship, and we now have a long list of honoured scholars who have presented this lecture in his name, including Anthony Liddicoat, David Ingram, Angela Scarrino, Howard Nicholas, Joseph Lo Bianco, Alistair Pennycook, Lesley Harbon, Jane Orton and John Hajek. Our honoured speaker this evening, to present the Horwood Lecture, is Professor Jane Simpson.

Jane Simpson majored in Chinese and English literature at ANU, followed by honours in Middle English and an MA in Linguistics (1977). She spent 10 months in Moscow as an ANU exchange scholar (1977-78). She has carried out fieldwork on Indigenous Australian languages since 1979, and received a PhD in linguistics from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1985, for a study of Warlpiri in the Lexical-Functional Grammar framework.

Jane was a Sloan postdoctoral fellow at Stanford University. She then worked in Central Australia on Warumungu language and language maintenance, and helped set up a language centre in Tennant Creek. She also carried out various consultancies (e.g. for Aboriginal Legal Aid, and the Aboriginal Sacred Sites Protection Authority), and worked on the Warumungu land claims. In 1987-89, with David Nash, she worked as Lexicography Fellow at the Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, helping set up a digital archive of Aboriginal language material, which became ASDA. In 1989 she became a Lecturer in Linguistics at The University of Sydney. In 2005, with Mary Laughren and David Nash, she shared the Linguistics Society of America Summer Institute Inaugural Ken Hale Chair.

In 2011 Jane moved to ANU as the inaugural Chair of Indigenous Linguistics and head of the School of Language Studies. In 2014 she stepped down as Head of School and is now Deputy Director of the Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for the Dynamics of Language. We welcome Jane, are honoured she has agreed to present the Horwood Lecture, and look forward to her insights in her presentation ‘Learning and speaking first nation languages in Australia’. Thank you Jane.

THE HORWOOD LECTURE: JANE SIMPSON

I acknowledge the traditional owners of the country we are meeting on. As you heard so wonderfully from Theresa Sainty, who provided us the Welcome to Country, we are in lutruwita. The image here is John Glover’s 1834 painting of the area, which provides an idea of what it was like very early in the settlement of this country. (The painting is in the National Gallery of Australia, and can be found at www.cs.npa.gov.au/detail.cfm?id=141634.)

In the image you can see the muwinina and palawa people, as they were. And I honour, particularly, the efforts of the modern day people to reclaim and renew their languages. As we will hear from Theresa, they suffered the greatest devastation and yet they managed to show such amazing resilience in reclaiming and renewing palawa kani language.

And I also am very grateful to the organisers for the opportunity to give this paper to honour the memory of Keith Horwood. As you have heard from Anne-Marie, he was clearly an inspiring figure. He was a great promoter of language technology - in those days, language laboratories - and, as you heard, he was a great promoter of professional infrastructure, like the AFMLTA and the Applied Linguistics Association of Australia (ALAA). These associations are an absolutely crucial part of the teaching and research infrastructure, because they give us the chance to share ideas, they break down the silos that many of us inhabit, and they also protect us, or help us protect ourselves, against all the unexpected shocks that we get from governments, technologies and the economy.

When Keith Horwood was working in the 1960s and early 1970s, the importance of Indigenous First Nations languages was only just beginning to be recognised. Pitjantjatjara began to be taught at The University of Adelaide in the late 1960s. In the early 1970s, bilingual education programs in Indigenous languages began in the Northern Territory. But it is no wonder that, in the Australian Academy of Humanities’ first report on language teaching in Australia (AAHCLF, 1975), they focused on foreign languages, not on Indigenous languages. That was before multicultural policy had been established, before people realised how endangered our First Nations languages are, and, of course, the focus then was on the study of written texts in the original language, so there have been many changes since then.

In the AFMLTA documents there is a very nice piece by Keith Horwood’s son, Chris Horwood, where he says that:

Keith really believed the academic world should actively support all levels of language teaching and also that we must ensure that the vibrant and vital cultures that exist in non-English-speaking areas of the world are not submerged by the seemingly inevitable march of linguistic dominance (AFMLTA, n.d.).
I feel, given this sentiment by his son, that Keith Honwood would have appreciated the new focus on Indigenous languages.

What I will do in this talk is talk briefly about Indigenous languages and their present state. I will give some definitions of language ecologies and linguistic landscapes based on work that my colleagues are doing in the Centre of Excellence and then I will talk briefly about learning and teaching ecologies and landscapes.

The first thing is: Why are First Nations languages so important? Well, they are the first languages of Australia. Bonnie Deegan, a Jaru leader who has chaired the Kimberley Language Resource Centre, which was the first Indigenous organisation to focus on language renewal, said this about why language is so important:

Language is a very big part of the culture of Aboriginal people in the Kimberley. We know who we are by the language we speak. It joins us to our past and our old people, right back to the dreamtime. It ties us to our land, and it makes us proud and strong.

Language also gives us a place in the present day. It shows all Australians that we have something to give to society, and that we have a rightful place in today’s world. By keeping our language strong, we let everyone know that our lives and feelings and wishes are important, and that we are here to stay.

Most importantly, we keep our language for the future. Our children will grow up knowing where they come from, and knowing that their parents are proud to be Aboriginal Australian. And they will be able to follow the path right back to their ancestors. This will help young people to belong (Deegan, in Kimberley Language Resource Centre, 2011).

I think that is a beautiful expression of the importance of language.

There are many different beliefs about language and you heard some of them from Theresia in her story - the importance of language and its ties to land. Speaking in a particular language can be seen as a way to participate in society, or it can be seen as an obligation and that is what English is seen as in Australia - the monolingual mindset of Australia obliges people to speak English. Speaking language as an inherited right for your family is the view of many Indigenous people. Language is seen as intellectual property, so inherited rights to it determine who has the right to speak it and who has the right to teach it, or learn it. By contrast, English is usually seen as something belonging to everyone. It is also seen as something that is all of us, not inherently connected with land. So these are different views of language that have strong consequences for the place of Indigenous languages in our society.

So, here we are, in the International Year of Indigenous Languages. In 1788, the whole continent was covered with hundreds and hundreds of different speech communities, all speaking different languages. In 2010, the number of people who are speaking an Indigenous language as a first language has massively dropped. In the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) 2016 census, it was down to fewer than 40,000 people and of those 40,000 people there were only 13 languages still spoken by children, all in remote areas - southern Australia, central Western Australia, Central Australia and Cape York. And the numbers for each of those languages is really small. Djambampanyu, which is the biggest traditional language, spoken in Arnhem Land, has about 4,000 speakers; Pitjantjatjara, in the north of South Australia, has about 3,000 speakers and Warlpiri in Central Australia has just over 2,000 speakers (Simpson, McConnell & Thieberger, 2019). These are tiny numbers.

These numbers, now, are shifting also because people are becoming more mobile and moving away from their heartlands. Warlpiri speakers, for example, are located around the country - in Queensland, in Canberra, in New South Wales, in Victoria, in Perth - many people moving away from their homeland. Whether a language is learned by children at home is a measure of its level of endangerment. If it is not learnt at home, it is severely endangered. When people move away from their heartlands, then the chances that the children will continue speaking the language also diminish.

Now, let’s look at another kind of endangered language. The Iltyelem-iltyelem (Australian Indigenous Sign Languages) website (www. iltyelemhythem.com) has many illustrations and examples of the use of sign language. Originally they were used in times of mourning, in times of hunting and also as a way of showing respect. There are very few people left now who actually use those sign languages in everyday talk. People may use some signs but not the full range.

Language shift is very rapid. For example, in a family that I worked with in Tennant Creek, the eldest member of the family - the great-grandmother was highly multilingual, speaking Alyawarr, Kaytetye, and as a second language pidgin English, as well as other languages. Her daughter, who I worked with a lot with spoke Warumungu and Warlmanpa, Aboriginal English and she had passive knowledge of other languages. Her daughter spoke mostly Aboriginal English, some standard English and some pidgin English. Her daughter speaks English and Aboriginal English with some passive knowledge of Warumungu and the baby has grown up to speak Aboriginal English and standard English. That shows you how rapidly a language can disappear within a single family.

As well as the traditional languages, a number of new languages have arisen since the invasion of 1788 and these have arisen by contact between traditional Indigenous languages and English. Some of them have large speaker numbers, so Kriol, which is a new language spoken in the Northern Territory, has somewhere between 20,000 and 30,000 speakers. The numbers are very rough because the census is particularly bad rough because the census is particularly bad at picking up languages. Another new language, Yumplatok, again, spoken on Cape York and the Torres Strait, has at least 20,000 speakers. Most of the words in these contact languages come from English but they don’t have the same grammar and they don’t have the same ways of making new words.

This can be seen by going to the Living Archive of Aboriginal Languages (www.livingarchive, cdu.edu.au), and looking at and listening to the books in Kriol that are housed in the archive. For example, Lily Bennett (Barunga Press, 1986) has written a book Purdiwan Dakidak. The title alone shows that the Kriol adjective for English ‘pretty’ is created by changing the pronunciation and suffixing -wan, while the Kriol translation for ‘duck’ is the reduplication ‘dakidak’.

Most of Australia’s Indigenous languages are no longer used as everyday means of communication. However, the inherited views of these languages, the languages themselves, are often keen to revive them. Most people have not grown up learning their family’s heritage languages. Reawakening and renewing these languages is very important for many people, and the kind of effort that they have put into renewing and reawakening their language heritage can be seen from the 2016 ABS Census.

In the ABS 2016 census, 440 people put down Nyungar as the language they spoke at home, so Nyungar is a language that has been reinvigorated. For Wiradjuri in central New South Wales, there are 432 speakers. For Gamilaraay, there are 94. And then, when you go down to Victoria - Yorta Yorta – has 52 people speaking the language, and in Adelaide and further south 44 people speak Kaurna, the language of the Adelaide mainland, and 300-odd people speak Ngarinyin, the language of the Coorong and the lakes. These numbers show the strength and the passion that people have for their heritage languages.

People’s passion for their languages, both the languages of everyday use and the reawakened languages, can also be seen and heard in the Gambay map, which was developed by First Languages Australia. The map can be found at www.gambay.com.au/ map. This is a map with clickable dots where you can hear someone from that area telling you about their language and what it means to them. If you go to Tasmania, from the dot you will find about palawa kani and the Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre where Theresa Sainty works. And so you can hear more about their language.

I will now briefly talk about the special double issue of Babel (2019, Volume 54, Issues 1-2), which I have been privileged to co-edit with Samantha Disbray and Carmel O’Shannessy.

Here come the definitions - a couple of terms. Language ecologies

“Language ecology” is the configuration of languages spoken, heard and identified with, in a specific place. More than one language can be spoken in any one place and people can use the language to differing extents and for differing purposes. This is basically to say that an important aspect of the community you live in is the languages you hear and you use in everyday life.

With respect to Indigenous Australian languages, we have four main language ecologies and they differ, in part, according to what they are used for. A major division is that between using language for everyday communication and for expressing identity, and using language primarily for expressing identity. In the first language ecology, traditional Indigenous languages are the main language and there are still a few communities in Australia which have that kind of language ecology - places in Aninhom Land, places like Wadeye, Groote Eylandt, Yuerdumu, Aurukun, where most of the community is speaking a traditional language as their first language.
Then, the second kind of language ecology is one involving the new Indigenous languages. These are languages like Kriol and Yumplatok, which have been around for 100 years at least, and a number of emerging languages. For example, at Yarrabah there is an emerging new language that they call Yarrie Lingo there. And that is the first language of children and people in the community (Angelo, Fraser & Yeatman, 2019).

