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ABSTRACT

The growing political and economic influence of China has drawn increasing attention from overseas governments on the importance of promoting Chinese language learning and teaching (CLLT) in their countries. In a context of English increasingly being used as a proxy-international language, governments of English speaking countries have seen the promotion of languages other than English (LOTE) in terms of strategies to gain a competitive edge in the global context. In the case of Chinese language in Australia, a shortage of qualified Chinese teachers has been a major hindrance to the development of Chinese language programs in local schools.

In the analysis of this phenomenon in Australia, a vertical case study approach is used to identify, examine and explain the common and unique practice of Chinese language teacher education (CLTE) Programs in Australia’s teacher education institutions. The approach sets out political, economic and sociocultural aspects at the international, national and local levels, describing how these interrelated influences historically have conditioned the development of CLLT and CLTE Programs in Australia. This process is traced through the impact of international Chinese education, associated international tendencies of learning LOTE, and domestic political imperatives of promoting multiculturalism in Australia and engaging with the regional economic powers, with direct implications for CLLT and CLTE Programs.

The approach used provides a viable, historical account of the Chinese teacher preparation in Australia. Major constraints and enabling factors are identified, in relation to the broad, multi-level influences. The analysis of the Australian case in this way provides a better understanding of the preparation of Chinese language teachers in the global context.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Introduction

Compared with the well-established TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) in Asian countries, the study of Asian languages in English speaking countries remains limited, but growing recently. Taking the example of Chinese as a second language, because of the economic rise of the People’s Republic of China (PRC), Chinese language has gained increasing attention from English speaking world. However, the lack of qualified Chinese language teachers seems to be a major hindrance of the development of Chinese language programs in English speaking contexts such as Australia.

One the one hand, the guest Chinese teachers trained in China, though functioning as valuable consultants, have experienced difficulties due to pedagogical and social differences, which they are not familiar with, in the English speaking countries. On the other hand, locally prepared Chinese teachers in English speaking countries are small in number, and have therefore struggled to meet the needs of local schools. This research will investigate the existing pre-service education of Chinese language teachers in China as well as in English speaking countries, with a particular focus on Australia.

In this starting chapter, three fundamental components will be identified. First, the research context and motives of the study will be clarified. Second, a brief literature review will be presented to outline the problems in current practice, and on this basis the key and subordinate research questions will be defined. Finally, the potential significance of this research will be listed as justification for the investigation, followed by a layout of the thesis structure.
Research Background

International communications in the global age have witnessed a noteworthy growth of foreign languages study in the world. Lo Bianco & Slaughter (2009b, p. 11) have compared the first choice of foreign languages taken by students in schools across the world, over the past 155 years, and identified that the percentage selecting English has steadily increased from 8.3% during the period of 1850-1874, to 82% during 1990-2005. In comparison, German and French, which used to make up 50.0% and 33.3% of foreign language first choice selections respectively during 1850-1874, fell to 0.07% and 13.6% between 1990 and 2005. As Nunan (2003) has pointed out, the study of Asian languages has been, and remains, limited in English speaking countries.

However, the situation is changing. The National Foreign Language Centre (2012) in the United States has been launching projects to improve the capacity in use of languages other than English, with particular attention on Arabic and Chinese. In Australia, Chinese, Japanese, Indonesian and Korean were recognised as the four key Asian languages in a report Asian Languages and Australia's Economic Future, and the teaching and studies of these four languages were provided with extensive funding via the National Asian Languages and Studies in Australian Schools (NALSAS) Strategy (1994-2002) and the continuous National Asian Languages and Studies in Schools Program (NALSSP) project (2008-2012).

At least three contributing factors can be identified for the trend of growing Asian languages study in English speaking countries. The first, and perhaps most significant, is the attempt by national governments and policy-makers to benefit from the growing economic ties with the Asian region. An example is the secured presence of Japanese language study in the mainstream education system of the United States and Australia, which was a result of the substantial economic growth
of Japan since the 1960s and its corresponding importance as a trading partner to Australia and the United States (Furman et al., 2010; Lo Bianco, 2009).

A second motive for the English speaking countries to promote the study of Asian languages falls under the banner of national security. A good example is the remarkable expansion of Arabic study in the United States since the September 11 attacks in 2001. According to the report of language enrolments in the HEIs in the United States, from 2002 to 2006, the enrolment of Arabic course showed the highest growth rate of 126.5%, followed by 51.0% in Chinese and 37.1% in Korea. In contrast, traditionally taught foreign languages such as Spanish, French and German, while still enjoying almost three-quarters of total foreign language enrolments, showed a slower growth rate at 10.3%, 2.2% and 3.5% respectively (Furman et al., 2010).

A third contributing factor is the social and political imperative to provide more equal and equitable educational rights with respect to the languages of immigrant groups within the dominant English speaking society. Large numbers of immigrants from Asian countries have fostered the spread of their languages both at the community and mainstream education level. A good example is Vietnamese language. In the United States, mass Vietnamese immigration started after the end of Vietnam War in 1975. According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2011), for nearly three decades, from 1980 to 2007, Vietnamese showed the highest rate of increase at 510.9% among LOTE spoken at home, followed by Korean (299.0%) and Chinese (290.7%). Since World War II, there has been an emerging trend of seeing Asian languages as strategically important for the national interest. This trend is more apparent in English speaking countries, where English is the official or national language and only a few other European languages are taught. Alongside the rise of English as the de-facto international language, a comparative advantage remains for multi-lingual nations (Clyne et al., 2007; Graddol, 2007).
The study of Chinese language, being driven by all three factors discussed above, characterises an important part of Asian languages study generally in the global context. It is predicted that Chinese and Spanish will be the two largest rival languages of English globally in the near future (Clyne et al., 2007). With the priority placed on the teaching of Chinese from both local governments and Chinese authorities, Chinese language programs teaching Modern Standard Chinese (also commonly referred to as Putonghua or Mandarin) have been promoted in education systems, from primary to secondary and tertiary levels, in many countries. It is reported that in 2010 there were approximately 360,000 enrolments in overseas Confucius Institutes and Confucius Classrooms (Confucius Institute Headquarters (Hanban), 2010). Lo Bianco (2011) argues that Chinese language will secure its presence among the ‘priority languages’ in government policies in African, European, Australasian and wide American settings.

**Progress of Research**

As a terminology for research, the teaching of Chinese to non-native Chinese speakers is commonly named by academics inside China as Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language (TCFL) or Teaching Chinese as a Second Language (TCSL) (Jianji Lu, 1998; Jianming Lu, 2007; Jianji Lu & Zhao, 2011). Since 2007, the term Teaching Chinese to Speakers of Other Languages (TCSOL) has replaced the previous terms. As a discipline, the university graduate program preparing Chinese teachers to work in an overseas context is accordingly named Master of Teaching Chinese to Speakers of Other Languages (MTCSOL).

To further complicate the terminology, in overseas countries, because Chinese language has been traditionally studied by Chinese descendants in community schools amongst the Chinese Diaspora, it is often referred to as teaching Chinese as a heritage/community language (TCHCL) (Tsung & Cruickshank, 2011). Sometimes because the students’ language background is extremely complex, it is also referred
to as teaching Chinese as an additional language (TCAL) (S. C. Wang, 2007). This thesis will use TCSOL as a broad and encompassing term to refer to the teaching of Chinese language and culture to all L2 speakers, regardless of their language and cultural background, as a research term.

Other than mainland China, institutions in Taiwan, Hongkong, and some Southeast Asian countries such as Singapore and Malaysia, have all contributed to the development of TCSOL on a global scale. The current norm of teaching Chinese in overseas countries is Modern Standard Chinese, which uses the Pinyin system as the phonetic guide to the pronunciation of Chinese characters, Putonghua (common speech) as the oral communication form, and simplified Chinese characters as the written communication form. Considering Chinese teaching in the other regions use various other forms of Chinese (which will be discussed in detail in Chapter 3), this study focuses on mainland China when discussing CLLT and TCSOL teacher education in Chinese speaking countries.

CLLT has witnessed some remarkable changes alongside international Chinese education. Firstly, the range and number of Chinese learners in overseas countries has expanded significantly. At the school level, CLLT has moved from being primarily within Chinese Diaspora communities to mainstream school students (Bellassen, 1993; B. Li, 2004; Lin, 1998; Sun, 2002). At the tertiary level, Chinese courses, which were previously the preserve of elite academics in the discipline of Sinology, have been provided to students from a wide range of disciplines (X. Zhang, 2009). As a result, the target group of Chinese study has gradually expanded from a limited range of the population, to learners in a wider range of education systems.

A second global trend is the increasing opportunities for students from English speaking countries to visit and study in China, and so to gain in-country experience. According to China Association for International Education (CAFSA) (2013), in one single year of 2012, in addition to the traditionally significant enrolment of international students from Asia (63.22% of total), those from Europe took up 16.58%
(numbered at 54,453 out of a total enrolment of 328,330), followed by those from North and South America (10.62%), Africa (8.24%) and Oceania (1.34%). In particular, those from the United States formed the second largest source of international students in China, numbered at 24,583 enrolments. The expanding range of international students in China forms part of global education.

Thirdly, as a result of global education and migration, the language, culture and education background of students of CLLT is increasingly broadened and diversified. In contemporary contexts in English speaking countries, learners of Chinese could be categorised according to various criteria (Lo Bianco & Liu, 2007). They may be locals with a relatively homogeneous language, cultural and education background. They may have migrated from Asian countries that share some aspects of Confucius culture with China, or from other countries that have distinctively different social ideologies and culture norms with Chinese speaking countries. They may be native speakers who have lived and been educated in Chinese speaking countries for a significant period of their life before they study overseas. Of course, there may be other combinations of these and other cultural and educational backgrounds, as part of the cosmopolitan composition of many migrant-based nations of the world.

In line with these three major global trends of CLLT, the shortage of qualified teachers that could work adequately in this global context is increasingly presented as a major hindrance to the development of CLLT in those countries. Authorities and researchers in many countries have expressed similar concern. For example, policy makers in China officially acknowledged in 2007 that research into TCSOL at international level should be incorporated in the agenda of international Chinese education (L. Xu, 2007). CILT, The National Centre for Languages (2007) in the United Kingdom, similarly announced that the availability of trained Mandarin teachers has been one of the main constraints to developing a quality Chinese language program in schools. In the United States, both short- and long-term approaches have been recommended to create a steady supply of qualified Chinese
language teachers to remove the “roadblock” of the development of Chinese courses (Asia Society, 2005, p. 9).

In terms of how to train qualified teachers of Chinese working in the English speaking environment, the first and earliest attempt made by researchers in China is to learn from contemporary second language acquisition and teaching theories in the English countries (Lv, 1989b). Sheng (1990) introduced and examined the basic theories, concepts and practices of key TESOL teaching paradigm around the world and their evolvement over the years, and applied them in curriculum design and implementation of TCSOL in China. However, learning theories acquired from the Western world without having real world experience could not provide a substantial solution for teacher trainees to fully understand those theories.

Based on this constructed theoretical framework for CLLT, studies have emerged to investigate CLLT in overseas countries and gain first-hand material on CLLT. For example, features of CLLT in the United States were explored from a socially and culturally comparative perspective (F. Chen, 2009). The supply, training and challenges of Chinese language teachers in the United States, and in a wider range of countries, were analysed to find possible solutions to the professionalisation of TCSOL teachers prepared in China (J. Li, 2008). These studies are largely descriptive and have not proposed any viable solutions to the problem.

International collaboration is regarded as a possible solution in this context. In 2007, the Standards for Teachers of Chinese to Speakers of Other Languages (Henceforth, referred to as Standards) was published to regulate the preparation of TCSOL teachers in the global context. The Standards is a collaborative work designed by TCSOL professionals in China and experts in CLLT from around the world. It draws heavily on lessons of other second language teaching, mainly TESOL, as a basis for the education and evaluation of TCSOL teachers in China. However, whether the English speaking countries consider the Standards to be appropriate according to their socio-cultural perspective remains questionable.
Trends of CLLT in the global context have also drawn growing interests from international scholars, as evident in the recent works such as Tsung and Cruickshank (2011), J. Chen et al. (2010), and Curdt-Christiansen and Hancock (2014), exploring issues on Chinese learners, teachers, learning and pedagogy in both mainstream schools and Chinese community schools in overseas countries. But how to prepare for qualified teachers of Chinese for the variety of needs of learners has not drawn enough attention from them.

The major factors affecting the efficient work by China trained teachers in local schools of English speaking countries have been well documented (Asia Society, 2005; S. Chen & Sit, 2010; S. Chen & Zhang, 2010; Orton, 2008). These issues have been identified as a result of the insufficient proportion of education and pedagogy studies and practice teaching in the existing CLTE Programs in China (Jiang, 2009; X. Li, 2000, 2002). The language barrier and cultural shock in everyday life contribute to their struggle in the new working environment as well (H. Huang, 2002).

Considering the difficulties of transferring TCSOL teachers from China to work in English speaking countries, the importance of training Chinese teachers in local institutions within the country were stressed (L. Xu, 2007). It has been acknowledged that inviting TCSOL teachers from China is only temporary solution to the shortage of Chinese teachers in these countries; whereas preparing locally trained teachers is the longer-term solution for sustained supply of Chinese teachers for their own schools (Wu, 2007). However, research into the preparation of Chinese teachers in English speaking context is very limited. For example, Y. Wang (2010) and Zhu and Zeng (2010), as pioneers of research into preparation of Chinese teachers outside China, introduced the training modes of Chinese teachers, mostly in-service training, based on studies of one site of CLLT in Thailand and France respectively. This limited work underscores the need for more analytical research of Chinese teacher training in a wider context.
Searching for existing research literature on CLLT and teacher training outside China, it is notable that Australia is distinctive, amongst English speaking countries, in the sense that both federal and state governments have given great attention to the preparation of its Chinese teachers. Compared with other English speaking countries, the Australian government has been taking the study of Asian languages seriously since the 1970s, and emphasises this as a strategic priority at different points in time. This is mainly due to Australia’s geographic location in the Asia-Pacific region and its strengthening economic connections with Asian countries (Lo Bianco & Liu, 2007). Chinese language programs have been established nationwide in the schools system since the late 1980s (Smith et al., 1993), and Chinese language have been set as one of the four priority Asian languages since 1994 (Council of Australian Governments, 1994).

However, despite the apparent determination to facilitate nationwide CLLT and teacher supply in Australia, a shortage of appropriately trained and qualified teachers is still identified as a major issue hindering CLLT in the country. It is worth noting that the lack of appropriately prepared teachers is not unique to the Chinese case, but raised as a common issue with the LOTE teacher workforce (Kleinhenz et al., 2007). Orton (2011) cited the decline of Japanese language study in Australia in recent years as a result of shortage in qualified teachers, and warned that if the lack of qualified Chinese teachers in Australia was not solved soon, it would similarly lead to the collapse of the spreading Chinese language programs in the near future.

In order to provide other English speaking countries with the pre-service education of TCSOL teachers, it is necessary and feasible to examine the success and lessons of the Australian case and explore how the Chinese teachers are prepared in its universities within the global tendencies and the sociocultural context in the country. It should be made clear that this research is not based on the assumption that the pre-service CLTE Programs in Australia is successful and the existing ones in other countries are not. Rather, the case of Australia is selected because of its
representative social structure among English speaking countries, in that it has a diverse language and cultural context. Meanwhile, over three decades of explicit (but varying) support for CLLT and Chinese teacher education from different levels of government, and the ongoing pre-service CLTE Programs nationwide at university level, makes Australia a rare and unique case.

Needless to say, this research investigates the practices of Chinese teaching and teacher education in the sociocultural context of contemporary Australia, with particular focus on the problems and difficulties influenced by the global tendencies of CLLT and Australia’s special sociocultural context for language learning. It is likely to provide more insight into the problem of Chinese teacher education in Australia, as well as contribute to the preparation of TCSOL teachers in a wider range of countries and the innovation of existing CLTE Programs in China.

**Research Questions**

In order to explore how to prepare TCSOL teachers in the global context, especially in the English speaking countries where CLLT is a more recent tendency, this study aims to investigate Australia’s pre-service CLTE Programs influenced by the international and domestic tendencies of CLLT. The key research question for this study is:

*How can the Australian practice of pre-service CLTE Programs contribute to the preparation of TCSOL teachers in local teacher education institutions in English speaking countries and on a wider global scale, in the current context of the expansion of international Chinese education?*

In order to find a comprehensive answer to this central question, three sub-questions need to be answered:

1. *Why should Chinese teacher supply be a major concern for CLLT in English speaking countries?*
2. What international tendencies and domestic sociocultural factors have shaped Australia’s current situation of Chinese teacher education?

3. What are the major factors influencing the discrepancy between policy goals and outcomes of the CLTE Programs in Australian universities?

For the first sub-question, the shifting educational needs of CLLT in the global tendencies, the emerging challenges for the TCSOL teachers in English speaking countries, and the issues with current supply and training of TCSOL teachers as the contributing factors to such challenges will be taken up in Chapter 2. This sub-question will be answered through a comprehensive review of literature on the historical development of CLLT and TCSOL teacher preparation in China and the global context, especially in English speaking countries. The identified issues with TCSOL teacher supply and training will justify the necessity to research into the pre-service CLTE Programs in Australia in the following Chapter 3.

For the second sub-question, the sociocultural context for CLLT, along with the trends of LOTE teaching in Australia, will be analysed. The shifting social conditions for (Chinese) migration and the CLLT and the corresponding language policies will be further explored. This sub-question will be answered through an historic review of the official documents and reports towards LOTE, Asian languages, with a focus on Chinese language. These investigations will provide a broader sociocultural context to explain and understand the practices of pre-service CLTE Programs in Chapter 4 and 5.

For the third sub-question, the design, implementation and outcome of the pre-service CLTE Programs in Australian universities, influenced by the international and national trends discussed in Chapter 2 and Chapter 3, will be explored. Data will include both document studies and empirical interviews of participants of the pre-service CLTE Programs. Based on the investigation of Australia’s practice in preparing TCSOL teachers in national teacher education institutions in Chapter 4 and 5, recommendations for quality supply of TCSOL teachers in the global context will
be suggested in Chapter 6. Cumulatively, this work builds a response to the key research question.

**Research Design**

*Research methodology*

In this study, the situation of CLLT and TCSOL teacher preparation at various levels in Australia will need to be investigated in a detailed way. A vertical case study approach, which is an innovative approach in the domain of comparative and international education, will be adopted to gain a comprehensive understanding of CLLT and TCSOL teacher preparation.

In the work of Vavrus and Bartlett (2006), the vertical case study approach was introduced as “a means of comparing knowledge claims among actors with different social locations in an attempt to situate local action and interpretation within a broader cultural, historical, and political investigation (vertically-bounded analysis)” (p. 95). Inspired by the work of Bray and Thomas’ (1995) work on multilevel analysis, the attention to “context” and the “local level” is considered by Vavrus and Bartlett (2006) as an “obligatory” approach to “generate trustworthy knowledge” so as to broaden the “historically dominant epistemological bases” of both comparative and international education (p. 96).

The developments of CLLT in the education systems and the establishment of pre-service CLTE Programs in Australia have been closely influenced by factors at both macro-level and micro-level. Developments within national cases require an understanding of the broader, global contexts in which nations are located, and with which they interact. At the macro-level, the international trend of globalisation, migration, multiculturalism and the influence of Chinese speaking countries have urged the Australian government to pay attention on the needs of second language education. At micro-level, the resources for CLLT in local schools and CLTE
Programs in teacher education institutions are determined by the international trends, national policy imperatives, and regional demands, for (Chinese) language education. The vertical case study approach in this study builds on established work that has focused on the preparation of TCSOL teachers in separate, and seemingly self-contained, national case studies, mainly in China and English speaking countries.

As Vavrus and Bartlett (2006) pointed out, in the vertical case, “historical trends, social structures, and national and international forces shape local processes” at the principal site (p. 96). Hence in this project, the ‘larger structures, forces, and policies’ are investigated to understand the nature of their influence on the CLTE Programs in Australia, and the insights that an understanding of the multiple (vertical) levels of influence on policy can provide. It situates the design, implementation and outcome of the pre-service CLTE Programs in Australia in a broader context, so as to fully interpret how the cultural, historical and political factors at international, national and state levels have interacted with and shaped language policies in Australia, and how these factors at multiple sites have facilitated, and hindered the outcome of the CLTE Programs at institutional and personal levels.

Research procedure

This study consists of library search and fieldwork collecting qualitative data on CLLT and TCSOL teacher preparation. Because the collected documents “may be protected information unavailable to public or private access” and “materials may be incomplete” (Creswell, 2009, p. 180), it is necessary to also focus on several case studies to interpret how factors at macro-level have interacted with and explained the practice of pre-service CLTE Programs at micro-level. The technique of focused in-depth interviews and program handbooks reviews will be applied to achieve this goal. The comprehensive coverage of these different aspects makes the vertical case study more rigorous, and capable of providing greater insight into understanding and explaining its outcomes.
Level A: International context

In order to answer the first sub-question, this study reviews firstly the international context of CLLT and TCSOL teacher preparation. The literature review identifies and synthesises major trends, to reveal contradictions and tensions, and to situate the study of the particular case (NSW, Australia) in its national and global context. The bulk of this research in China and in the international scale involves the review of studies by (mostly native Chinese and some non-native Chinese) scholars on following aspects:

1. The historical development and expansion of Chinese language education;
2. The formation of TCSOL as an independent discipline within the PRC;
3. The curriculum design of the CLTE Programs in China;
4. The professional development of TCSOL teachers in China; and
5. CLLT and TCSOL teacher preparation in English speaking countries.

These studies are generally viewed through the following sources:

1. Peer-reviewed journals on international Chinese education published in China;
2. Proceedings of international conference on international Chinese education;
3. Books that either specifically discuss issues on CLLT and TCSOL teacher preparation, or include relevant issues; and

Studies on CLLT and the preparation of TCSOL teachers outside China are reviewed and assessed, with particular focus on English speaking countries, to identify the shared challenges of TCSOL teachers working in overseas countries. These studies include cases of: the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, and Australia. The number of studies in the cases of United States and in Australia is the largest due to the relatively more developed CLLT in the national education systems. Thus a significant proportion of literature review will approach such studies.
**Level B: National context**

In order to understand the sociocultural context for CLTE Programs in Australia, a further literature review is conducted covering Australia’s immigration history in the global context, the position of Chinese speaking population in Australia, the development of Chinese languages education in Australia, and the process of professionalisation of Chinese teacher workforce in Australia. The analytical work here brings these factors together to construct a comprehensive picture of the national context in relation to the international trends. Four major sources are explored to draw a relatively complete picture of the Australian context:

1. A comprehensive literature review of immigration history in Australia and Chinese migrants in Australia;
2. Fact sheets and statistics of Australia’s immigration, international education, and economic structure and international relations, provided by Australian government organisations such as Department of Immigration and Citizenship, Australia Bureau of Statistics etc.;
3. Australian government’s successive policies towards migrants and language education since its colonial history; and
4. Initiatives and reports on Asian, and specifically Chinese, language education in Australia issued by relevant organisations.

It is worth noting here that Herriman and Burnaby (1996) pointed out the constant changing rationale towards economic concerns in Australian language policies have reduced the term ‘policy’ that the Commonwealth Government rely on for determining priority funding area of language and language teaching into “at best…a loose set of guidelines” (p. 36). Therefore this study uses a broad definition of policy, to include reports and statements, along with legal documents as stated policy. These reports generally analyse specific language issues such as language status, language rights, language teaching and provide a list of recommendations to the Commonwealth Government. A majority of the exploration into CLLT and CLTE in Australia in this research is therefore based on the analysis of the variety of policies,
reports and initiatives. The series of policies and reports with a focus on Asian (including Chinese) language education in Australia are listed in Appendix 1.

Online program handbooks of teacher education degrees in the 39 universities at national level in Australia will also be reviewed. The degree settings of the CLTE Programs in Australia are analysed from the handbooks. The curriculum structure of the CLTE Programs in Australia is analysed with the purpose of reviewing the degree settings and curriculum structure. Review of the program handbooks will also set the background for further empirical studies of some case CLTE Programs in the next level.

Level C: Local level

To answer the third sub-question, qualitative data based on three universities in one state of Australia are collected to further explore CLLT and TCSOL teacher preparation at the local level. The conventional case-study techniques are applied here, positioning particular cases as one of the “multiple sources of data collection methods” (Punch, 2009, p. 120) in order to guarantee the “authenticity, credibility, representativeness and the meaning” (V. Jupp, 1996, p. 303) of collected archival data previously gathered, which "may be incomplete and inaccurate sometimes" (V. Jupp, 1996, p. 231).

Three universities located at distinctively different regions in the State of New South Wales are selected for case study, and are coded as University 1 (U1), University 2 (U2), and University 3 (U3). New South Wales is selected because of the relatively well-developed CLLT across the education systems and the large number of universities operating the CLTE Programs. Three regions with distinctively different demographic structure and features of language teacher education programs are selected, in order to explain how the local and institutional resources can facilitate or hinder the development of the CLTE Programs. The degree settings, curriculum design, implementation and outcome of the CLTE Programs in the three case-study
Universities are explored in detail to provide “a thorough understanding of the particularity of the micro-level” (Creswell, 2008, p. 97).

In-depth interviews are used as a major method for the empirical study. Compared with other qualitative research methods in educational research, interview is commonly considered as a useful technique for collecting qualitative data that helps researchers to be engaged in the details and specifics of the data, to “get close to an individual’s perspective” (Kayrooz & Trevitt, 2004, p. 110), and therefore understand people’s experience to find useful explanations or interpretations (Yin, 2009).

The major teacher educator(s), namely the curriculum designer and implementer from each selected university will be firstly interviewed. Compared with the other traditionally popular LOTE in Australia’s education system, CLLT is enjoying newly-gained popularity. Hence this involved only one or two people at each site. These teacher educators have rich experience in languages teaching both in Australia and other countries, and have extensive experience training language teachers in Australia. Interview with these teacher educators will not only offer key insights into the particular Chinese issues, but also can well situate the identified Chinese issues within the broader context of language teaching and teacher education in Australia and the global contexts. Student teachers and graduates of the CLTE Programs in the three case-study Universities will be recruited for the second group of interview. The numbers here are limited due to the relatively low enrolments of the CLTE Programs, and difficulties identifying and contacting former graduates since they may work in different states and keep no contact with the original universities.

Consequently, a total number of 5 teacher educators, 5 student teachers, and 4 graduates were recruited. The empirical work of this project has been conducted in accordance with the University of Newcastle’s Human Research Ethics Committee (Approval No.: H-2012-0021). All interviews were conducted face-to-face, at a time and location convenient for the participants. The interviews aimed to last for one
hour, however, in practice, the duration varied significantly due to the available schedule of the participants and the nature of the actual interview. All participants in the study remain anonymous, with non-identifiable codes used, in order to protect their identity. The basic demographic information of the interviews and guiding interview questions for each group of participants are listed in Appendices 2, 3, 4 and 5.

Data analysis

Data collected in this study will be analysed by three steps. First, this study will rely on a basic content analysis. Documents and studies of CLLT and TCSOL teachers at multiple sites will be reviewed, to map the historic trends of CLLT in the global context, identify the emerging themes of CLLT in the contemporary CLLT, and explore the emerging challenges for the supply and training of TCSOL teachers under global tendencies.

Second, the identified themes and trends from the policy texts will be synthesised through a critical assessment. In a broader sense, this involves examining policy texts against underlying political and economic pressures to make an argument for a more comprehensive account of policy and practice beyond what is officially set out in policy.

Third, this study involves a vertical analysis that brings together the previous analyses of the global policy context and trends, the national manifestation of these, down to the local (3 case-study Universities) level and participants within them, to generate key insights into and an account of the phenomenon on CLLT and TCSOL teacher preparation in contemporary Australia. By analysing the data, the objectives of following chapters will be achieved:

- Provide a comprehensive overview of the historical developments of international Chinese education and its teacher supply in the global scale, and to
locate the Australian case and its particular development within this context (Chapter 2);

- Describe and discuss the sociocultural context and policy context for Chinese language education and teacher supply in Australia (Chapter 3);

- Discuss the implementation of language policies in the CLTE Programs in Australian universities, and explore how the policies are interpreted at institutional level. It investigates how individual case universities design and implement their curriculum to cater for, adjust to, and make compromises with respect to the resources and limitations for Chinese language education and teacher education at multiple levels (Chapter 4);

- Discuss the reasons behind the identified discrepancy between the policy expectation and the outcome of the CLTE Programs. It explores the challenges met by individual student teachers with course studies and workplace environment, which are closely influenced by individual language, culture and education backgrounds and the factors at multiple levels in the broader institutional and social context. (Chapter 5);

- Understand the lasting and emerging issues of CLLT and TCSOL teacher preparation in Australia that are not only applicable to the Australian sociocultural context, but can be generalised to TCSOL teacher preparation in the global context (Chapter 6).

Significance of Research

Significance to Australia

Though pre-service CLTE Programs in Australia have been carried out nationwide for over two decades, the shortage of qualified Chinese language teachers, which leads to unsatisfactory outcome in the CLLT, is still considered a major issue (Orton, 2008, 2011). The underlying dilemma of the apparently limited expansion of CLLT in the country despite the lasting policy efforts and political and economic imperatives needs to be better understood and explained, if significant improvements are to be made.

This research will situate the discussion of Chinese issues within the broader context of Asian language teaching, and more broadly, LOTE teaching. Some lasting and
emerging challenges faced by Chinese teaching, particularly the student enrolment issues and quality teacher supply, are shared by other languages in Australia as well (Kleinhenz et al., 2007), influenced by the domestic context for language teaching. Solutions for the Chinese issues can provide some implications for the teaching and teacher education of other languages, especially the less well developed languages, in Australia.

**Significance to English speaking world**

Australia, whose educational system historically follows the British tradition, and whose education theories are heavily influenced by the United States, is seen as a ‘convergent point’ where both the British and American influences are reflected (C. Zhang, 1996). Australia, as a modern, multicultural, nation-state with high levels of migration, plus its particular geographic locations in the Asia-Pacific region and representative education systems of the English speaking world, makes it a key site for providing insights into the phenomenon of CLLT and LOTE teaching in the global context more broadly.

**Significance to China**

Considering identified difficulties experienced by TCSOL teachers prepared in China working in an overseas context, this study will inform the Chinese policy makers and researchers about the domestic political, economic, policy and education context for CLLT and TCSOL teacher supply. The influencing factors for designing the curriculum, and the structure of the curriculum of CLTE Programs in Australian universities, can also provide some implications for the innovation of the CLTE Programs in China, so as to prepare graduates with appropriate knowledge structure and professional training for teaching in an overseas context.
Summary and conclusion

As described above, the logical connections between each chapter can be summarized as a diagram which serves as a framework for this thesis.

Diagram 1: Thesis structure
CHAPTER 2: THE INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Introduction

Through a review of TCSOL teacher preparation internationally, with a particular focus on English speaking countries, this chapter responds to the research sub-question 1. Why should Chinese teacher supply be a major concern for CLLT in English speaking countries? Based on a broad review of existing research on this phenomenon internationally, this chapter explores the challenges faced by both invited Chinese teachers from China, and locally prepared Chinese teachers, in English speaking countries. In addition to the traditional channel of international students studying within China, the globalisation of CLLT saw a shift in Chinese language students’ learning environment, their background and motivations, and the nature and level of suitable resources and strategies, as they learn Chinese in their home countries. This review finds that the TCSOL language teachers prepared in China experience both pedagogical and social difficulties working overseas due to deficiencies in the curriculum structure of their training programs. In the English speaking countries, efforts in preparing locally supplied teachers often experience difficulties due to funding issues and the associated implications for appropriate and effective resources, and limitations in the quality of specific Chinese pedagogical practice. Through some comparative reflections on the preparation of TCSOL teachers in China and in English speaking countries, this chapter concludes by highlighting the identified global tendencies and tensions, to be further taken up in the next level of analysis of the vertical case-study.