Then, the second division is language as identity and heritage. These are vast areas of Australia where English is everyone’s first language but there may be intense interest in reawakening and revival of traditional languages. This has strong education department support in NSW, as discussed by Kevin Lowe and John Giacon (Lowe & Giacon, 2019).

And finally, there are the cities and the big towns, which are mixed language ecologies, where there may be speakers of traditional and new languages, there may be people who want to revive their languages, but English is basically dominant as the language of everyday use.

The last definition is that of the linguistic landscape.

Linguistic landscapes

Linguistic landscape is a term that people use for the audibility, visibility and salience of languages in public places. For example, Kaurna, the language of the Adelaide Plains, is used in a football sticker as a way of making Kaurna language visible on your bumper bar or on your house, wherever.

Linguistic landscapes traditionally have been thought of in terms of visual and especially written language and signage. Dual naming of places is one example of this. For example, Mount Wellington now has its original name, kunanyi, restored. And across Australia, there is a big effort dedicated to bringing back some of the traditional names in this dual-naming practice. But, as we all know, across Australia, English is the most visible language on street signs, advertisements, shops and so forth. Occasionally, say in Chintowna, you will see more Chinese signs, but it is a big effort to make other languages visible in the public space. One other way of bringing other languages into the public visual space is through the ‘Welcome to Country’ signs. So: ‘Welcome to Canberra - Ngunnawal Country’. This is becoming a lot more common.

We can also think of linguistic landscapes in terms of soundscapes, where we hear the sounds of Indigenous languages. And it was wonderful, just 10 days or so ago, on 1 July, to hear the Governor General’s swearing-in speech in Canberra, where he used Ngunawal language. Again, this is bringing the Indigenous languages in Australia into the public space, with the permission of the Indigenous language owners. He consulted and was trained by Ngunawal people to say those words. And similarly, with the previous Prime Minister, Malcolm Turnbull, who used Ngunawal language in Parliament.

In the International Year of Indigenous Languages we have seen a lot of energy in enriching the linguistic landscape. Examples include ABC Awaysi’s Word Up segment, where you get three words in a language. The Research Unit for Indigenous Languages of Melbourne has a 50-word project, where you can hear 50 words in a whole range of Indigenous languages. And some of you may have been lucky enough to get the Australian 50-cent coin that has words of Indigenous languages on it - the Australian Mint’s contribution to the International Year of Indigenous Languages.

But the biggest way of improving the linguistic landscape and of making languages visible and audible, is at schools and universities, because a language that is taught as a subject at school is a language with status. And the language that is the medium of instruction at school has even higher status, because it comes with a strong necessity to produce many resources so that you can teach all aspects of the curriculum in that language. And it also gives speakers the opportunity to enrich their own vocabulary and concepts. The fact that English is the medium of instruction in almost all schools in Australia certainly contributes to the dominance of English, and to the downplaying of those Indigenous languages that are still spoken by children.

Here, Warlpiri is a language that has been used as the medium of instruction in schools in the Northern Territory and is still clinging on to that role, thanks to really dedicated Aboriginal teachers and non-Aboriginal staff. But they put in enormous efforts, as groups, into developing ideas of how, for instance, to teach maths through Warlpiri, and that means bringing people together from various Warlpiri schools to discuss and work out ways of teaching the curriculum through Warlpiri and of finding simple ways to expressing some concepts such as mathematical concepts (Disbrey, 2014). It is crucial for that kind of content to have a shared vocabulary. To illustrate, perhaps some people, like me, remembering being confused at primary school when teachers said ‘minus, takeaway, subtract’. Were they the same idea or different ideas? It took me a while to learn they were all the same thing. Aboriginal teachers face that same problem in translating from English into their traditional languages.

Language at school

Language, as I have illustrated, is used to communicate ideas and also to express associations, to express your identity. Which indigenous languages are taught at school and how they are taught really depends on the language ecology and the desires of the language custodians. Those are key things.

If we are thinking of language as everyday communication, the Australian Curriculum: Languages first-language-learner pathway provides a pathway for both the first ecology - where traditional Indigenous languages are the main language of children - and for the second, where new Indigenous languages are the main languages for students. Schools in both ecologies can benefit from mother-tongue medium instruction programs, language development and explicit teaching of English. They face a massive challenge in that, to Australia’s shame, there are fewer Indigenous teachers now who are first-language speakers of Indigenous languages than there were in the 1980s. This is terrible because it places such an obstacle for those schools.

For the third ecology, where English is the first language but there is an intense interest in revival of traditional languages - the Australian Curriculum: Languages provides a language revival pathway. There are in-school programs, but also lots of Indigenous people are running out-of-school programs, adult language learning groups, and Facebook and social media groups of all kinds. A great deal of energy is going into that. For these programs, there are many challenges. The first challenge is reconstructing languages from old sources. A group may be lucky. For Kaurna,
for example, there is a dictionary from 1840, which has roughly 1800 words (Teichelmann & Schürmann, 1840), but the language revivers had to reconstruct the pronunciation from neighbouring languages. They had to work out ways of making vocabulary for new things like computers, or telephones, all sorts of things. And they had to face the challenge that the grammar is very different from English and it was not easy to reconstruct it from the 1840 dictionary (Amery, 2016).

The second challenge language revivers face is that language learning is really hard and it is even harder when you do not have many resources. And, again, just as with the first-language programs, teacher education is a challenge. The teachers of Indigenous languages, heritage language, the reconstructed languages, have two challenges, because they have to learn the reconstructed language as well as learning how to teach it. And that is difficult to do without spending some time. So it is worth doing a Bachelor of Education and a year/two years learning the language. These are challenges that we should be able to overcome. The benefits, if we can do so, are fantastic. This is what Michael Jarrett, who is a Gumbaynggirr person, says about learning his heritage language:

It has opened up many doors in my Gumbaynggirr language journey across all facets of my life, and has given me back my pride as an Aboriginal man. I’m passing on my knowledge and skills to other Aboriginal people so they can feel the way I feel. I feel more connected to my language, my homeland, the spirits of my homeland, and most of all to my ancestors (www.cel.org.au/uncle-michael-jarrett/).

So it really is worth doing.

The final group to mention are second-language learners. The Australian Curriculum: Languages does have a second-language learner pathway and First Nations People may choose to teach their language to outsiders or they may decide not to, and that is their right – it is their property. The very first such teacher was Patyegarang (Patye or Patji), in the late 1780s. She appears to have been the first person to teach an Indigenous language to an English-speaking outsider. She taught it to Lieutenant William Dawes, who was on the first fleet, and he wrote down a very detailed description of the language. His notebooks are available online. They seem to have had a good and warm relationship; she gets him to learn his heritage language:

To honour second language learners, the ARC Centre of Excellence for the Dynamics of Languages, set up a language-teaching award named after Patyegarang and William Dawes, to recognise outstanding achievements in teaching any language, Indigenous or non-Indigenous. It is co-sponsored with AFMLTA and with the Languages and Cultures Network for Australia Universities (LCNAU). This year’s winners and their nominators were recognised in an awards ceremony at this AFMLTA conference and also at the LCNAU colloquium in Perth. The winners are Sophia Mung, who is a Girr woman from the Kimberley, who teaches in a situation more like a first-language situation; and Brother Steve Morelli who has worked closely with Aboriginal communities on the north coast of New South Wales for over 30 years, helping to revive Gumbaynggirr language. And his nominator, Gary Williams, is a Gumbaanyguuy elder who has been deeply involved in the language revival movement.

To find out more about where you can learn an Indigenous language as a second language, the University Languages Portal of Australia is an LCNAU-initiated website which tells you, for all languages at universities in Australia, which university you can learn them at, but it also has a special focus on Indigenous languages (www.ulpa.edu.au).

I will leave you with a recording in honour of lutrawita, of Fanny Cochrane Smith, who was recorded in 1899. She was recorded on a wax cylinder. The recording can be found at www.aso.gov.au/files/music/sanpyn- cochran-smith-songs/clip1/.
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ABSTRACT
Although distance models for languages programs have shifted in recent years from a marginalised practice to being regarded as innovative (White, 2017), questions persist about what knowledge schools and teachers need to provide them successfully. In this article we explore these questions through a study of using videoconferencing to provide access to specialist language teachers in primary schools in regional and remote areas in Australia. To frame the issues, we draw on the ‘technological pedagogical content knowledge’ (TPACK) framework (Koehler & Mishra, 2005; Mishra, 2018) which places emphasis on understanding the relationship between three areas of teachers’ knowledge: content, pedagogy, and technology. Based on our case study findings, we argue that a deeper understanding is needed of the relationship between technological and pedagogical knowledge, and that the understanding of technology needs to encompass the role of infrastructure and infrastructural planning (Garrett, 2009) in order to best attend to the specific nature of language learning and teaching.

INTRODUCTION
The role of technology in languages education is constantly evolving and changing and has long promised both opportunities for innovation while at the same time presenting significant challenges. Much effort by teachers, institutions and researchers has gone into selecting and using technologies to augment and strengthen teaching, rather than simply providing a poor substitute for traditional methods (Comber & Lawson, 2013; Hamilton, Rosenburg & Akcaoglu, 2016). The technologies involved encompass a wide range of concepts and elements, including hardware platforms at various scales, different kinds of software for delivery and content management, changing user protocols, and networking and other services. In this article, we focus on the use of technologies to provide languages education through videoconferencing, in particular, for rural and regional school communities. Technology-mediated distance language teaching, focused on videoconferencing (VC) in this article, involves the use of web-based video and audio communication between parties at different sites.

The use of technology to deliver education services to rural and remote students has a long history in Australia where various forms of distance education have operated since the early 1900s, and continue in modern services such as the Brisbane School of Distance Education, the Victorian School of Languages, and the Alice Springs Language Centre, among others. The use of online only and blended (online and face to face) models of subject provision by many schools outside of metropolitan areas also plays a critical role in addressing educational inequity. This has historically been and continues to be the case where small school sizes and geographic isolation can prohibit access to expert and specialised teachers (e.g., Kleinhenz, Wilkinson, Garson & Ingvarson, 2007; Pritchard, Hunt & Barnes, 2010).

White (2017, p. 134) argues that the use of distance models for language programs has changed significantly in recent years, shifting ‘from being regarded by many as a somewhat marginal enterprise, to being recognized as sites for technological and pedagogical innovation that extend the theory and practices of language teaching’. These models have moved from a more traditional approach where language programs tended to focus on text-based course materials and asynchronous listening activities to newer, emerging models which integrate multimodal avenues of interaction. These new generational models allow greater possibilities for language teachers and learners to focus on key tenets in contemporary languages education including ‘communication and learning as a social process’ (White, 2017, p. 134).

Research into distance programs has investigated a range of factors influencing technology-mediated teaching, as well as its use for language learning in particular, including the affordances of program delivery through VC tools, pedagogical implications for teaching with VC tools, and paralinguistic and socio-affective aspects of language learning through online modes (e.g., Golonka, Bowles, Frank, Richardson & Freynik, 2014; Guichon, 2009; Hampel and de los Arcos, 2012; Lomicka and Lord, 2009; Otto, 2017; White, 2017). However, to date, almost all of this research has looked at university or other higher education settings, with a focus on individual or small group interaction (White, 2017). Few studies have looked at the role of distance education for school-based, whole class contexts, and these have predominantly been in European contexts (e.g., Anastasidas et al., 2013; Austin, Hampel & Klukis-Hulme, 2017; Macrory, Christen & Ortega-Martin 2012; Pritchard, Hunt & Barnes, 2010; Whyte, 2011) or United States contexts (e.g., Thompson & Nutta, 2018).

As the field continues to evolve, it is critical to ensure, argues White (2017, p. 144), that research is ‘carried out in as wide a range of settings as possible and with a wide range of target populations and target languages, including those with non-Roman scripts’. Our research aims to build on this research trajectory and to contribute research into distance education languages programs at the primary school level, within an Australian context. In a recent project (see Slaughter, Smith & Hajek, 2019, for a detailed analysis of the research discussed in this article), we explored the evolution and maintenance of two networks of primary schools in Victoria in rural and regional contexts, where the sharing of teachers and resources through distance education is indispensable for the provision of language programs. Our study shows that any questions around the effectiveness of distance education languages programs need to be set within a broader discussion about pedagogy; the acquisition of technology; ongoing professional development in the use of technology; staffing; scheduling, and space considerations, among others (Slaughter, Smith & Hajek, 2019).

In this article, we focus on some of the key issues arising from the research project using the ‘technological pedagogical content knowledge’ (TPACK) framework (Koehler & Mishra, 2005; Mishra, 2018). While the original investigation did not use the TPACK frame, we are applying the TPACK lens here in order to develop a better understanding of the more sophisticated knowledge that evolves in the development of distance education programs. In line with Garrett (2009, p. 720), we argue that the effectiveness of digital technologies in languages education lies in...
moving beyond thinking of Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) as simply the “use of technology” to instead realising that “technology, theory, and pedagogy are inseparably interwoven” (see also, Lafford, 2009; Lomicka & Lord, 2019). Through this analysis we aim to illustrate the nature of technological knowledge, how it evolves and how this can inform the ongoing development of sustainable distance education programs.

**THE TPACK FRAMEWORK**

The TPACK framework extends Shulman’s (1986, 1987) seminal theory of teachers’ ‘pedagogical content knowledge’ (PCK), a knowledge which develops in the overlap of two separate but concurrent and interrelated domains of specialised teacher professional knowledge: (a) content knowledge – what the teacher knows and how this is organised in the teacher’s mind; and (b) pedagogical knowledge – knowledge of how to best teach this. Shulman (1986; 1987) argues that teachers develop PCK as new, context-responsive, integrative professional knowledge, as they naturally combine aspects of content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge in planning, teaching, assessing, evaluating, and reflecting on their teaching practice. As a theoretical construct, PCK enables a focus on how teachers draw on their professional knowledge and skills to actively transform content knowledge and adapt and adjust instruction to support student learning across all aspects of teaching (see e.g., Hashweh, 2013; Shulman, 1986; 1987).

The TPACK framework adds ‘technological knowledge’ to the PCK framework to address teacher technological knowledge (TK), broadly define teacher technological knowledge as teachers knowing ‘enough’ to be able to apply information technology productively at work and in their everyday lives; recognise when technology ‘can assist or impede the achievement of a goal’, and continually adapt to technological changes.

Overall, however, it is evident that definitions of technological knowledge are not always clear or consistent across a range of studies using the TPACK framework (Graham, 2011) because teacher technological knowledge is inconsistent by nature, determined by choice of technology as well as issues around access and purpose (Koehler & Mishra, 2009). Issues include the diversity of technologies available; the open-ended nature of many digital information technologies; the different affordances of various digital technologies; constant and rapid technological developments; and associated social and contextual factors (Koehler, Mishra & Cain, 2013).

The relationship between the three core teacher knowledge domains in TPACK is shown in the overlapping circles in the Venn diagram in Fig. 1, adapted from Mishra (2018). In this updated TPACK diagram, Mishra draws explicit attention to the importance of contextual knowledge for the first time. In relabelling the outer, dotted circle ‘contextual Knowledge’ (XX), Mishra explicitly shows how technology, pedagogy, and content knowledge, and in turn, TPACK (and PCK), are always shaped by teacher knowledge of the learning and teaching context.

While the TPACK model provides a framework for a more sophisticated understanding of how pedagogic choices can work with technological and content knowledge, interpretation of the positioning of technology varies widely. Hockly, Dudleye & Pegrum (2014, p.44) for example, argue that ‘content and pedagogy should take primacy over technology in curriculum design and lesson planning’. However, Voogt, Fisser, Pareja, Roblin, Tondeur & van Braak (2013) found, as part of a systematic literature review of research examining the theoretical basis and practical use of TPACK, that integrating technology into a specific educational context benefits from teachers’ professional, and informed alignment of content, pedagogy and ‘the potential of technology’. These authors also argued that teachers who want to integrate technology into their teaching practice need to be competent in all three domains, bearing in mind contextual variables. As noted in the introduction, we agree with the contention that digital technologies and learning are most valuable when they are integral to the language learning process, program structure and institutional systems, rather than being positioned as peripheral to the planning and program development processes.

Additionally, while many studies focus on the use of TPACK for individual teacher knowledge development generally, with less domain specific research (Voogt et al., 2013), we argue that the TPACK framework is also potentially useful in understanding knowledge beyond that of individual teachers. Our analysis of the two networks is framed under the umbrella of ‘structuration theory’ which contends that technology in practice is socially constructed rather than technologically-determined (Leonardi & Barley, 2010; see Slaughter, Smith & Hajek, 2019). The TPACK framework can also be used to examine the collaborative knowledge required to establish, negotiate, manage and sustain VC-based language programs. The questions then become: What does technological knowledge look like within the evolving practices of networks of schools? And what are the implications for distance education programming more broadly?

---

**Figure 1:** An adaptation of Mishra’s (2018) updated TPACK model which highlights the significance of contextual knowledge (XX).
The research project reported here employed a case study approach, comparing two school networks of language learning in regional and rural Victoria. The affordances of case study research and the focus on just two networks of program delivery allowed us to develop a deep understanding of the rich contexts surrounding the development and maintenance of each program, but is also a reflection of the small number of VC-based networks currently being sustained. The use of two networks also allowed us to illustrate how the two models are unique responses to specific local contexts, representing neither good nor bad practice, but a dynamic and active response to the ongoing challenge of using VC-based language programs in regional and rural contexts.

The first school cluster, Network One, is geographically-dispersed, consisting of one host school that provides a Japanese language program and 11 schools that receive it. Situated in south-western Victoria, these schools are spread over approximately 20,000 square kilometres, and enrolments range from 10 to 174 students. The host school that operates the languages program is a small primary school (20 students), where the Japanese language teacher (LT1) has a small room set up specifically to provide VC-based Japanese language lessons to students at the receiving schools. In addition, LT1 also provides face-to-face language classes at her own school, while also travelling weekly to another local school to provide face-to-face language lessons. Four schools within Network 1 took part in the research project.

In comparison, the second school cluster, Network 2, consists of three schools in closer proximity, relatively speaking, located over approximately 400 square kilometres in Victoria’s north-western region. Enrolments in the schools range from 15 to 69 students. The three schools share the one language teacher who teaches a Japanese language program for one day a week. The language teacher (LT2) teaches one class face-to-face, while simultaneously teaching to classes at the two other schools through VC. Each week the teacher produces content so that classes have a face-to-face lesson once every three weeks. Two schools within Network 2 took part in this research project, along with the principal from another local school that does not currently provide a languages program. The school had previously had a VC-based language program which the school had not been able to maintain. The insights of the principal and other VC-based language programs, with the school currently using an online commercial program for their language program.

In adopting a case study methodological approach, we have collected data from multiple sources in order to develop detailed accounts about Network 1 and Network 2. These included interviews with staff, observations of the classes in action from the position of the host school, as well as the receiving school. A questionnaire with closed and open-ended questions was completed by the principal prior to school visits, followed by face-to-face interviews with principals and teachers conducted either individually or in groups. Interviews were transcribed and along with observational notes, were thematised into categories for analysis. All of this information, along with school-based data (e.g. enrolments, location, socio-economic index), informed the development of our account and key elements are presented in the discussion below, as we focus on implications of the findings for pedagogical practices and teacher training (see Slaughter; Smith & Hajek, 2019, for further detail).

**TPACK AS AN ANALYTICAL FRAME**

The TPACK framework allowed us to consider the different types of knowledge needed for distance education in primary schools. In the following sections, we focus on what knowledge evolved, and illustrate what they look like in practice. As the two networks in this study have evolved different models of provision, we draw on each network model to illustrate both the relationship between technological, content and pedagogical knowledge, as well as differences in how this knowledge is constructed in response to programmatic and localised differences.

**THE INTEGRATION OF TECHNOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE**

In Network 1, the role of contextual knowledge to supplement TPACK knowledge, played a crucial role in shaping the development of the VC-based language program. Both LT1 and her school principal (P1) have been involved in VC-based language programs in the past, with a regional high school providing a language program into their primary school. Ultimately, the school found the program too expensive, and both P1 and LT1 argue that the program pedagogy and tasks were not appropriately adapted for the primary school context. Having close ties with the other local schools that were also accessing the same program, LT1 and P1 had a detailed understanding of the viewpoints of school leadership towards the challenges of engaging with distance education language programs, and in meeting the needs of primary school students. This in turn informed their development of the language program they offer through VC. With a focus on the cost of programs and on pedagogical approaches more suitable to primary teaching contexts, LT1 and P1 accessed expert support through the Victorian government’s Regional Digital Learning Officers (RDLO), whose brief is to provide support for digital learning initiatives in government schools, and Regional Language Officers (RLO), who facilitate the provision and ongoing development and progression of languages programs in schools. Both officers undertake their different roles in different offices within the Department of Education and Training, although their knowledge sets are not exclusively bound to a singular remit. LT1 and LT1 worked with the officers to collaboratively attain a deeper understanding of the needs specific to languages education through technology-mediated programming, which in turn closely shaped the development of the language program.

P1 also undertook professional learning based in a neighbouring state at a facility running a VC-based language program. The program, run in multiple languages, is provided through a static desktop computer and web camera to rural and remote primary and secondary schools. Subsequently, drawing on this professional learning, as well as the range of expertise advice and their own experiences, LT1 and P1 were able to draw on their own, localised response, where technology and its innovative potential were central to the planning process. The most important manifestation of this process was a program design which gave considered weight to technology, as well as pedagogy and content knowledge in the planning and development stages. That is, they were able to develop a program that embraces the flexibility and innovation which technology can allow, while taking into careful consideration the financial constraints experienced by small rural schools.

In more detail, the language program in Network 1 is set up as a series of components where receiving schools commit to the basic component - a 30-minute session provided by LT1 - with the classroom teacher, who then undertakes a further 30 to 60 minutes of expansion of the lesson materials offline, using additional materials provided by the language teacher. As a further extension, schools can then log back into a VC session in the afternoon in order to access a collaborative session with another regional or rural school, facilitated by LT1. The focus of the morning and afternoon sessions tends to move from a language acquisition focus in the morning to language production activities in the afternoon. A final module can be accessed by schools that wish to extend their students. As many of the classes are multi-aged whole school groups, differentiation of the curriculum must be built into the language lessons. However, in order to extend older or more advanced students, LT1 also offers hiragana (Japanese writing) lessons as an afternoon session, where any student can log in to access the extension lessons. The flexibility of this approach to language lessons allows schools to keep costs down by building in classroom teacher-led components, in addition to the language teacher-led sessions. This approach also allows for the possibility of...
accessing some but not all of the components available, although only the smallest schools (less than 10 students) tended to access only the basic component (Slaughter, Smith & Hajek, 2019).