Teaching Chinese to speakers of other languages: The global scale

TCSOL on the world scale has always been closely influenced by two factors. It is reliant on the political, economic, cultural and military status of China and its influence on the international stage. Meanwhile, it is determined by the language
policy in the individual overseas countries, and their sociocultural relations with China and the entire Chinese speaking population. The stable domestic situation and prosperous economic development of China forms the foundation of both China’s financial capability to promote international Chinese education and overseas countries’ willingness to introduce Chinese language in the education systems. Moreover, the sustained support from local governments and a positive sociocultural context for CLLT in overseas countries is considered by P. Chen (2013) as a vital, if not more important, factor determining the success of CLLT in the country. The scope of the historical development of CLLT and teacher supply in the global context is necessary to be first reviewed in this section.

**Historical development of CLLT in China**

CLLT in the world range originated from within China. Based on the limited research of the history and development of TCSOL, mainly the work of T. Cheng (2004), Y. Cheng (2009), Jianji Lu and Zhao (2011), and X. Zhang (2009), it is evident that the extent of CLLT relates, in part, to the level of China’s governing authorities’ formal relationships with other countries and extent of openness politically, economically and socially. A path of TCSOL development in China can be drawn based on review of these limited studies. Two peaks of TCSOL in ancient China can be identified, firstly the Han Dynasty (202BC-220AD) and then later the Tang Dynasty (618-707AD). Both periods shared similar features of China being the merging point of regional social and cultural interactions.

During the Han Dynasty, China was in an age of unprecedented economic prosperity. Merchants from modern northwest China and central Asian countries came to the commercial centres of China through paths newly discovered during the Han Dynasty, which are now known as the Silk Road, to trade silk, spices, tea, porcelain and other commodities. The prerequisite for doing business was to speak the
language and follow the customs of the majority Chinese ethnic group, Han people\(^1\). These ongoing activities were reflected in some historical documents. For example, part of the third volume of *The Monasteries of Luoyang* (《洛阳伽蓝记》) recorded the daily language and cultural interactions among various ethnic groups in the capital, Luoyang, of Northern Wei Dynasty (386-534AD), which was ruled by the Xianbei People. The capital was prosperous with trades, and an Ethnic House (四夷馆) was specially built by the government to accommodate traders from West Asia, the farthest from ancient Rome (大秦) (cited in X. Zhang, 2009). Through daily contacts with local people, these traders had naturally achieved fluent proficiency in Chinese speaking and had been well accustomed with the local people. Meanwhile their life style had also exerted a large influence on the local people.

Interactions among China and other countries reached a second peak during early Tang Dynasty, when its capital Chang’an, which is located near nowadays Xi’an, became the most populous city in the world and the whole country reached a high level of civilization and a golden age of cosmopolitan culture. Other than the lasting commercial incentives, religious activities also started to promote language interactions between Chinese and other languages across a wide range. A well-known example is the Chinese Buddhist Monk, Xuanzang (602-664AD) who travelled for seventeen years to India, brought the original Buddhism scripts back to China and translated them into the Chinese language. Meanwhile a large number of monks, scholars and merchants from neighbouring Asian countries came to China to learn from Buddhism, Chinese religions and ideologies, as well as Chinese history and philosophy. The learning was through reading classical Chinese literature.

---

\(^1\) Han people are the largest ethnic group in China. The name is derived from the Han Dynasty, though there have been several other common names to address the Han people. Throughout Chinese history, the Han people have been interacting with other ethnic groups and absorbing their various customs to form its own norms (D. Wang, 2004).
Compared with the language proficiency demanded for trades, religious activities have further promoted the study of Chinese in the written form and some research based learning.

Since the Tang Dynasty, the Imperial Academy (国子监) had been sponsored by the central government as the national institute for elite education through to the end of Qing Dynasty (1644-1912AD). In each dynasty the Imperial Academy was built in the capital city, which was usually the national business and cultural centre. Being the highest institute of education in China’s traditional education system, the Imperial Academy had attracted Chinese students from prominent families, as well as international students sent by their governments or their wealthy parents\(^2\). Within these institutions, international students had been learning Chinese language and culture in the same way as native Chinese students acquire their first language, which was through reading original classical Chinese literature. The acquisition of Chinese language proficiency and cultural understanding by international students was a natural process, gained through daily contacts with native Chinese speakers in the immersive learning environment.

This trend of Chinese language and culture dissemination can be identified in TCSOL over the period of some two thousand years in China. Similar to the historical trend of TCSOL in ancient China, TCSOL in contemporary China is also directly influenced by China’s political and economic interactions with the world. Over nearly three decades after the establishment of PRC in 1949, in the context of the Cold War and associated political isolation of the PRC from many countries in the world, the range of CLLT was limited by professional contacts and exchanges, and was constrained within a few countries that were politically close to China.

\(^2\) There were exceptions. For example, two Imperial Academies were established in the Ming Dynasty, one in the first capital Nanjing, and the other one in the later replacement capital Beijing. For many years in the Qing Dynasty when Catholic religion activities were officially prohibited, it was not allowed to teach foreigners Chinese (X. Zhang, 2009).
Starting in 1950, 33 diplomats from five Eastern European socialist countries\(^3\) studied in Tsinghua University as exchange students. The course was named *Special Chinese Language and Literature Class for Eastern European Exchange Students* (东欧交换生 中国语文专修班). From 1952, when this class was moved to Peking University, students from some neighbouring Asian countries began to be accepted in the course\(^4\). The name of the course was changed to *Special Chinese Language and Literature Class for International Students* (外国留学生 中国语文专修班), reflecting the expanded sources of its student cohort. Subsequently, similar classes were opened up catering for students from some particular countries based on particular, bi-lateral, political and economic agreements and terms. For example, the *Special Chinese Language and Literature Class for Vietnamese Students* (越南留学生 中国语文专修班) in Nanning (ran from 1952-1955) and Guilin (ran from 1953-1957) in Southwest China to support the Vietnamese side during the First Indochina War for national liberation (1946-1954). In 1960 an *Office for International Students from Africa* (非洲留学生 办公室) was initiated in what is now known as the Beijing Foreign Studies University. This course was to cater for the influx of African students since the establishment of bi-lateral trade agreements between China and several African countries\(^5\) in the late 1950s, which had active national liberation movements opposing colonial rule. From 1950-1961 a total number of 3,215 students from 57 countries studied in the PRC.

---

\(^3\) These 33 students included 6 from Romania, 6 from Hungary, 5 from Bulgaria, 9 from Poland, and 8 from Czechoslovakia (Cheng, 2005).

\(^4\) In 1952, 77 students enrolled in this course, including 44 students from East European countries, 29 from North Korea, and 4 from Mongolia (Cheng, 2005).

\(^5\) Such as Egypt, Sudan, Somalia, Cameroon, Zanzibar, Kenya, Northern Rhodesia (now Zambia), Ghana, Sierra Leone etc. (Source: Lu, 2011, Memoir of the establishment and development of BLCU, [http://news.blcu.edu.cn/jsgc/390472.shtml](http://news.blcu.edu.cn/jsgc/390472.shtml))
Influenced by the deteriorating relationship and final split between the PRC and the Soviet Union (the Sino-Soviet split) in the early 1960s (see Lüthi, 2008), students from a wider range of countries started to be accepted in China. This is probably a conscious policy to win over international student groups and political movements to the Chinese position. This political change brought about a turning point for TCSOL in China. In 1965 a language centre dedicated for CLLT, which is now the Beijing Language and Culture University (BLCU), was founded by the Ministry of Education, PRC. An initial enrolment of 3,000 Vietnamese students in this centre initiated the large scale intake of international students in language centres established in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in China. Intensive Chinese language courses were provided as stepping stones for further academic studies in the HEIs, with a majority of the students majoring in pragmatic areas such as science and engineering. By the end of 1965 the number of overseas students in China in a single year jumped to 3,312 (Y. Cheng, 2009).

However, during the destructive Cultural Revolution (1966-1976), which basically paralysed China in economic, cultural and social aspects, the political environment became sensitive and changeable (see Slavicek, 2010). Most schools and universities could not maintain a normal teaching schedule in this period, and for six years no international students were accepted in HEIs. As a result BCLU was forced to close in 1971, and TCSOL classes in many HEIs were suspended. The number of overseas students in China dropped dramatically. The exact number was not properly recorded (X. Zhang, 2009). By 1987 the number of overseas students in China had climbed back to just 2,044, which was still approximately one third less than the number in 1965. This is arguably a reflection of the devastating and lasting effects of the Cultural Revolution on the development of TCSOL in PRC.

Since the restoration of diplomatic relationships with a widening range of countries in the early 1970s and the practice of social and economic reform beginning in 1978, China has gradually engaged actively in the international stage in various areas.
China’s growing importance in the global economy has invoked interest around the world to know more about China, and interest in learning its language and culture to better engage with the nation. As shown in Table 2.1 below, from 1999 to 2012, other than a slight drop in 2003, there has been steady and significant expansion of international students in China each year. In a relatively short period of approximately 50 years, the volume of international students in China had expanded from a small basis of 33 students from 5 countries in 1950 to 328,330 from 200 countries in 2012. Such a growth is significant, and can be largely contributed to China’s active involvement in regional and international affairs since its political open-up and economic reform in 1978.

Table 2.1 Statistics of international students in China from 1999-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of intl. students</th>
<th>No. of source countries</th>
<th>No. of accepting Chinese HEIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>44,711</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>52,150</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>61,869</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>85,829</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>77,715</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>110,844</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>141,087</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>162,695</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>195,503</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>223,499</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>265,090</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>292,611</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>328,330</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on annual statistics of international students in China from 1999 to 2012, provided by China Association for International Education (CAFSA) (2013).

*Historical development of CLLT in English speaking countries*

Across Europe, widespread attention on China has been seen as a by-product of the exploration of overseas colonies and markets after the Renaissance (14th-17th centuries) and Industrial Revolution (18th-19th centuries) (G. Xu, 2009). Starting
from the 13th century when the Italian traveller and merchant Marco Polo described the prosperity of China in his book *The Travels of Marco Polo*, European countries have shown an interest to develop a trade relationship with, and gain knowledge from, China. From the late 15th century in the late Ming Dynasty (1368-1644AD) through to the end of World War II, European missionaries had been promoting Jesuit missions in China, while bringing literature and knowledge of Chinese language, history, culture, society and philosophy to Europe. One of the emblematic examples is the Italian priest Matteo Ricci (1552-1610) who gained sound knowledge in the Chinese language and genuine appreciation of Chinese culture (X. Zhang, 2009), and is generally considered the pioneer of Sinologiest in Western countries (Bellassen, 1993).

The study of China and Chinese topics came to be described in the West, and particularly within Universities, as Sinology or Chinese Studies. Aside from the development of Sinology in neighbouring Asian countries, European countries led the development of Sinology in the world (X. Zhang, 2009). It originated in Southern European countries that were significant naval exploring powers, mainly Italy, Portugal and Spain. Navigators and missionaries brought Chinese literature to Europe, most of which was translated into local languages. From the 17th to the 20th century, peaking in the 18th century, France led European countries in Sinology research, in that it produced a large number of renowned Sinologists (Bellassen & Zhang, 2005; L. Xu, 2007). Meanwhile interest in Sinology in the United Kingdom also emerged, marked by the publishing of popular novels, tales and biographies about China and Chinese people (Wesołowski, 2008). The sources of these publications were mostly based on second-hand materials translated in Latin, French and Spanish, occasionally directly translated from original Chinese literatures (X. Zhang, 2009).

In the 19th century, studies of China began to be carried out in prestige universities in Europe. In English speaking countries, Sinology was initiated in 1837 in
University College of the United Kingdom and in 1876 in Yale University of the United States. Original Chinese literature was collected in the university libraries, Chinese research centres were established, and Chinese language courses were opened-up (Wesołowski, 2008; X. Zhang, 2009). When Sinology was established as an academic discipline in these universities, the study of Chinese language was centred on training researchers to read original Chinese work. Therefore in the Chinese classes, the study of Chinese language was not a comprehensive study of all four micro-skills, namely listening, speaking, reading and writing. Instead, only reading and grammar analysis of ancient Chinese language had been the focus. The study of Chinese culture, which is a major component of CLLT, was mostly pursued through reading translated materials in English. Significantly, according to Y. Li (2007), many renowned professors and researchers of Sinology did not speak Chinese, and/or had never been to China.

This situation of CLLT in English speaking countries had changed significantly by the end of World War II, influenced by the changing economic, political and demographic of the world. In the context of post-War and Cold War era, there has been a rise of ‘area studies’ within universities, which are designed to provide governments with comprehensive knowledge of particular countries and regions. Several Asian countries, due to their rapidly expanding influence in economic and political aspects, have gained growing attention in the area studies in western countries. In the 1960s, Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan, also known as ‘Four Asian Tigers’, were well-known for their model of export-driven industrialisation. Their focus on exports to highly-industrialised nations has maintained lasting regional economic relations with English speaking countries. Three of these four regions/countries use Chinese as the official language (Taiwan) or one of the official languages (Hong Kong and Singapore).

The PRC, marked by its economic reforms which began in the late 1970s and its entry into the World Trade Organisation (WTO) in 2001, has grown to become a
significant trade partner with many countries, including major English speaking counties (Asia Studies, 2012b). The trend of multiculturalism around the world and the abolition of restrictions against Asian immigration in the late 20th century, particularly in Canada and Australia, have boosted the influx of Chinese speaking immigrants in these contexts (Herriman & Burnaby, 1996). According to statistics provided by U.S. Census Bureau (2011), Statistics Canada (2011), and Australian Bureau of Statistics (2013), Chinese language has grown to become the second largest minority language in the United States, and the largest minority language both in Canada and Australia.

The attraction of potential economic benefits, concerns about national security, and the politics of immigration policy and equal rights, have contributed to an increased attention on the study of Chinese language by governments. The support of CLLT by the authorities is seen as a way to increase interest of learning Chinese language amongst the public, as well as its teaching within education systems. For example, in the United States, Voice of America conducted an examination into the Rosetta Stone company, which offers leading computer language learning services in 24 languages to the public, and found that Chinese is among the top 10 languages sold with a huge sales increase of 719% over a one year period from 2008-2009 (Mellman, 2010). In the 2005 national plan on expanding Chinese language capacity in the United States, the development of “functional proficiency in Chinese” amongst the American students was considered “undeniably urgent” (Asia Society, 2005, p. 4).

In the education systems in English speaking countries three major types of contemporary CLLT could be identified. Each type of CLLT has different educational purposes and student groups. The first main type is Chinese language and literacy courses provided within universities. From being foundation courses of Sinology, Chinese related courses have expanded to become an integrated component of degree study in various disciplines. In some universities, Chinese is
provided as a major or minor in modern languages study, whereby advanced proficiency in Chinese language is expected to gain a degree in Bachelor of Arts and pursue closely Chinese-related job positions. There is also an increasing trend of combining Chinese language study with another degree, in areas such as commerce, business, economics, laws, science, and education (X. Zhang, 2009). Elementary and/or intermediate Chinese language courses are provided as a major or minor, while relevant courses about Chinese culture and society are provided as part of the major/minor courses or as elective subjects. The combination of degree courses with Chinese language is presented explicitly by Universities as a mechanism to provide graduates with broader career opportunities in the expanding Chinese speaking market (X. Wang, 2004).

As a result of the promotion of pragmatic Chinese study, enrolment in Chinese courses at university level has been expanding steadily. For example, according to the Furman et al. (2010), in the United States a small number of 1,844 students enrolled in Chinese language course in HEIs in 1960. Since then, this number has increased approximately 33 times to reach 60,976 in 2009. In the United Kingdom, based on the report of Mandarin learning in the country, from 2005-2006, a total of 850 students majored in Chinese at undergraduate level and 180 majored in Chinese studies at graduate level. Another 2000 or so students studied Chinese language to meet part of their degree requirements. Amongst undergraduate students, 62% combined the study of Chinese with other subject areas, while this ratio was 39% at graduate level (CILT, The National Centre for Languages, 2007).

A second main type of CLLT that is common in English speaking countries takes place in independent Chinese ethnic schools, which are mainly sponsored by local Chinese communities. This type of Chinese language class were generally established between the period of the late 1890s and early 1990s, and is the earliest form of CLLT at school level in English speaking countries (Lin, 1998). Traditionally, students in these courses are descendants of Chinese immigrants who
have been encouraged by their parents to attend Chinese classes in an effort to maintain their language proficiency and cultural heritage of their home country. Classes are usually part-time, provided either in the evening or on weekends in rented rooms of regular schools. In the past, such classes have often been isolated with the mainstream society and have experienced an unsteady path of development. Once they lacked financial support or some government policies changed towards immigration and community languages, the schools had to be shut down or suspended (T. Li, 1999; Liang & Zhang, 2005; Lin, 1998; Sun, 2002). In recent times, with the rapidly expanding number of Chinese immigrants, enrolments in Chinese ethnic schools have been increasing dramatically. Together with stronger support from local Chinese organisations, Chinese embassies and local governments, Chinese ethnic schools have been gradually included in the network of national education (L. Huang, 2003; B. Li, 2004; S. C. Wang, 2008).

A third main type of CLLT is a relatively new trend of opening up Chinese language classes in mainstream schools. After World War II, the influx of immigrants brought various languages to the English speaking countries. This trend was especially obvious in the United States, Canada and Australia, where post-war reconstruction in relied heavily upon immigrant labour (Freeman & Jupp, 1992; Jakubowicz, 1989). English is either the official or de facto language in the country and it is the medium of instruction in schools. In order to provide equal opportunities for education of community/foreign languages, and prepare the students intellectually for the future needs of a multicultural society, mainstream schools have increasingly sought to provide one or several languages other than English in the curriculum, with Chinese being among the first to be enlisted (Lo Bianco, 1987; Wen, 2011).

In this context, Chinese has gradually been widely listed as a choice of languages in the curriculum of mainstream schools. For example, in the United States, the inclusion of Chinese as one of the SAT II courses in 1994, the development of Chinese Advanced Placement (AP) Program since 2003 for university entrance
examination, and the prioritisation of Chinese as a ‘Critical Language’ in the 2006 National Security Language Initiative, signaled the establishment and significant expansion of Chinese in the American mainstream education system (Wen, 2011). Driven by this momentum, the number of K-12 public schools students learning a Chinese language in school has tripled from around 20,000 in 2005 to 60,000 in 2008. At the same time, there were 50 Chinese immersion programs in the country in 2011; compared with only a dozen six years ago (Mail Online, 2011). In Australia, in response to the recommendation of its first national language policy in 1987, Chinese teaching has been widely introduced to mainstream schools (Smith et al., 1993). A series of standards, syllabus and instructions for the Chinese course have been published by local Departments of Education and national and local Chinese teacher associations.

**The shifting nature of CLLT in English speaking countries**

Based on the above review of the development of CLLT, compared with the features of CLLT in China, three major shifts of CLLT in English speaking countries that can pose potential challenges for Chinese teachers prepared in China’s education system can be identified. Firstly, there is a shift in the learners’ learning environment. Traditionally, non-native speakers who needed to learn, or were interested in learning Chinese, would have to travel to China to learn Chinese language, culture and social norms in the country. The learning took place in an immersive environment. The communication skills were gained through conversations with local Chinese on a daily basis; whereas literacy was gained through reading Chinese classic literature. Since the Tang Dynasty, the CLLT was mainly through attending classes in the Imperial Academy with native Chinese students. As authentic Chinese books were brought to Europe by travellers, merchants and missionaries in the 13th century, CLLT in Europe started to take place in local contexts. Books about China written in local languages began to be published based
on the translation of original Chinese books. Research about China, together with the teaching of Chinese literacy for reviewing literature, started to be conducted systematically (under the banner of Sinology) at universities from the 18th century. After the rise of Chinese speaking countries and regions since the 1970s, a wide range of students in national education systems, including both school and tertiary levels, started to learn Chinese in local education institutions. This lead to the situation where, in contemporary times, the majority of the students’ Chinese language and culture study take place in their home country. Furthermore, increasing communications and cooperations between China and English speaking countries have brought a growing number of students learning Chinese in their home country to study in China for short or long period. The locations of CLLT are no longer limited by previous geographic boundaries or political segregation, such that the context of CLLT has been steadily expanding across the globe.

A second discernible shift relates to the learners’ background and motivations. Learners of Chinese before the 20th century were mostly merchants, religious people, researchers and others who needed to, or had a very particular interest to, learn Chinese language and literacy. The knowledge of Chinese language and culture was often a requirement for their work. In contemporary language centres in China, the majority international students are similarly adults with a clear purpose of study. According to Ministry of Education PRC (2010), approximately 60% of the international students at the university affiliated language centres are either employees of international companies and sponsored by their employers to be trained for their positions in China, or students from overseas universities on short-term exchange programs to gain in-country experience. These students usually enrol in intensive language courses to boost their Chinese language proficiency, especially listening and speaking skills. The rest approximately 40% are studying full-time for academic degrees. According to the statistics provided by China Association for International Education (CAFSA) (2013), in 2012, 133,509 (40.66%) international
students in China were enrolled in degree courses, with 27,757 (20.79%) pursuing a master degree, 8,303 (6.22%) a doctoral degree, and the rest 72.99% enrolled in an undergraduate degree.

Among the international students in China, approximately 60% of them major in Chinese language and literature, and the others are, from most to least order of enrolment, in medicine, economics, engineering, administration, law, education, science, history, agriculture and philosophy (Ministry of Education PRC, 2010). The intensive language classes, usually lasting approximately six months to two years, are designed to equip the students with basic language knowledge and skills for both daily needs and future academic study. Similarly, in the English speaking countries, contemporary students enrolling in Chinese related courses at university level would have consciously incorporated the Chinese component in their career plan, especially those doing a combined or double degree with Chinese.

At the start of CLLT in PRC, most of the international students were on scholarships provided by cooperation conditions between China and their governments. In recent years the rapidly increasing student number has significantly limited their chances to be granted with a scholarship. It was reported that in 2012 only 8.76% of the students were on a scholarship, while the rest were self-supported full-fee paying students (China Association for International Education (CAFSA), 2013). The financial status of these students has also acted as a driving force for their commitment to the intensive language study. In contrast, in English speaking countries, following the active promotion of Chinese in the education system by local governments, Chinese was often provided as a compulsory subject for a couple of years in mainstream schools that are willing to introduce Chinese. For example, in Australia, Chinese, together with other LOTE, is mandated, or at least ‘implied mandate’ in five out of the eight states and territories⁶ (Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2010).

⁶ Chinese is mandated for 100 hours study in New South Wales, and implied mandated for Years 4-7 in Queensland, P-10 in Victoria, R-10 in South Australia and Years 3-10 in Western Australia.
The students in contemporary Chinese classes could be from a wide range of language, culture and education background under the trend of globalisation, especially those in the major migrant countries of the United States, Canada and Australia.

As young learners, these school students do not necessarily have a clear purpose of learning Chinese. This is in contrast with adult students at a tertiary level. Other than some background learners, most do not have access to daily communications with native Chinese speakers. With only a few hours study per week in the school, it is difficult for the students to practice the language on a regular basis and thus gain a satisfactory level of proficiency. In addition, for most English speakers, Chinese is a very difficult language due to its remarkably different linguistic features with most European language. Students are reported to have to spend at least three times the effort learning Chinese compared to learning European languages to reach a similar level of proficiency (National Virtual Translation Centre, 2007). Thus the students are often reported as lacking motivation and commitment to learning Chinese (Orton, 2008). Because their study of Chinese is often enforced by the school as a compulsory subject, instead of their personal choice, the students tend to drop the course immediately when Chinese becomes an elective subject. This has caused a serious issue of low retention rates in existing Chinese language programs beyond compulsory years in English speaking countries (CILT, The National Centre for Languages, 2007; Orton, 2008; Wen, 2011). Solutions for motivating the majority local English speaking students at schools level to learn Chinese in thus considered on a serious research agenda (Orton, 2008).

Thirdly, we can see a shift in the resources and strategies for language learning. Before the 20th century, both formal studies of Chinese literacy in China and research of China at the university level in English speaking countries were reliant on reading authentic Chinese books. In China, learners lived with local Chinese to gain communicative skills, and attended classes together with native Chinese
speakers to gain literacy. They used the same books, which were often classic Chinese literature, and learned Chinese exactly the same way native Chinese speakers learn their mother tongue. In such an immersive environment, they could acquire the language proficiency and cultural knowledge needed to become proficient users of Chinese language relatively easily. In English speaking countries, Sinologists in the 19th century mainly learned formal Chinese literacy, rather than communication skills, by virtue of learning Chinese as a foreign language. Modes of travel to China imposed additional restrictions on the capacity to visit the country. In order to review primary sources of Chinese literature, the researchers prioritised their Chinese language reading skills. The study of Chinese literacy was based on grammar translation strategy, where the researchers would learn linguistic aspects of Chinese language through existing translation of authentic Chinese literature (X. Zhang, 2009).

After the creation of the PRC, international students in China started to learn Chinese in a distinctive way from the traditional absolute immersive approach. Based on the studies by Y. Cheng (2009), Deng (1990), and P. Li (1987) on TCSOL following the establishment of PRC, some features of the modern CLLT can be identified. Special language centres affiliated with universities have been dedicated for international students since 1950. Unless they pursue further academic studies to gain a degree in China, these students would have limited opportunities attending the same classes with native Chinese students. They are also arranged with separate on-campus accommodation, which were supposedly to provide high standard of living conditions for the international guests. With the increasing number of overseas visitors and residents in China, hubs of people from the same country have formed in regions where international students and visitors concentrate to facilitate their living in China. The globalisation of English has also gradually made English present in basic public facilities and institutions in China, especially in large cities. Therefore, originally expected to provide international students with special treatment and
careful protection, this mode of in-country studies has seen international students often segregated from local Chinese. Unless they actively engage with native Chinese speakers, the comforts of having English to assist their basic living in China have gradually impacted on the intended immersive learning environment. This is in comparison with the age of small number of international students and limited influence of English language in China prior to China’s adoption of reform and open up policy the late 1970s.

Instead of using authentic Chinese literature, a wide variety of textbooks are now carefully designed in China to cater for the international students’ study of Chinese micro language skills in the designated language centres. Intensive language courses usually consist of five sub-courses: comprehensive Chinese, listening, speaking, reading, and writing courses. The contents of textbooks usually start with conversations designed for campus life and daily topics, and move on to introducing short articles which are usually simplified from Chinese literature to cater for the students’ language levels. Explanatory notes in English and sometimes in other languages are often provided along with the text. TCSOL teachers mainly deliver the classes in Chinese language, using different strategies that suit the type of language skill training. For example, a traditional grammar translation approach is more often used in comprehensive courses, while an audio-visual approach and task based communicative approach are more often used in the listening and speaking courses.

In summary, the learning environment, resources and strategies of CLLT in the Chinese language centres are carefully designed to provide intensive and targeted teaching, so that international students can acquire basic Chinese language skills in a short period. Culture understanding is provided through special cultural courses (Q. Li, 2011), but more often it is something to be gained through daily contacts living in the Chinese speaking society.

Comparatively, in the English speaking countries, local students learn Chinese in an environment that is largely isolated from Chinese speaking populations.
textbooks come from two major sources. Scholars in China, in addition to designing
textbooks for international students in China, also design textbooks for overseas
learners in the local context. Responding to a perceived lack of relevance to local
teaching contexts in such textbooks designed by Chinese scholars, textbooks are also
developed by and sourced from local organisations to cater for the learning needs
and learning style of local students (S. Chen & Zhang, 2014). The language teaching
is often task based, with a focus on developing the students’ communicative skills of
the language. Unlike the situation of CLLT in China, pure study of linguistic aspects
of Chinese is much less emphasized in non-Chinese speaking countries. Aside for
some learning of basic language skills, students are provided with resources and
activities on various topics such as Chinese calligraphy, cooking, painting, chess,
mathematics and other traditional Chinese cultural elements, mainly to motivate the
young learners’ interest in Chinese language and culture (Liang & Zhang, 2005).

These three major shifts of CLLT under global tendencies in terms of learning
environment, learners groups and learning resources have posed growing challenges
for TCSOL teachers. In order to gain insights into the challenges faced by invited
TCSOL teachers prepared in China and the locally prepared Chinese teachers in
overseas countries, it is necessary to map the development of Chinese teacher supply
in the global context.

**The supply of Chinese language teachers in English speaking countries**

**Supply of contemporary TCSOL teachers**

A significant proportion of professionally trained TCSOL teachers in English
speaking countries are native Chinese speakers who are trained in China and invited
through government cooperation schemes. In recent years, the involvement of local
domestic governments in teacher preparation of CLLT also initiated both in-service
training and certification, and pre-service education, of locally supplied TCSOL
teachers. Based on a limited number of studies focusing on TCSOL teacher supply and preparation in China (T. Cheng, 2004; Xun. Liu, 1996; Lv, 1989a, 1989b; H. Zhang, 2006), English speaking countries (Orton, 2008, 2011; Song, 2007; Yu, 2007) and the global context (S. Chen & Sit, 2010; S. Chen & Zhang, 2010; J. Li, 2008; L. Li, 2006), we can map the path of TCSOL teachers' professional development on the world scale. The different definitions of TCSOL teachers’ knowledge base, which are guided by the different educational concepts in China and the English speaking countries, can help to understand TCSOL teachers’ professional performance and their challenges with Chinese teaching in overseas contexts.

The pioneer TCSOL teachers in PRC (1950-1970s) were elite scholars who specialised in Chinese language and literature and were carefully selected by the Chinese government. They taught Chinese classes to international students, who were mainly from countries politically close to PRC, in specially established language centres in leading universities appointed by the government (Y. Cheng, 2009). The dedication of combining elite Chinese scholars with premier study sites was part of the long-existing Chinese tradition of warmly welcoming overseas guests. This approach sought to offer the most authoritative source of knowledge about China and provide optimal learning environment to overseas students (Jianji Lu & Zhao, 2011). Some elite scholars were also invited to teach in East-European countries to support local CLLT (X. Zhang, 2009).

In addition to Chinese language specialists, since the late 1970s, some academics from professions such as foreign language teaching, education, psychology, and humanities and social science also started to convert into the TCSOL profession (H. Zhang, 2006). This phenomenon was generally caused by increased market demand for TCSOL teachers that the rapidly increased number of overseas students in China created in the post-1978 period. The shortage of TCSOL teachers provided opportunities for professionals in related areas of language education to work in the newly established language centres. They were considered competent teaching
Chinese language and culture to international students because of their native language proficiency and qualifications with higher education.

However, the shortage of TCSOL teachers later lead to extremely loose criteria of selecting teachers for international students. There was a wide spread assumption in China, which was due to lack of professionalisation of TCSOL, that any native Chinese speaker was able to teach Chinese to non-Chinese speaking students. This was evident when, for example, nurses at the University health service were pushed into the CLLT classrooms due to insufficient number of teachers (Lv, 1989a). In response, Lv (1989a) argued that without a team of TCSOL teachers that have solid academic background in Chinese linguistic, the effectiveness and quality of TCSOL in China facing the fast expanding student group in intensive language courses were significantly undermined. Meanwhile, the existing TCSOL teachers who have become authorities in CLLT through years of teaching experience face aging issues (Xun. Liu, 1996). Innovation in the supply of TCSOL teachers, accompanied with the call for establishing TCSOL as an independent discipline in the late 1970s (Lv, 1983a), became a necessary response.