An important caveat to note is that we have not examined alignment with the program content and the Victorian curriculum for languages (VFLSS). While the Victorian government recommends a minimum of 120 hours of languages study a week, very few state schools, indeed only 1% of state primary schools (excluding bilingual schools), meet this requirement (DET, 2019). The extent to which schools engage with the curriculum through this modular approach to language learning is an area that requires further research. Indeed, this is an area that requires considerable research across all schools working with the Australian Curriculum: Languages or state-based adaptions.

THE COMPLEXITIES OF MULTI-SITE PROVISION

The approach undertaken by Network 2 has been significantly different from that of Network 1. Also driven by the financial constraints of employing specialist teachers for small rural and regional schools, the school leadership teams across the three schools agree to provide a language program through VC, with a language teacher secured through an agency at a later stage. The preparations for the program development were not initially informed by the particularities of teaching languages through technology-mediated tools, but, rather, the teaching of a subject through technology. The resulting program design requires LT2 to teach a face-to-face class and classes at other schools through videoconferencing, simultaneously. A key driver in the development of the language program has been a strong commitment to a significant time allocation of 90 minutes per week for language learning. This allocation is substantial relative to most Victorian primary schools, as previously mentioned.

The schools’ sizes are typically larger in Network 2 than in Network 1, with language classes predominately broken into Foundation to Year 2, Year 3 to 4, and Year 5 to 6 groups. These classes teach face-to-face to a Foundation to Year 2 class, while teaching to similar classes at two other schools at the same time, for 90 minutes. He then continues through the other year levels/classes over the course of the day. The structure of the language lessons is closely aligned to the school timetable, with the distance education program serving as a vehicle through which to replicate standard classroom-based language lessons.

The physical space provided to LT2 in Network 2 is also different. It is larger and more adaptable from the language teacher in Network 1. While Network 1 was created by staff at one school, the language program in Network 2 was created collaboratively by three schools, in order to ensure each school can meet its legislated obligation to provide a languages program. In this program, the teaching of three classes simultaneously, combining face-to-face and online teaching, requires considerable planning of physical placement, on the part of the teacher, within the class, particularly in relation to the VC screen. LT2 must position himself so that he can turn and face his students, without having his back to the on-screen classes for too long, while also manoeuvring to the laptop to control the VC functions. The constant movement also minimises student access to paralinguistic cues, which we will discuss further shortly, and the delivery of audio to three different locations – from distant locations results in an asynchronous manner due to small time lags associated with sound delivery through the VC system, and, as a result, an asynchronous response on the part of students.

Also challenging is that the location changes each week as LT2 rotates through the three schools and, therefore, to three physical spaces differently for each location. A significant part of LT2’s planning, therefore, needs to be given to the physical enactment of each lesson, which also takes into consideration different pedagogical choices required for those students in the teacher’s presence, as well as those studying at a distance. The physical planning required as part of technological/ pedagogical knowledge presents significant challenges for LT2 in creating an effective language teacher presence for students taught remotely and in producing the conditions that attend to specific characteristics of language learning, as will be discussed next.

TECHNOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE AND THE NATURE OF LANGUAGE TEACHING AND LEARNING

In integrating pedagogical and content knowledge with technological knowledge, it is important to understand the nature of language learning. Learning additional languages does not just involve the acquisition of new knowledge, but is, in practice, a complex, on-going, multidimensional endeavour influenced by a wide range of internal and external variables (Hall, 2019, p. 4). Communication involves interacting with a varying range of semiotic resources, including a wide array of linguistic constructions in addition to nonverbal, visual, graphic, and auditory modes of meaning making (Hall, 2019, p. 4). In instructed additional language settings, therefore, the role of the teacher as a model for language learners, and the interaction and learning facilitated in the classroom play a critical role in any learner’s ability to access and understand the linguistic and paralinguistic cues underpinning communication.

The transference of these requirements to the online learning space requires careful consideration - the critical question being: How do you create teacher ‘presence’ with a lack of face-to-face contact? That is, how do you develop a strong sense of engagement with students, which includes taking into account the specific characteristics of language learning. Research into online language learning has shown that careful framing of teachers through web cameras allows for the richer exchange of paralinguistic cues (Codreanu & Ceilk, 2013), indicating ‘pedagogical skills’ of language teachers. That is, there is the need to understand how to use semiotic resources such as the use of gestures, head, hand and body movements, and facial expressions in sophisticated ways across the visual and audio dimensions of program provision (Develotte, Guichon & Vincent, 2010, p. 294). In their small study with learners of French, Guichon and Cohen (2014) found that the most important influence within an online language learning environment was the ‘teacher knowing when to interrupt, prompt, or employ paralinguistic skills’ (Slaughter, Smith & Hajek, 2019, p. 205). Many of these studies investigating interaction between language teachers and learners through web cameras focus on one-to-one engagement.

In this study, however, the ability to develop these skills as language teachers through networks is complex because they both teach to whole classes, and at various points, to multiple classes at once. In focusing just on Network 1 in order to provide a deeper illustration of technological and pedagogical knowledge, we can see that the creation of presence involves attention to all three types of knowledge in the TPACK framework, along with careful consideration of infrastructure planning. The program provision is facilitated by the use of a small dedicated room for the presentation of the VC-based language lessons. LT1 and P1 also understand technology as socially-constructed and link the creation of presence with broader social interactions, including developing a social compact around the value of language education in all schools that join the program, and seeking a commitment that the receiving schools remain with the program for a minimum agreed period of time.

Additionally, LT1 endeavours to visit schools joining the program, regardless of distance, to develop rapport with the students and with the classroom teacher who is central to the success of the program. LT1 brings a ‘culture box’ for the school which contains cultural artefacts and small prizes that can be drawn on by the classroom teacher to facilitate the learning experience during the VC-based lessons. These processes assist in the creation of presence for the language teachers when they are teaching the language lessons as the classroom teacher is positioned as an active participant as well as language learner during the VC-based lesson components.

The classroom teacher also attends to classroom management, and managing appropriate technological practices. The management of behavior around technology-led learning is facilitated through a code of conduct for students, who also have to adapt to the blended learning context. The development of a shared code of conduct is important because of the particularities of online learning during the language lessons as the classroom teacher is positioned as an active participant as well as language learner during the VC-based lesson components.
use of the time, given that it is mediated through technology.

Although not elaborated here, the complexities of addressing these areas of technological and pedagogical knowledge within the multi-site model of Network 2 requires a sophisticated response— one that LT2 is developing over time as the program model evolves (see Slaughter, Smith & Hajek, 2019, for further detail of LT2’s experiences in this area).

MOVEMENT THROUGH TECHNOLOGY

Within Network 1, in evolving her technological practices to enhance her ‘presence’ in the classes, LT1 has also developed expertise in the use of tools such as oratory points or focal points that can’t be programmed to focus the web camera on different locations. This expedites the process of changing the camera view visible to the students as well as to the teachers. By using the presets, LT1 is able to create a sense of movement and dynamism that would normally be achieved in a physical classroom through physically moving around. For example, presets can be set for a close up of the teacher’s face, a spot on the whiteboard, a specific area of the whiteboard, a drop down or up from images, and where artefacts can be placed, a spot on the whiteboard for display of text and images, as well as close up or wide-angle shots of the students at the receiving school. The use of presentation tools such as tools to create a sense of dynamism and enables improved access to paralinguistic cues provided by LT1 (see also Slaughtor, Smith & Hajek, 2019). The possibilities in Network 1 are a consequence of LT1 working in a dedicated space, designed for this purpose.

The ability to engage with these functions is dramatically different for LT2, who is constantly moving physically both within lessons and week by week. Here the ability to engage with presets is limited to broader changes between classroom view to PowerPoint or video display, with little ability to tailor movement to pedagogical aspects.

Whyte (2011) argues that there is a close orchestration between technological and pedagogical issues for teachers as they continually develop and adapt knowledge around how to effectively design and implement the plans while avoiding the dangers of the teacher becoming too dominant during classes (see, e.g. Hampel & Stickler, 2012). LT2 contends that her pedagogical approach has changed as she has gained more experience and she has become increasingly confident in creating a more student-centred, rather than teacher-centred approach to the VC-based classes, working to ensure that activities are also physically interactive, while in the view of LT2 the development of more sophisticated enactment of this knowledge is limited by program design.

THE POSITIONING OF TECHNOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE IN DISTANCE EDUCATION LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

Using the TPACK framework as a guide, this article reflects on the nature of TPACK knowledge and has attempted to illustrate, in particular, what technological knowledge looks like for distance education in two networks of primary schools. While both networks were driven by the same goal of providing a cost-effective solution to the lack of available language teachers across rural and regional contexts, the nature of the technological knowledge that was drawn upon and developed differed notably across networks.

In Network 1, LT1 and P1 drew strongly on their prior experiences with VC-based programs, including the experiences of their students, and that of other schools within their network, whilst also seeking out relevant professional training and learning opportunities, including observing interstate programs. Their focus on infrastructure planning as part of technological-pedagogical knowledge included a dedicated space for the delivery of the language programs, a modular approach to the delivery of the language programs, and a commitment to developing required knowledge within network schools in order to facilitate program engagement.

In Network 2, the combination of face-to-face classes with simultaneous delivery to two other schools represents another interpretation of VC-based programming. In this instance, the initial planning of the program by school administrators did not involve the language teacher, who was brought in after the planning stage. As a result, initial technological planning was undertaken prior to the development of content and pedagogical knowledge. The technological-pedagogical knowledge of the teacher has evolved, instead, within the fixed frame of a pre-determined approach, and in response to the teaching imperatives of simultaneous multi-school/class lessons.

LT2 has focused on physical positioning and pedagogical possibilities within his context in order to best maximise the opportunities presented within this approach.

Reviewing elements of both networks programs through the TPACK frame highlights the critical role of established knowledge in determining how technology is enacted in language programming (Benini, 2014; Norris & Coutas, 2014); the necessity of proactively seeking out and incorporating knowledge sets and skills that were previously unknown by school staff, as well as the importance of documenting and sharing practices across different educational contexts.

There are limitations to this analysis, as well as to the original research project. Whilst we have focused on examples of ways that the languages teachers and schools have been developing their knowledge and expertise around distance education, there are numerous other elements of technological, pedagogical and context knowledge which require further examination of this practice, for example, task design, how curriculum and assessment are being met against required standards, how this works within multi-level class contexts, and how individual learner needs can be met under such teaching and learning circumstances (see White, 2017 and Hampil & de los Arcos, 2013, for further suggestions on research trajectories for the field). Given the critical role distance education plays and is likely to play in the future, it is essential that we not only continue to build depth and breadth in research to best facilitate the development of models responsive to dynamic, local contexts, but also to develop a deeper understanding of knowledge that is needed to ensure that distance education programs are reflective of the nature of language learning.
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ABSTRACT
This paper reports on the member survey conducted in 2018, to understand member interests and concerns, and what they want from the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations (AFMLTA), as the umbrella languages teachers association of which their state or territory association is a member. Analysis of member feedback confirms the desire for national perspectives from the AFMLTA, and reveals that national representation and advocacy, national projects, nationally-based professional learning, and national/international conferences are the key provisions members seek. Members want to communicate through social media, notably Facebook, and to hear from the AFMLTA through News in Brief (NIB) online newsletter and via the website. Members value the academic journal Babel, with high levels of readership, and they want it in both digital and paper formats. Articles on languages teaching and learning, and innovative teaching research are the most sought after content in Babel. Members look to their state/territory associations more for local context professional learning, and to language specific associations for professional learning about the language they teach. Website links to presentations and face-to-face professional learning in the school holidays are the most preferred professional learning formats and times, and would most like AFMLTA to focus on languages education research, CLIL/immersion/bilingualism, resources for intercultural learning, and the Australian Curriculum: Languages for professional learning. Issues of most interest at the school level are learner attitude and motivation, and programming and reporting on learning. The top three concerns about languages teaching and learning megaphone state/territory quarterly teaching time, government support for primary programs, and declining enrolments.

The AFMLTA, through its mission of providing vision, leadership, representation, advocacy and support for quality teaching and learning of languages (AFMLTA, 2019), and through its four focus areas of member services, governance and operations, leadership and representation, and research and professional practice, appears to be targeting resources and energy into the areas most sought after by members. The AFMLTA is well positioned to address challenges that might arise, and to respond to target areas of the new national declaration of goals for schooling, in which languages remains a key curriculum content area (Education Council, 2019). There are opportunities for curriculum renewal on the horizon, nationally, and for some states— notably NSW following a comprehensive review which points to languages as a common entitlement for all students. There is a commitment by the Australian Government to develop a national plan and strategy for languages education, which is a welcome initiative, and long overdue, to guide this critical learning area. Commitment to ongoing consultation, surveys, and focus group participation by the AFMLTA, and its continual adaptation to teacher needs, should ensure the AFMLTA has the agility to respond effectively to these evolving demands.
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INTRODUCTION
This paper reports on the AFMLTA member survey conducted in 2018, to understand member interests and concerns, and what they want from the AFMLTA, as the national umbrella languages teachers association. The AFMLTA, through its state and territory members (Modern Language Teachers’ Associations [MLTAs] of the ACT, NSW, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania, Victoria, Western Australia; and the Languages Teacher Association of NT), conducted the survey using the Survey Monkey platform, with a request for interested members to complete the online survey.

The purpose of the survey was to gather a representative sample of members’ views on the communications strategy of the AFMLTA, on the AFMLTA peer-reviewed journal Babel, and members’ professional learning interests. Additional open-ended questions gathered data on what members saw as key issues and concerns about the current state of languages education in Australia. This survey is one of a range of consultation and member surveying processes used by AFMLTA, others including post-conference surveys (see Absalom & Morgan, 2012; Morgan, Absalom & Scrimgeour, 2014; Absalom, Morgan & Scrimgeour 2016; and Scrimgeour & Morgan, 2018) the National Assembly held every year with liaison officers from each member association and the AFMLTA executive; regular Presidents meetings, when the AFMLTA President meets with the member association Presidents; attendance, meetings, presentations and consultation at state and territory conferences and events including formal and informal network meetings; and informal meetings with members around Australia throughout the year. The data gathered from this survey, and other member consultation processes, guides the planning and operations of the AFMLTA, in line with strategic planning undertaken by the AFMLTA for 1, 3 and 5+ year (short-, medium- and longer-term) plans.

A total of 113 responses to this member survey were received. These were from all states and territories, with highest participant numbers from Queensland, Western Australia and ACT (each around 20% of the total respondents). The largest proportion of respondents was in the 50-59 age group, with 44% over 50 years of age, and early career teachers under-represented (just 2% of respondents under 30). 85% of respondents were female.

A total of 22 questions was asked. Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected, with quantitative counts for questions and propositions posed to members, which were translated into percentages of total responses. Percentages are reported here. Qualitative data were in the form of comments related to quantitative questions, or specific questions asking for suggestions as to what respondents wanted from the AFMLTA. The data were analysed through direct quantitative counts (percentages), and thematic analysis of comments and open-ended questions. Several key themes emerged, which are discussed below.

Analysis of member feedback confirms the desire for national perspectives from the AFMLTA, and reveals that national representation and advocacy, national projects, nationally-based professional learning offered by the AFMLTA, and national/international conferences run by the AFMLTA are the key provisions members seek.

Members want to communicate with the AFMLTA through social media, notably Facebook, and to hear from the AFMLTA through the regular (around 12 editions a year) email newsletter News in Brief (NIB) and via the website (with daily updates).

Members value the academic journal Babel, around 70% of respondents read it (but 15% don’t receive a copy—likely because they are part of a school and not individual membership), and they want it in both digital...
and paper formats. Languages teaching and learning research, and innovative teaching practice research are the most sought after content for Babel.

Members look to their state/territory associations more for state/territory issues professional learning (e.g. state curriculum), and to language specific associations for individual language professional learning (e.g. the teachers of Chinese consider issues related to teaching Chinese). This is not surprising, and indicates that the stratification from the national to the state level, and then within a single language network appropriately targets the kinds of activities each is best equipped to provide.

Website links to presentations/lectures and face-to-face professional learning in the school holidays are the most preferred professional learning formats, and would most respondents would like AFMLTA to focus on languages education research, CLLL/immersion/ bilingualism, resources for intercultural learning, and the Australian Curriculum: Languages, in professional learning. Issues of most interest at the school level are learner attitude and motivation, and programming, assessing and reporting on learning. The top three concerns about languages teaching and learning more generally are adequate teaching time, programs support for primary languages programs, and declining enrolments in languages.

The AFMLTA, through its mission of providing vision, leadership, representation, advocacy and support for quality teaching and learning of languages, and through its four focus areas of member services, governance and operations, leadership and representation, and research and professional practice, appears to be targeting resources and energy into the areas most sought after by members. As we move into a new national declaration of goals for schooling (Education Council, 2019), the AFMLTA is positioned well to respond to the continuing and evolving challenges. There are opportunities for curriculum renewal on the horizon nationally and for some states- notably NSW following a comprehensive review which points to languages as a common entitlement for all students- and there is an Australian Government commitment to develop a national plan and strategy for languages education. Commitment to ongoing consultation, surveys, and focus groups, and regular evaluation of languages teacher needs should ensure the AFMLTA has the agility to respond to evolving demands. This is a significant achievement for a voluntary, non-profit organisation.

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

The following figures indicate the demographic data of respondents. As noted above, most are female, and over 50s represent 44% of respondents. High percentages of 30-39 (24%) and 40-49 (28%), indicate that there is a solid base of mid-career teachers to lead the profession over the next two or three decades. Of concern, however, is that only 2% of respondents are under 30. These figures echo data collected in AFMLTA post-conference surveys (see Absalom & Morgan, 2012; Morgan, Absalom & Scrimgeour, 2014; Absalom, Morgan & Scrimgeour, 2016; Scrimgeour & Morgan, 2018), in which a similar demographic is present, and which further suggests that most respondents and conference attendees have over 15 years of languages teaching experience. While the experience of the over 40s is helpful to the early career teachers, it would be encouraging to see more younger teachers, to continue to provide quality languages teaching when the more experienced teachers retire.

THEMATIC ANALYSIS

THEME 1: COMMUNICATION

The first section of the survey focused on gathering responses on communication. Most questions required a response on a graduated scale, usually represented with statements rather than numerical values on a Likert scale. There was also opportunity for additional comments if desired for most questions. The communications section of the survey explored members views on aspects of AFMLTA’s communication strategy, including their views on the regular News In Brief (NIB) distributed by email, the AFMLTA website content and functionality, the AFMLTA social media platforms, and the AFMLTA journal Babel.

NEWS IN BRIEF (NIB)

In response to the question The AFMLTA News In Brief (NIB) is distributed electronically (via email from your MLTA). Do you read it? 80% of respondents stated they do read the NIB with 85% declaring they find the NIB very useful (19%) or somewhat useful (66%). Not all respondents were aware of the NIB, suggesting that not all AFMLTA correspondence may be shared to all members of school-based memberships where online communications are directed to a key contact within the school. Respondents found the NIB a useful way to keep up to date on issues and events at the national level. To address the issue of some respondents being unaware of the NIB, a targeted strategy of promotion of the publication through Presidents meetings, so that they might work at a state or territory level to consider how to increase access. The NIB was also moved to a more prominent area of the AFMLTA website, to direct attention to it for those browsing the AFMLTA website.

AFMLTA WEBSITE

In response to the question The AFMLTA maintains and regularly updates its website (afmlta.asn.au). How often do you visit the website? 26% of respondents said they visit the site a few times a month (10%) or a few times a year (16%). Nearly 50% said they visit the site occasionally, when searching for specific information. 27% did not access the AFMLTA website at all, unless directed
there from another site (16%). 11% had never visited the website, 25% of respondents found the information on the AFMLTA website very useful, another 60% found the website content somewhat useful - a total of 85%. 50 individual respondents identified Babel as the most useful site in terms of information on the AFMLTA website, mainly focusing on suggestions for improvement in content or format. These included requests for more teaching ideas (tasks, texts, assessment) to be made available via the website, for there to be more information on conferences and professional learning events, including at the local and state level, and for there to be more information (perhaps media kits) on ways teachers can advocate for languages at their local school level.

The AFMLTA website is consequently undergoing reconstruction, to make the most desired information more accessible. Shifting the position of the NIB was one example, and also enhancing the social media presence through Twitter and Facebook posts on the landing page has increased traffic to these platforms. A list of upcoming state and territory conferences has also been included, as well as making the bank of AFMLTA professional learning materials both more prominent and expanded.

SOCIAL MEDIA

In response to the question The AFMLTA uses Facebook and Twitter to share information and would like to enhance our use of social media. Which social media platforms would you like AFMLTA to use? 74% of respondents said they would like the AFMLTA to share information via Facebook, whilst 32% recommended using Twitter. 17% stated they did not use social media. Some recommended AFMLTA consider using Instagram and LinkedIn as alternative or additional means to connecting with members.

In terms of the types of information members would you like to receive via these social media platforms, nearly 90% said they would like to be kept informed of AFMLTA’s strategic areas. This preference is indicated in Figure 6, to relate directly to the content of the article in question. Recent issues have adopted this focus, with more targeted messages.

When asked what is important to language teachers in regional areas, respondents identified articles related to innovative practice research (88% important, 14% useful), to languages teaching and learning research (82% important, 19% useful), and to languages curriculum and assessment research (76% important, 25% useful), as being of greatest importance (see Figure 3 below). Articles related to teacher education research (49% important, 48% useful) and those related to theoretical issues (47% important, 46% useful) and empirical research (47% important, 51% useful) were rated next in usefulness, with textbook reviews (41% important, 50% useful) and opinion pieces (29% important, 60% useful) being of lesser importance to these respondents, although there was still significant support for these inclusions, as can be seen by the combined important and useful percentages, and illustrated in Figure 3, to the right.

THEME 2: PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

The second theme addresed in the member survey explored teachers’ experiences with and future preferences in professional learning provision. The AFMLTA has a long history of developing and delivering projects for national engagement, including the Professional Standards Project (2006-2013) and the More Leaps Project (2011-2013) (full resources available at www.AFMLTA.asn.au), and the Ready? Set? Assess! Project (AFMLTA, 2015-2019). Professional learning is a central focus area of the AFMLTA, and the survey questions were intended to identify areas of most interest to members for future projects and programs.