As a consequence, pre-service CLTE Programs were established at Bachelor (in 1983), Master (in 1986) and Doctoral (in 1992) levels successively in leading Chinese universities, while various forms of in-service training were provided to practicing TCSOL teachers (Xiaoyu. Liu, 1999; Xun. Liu, 1996). It is expected that their knowledge structure is supported by theories on linguistics, second language acquisition and education, and they can handle different types of CLLT activities (Xun. Liu, 1996; Lv, 1983b). Lv (1989a) envisaged that the establishment of pre-service and in-service CLTE Programs should aim at preparing TCSOL professionals at three different levels, namely teaching, research and administrative levels, to meet differentiated needs in the broad agenda of TCSOL development.

Graduates of the CLTE Programs had, to a certain extent, relieved the shortage of professional TCSOL teachers in China; however, they also faced significant career
problems. In practice, very few graduates actually had the opportunity to work as TCSOL teachers. There exists a systematic tension between employing TCSOL teachers and the general employment requirements in HEIs in China. Prestige universities that provide major sites of CLLT often required at least a doctoral degree qualification of academic staff, making it difficult for new graduates of the CLTE Programs, holding a bachelor or master degree, to be employed as TCSOL teachers in Chinese universities. Compounding this problem, when the graduates did hold a doctoral degree in TCSOL, their work shifted more to research, leaving an ongoing demand for TCSOL teachers. In this situation, the establishment of professional CLTE Programs could not fundamentally resolve the shortage of qualified TCSOL teachers by the 1990s (Xun. Liu, 1996). There were even more language, cultural, and legal procedure hindrances for CLLT graduates to find employment as TSCOL teachers in overseas schools, especially in Western countries, in the 1980s and 1990s (S. C. Wang, 2007). These difficulties were a result of the initial stages of China’s re-establishment of diplomatic relationships with Western countries.

This issue with employment among graduates of existing CLTE Programs required further innovation. It included providing targeted CLTE Programs whose student teachers can work in CLLT in China and the global context immediately upon graduation. This is accompanied by the acknowledgement of the importance of promoting CLLT in overseas countries by the Dean of Hanban in 2007, who advanced an agenda of preparing TCSOL teachers for work in overseas countries to facilitate the development of local CLLT (L. Xu, 2007). In response to the agenda, a special program named Master of Teaching Chinese to Speakers of Other Languages (MTCSOL) was initiated by Ministry of Education, China, first in 24 pilot universities in 2007, and then expanded to 82 universities in 2010 (National MTCSOL Education Steering Committee, 2011). Graduates of the MTCSOL program, together with some graduates from the traditional TCSOL teacher preparation programs, are provided with growing opportunities to applying for
overseas job positions through cooperative bilateral programs and agreements between Chinese and overseas institutions. Positions such as working as independent language teachers or teacher assistants in overseas schools and language training agencies are the common opportunities for these graduates (Hanban, 2010).

English speaking countries have used invited TCSOL teachers from China, as well as locally supplied Chinese teachers in the workforce. The first major source of locally supplied teachers is the Chinese immigrant communities found in these countries. This potential source is significant in quantity. In the United States there were roughly 3.8 million Chinese immigrants in 2010 and approximately 75% of them speak some form of the Chinese language at home (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). In Canada, there were roughly 1.3 million Chinese immigrants in 2006, taking up 3.1% of the languages categorised by mother tongue, compared with English 58.2%, French, 21.7%; Italian, 1.4% and German and Spanish both 1.2% (Statistics Canada, 2011). In Australia amongst its population of 21 million in 2011, 1.7% of them speak Mandarin and 1.3% of them speak Cantonese at home, which are the two major forms of Chinese language amongst overseas Chinese Diaspora (ABS, 2013).

The large number of Chinese migrants in the English speaking countries has provided abundant sources of personnel who are willing to teach Chinese. These native and Chinese background teachers have mostly taught in Chinese community schools that have been independent from the mainstream education system and self-sponsored by local Chinese communities (S. C. Wang, 2007). They teach Chinese as first language to students who are native, background or heritage speakers of Chinese. With the expanded scale of higher education in China since the 1980s, an increasing proportion of the Chinese migrants have received university level education. Similar to the misconception in China, many of these Chinese speakers have been employed teach Chinese classes based on the assumption that their language proficiency and educational level is sufficient to teach Chinese language well. As a result, few of the Chinese language teachers in overseas Chinese
community schools hold a degree or certificate in Chinese teaching (J. Li, 2008; Sun, 2002).

The involvement of overseas governments in CLLT has gradually incorporated CLLT in Chinese community schools within the mainstream education systems. Together with the assistance from local Chinese organisations, teachers from Chinese community schools have gained increasing opportunities for in-service training and certification. These teachers are expected to gain deeper understanding of Chinese language and culture, and can combine the teaching in Chinese community schools with the general educational value in the country. Following in-service training some of these teachers can be registered to teach Chinese to English speaking students in mainstream public schools, particularly where new Chinese language programs are introduced and a registered teacher certification with the local education department is a necessity (S. C. Wang, 2007).

Providing in-service training to certify practicing Chinese teachers who are native or background Chinese speakers is perhaps the most popular approach currently, in countries like the United States, to prepare Chinese teachers that are oriented to the local CLLT (Asia Society, 2005). In teacher institutions, pre-service CLTE Programs have also been introduced to prepare local TCSOL teachers, some of whom are non-native Chinese speakers. Such programs are relatively well-established in most Asian countries where there is a long history of interactions with China. Comparatively speaking, in the English speaking countries, CLTE Programs at pre-service level have only been introduced at a small scale in the United States (S. C. Wang, 2007), and to a larger extent, in Australia (Zhang, 1996), with rare evidence in the United Kingdom and Canada.

In summary, TCSOL teachers in English speaking countries generally fall into three groups of people: graduates of the CLTE Programs in China who have received the entire or most of their pre-service training in China; Chinese migrants who may hold a higher education degree and some forms of formal second language teacher
education certified by local education institutions; and a small number of English speakers educated by the local education systems. The supply of TCSOL teachers in China has witnessed a process of professionalisation and efforts to address the emerging challenges brought by globalisation of CLLT; while the English speaking countries have similarly experienced a formal qualification and registration process of potential teachers of Chinese. The features of contemporary CLLT in overseas countries have brought challenges for TCSOL teachers professionally prepared both in China and local teacher education institutions in the workplace.

**Challenges faced by TCSOL teachers in the workplace**

For graduates of the CLTE Programs who have received their entire school education and TCSOL teacher preparation in China, the new educational context of CLLT in English speaking countries have brought great challenges.

The first major challenge is the changed status of TCSOL at a national level in English speaking countries due to changed education environment for CLLT. In China, TCSOL has received great attention from the Chinese government. This is partially an extension of the long-existing Chinese tradition, and more recently as part of China’s long-term strategy of exerting soft power in the international arena. TCSOL is seen as a feasible channel for the world to be familiar with and understand modern China and its history. CLLT in China are carried out mainly in prestige universities selected by the Ministry of Education, PRC to guarantee the students’ formal and intensive study. The work of TCSOL teachers is thus highly ranked by the Chinese government.

Comparatively speaking, in most overseas countries, TCSOL is often not given as much special attention by their governments. Even when CLLT is promoted nationwide, such as has recently occurred in English speaking countries, the teaching of Chinese does not enjoy a prestige attention. Often it is presented within the scheme to develop and enhance multicultural society, and promoted together with
the teaching of a wide variety of other languages. Though in recent initiatives, Chinese has been placed as one of the priority languages, Chinese teaching is still often in a disadvantaged place compared with the traditionally taught European languages in English speaking countries. Without well-established resources that could be utilised for overseas CLLT, together with the sharp change of their professional status, TCSOL teachers from China often experience a sense of loss and isolation in the workplace in an overseas context (H. Huang, 2002).

Secondly, the expanding group of Chinese learners in CLLT has required different teaching strategies for the TCSOL teachers trained in China. Instead of special language centres affiliated with prestige universities in China, CLLT in overseas countries take place at a diverse range of education institutions. Public schools, private schools, weekend Chinese community schools, colleges and universities, Confucius Institutes, and commercialized language service agencies are all existing classrooms for CLLT (Song, 2007; Zhao, 2009). As discussed above, the features of students of Chinese in overseas countries, compared with those in China, are different in some key ways. For the TCSOL teachers working in China, they are hosts introducing their home language and culture to the guest students in a more traditional Chinese style of teaching. When they are invited to work overseas, their role changes; they become the guests who need to introduce their language and culture to the mainstream non-native speakers in approaches that are more directly connected to the learners’ diverse interests and needs. This phenomenon, being a characteristic of teaching any language in such distinctive contexts, has made it necessary for TCSOL teachers invited from China to always deepen their understanding of the local education environment for CLLT, to combine their knowledge gained in China with the local realities, and to convey their home language and culture in socially appropriate approaches to the local learners.

The third challenge for China-trained TCSOL teachers working in English speaking countries is the distinctive pedagogical practices, which are largely determined by
the different cultural perceptions. TCSOL in China follows the educational goals and standards set up by the Ministry of Education, PRC, and the students’ performances are assessed by national Chinese Proficiency Test (also known as Hanyu Shuiping Kaoshi, HSK). Traditional Chinese education philosophy positioned teachers as the absolutely authoritative source of knowledge. Few interactive activities with the students are organised. Such an approach has arguably worked well for TCSOL in China, because most of the learners are adults who have a strong motivation and clear purpose when they make an effort to go to China for intensive language study (S. Chen & Sit, 2010; Yang, 2005), though there do exist some cultural conflicts between the TCSOL teachers and international students (Light & Zhang, 1987). These students are more likely to accept the intensive and structured language study that is seen as essential in preparing them for living and/or pursuing further academic study in China.

In contrast, for CLLT in overseas countries, a significant and fast growing proportion of the learners are school aged students who are presented with the opportunities to study Chinese as part of their school curriculum. However, due to lack of motivation, sense of accomplishment and interest learning Chinese, only a small group of students will actually take Chinese in senior years for matriculation examination. For example, in Australia, Chinese courses have an extremely low retention rate. In the recent report of Chinese education in Australia (Orton, 2008), 94% of Chinese learners in school section would drop the course beyond compulsory years. This low retention rate is shared by other LOTE programs in Australia, and is arguably due to more general lack of interest or motivation to learn LOTE facing the international influence of English (Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2009a). As a consequence, the ability to understand the educational concepts and teaching strategies in overseas context, and the ability to effectively motivate and relate to the students, are considered essential for Chinese teachers working in overseas context (S. Chen & Sit, 2010; Orton, 2008; S. C. Wang, 2007).
Compared with China-trained teachers, locally trained Chinese language teachers are found to be better situated within the local education context, more familiar with the student features and educational practices, and thus often preferred by local schools (S. Chen & Zhang, 2010; Orton, 2008). However, locally supplied TCSOL teachers also experience difficulties in the workplace. For most teachers who are native Chinese speakers and received most, or all of their education in China and other Chinese speaking countries, the challenge is mainly a difficulty with English language proficiency and social adaptability. Whereas for most background or heritage speakers of Chinese and native English speakers who have been born and/or educated in the English speaking countries, a major challenge is often proficiency of Chinese language and understanding of Chinese culture (S. Chen & Zhang, 2010; S. C. Wang, 2007).

**Training and knowledge base of TCSOL teachers**

These challenges encountered by TCSOL teachers in the workplace in English speaking countries, could be considered a result of identified deficiencies in the structure of their teacher education. The curriculum structures of existing CLTE Programs both in China and in English speaking countries have not fully addressed the challenges brought about by the shifts of CLLT in the global context.

As to the pioneer TCSOL teachers in PRC, Lv (1989a) explained that because of the academic reputation of these elite scholars in Chinese language, their professional performance as TCSOL teachers was rarely questioned. The immature discipline development of TCSOL at this stage rendered the pre-service and in-service training of these TCSOL teachers being merely an extra study of foreign language, which was usually Russian due to China’s close foreign relationship with the Soviet Union. The purpose of training was that the teachers could better communicate with the mostly Russian speaking students, understand the differences between Chinese and Russian language and thus better address the difficulties for Russian speakers
learning Chinese language. Such a knowledge structure would be sufficient to address the needs of the Chinese learners who were from a relatively homogenous background. According to the evaluation by Lv (1989a), this model of TCSOL teacher training had been carried out for decades following the establishment of the PRC without any significant critique from researchers.

Following the tradition of employing scholars of Chinese language as TCSOL teachers, CLTE Programs in China have been traditionally affiliated with the Department of Chinese Studies within prestige Chinese universities. The curriculum of CLTE Programs has thus been heavily emphasizing the language aspect of CLLT rather than the education aspect. The structure of the curriculum can be categorized into the following five aspects: 1), theories of Chinese linguistics; 2), theories of generic linguistics and language acquisition; 3), foreign languages; 4), cultural knowledge; and 5), other relevant subjects in humanities and social science (F. Chen, 2005; E. Deng, 1990; X. Li, 2000). A systematic study of the linguistic aspects of Chinese language and an inclusive understanding of traditional and contemporary Chinese literature and culture were the focus of the training courses. Considering some of the graduates will teach Chinese in overseas contexts, the English language was also taught in the CLTE Programs, replacing the dominant position of Russian in foreign language teaching in China in the late 1980s. English literature introducing the culture and society of western countries, especially English speaking countries, was included in the curriculum as well. In contrast, courses on education studies and pedagogy studies which train the candidates how to teach Chinese to speakers of other languages, take a minor proportion compared with second language teacher education curriculum in other countries, at only 10% to 30%, of the curriculum of the CLTE Programs in most universities in China (X. Li, 2000).

In order to accommodate the emerging challenges faced by TCSOL teachers working overseas under globalisation of CLLT, concerns have been raised in recent years to innovate the curriculum of the CLTE Programs in China. For example, S.
Chen and Sit (2010) argued that for the purpose of providing intense language courses for adult international students in a Chinese education context, such heavily language based curriculum would have been a proper model of preparing TCSOL teachers for the teacher-centred classrooms in China. However in a linguistically and culturally different teaching context in overseas countries, it is imperative that these TCSOL teachers be equipped with an adjusted structure of knowledge and proficiency. This adjustment means the innovation of existing curriculum of the CLTE Programs in China. Chinese policy makers and academics, considering the different context of CLLT in overseas countries, also claim it urgent to make significant adjustment in the research agenda regarding the concepts, strategies, criteria and pedagogy that suit promoting CLLT effectively in the global context (Q. Li, 2009, 2010).

In response to the official agenda of promoting CLLT on a global scale, education and pedagogy components of TCSOL teacher preparation have been consciously added into the CLTE Programs. In the Standards for Teachers of Chinese to Speakers of Other Languages (Henceforth, referred to as Standards) released by Hanban (2007), for example, it is stated very clearly that TCSOL teachers should have a good understanding of: 1), basic language knowledge and proficiency; 2), culture and cross-cultural communication; 3), second language acquisition and learning strategies; 4), teaching strategies; and 5), comprehensive teacher quality. In the Standards, the Chinese and English language and culture components are compressed into only one section of the curriculum. Effective communication with the parents, students, colleagues and the community in the local context, namely cross-cultural communication, is added in the curriculum. The study of theories of second language acquisition and effective learning, as well as effective teaching strategies, including assessment practices, resource development and technology of CLLT, are clarified as essential components of the curriculum. Meanwhile, comprehensive teacher quality in terms of professional development and
professional value, which was rarely addressed in previous TCSOL teacher preparation initiatives, is also emphasised. Obviously, compared with the existing Chinese model of the CLTE Programs, the Standards put a much heavier proportion of the education and pedagogy components in the curriculum.

In response to the Standards, In 2009 the National MTCSOL Education Steering Committee issued a guidance policy of MTCSOL program, Instruction on Master of Teaching Chinese to Speakers of Other Languages (MTCSOL) Full-time Training Program Admission in 2010 (Henceforth, referred to as Instruction). The attention on education and pedagogy studies regulated in the Standard is proportionally reflected in the Instruction. Subject matter studies are no longer dominating the curriculum. Instead, the satisfactory level of Chinese and foreign language proficiency is set as prerequisite for admission to the program. Meanwhile, curriculum hours allocated to pedagogy studies and practicum has significantly increased based on the structure of the Standards. Universities running MTCSOL programs in China are also encouraged to establish extensive cooperation programs with overseas educational institutes for establishing overseas practicum sites for the candidates in the MTCSOL programs.

The new guidelines of MTCSOL programs demonstrated an explicit effort from China’s side to change the curriculum design from one that was heavily language based to one that is more education and pedagogy based. However, it has been criticised by some who have argued that this new program, in practice, has no substantial differences with the previous CLTE Programs in the sense of its curriculum implementation (Ma, 2007). This can be seen as a consequence of Chinese universities running a MTCSOL program with still limited experience of innovating curriculum that is both tailored to their specific institutional resources and reflects the requirements of relevant national guidelines. Also, as with any major reform, it would arguably take a substantial amount of time and effort to break with the traditional model and establish a new one. Since 2007 the MTCSOL program has
been established in a growing number of Chinese universities. Therefore in order to guarantee the achievement of its set goal of training TCSOL teachers adaptable for overseas contexts, it is necessary to research viable curricular innovation.

Several studies have examined second language teacher education (usually TESOL) in countries such as the United States, Japan, Canada, Australia and the United Kingdom (F. Chen, 2005; Jiang, 2009; X. Li, 2002; Shi, 2010), in order to search for implications for curriculum innovation of the CLTE Programs in China. Through comparison, these studies have identified four areas as the persisting issues of the CLTE Programs in China: 1) unbalanced ratio of professional training and subject matter studies; 2) lack of overseas practicum opportunities; 3) disconnected and isolated courses across university disciplines; and 4) insufficient integration with comprehensive areas of language teaching system.

These studies demonstrate the conscious efforts in reforming the current CLTE Programs in China. The issue with such studies is that they are mostly examining the training of TESOL teachers at the university level in overseas countries to find implications for the innovation of TCSOL teacher training. It is argued by S. Chen (2000, 2009) that the borrowed theoretical framework of TESOL teacher education is produced in western countries and addresses the English language issues. When this framework is transferred to solve the Chinese language issues in the Chinese cultural context, cross-cultural factors in different contexts during the curriculum design and delivery would hinder its practical effects in innovating the Chinese mode. It is therefore considered necessary to directly look into the experience of CLTE in overseas countries (S. Chen & Zhang, 2010).

In the English speaking countries, government attention on CLLT has generally increased only in the last few decades, thus the official and widespread concern of solving issues in TCSOL teacher supply and training are rather recent compared to within China. Other than inviting TCSOL teacher from China, three areas of focus can be identified to improve the quality of locally trained Chinese teachers. The first
and most popular one is short-term in-service training as part of professional developments of the practicing (Chinese) teachers (Song, 2007). This is expected to improve the TCSOL teachers’ language proficiency, cross-culture understanding, teaching strategies, update of technology used in teaching, theory studies and other issues with CLLT.

This type of in-service training is increasingly carried out in a joint effort between national and local Chinese associations, supportive education organisations and projects, and relevant organisations in Chinese speaking countries. For example, in the UK, the British Council, the UK Association of the Promotion of Chinese Education, and the UK Federation of Chinese School, have been the major forces collaborating to organise TCSOL teacher training sessions (Song, 2005, 2007). In the United States, the major equivalent organisations are the Chinese Language Teachers Association (CLTA), Chinese Language Association of Secondary-Elementary Schools (CLASS), and the recent government project STARTALK initiated in 2006. In Canada, it is predominantly the Chinese Language Teachers Association of Canada. In the case of Australia, this work is being driven by the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations (AFMLTA), and the Chinese Language Teachers’ Federation of Australia (CLTFA) at national level. Support from China, which is generally provided through Hanban, has also been assisting with in-service training of TCSOL teachers in the global context (Hanban, 2010).

The in-service training ‘solution’ has experienced limitations to date. According to Song (2005, 2007), the training that took place at the regional level is often small scale with insufficient frequency because of funding problems; though the funding issues would have been relieved to certain extent due to the growing support from local and overseas organisations. National training sessions do take place regularly; however such trainings are often attended by teachers of all second languages and thus addressing generic issues with second language teaching rather than language
specific. These training sessions are considered by Orton (2008) as lacking relevance to the problems of CLLT, such as the teaching of tones, Chinese characters and some grammar challenges that are peculiar to Chinese linguistic features. Therefore constraints of funding and lack of pertinence to Chinese issues have limited the effectiveness of these in-service training sessions for the specific needs of local TCSOL teachers.

The second major area of attention to improve TCSOL teacher preparation has focused on exploiting the existing language repertoire of native Chinese speakers in the country. This has commonly involved finding alternative ways to certify existing Chinese language teachers, most of whom are Chinese speaking immigrants working in community and independent schools without official registration with the Department of Education. A ‘pipeline’, or a ‘fast-track’ alternative route to teacher accreditation, to solve such certifying problem, has been suggested as an urgent agenda in providing certified TCSOL teachers in the United States (Asia Society, 2005; S. C. Wang, 2007). The Ontario government in Canada has funded a special Bachelor of Education program Alternative Teacher Accreditation Program for Teachers with International Experience (ATAPTIE). It is expected to provide new immigrants, including those from China, with the skills and knowledge that are necessary for re-certification and job application in Ontario elementary schools (Myles et al., 2006).

The special re-certification process could provide an official channel for the marginalised Chinese language teachers to enter the mainstream education system; however, the availability of adequate and effective training that are essential to guarantee the outcome of the certification remains a concern (Myles et al., 2006). Moreover, Orton (2011) warns that in the case of Australia, the sudden privileging of Chinese language from the government is likely to cause division amongst the many languages that contribute to contemporary multiculturalism. The special fast-track to certify Chinese language teachers also may seem unfair and cause discontent.
amongst the European language teachers who have taken great efforts to slowly establish the position of European languages in the education system and eventually achieved current high standards of teacher qualification.

Efforts to address the concerns in the above two approaches of re-training and re-certifying Chinese language teachers lead to a third type of initiative: the expanded provision and improvement of pre-service CLTE Programs in local universities. In his interview with Su (2006), the president of the Asia Society in the United States analysed the situation of CLLT and issues with its current teacher supply in the country, and concluded that “the United States will likely have to rely on locally trained teachers” (Su, 2006). The pre-service CLTE Programs established in HEIs in the country would ideally train TCSOL teachers that have more comprehensive understanding of local education context, compared with both the TCSOL teachers trained in China, and the native Chinese teachers working largely in Chinese community schools (S. C. Wang, 2007).

However, currently the pre-service CLTE Programs have been opened up in a very limited number of universities in the English speaking countries. In the United Kingdom the supply of its Chinese teachers heavily rely on exchange programs with China. The training of its Chinese teachers is generally achieved via short-term in-service courses, and there is rare evidence in research literature detailing the introduction of CLTE Programs the HEIs. Even in the United States where the scale of CLLT is significantly larger than in other English speaking countries, only a few institutions offer a full-fledged CLTE Programs. Asia Society (2005) reported the University of Iowa, Ohio State University, New York University, and University of Massachusetts at Amherst as the only universities providing the pre-service CLTE Programs within a teacher education degree. In addition, there is a growing number of universities providing courses targeted at solving specific short-term problems of TCSOL teacher preparation, usually under the cooperation with institutions in China (S. C. Wang, 2007).
Currently, the limited number of direct studies on TCSOL teacher preparation in overseas countries generally focuses on short-term in-service training of Chinese teachers in individual countries (such as Y. Wang, 2010; Zhu & Zeng, 2010). Studies of pre-service CLTE Programs national teacher education institutions in overseas universities are very limited. Shi (2010) examined one pre-service CLTE Programs in one university in the United States to search for innovations of the Chinese mode of TCSOL teacher preparation. Further and larger scale studies of TCSOL teacher preparation in overseas countries, particularly at pre-service level, are extremely important to inform the innovation of CLTE Programs in China and other countries, to effectively prepare TCSOL teachers that are capable of working in the global context.

In comparison, Australia can be seen as unique in the English speaking countries, in terms of its long-term government investment in the preparation of its Chinese language teachers in national HEIs. It was evident that by the late 1980s the Australian governments had launched language policies, education initiatives and achieved significant development of CLLT in the country. From C. Zhang’s (1996) research that involved Chinese and Japanese language teacher education in Australia, it can be traced that by 1996 Chinese was already widely included in the second language teacher education programs at university level in Australia. However, despite this exceptional status of over 20 years of pre-service CLTE Programs in Australia, a lack of qualified Chinese teachers remains as a major hindrance to the development of CLLT in the country (Orton, 2010, 2011). The study of the success and lessons of the pre-service CLTE Programs in Australia may provide viable solutions for institutions in the global context as to the preparation of quality TCSOL Chinese under the global tendencies and domestic context.
Summary and conclusion

This chapter has explored the general question of why the supply of contemporary Chinese language teachers is a concern for CLLT in English speaking countries, via the review of literature on the development of CLLT in China and in overseas countries, with a particular focus on English speaking countries. The globalisation of CLLT has, almost inevitably, brought complex changes to the nature and delivery of CLLT. Within the current cohort and major sources of TCSOL teachers in English speaking countries, a set of significant challenges faced by these teachers was identified, in relation to the particular training they received. A lack of training in educational and pedagogical components that directly address features of CLLT in English speaking countries, within current CLTE Programs, can be seen as a major factor contributing to these challenges.

From a historical perspective, the development of CLLT at the global level has consistently been driven by perceived economic benefits, followed by a range of other social benefits. Accordingly, fluctuations in CLLT development are influenced by political factors, including China’s changing status on the international stage. As we would expect, the research confirms that the context of CLLT in overseas countries is remarkably different to that found in China, in terms of the learning environment, learners’ background and motivation, and the associated resource materials and teaching strategies. A major finding confirmed here is that these differences in an overseas context have posed significant challenges for TCSOL teachers trained in China when they work overseas. This has resulted in the needs for teachers to adjust their teaching expectations, teaching resources and strategies to the particular conditions, and for local governments to enhance the preparation of TCSOL teachers in local institutions.

The insufficient education and pedagogy studies in the curriculum of the contemporary CLTE Programs China contribute to the challenges faced by TCSOL
teachers from China working in English speaking countries. Meanwhile, in English speaking countries, relevant organisations have been holding re-training and re-certifying sessions to prepare Chinese teachers that meet with their training procedures, standards, and CLLT needs. However, ongoing problems associated with funding for these programs, and the difficulties to target at Chinese specific issues in the often generic language methodology courses provided, have lowered the effectiveness of these training sessions.

The inclusion of pre-service CLTE Programs in teacher education institutions of English speaking countries emerges in the literature as an approach that is considered to be the long-term solution to the development of CLLT. Most immediately, it addresses the historic reliance on inviting China-trained TCSOL teachers, increasing in its place the preparation of qualified Chinese teachers that meet the national teacher education criteria and standards. The domestic graduates are expected to reach the required level of Chinese/English language proficiency, and have sufficient understanding of the learners, the learning process, the school environment and the education context in the country, and the associated skills to effectively teach Chinese language to school students under these conditions. From this work it is evident that Australia is an exceptional case in this regard in terms of its level of implementation of such programs compared to other English speaking countries.

The next chapter will review the Australian context for Chinese teaching and teacher education, in detail, in relation to the global tendencies of CLLT identified in this chapter.
CHAPTER 3: THE AUSTRALIAN CONTEXT

Introduction

Building on the international review of the previous chapter, this chapter explores in detail the available literature, language policies and reports on the phenomenon of CLLT in Australia. This includes, as appropriate, the relationship between policy, practice, and the socio-historical context of Australia in which these were developed. The chapter builds a response to sub-question 2. *What international tendencies and domestic sociocultural factors have shaped Australia’s current situation of Chinese teacher education?* In particular, the sociocultural factors in Australia’s history with respect to its relationship to China, including its demographic features and immigration policies, are elaborated. This chapter further analyses the impacts of these sociocultural aspects on the development of Chinese teaching in Australia’s education systems, and shifts in the supply and education of Chinese teachers, from a historical perspective.

**An Overview of Australia’s languages landscape**

Australia has been considered one of the most “ethnically, culturally and linguistically diverse nations on earth” for most of its history (Ingram, 2002, p. 3). Before the arrival of the British first fleet bringing convicts to NSW in 1788, there were already approximately 250 individual nations of Aboriginal people in Australia, each using their own distinctive indigenous language, plus approximately 700 dialects, though most of these have been lost today (Clyne, 2005). In addition to the diversity of the Indigenous population and languages, there have been successive waves of immigration to Australia from various parts of the world since 1788, marking the beginning of Australia’s colonial history. By the 1850s the population in Australia was composed of indigenous Australians, settlers and convicts from Great Britain, and free settlers from Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America (Macintyre,
By the 1980s, approximately 99% of Australia's population were non-indigenous people, who were immigrants or descendants of immigrants that had arrived in Australia over the past two hundred years (ACPEA, 1982). According to report, *The People of Australia* with a population of over 22 million, 44% of Australians were born overseas or have an overseas born parent. Over 260 languages are spoken and 270 ancestries are identified (DIAC, 2011b). Along with the national language, English, imposed by the British colonial powers, Australia’s language landscape includes many indigenous languages, and languages spoken by its immigrants from various countries (Lo Bianco, 1989).

The demographic structure of Australia has been noticeably diversified; however, for an extended period of time from the 1850s until the 1960s, the public and official attitudes were in favour of European settlers (DIAC, 2006), reflected in the formation and adoption of restrictive immigration policies. Free settlers from Britain and Ireland had always been encouraged and assisted by Australian governments, and were provided with support programs and services (DIMIA, 2003). On the other hand, the percentage of immigrants from non-European countries, including those from China and other Asian countries, remained very low, making them very small minority ethnic groups in this mainstream British society of Australia. In general non-British immigration into Australia has gone through subsequent waves of ups and downs. The trends have historically been influenced by historical events in domestic and international contexts, and of course by the governing political Party’s policy and attitude. These waves have further influenced, and also in turn been influenced by, a series of migration policies, including both restrictive policies that were a legacy of its colonial history and facilitative policies that were a reflection of its multicultural facets.

Australia’s language policies hold a reputation of having “constant shifts and realignments”, involving a complex evolution (Djité, 2011, p. 54). Influenced by the shifting attitudes towards migrants from different source countries, Australian
governments’ attitudes towards languages used by the migrants went through corresponding shift, from a state of not interfering up to the late 1900s, to restricting and assimilating non-English speaking communities into the mainstream British society throughout most of the first half of the 20th century, moving towards accepting and fostering multiculturalism (including language maintenance) since late 1960s up to now (Clyne, 2005; Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2009b). Given the strengthening economic and political ties between Australia with Asian countries, a tendency of “Asianist” and “economic rationalism” started to emerge strongly from the early 1990s (Djité, 2011, p. 54).

The evolution of language policy in Australia has been categorised by several researchers into different categories. Though differing slightly in the terms used, and the timing of identified stages or phases, these categorisations capture the broad scope of Australia’s language landscape throughout its history. Table 3.1 summarises these categorisations.