In response to the question of members’ current participation in professional learning events, over 70% of respondents were likely or would usually attend state/territory MLTA/LTA professional learning events. The third most popular form of professional learning was national AFMLTA events, such as the recent Ready? Set? Go! series (AFMLTA, 2015-2019), available at www.afmlta. org/ready-set-go, which was designed with a focus on national engagement with the Australian Curriculum: Languages (ACL), including conceptual underpinnings and design (Ready? Set? Go!), planning for the ACL (Ready? Set? Plan!), and assessing using the ACL (Ready? Set? Assess!).

Some respondents provided comments on preferred professional learning, with a notable feature being reference to the limited availability for language-specific professional learning for teachers of community languages. Figure 4, to the right, indicates the distribution of preferences for providers of particular professional learning events.

In terms of preferred format for professional learning presentation, face-to-face sessions were favoured, with a preference for these to be held in the school holidays or on the weekend, with respondents commenting on the difficulty and cost of being released and replaced during school time, and the challenges of commuting to professional learning events immediately after school.

Web-based professional learning including live- to-air (synchronous) webinars attracted some interest although the numbers of respondents unlikely to access these or not interested in doing so was higher than for all face-to- face options. Teachers in regional areas also commented on the difficulties in accessing any form of face-to-face sessions. Figure 5 shows preferred presentation formats for professional learning events, and likelihood to access these.

Language teachers have a range of sources for professional learning, with the AFMLTA providing national professional learning programs, as well as the biennial international conference; state MLTAs/LTAs offering regular professional learning events and using social media platforms. A list of upcoming state and territory conferences has also been included, as well as an annual conference, and local language-specific associations conducting workshops and often a separate annual conference. There are also specialist providers who undertake targeted professional learning events, often for a fee, in major urban areas.

Members were invited to nominate which of these providers and formats were best suited to different types of professional learning provision. The AFMLTA was nominated as the preferred provider for professional learning events focused on the latest research into languages teaching and learning, and on new initiatives in languages education, such as CLIL, immersion and bilingual education. Local MLTAs/LTAs were preferred providers for professional learning related to developing resources for intercultural language learning and improving classroom teaching practice; with local language-specific associations preferred for Australian Curriculum related professional learning pertaining to their language, for ICT applications in language education, both of which have language-specific issues to address, and naturally local language associations for professional learning addressing language- specific issues. Education specialists were also preferred for site-specific professional learning needs such as CLIL and TCI methodology, and for some languages such as literacy development in Chinese and Japanese. These preferences are indicated in Figure 6, to the right.
Figure 3:
Preferred article types in Babel.

Figure 4:
Preferences for providers of professional learning events.
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Preferred presentation formats for professional learning.

Figure 6:
Preferred professional learning topics and providers.
In terms of preferred format for these same types of professional learning offerings, local face-to-face events were the preferred mode of delivery for the majority of professional learning options provided, except for latest research and specialised program types (CLIL, bilingual, other immersion programs), with conference presentations being quite popular as well.

Pre-recorded web-based presentations were also popular for issues members identified as being informative but not requiring interactive face-to-face contexts, including latest research, Australian Curriculum: Languages related professional learning, and specialised program types such as CLIL and bilingual programs – where members may not be directly involved in presentation of such programs, but are interested to see how they operate, and understand the rationale behind these program types. Figure 7, to the right, shows preferred professional learning presentation formats for specific topics.

**THEME 3: CRITICAL ISSUES**

As a third theme, the member survey sought to elicit information from members on issues of particular concern to them. In response to the question What are the key issues for you in languages teaching and learning at the local (school) level?, respondents nominated learner attitude and motivation as the most critical issue, followed by programming and planning, and assessing and reporting. When considering issues considered either critical or important, programming and planning, assessing and reporting were ranked first and second, followed by learner attitude and motivation. Figure 8, to the right, details critical issues identified by, and level of importance to respondents.

When asked to identify some broader concerns in the more general field of languages education, respondents identified time on task, the decline in enrolments and government commitment to languages in the primary school as most critical concerns. Figure 9, to the right, identifies these broader concerns and levels of importance.

Comments from individual respondents to the two above questions highlights some key concerns, which are addressed in more detail in the following section. These comments focus particularly on the challenges of meeting expected achievement standards where time on task is so limited. Two indicative responses are provided below:

*It doesn't matter how hard we work and how good/passionate we are as teachers of languages; if you don't have time with the students, you are never going to be able to meet the standards, nor allow the students to get to a useful level of proficiency in the language.*

*Learner attitude is unfortunately related to the fact that we only have 1 period of 60 minutes per week to teach to the Year 7-9 students, which is detrimental to motivation, progress and interest. The curriculum is not the problem, but the lack of time we have to deliver it, and the poor pedagogy we are forced to employ because at the end of the day we need to assess and ultimately report on achievement. This is not the way to teach/learn a language.*

Figure 7: Preferred professional learning presentation formats for specific topics.

Figure 8: Critical issues identified by respondents and level of importance.

Figure 9: Broad concerns and level of importance to respondents.
OPEN-ENDED RESPONSE SECTION

To conclude the member survey, two open-ended questions were provided to elicit respondents’ views on how the AFMLTA can act on members’ behalf to improve the state of languages education in schools.

A range of themes emerged from the question What are your key recommendations to AFMLTA on actions required at the national level? These included an ongoing need for advocacy for improved language learning opportunities in schools, better allocations of time for language learning in order to meet anticipated achievement standards, concerns over the use of online and digital technologies to teach programs rather than using qualified teachers in face-to-face classrooms, calls for mandated language learning across the years of schooling, the need to improve language teacher education and teacher supply.

Examples of typical comments on each of these themes is provided below:

The need for advocacy to ensure a more consistent approach to language teaching and learning and assessment and reporting across all states and territories.

Promoting languages as a valuable/important subject in the community and to policy makers
Continue to lobby government for funding of languages and ensuring the ongoing importance of languages in education
Addressing a balanced education that is not all about numeracy and literacy and supporting principals/education bodies to understand the bigger picture of a school’s purpose. Sharing the positive stories in Australia of successes in languages education.

Keep advocating for Languages to be on the Gonski agenda and a key priority in discussions/planning in education. A National Languages Policy would be the ultimate goal!

Avoid going down the ‘priority languages’ debate - it creates a ‘two steps forward, one step backwards’ approach. Don’t forget Aboriginal and community languages – for example, ELLA should be expanded to include more language choices, rather than more years in the same languages, where there are the teachers.

To advocate for support for languages programs in schools from F-12, including consideration for the amount of time needed for authentic programs and the training of teachers to implement them.
Use available data to highlight trends in number of students studying languages at all levels of schooling. Showcase models of effective and sustainable languages programs from all states and rural and metro schools. Organise a forum/PD for leaders in schools and school executive. Discuss how to implement a sustainable school languages program. Lobby for a serious discussion with sectors about the place of Languages within Australian education that goes beyond the barriers.

Better, nationally consistent allocations of time for language learning in order to meet anticipated achievement standards.

We need to continue to publicise the benefits of early language learning (i.e. beginning in early childhood). Time allocation vs curriculum requirements/expectations in primary schools is a major issue.

Too many inconsistencies between individual state and territory legislation. Individual schools shouldn’t have it left open to allocate x amount of hours as those hours are likely to be reduced to a minimum. Set a reasonable target Australia-wide so that it’s a level playing field for everyone.

Address inequity in Languages provision... different schools with different time allocations for Languages-different schools offering Languages to varying Year levels.

Consistency across states in time on task/ability to meet achievement standards.

Concerns over the use of online and digital technologies to deliver programs rather than using qualified teachers in face-to-face classrooms.

I’m concerned about (online) programs... that make schools/admin/parents think that anyone can teach a language, and that a trained face-to-face professional isn’t necessary. Also concerned about expansion of ELLA - it’s a great resource, but it is NOT a substitute for a trained Languages teacher in an Early Childhood Classroom. We have fought hard to convince schools to start languages as early as possible, and this will be a cheap way for some of them to opt out, if we let them.

Calls for mandated language learning across the years of schooling

Consistent, higher, mandated hours in secondary school... Without hours we have no status. Without status we have no students.

For languages to have the same importance/value as other subjects - should not be an elective - it should be compulsory just like in many countries.

The need to improve languages teacher education and teacher supply, and better career pathways.

Better teacher training is required, especially at primary level.

The total lack of promotional opportunities for language teachers is also of huge concern - we need a voice within schools when it comes to planning and decision-making and this is a national issue.

Getting Language Teachers permanent positions within school in rural areas rather than having us on temp contracts.
CONCLUSION

The 2018 member survey set out to elicit members’ interests and concerns about languages education, and to allow members to respond to the AFMLTA communication mechanisms and provision of professional learning.

A large data set of information has provided much food for thought for the AFMLTA executive and Assembly. Many of the issues raised around communication have been addressed through changes to communication timeframes, more attention to social media, and re-organisation of information and resources on the website.

The wide level of satisfaction with Babel, and for its existing dual format availability—printed and digital copies, suggests that while funds are available to support both formats, these should be continued.

There is confirmation from member feedback and comments to support the major emphasis of AFMLTA on national level events, including national professional learning programs, international conferences, and advocacy and representation. There is also recognition of the importance of the range of professional learning that occurs for teachers on a range of critical issues from all providers, including state/territory associations and language-specific providers.

Frustration with ongoing issues including time available for learning, languages being part of all primary school children’s learning, and better conditions for languages teachers, from education programs to permanent positions, to consistency of supply are also evident in other languages teacher representation forums, such as in feedback to curricula reviews. The time is ripe for changes to the state of languages education in Australia to address these concerns and frustrations. The AFMLTA will continue to contribute and strive for these improvements.
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Book Review
TALKING NORTH:
The Journey Of Australia’s First Asian Language
Monash University Publishing, 2019
Edited by Paul S. Thomas
Reviewed by Anne-Marie Morgan, University of New England

This timely book, which brings together voices of some 16 Australian and Indonesian-Australian authors who have been deeply connected with the study of Indonesian in Australia over the last seven or so decades. It is a nostalgic retrospective of what the Indonesian-Australian relationship has been, and what it has meant to those who have engaged deeply with this new nation, endeavouring to bring its languages and cultures to Australian learners.

It is also, however, surely a call for a reawakening of the critical imperative to engage with Indonesia, with its languages, cultures, tourism, political/diplomatic allegiance and trade possibilities. The authors rightly identify the urgent need to expand this relationship with one of our nearest neighbours, and to ensure Australians are more closely connected with the languages and cultures of Indonesia, through the learning of Indonesian, in our pre-schools, schools and universities.

Framed around two key ideas of studies in language and culture, and reflections on those studies and of teaching Indonesian, the authors in this text embrace both the challenges and affordances they have encountered in introducing a ‘new’ and dynamic language to Australia, despite Australia’s prevalent monolingual mindset, and its widespread bigotry towards a predominantly Moslem nation. They explain both the joys and tyranny of geographical co-location as two key nations in the most rapidly changing quarter of the world. The recounts illustrate the waves of interest and enthusiasm as well as the declines and rejections in the relationship, the growth and popularity of Indonesian and Asian studies more generally, and the current precipitous decline in numbers of students learning the language.

Paul Thomas, from one of the key centres of Indonesianist activity at Monash University, as editor, centres the volume on the idea of Australia reaching out to its neighbour, despite the Australian history of defensiveness and its monolingual focus on English. He frames this ‘talking north’ (hence the title) process as an experiment, a ‘test case’ for Australia in engaging with the rest of the (especially non-English speaking) world.

Political and cultural engagement with Indonesia can be considered a test case in Australia’s independent engagement with the region. With Indonesia having little cultural impact on the United States or the United Kingdom, Australia needs to set its own cultural cues in the relationship. Australia’s geographical borders are naturally defined by immediate neighbours of New Zealand, the Pacific Island nations, Papua New Guinea, East Timor and Indonesia, but direct cultural relationships with these nations will provide the intellectual parameters capable of defining a unique nation (pp. xii-xiii).

Thomas points out that Australians in general remain unfamiliar with Indonesia, as Indonesia lacks presence in Australian popular culture. Indonesian comes to prominence for Australians more as a tourist destination, and through media when there is a problem for Australians, such as the Bali and other bombings, the live meat export trade, natural disasters, disputed territories, and Australians falling foul of Indonesian laws leading to lengthy incarcerations and even executions.

Thomas reminds us that Malay/Indonesian language arrived in Australia along with other languages of Malay fishermen and traders many centuries ago, before European invasion and colonisation. There is considerable evidence of mutual learning of each other’s languages between Malay fishermen and traders and Australia’s Indigenous nations of the north. The same inquisitiveness of these early interactions that sparked language and culture exchanges and influences is, however, not widespread in Australia’s population—but arguably should be. The interest and engagement with our near neighbour, argues Thomas, remains the challenge for Australians today. The authors in this text each speak of their contributions to this cause, and indicate that there is much more to be done if the relationship is to flourish.

SECTION 1: STUDIES IN LANGUAGE AND CULTURE

There are seven chapters in this section, which focuses on the learning of Indonesian in Australian schools and universities, situated within political and social developments and winds of change through the decades of the second half of the 20th century CE and the early years of the 21st.

Firstaus, well-known and loved for her decades of teaching Indonesian at Flinders university (including of me), in her chapter The political dimensions of language policies, explores the educational infrastructure of both government and education professionals around this modern language. She charts government and education authority programs and emphasises on Asian languages and cultures learning and understanding, but concludes that the ‘national policy on Asian languages seems more than ever a pipe dream’ (p.4). She notes the placement of Indonesian studies in universities more often than not in social science faculties, rather than with other languages, often meaning that social scientists are positioned hierarchically superior to the ‘technicians’ teaching languages. She charts the political developments leading to the strategies to increase the learning of Asian languages, and in particular explains what has happened in tertiary programs, with the regrettable decline in enrolments (from the data collected by David Hill, also in the volume) since 2004 to very low numbers indeed, nationally, by 2009. She includes in her chapter a first analysis of the New Colombo Plan, designed to support young Australians to engage in the Asia-Pacific region during their tertiary studies, and notes that Indonesia is a popular destination for NCP travellers, which will hopefully engage more young Australians in learning about Indonesia, and as a consequence also taking up learning the language— for real, informed engagement centred on understandings only possible through knowing and being able to interact in the language. She urges greater respect for and understanding of teachers of languages to support growth in language learning from a secure basis of employment and recognition of contribution to the national interest- and away from the bean counters of low enrolment.

She notes that the Indonesian government will also need to be committed to this aim of mutual engagement, as the best examples of enhanced diplomatic relationships and uptake of language learning occur when there is significant support from the governments of those nations from where the languages originate. Some of her data are a little out of date (the paper seems to have been developed around 2015), but in a retrospective volume...
such as this, contextualisation of the situation as it unfolded during the last decades of the 20th century, and early into the 21st, provide a useful snapshot and viewpoint from the perspective of a tertiary languages teacher who has ridden the waves of change. Paul Thomas provides the next two chapters, Early explorations of the Malay language in Australia: An English-translated The Menzies’ government’s sponsorship of Indonesian studies during the Cold War. The fascinating, but little known history of Malay and Indonesian in Australia makes for excellent reading in these chapters. Goyang lidah: - means to shake or wag the tongue, and is often used in reference to food being great- hence the recipes reference, but also serves in Indonesian and Sarumpaet and others. Coppel takes us through the serious lessons learned from the first 50 or so years of teaching Indonesian in Australia, in particular tracing the textbooks and teaching materials, and the methodologies and approaches on which these are based. The authors reveal that well over 60 different textbooks/series were produced in this period, which is phenomenal. The materials had the added advantage of language teaching orientations- grammar-translation, audio-lingual, functional-notional and communicative, and now some newer approaches including task and text types. They explain the intercultural orientation. They provide extensive detail on the Teaching Indonesian as a Foreign Language (TIFL) Tertiary Curriculum Materials Project, established by the Asian Studies Council in the 1960s, and the Suara Siswa materials, developed by the National Indonesian Language Curriculum Project, provided banks of materials for teachers rather than prescriptive lessons, and remain popular in Indonesian teacher training across the country. Coppel takes us through learning Indonesian-language and its influence he had in the Indonesian teaching community. He created his own materials, which later formed the basis of Sarumpaet and Mackie’s materials. James Mackie joined Zainuddin in 1958, fresh from working on the original Colombo Plan in Jakarta, and the study of Indonesian became part of the Bachelor program. Initial enrolments were very small- in the single figures for the first few years, and growing to 117 in 1966. Sarumpaet joined the university in 1961, and remained in the program till his death in 1991. Several notable Indonesian teachers developed their careers in this era: the prolific Sarumpaet and others. Coppel takes us through staff changes and increases, in a who’s who of Indonesian teaching and achievement, and changes to the program over the ensuing decades, including changes to languages learning methodologies and pedagogies (largely resisted by Sarumpaet who remained wedded to grammar-translation methods), interactions with other universities internationally also offering Indonesian, and the changed ‘model’ of tertiary education adopted by Melbourne. It is not always a smooth passage, with many crises and struggles for survival, but Coppel informs us Indonesian has been taught continuously at the university for over 50 years, which is remarkable. Julia Read and David Reeve (the latter another of his teachers and mentors) provide the next chapter, Grassroots for teaching Indonesian. This is a playful chapter: ‘goyang lidah’- means to shake or wag the tongue, and is often used in reference to food being great- hence the recipes reference, but also serves in Indonesia and Malaysia and joyfully using the language. Read and Reeve take us through the serious lessons learned from the first 50 or so years of teaching Indonesian in Australia, in particular tracing the textbooks and teaching materials, and the methodologies and approaches on which these are based. The authors reveal that well over 60 different textbooks/series were produced in this period, which is phenomenal. The materials had the added advantage of language teaching orientations- grammar-translation, audio-lingual, functional-notional and communicative, and now some newer approaches including task and text types. They explain the intercultural orientation. They provide extensive detail on the Teaching Indonesian as a Foreign Language (TIFL) Tertiary Curriculum Materials Project, established by the Asian Studies Council in the 1960s, and the Suara Siswa materials, developed by the National Indonesian Language Curriculum Project, provided banks of materials for teachers rather than prescriptive lessons, and remain popular in Indonesian teacher training across the country.

Hendarto Darudcyo’s chapter Exporting culture and Indonesian world view takes us into an alternative perspective, charting Indonesian language learning in Australia and other nations, especially through cultural exports- and seeing language as much as a ‘parlous state of Indonesian language study in this country’ (p.229). She acknowledges the work of early Indonesian teachers, and points to the success of several in-country experience and language programs, embedded in Indonesian universities for semester long duration, which have importantly brought more Australian students to Indonesia, and significantly increased learners’ language skills, as one way to improve outcomes. Cooperation between universities, facilitated by the relatively new Languages and Cultures Network of Australian Universities (LCNAU) is another suggestion for a nationally coordinated approach. Online learning is another, Hill cautioning about that without government facilitation from both sides, the slide in numbers and its inevitable consequences of a bleak and uncertain future is what confronts us.

SECTION 2: REFLECTIONS

The shorter second section of the book focuses on personal reflections of engagement with Indonesian language teaching and learning for eight key academics.

Jan Lingard - in Getting to know the neighbours - recalls the 1960s and 1970s as the heyday of tertiary study of Indonesian, and her own journey during these years is remembered fondly for ‘the life’s work’ it led her to - ‘I count myself lucky to have found new horizons through my knowledge of Indonesia’ (p.229). She acknowledges the work of early Javanese teachers who came to undertake doctoral studies and remained to teach Indonesian language and cultural studies, at ANU and other universities. Yohanni Johns receives a special mention, for her driving force, textbooks, and diverse curriculum, which, at ANU, included literature, classical Malay texts, politics and economics, and, if undertaking Honours, Dutch, Old Javanese and Arabic. Lingard stayed on to teach for 13 years at ANU, and then taught at The University of Sydney for 11 years. She refers to the special capacity of Indonesians and Australians to ‘get on’, and comments that many young people are apparently having this opportunity because of the ‘parlous state of Indonesian language study in this country’ (p.229).
Stuart Robson, in his chapter Indonesian at Sydney University in the early 1960s picks up on similar themes to Lingard, elaborating the path of Indonesian language studies at The University of Sydney. Teaching began at Sydney University enrolled in 1960. Staff for the initial program included those of Dutch origin, who had grown up in Java, and those with Malay scholarly backgrounds, before those with specifically Indonesian language experience were employed. Robson recalls this period as an exciting time, “when Australia was just waking up to the existence of Asia” (p.232). He also recalls the students from Indonesia, some of whom had come under the Chinese Communist influence to enrolment in German and French as well as Economics. An acquaintance with a student from Indonesia who began to teach Witton Indonesian led to his change of enrolment into the Department of Malayan Studies. Enthralled with the teaching of Pak Emanuels as the foundation for his whole life’ (p.240). Witton attributes the learning affection for Indonesia that has ‘lasted my life’ (p.238). Study led to the development of programs for teachers, and school level Indonesian programs ‘exponentially increased’ (p.238). Study led to extensive travel and ‘deep immersion in the wider world of history, culture and society’ (p.254), New Criticism’s view of ‘good’ literature which was decoupled from the universal sense that defined culture, arts and literature learning alive, several of whom feature in this book, as well as students who have gone on to champion Indonesian language teaching in schools. A graduate diploma in teaching led to teaching Indonesian in schools, several states and territories of Australia, and then into the tertiary sector. Harbon’s web is extensive, across Australian teachers and international connections, and her rainbow connection with Indonesia is expansive, for both herself and her many students. She talks of influential programs, including the Endeavour Language Teacher Fellowships that did so much to promote Indonesian and better prepare teachers, and renewed teaching of language educators across Australia, which are preparing the next generations of teachers. She concludes by encouraging us to keep sight of the important goals, and the benefits that the web and rainbow can bring in both good and troubled times.

Keith Foulcher (my teacher, mentor, PhD supervisor) provides a very personal insight in his chapter Indonesian literature and the Australian university: A personal journey. In his own undergraduate and postgraduate studies, he found himself on the cusp of an international intellectual dilemma regarding the place of literature in Indonesian language programs, and indeed about the nature of literature itself. He was caught between views of literature courses as a ‘gateway into the wider world of history, culture and society’ (p.254). New Criticism’s view of ‘good’ literature dedicated to close reading of aesthetics of texts in a universal sense decoupled from the specific historical context, and the situation for Indonesian literature (which was so vital and served as a body of literature in the 1960s and 1970s), as it developed in relation to highly contextualised factors and sites of resistance and personal storytelling. He explains that

For someone like myself, an undergraduate student of Indonesian, as well as European languages, in the mid to late 1960s, Indonesian held out an invitation to become involved in something completely new. In contrast to the status of university-level French and German, where the fields were so vast and impersonal, and ways of understanding literature were fully formed and embryo, like the web, also to change, modern Indonesian literature was a field of study just waiting to be explored, a field where an honours student in Australia might write the first-ever study of a writer and his (or her) work. For a 20-year-old with a love of literature and the study of languages, what could be a better prospect and a more exciting way to embark on an academic career?… However, it was not long before storm clouds began to gather on the horizon of this privileged existence (p.257).