Table 3.1: Development Stages of Australia’s Language Landscape

| Clyne (1991, pp. 24-25); Djité (2010) | • Accepting but laissez-faire (up to the mid-1870s);
• Tolerant but restrictive (1870-early 1900s);
• Rejecting (c.1914 – c. 1970);
• Accepting – even fostering/multicultural (c. 1970 - present ); and
• Asianist/Economic rationalism/English as literacy (late 1980s – early 1990s) |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Lo Bianco in Clyne (2005, p. 143)   | • Laissez-faire (up to 1969), with no intervention to support community languages or the ESL needs of children;
• Rights-equality (late 1960s to mid-1970s), supporting community languages for human rights reasons and ESL in the interests of access and equality;
• Culturalist or multicultural (from mid- 1970s) where class and equity issues are replaced by cultural ones; and |
Shifts of language policies in the sociocultural context of Australia have directly influenced the development of (Chinese) language teaching, teacher supply and teacher education in the country. In this study, drawing on the above categorisations of the development of Australia’s language landscape, the history of CLLT and CLTE in Australia is divided into three general stages: 1) from laissez-faire to restriction period (1788-1950s); 2), the promotion period (1960s-1991); and 3) the prioritisation period (1991-present).

At the start of Australia’s colonial history, the use of Chinese, like other LOTE, did not experience any official intervention. The formation and practice of the White Australia Policy, from late 1900s until early 1970s, involved a restriction on and rejection of the use of LOTE in both the public and private domains. Towards the development of a multicultural policy since the late-1960s/early-1970s, Chinese and other LOTE began to be acknowledged and supported for their contribution to mainstream cultural diversity in Australia. The growing political and economic influences of Chinese and other Asian countries since the 1980s have urged the Australian government to increasingly prioritise the teaching of several key Asian languages in the national education system. The following expansion of Chinese language programs at the school level called for the supply of quality Chinese teachers that could meet accreditation standards and be registered with local
education departments. Chinese thus began to be incorporated in national teacher education institutions from the early 1990s. The development of Chinese teacher education programs in Australia has thus been closely linked with the influence of Chinese speaking migrants in Australia, the domestic tendencies of migrant and language policies, and the bi-lateral relationships between Australia and China.

**From laissez-faire to the restriction period (1788-1950s)**

*Free settlers and the first significant Chinese presence*

Chinese immigrants started to arrive in Australia in the early 1800s, soon after the European settlement. Small numbers of Chinese, together with other Asian coolies, were imported before 1851 as indentured labour for the pastoral frontier in Australia to fill in the gap created partly by the end of convict transportation (Rickard, 1996; Wilton, 2004). The ‘Gold Rush’, which refers to the time when gold deposits were discovered in New South Wales and Victoria in the 1850s and onwards, brought the first influx of Chinese migrants in Australia (Macintyre, 2009). Indentured Chinese labours, mostly men, gathered in these two states in Australia, also a large number headed to North America where gold was discovered as well, in the hope of making their fortune, and/or escaping life in China hardened by overpopulation, drought and wars (DIAC, 2006; Wilton, 2004). Most of the Chinese migrants coming to Australia in this period were from southern Chinese provinces along the coastline such as Guangdong and Fujian. A majority of them returned home for reunion with their families once they have found gold. Some stayed in Australia regardless of their success in the gold fields, and made a living by providing services and skills (Macintyre, 2009). They settled in various areas, including tin mines, metropolitan cities and remote stations in outback areas (NAA, 2003).

The Gold Rush, associated with the influx of Chinese and other overseas workers, completely changed the demographic structure of Australian colonies (Macintyre,
Between 1788 and the 1850s Australian settlers had been predominantly British and Irish. During the height of the Gold Rush (from 1851 to 1861), over 600,000 immigrants added to a population of 400,000 in one single year in 1850. While the majority were from Britain and Ireland, 60,000 came from Continental Europe mainly Germans, Poles, Scandinavians and Hungarians, 42,000 from China, 10,000 from the United States and just over 5,000 from New Zealand and the South Pacific (Macintyre, 2009; Pietsch et al., 2010). In the 1861 Colonial Census, the number of Chinese immigrants was 38,258, taking up 3.4% of the Australia's population. Chinese immigrants thus formed the largest non-British ethnic community in Australia, and established the first significant Asian presence in Australia. By the end of 1890s, several other Asian groups and Pacific Islanders also lived in Australia (DIAC, 2006; DIMIA, 2003).

The number of Chinese immigrants coming to Australia declined gradually after the Gold Rush, partly because most of them eventually returned to China and increasingly because of the continuous public animosity and government restrictions towards them since the 1850s (DIAC, 2006; Guo, 2005; Wilton, 2004). In 1877 some 17,000 Chinese workers remained in Australia, making up about 90% of the gold diggers in some regions (Jones, 2005). Concentrated Chinese immigrants caused alarm during the economic depression of the 1880s (Djité, 1994). Due to miscommunication and stereotyping, they were subject to consistent racism in Australia at that time, accused of upsetting social harmony and treated as an inferior group (Macintyre, 2009; Rickard, 1996; Wilton, 2004). Fears and accusations emerged that the rapidly expanding Chinese communities, who were mostly self-contained and tend to send the gold they found in Australia back to China, were taking away the chances of other gold prospectors and business that should have been for Europe alone (Wilton, 2004). Initiated by competition of economic interest, this fear is arguably a major factor pushing efforts to apply greater controls over
Chinese and other Asian immigration to protect the alleged ‘racial purity’ of the Australian colonies, and later the Federation of Australia (Macintyre, 2009).

A series of acts and laws were issued since the 1850s to restrict particularly the migration of Chinese in Australia. For example, the Victorian government, in 1857, passed a discriminatory act imposing a capitation, or entrance fee, on Chinese immigrants, and limiting the number of Chinese passenger to one person per 10 tons of registered tonnage. A monthly residence fee of 1 Pound/month was imposed afterwards, and was later reduced to 6 Pounds/year. In 1858 and 1861 respectively South Australia and New South Wales introduced legislation along similar lines to Victoria in order to restrict Chinese immigration. By the mid-1900s, these restrictions were considered safe to be repealed due to the declined number of Chinese immigrants, and were eventually abolished by 1967 (J. Jupp, 2001). These several abandoned attempts amongst the states to restrict non-European immigration posed some, but limited, restriction on migration to Australia (Harvey, 2003, p. 30).

The national body representing Australian workforce, Trade Unions (later the Australian Labor Party), organised movements to oppose Chinese immigration in 1878 and later extended to all non-European peoples in 1896 (Australian Council of Trade Unions, 2012). This was due to their concern that migrants would pose a threat to existing working conditions and living standards through unfair labour market competition (Lopez, 2000). These movements were among the biggest supporters of a White Australia into the 1960s.

One of the very first laws passed by the new Federal parliament of Australia, following Federation in 1901, was the Immigration Restriction Act 1901. Known as the White Australia Policy, this law effectively banned Asian immigration to Australia for the next fifty years. The infamous Dictation Test applied to potential migrants limited the numbers of non-European migrants, generally the “coloureds” and Chinese in particular (DIBP, 2009). This applied to restrictions on Australian-
born Chinese as well, by limiting their freedom to travel in and out of the country (Jones, 2005).

Since the White Australian Policy was issued by the Federal government in 1901, until the outbreak of World War II, only British and Irish immigrants were encouraged and assisted by Australian government. Immigration of continental Europeans were discouraged or not assisted, while all non-Europeans were rigorously excluded (DIMIA, 2003). By 1947 nearly three-quarters of the overseas-born population were from Britain and Ireland, while the remainders were mainly from southern Europe (7%), elsewhere in Europe (7%) and New Zealand (6%) (Collins, 1991). The percentage of immigrants from non-English speaking countries remained very low (Pietsch et al., 2010). Due to the two World Wars and the Great Depression in the 1930s, the overall level of migration to Australia dropped significantly, from around 23% of non-Indigenous population born overseas by 1901 to only 9.8% by 1947 (DIMIA, 2003).

As a direct consequence of government restrictions, the total number of Chinese in Australia went through a steady decline, dropping from 32,700 in 1901 to just 12,000 in 1947 (NAA, 2003). Among the 12,000 Chinese, only 6,404 were China-born. The other half were born either in Australia or in other Asian countries (DIAC, 2006). Being an ‘Asiatic’ group, although a few Chinese became successful merchants and excelled in market gardens, laundries and furniture making, they were still in effect socially quarantined (Rickard, 1996). The official restrictions placed on Chinese migrants limited the number of Chinese in Australia and their socioeconomic status in the country. In this context, the conditions for Chinese teaching, including student sources, support from the community and the society were absent in Australia from 1788 until the 1960s.
Limited demand and conditions for Chinese teaching

During this Laissez-Faire period, Clyne (2005) recorded that language services were common across the colonies, and the extension of bilingual education was far wider than in contemporary society. For example, by the 1860s, except for the indigenous languages, LOTE such as Chinese, German, Irish, (Scottish) Gaelic, Welsh, the Scandinavian languages, and French were widely used in Australia. In Melbourne and Adelaide, almost all business transactions could be done in German. Later in the 19th century, newspapers in five languages were published in Australia. In bilingual schools that spread across Australia, subjects were commonly taught in English and another language, mainly German, French, Gaelic, Polish or Hebrew. Both children from non-English background and those from English speaking families attended these bilingual schools. It is safe to say that multilingualism has been part of life from the very beginning in Australia (Clyne, 2005).

Despite these wide use and teaching of languages in Australia during the Laissez-Faire period, the conditions for operating Chinese community schools to teach Chinese language were absent for decades. One main reason was that the Chinese population structure was seriously skewed, the majority of them being single male or married male who left their family back in China. For example, in 1861 amongst the total number of 38,247 Chinese in Australia, only 11 were females. By 1891 the female number increased slightly to 298, but still composed less than 1% of the total 35,523 Chinese in Australia (Choi, 1975). The lack of pure blood Chinese children provided limited source of students for Chinese learning amongst Chinese migrants (Sun, 2007).

Moreover, the overall social context in Australia gradually became restrictive for developing community schools within the ethnic groups. The hostility against Chinese migrants and other ‘coloured’ people since the 1860s until the formation and peak of the White Australia Policy allowed minimum space for establishing Chinese
community schools. The diminished influence of the then Chinese Qing government also drew no attention from Australian government to promote the learning of Chinese in the country. Thus until the adoption of a multicultural policy in the 1970s, the teaching had always been restricted to the community schools (Sun, 2002).

The Chinese community schools, which emerged in the early 20th century, were the major channel for Chinese teaching during this restrictive period. They experienced a rough path of development. Generally speaking, these community schools were complementary to mainstream schools, and delivered Chinese language classes at night or on the weekends to students who were predominantly native and background Chinese speakers. The purpose of learning Chinese language was to maintain cultural identity and pass on cultural traditions and values to the coming generations in an English speaking environment. Teaching activities were mainly sponsored by local Chinese communities and targeted at students from Chinese families (Smith et al., 1993). However, the number of Chinese community schools was very limited. In 1913 only three were operating, one in Melbourne and two in Sydney (Djité, 1994), driven by the needs of highly concentrated Chinese migrants in these two cities. Similar to the situation of Chinese community schools in other immigrant countries, especially the United States and Canada, the teaching of Chinese in Australia was small scale, in terms of enrolment statistics and available resources at this stage (Lin, 1998).

Around 1920, Chinese community schools in Australia experienced a short period of development under the support of some ambassadors and patriotic community leaders from China. This was a direct result of the movements demanding the rights of immigrants against the restrictive policies in Australia, and the political reform in China since the overthrown of Chinese Qing government in 1911 that entailed pacifying overseas Chinese communities (see Sun, 2002; Lin, 1998). However, despite the increased attention on establishing Chinese community schools in the 1920s, it was often difficult to maintain a continuous teaching (Sun, 2002).
The restrictive White Australia Policy is arguably the fundamental hindrance to the development of Chinese community schools from the 1920s through to the 1950s. Based on the studies of Sun (2002) and Lin (1998) on the development of Chinese community schools in Australia, it can be seen that the economic regulations against Chinese migrants had seriously deprived their benefits in trades, which provided limited financial support for the Chinese community schools. On the other hand, it was difficult to find well-educated Chinese to teach the class in Australia due to the low level of literacy among the predominant Chinese coolies who were deprived of education back in China. The restrictions against Chinese immigration also cut off the channels for importing teachers from China, and other neighbouring Asian countries where Chinese community schools were operating on a larger scale than in Australia. Many teachers in the Chinese community schools, usually being renowned community leaders and the only teacher in the school, were forced to leave Australia once their visa expired, thus causing suspension and even cancellation of the entire teaching activities.

The domestic and international tendencies towards language use also constrained the development of Chinese community schools since the 1920s. Despite the pluralistic social facts in Australia, there had always been tension between monolingualism and multilingualism, namely between “the one language (albeit in different varieties) as a symbol of British Empire loyalty or of Australian nationalism” and “the many languages as a feature of multicultural reality” (Clyne, 2005, p. 2). The Great Depression in the 1930s and the outbreak of World War II in the 1940 intensified hostility towards ‘foreign languages’, that is, the languages other than English. The teaching of languages used by a wide range of immigrant groups were rejected in the official policy, and were “relegated to the private sphere” (Djité, 2011, p. 55). The assimilation policy practiced on non-English speakers in Australia expected among them a language shift, replacing their first language with English, and adoption of existing cultural norms of Australian society, namely a distinctive British pattern of
social behaviour (Clyne, 1991, 2005; DIMIA, 2003; Pietsch et al., 2010). This was enacted through widely providing ESL courses to immigrants and enforcing laws prohibiting bilingual education and language services (Clyne, 1991, 2005). After a short burst in the 1920s, Chinese community schools soon dropped significantly in scale due to a limited source of students, funding, teaching resources and teachers, as well as a general restriction on the use of migrant languages (Sun, 2002).

Given the limited number of well-established Chinese schools in Australia, chances for Chinese speaking children to learn Chinese in Australia were scarce during the restrictive period. The majority of Chinese parents, who cherished the Chinese tradition, would send their children back to China for education and have them settle in Australia once they finished their study. The restrictive immigration regulations terminated this channel because the parents were afraid their children would be unable to return to Australia. In order to survive in an English speaking society, these Chinese parents chose to send their children to mainstream schools in Australia to learn English. Learning in Chinese community schools was seen as only sentimental compensation, but not a realistic choice (Sun, 2002). As a result, the descendants of the earliest Chinese migrants during the Gold Rush have mostly lost their mother tongue of Chinese through intercultural marriages and assimilation into the mainstream culture (S. Chen & Zhang, 2014). According to Smith et al. (1993), less than 3% of the descendants of the earliest Chinese migrants could speak Chinese.

The promotion period (1960s-1991)

Towards a multicultural Australia: The post-World War II shift

During the post-World War II period, acceptance of migrants from an expanding source of countries witnessed a diversifying demographic structure in Australia. Immigration came to be seen as a crucial strategy in a broader project of national development and construction. The vast land, rich natural resources and thin
population in the United States, Canada and Australia attracted massive numbers of migrants (Samuda, 1985). Given 7 million people dwelling on 3 million square miles of land in Australia in 1945, post-war mass immigration was seen by the then Minister of Immigration Arthur Calwell as “urgent and imperative” to Australia’s survival, as one of the lessons learned in the Pacific War (quoted in Zubrzycki, 1995, p. 1).

The governing Australian Labor Party, though traditionally oppose to immigration in order to protect the Australian workers, relaxed the preference of British and Irish migrants, and negotiated migration agreements with a broader range of European countries beginning in 1945. It was declared by Mr Calwell in 1945 that realistically 70,000 migrants were needed each year to meet the official growth target of 2% annual population growth, with 1% from natural growth and 1% from net immigration (Zubrzycki, 1995). The planned immigration was expected to...

"...increase the nation’s potential for defence, in light of the recently averted Japanese military threat; provide manpower for the future development of the manufacturing sector and exploitation of Australia’s resources; and to a lesser extent, cater to humanitarian sentiment towards aiding suffering people in devastated post-war Europe.” (Lopez, 2000, p. 44)

Priorities were given to skilled tradespeople who could assist with Australia’s critical housing shortage and the development of manufacturing industry (Pietsch et al., 2010). Worries still existed that Australia had to compete with the overpopulated Asian countries that were eager in choosing Australia as a destination for settlement in the interest of its abundant resources and convenient geographic access (Samuda, 1985). Therefore, when recruiting overseas labours, in order to preserve the high level of ethnical and cultural homogeneity, Australia once more showed explicit discrimination against Asians and other non-whites, and strong preference towards Anglo-Celtic, followed by North Europeans and to a much lesser extent, Southern Europeans (Lopez, 2000). Between 1947 and 1953 more than 170,000 European war
refugees arrived in Australia, followed by further waves of assisted European immigration (DIMIA, 2003).

Large scale organised migrations since 1945 again lead to major changes in the ethnic composition in Australia. By 1954, for the first time, the proportion of British-born settlers in Australia declined to less than half of all overseas-born population; while the number of migrants that spoke a language other than English had, for the first time in Australian immigration history, increased steadily and significantly (Pietsch et al., 2010). In the 1961 census, up to 60% of the settlers were from European countries, mainly from Italy (12.8%), followed by those from Germany (6.1%), Netherlands (5.7%), Greece (4.3%), Poland (3.4%) and Yugoslavia (2.8%) (DIMIA, 2003). Australia’s overseas-born population expanded fast from 9.8% in 1947 to 14.3% by 1954 (DIMIA, 2003). In fact under this government assisted immigration plan, in the immediate post war years Australia was second only to Israel in the proportion of overseas-born in its population (Zubrzycki, 1995). However the intake of Asian immigrants remained extremely low, shaped by the still active White Australia Policy.

The diversifying demographic structure eventually led to the necessity to bring multicultural policy in Australia in the 1970s. Since the 1960s, Australia started to emerge from its history of differential exclusion, towards a policy of pluralism that began to acknowledge and value the ethnic diversity (Hawthorne, 1996; Ingram, 2002; Smolicz & Secombe, 2002). There was still some governmental resistance, for example, in 1969 the Minister of Immigration, Billy Snedden, stated, “We must have a single culture. We do not want pluralism.” (cited in Clyne, 1991, p. 83). However, because of the large number of immigrants from a diverse range of places, Australia's sociocultural context, as well as policy orientation, was unstoppably moving towards a process of “mainstreaming cultural diversity”. (Clyne, 2005, p. 143).
In 1972 the first Labor government since 1948, under the leadership of Gough Whitlam as a reformist government after 23 years of conservative rule, formally, and in many ways radically, changed the official immigration policy (Clyne, 2005). The White Australia Policy was officially abolished in 1973. Also in 1973, the Minister of Immigration, Al Grassby, giving a speech entitled *A Multi-Cultural Society for the Future*, used the term ‘multi-cultural society’ for the first time in an official Australian government policy statement (Koleth, 2010); although this multiculturalism as ministerial policy was criticised as in a “precarious status” (Lopez, 2000, p. 254). Grassby declared that by putting an end to the White Australia Policy, every relic of past ethnic or racial discrimination had been abolished, and all forms of discriminatory treatment based on race and ethnicity were prohibited as well (Macintyre, 2009). The *Australian Citizenship Act* of 1973 further required that all migrants were to be accorded equal treatment. Any differential selection of migrants was to be based on their personal and social attributes, and occupational group, and not on their country of origin (Macintyre, 2009). The enactment of *Racial discrimination Act* in 1975 through the Commonwealth Parliament aimed to prohibit all forms of discrimination based on race and ethnic origin as well, so that Australia abides by the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1969) (Koleth, 2010).

In the next government run by the Liberal Party, the concept of multiculturalism was equally advocated. Malcolm Fraser, then Opposition spokesperson for Labour and Immigration, acknowledged in the policy *The Way Ahead*, released on 30 April 1974, that “there is a need to overcome the complex problems confronting migrants, especially non-English speaking migrants, who already live in the multi-cultural society of today’s Australia” (cited in Lopez, 2000, pp. 259-260). Progressed from Grassby’s arguably unsubstantial concept of multiculturalism, Fraser used the term ‘multi-cultural society’ for the first time in the parliament and adopted multiculturalism as a model to found policy on migrant settlement and welfare
(Lopez, 2000). When Mr Fraser became Prime Minister in November 1975 his support for the concept of multiculturalism, alongside the promotion by the previous Labor government, established a bipartisan support of multiculturalism in Australia (Koleth, 2010).

Along with the trends towards a multicultural society in Australia, the relaxation of the restrictive policies against Asian migrants since the 1960s witnessed a reorientation of Australia’s relationship with Asian countries and reappraisal of Australia’s traditional attitudes towards Asia. In the revised *Migrant Act 1958* the Minister of Immigration, Sir Alexander Downer, stated that “distinguished and highly qualified Asians” might immigrate. By 1966 the condition was revised into “well-qualified” non-Europeans who would be accepted into Australia “on the basis of their suitability as settlers, their ability to integrate readily and their possession of qualifications positively useful to Australia”. In addition, these people were allowed to immigrate in a number “somewhat greater than previously” (quoted in DIBP, 2009). By 1989, *The National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia* explicitly declared that "our strategic relationships, trading network and investment patterns have become far more enmeshed in the Asia Pacific region; and our immigration policy has been progressively liberalised." (Office of Multicultural Affairs, 1989, p. 1).

These explicit statements of a multicultural Australia arguably demonstrated a shift in policy orientations towards the Asian region over a long period. Australia’s geographic location in the Asia Pacific region significantly underlies this trend. The Australian government has arguably started regarding Asia as less of a threat, and more of an opportunity for economic development, especially since the economic rise of some Asian countries during the post-colonial period (Auchmuty, 1970).

As a result, Asian immigrants were permitted to enter Australia again, after over a century’s restriction. The increased rate of Asian immigrants since the 1960s was substantial compared with the first influx during the Gold Rush period. Between
1973 and 1983 almost one-third of the migrant intake were from Asian countries, compared with just over 40% from the United Kingdom (Pietsch et al., 2010). This significant growth of Asian migrants lasted over the next few decades. The 1991 census showed that Asian countries, mainly Vietnam, China, India and the Philippines had emerged as prominent birthplace countries of immigrants into Australia (DIMIA, 2003). From 1996 to 2001, immigrants from Middle-Eastern countries, mainly Sudan, Afghanistan, Somalia, Bangladesh and Iraq increased with the highest rate while immigrants from Eastern European countries such as Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania and Poland had decreased rapidly (DIMIA, 2003). Associated with the changing demographic structure, Australia has gradually become an active member of military, security, economy and culture and social organisations with its Asian neighbours.

In contrast to the significant growth of Asian migrants predominantly from Southeast Asian countries since the 1960s, the volume of migrants from China was minimal until the late 1980s. The isolated political and socioeconomic situation after the inception of PRC, as well as Australia’s immigration policy favouring business migrants, limited the growth of Chinese migrants in Australia. According to Q. Zhang (2002), right after the establishment of PRC in 1949, the outbreak of the Korean War (1950-1953) and Australia's hesitation in following the U.S. side into the war kept Australia from acknowledging and establishing a diplomatic relationship with the PRC government. The following Vietnam War (1955-1975) again kept such chances away between Australia and China in the following two decades. Therefore, although there was a steady increase of immigration from other Asian countries beginning in the 1960s, a significant number of whom being ethnic Chinese, immigration from mainland China was still restricted due to the McMahon government's continued refusal to recognise the communist government of PRC up to 1972.
The establishment of diplomatic relations with PRC by the Australian Labor government in 1972 saw a steady increase in the number of Chinese migrants directly from mainland China (Guo, 2005). In the 1976 Census the population born in mainland China was small, numbered 19,971 (DIAC, 2006); while in the next census held in 1996, the population born in mainland China expanded over 4 times to 111,009 (ABS, 2006). By then Australian residents born in China had formed the largest volume of Asian migrants in Australia, following those from the traditional source of the United Kingdom (1,072,562), and the more recent sources of New Zealand (291,388), Italy (238,246) and Greece (126,520) (ABS, 2006).

The unprecedentedly diversifying language and culture backgrounds of migrants in Australia during post-World War II period demanded changes in existing migrant and language policies that can better address their post-immigration needs. Being an important component of the multilingual and multicultural Australia, the language of Chinese, together with many others used by significant size of migrant groups, gradually gained attention and official supports in relevant policies.

**Developing multicultural language policies**

The assimilation policy practiced throughout the first half of the 20th century proved unable to address the needs of migrants from a wide range of countries. Government sponsored settlement services during immediate post- post-World War II period were provided to the new arrivals based on the assumption that immigrants from diverse European backgrounds were able to readily assimilate into the Australian society (DIMIA, 2003). However, the reality was that these immigrants faced great challenges being assimilated into the mainstream society. These challenges were highlighted by the general inequality, isolation and frustration experienced by the fast expanding body of immigrants whose first language was not English, as well as the high rate of settlers returning to their home countries, which amounted to 16% of all settlers from 1959 to 1965 (Pietsch et al., 2010).
Having found it unrealistic to expect immigrants to detach themselves from their original cultures and languages, in 1962 the Australian government issued the policy of integration to show their greater responsiveness to the diverse needs of immigrants. Migrants were still encouraged to incorporate themselves into the dominant Anglo-Celtic society, but the integration policy also showed the acceptance that these migrants have their rights and could integrate into the Australian society without losing their distinct national and cultural identities completely (DIMIA, 2003; Koleth, 2010).

As a further step towards supporting the languages and cultures of migrants, Zubrzycki raised the first concern in 1968 for “a modest commitment to cultural diversity through the maintenance of migrant languages and the development of studies in European cultures”, which was to promote group and individual interest “that are not in conflict with national interests” (cited in Martin, 1978, p. 55). By this stage, the languages and cultures of migrants were accepted and even fostered, which soon lead to the promotion of multiculturalism in the policy (Djité, 2011). Numerous community schools teaching European languages were initiated by local communities (Smith et al., 1993). However, the fostering was still confined within the ‘European cultures’. The incorporation of Asian cultures was not mentioned.

After the short period of integration policy (1962-1972), the fostering of multiculturalism emerged as a theme in social life and Australia’s language policy. Intensive discussions on the role of education institutions in a culturally diverse Australia were initiated amongst the public before the formal declaration of adopting multiculturalism in the official policy. Ignited by the Greek community and signed by 40 signatories from four states, the Statement on Immigrant Education, Cultures and Languages (1973) became the first manifesto by supporters of multiculturalism. Amongst other items, the statement demanded the teaching of migrant languages and cultures across the Australian education systems both in schools and in universities,
multicultural components in the training of all teachers, and the inclusion of the understanding and appreciation of multiculturalism in the curricula (Clyne, 2005).

Following these public calls for maintenance and planned teaching of migrant languages in schools, the Australian government policy framework started to shift from assimilation and integration towards promoting the cultural and linguistic diversity (Clyne, 2005). In 1977 the first official definition of multiculturalism was stated in *Australia as a multicultural society* as ‘cultural pluralism’ through maintaining that “government and established institutions acknowledge the validity of ethnic cultures and respond in terms of ethnic beliefs, values and customs” (cited in Koleth, 2010, p. 6). This statement was based on principles of social cohesion, equality of opportunities and cultural identity. It can be seen that the previous emphasis on social equity towards immigrants during the integration period had started to shift towards the mainstreaming of multiculturalism (Clyne, 2005).

The Galbally Report (Galbally, 1978) was considered as a watershed in the development of multicultural policy (Koleth, 2010). It examined the effectiveness of programs and services for migrants and addressed the various post-arrival issues faced by immigrants. For the first time multiculturalism was identified as a key concept for the future government immigration policy and an inherent component of Australian society, stating that “…ethnic identity…is interwoven into the fabric of our nationhood by the process of multicultural interaction” (Galbally, 1978, p. 104). This report adopted a formal statement against assimilation and integration by proposing the needs to value and to preserve the linguistic and cultural rights of minorities in Australia, and urged the government to instigate multicultural policies to encourage social harmony and enrichment within an ethnically diverse context (Galbally, 1978; Pietsch et al., 2010).

Adopting the recommendations of the Galbally Report, the Fraser government took initiatives to accommodate the needs of the migrants from diverse backgrounds via boosting new language services and existing assistance programs. Initiatives
included English language teaching, on-arrival accommodation and orientation assistance, interpreting and translating services, assistance with overseas qualification recognition, as well as establishment of multicultural resource centre to enable ethnic communities and voluntary agencies to cater to the welfare needs of migrants (DIMIA, 2003). In the 1989 policy *National Agenda for Multicultural Australia*, emphasis was once again put on the removal of barriers to access and equity for immigrants, mainly in areas of government services and programs, to reaffirm the government support on the availability of language resources (Pietsch et al., 2010).

Several reports were issued alongside the Galbally Report to dispel the public’s doubt about and elaborate the essence of the multicultural policy. Despite the efforts to promote multiculturalism by Federal and State governments during this period, public mind about the meaning of multiculturalism was noted as “widespread uncertainty” in the paper *Multiculturalism for all Australians: our developing nationhood* (ACPEA, 1982, p. 2). This paper tried to counter these public doubts about the relevance of multiculturalism to the nation as a whole, by interpreting multiculturalism as “much more than the provision of special services to minority ethnic groups”, but rather a “way of looking at Australian society” that “involves living together with an awareness of cultural diversity” (ACPEA, 1982, p. 17). Other than the existing three principles of multiculturalism formulated by the Australian Ethnic Affairs Council (AEAC) in 1977, namely social cohesion, cultural identity, and equality of opportunity and access, a fourth principle of “equal responsibility for, commitment to and participation in society” was added in the paper (ACPEA, 1982, p. 12). This added principle was to raise the public awareness that the success of multiculturalism in Australia does not only rely on the minority ethnic groups that are expected to integrate into the Australian society, but also relies on all Australians to understand, get involved and embrace other cultures (Koleth, 2010).
In 1986 the Jupp report *Review of Migrant and Multicultural Programs and Services*, it was further emphasised that though adjustments by immigrants were justified, changes on the Australian side as the host society were also necessary to provide broader access and equity for the cultural diversity (cited in DIMIA, 2003). These changes in Australian social life have altogether facilitated a series of pluralistic language policies. The promotion of languages used by non-English speakers mainly for considerations of social justice in a multicultural Australia further facilitated the teaching of Chinese and other LOTE across the education systems in Australia.

**Multicultural policy and the promotion of LOTE teaching**

Education was recognised as a key element in achieving the goal of multiculturalism set by Prime Minister Fraser, namely, to “give significant further encouragement to develop a multicultural attitude in Australian society” in order to “foster the retention of the cultural heritage of different ethnic groups and promote intercultural understanding” (Galbally, 1978, pp. 6-7). Therefore funding was committed to developing multiculturalism and community language education programs in schools. Special organisations, such as the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs (AIMA), were established to research into and provide advice on multicultural issues to the Commonwealth. Special services to ethnic communities were also funded, such as the Special Broadcasting Service (SBS). In the 1980s the State and Territory governments also committed to consolidating multicultural policies and institutions, establishing Ethnic Affairs Commissions and Migrant Settlement Councils following the recommendations in the Galbally Report (Koleth, 2010).

The language profile of community schools in Australia changed significantly since the influx of Asian migrants in the 1970s. Asian languages such as Vietnamese, Khmer and Lao, and various forms of the Chinese language, mainly Modern Standard Chinese (Mandarin) and Cantonese, added to the predominantly European languages in community schools (Smith et al., 1993). Supported by the increasing
proportion of well-educated professionals amongst Chinese immigrants, there were renewed efforts to re-establish existing, but diminished Chinese community schools. As a result, by the 1980s, Chinese schools had been established in all major population centres (Smith et al., 1993).