Changing views in many universities about what should be studied in reaction to Indonesia’s highly criticised New Order regime, and moral and political questions that arose from events in Indonesia, shifted views of literature and its ideological and political questions in favour of engagement with the harsh realities of life for the Indonesian masses. Foulcher explains how he found himself unprepared, without the solid intellectual foundation he needed, to engage with literature in this new context. His discommodification led him to leave Monash University to work for a while in a college of advanced education, teaching producing teachers where there was clearly a merely definable pragmatic purpose. He later moved to Flinders University, where he felt fortunate to be able to find his way back into university teaching and research and build an approach to modern Indonesian literature that painfully confronted the so-called difference between ‘high’ and ‘popular’ literature, and engage with a new generation of writers, notably Pramoedya Ananta Toer, whose ‘serious’ Indonesian literature to the attention of mass audiences and bridged the literature divide. He embraced new and interesting ways of talking about literature, and literary fields such as Postmodernism, Postcolonialism and New Historicism rendered possible. Armed with a new intellectual confidence, Foulcher brought literature units back into Indonesian programs on his return to The University of Sydney, in the early 2000s. He hopes that his own sense of excitement and discovery, through engagement with Indonesian literature that has underpinned his own work, is still available to students today. As further imaginative and effective programs are developed in universities, he further hopes that Indonesian literature classes of several hundred students he himself experienced as a student will return to Australian programs.

Barbara Hatley (one of my PhD examiners) writes about Teaching Indonesian language through drama in her chapter. She describes staging Indonesian language plays as one of the most enjoyable language teaching experiences she has had, and notes that the extended students’ language skills across multiple registers and contexts of use, cultural knowledge, and, more generally, Indonesian involvement. Although supported by timely grants to undertake these drama activities, Hatley also notes the shifts in understanding Indonesian literature and drama (as identified by Foulcher), and changes in ‘modern’ drama in Indonesia that also made these activities possible, accessible and interesting to learners engaging with Indonesia through the language program. Her own interest in regional language politics was so vast and seemingly impervious to change, without the solid intellectual foundation he encouraged her to move in this direction. The debut production was Rendra’s Sekda, and was directed by a member of the popular Melbourne-based alternative theatre company, Anthill. The collaboration with a professional theatre company gave weight and impetus to the production, and engaged students to a professional level of performance. More plays by Rendra, and other playwrights including F. T. Mochtar, Putu Wijaya and Riantiano followed. These playwrights, especially Rendra, saw drama as a classroom learning experience and hence their work sat well in this context.
Hatley laments that the staging of full plays is impracticable in the current conditions of Australian universities, with few students able to commit to the lengthy sessions needed, but is cheered by the fact that in some way or other, production of Indonesian drama has continued at Monash. There are play productions in in-country periods, and attention to Indonesian drama in curricula, including writing workshops and theatre skills sessions. She envisages further in-country programs having scope to increase dramatic productions, when students have the time and resources to commit to this mode of learning. She would also love to see the revival of full productions of Indonesian plays on Australian campuses, and conditions for this to happen made possible.

Dwi Noverini Djenar writes of her Reflections on writing and teaching Indonesian grammar in the seventh chapter in this section. Djenar discusses the importance or otherwise placed on learning and using standard Indonesian, as promoted in the 1970s by the Indonesian government, and an idea which has been inculcated into many Indonesian language programs in Australia. As Indonesian is a second language for most Indonesians (they learn and use their regional language first), there was a push, tied to nationalist promotion of one language, one people, one nation, to ensure a standard form was used by all, and that it identified itself differently from Malay, to serve the new nation of Indonesia uniquely. Non-standard forms of Indonesian include grammar constructions, idiom and lexical items influenced by or directly from regional languages, hence there is Bahasa Jakarta, the non-standard form used in the Jakarta region, and so on. Almost all ‘foreign’ generated textbooks for learning Indonesian promote the standard form of Indonesian. Grammar descriptions in textbooks are also generally based on standard Indonesian. Sneddon’s Indonesian Reference Grammar, published in 1996, provided, Djenar argues, the first comprehensive and comprehensible descriptions of standard Indonesian for English-speaking learners. Her own A student’s guide to Indonesian grammar published in 2003, is also principally devoted to standard Indonesian, with a few snippets of colloquial Indonesian. She describes how it follows the principles of functional linguistics, of grammar in use. Djenar acknowledges that textbooks that only cover standard Indonesian only tell half the story, and that colloquial or informal Indonesian, in its many varieties, is also important for learners, but to include these presents a dilemma for writers and teachers as it is so variant and so dynamic. She argues that promoting a greater awareness of learners about the varieties of Indonesian is now an important part of learning Indonesian, and one requiring more investigation.

The final chapter in the book, from Lindy Norris, On teaching the teachers of Indonesian presents a view from an educator of Indonesian teachers. She describes the happy nexus at Murdoch University between the Asian Studies and Education disciplines, which work together to enhance learning for initial teacher education students. She also addresses various projects that have enhanced the teaching of Indonesian and teacher preparation, including the development of the Suara Siswa resources, and the National Asian Languages and Studies in Australian Schools (NALSAS) project, which allowed for many more teachers of Indonesian to be educated and enter Western Australian schools, even if some were initially attracted by the scholarships and the ‘idea’ of Indonesia idealised by Balinese tourism. She laments that many of those educated through these programs are no longer teaching, let alone teaching Indonesian. Norris credits the ACICIS in-country program with more success than NALSAS projects in improving teacher quality. Relatively speaking, Indonesian remains a strong language in WA schools, despite the plummeting enrolments. Norris talks of a polarised teaching workforce, with very strong and very weak programs. She also canvasses the issue of native speaker teachers who come from non-Indonesian, and usually Malay, contexts, and the effects this is having on Indonesian programs. She is pessimistic about the state of languages education at all, and Indonesian in particular, in this extended period of ‘downturn’. She points to the exceptional teaching in some classrooms, however, and urges that these ‘oases’ be considered as the basis for a re-emergence of Indonesian language teaching.

**CONCLUDING COMMENTS**

You will see that in this review I have noted some of the relationships I have had professionally with a number of these authors. Others are friends. Reading this text was a journey through a catalogue of mates, reliving some of the experiences they describe, especially those of the last three decades. I commented at the beginning of the review on the nostalgia of this book, and I have some concerns that while this provides a solid basis of historical accounts of the journey of introducing Indonesian language and culture into our schools and universities, ‘talking north’, there is little forward thinking, and the most recent data are missing, given the publication date is 2019.

The book might also have benefited from provision of short biographies of the authors, because they represent specific periods, times and places of endeavour. Additionally, an index would have helped to locate and return to sections of interest that arose after moving further into the text, and for new readers to the field, to locate significant events and people.

There are a few significant voices missing, even recognising that one text cannot capture all perspectives. The authors of the review of Indonesian in Australian Schools, those associated with the development of the Australian Curriculum: Languages: Indonesian, the national and state Indonesian teachers associations and Balai Bahasa would have provided some further insights, as would more voices from the peripheries, in the regions and smaller states and territories. There is plenty of scope for further publications, that enrich and continue this story.

I have taken time to review and note each of the authors, as each of the stories is important in this fragile history, and one can see from reading my précis what full accounts of this ‘talking north’ test case have been presented here. I also mentioned how timely this book is. The endeavour of engaging with Indonesia, its people, languages, cultures and histories is nothing short of an urgent necessity to address a crisis for Australia in disengagement. As I write this, the press is exploding with accounts of Australia’s falling PISA results, looking for who to blame, with little focus on how we might address this situation. The very best thing we could do for our learners is to have them all learn at least one additional language, have their own languages recognised, and acknowledge the cognitive, learning, problem-solving, and personal gains that come through learning languages taught well and with sufficient time for tangible outcomes. Engaging thousands of young people in learning Indonesian, for all the reasons championed in this book, would provide a very good start.
It is the highest honour of the association. The AFMLTA is delighted at the success of its nomination of John for this highly prestigious award. We are also thrilled that the announcement of the award has coincided with this LCNAU colloquium, so that we may award him his certificate at our sibling association event, in the presence of many of his colleagues, who not only know his contribution, but who will certainly share in AFMLTA’s celebration of this honour for one of our own.

A number of the AFMLTA Executive are present today, including Andrew Scrimgeour, Kylie Farmer and Sherryl Saunders. Our President, Amanda Pentti, is currently in transit from representing AFMLTA at the American Council for the Teaching of Foreign Languages in Washington, so could not be here. Our President Elect, a West Australian- Nathan Harvey- joined us at the dinner last night to congratulate John. We will hold a further celebration with our members, the state and territory language teacher associations at a later date, also. The honour of presenting John his certificate has thus fallen to me. Let me read his citation, before presenting him with the certificate.

CITATION:
Professor John Hajek has a distinguished and lengthy career as a languages educator, and has made exceptional and outstanding contributions to the field as a leader of languages education throughout his career.

His contributions to community languages in Australia; to the professional engagement of teachers of languages in schools and universities; to the learning of languages in pre-schools, primary and secondary schools, in universities and in community schools; and his involvement in numerous projects to promote languages education and the importance of language recognition nationally and internationally in the political arena give him exceptional prominence in the profession. He is recognised through many keynote presentation invitations, including several at AFMLTA international conferences and notably the Horwood Address in 2017, as well as consultation invitations from government, education departments, professional associations, and community organisations.

John led the project team in 2011 to establish the Languages and Cultures Network of Australian Universities to bring together teachers of languages in Australian universities to support the profession through political representation and advocacy, promote the importance of languages learning, enhance collegial relationships, conduct colloquia and projects, and develop a portal of Australian languages offerings, as the peak body of the tertiary profession. He continues to serve on the executive of this critical languages educator association.

John is Director of RUMACC, the Research Centre for Multilingualism and Cross Cultural Communication, at The University of Melbourne, originally established by Michael Clyne in 2001. He continues to lead exemplary work at this centre.

His work with schools and teachers of languages in schools is extensive, including consultations on pre-school and early years languages programs, with AFMLTA, LCNAU, with education departments and governments across Australia, and, of critical importance, with individuals and groups of languages teachers. His willingness to share and collaborate, to engage and give unlimited time to the profession has had a profound effect on languages teaching over the past decades. He is currently active in bilingual schools networks, including for Italian-English schools and pre-schools. His work on literacy in these areas informs the collaborations and programs adopted in the schools, as well as engaging local communities. He is currently a Chief Investigator on an ARC Discovery Project investigating early years languages learning in Australia.

His work in the school languages education space has led to development of new curricula, approaches to languages education, language teacher preparation, and community attitudes to learning languages and plurilingualism. He has provided extensive professional learning sessions for teachers of languages, across all the states and territories of Australia.

In summary, Professor Hajek has made exceptional contributions to the languages education field in Australia that clearly meet the criteria for the FIPLV International Award. These contributions span community, school and university programs, and involve work with students, teachers, schools, departments, government, industry and communities. We believe him to be a highly deserving recipient of this award.

The FIPLV award honours internationally recognised service to the profession of languages education