Ethnic schools, including those operated within the Chinese community, started to receive funding from the Australian government beginning in 1981 (Smith et al., 1993). Having gained official support is a significant breakthrough for the development of Chinese teaching in Australia, which have historically been self-reliant and, therefore, subject to unstable development. Since the late 1980s, the rapidly expanding new migrants from mainland China had brought new ideas and resources to the local community schools of Chinese. Xinjinshan School of Chinese in Melbourne, which is the largest Chinese community school in Australia, is a typical example of innovative community schools of Chinese run by a group of teachers, educational administrators and community leaders who mostly migrated from China and have received higher education degrees (see Sun, 2007).

In line with the revitalisation of the (Chinese) community schools, the teaching of Asian language and culture, including Chinese, began to be widely incorporated into the mainstream education system since the 1970s. The study of Chinese language and literature in Australia, similar to the situation in the United States and United Kingdom, was first established as part of humanities and social science research at the university level, prior to being introduced into the schools system.

At the tertiary level, Chinese courses was introduced to Australia at a relatively later stage than in European and North America. In 1939 only three institutions (University of Melbourne, University of Sydney, and Royal Military College, Duntroon) offered Chinese courses (C. Zhang & Chen, 1994). There was no significant government initiative to promote the study of Asia until in the 1950s when events in Southeast Asia began to cause concern in Australia (S. FitzGerald, 1980). The first government move was in 1953 when the Commonwealth
government sponsored the establishment of the School of Oriental Languages at the Canberra University College (now the Faculty of Asian Studies of Australian National University), as a “real move” towards training Asian languages and cultures at undergraduate level in order to produce Australia’s own scholars in these fields (Auchmuty, 1970, p. 38). Initially the School offered courses in Chinese, Japanese and Asian Civilisation. Later Indonesian studies were set up in the Universities of Melbourne, Sydney and in the Canberra University College due to further Commonwealth initiatives (Auchmuty, 1970). As a result of this initiative, by the 1960s, both language departments and social science departments have included the study of Asian, in established universities and newly opened institutions. In 1988 nine universities and four colleges offered Chinese courses nationwide, and by 1992 the number increased to 23 higher education institutions (Smith et al., 1993).

Similar to the other English speaking countries, the development of reading skills and the study of literature were traditionally the focus of language study in Australian universities. Since the 1960s increasing emphasis had been put on the oral and written communication skills of language study, as well as the necessity to relate languages, especially those traditionally unfamiliar to Australia, with the societies and values of its people. This is to increase the usefulness of learning the language to a greater range of student ability (Auchmuty, 1970). The four major reports on Asian studies in Australian higher education by Auchmuty (1970), S. FitzGerald (1980), Ingleson (1989), and J. FitzGerald et al. (2002), increasingly emphasised the importance of adding pragmatic Asian related courses in university students’ study to broaden their career opportunities in the growing market with Asian countries.

At school level, as an Asian language, Chinese was introduced much later than Japanese and Indonesian in Australia. According to S. FitzGerald (1980), around 1918 the first Asian language course, Japanese, was established in a secondary school. However the teaching of other Asian languages in Australian schools had been scarce. It was not until the 1960s that secondary schools in all States had
introduced Asian languages, and during the 1970s that some States provided a second Asian language in schools, typically a combination of Indonesian and Japanese. Also, Asian elements began to be combined in some history and geography courses at pre-matriculation level since the 1970s. By 1980, Indonesian and Japanese had been introduced widely in schools, however, the teaching of Chinese was “on a more limited scale in most States” (S. FitzGerald, 1980, p. 6).

The issue of Australia’s first national language policy National Policy on Languages (NPL) in 1987 marked the official provision of LOTE, including Chinese, in Australian schools. In NPL, languages were respected as an important cultural resource, and a highly diverse range of languages and cultures in Australia were identified as key characteristic contributing to the multilingual and multicultural society of Australia (Hatoss, 2005). “A Language Other Than English for all” (Lo Bianco, 1987, p. 120) was recommended in NPL for a wide range of reasons: to boost national consciousness, social justice, educational equity, long-term economic strategy and personal satisfaction in the country (Lo Bianco, 1990, 2003). Nine ‘languages of wider teaching’, which had comprehensive importance to Australia, were considered representatives of second language teaching in Australia, including four Asian languages (Arabic, Modern Standard Chinese, Indonesian/Malay, and Japanese) and five European languages (French, German, Modern Greek, Italian, and Spanish). An Australian Second Language Learning Program was recommended in NPL to be established by the Commonwealth Schools Commission to implement the teaching of LOTE in Australian schools (Lo Bianco, 1987), and it was funded with 7.5 million dollars each year from 1987 to 1990 (DEET, 1990).

In the immediate years following the recommendations of NPL, the enrolment of Chinese students in Australian schools experienced significant growth. In 1988, there were 11,295 enrolments in primary and secondary schools, and by 1991, the number more than doubled to 25,500. The increase rate in primary section was significant, at a rate of 440% across the states, while in secondary schools the rate
was relatively moderate at 52% (Smith et al., 1993). The rapid expansion of Chinese enrolment in primary section demonstrated the Australian government’s determination to widely introduce Chinese to Australian students in the late 1980s.

The official initiatives promoting Chinese language teaching in Australian schools was accompanied by an explicit support of preparing registered Chinese language teachers in national teacher education institutions. The NPL argued that teacher education was a significant site to realise the goal of providing one of the nine ‘languages of wider teaching’ for all Australian students, given that the existing supply of language teachers could not support universal language study. It was proposed in NPL that “funds are to be allocated to stimulate specific initiatives” in “teacher education institutions to address the teacher education proposals…for teachers of languages other than English” (Lo Bianco, 1987, p. 199). Following the proposition in NPL, the per-service education of Chinese language teachers, together with teachers of other newly supported languages, have started to be widely introduced into the teacher education institutions in Australia since the early 1990s.

The Prioritisation period (1991-present)

*Australia’s intensifying economic relationship with China*

Australia witnessed a steady and substantial increase of Asian migrants, especially those from China, over the past two decades. Currently China, and some other Asian countries, had again become a major source of immigration in Australia. During the calendar years 2010-2011, for the first time in Australia’s history, migrants from China (excluding SARs and Taiwan) overtook the traditionally dominant number of British settlers and became the single largest source of Australia's overseas-born population, at an annual number of 29,397 (DIAC, 2011a). In the latest 2011 census, the population from China (excluding SARs and Taiwan) numbered 319,000, making up 6.0% of the total overseas-born population in Australia. Settlers from
mainland China currently form the third largest ethnic group in Australia, ranked after those from United Kingdom (20.8%) and New Zealand (9.1%), and was followed by those from India (5.6%) and Italy (3.5%). Population from Vietnam, Philippines and Malaysia also started to emerge as significant component of the overseas-born population, taking a percentage of 3.5%, 3.2% and 2.2% respectively. Migrants from other traditional source countries in Europe, mainly Italy, Germany, and Greece, and a wide range of other source countries, altogether take up approximately 40% of the overseas-born population in Australia (ABS, 2011b).

Australia’s economy has enjoyed growing benefits interacting with the Chinese and other Asian population, particularly in the international education and trade areas. International education is currently Australia’s third largest export industry, contributing $16.3 billion in 2010-2011 to the Australian economy (AEI, 2012). International students from China and other Asian countries take a significant proportion in each of the education sectors\(^7\), with China being overall the largest shareholder across the education systems. According to ABS (2011a), in the Higher Education sector, which has the largest volume of international student enrolment, students from China comprised a dominant proportion (40.6%) of the enrolments, followed by students from Malaysia (7.6%). In the VET sector, which ranked second by volume of enrolments and commencements, India and China took the largest proportion, at a share of 23.2% and 11.0% each. In the third largest sector ELICOS, China again took the largest market, with 24.4% share of enrolments. In the fourth largest sector in schools, students from Asian countries contributed 87% of overseas students’ enrolments, with 44.5% being from China. Lastly in other courses such as

---

\(^7\) ABS (2011a) classified international students in Australia into five sectors. These are: 1) Higher Education - undergraduate and postgraduate university students; 2) Vocational - Technical and Further Education (TAFE) and related students; 3) School - kindergarten, primary, secondary (junior and senior) students; 4) English Language Intensive Courses for Overseas Students (ELICOS) - English language intensive students; and 5) Other - courses outside the above categories, e.g. foundation courses, non-award and enabling courses.
exchange and foundation programs, China and USA share the largest proportion of enrolments, with 25.7% and 21.9% respectively.

In the past, international students holding matriculation score or a degree granted in China were rarely acknowledged by an Australian education institution, which posed certain difficulties for the intending Chinese students to study in Australia. In April 2011 the *Arrangement on Higher Education Qualifications Recognition between the Government of Australia and the Government of the People’s Republic of China* (Henceforth *Arrangement*) (AEI, 2011) was signed. The purpose of this *Arrangement* is to “establish a mechanism to promote cooperative activities in education and to improve student and professional mobility between Australia and China” (p. 2). This *Arrangement* is expected to facilitate an increasing volume of international students from China to study in Australia, especially in Higher Education sector, in the foreseen future.

Apart from international education, Australia’s geographic location in the Asia-Pacific region means that its trade relations have also been increasingly reliant on its neighbouring Asian countries. As recorded in Auchmuty (1970), in 1949-1950 only 15% of Australia’s export value was attributed to Asian countries, while a heavy proportion of 60% went to the United Kingdom and 8% to the United States. By 1969-1970 the proportion to the United Kingdom and Europe dropped significantly to 25%, while the United States’ share moderately increased to 14%, and Asian countries’ share almost tripled (41%), with Japan alone taking up 25% of Australia’s total export values.

Statistics about Australia’s direction of trade over the years from 1993 to 2010 provided by Asia Studies (2012a) showed a more obvious shift towards Asian countries. Among the top 10 importers of Australia’s commodities in 2010, seven of them were Asian countries, taking up approximately 66.57% of the total export value. In 2010, China and Japan became the two most significant importers of Australian products (25.08% and 18.92% respectively), followed by R. Korea (8.89%) and
India (7.10%). Meanwhile, over the years from 1993 to 2010, export value to the other three non-Asian countries on the top 10 list, the United States, New Zealand and the United Kingdom, had dropped from 18.30% in 1993 to 11.63% in 2010.

In 1993, the annual value (unit: million US Dollars/Calendar year) of exports to Japan (10,466 units), which was traditionally Australia’s largest trade partner in Asia, took an overwhelming proportion (24.56%) of the total amount of the export value (42,610 units). Meanwhile China only took up around 3.62% (1,541 units) of the total value, ranked 7 after Japan, the United States (8.00%), R. Korea (6.85%), New Zealand (5.80%), Singapore (5.25%) and the United Kingdom (4.49%). The export value to China increased at a slow and unstable pace from 1993 on until after China joined the World Trade Organisation (WTO) in 2001. Since then this value had expanded steadily to almost 7 times, from 3,904 units (6.15%) in 2001 to 27,068 units (14.58%) in 2008. When the import value from Japan started to fluctuate downwards since 2008, China surpassed Japan in 2009 with a value of 33,499 units (21.79%) and took a further leap in 2010 to 53,122 units (25.08%).

Similarly, as to Australia’s top 10 suppliers of trades in 2010, six were Asian countries. In 1993 the United States and Japan took a significant large share of the value at 10,047 units (21.50%) and 8,894 units (19.03%) respectively, followed by Germany (5.77%), the United Kingdom (5.69%) and New Zealand (4.87%). In 1993 imports from China ranked 6 with a value of 2,185 units (4.68%). China’s share increased steadily over the years and became Australia’s largest import partner in 2006 (14.37%). By 2010 China had taken the largest proportion of Australia’s imports at 18.60%, followed by the United States (11.01%), Japan (8.59%), Thailand (5.19%), Singapore (5.03%), and Germany (4.96%).

It can be seen that since Asia’s overall booming economy in the 1970s, Australia has seen strengthening economic ties with Asian countries. This shifting situation calls for increased numbers of Australians who are familiar with the Asian culture norms and can speak some Asian languages. This market demand for Asian literacy has
driven Australian researchers and authorities to emphasise the importance of teaching Asian languages in the education systems in a series of language reports and policies. Accordingly, the prioritisation of ‘strategically important’ Asian languages based on merely trade volume has been gradually highlighted in the recent two decades’ language policies in Australia (Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2009b).

**An economic rationale for Chinese teaching**

Due to the “fluctuations in the political climate” (Lo Bianco, 1997, p. 64) in Australia, there are always shifts in focus of the language policies as to which of the numerous languages should be supported. The priority funding area of the national language policy has experienced transition from the language diversity and multicultural imperatives in the 1980s, to solo English language and literacy plus several strategically important Asian languages economic-wise since then (Ozolins, 2004). Chinese language, due to the strengthening economic ties between Australia and the Chinese speaking countries/regions, gradually gained great attention in Australia’s language policies.

In the Dawkins Report ‘*Australian Language and Literacy Policy (ALLP)*’ (DEET, 1991), English language and literacy was set as the primary goal to be taught in the education systems. Languages of immigrants were still claimed to be important resources for Australia, but as can be seen from its funding schedule, financial commitment for LOTEs was approximately only one tenth of the funding for English as Second Language (ESL). Moreover, considering the “wide range of language groups represented” in Australia’s community and “limits of resources that are available”, “some selections” were considered “inevitable” to “strike a balance” between these two factors, and further guide the government’s efforts in “curriculum development, teacher training and resource allocation” (DEET, 1991, p. 25). It was noted that “the balanced approach between the social, economic, and cultural”
rationale listed in the NPL was giving way to “a strong emphasis on short-term economic goals” in ALLP (Clyne, 2005, p. 155).

ALLP decided to give priority attention only to “languages of broader national interest to Australia” (DEET, 1991, p. 25), which especially referred to the economic benefits gained through overseas trade in the Asia-Pacific region. Fourteen languages were prioritised in ALLP for widespread teaching, including Aboriginal languages, traditionally influential European languages (French, German, Italian, Modern Greek, Russian, and Spanish) and some Asian languages demonstrating increasing importance to Australia economic-wise (Arabic, Chinese, Indonesian, Japanese, Korean, Thai and Vietnamese). Each State was required to choose eight from these fourteen languages for teaching, and only three Asian languages – Japanese, Indonesian and Chinese - were prioritised in all States and Territories.

In 1994, COAG issued a report Asian Languages and Australia’s Economic Future (commonly referred to as Rudd report). It highlighted the growing importance of the languages of strategically important Asian countries due to the economic rise of these countries. The Rudd Report initiated the NALSAS Strategy, an 8-year cohort (1994-2002) that had gained cooperative support from the Commonwealth, State and Territory governments. It explicitly supported the teaching of four key Asian languages in Australia: Chinese, Japanese, Indonesian and Korean. NALSAS aimed for 60% of all Year 10 students to be studying one of the four priority Asian languages by 2004. At the same time, 25% students in Year 12 should still be learning a LOTE and 15% studying an Asian priority language.

This initiative demonstrated a tendency of narrowing the government’s support onto several Asian languages justified by their ‘economic rationalism’ in the process of Australia’s active engagement with Asia; although traditional European languages and indigenous languages that were equally important components of Australia’s multicultural society were excluded from this enduring initiative. The focus on mainstreaming and prioritising Asian language studies is seen as the pragmatic way
to promote national interests due to geopolitical, economic, demographic, educational and cultural concerns (G. Liu & Lo Bianco, 2007).

Through the NALSAS Strategy, the government provided over $208 million to support the education and research of the four Asian languages over eight years, and an extra annual grant of $1.2 million for the Asia Education Foundation (AEF). Funding supported the studies of Asia across all curriculum areas, especially in English, mathematics, science and history (ACARE, 2013), as well as the new curriculum resources, professional development and research related with the four languages. This support brought Asian languages from being the marginalised subjects into one of the most widely taught subjects across the education systems. For example, the ratio of Japanese course enrolment to the total students in Australia had been the highest among the world for years, as a direct result of Australia’s lasting economic relationship with Japan, despite Japanese being a relatively minor ethnic and linguistic community, numerically, in the country (Lo Bianco & Liu, 2007).

In 2007, the Australian Labor Party’s leader Kevin Rudd, who had prepared the 1994 Rudd Report, became the Prime Minister of Australia, and the first fluent Mandarin Chinese speaker amongst leaders of western countries. The NALSSP (2008-2012) project was launched as a continuation of the NALSAS Strategy, which was not further supported by the governing Liberal government during 2002 to 2007 when the funding drained out. The NALSSP initiative further devoted over $62 million to the promotion of the four Asian languages on a similar agenda to the NALSAS Strategy, to support the teaching, teacher education and research of the four key Asian languages. In NALSSP, 12% of Year 12 students were expected to achieve sufficient fluency in the targeted languages to engage in trade and commerce in Asia and/or university study. Also included was the focus to ensure an increased and maintained supply of quality Asian languages teachers.
Chinese language has demonstrated growing importance in Australia. Domestically it is used by one of the largest ethnic groups and is an important component of the multicultural society of Australia. Internationally, it is currently used by Australia’s largest trade partner. The Australian government has devoted decades of efforts promoting and prioritising Chinese teaching and teacher education in the country. Australia’s explicit official supports of Chinese, and the teaching of other LOTE, through the issue of a series of language policies, are leading among the English speaking countries. Australia also precedes other English speaking countries in the provision of Chinese courses across the school system in the late 1980s, and the incorporation of CLTE Programs in national teacher education institutions since then.

**The professionalisation of Chinese language teachers**

The workforce of Chinese teachers in Australia, in line with the global tendencies as discussed in Chapter 2, witnessed a trend of professionalisation along with the development of Chinese teaching. When Chinese teaching was constrained with the Chinese community schools before 1987, the teaching activities and teacher supply lacked strict criteria and regulations. The complicated structure of Chinese community also posed great challenges for regulating teaching content, school syllabus and qualification of teachers. Such issues were not exclusive to Australia, but were common concerns with Chinese community schools in migrant countries such as the United States and Canada, influenced by similar pattern of Chinese migration in these countries after World War II (Lin, 1998).

The composition of Chinese communities in Australia has always been and is increasingly diversified. The majority of Chinese immigrants in Australia since the 1960s came from Hong Kong, Taiwan, Singapore, Malaysia, Vietnam, and later from mainland China since the 1980s. Their migration was closely influenced by Australia’s forming multicultural policy and the political and economic events in their home country. According to S. Chen and Zhang (2014), in the 1970s, over
60,000 international students from Malaysia who used to study in Australia were allowed to return Australia with their family, and the majority of them were Malaysian Chinese. Around 1980, after the Vietnam War over 60,000 Indo-Chinese refugees were accepted by the Australian government, where over 60% of them were Chinese. In 1989, the students’ democratic movement in Beijing (Tiananmen Incident) resulted in taking in approximately 40,000 Chinese students and their families as migrants by the Australian government. The pressure of the handover of Hong Kong from Britain to PRC trigged another wave of Chinese migrants from Hong Kong to Australia before 1997. In the 21st century, rapidly increasing numbers of migrants from mainland China have arrived in Australia for education, business and cultural exchanges.

Consequently, the Chinese community in Australia consists of a number of sub-groups who are of Chinese ancestry and speak some form(s) of Chinese language (DIAC, 2006). The linguistic background and proficiency of Chinese migrants are very complicated, depending on where and when they migrated to Australia. The earliest settlers were mainly from the south-eastern coastal provinces of mainland China. These settlers, together with those from Hong Kong and Taiwan after the 1960s, often speak a southern Chinese dialect such as Cantonese (Guangdong Hua), Hokkien (Fulao Hua), Hakka (Kejia Hua) and Teochew (Chaozhou Hua). They might also speak Mandarin but prefer using traditional Chinese characters. Chinese migrants from other Asian countries are diversified in spoken and written forms of Chinese as well. For example, Chinese-Singaporeans speak Mandarin (Huayu) and use simplified Chinese characters; while Chinese-Taiwanese speak Mandarin (Guoyu) and use traditional Chinese characters. Newly arrived migrants from mainland China generally use Modern Standard Chinese (Putonghua) as speech form and use simplified Chinese characters; while younger migrants from Hong Kong experience a shift from Cantonese and traditional characters into Morden Standard Chinese and simplified characters due to the hand over to PRC in 1997. A profile of
the distribution and use of Chinese languages in Australia over the period from 1996 through 2006 are provided in Appendix 6.

The complicated language usages lead to diversified and unregulated content for teaching and learning of Chinese languages in the cultural context of Australia. Numerous Chinese community schools were operated through various Chinese sub-groups in Australia. These immigrants used different forms of speech and writing depending on the official form adopted in their homeland or the form used in their hometown. Because China has been enjoying a rising status in the global stage after its economic reform starting in the late 1970s, the Australian government designated the speech and written form used in China as the norm of Chinese teaching in its mainstream education system in 1987 (Clyne & Kipp, 1997). As a result, many community schools faced challenges during the transition of teaching contents and teachers’ knowledge base. Currently, many students from a Chinese background tend to learn Mandarin at school and speak one or more forms of Chinese dialects at home. A significant proportion of the written Chinese that the students in Australia encounter with in daily life are still published in traditional Chinese characters, such as newspapers, posters, advertisement, restaurant menus etc. Therefore, in the community schools, as well as the mainstream schools, it is regulated that the student to be able to recognise the traditional characters in addition to mastering all linguistic aspects of simplified Chinese characters.

Moreover, there was no formal state-wide syllabus for Chinese teaching in the community schools before the Australian governments’ involvement. The schools usually used textbooks imported from the origin country, or materials compiled by the teachers. Therefore, the content of language and culture was completely reliant on the teaching materials available at that time and the knowledge of available teachers of Chinese in the communities. For instance, in Melbourne, a cluster of Chinese language schools were organized and sponsored by the Taiwanese Committee of Overseas Chinese before Australia established diplomatic relations.
with PRC. The Chinese Association of Victoria, consisting of migrants from Singapore and Malaysia, followed the syllabus issued by Singapore government. Obviously, in addition to the linguistic variations of the ‘Chinese language’, the cultural content also differed within various sub-groups. Without a definite syllabus, both language and culture were left in the hands of individual teachers (S. Chen & Zhang, 2014).

Chinese teachers in the community schools usually did not receive professional training to teach Chinese. Compared with the earlier coolies during the Gold Rush, the newer Chinese migrants in Australia have reached much higher rate of literacy, many of them being international students holding higher education degrees from domestic and/or Australia universities. These migrants were generally considered by the schools and parents as qualified Chinese teachers. Therefore many of the migrants with an academic background in a variety of disciplines were employed. The teachers, who were from diverse background, could have formed distinctively different perspectives of Chinese language and culture, and their educational experiences could have developed diverse perspectives and approaches of teaching. Without a state-wide syllabus and standard of assessment, the teaching content and teaching methods in the community schools were not regulated and could be individualised to a large extent.

The achievement of official support in Chinese teaching and its teacher supply in Chinese community schools since 1981 and in mainstream schools since 1987 is significant. In addition to on-going in-service training provided to practicing Chinese teachers, contemporarily the status of Australia’s pre-service CLTE Programs is significant and rare in the English speaking countries. Through examination of the 2012 online program handbooks of the 39 universities in Australia, an outline of the pre-service CLTE Programs in Australia can be sketched. Amongst the 39 HEIs, 36 offered Chinese related courses in a variety of disciplines. Chinese is commonly provided as a major or minor in Bachelor of Arts, and combined with degrees in, for
example, business, commerce, science, medicine, laws, international studies, translation and interpretation. Twenty-four universities in Australia combined the study of Chinese with education, where student teachers studying for educational degrees could enlist Chinese as one of their teaching specialities and can work as registered Chinese teachers after graduation. The name of universities and degrees offered in their CLTE Programs are listed in the following Table 3.2:

Table 3.2: Universities offering pre-service CLTE Programs in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name of University</th>
<th>Degrees offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales (6)</td>
<td>Macquarie University</td>
<td>BA/DipEd; BA/BEd(Prim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University of New England</td>
<td>BA/BTch(Sec); Grad DipEd; MTch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University of New South Wales</td>
<td>BA/BEd(Sec); MTch (Sec); Grad DipEd (Sec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University of Newcastle</td>
<td>BA/BTch; MTch (Sec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University of Sydney</td>
<td>BEd (Sec)/BA; MTch(Sec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Western Sydney</td>
<td>BA/MTch (Prim); BA/MTch (Sec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria (6)</td>
<td>Deakin University</td>
<td>BEd (Prim); BTch(Sec)/BA; MEd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
<td>BA/BEd(Sec); Grad DipEd; MTch(P-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>BA/BEd(Sec); MEd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMIT University</td>
<td>BEd (Prim); Grad DipEd(Sec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>Specialist Certificate in Chinese Language Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria University</td>
<td>Grad DipEd(Sec)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland (5)</td>
<td>James Cook University</td>
<td>BEd/Bachelor of Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queensland University of Technology</td>
<td>BEd(Prim); BEd(Sec); Grad DipEd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Degrees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Queensland</td>
<td>BA/BEd(Sec); Grad DipEd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Queensland</td>
<td>BEd(Sec)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the Sunshine Coast</td>
<td>Grad DipEd(Sec)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Flinders University of South Australia</td>
<td>BEd(Prim)/BA; BEd(Sec)/BA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Adelaide</td>
<td>BTch(Sec)/BA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtin University of Technology</td>
<td>BEd(Sec); Grad DipEd(Sec)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
<td>BA/BEd; MTch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia Capital Territory (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Australian National University</td>
<td>Bachelor of Asia-Pacific Studies/Bachelor of Education(Secondary Teaching)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Canberra</td>
<td>BEd(Sec)/BA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
<td>Graduate Diploma in Language Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pre-service education of Chinese language teachers in Australia, as well as those in the HEIs in the United States, is one division of second language teacher education. It generally follows the framework of teacher education in Western countries, which so far is largely based on the Teachers' Knowledge Base (TKB) proposed by Shulman (1987) to interpret the relationship among the elements of the curriculum (Walker et al., 1995). Based on Shulman (1987), seven aspects of knowledge were considered as necessary for teachers of any subjects:

1. Content knowledge, or knowledge of subject matter, including understandings of the facts, concepts and structures of the subject;
2. General pedagogical knowledge, which are general instructions and guidance of teaching principles and strategies in the classroom;
3. Curriculum knowledge, which provide an understanding of one single lesson of the subject and its sequential role in the overall curriculum;

4. Pedagogical content knowledge, where specific subject teaching methodology is provided;

5. Knowledge of learners and their characteristics, which need to be gained through studies of student characteristics, cognitive capability, learning styles etc., as well as the close observation during practice teaching;

6. Knowledge of educational context, including the features of the system operation of the office, school, community, and the broader society; and

7. Knowledge of education ends, purposes and values, and their philosophical and historical grounds, which have peculiar features in different countries

Shulman's seven aspects of teachers' knowledge were summarised by Grossman et al. (1989) into four components, which could succinctly represent the criteria of developing the knowledge based of Chinese teachers prepared in Australia’s national teacher education institutions:

1. Subject matter knowledge (Chinese courses), which in the case of Chinese teaching, means Chinese teachers need to reach satisfactory level of proficiency in Chinese language and understanding in Chinese culture;

2. General pedagogical knowledge (Education Foundation Courses), which means Chinese teachers need to understand the learners, who are the centre of the teaching, in terms of their learning motive and goals, individual features and learning style;

3. Knowledge of context (Professional Studies), which means Chinese teachers need to understand the education systems, regulation, standards and the local and national sociocultural context for Chinese teaching in the overseas country; and

4. Pedagogical content knowledge (Specialist Studies), which means Chinese teachers need to apply appropriate teaching strategies to deliver the subject matter knowledge effectively to the students and accommodate both the students’ individual needs and the educational goals of promoting Chinese language education the country.

The regulation of Chinese teaching and teacher education in Australia also witnessed a process of collaboration among states towards national standards. Each state used to design their own Chinese syllabus and curriculum for schools across the state,
while in 2011 a national curriculum *The Shape of the Australian Curriculum: Languages* was issued to guide the teaching of LOTE in Australia (Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority, 2011). Similarly, graduates of CLTE Programs in each state of Australia used to be assessed and certified against professional standards issued by state teacher institutions. Since 2010, the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) started to work collaboratively across jurisdictions and provided a set of national professional standards for (Chinese) teachers (AITSL, 2011).

The process of professionalisation of Chinese teachers in Australia, similar to the nationwide teaching of Chinese, is a combined result of both domestic and international influences. The official attention on Chinese teaching called for greater support of improving Chinese teachers’ professional capacities to develop teaching resources and deliver quality teaching. Meanwhile, the development of teacher education modes, from the traditional craft model to scientific model and further to contemporary reflective model, demonstrated the trend of professionalisation of the whole teacher workforce in the international context (S. Chen & Sit, 2010). The preparation of Chinese teachers in Australia thus abides by some international framework of teacher education, and influenced by its sociocultural context, has its distinct features and challenges, which will be further explored in the next two chapters.

**Summary and conclusion**

The historical review of Australia’s language policies presented in this chapter illustrates a gradual but intensifying trend amongst the Australian Commonwealth government, and Australia’s State and Territory governments, of acknowledging the importance of Asian languages. Compared to some traditional and widely taught European languages, several Asian languages used by Australia’s increasingly important trade partners have been allocated increased financial support.
Two significant factors can be identified to have contributed to the shifts in Australia’s language policy. The first factor is the changing international context. Located in the Asian Pacific region, Australia’s economy, along with other aspects of its national affairs (e.g. security), has been increasingly reliant on the economic development of its regional Asian neighbours rather than its traditional European partners. Understanding the languages and cultures of major Asian economic powers has, as a consequence, been directly linked to the national benefits of Australia. The shifting multicultural and language policies demonstrate the Australian government’s awareness of and response to these conditions.

Secondly, in the Australian domestic context, there has been a parallel increase in the need for teaching and learning Asian languages in Australian schools as a direct result of the changing composition of Australian migrants, and a heightened acknowledgement of the demographic composition of the Australian population, in formal policies. Since the early 1970s the government has been under pressure from local communities, which have well established and articulated expectations for support for community languages, and so for Asian language education. Government policy driven by perceived economic imperatives, combined with community demands for linguistic and cultural recognition, promoted the teaching and learning of Asian languages in two types of schools: weekend community schools of languages and regular, mainstream schools. The development of teaching and teacher education of Chinese (Mandarin), as one of the priority Asian languages in 1991, is a clear indicator of the changed context, underscored by the Australian government’s language policies and the local communities’ expectations.

Chapter 4 will explore how the governments’ identified policy priority of Asian language for economic reasons has been interpreted and implemented in the Chinese teacher education programs within Australia’s sociocultural context.
CHAPTER 4: THE INSTITUTIONAL PRACTICES

Introduction

Based on the review of Australia’s sociocultural context for Chinese teaching and teacher education at national level in Chapter 3, this chapter responds partly to research sub-question 3. What are the major factors influencing the discrepancy between policy goals and outcomes of the CLTE Programs in Australian universities? This chapter sets out, and begins the examination of CLTE Programs in three case-study Universities of the Australian State of New South Wales. Multiple sources of data are drawn for analysis, including interview data of teacher educators, student teachers and graduates of the three case-study Universities (Appendencies 2, 3, 4 and 5), as well as a review of relevant policies, initiatives, language reports and program handbooks related with the investigated CLTE Programs (Appendices 7, 8 and 9).

This chapter focuses on exploring how government policies have been interpreted and implemented at the institutional levels since the 1970s, and the onset of Australia’s multicultural policy. From a thematic analysis of interview data, three factors are identified as the major considerations of Chinese language teacher educators when designing and implementing the curriculum, which will be explored in this chapter: 1) the source of student teachers; 2) financial incentives and education resources; and 3) job market needs. The chapter concludes by considering how these factors relate to, and reflect, Australia’s sociocultural context for Chinese teaching and teacher education.

The source of student teachers

Distinctive CLTE curricula in the 1990s

In the broad context of national incentives for incorporating a Chinese component into existing LOTE teacher education programs, the CLTE Programs was introduced
in the three case-study Universities at different stages throughout the 1980s to the 1990s. The different stages of introducing the CLTE Programs were largely based on regional demands for Chinese teaching, which further depended on the proportion of Chinese speaking population in the region and the extent of government promotion of Chinese teaching in local schools.

The source of student teachers for the CLTE Programs has been a major consideration in conceptualising the CLTE Programs’ curriculum content and structure. To a significant extent it reflects the demographic structure in the regions where the case-study universities are located. In this study, the three case-study Universities are coded as U1, U2, and U3, while the three regions they are located in are coded as Region 1, Region 2 and Region 3 respectively. The demographic details of the three regions that the case-study Universities are located in, including language use, are listed in the following Table 4.1:

Table 4.1 Demographic structure and use of languages in the three Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Area* (km²)</th>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>English only</th>
<th>Chinese at home</th>
<th>Mandarin</th>
<th>Cantonese</th>
<th>Other Chinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12367.7</td>
<td>4,391,674</td>
<td>2,732,446 (62.2%)</td>
<td>283,969 (6.5%)</td>
<td>133,887</td>
<td>132,136</td>
<td>17,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>19092.8</td>
<td>138,388</td>
<td>128,423 (92.8%)</td>
<td>426 (0.3%)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>58967.3</td>
<td>144,887</td>
<td>134,353 (92.7%)</td>
<td>588 (0.41%)</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011 Census (ABS, 2011b)

*Region is divided by Commonwealth Electoral Division

Based on statistics of the distribution of Chinese speakers in Australia (Appendix 6), it can be seen that 47.2% of Australia’s Chinese speaking population live in NSW; while over 96% of the State’s Chinese speaking residents are concentrated in Region 1 (ABS, 2006). Table 4.1 also shows that in Region 1, 6.5% of the local population speak Chinese languages at home, in comparison with an average of 3.0% nationwide (ABS, 2011b). The strong presence of Chinese speaking population in
Region 1 has created stronger demand for Chinese teaching than anywhere else in the State. This is reflected in the fact that, according to TE1b, the CLTE Program in U1 has long existed prior to the ones in other teacher education institutions in the State. It was initially provided through a Teachers College, where all registered teachers in the State were prepared. After several amalgamations since the 1980s, this Teachers College eventually became part of the School of Education in U1 in the early 1990s. It is not clear when exactly the CLTE Program was started; however, given the short history of official support for Chinese teaching in NSW, it is very likely related to the Federal government’s initial support of Chinese teaching in community schools in 1981. TE1b recalled when she was a student teacher in this Teachers College in the early 1980s, there had already been steady enrolments of approximately 15 student teachers in Chinese teaching per year.

In Region 2 where U2 is located, locally-driven demand for Chinese teaching has been small. With the growth of Chinese migrants in the region, and especially international students from China enrolled in U2 in recent years, as shown in Table 4.1, the Chinese speaking population still accounted for just 0.3% of the local population in 2011. The vast majority of the population only speak English at home. According to TE2, prior to government promotion, there was no Chinese teaching at school nor tertiary level in Region 2. The establishment of the CLTE Program in 1991 thus demonstrated a direct link with the recommendations of offering LOTE in Australian schools in NPL. Following the steady enrolments of Indonesian and Japanese language programs in NSW (see S. FitzGerald, 1980, pp. 46-47), the State government’s intention in continuing to promote Chinese teaching as a representative Asian language in Region 2 resulted in a coordinated plan to introduce the CLTE Program in U2. As TE2 explained:

> The reason the university has this Chinese teacher education program is because NSW Department of Education wished to promote the Asian language teaching in NSW schools. In the past, NSW had made a good move in Japanese language teaching.
However, in comparison with Victoria, the State schools do not have many Chinese teaching programs. So the government believes it’s a good idea to start Chinese language in this region. So they were providing the resource and money to the university. The university considered this proposal and decided to start its first Chinese language teacher training program. (TE2)

In Region 3, the population density is very low. In order to overcome geographic hindrances, U3 has been renowned for its innovation in providing distance education since the 1940s to students in the region, across the country and even overseas. Striving to become a comprehensive university, a growing range of discipline studies have been introduced over the years. With respect to languages, French, German, Italian, Japanese and Indonesian, as the well-established languages across Australia prior to the 1990s, have been gradually incorporated across the discipline areas in U3, including its teacher education programs. A Chinese component was introduced in the late 1990s. According to TE3, though Chinese teaching in local schools remains on a minimum scale, the provision of Chinese was mainly to cater for Australian public’s needs of learning. Their interest in Chinese presumably stemmed from the national attention on Asian studies since the 1970s and official promotion of Chinese across the education system since 1987. As TE3 commented:

[Chinese has been taught in this university for] maybe 10 or 15 years, not as long as French and German. Italian is newer, Japanese is newer, Indonesian is newer... [Chinese was introduced] because people wanted to learn it. It was one of the subjects people want to learn. And every university has French and German, so this university wanted to be seen as a real university with a variety of subjects. (TE3)

As with any University program, the characteristics of the student cohort, and their particular demographic features, impact on the design of the curriculum. In Region 1 where Chinese migrants in the State are concentrated, the CLTE Program at U1 witnessed a high level of native Chinese speakers throughout the 1990s, who were usually first-generation migrants. As TE1a recalled:
I remember when I worked in the program [from 1991 to around 1998], there were over 20 student teachers each year. Most of them came from mainland China and Taiwan. Maybe only one or two were English speaking Australians. (TE1a)

Orton (2008) reported a dominance of native Chinese speakers amongst Chinese language teachers in Australia nationwide, particularly in capital cities where Chinese migrants tend to concentrate. A common view about why native Chinese speakers are interested in teaching Chinese can be illustrated by G2a’s explanation of their motivations to enrol in the CLTE Programs:

At that time, Australia didn’t acknowledge a Chinese degree. Even with my higher education degree and ESL teaching experience in China, I can’t teach here unless I gain another degree in local universities...I did some labour work here and there for five or so years before I gained permanent residence in 1995. I am not strong built, and I don’t have those professional skills, I think realistically it’s best for me to study for a degree and do what I was trained for - teaching. At least this way I can get a stable job. But what can subject I teach? The best option is Chinese. (G2a)

As discussed in Chapter 3, though restrictive immigration policies were progressively removed by 1973, migrants from Asian countries were selectively accepted in Australia (Pietsch et al., 2010). A majority of these migrants were skilled professionals who had been international students in Australia or had received higher education in their home countries. In the case of Chinese migrants, since the 1980s, many of them arrived in Australia with some tertiary education credentials gained from Chinese speaking countries (S. Chen & Zhang, 2014). With their advantage of Chinese proficiency in an English speaking country, and the expectation of securing a stable job after migration, some Chinese speaking migrants, especially those with an academic background in language, literature and education, were willing to study for a teaching degree when the Australian governments started to promote Chinese teaching in schools.
In part to meet the demands of student teachers who were predominantly native Chinese speakers with a tertiary qualification, a one-year Diploma of Education (DipEd) was introduced in the CLTE Program at U1 in 1991. Generally speaking, the DipEd was an historic pathway into teaching for all student teachers with a Bachelor’s degree in different subject areas. Among the four knowledge bases of teachers categorised by Grossman et al. (1989), given the student teachers’ presumed Chinese language proficiency, ‘subject matter knowledge’, namely Chinese language courses, were not included. ‘Knowledge of context’ was not explicitly taught, but weaved throughout the study. Courses of the DipEd degree focused on the ‘general pedagogical knowledge’ and ‘pedagogical content knowledge’. As TE1a elaborated:

One course was attended by all student teachers of Asian languages. They would learn second language acquisition theories, and very general pedagogical strategies such as how to teach the four skills, how to design the syllabus. Then there is another two-hour course specifically for Chinese teaching. It deals with issues in Chinese teaching, such as how to design a Chinese syllabus or lesson unit, how to assess the students, and especially how to teach Chinese characters. Basically, it applies the theory framework of language teaching into Chinese teaching. (TE1a)

These methodology courses, in TE3’s opinion, are especially necessary for student teachers who have received education outside Australia. The major concern is that teaching their language as a foreign language in the Australian teaching context is significantly different to teaching it as the first language, or second language, in their home country. The understanding of different styles of teaching and learners’ motivations and expectations of learning is an essential component of these student teachers’ knowledge base. As TE3 illustrated:

We had people who had been teachers in another country, who want to be qualified to teach in Australia. They need to do the methodology course because in their country the language was often taught more formally, and students are often more willing to learn the language. But the Australian situation is different. It’s like looking at a mountain and a lake. You’ve got the reflection, and
you’ve got the real thing. They are very similar, but not quite. The reflection, a lot of it is the same, but there are certain aspects of it that are not the same, which they need to be thoughtful about. (TE3)

In U2, there was an obviously different conceptualisation of the CLTE Program. The potential student teachers in the early 1990s came from a predominantly English speaking population in the region. Orton (2008) noted that in some Australian classrooms, especially at senior secondary schools, the dominance of Chinese speaking teachers and students have made it “overwhelmingly a matter of Chinese teaching Chinese to Chinese” (p. 4). In contrast, Chinese teaching in Region 2, as TE2 perceived, has been largely teaching Chinese as a second language to English speakers who are absolute beginners of Chinese learning.

Despite their apparent disadvantage with respect to their Chinese language proficiency, the future English speaking teachers of Chinese are perceived by TE2 as having particular pedagogical strengths. This advantage was seen as more valuable than an advanced level of Chinese proficiency, particularly when they are teaching beginners Chinese to Australian students who come from a broadly similar language, cultural and educational background. As TE2 commented:

*The Chinese teachers with an English background, they are normally most welcomed by the school kids. The reason is very simple. These teachers themselves were learners of Chinese, so they are aware of the difficulties and special problems, and they know how to resolve those problems. In addition, because they are native speakers of English and culturally they are same as most of the kids, when they teach they will use the most effective and most popular teaching strategies. Of course that’s why the local English speaking kids find Chinese language can be easily learned when the English speaking teachers are using the teaching strategies they familiar with. (TE2)*

Native Chinese speakers, on the other hand, are perceived by TE2 as having quite particular challenges teaching in local schools. They may not be aware of the special difficulties of Chinese language for non-native learners; while this awareness is
essential for effectively addressing challenges encountered by Australian students learning Chinese as a second language.

Native speakers of Chinese may have little problems in the schools, in that they normally teach the language in the way of teaching Chinese as a first language, rather than a second language. They may not be aware of the specific difficulties came across by the native speakers of English. Most of those Chinese teacher received education in China, or in other Chinese speaking countries. The culture value and teaching philosophy are totally different from those in Australia. Of course, there will be cultural conflicts. There will be a gap between teaching and learning when they teach Chinese in Australian schools. (TE2)

Therefore, considering the nature of Chinese teaching in Region 2, recruitment of the CLTE Program at U2 gave priority to English speaking student teachers who grew up in Australia, though native Chinese speakers like G1 were not excluded. Considering these student teachers may encounter difficulties learning Chinese, a relatively large number of 30 student teachers were enrolled to allow for the possibility of some withdraw from the CLTE Program before graduation. Because most of these student teachers were high school leavers who had not previously learned Chinese in their schools, the CLTE Program was firstly introduced at undergraduate level. A Bachelor of Education (Asian Studies and Languages Other Than English) degree, which was a five-year cohort from 1991 to 1995, was established in U2.

According to TE2, the development of the student teachers’ knowledge and skills in four areas gained special attention in the curriculum design of the BEd degree. These four areas were in line with the four categories of teachers’ knowledge base proposed by Grossman et al. (1989). Courses under these four components were closely related with Chinese teaching as a second language in Australia and the needs of the majority English speaking student teachers:
• Chinese language itself (subject matter knowledge), focusing on the special linguistic features of Chinese language for non-native speakers;

• Language acquisition (general pedagogical knowledge), focusing on the different processes of Chinese being acquired by native speakers and non-native speakers;

• Methodology and syllabus design (pedagogical content knowledge), including how to organise the Chinese teaching content, and how to focus on the teaching process in Australian schools; and

• Social and cultural context (knowledge of context), addressing different culture values brought by the teachers and students in the same classroom in Australia.

Guided by the overarching framework for teacher education, curriculum content of the BEd degree was specially designed to attend to the student teachers’ language, culture and education background comprehensively and prepare them to teach Chinese at beginners level upon graduation. Through this approach, development of both the student teachers’ “specialist expertise in language” and their “ability to integrate this specialist knowledge with good general curriculum delivery” (Howard et al., 1993, p. 59) were consciously combined within the curriculum of the BEd degree at U2.

In U3, due to the nature of distance education mode, student teachers in the CLTE Program tend to come from a wider range of sources, and thus have a mixed language background and education qualifications. This feature is generic to candidates in other degrees at U3. As TE3 illustrated:

Most of them have got families. They might be working at another job...The majority of our students, 15,000 out of 20,000 are external students. And many of those are mature age people. I had a 60 years old, a couple of 50 year olds, some 30 and 40 year olds, and quite a few 20s too. It is an interesting group...I always had a mixture of people who were experienced teachers but maybe didn’t have the formal qualification, or those who were new. There was always that mixture. (TE3)

With a majority of the student teachers being mature aged, and often pre-occupied with family and/or work, a flexible schedule of study has been provided in U3 for all
degrees, including the CLTE Program. On-line courses combined with short periods of on-campus intensive study have been provided:

*They enrol externally, but they come on-campus for the 4-day intensive school...They come just for that time, the rest of the time by distance. And we have website and we have discussion topics each week, they submit assignments electronically online.* (TE3)

As a newly added component in the existing wide range of language teacher education programs in the late 1990s, the CLTE Program at U3 did not receive as much attention as at U1 and U2. Student teachers of Chinese have been attending the same second language teacher education courses with those of other languages. The CLTE Program at U3, according to TE3, follows the common structure of teacher education found in Australia and other western countries, which were discussed in Chapter 3. Education foundation courses, generic language teaching methodology (Specialist Studies) and induction to practice teaching (Professional Studies) have been included in the curriculum at graduate level degrees (Graduate Diploma of Education and Master of Teaching); while Chinese language courses are also included in the undergraduate level degree (Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Teaching). These courses are all provided through on-line distance education.

It can be seen that, at the initial stage, the CLTE Program at the three case-study Universities each has distinctive features of student teachers based on the regional demographic structure. In U1, there was a predominance of adult native Chinese speakers, often coming with a higher education degree gained outside Australia. In U2 there was a predominance of native English speakers who had newly graduated from local high schools. U3, in contrast, involved student teachers from a broader and more even mix of language backgrounds and education qualifications. The curriculum of CLTE Program at U1 was arguably more targeted at mature aged people who had gained a satisfactory level of Chinese proficiency, providing them with additional education and pedagogical studies of the Australian schooling; in U2 it was more targeted at equipping young Chinese language teachers with the
necessary knowledge and skills to build new Chinese language programs in local schools; whereas it was a combination of the two purposes in U3. Accordingly, the CLTE Program at each university was introduced under different levels of degrees. It was initially offered at graduate level in U1, at undergraduate level in U2 and at both levels in U3. The conceptualisation of the CLTE Program at the individual case-study Universities can thus be seen to be closely related to, and shaped by, their student cohort and their particular institutional features.

**Influence of migration tendencies and policy imperatives**

International and national trends, however, have brought a changing student structure to the CLTE Programs of all three case-study universities. Fast expansion of Chinese speaking migrants in Australia since the 1990s has brought changing demographic structure of student teachers in the CLTE Programs. This change is especially distinctive in U1 and U2. Student teachers of the DipEd degree and the replacing Master of Teaching degree since 1994 at U1, as TE1a suggested, were predominantly first-generation migrants; while according to ST1, today, nearly three decades later, at undergraduate level where the student teachers are predominantly high school levers, they are mostly second or third generation Chinese Australians. As the interviewed participants note:

*My parents are from Taiwan. I speak Mandarin Chinese at home, but I’ve been raised here most of my life. So my main language is English.* (ST1)

*Those who want to be Chinese teachers in the class, they are not from China. Most of them are just raised here as well. Most are Australians. They are from Taiwan, Thailand, or Malaysia, places like that. But same as me, they’ve been raised here most of their lives.* (ST1)

*In a class of 40 [LOTE student teachers], there is probably 7, 8, 9 doing Chinese. Some have Chinese heritage, maybe born in Australia, but one parent, or both parents speak Chinese. Some have*
learned it purely as a foreign language, and speak English. So there is a real mixture. The bulk would have the heritage. (TE1b and TE1c)

These second and third generation Chinese Australians, in documents of NSW education department, are referred to as background or heritage speakers (such as Board of Studies NSW, 2012). Admittedly, according to G1a, not all background and heritage Chinese speakers are encouraged by their parents to learn Chinese. However, there are growing numbers of Chinese Australians who do study Chinese seriously by taking Chinese at matriculation level and combining a major or minor in Chinese with other disciplines (Lo Bianco & Liu, 2007). Broadly speaking, through preparing these Chinese teachers who are “bilingual, bicultural and familiar with Australian schools, relationships and learning styles” in the CLTE Programs, these talents brought by Australia’s multicultural society are being nurtured to form a “future pool of professionals” in Australia (Orton, 2008, p. 5). This is a good start to the preparation of quality Chinese teachers that are in tune with the Australian education context, to further realise the national benefits in promoting Chinese in Australia’s national policies and initiatives.

In U2, TE2 noted that, in pace with the fast expanding volume of Chinese migrants and international students in Australia, there had been a steady growth of Chinese speaking students across discipline areas, including the CLTE Program. In particular, as TE2 introduced, there was increasingly a mix of English speaking and Chinese speaking student teachers at the Bachelor of Teaching/Bachelor of Arts (BTch/BA) degree, which replaced the BEd degree in 1996. For the Master of Teaching (MTch) degree, which was introduced in 2007, enrolments in the recent two years were only native Chinese speakers who graduated with a bachelor degree in their home country and wished to be qualified to teach Chinese in Australia. The significantly changed student structure has posed new challenges to the design and delivery of the curriculum of the CLTE Program at U2.
In the past when we have this Bachelor of Education, Chinese, that is very simple, because most of the students, I mean, 99%, they are Aussie, English speakers. So we are focusing on the teaching method. And later these students start to mix with the native speakers of Chinese, then it became very hard, because they’re mixing in the same group. (TE2)

The mix of student teachers started to make the existing one set of curriculum not sufficient to address the particular needs of student teachers from significantly different language and culture backgrounds. It became difficult to use the curriculum, which was specially targeted at the English speaking student teachers who were new to Chinese language, to also prepare native Chinese student teachers, who needed less study of Chinese language itself, but more instructions on the specialist studies and professional studies. Together with the cancellation of special Chinese methodology courses due to funding issues, which will be discussed later in this chapter, it became more difficult for the curriculum of the later BTch/BA and MTch degrees offered in the CLTE Program at U2 to be closely targeted at a mix of student teachers than the original BEd degree.

In U3, with the support of the new national initiative NALSSP (2008-2012) in preparing teachers of the four key Asian languages, a new teacher retraining scheme was introduced to the CLTE Program in 2009. It is a major cooperation between U3 and the Federal government amongst the many projects under NALSSP. The purpose is specifically targeted at practicing school teachers to upgrade their teaching specialties, by adding one of the four key Asian languages to their qualifications so as to promote the language they are trained with in their schools. U3 is chosen to run this special CLTE Program because of its experience in providing distance education. Online study can provide very a flexible schedule for the retrained teachers who are employed full-time or part-time. The retraining program in U3 offers 3.5-year study under the Diploma of Modern Languages. Those who are qualified language teachers will only learn Chinese language courses, while those who are teachers of non-language subjects need to learn extra language teaching methodology courses.
These retrained teachers in U3 have special advantages in building Chinese language programs in Australian schools. Comparatively, native Chinese speakers often have difficulties communicating effectively with participants in the school community (Orton, 2008; S. C. Wang, 2007); while generally newly graduated student teachers may experience difficulties working in an unfamiliar school. As TE3 commented on these retrained teachers’ advantages:

_They are established people in the school, so they have credibility in the school. So if they then start teaching a language program, in principle, it should be a little easier for them to make an impact than, say, for a newly trained teacher arriving at a school where they are not known well in the school, where they are not really supporting languages. Because every subject thinks we need more space for our subject, a new subject is not a popular thing. But already established teacher might have a better way to persuade colleagues, principal and the students._ (TE3)

These shifts in the source of student teachers in the three case-study Universities have brought both resources and challenges to their CLTE Programs. On the one hand, we can see an overall improvement of the student teachers’ professional knowledge base prior to enrolment. The inclusion of second generation Chinese Australians brings students with both a good understanding of the Chinese language and culture, and experience and understanding of Australian schooling. The native Chinese speaking graduates with a relevant degree in Chinese, English, education, and in recent years increasingly a TCSOL degree, generally come with some base knowledge of Chinese language education, but less understanding of the Australian education context. They require professional learning with this before they are qualified to teach in Australia. Australian practicing schools teachers, who are usually experienced teachers, on the other hand, have this experience and understanding but require additional Chinese language learning support.

These developments contrast with the early stage of CLTE Programs in Australia. Student teachers who were first generation Chinese migrants usually had a limited
understanding of Australian education context. The native English speaking student teachers were often high school leavers with both limited knowledge or proficiency in Chinese language and limited understanding of the associated pedagogical practices for CLLT. The new sources of student teacher in the contemporary CLTE Programs, as a direct result of international migration tendencies and change of national policy imperatives, have showed improved understanding of both the Chinese knowledge and the Australian schooling, thus an upgraded level of professionalisation of the future Chinese teacher workforce in Australia.

The ever more diverse, and so complex, nature of student teachers enrolled in CLTE Programs has brought new and additional challenges for the teacher educators. Initial efforts to design a curriculum to cater for the challenges of student teachers from certain language and culture background, as practiced in the DipEd degree at U1 and the BEd degree at U2, must now respond to the needs of student teachers from increasingly mixed and diverse linguistic and sociocultural backgrounds. Under the current generic framework of language teacher education, the pertinence of curriculum delivery to Chinese teaching issues is largely reliant on the language expertise of the language teacher educators available at the University, while often their expertise do not necessarily cover Chinese (Appendix 2.2).

This section of the study has illustrated the link of the curriculum design in the three case-study Universities with the demographic structure of student teachers in the region they are located in. The different emphases within each CLTE Program has been closely related to their particular student teachers cohort. The changing nature of the student teachers cohorts over the past three decades are a direct result of the immigration trends in the country and the imperatives of successive government language policies. The way these trends and connections have influenced the design and delivery of the curriculum can illustrate some of the key factors at work in the process of preparing Chinese language teachers in Australia, conditioning it success.
Government financial initiatives and regional education resources

Financing provided by the Federal government, and the distribution of these and other resources available at institutional level, are the second major consideration when the teacher educators design and deliver the curriculum of the CLTE Programs. The influence of financial incentives and education resources is evident in two key aspects in the case-study Universities: the opportunity of fully-funded study, especially that which included ‘in-country’ experiences; and the availability of specialist Chinese language methodology courses.

Impact of fully-funded study on enrolment trends

The influence of financial incentives from the Federal government is most evident the CLTE Program at U2. As TE2 introduced, the establishment of the CLTE Program at U2 in 1991 was a direct result of governments’ initiatives in promoting Chinese teaching, responding to Australia’s national initiatives in Chinese teaching and teacher education since 1987. Though Chinese was introduced at a later stage in New South Wales compared with other well-established languages, Chinese teacher education had gained sudden and substantial support.

When the CLTE Program was first established under the BEd degree at U2 in 1991, Chinese teaching was required as a compulsory component, to be studied either as a major or a minor, for all LOTE student teachers. A full-scholarship that covered tuition fees of the entire course studies was provided to all the student teachers. A four-month in-country experience was also included by the end of their candidature. It included both Chinese learning at intensive language centres, and practice teaching of ESL to university students in China. As TE 2 recalled, “the university was funding everything. The students were provided with the airfare, the living allowance. We also paid the Chinese partner universities.” The inclusion of in-country experience in the BEd degree attracted significant enrolments. Beginning from scratch, it enrolled 30 student teachers in the first three years, though not all of them completed
their studies. Such an enrolment number turned out to be the largest in the history of the CLTE Program at U2.

Government financial support was vital in attracting this large enrolment in the CLTE Program at U2, particularly when CLLT was introduced for the first time in the education systems in the region and faced competition from other well-established languages. A graduate highlighted this phenomenon, noting:

> When I was in high school, because of my ethnicity, I was also bilingual. I found it interesting and quite easy to learn languages. So I did well at Japanese, not so much French, I did well German as well. So when the opportunity arose to look at a degree, I looked at some teaching, and I looked at the languages. And part of the degree offered in-country experience, which meant you travel to China to study, and that was a big draw card. (G2c)

The in-country experience offered in the BEd degree was highly valued by the interviewed student teachers. It was identified to have greatly consolidated the knowledge and theories learned during the courses, and improved the student teachers’ Chinese proficiency, cultural understanding, and confidence in teaching. Especially for these native English speakers, immersion in a Chinese speaking context significantly enhanced their communication skills, particularly with respect to the challenges of the tonal system in Chinese language.

> I think probably the most difficult part for me would have to be speaking...If I haven’t gone there and experienced it and spoke Chinese every day, then I don’t think I would have picked the tones up as well as I did. I didn’t need to go to China to do the reading and writing; really it was more the speaking and listening. So just interacting with everyday Chinese, because otherwise living in here I wouldn’t have that experience. (G2d)

> Living in China, that was just the best experience at the end of your course, to get all that learning, then go with the native speakers. That’s where I found my tones got easier. And I remember in a day we were sitting in my class in China, and a lady was teaching us, and I could actually hear the tones...just something in my brain switch.
And prior to that it was harder...So it was really good experience for us to do that. (G2b)

However, opportunities for in-country experience in the CLTE Programs declined significantly since the termination of BEd degree in 1996. In-country experience was moved from being a systematic part of the CLTE Program for all student teachers, to something reliant on applying for and receiving special funding. These changes in government funding are common to LOTE teaching in Australia. As noted by TE2, fluctuating financial incentives are influenced by changing governments, and accordingly by their political priorities:

When this CLTE Program started, it was the time the Labor government put forward the language policy. When the Liberal government won the election [in 1996], they seemed to pay more attention to the European languages. They were closer to the USA, Britain, particularly after September 11...The government policies may not be continued if they have different ideas about developing Asian languages. (TE2)

In addition to the shifts of focus away from Asian languages in the succeeding Liberal government in 1996, a shift in the demographic of student teachers in the CLTE Program to include greater numbers of native Chinese speakers lowered the necessity of in-country experience in U2. According to TE2, “there is no point for them to go to China”.

Under renewed initiatives under the Federal Labor government (2007-2013), the retrained teachers of the four priority Asian language in U3 were again provided a full-scholarship to cover their studies and a 2-month in-country experience. According to TE3, the impact of this policy was significant, with more than 20 additional student teachers enrolling in the four Asian languages.

Such an opportunity to add Chinese teaching to their qualification was highly valued by the retrained teachers. Because they already have a stable teaching position in schools, the motivation is less about securing a job in Australian schools, and more about fulfilling personal interest, and bringing broader opportunities of language
learning for their students. These aspects were reflected from the participants’ experience and comments. For example, as a background speaker, ST3a was not confident with his Chinese skills because he grew up in Australia. Though he always had a passion for learning Chinese, attempted to enrol in some university Chinese courses, and volunteered teaching English to the Chinese communities in Sydney to practice his Chinese, he could not commit himself to these studies and practices. The main hindrance is that he is occupied with a full-time job and a family life, while the opportunity provided by the retraining program in U3 made it possible for him to commit to the study systematically and gain a qualification in Chinese teaching.

Up to that point [seeing advertisement for this retraining program], it had never occurred to me that I would be teaching Mandarin. It never crossed my mind at all. But I’m really glad. It’s one of those things in life where it happens, and it’s for the better.

Now I really love teaching Mandarin. (ST3a)

Similarly, ST3b and ST3c, as native English speakers and experienced language teachers, have been actively expanding their languages specialties. ST3b is a qualified Italian and French teacher for nearly 20 years, while ST3c has received qualifications in teaching French, German, Indonesian, and Japanese throughout her over 30-year teaching career.

Do I need a Diploma of Modern Languages? At my age, I don’t think that’s important. I want to finish this year, because I think it’s important to finish. But some of the younger teachers that were in the group, they need the extra qualification. (ST3b)

[Chinese] is hard. But don’t forget I’ve already done four languages, I LOVE learning languages, so I’m sort of geared into the differences, I’ve really enjoyed the differences. (ST3c)

The immediate outcome of retraining these school teachers is that a Chinese language program was introduced to a wider range of schools in the State. In ST3a’s primary school, where language teaching is not compulsory, Chinese, as the first language program, was introduced to all of the approximately 700 students. In ST3b’s and
ST3c’s secondary schools, where European languages have long been the dominant language courses, Chinese was for the first time offered on a small scale at beginners level. The opportunity offered by the government in retraining school teachers was also valued for broadening their students’ choices in language learning.

*It meant a really big change to the school. There are no other schools in primary doing Chinese in the area. There are very few schools doing Chinese, and there are even fewer schools that are doing twice a week Chinese. These kids they got it so they are very lucky, really, that they have that opportunity... the kids really love it... they were enthusiastic...they really surprised me, they have learned so much.* (ST3a)

The withdrawn financial incentive from the CLTE Program at U2 in 1996, which means the end of fully-funded scholarships in the BEd degree, together with the falling incentive for Chinese teaching in schools, has arguably led to a sustained decrease in enrolments of the CLTE Program since the early 1990s. In the double degree, there was an average of 10 language student teachers, including Chinese, French, Japanese and German; whereas in the master degree, there has been only one student teacher each year. Similarly, in U1, though in-country study units are currently incorporated in the CLTE Program, the enrolment has been continuously declining. According to TE1c, at one point there were only 2 or 3 enrolments some years in the 2000s. With further government support under the renewed national initiatives by the Labor Party since 2007, injection of financial resources lead to a rise in enrolment of the CLTE Program since the late 2000s in some demonstrate. The enrolment in U1 increased slightly to a current average of 7 student teachers. In U3, according to TE3, the number of Chinese teachers trained in the methodology classes had been “fairly consistent”, fluctuating from 2 to 4 over the recorded period
of 2004 to 2011; whereas the retraining CLTE Program doubled the enrolment to 9 in 2012.

Even though in U3, “the conditions for this (retraining) program are a little bit better than the previous ones” (TE3), the situation is far from ideal in terms of securing the place, and required resources, for the effective teaching and expansion of enrolment of languages candidates, including enrolment of Chinese teaching. TE3 shows concern of its sustainability of resources, due to expected fluctuations in government policy focus and funding.

[The big enrolment] might continue for a couple of years, but it might drop back to the previous...It depends on the government too. So John Howard was not particularly outward looking person, well, America, yes, but not Asia. Whereas Kevin Rudd speaks Chinese, that was very positive. But then of course, he lost his position, and Julia Guilard is not quite so language oriented. But still, but still, but still...we will see. (TE3)

Impact of education resources on the provision of methodology courses

The falling enrolments due to withdrawn of government financial incentives added pressure on universities to provide adequate resources to maintain programs. In the case of languages, it is evident in combining specific language methodology courses into a generic one, driven by financial imperatives. This change is not only for Chinese, but common to all languages. This point, seen as a negative development in terms of professional training in language teacher education, was well illustrated by the comments of the participants:

When I was trained [in the Teachers College] the number here was huge. French class became French teachers were more than 100, German class was more than 50, Chinese maybe 15, Indonesian

---

15...They had enough students therefore to have one curriculum teacher educator for each of those groups. (TE1b)

When I trained [in the 2000s], it was already a combined methods…which is the same sort of pattern that we have got. But at that time we also had a certain amount of hours each semester with a specific language teacher of our language as well. I think it was about 10 or 12 hours per semester, on top of the combined class that we had. (TE1c)

[Currently] we don’t have those very specific like Chinese teacher classes. But you can’t help it because you only going to have a few, like 5 teachers maybe, in each category per year. So you can’t have one lecture per five students. That’s just not reasonable. (ST1)

Of course it is necessary to provide specific language methodology courses, as we used to do. But if there is not enough funding, there is nothing we can do. (TE1a)

You understand that if the [enrolment] number is very small, it is very uneconomic. It is not practical. (TE2)

Unless the numbers are big, unless there are 30 people wanting to teach Chinese, and 30 people wanting to teach French, and 30 people want to…I don’t think it’s likely. (TE3)

In addition to falling enrolments, the professional expertise of available teacher educators as education resources in the CLTE Programs has also significantly influenced the availability of specific language methodology courses. In the early 1990s, aimed at enhancing the preparation of Chinese language teachers, U1 employed TE1a, a native Chinese speaker, as the teacher educator of Asian languages, working together with a teacher educator of European languages. With special attention from the government and TE1a’ professional expertise, it was able address particular Chinese pedagogy issues in the curriculum design and delivery. Change of staff arrangements in the late 1990s ended this priority enjoyed by Chinese teaching. When TE1a left U1 in 1998, and the teacher educator of European languages retired at the same time, TE1b was employed as the sole language teacher educator, because of her specialisation in Indonesian and German, which covers both Asian and European languages. The difficulties in looking after student teachers studying a
wide range of languages also contributed to the merging of special Asian and European language methodology courses. As TE1b explains:

Now of course we face the difficulty of having all of those language preventatives, 11 languages 1 teacher educator…. we used to have enrolments in each of the unit, and they all have their single name, Chinese curriculum 1, Chinese curriculum 2. Can you imagine how many units I managed in those days when I had 11 languages, and each had 6 units…I had too many units, so we collapsed all the units to teaching languages 1A or languages curriculum 1. (TE1b)

Similarly in U3, the teacher educator’s expertise in European languages and the availability of experienced European language teachers in local schools has made the course study and pedagogy training less targeted with Chinese teaching issues but more favourable for European languages. For example, according to TE3, currently it is still possible to invite experienced language teachers to the discussion group attended by student teachers of all languages during their 4-day intensive school that is part of their training. However, because Chinese teaching is limited in the region, in that only one Chinese teacher works in the region providing one class per week for some background students in local schools, the invited teachers have always been specialists of traditional European languages, mainly French and German.

The absence of specialist Chinese methodology courses thus rendered the study of specific Chinese pedagogy heavily reliant on personal efforts, where the achievement can be variable. Student teachers are expected to take the initiative and link their learning in the CLTE Program with Chinese teaching themselves during the course study, and apply the generic theories and methodology into their specific language in their assignments.

In the lecture it is impossible to talk Chinese in front of other students who may major in Japanese or French. The teacher might give different examples, some of which are about Chinese. When the students do assessment tasks, they basically can relate to Chinese language. Talking about the syllabus, I have to give the students
different ones for different languages. Basically they have to search for the syllabus documents by themselves, rather than the teacher prepares everything for them. (TE2)

All of their assignments will be specific to their language. So when they do their lesson plans, obviously they will be Chinese lesson plans. When they do their portfolio, it will be for Chinese. When they do an assessment task or an e-resource, it will be for Chinese. So all their assessment tasks are language specific, in that they are relating it back to their language. (TE1c)

In the context of excluding specific language methodology courses, the language teacher educators seem to have found special value in generic methodology courses, bringing together students studying diverse languages in the same classrooms. In the generic courses, other than theory studies, candidates are often organised with various forms of interactive and cooperative learning, such as presentation, peer teaching and group discussion. Instead of grouping candidates of the same language, the teacher educators actually encourage the candidates to “go to different languages groups and discuss” (ST1). This mix of student teachers from different languages has proved to be an efficient way to understand languages education and how to promote their languages in the multicultural context in Australia. Moreover, for student teachers of Chinese, it is valuable experience to observe and learn practical strategies and resources used by other well-established languages in the generic methodology courses.

They had to talk about the things about their language and culture they thought were easy to sell to Australian students…what were some of the challenging things, more difficulty things…[In peer teaching] they use a lot of visuals so we can understand well, even we don’t speak the language. We could see what she was doing, look at the way she conveyed meaning, how she explained things, the visual she used, the activities she set up…We are looking to see if she had, for example, deep culture connection, that culture significance
was made clear, or whether the students were really engaged in using the language. (TE3)

This section illustrated the link of the curriculum design in the three case-study Universities with the availability of financial incentives at national level and education resources at institutional level. The special support of Chinese teacher education in the early 1990s brought sufficient funding to support the fully sponsored course studies. This is a major motivation for English speaking student teachers to be trained with a Chinese teaching qualification, considering their advantages with understanding of the Australian education context. The specialist Chinese methodology courses included in the CLTE Programs drawing on sufficient education resources also made the professional training directly targeted at dealing with specific Chinese issues. The changing financial incentives and education resources are a direct result of the shifting policy imperatives of the governing Party. Without sufficient funding and resources for each LOTE, it is difficult for teacher education institutions to attract enrolment for the prioritised languages, such as Chinese and other newly promoted Asian languages. It is also difficult to provide methodology courses that address language specific issues to ensure the quality of professional training for student teachers of each language group.

The job market needs

Influence of fluctuating job market demands

A third factor influencing the conceptualisation of the CLTE Programs is identified as the job market demand for Chinese teachers. Graduates of the CLTE Programs are essentially prepared to teach in public schools, where teacher registration with State education department is a must. As noted above, the demand for Chinese teaching, and teachers, appears to go through cycles influenced by demographics, political support and initiatives for Chinese language learning, and the general social and political climate. Reduced support from the Liberal government for Chinese teaching
in the 2000s, upon the termination of the NALSAS Strategy in 2002, led to a lower take up of Chinese language programs in schools. This led to lower demand for teachers, which in turn contributed to a lowered demand for teacher education places in Universities. The declining number of Chinese language teachers further lowered the schools’ ability to staff a Chinese language program. This is a downward spiral pattern. The teacher educators have raised concern about this phenomenon, and the associated backsliding of languages promotion due to inconsistent government support:

*They set things up and then they took the money away. You can’t do that with an education initiative like language learning. And the schools don’t have lots of money, so they are not going to keep on paying for trips to the country, or all the things that make it attractive. So it sort of collapsed a bit. And then there is the Asian economic crisis, the world economic crisis. So it’s sort of two steps forward, and one step back, and then one and half steps forward, and half a step back, and two steps forward....it’s like that. We can’t say that once it starts, it just snowballs. (TE3)*

The declining position for Chinese teaching in schools caused by this inconsistent government support in Australia is reflected in two aspects: the student teachers’ practice teaching opportunities and the graduates’ career opportunities in Chinese teaching.

When asked about whether it is easy to find a practice teaching opportunity, ST1’s reply could reflect a common issue faced by student teachers of the CLTE Programs:

*No, no, absolutely not. No no no...it’s so hard right now, for every university... It’s just a big problem. I almost didn’t get my prac last year. I was so stressed. But luckily my lectures were able to get me a school, just in time, just in time. And I had a lot of friends this year who couldn’t get themselves a prac...I don’t know why though, because schools need young teachers, but some teachers who are teaching there, they won’t take them. It’s just...I don’t know. I don’t know why not. (ST1)*
One of the reasons that caused the difficulties in finding practicum sites in U1 was considered by the teacher educators as fluctuations in government incentives. Declined financial support on Chinese teaching since the Hawke-Keating Labor government (1983-1996) has brought continuously declining enrolments in school Chinese language programs. The renewed national NALSSP initiative, when Labor Party was back in power in 2007 under Kevin Rudd, brought renewed growth in the CLTE Programs; whereas there is a time-lag in the associated recovery of positions within schools.

When I first started working here 10 years ago, we had problem for Korean and not Chinese. We could always find a Chinese placement. But now we met in the last three semesters, problem for finding a placement. Maybe it is partly reflecting growing numbers of teachers training for Chinese... So in the past if we were only training two or three teachers a year, we would be fine finding a placement. Now if we were training 7 or 8, it’s hard to find a placement. (TE1b and TE1c)

In regions with low population density and a low proportion of Chinese speaking population, especially in Region 3, the job market for Chinese teaching is minimal. Therefore, student teachers consistently experience difficulties finding placement in local schools. Local student teachers always have to travel to larger cities for practicum, which may bring more pressure on finding placements of student teachers in those regions. As TE3 notes:

Every university has an area of state that is allocated to them. We often have to go in and seek schools in places which are already accepting students from another university. So sometimes it is quite difficult finding a placement. (TE3)

In Region 2, upon the establishment of the CLTE Program, the goal of building up Chinese language programs in local schools led to the student teachers of BEd degree taking the initiative to promote Chinese teaching in local schools during their teacher education.
Every week they go to local primary schools to teach Chinese voluntary. And the schools are very happy to have that. One is the kids they can learn Chinese, the other thing is by asking them to teach Chinese language in the primary school, we are try to creating jobs. (TE2)

The success of these efforts to promote Chinese language learning and to create positions for Chinese teaching in local schools was immediate, in that Chinese language programs were successively introduced in several local schools. However, the low demand for Chinese learning among the predominantly English speaking population and the dominance of well-established languages in local schools in Region 2 resulted in a relatively small scale of Chinese teaching. At its peak time in the 1990s there were five or six schools offering Chinese in Region 2.

The majority of student teachers attracted by financial incentives in the BEd degree experienced difficulties finding practicum sites. The relatively number of established Chinese language programs in local schools could not provide sufficient placement to the large number of student teachers. They had to travel, even interstate, to find a suitable placement. Difficulties in finding placements burdened the student teachers’ study, and lowered the CLTE Program’s credibility. As G2c commented,

They [the student teachers] have to find accommodation, find schools, to finish their degree, to pass their degree, it was a big shemozzle. To me it was very unprofessional and unorganised, offering a degree that we can’t even get placements in schools. (G2c)

Since government funding for Chinese teaching diminished in 2000s, together with the declining enrolment of existing Chinese language programs, some schools in Region 2 cancelled existing Chinese teaching. The number of schools with available Chinese language programs has been struggling to reach three over the past two decades. Matched with this lowered demand for Chinese teachers in local schools, enrolments in the CLTE Program have been steady declining, from 30 in 1991 to 1 in 2010. The issue with finding placement thus “becomes simple” (TE2), and it is currently possible for the student teachers to find placement in local schools.
Graduates’ opportunities in Chinese teaching are also influenced by the small and fluctuating number of Chinese language programs in Australia. This is essentially a supply and demand issue. The diminished national initiatives following the issue of NPL in 1987 and the launch of NALSAS Strategy (1994-2002) lead to shrinking demand for (Chinese) language teachers in Australian schools.

When the CLTE Programs started, there was a great shortage of Chinese language teachers. You can easily find teaching position. Most of my graduates got job straight away after graduation...But this country does not have large population. If the school has one or two Chinese language teachers, that’s enough. When most of the schools have these Chinese programs, they do not need it anymore. So the job market has changed; there is no longer that vacancies available. That is why people don’t enrol in the Chinese teaching. (TE2)

It’s a supply and demand of teachers. I think we can talk about supply and demand of all teachers of all languages, Chinese is just one story. (TE1b)

Other than fluctuations in government support, a major reason underlying the overall small demand for (Chinese) language teaching in Australian schools is, according to the interviewed participants, the public’s negative attitude towards LOTE learning generally. The Federal and State governments have been actively promoting language education, focusing on a wide range of rationales such as economic, national, social, educational, and personal benefits (Lo Bianco, 1987). However, under the lasting influence of mainstreaming English language and marginalising other languages in Australia’s recent history (Clyne, 1991, 2005), it is generally difficult to promote LOTE education in a context where English language is dominant. Currently LOTE seem not to have played a significant role in the life of the vastly mono-lingual Australians, because a significant proportion of LOTE speakers can also speak English well due to the lasting supportive ESL language programs and/or the English language proficiency requirements for certain types of
visa. Thus the public may not have a strong motivation or need to learn LOTE. This negative attitude towards Chinese learning was well articulated by TE2 as follows:

Population of this region is mainly Anglo-Saxons. Whether they learn, or not learn, Chinese language, it really does not matter...If you learn Chinese, of course, it is very good. In a way, people start to know about culture, and become multicultural...But if there are no students understand Chinese language, you do not really produce a big difference. And there are a lot of Chinese in this country. If the English speakers cannot speak Chinese, most of the Chinese are speaking English very well. (TE2)

TE2’s comment does not only apply to the case of Chinese teaching, but also reflects the situation of the whole LOTE teaching in Australia. Attributed to some policies trying to dispel the public’s doubt of multiculturalism and encourage language learning amongst the Australians (see Chapter 3), “there are some successes” in the government effort and “it certainly did mean a growth in language learners” (TE3). However, at present, a generalised indifference towards LOTE study does not seem to have changed significantly to facilitate the teaching of LOTE.

ST3c, as an experienced teacher qualified to teach 5 languages, raised the distinctive paradox between the multicultural nature of Australian society and the negative public attitudes for Asian languages study. She emphasised the importance of raising the public awareness of the importance learning LOTE, especially Asian languages:

Look at where we live. We live in the South Pacific. Our neighbours are Asian speaking people...our country is made up of all cultures; it’s quite an interesting situation, different to most other countries...But they might come into really negative frame...My whole job is not just teaching the language, but it is about understanding, appreciation, tolerance, all of these things come into teaching a language. So you are constantly fighting this little battle, which still exists in Australia, it’s quite amazing. (ST3c)

Behind this Australian public mentality towards LOTE, is the position of English, the proxy international language, as the national language of Australia. TE3 noted
dominance of English as a major hindrance to realise the governments’ ambitious goals in promoting LOTE teaching nationwide.

_The Australian population, the Australian context, is resistant to learning languages. We are isolated. It’s an island mentality. Everywhere in the world, there are now people speaking English. So Australians can say, oh, well, why should we bother learning another language? Who do we speak to? There is no one speaks other languages…_We are very blind to our immigrants. And they [the government] also mandate it. They said there will be 100 hours of language learning, but of course as soon as you make something mandatory, obligatory, people say “make me”, “why should I”. It’s that kind of mentality. (TE3)

**Implications for curricula innovation**

Facing the current improved, but still limited, demand for Chinese teaching positions in schools, the CLTE Programs in the three case-study Universities have been innovating to secure the graduates’ job opportunities in case positions in Chinese teacher fluctuate. The change of degree settings is common to all Australian universities. According to TE2, this is in accordance with a general change of education philosophy in western countries. An expanded range of qualifications and extended duration of candidature is thus expected to well equip the graduates with necessary skills in the job market.

Considering the fact that positions of Chinese teaching are currently very unstable in Australian schools, the student teachers need to equip themselves with multiple teaching areas to secure a job position. The multiple teaching specialties are especially necessary for teaching in regional areas where a Chinese teaching position is rare and unstable due to limited demands for Chinese learning. Student teachers in current CLTE Programs have been required to choose at least two teaching specialties. The benefits were noted by ST3b:

_I think it’s a good thing to have two areas, at least two, even three, teaching areas, so that you don’t make yourself not marketable. I_
guess it is very difficult now, for people who are coming out, in any area, teaching, or in anything, if they don’t have more experience, if they don’t take the opportunities that are there, to put more feathers in your cap, you know, more experience, then you don’t get positions. (ST3b)

Amongst the interviewed graduates in U2, other than a compulsory specialty in Chinese teaching and ESL, they either majored or minored in another language. As a result, in G2b’s schools, when the Chinese language program was replaced by an Indonesian program, G2b was able to teach Japanese, which was her major in U2, while studying for a further qualification to teach Indonesian. Similarly, in G2d’s school, whenever enrolment in Chinese is too small to start a class, her qualification in French teaching could secure her teaching position in the school. For G3c, having difficulties in finding a Chinese teaching position, she studied a further course in special education. Together with her qualification in ESL teaching, she has been since working with international school students in Australia utilising her multiple language skills.

At undergraduate level, as TE3 explained, the double degree has widely replaced the single education degree since the late 1990s, so that graduates are qualified to work in other Chinese related professions under the Arts degree, when a teaching position in Chinese is unavailable. The master of education degree has also come to replace the initial, and shorter, Diploma or Graduate Diploma of Education, so that graduates would have time to meet the revised requirements of teacher accreditation authorities.

*The Grad DipEd, is becoming 18 months, because really 1 year was just not big enough. And actually 1 year is just 8 months. They started at the end of February, go to the end of October, 8 months. If you take out holidays, and prac teaching, in terms of formal academic study, there might only be 6 months, 5 months in a 12 month one…If students want, they can do a next 6 months and finish with a MTe. The MTe is really the Grad DipEd plus 6 months. But it just gives it a bit more time, a bit more depth. They can do an extra practicum; they can do some more theory studies. So I think it’s a quite good…I hope it’s quite good. (TE3)*
In addition to changing degree settings, during curriculum delivery, teacher educators particularly focus on developing two aspects of awareness in the student teachers. Firstly, teacher educators focus on raising the awareness of maintaining Chinese language proficiency among the English speaking student teachers. This is particularly important when the study of Chinese language is separated with educational studies in contemporary double degree and graduate degrees offered widely in Australian universities. Other than previous progressive study of Chinese language in the language department, the student teachers are encouraged by the teacher educators from the School of Education to practice their Chinese through various approaches.

Because many of them they do the Grad DipEd, they finish their three years of Chinese, and then they don’t do any more Chinese, they just do their teacher education. And then they just forget what they learned. So at the right beginning, I say you need to keep your language, not burning, but simmering, you need to keep it bubbling on. [You can] create a cartoon, read the Shanghai Daily or Beijing Weekly every day, do crosswords, read the articles, exchange emails with penfriends in China, travel to the country etc. (TE3)

Across these three semesters that we teach them, they produce a portfolio each semester, but essentially building on the portfolios that they have done in the previous semesters. And within that they have to find a way to document how they maintain the language that they are going to teach. So for Chinese they would need to demonstrate how they are engaging with the language themselves to keep the language going, to keep it current, to show that they are engaging with colloquialisms and new developments in the language. So within the portfolio they can choose how they wish to document that and what skills they think they need to work on. (TE1c)

Secondly, during educational studies, the teacher educators focus on raising the student teachers’ awareness of the possible hindrances of (Chinese) language teaching in the Australian context. In this way, it is expected that the graduates are mentally prepared to face the challenges of teaching in a diverse range of school environment, as noted by the teacher educators:
We engage with them in the fact that not all schools in NSW are in a city, some are rural and country. So what happens would the context be different? Will the teaching need to be different if you are teaching 3 hours out of Sydney? And there will be certain ethnic groups there in the areas of Sydney. Teaching Chinese to a group in the inner city might be different to teaching Chinese in the upper north shore...So the NSW context has to be discussed. (TE1b)

They can be in a school where they are part of the big language department, very enthusiastic, very well supported...Or are you going to be in a little country school, out here, where half the parents are out of work, and can’t imagine, ever, travelling overseas, let alone needing to speak a language, overseas or here. And would rather you do something practical, like woodwork, or agriculture...You might be the only language teacher in this school. Your predecessor might have left nothing for you. You have to construct the syllabus, and you have to build relationships with your fellow teachers and students and so on. (TE3)

Because Chinese is newly introduced to Australian schools, it is especially necessary to equip the graduates with the ability to independently develop a Chinese language program in a relatively isolated and unsupported environment. Often, they might be the only Chinese language teacher in the school (such as G2d), the only Asian language teacher (such as G2b), and even the only language teacher in the school (such as G2a). G2b’s comments reflected the necessary capabilities and mental strength to deal with Chinese and other Asian languages teaching in Australia.

Sometimes I feel with the Asian languages you ARE the pioneer. So that takes a lot more. You don’t only teach classroom and go away, you plan these events and you plan your classes. So I think it’s a lot busier... Sometimes, I feel very isolated as the Asian language teacher. I don’t feel like others understand. Even in your own [language] faculty, you hear people say to our students, “oh, but Japanese and Chinese, it is so hard, because they’ve got characters.” But I would argue that characters, particularly in Japanese, are very easy. The grammar in French and German, male and female, all the tenses are so hard. So if you get that kind of ignorance with even language teachers, it is very hard to fight against in a big school community. So I find it a little frustrating. (G2b, original emphasise)
In summary, the CLTE Programs in the three case universities have been innovating to prepare the student teachers with expanded range of qualifications. Degree settings and curriculum structure have been shifting over the last three decades. This shift is a combined result of changing demographic structure of student teachers, available funding and education resources, local job market needs and international teacher education philosophies. Other than teaching solid knowledge, teacher educators have been particularly raising the student teachers’ awareness of their personal lifelong professional development, and the potential difficulties linked with teaching (Chinese) languages in Australia. Through these approaches, the CLTE Programs have been designed and delivered to maximise the student teachers’ career opportunities upon graduation and have them strategically and mentally prepared for the workforce.

Summary and conclusion

This chapter has explored the design and delivery of the CLTE Programs in the three case-study Universities, and the relationship between this and the broader questions of governmental support for LOTE and Chinese language learning in particular, and the impacts on language programs in schools. It has identified and analysed three major factors considered by the teacher educators when conceptualising the CLTE Programs. The incentives and hindrances for (Chinese) language teaching in Australia are weaved into the investigation of degree settings, curriculum design, delivery and outcome of the CLTE Programs.

The supply of language teachers is contextualised in the job market demand and the broader social context. Though Australian governments have demonstrated clear support for LOTE teaching since the development of multicultural policy in the 1970s, the constantly shifting focuses in government language policies and a consistent emphasis on English literacy have seen a steady decline in enrolments in School LOTE programs over the past few decades (Liddicoat, 2010; Lo Bianco &
Slaughter, 2009b). This tendency has lowered the demand for language teachers. The shrinking job market for language teachers has led to decreasing enrolments in language teacher education programs. This has further lowered the proportion of funding and resources allocated to language teaching training. The universities, driven by their own financial conditions and constraints, often had to cut back and even cancel scholarships that were once provided as part of national incentives. Accordingly, opportunities for extensive in-country studies were also cancelled or provided at a much smaller scale, impacting on the language proficiency and cultural understanding of the target language among the non-native student teachers. We also saw how specialist methodology courses for each language group were merged into a generic language methodology course, due to declining enrolment in each language group. This has, arguably, lowered the link between the student teachers’ professional training with addressing the specific language teaching issues. There is clearly a risk that these conditions may contribute to a fall in the linguistic and pedagogical skills of university prepared language teachers, which may in turn impact negatively on school students’ motivation and outcome in language learning. This sort of downward spiral pattern is not only a characteristic of Chinese teacher education, but a common problem to all language teacher education in Australia.

Though having been prioritised in Australian government policies and initiatives, because the large scale of Chinese migration in Australia is relatively new, Chinese language teaching is not well established in Australian schools. Given the Australian government wants to strengthen the ties with China and prioritise Chinese teaching, special attention and sustained support from national initiatives are vital to develop continuous Chinese language program in schools and secure sufficient funding and education resources for the CLTE Programs. The analyses here indicate that a sustained push over a significant period of time is needed if Chinese language teaching is to really develop, consolidate, and make a significant impact in Australian schooling and society.
Providing stable demands for Chinese teaching in Australian schools requires broader initiatives beyond simply funding language and teacher education programs, which involve extensive social and cultural changes in society. It is necessary for the governments to, in a sense, create the demand by raising the public’s awareness of the value of learning languages. This is particularly important given Australia’s domestic multicultural social tendencies and Australia’s active involvement with international affairs, especially with its neighbours in the Asia-Pacific region. The White Australia Policy has arguably left a legacy of some prejudice against Asian languages and studies; while the short history of Chinese language teaching in Australian schools means it remains unfamiliar for many English speakers, compared with the other, traditional European school language programs. Shift in the public mind towards Chinese learning, however, can be achieved by combining the language learning with other professions and career paths, demonstrating the potential value of the language to the public in terms of future employment and career prospects. Similarly, efforts to promote the social and cultural benefits of learning LOTE, including Chinese, can help to consolidate this trend.

To conclude, we can identify three factors that are essential to ongoing efforts, in the sociocultural context of contemporary Australia, to better realise the intended outcomes of government investments in CLTE: 1) stable government policy imperatives over a significant period of time to guarantee the operation of continuous language programs at schools; 2) sustained financial support and education resources for CLTE Programs to design courses that are targeted at the needs of student teachers from different language and culture backgrounds; and 3) sustained efforts to raise public awareness of multiculturalism and the importance of (Chinese) language learning, so as to create sufficient demand for Chinese teaching in the long-term.

The next chapter will examine the implementation and outcome of the CLTE Programs, through the investigation of specific government initiatives in Chinese teacher education programs.
CHAPTER 5: THE INDIVIDUAL EXPERIENCE

Introduction

Chapter 4 explored factors influencing the formation and development of CLTE Programs at the institutional level in the three case-study Universities. Building on that work, this chapter investigates the outcomes of CLTE Programs from the perspective of student teachers’ individual experiences within these programs. In this way, this chapter also responds to research sub-question 3. What are the major factors influencing the discrepancy between policy goals and outcomes of the CLTE Programs in Australian universities? Three major aspects of the student teachers’ challenges with curriculum studies and workplace experience are explored in detail: 1) challenges associated with Chinese language courses; 2) challenges associated with professional training; and 3) challenges embedded in the broader context of language education more generally in Australia. This chapter concludes by considering how teacher education, and the work place experience of these qualified Chinese teachers, is influenced by individual, institutional, and social factors, which in turn impact on their Chinese learning and teaching in Australia.

Challenges with Chinese language course studies

Innate challenges of Chinese language for English speakers

The linguistic features of Chinese language have consistently presented some innate difficulties for English speaking learners. The commonly acknowledged ones are the tonal system in its pronunciation; vocabulary, particularly characters and large number of homophones, which refers to the characters in different writing forms with different meanings sharing the same pronunciation; and certain grammar aspects such as the particles and verb complements (Orton, 2011). The education of Chinese teachers in Australia is considered by researchers, such as Orton (2011), D.
Wang et al. (2013), and Moloney and Xu (2012), as lacking instruction in effective pedagogy to engage the English speaking student teachers with these linguistic challenges.

When asked about the challenges during their teacher education, the English speaking student teachers in this study, as adult learners, reported that Chinese speech was the primary challenge they faced, linked to the Chinese pronunciation system and the vocabulary. The study of Chinese characters is not reported as a challenge for those who have already learned Japanese (G2b, ST1 and ST3c) or with a Chinese background (ST1 and ST3a). Some student teachers who have not had previous experience with Chinese characters consider then very challenging, but meanwhile consider personal dedication in memorising and practicing the characters a necessary and possible approach to achieve and maintain a satisfactory level of Chinese reading and writing. Some representative examples of this view include the following:

*I found the tones the hardest, as far as the language goes. I had already studied Japanese, so the characters weren’t difficult for me, I enjoyed them…The grammar in Chinese is quite easy. (G2b)*

*The BIG thing with the Chinese is the tone system…I think more important with Chinese is the pauses, position for pausing, more so than English. We really need to concentrate on breaking those sentences up into their components and doing that pausing correctly. (ST3b, original emphasis)*

*The writing was very difficult. So if you don’t use the writing all the time, especially now after finishing the degree and not having to learn Chinese, I can recognise that, maybe familiar with that character, but I’ve forgotten how to pronounce it, how to write it. There is no point in me in reading Chinese now. (G2c)*

Even the two home-users of Chinese language (ST1 from Taiwan and ST3a from Vietnam), who have Chinese speaking parents, were not confident with their Chinese conversational skills. The major concerns are with learning the written and speech form of Modern Standard Chinese. These concerns appear to represent what are
common difficulties experienced by background speakers of Chinese in Australia. Their parents tend to have migrated mainly from places other than mainland China before the 1980s, and use forms of Chinese language at home that differ from the Modern Standard Chinese being taught in Australian schools and the CLTE Programs. Moreover, these background Chinese speakers often have limited development in Chinese skills, having grown up in an English speaking country. Here again the participants articulated these concerns:

*I suppose it is easy going from traditional to simplified [characters], but I still hate it. I have to learn pinyin as well. I always forget what the tones are. I never officially learned what the tones mean and all that. So there is always a bit of worry to me when teaching Chinese. Also I have been here most of my life, so I know my Chinese accent isn’t very good. It’s very Australian accent. If my students copy my accent, hypothetically, then it’s going to be a problem. (ST1)*

*When I started school, my parents would speak to me in Chaozhouhua [Teochew dialect] at home, and gradually I would stop answering them, and I would answer them in English. And at that school, there were no other Chinese children. This was in the early 1980s. And the school I was in was just me and my brother [as the Chinese speakers]. So we lost our language very quickly...Well, we didn’t lose it, it didn’t develop. I could say ‘I am hungry’, or ‘I’m gonna have a bath’. But I couldn’t talk about anything that was adult. (ST3a)*

Compared with the several well-established European languages and Asian languages in Australian schools, Chinese vocabulary has its special challenges. In the English speakers’ eyes, it does not share the Latin origin with many European languages; it does not use the alphabet system; and the written form does not indicate the pronunciation. These features have made Chinese arguably the most difficult language among those offered in the curriculum; while difficulties in learning and expanding Chinese vocabulary have greatly impeded the learners’ ability to develop their conversational skills.
The vocabulary doesn’t have links to European (languages), to English, whereas French, German, Spanish and Italian, they are similar, and a lot of words are the same. (TE3)

Studying Chinese, It’s the hardest language of the five I have done. I did correspondence course with Indonesian too, but Indonesian doesn’t have the script, the characters, just use our alphabet, and the sentence patterns are much easier. (ST3c)

It’s such a vocab based language. When you learn a new word, you have to know how to read it, how to recognise it, how to speak it, how to write it, how to pronounce it. So it’s five different things for every new word. At least with Japanese, it’s a set alphabet. So even if you don’t know the word, you can at least still read it, even if you don’t know the meaning of it. So my Year 11s for Japanese, they can read; but for the Year 11s of Chinese, I found that their reading was very slow...So it is a little bit discouraging for students as well if they can’t really say exactly what they are thinking, express themselves completely in a way. (ST1)

The linguistic features of Chinese language appear to be a significant challenge for non-native speakers, including both those with and without a Chinese background. The United States Foreign Service Institute estimated that learners of Chinese who are English speakers need to spend at least 2200 class hours, with the second half of time preferably studying in-country, to reach a general professional proficiency level (National Virtual Translation Centre, 2007). Compared with the top five, well-established languages in Australian schools, this estimated study hours for Chinese is approximately four times of that currently provided for French and Italian (both 575-600 hours), a touch under three times of that provided for German (750 class hours) and Indonesian (900 class hours), and equal with that provided for Japanese. For English speaking student teachers who had limited experience with Chinese learning, the study of Chinese language courses for 3-5 years as a major/minor in the CLTE Programs obviously cannot easily reach the same level of proficiency with student teachers of other languages.
Challenges with untargeted content in Chinese language courses

The content of Chinese courses provided by the contemporary CLTE Programs in the three case-study Universities is generally considered by the English speaking student teachers as overly comprehensive. The contents are not well focused on preparing them with the Chinese knowledge necessary for teaching, usually at beginners level, in Australian schools. Such perceived deficiencies have, as unanimously pointed out by the interviewed student teachers from all the three case-study Universities, added to their difficulties with the Chinese subject matter study.

In the case of ST1, because he is a background Chinese speaker and was homeschooled in Chinese throughout his school years, he enrolled in the streamed Chinese classes for advanced learners in the first two years of subject matter studies in the CLTE Program. As with the Japanese courses, which he studied for his major teaching specialty, ST1 observed that these university language courses did target well at developing the aspects of language proficiencies that are appropriate for school teaching:

In Chinese I was already in advanced class straight off, so I was with other native speakers, just reading, writing and speaking, those were assessment areas. That’s how I was trained in Chinese…I didn’t learn much more Japanese at uni. I learned a few more vocab, a few more grammar points per semester, but you just cram for the exam, it’s not relevant to you. University just teaches a lot random stuff, it wasn’t very well organised. You don’t need to write essays like government spending on political stuff whatever; I am not interested in that stuff. I just want to teach the language. (ST1)

In U3, the three interviewed retrained teachers are all English speakers who had a long history learning languages before the enrolled in the retraining CLTE Program. These three practicing teachers, compared with other interviewed English speaking student teachers who had limited experience with language teaching, articulated a more critical evaluation of their Chinese language studies. Three comprehensive Chinese books are to be studied in the first two years, while one reading course and
one listening course in the third year of candidature. For the full-time school teachers who need to study in their spare time, and mostly are new to Chinese language, such intensive Chinese courses are reported as laborious and over-demanding; while the absence of pedagogy courses, due to their gained qualification in LOTE methodology, rendered the study of Chinese language courses immense and irrelevant with the Chinese teaching practice in their schools.

To be specific, they argued that the time framework for the content and delivery of Chinese language courses is unrealistic. This is a view that is shared by both the teacher educator and the retrained teachers. According to ST3c, such an issue is representative, in the sense that it was raised as the greatest challenge by most of the retrained teachers during their meeting at the regular intensive schools. This was articulated as follows:

*It’s much too fast when teachers are already teaching in their ordinary subjects in schools.* (TE3)

_The main challenge, they say to us, it’s a 12 hour per week course. To me that’s ridiculous. If I don’t do 28, 30 hours a week, at least, I can’t keep on top of it. When I’m doing it properly, I will do three, four, five hours, at nights, on the weekends and holidays. If I don’t keep on top it, it’s a horrible situation, because language is a building process, if you miss this step, how do you jump to that step. You’ve got to learn as it going. So it’s quite stressful, and everybody I know, all the teachers, I don’t hear anybody singing praise at all. If you are fitting in 12 hours a week, not a problem, but they’ve got to be realistic.* (ST3c)

Some intrinsic difficulties of learning languages through distance education (Galusha, 1997; White, 2003) raised a further challenge for the retrained teachers’ time management. Though having a flexible schedule, without fixed class hours, these teachers reported difficulties in trying to arrange a regular and progressive time for learning the language, especially when they are preoccupied with school work and family life.
It’s so much better to not do correspondence. Because when you study a language, you need so much constant input. In classes you can actually listen to it, have interchange. Whereas with correspondence courses, you have to be super organised, which teachers ARE, but all our class is older, married people with kids, you have a huge amount of things in your life. To organise your time is much harder this way than in a class, much harder. (ST3c, original emphasis)

I don’t [arrange time for the study]. In English we say “win it”. You grab five minutes here, five minutes there, I’ve got five minutes quick here... (ST3b)

I have to manage my time. I used to study a lot more, but I go through periods. I study every day or every second day at the moment, but I went through about three months I didn’t pick up the text book, I did nothing. In the summer holidays when the school was on break, I study six units ahead...then I stopped because work started. (ST3a)

Sure they send us tape and files, it does help. But you have to make a big hunk of time to learn. Then if you just have started to study Chinese, this would not be a great way to do it. (ST3c)

Given these time constraints associated with the distance mode of the retraining CLTE Program at U3, participants found the content of Chinese courses unduly demanding. Moreover, it is identified as unsuitable content to realise the purpose of upgrading practicing teachers’ skills in teaching Chinese at the beginners level. ST3c, for example, observed that the course was “lacking user-friendly textbooks”.

The three comprehensive textbooks used in the retraining CLTE Program were imported from China. In the preface of these textbooks, it is stated that they are targeted at English speaking learners in a general sense, and can be used by both international students at language centres in China and those in their home countries. For these retrained teachers in U3 who study in their spare time and in a non-immersion context in their home country, such textbooks are not suitable for their learning style and learning purpose.
Beyond the first comprehensive textbook, there is no phonetic guide to the entire passage. The large number of characters and new vocabulary to be studied in each lesson is very challenging for these English speakers who have just learned Chinese for one year. Moreover, in the retraining teachers’ opinion, the content of these comprehensive textbooks have limited connection with their intended classroom Chinese teaching. They are largely on topics of Chinese history, culture, and society, but demonstrated little link of how these topics could relate to their potential Australian students. ST3b gave two examples:

> There was a whole passage about coal, and if you go to this area in China, you will see the mining of the coal, and China discovered coal and discovered how to burn coal...WHO CARES! I don’t care about that! Maybe later in my studies, culture, the civilisation and the history of China, I’d like to know that, but now I want to learn basic conversation topics, it’s a waste of time! (ST3b, original emphasis)

> And the perils of smoking, if you smoke, it gives you heart disease, makes you very sick, causes cancer...Okay, that’s common knowledge, I suppose, we were talking about health issues. But maybe a similar passage on health issues, talking about good habits, sport and exercise, I think is far more relevant than just smoking, which is one isolated, negative, not really relevant to the classroom, it’s not even a relevant topic to teaching, it’s not something I’m going to take into the classroom. (ST3b)

The retrained teachers reported the contents of the Chinese language courses as too demanding, where the focus is mostly on study of characters and vocabulary, and topics irrelevant with classroom teaching at beginners level are excessively included. The Chinese language study was reported as challenging even for background Chinese speaker like ST3a. ST3a previously studied Chinese for 2.5 years in a university course, but is currently enrolled in the beginners Chinese course in U3, because he will teach Chinese at beginners level in his primary school, and expects more advanced language courses will be too burdensome. At the time interviewed, ST3a was commencing his second year at U3. Compared with his previous study of
Chinese, ST3a noted that the retraining CLTE Program at U3 was very fast-pace and demanding, in that:

We are studying now to get into vocabulary that I didn’t learn when I was at the other university. I think this course has moved MUCH faster. Incredible! Each lesson there is 50 or more vocabulary items; it’s SO much for people who only started the language last year. I probably have maybe 5 to 10 words I’ve never come across before. So it is manageable for me still. If I was actually a beginner, like if I was like everyone else, I would be really struggling. And I KNOW that people are struggling with the course. (ST3a, original emphasis)

A further aspect of the CLTE Program at U3 that was criticised centred on the suitability of the Chinese language textbooks. Though appreciating the abundant and various forms of online learning resources developed by lectures the from language department, such resources were considered generic and not modified by the retraining CLTE Program to cater for the needs of the retrained teachers. Like the critique noted in U1 above, teachers (re)trained under the School of Education use the same Chinese textbooks and resources as students from other disciplines in the university, such as business, law, medicine etc., who wish to gain a qualification in language. This is not surprising, but participants in U3 noted significant challenges, in that the learning is considered as not targeted and not well consolidated:

This course wasn’t targeted for anybody. We just got into a course that they [the retraining program] didn’t create for us, but I feel they should have. Even if we are doing that comprehensive book, then for each unit, they introduce something extra that could fit into the classroom, just for the teachers. The university didn’t modify anything for us. We are just doing the same course as everyone is doing. It should be specific for teachers. (ST3c)

They covered the issues, but too quickly, without giving us time to think, to consolidate it, to bring it all together. So it’s very rushed. (ST3b)

Moreover, the inappropriate course schedule in the curriculum was considered as lowered the effectiveness of the training outcome. The listening course seemed to be
the only Chinese language course that was welcomed by the retrained teachers. They saw it as providing a practical and communicative study of Chinese and would suit the Australian students at beginners level. However, they argued that this was introduced too late in the curriculum. As ST3c commented:

[The listening course] is what we should have done in Year 7. They are just little things, a little bit vocab, a little big grammar, but they are concise and useful stuff. It’s stuff that we can actually use in sentences of class. It’s not obscure stuff like those stupid first books, okay, that’s lovely because it’s culture, and it’s part of Chinese history, but give us user-friendly stuff, don’t give us obscure stuff, because it’s not going to be useful to us. (ST3c)

Because of the perceived inappropriate course content and arrangement of language courses, the retrained teachers reported that started with great interest, they currently continued with the study mainly to pass the exams and gain a qualification of Chinese teaching. In order to improve the outcome of their study, they hope the course would focus on consolidating their Chinese knowledge at the basic level, and they can learn how to teach basic Chinese effectively to their students. As ST3b commented:

Maybe the comprehensive book 1 was okay for year 1, maybe, and then this listening textbook, this one does all the topic areas, with good vocab, and would have been more beneficial to me to do that in second year when I started to teach, instead of trying to cram in to more comprehensive books in second year, with no pinyin and characters, very labour intensive to go in and find pinyin. We just work towards assignments and exams. (ST3b)

Orton (2008) reported the extremely low retention rate of Chinese enrolment beyond compulsory years, such that only 3% students take Chinese at Year 12 nationally. Considering the retrained teachers will introduce Chinese for the first time in their schools, and in order to guarantee their English speaking students’ continuous learning of Chinese through to tertiary level, Chinese courses in the CLTE Program
are suggested to equip the retrained teachers with the necessary knowledge to teach Chinese at Higher School Certificate (HSC) level.

*These people are going to be teachers starting at Year 7, and go through to Year 12, and get kids uni ready, or job ready, with the language. So why are we going to teach them about dividing camels, and other ancient proverbial stories, it's just crazy stuff. Give us stuff that ties in with our HSC courses.* (ST3c)

Similarly, in U2, even in the BEd degree when Chinese received special funding and the School of Education had designed particular Chinese language courses for the student teachers, the English speaking student teachers still identified the lack of learning resources that suit their learning style as a big challenge. Because their school learning was often filled with visual aids and interactive activities, they prefer some appealing resources with more visual aids and interactive activities in the CLTE Program, although acknowledging the different learning style among adults. As G2b noted:

*The resources, the books, are a little bit boring. They were just very black and white, just grammar, so...But as an adult learner that was okay, at least we had something that we could look at, so I don’t know.* (G2b)

In short, the interviewed English speaking student teachers showed great concerns about the content of their Chinese language courses. Their responses indicated a clear view that the content of the Chinese language course is not aligned with their expectations of training and the features of Chinese teaching in Australian schools. What this points to is a mismatch between content they studied at teacher education program and their practical focus in schools. The following quote can illustrate this point:

*I would like to be totally conversant at this stage. I’d like to be speaking quite fluently. But none of us are...They should have a made course. What you do is not always useful for where your main thrust is. My main thrust is teaching it. I mean sure I want to go China, I want to speak when I am in China, I want to do all that. But*
the most important thing AT THIS STAGE is teaching it, and being confident to actually teaching it, and be confident to use it in the classroom so that the kids get bombarded by the language. (ST3c, original emphasis)

Resources targeted at teaching basic conversational Chinese in Australian schools, and engaging cultural aspects that are relevant and engaging for Australian students, were endorsed as essential content of Chinese courses in the CLTE Programs. It is about content, sequence, timing, and relevance to actual practice in the particular school settings. In this way, the CLTE Programs could reach its aim of preparing these English speaking teachers with the adequate knowledge and skills to introduce Chinese for the first time in Australian schools.

**Challenges with the delivery of Chinese language courses**

In addition to concerns about the content of Chinese language courses, the question of the pedagogy and general approach of teacher educators in the CLTE Programs was identified by participants as an additional challenge in the BEd degree of the CLTE Program at U2. The linguistic challenges faced by the English speaking student teachers were exacerbated by the conflicting teaching strategies adopted by their original two lecturers in the same course. As G2b noted:

*As far as learning goes it [Chinese language] was difficult...because in the first two years we had two teachers that didn’t get along with each other, they both had very different ideas. One was very strict in the teaching and just followed these rules and read the book. The other one was about accelerated learning in using music to free your mind. One was like a free spirit, the other one was very very rigid...I like the style that was freer, the rigid style was difficult. And the personal clash between those two teachers really took away from our learning. (G2c)*

Though G2b acknowledged that “both teachers were good in their own way”, the Chinese classes in the first two years of her candidature were still seen as “disconnected” because of the teacher educators’ disagreements in best approaches
of Chinese teaching. G2b’s concern was shared by other student teachers in the BEd degree. According to TE2, over half of the enrolled student teachers dropped out of the BEd degree in the first two years of study, indicating some systemic difficulties with the delivery of Chinese language courses. Both having an enrolment of 30 at the start, in the first year 1991 cohort 15 graduated; while in the 1992 cohort only 8 graduated.

The then employed teacher educator in the CLTE Program, TE2, who followed the two with divergent approaches noted above, was welcomed by these English speaking student teachers. They reported that TE2 was able to combine both Chinese and Australian styles of teaching. A possible reflection of this is the retention and graduation rate for the 1993 cohort, in which 22 of the initial enrolment of 30 students graduated. G2b and G2c characterised some features of the optimal Chinese pedagogy that they experienced with TE2:

*He was fantastic. He was a mix; he was kind of like an Australian teacher, though he was Chinese. He understood our way. So his method of teaching was much easier for us...I’ve had experience from in China Chinese teachers, Chinese way in Australia, and then free spirit way, then normal school way. And I like his normal school way, it was what I was used to growing up....And sometimes I think in that free spirit way you feel more like a child than an adult learner, where the new teacher just has it right. (G2b)*

*He was so eloquent, he has really good English skills, he was quite explicit, he taught exactly what I am saying, he had that quality teaching methods where he was able to give lots of examples, share good practices, make sure you are in a safe environment to practice using the Chinese, before you had to do it independently. (G2c)*

In summary, the Chinese linguistic features have posed some innate difficulties learning the subject matter courses in the CLTE Programs for the student teachers whose main language is English. Questions about the suitability of some course resources, curriculum arrangements and sequencing, and pedagogical approaches in delivering Chinese courses in the CLTE Programs, were all identified by the English
speaking participants as having exacerbated the challenges faced with Chinese linguistic features.

The major issue arguably lies in the separated roles of education department that provides the teaching degree and language department that provide the arts degree. On rare occasions, the CLTE Program developed special courses that combine Chinese language courses with the educational studies within School of Education, such as practiced in the BEd degree (1991-1996) at U2, supported by sufficient funding and education resources from government initiatives. It seems the current common practice is offering Chinese language courses independently in the language department. This has reduced the direct link of the student teachers’ Chinese language studies with their future classroom teaching needs. The contemporary Chinese language courses as a university discipline, which are attended by candidates from various disciplines, aim to develop in the candidates’ comprehensive knowledge and skills of Chinese. Meanwhile, candidates who study for a combined teaching degree expect to learn Chinese language knowledge that is appropriate and ideally specifically designed for their future classroom teaching needs.

In this situation, the interviewed teacher educators from education department have applied various approaches to maintain and develop the student teachers’ Chinese proficiency and link their education and pedagogy studies with their Chinese language. However, when there is limited cooperation between the language and education departments, the Chinese language courses are considered by the English speaking student teachers as not targeted. In particular, for the three interviewed retrained teachers from U3, their entire training in the CLTE Programs involve only Chinese language studies with the language department. they see no obvious relevance of their study of the comprehensive and demanding Chinese language courses with their Chinese teaching at beginners level to their English speaking school students.
Challenges with professional training

Professional training includes generic education studies, pedagogy studies and practice teaching at teacher education institutions in Australia. The study of education and pedagogy course was reported as particularly challenging for native Chinese speaking student teachers in the CLTE Programs. These challenges were evident in two aspects. Firstly it was difficult for them to study these courses through English media, though many of them had reached the required level of English proficiency for international students before enrolment. Moreover, unlike the English speaking students, they had not personally experienced the Australian schooling and thus had difficulties understanding the generic education and pedagogy courses based on their limited background knowledge. The absence of specific Chinese pedagogy instructions made it equally difficult for both Chinese and English speaking student teachers to link their training with Chinese teaching issues. Secondly, native Chinese speaking student teachers experienced difficulties in genuinely understanding the pedagogical practices in Australian schools during their practice teaching, although they had already studied the education and pedagogy courses. Compared with their English speaking peers, they tended to experience more difficulties applying the theories and principles in course studies appropriately into practice teaching.

Challenges with Chinese language education and pedagogy courses

The cancellation of specific Chinese pedagogy courses in contemporary CLTE Programs is considered the major factor causing the difficulties studying education and pedagogy courses for the interviewed student teachers. In the DipEd degree at U1 in the 1990s, because the one-year courses were closely dealing with practical issues in Chinese teaching in Australia, generic educational concepts and theories were not taught as separate courses but weaved in the courses addressing language teaching and Chinese teaching issues. In contrast, in the current master degree at U2,
eleven education foundation courses are arranged in the two-year CLTE Program, in addition to five specialist courses (Appendix 8). These educational courses are to be undertaken by student teachers of all subject areas, and specialist studies for second language specialty are language generic. These courses are largely knowledge of the broad education theories, regulations, concepts, practices and school environment in Australia, but have limited connection with specific Chinese language teaching issues. Such contents can be very challenging for native Chinese speakers.

ST2, who used to be a qualified ESL teacher in Taiwan, had gained credit for the two language methodology courses via her previous ESL qualification. As a result, in the CLTE Program, ST2 needed to study the 11 educational courses to achieve a qualification to teach in Australia. In her opinion, the educational courses are intensive and laborious, and lack direct pertinence to her expectation of study:

* I used to teach ESL, and I thought my English skills were good enough. But there are so many materials to read in the course. Now I have to rush for assignment every week for those education courses, so I can graduate and get the qualification. Some courses are good, such as topics on learners, quality teaching, and technologies. But some courses are too general. Courses such as dealing with students of special needs, and Aboriginal education, though were necessary, have little to do with my Chinese teaching. I think these topics could be introduced as one lecture, instead of taking a whole semester of study. I just want to learn how to teach Chinese. (ST2)*

From ST2’s comment, there appears to be an innate conflict between the teacher education and accreditation criteria in Australia and the expectation of study by student teachers from various language, culture and education backgrounds. Admittedly, for native Chinese speakers who have not experienced Australian schooling, the educational course are although challenging but necessary for them to understand the Australian school environment for Chinese teaching. Such education foundation courses are also necessary for student teachers from any background, any discipline area and studying for any level of degree to gain a teaching qualification in
Australia. Meanwhile, it seemed what ST2 expected was to study education foundation courses in the approach as the ones introduced in the DipEd degree at U1. At graduate level, the candidature is often less than half the duration of the undergraduate study. As TE3 explained, excluding practice teaching and semester break time, the two-year candidature is often actually only 18 months or less. ST2 explicitly stated that her sole purpose of enrolling in the CLTE Program was to gain the Australian accreditation. Therefore, within the limited study time, it is natural that she wanted to compress the study of some education courses that seemed unduly generic and had little direct focus on how to teach Chinese in the Australian school environment.

The challenges ST2 experienced could be the issue of content and arrangement of the contemporary MTch degree offered in the CLTE Program at U2. In contrast to ST2, G2a, who enrolled in the BEd degree at U2 in 1995 and equally learned education foundation courses, did not report difficulties with education and pedagogy studies. The reason could be analysed from two aspects. Firstly, the four-year candidature in the BEd degree leaves more space for the student teachers to digest the education foundation courses. Secondly, and more importantly, the BEd degree had gained sufficient resources to design a special curriculum for student teachers of Chinese. It was targeted at preparing mainly English speaking student teachers who had received Australian schooling to teach Chinese subject. Therefore, generic education and pedagogy studies were closely integrated with Chinese pedagogy and explained through Chinese teaching issues. It thus demonstrated more explicit pertinence with Chinese teaching than the ones offered in the MTch degree. Such an integrated study could be much easier for native Chinese speakers to handle.

The common exclusion of specific Chinese methodology studies in the contemporary CLTE Programs in the three case-study Universities has left the learning of specific Chinese language teaching pedagogy largely with their practice teaching experience. The outcome of student teachers’ practice teaching experience
often is inherently variable, depending on the supervisor teachers and other various factors in the school environment.

Significantly then, the interviewed English speaking student teachers equally affirmed the need for specialised Chinese language teaching methodology/pedagogy courses. In the retraining CLTE Program at U3, because the three interviewed teachers were already qualified language teachers, they were not required to study language methodology courses. Upon their second-year candidature, they started teaching Chinese courses in their schools. In the interviewed teachers’ opinion, having learned some Chinese language knowledge, together with their experience in language teaching, did not sufficiently equip them with the effective strategies needed to teach Chinese in Australian schools. Specific Chinese pedagogy courses should be introduced to replace some of the Chinese language courses.

*In the second year, we did TWO books! Book Two and Book Three, no pinyin at all. Why not do one semester of Book Two, if you want, forget Book Three, which is irrelevant, not necessary. And the second semester, have a course set up where you had to write a teaching program for your school, at your level. Write some lesson plans for that teaching program, and some work sheet, and do some filming, and write the reflection, evaluation. Submit that to the university. Perfect! Why not? It’s much more relevant. (ST3b, original emphasis)*

*Something that’s more practical, something that you are using it, and you could share it with other teachers, it can go into a bank of programs and work sheets, where other teachers could share with. They should do that. (ST3b)*

ST1 showed similar expectation incorporating components of specific language pedagogy instructions in the curriculum. But considering the constraints of financial and education resources on the university’s side, ST1 also acknowledged the difficulties for the university in providing pedagogical support for student teachers of specific language group.
It’s impossible but I’d like to have that focus on our proper languages, very specifically, our languages, and how to teach that. I am thinking maybe they could grab a Chinese teacher from the school, or a retired one because they have more time, coming to talk in our individual groups of teachers and give us some strategies and tips on how to teach our specific languages. Maybe that would be useful but I don’t know, maybe it’s just too much trouble for the university. (ST1)

As discussed earlier in this chapter, the Chinese language courses of contemporary CLTE Programs were considered as overly comprehensive and lack pertinence to classroom teaching by the interviewed student teachers. Meanwhile, the provision of generic education and pedagogy courses in the education department rendered the contemporary CLTE Programs fail to draw a clear link between the Chinese knowledge learned in the language department with the Chinese teaching pedagogies. Chapter 4 found that sufficient financial support, significant enrolment number of each language group, and expertise of employed teacher educator are the necessary conditions to provide language specific pedagogy courses and instructions; whereas in the current sociocultural context for LOTE teaching and teacher education, this expectation may not be feasible. In-service training of special Chinese pedagogies sponsored by Chinese teacher associations and lifelong professional development in improving Chinese teaching strategies might be a practical complement to amend the deficiency of pedagogy studies in pre-service Chinese teacher education.

Challenges with understanding Australian education practices

Targeting at features of Australian students, the foundation of teacher education programs in Australia is succinctly summarised in D. Wang et al. (2013):

The aims of pre-service teacher curriculum reflect a “student-centred” image of education. Aligned with the aims of school curriculum, teacher education is grounded in a social constructivist learning model, which posits that learning occurs when a student constructs knowledge him/herself through being personally engaged in experiential learning with peers. The teacher is a facilitator of
learning, and the role of the learner is to be active and questioning. In language learning this means focus on language in sociocultural context, performance opportunities, and critical thinking about language and culture. (p. 122)

The interviewed English speaking student teachers in the CLTE Programs who have received most of their education in Australia did not report difficulties with applying education and pedagogy studies to practice teaching. They frequently use visual aids and organise interactive activities to engage the students during their Chinese teaching. This is more so for ST3a, ST3b and ST3c who were already experience language teachers and know their students well. In contrast, native Chinese speaking students who have not experienced Australian schooling tend to have difficulties understanding how to apply the theories and guidelines learned in the education and pedagogy course to practice teaching. G2a recalled his impression during observation of a supposedly good Chinese class by an English speaking teacher:

*Is this teaching Chinese? Firstly, everyone was talking; such a lack of disciplinary is intolerable. Secondly, in one lesson the teacher only taught two Chinese characters. The students just coloured the strokes of the characters, cut them off and patched them together. Other times they were singing, playing games, and watching video games. There was no serious study at all.* (G2a)

G2a’s response appears to align with a more traditional view of effective language instruction involving strict discipline and silent practices; whereas interactive activities are considered by G2a as not providing substantial learning. It seems that G2a emphasised more of the teacher’s role in disciplining the students and imparting a wholesome range of knowledge of Chinese language and culture, rather than the students’ preferred approaches of engaging with the learning and their expectations of learning outcome.

G2a’s attitude of downplaying the interactive pedagogical skills in native Chinese speaking student teachers contrasts with the English speaking teachers’ criteria of

---

9 For illustration of some of ST3a’s innovative teaching strategies, please refer to Appendix 10.
professional performance. Hence there are some conflicting opinions about what quality Chinese teacher should have between the native Chinese student teachers and the non-Chinese background teachers. Such conflicts, as mentioned in Orton (2008), may cause some friction in the workplace. As can be reflected from G2a’s comment on his practice teaching experience:

*My supervisor teacher was from Vietnam who graduated earlier in the same degree. Though he learned Chinese for several years, he could only teach beginners level. But he could teach me how to manage the class, communicate with the students. He grew up in the region, so of course he does better than me in these aspects. But in terms of learning the specialty, he surely can’t do it well…Now think about it, he was quite harsh. I helped him a lot with the teaching, but he just gave me a C in the report. I was quite frustrated.* (G2a)

These pedagogical challenges of applying interactive and engaging classroom activities faced by the native Chinese speaking student teachers could reflect the differences between their personal education experience in their home country and the education practices in Australia. Some distinctive differences were noted by TE2:

*Most of the English speaking Chinese teachers will use games to make the teaching very exciting. Students are encouraged through playing games, competition etc. So the kids are enjoying that. They can do well and think that difficult language can be a fun. On the other hand, native speakers of Chinese, they believe that these characters have to be learned by repetitions, by reciting they have to by learn heart, therefore organising very boring and teasing drills.* (TE2)

Similarly, as TE3 perceived, the student teachers’ “history of language learning” (TE3) could significantly influence their perspectives towards language learning. Having learned Chinese as a mother tongue, these native Chinese speaking student teachers may have difficulties understanding the Australian students’ perspective and their learning process. It takes time for them to genuinely understand the process of learning Chinese as a second language, and hence apply suitable strategies for Australian students.
The native Chinese speakers sometimes assume too much of the learners; whereas the non-native teachers genuinely understand that every syllable they utter has to be clear, or has to have a meaning. So you can’t go too fast, you can’t have a long sentence. If the students are not really comfortable in the language, use two words sentences, or the picture, or gesture...So it’s perhaps not the Australian teachers have better methodology exactly, but they remember what it was like for them, and so they do the things for their students that they know would have been helpful for them. Many of the native-speakers do too; they recognise very quickly how to get meaning across. (TE3)

Furthermore, the perceived differences in Chinese education, as representative of traditional Confucius value that emphasis on the leading role of teachers, and in Australian education, a characteristic of a more student-centred style of teaching, have also underlined some difficulties for the native Chinese (student) teachers to understand the Australian students’ learning process. The different attitudes towards learning between Chinese (and other Asian) and Australian students and different styles of classroom teaching were extensively noted by the interviewed participants:

I think students in China are much better behaved. Well, no, they are much more focused on learning. I understand if they don’t work hard at school, with 1.3 billion population, there is a lot competition, they may miss the boat. Whereas in Australia, it’s a lot more relaxed, and especially the languages. “Everyone speaks English, why do we have to do this?” So I’m sure convincing the students... the language teacher really has a difficult job, but an important job. (TE3)

Chinese is the same with the Japanese class, in that the kids in that class will listen to you, they won’t overtly be speaking and rude in Asian countries, they might go to sleep, but they won’t speak over you... (Whereas here) survival language teaching means you HAVE TO have that class listen to you. I have my room in groups, so they constantly competing with each other for prizes, stamps, points, things like that. So there is a lot of engaging activities in the classroom, and that CAN lead to chatting. But if it’s positive chatting, it doesn’t matter, but if it’s just chatting, no it ruins it. (ST3c, original emphasis)
I have been to Japanese schools, they are very quiet, it’s very teacher centred. Teachers do sort of all the work. They write stuff on the white board, they tell you what to say, it’s a lot of reading, a lot of writing, listening, maybe, but not a lot of speaking. In Australian classroom, we aim to be more student-centred. Language is even different from other subjects. We try to encourage interaction. It’s easier for them to learn if they are speaking it as sort of using language rather than just sitting down there, reading and writing. Australian kids they are a bit more wired to the hands-on stuff, games, and practical activities, and getting them to speak. They are a lot more in-tune with that kind of learning. (ST1)

I really think there is a lot of learning that happens when they play the games...when they laugh, when they scream with each other...none of that matters to me, because I know that the learning took place before it happens. (ST3a)

Because the native Chinese student teachers’ often strict approaches of learning do not fit with the Australian students’ expected interactive activities, TE1a noted the student teachers in U1 at graduate level, who used to be predominantly native Chinese speakers, constantly experienced classroom discipline issues in their practicum. Unpleasant experience at practice teaching could be discouraging for these student teachers, despite their original relatively clear purpose of obtaining an Australian teaching qualification when enrolled. As TE1a recalled:

When my students teach in the public schools, they often can’t discipline the students. This is a big problem. If they can manage the students, they usually can teach well, but usually in a 50 minute class, they have to spend half the time maintaining the order. Often after their practicum, these students don’t want to be a teacher anymore. On the other hand, maybe the students did not enjoy learning Chinese, finding it too difficult. Many of them attended to course because of the 100 compulsory hours of language learning set by the State government. So they were not interested, and the classroom was always not in order. (TE1a)

Again, the problem lies in the different cultural expectations between the Chinese speaking teachers and the English speaking students, which result in a perception of
poor student behaviour and discipline and failed attempts to change the situation. This problem is compounded by the overall indifference towards language learning in the English speaking Australia in the broader context. This public attitude, reflected in the students’ behaviour, is challenging for not only the native Chinese speaking teachers, but common for all language teachers.

*Australian students are very keen to learn some languages, but they really don’t want to take it seriously.* (TE2)

*I have observed similar problem in many classrooms of other languages, Japanese, French...The students don’t take languages learning seriously, they don’t have the motivation or the urge to learn languages. The whole society is like this.* (TE1a)

Similar pedagogical difficulties are also noted in a recent research conducted by Scrimgeour (2010), investigating the pedagogical training of the increasing number of student teachers, who graduated from universities in China and currently studying in the CLTE Programs at graduate level in other Australian universities. The school culture and education concepts in Australia are distinctively different with those experienced by the native Chinese speaking student teachers in their home country. In the CLTE Programs, it is vital to cultivate student teachers’ understanding of and empathy for their future students’ Chinese learning process, and so the ability to adopt suitable strategies that put students at the centre of classroom teaching, and the ability to cater for students’ different interest in Chinese learning. Such qualities are considered essential for Chinese teachers to handle the challenges of CLLT in an overseas context (Wen, 2011), as elaborated in Chapter 2. In order to bridge the gap encountered by native Chinese speaking (student) teachers in the Australian context, deepening intercultural understanding have to be developed in these teachers (Moloney & Xu, 2012; Orton, 2011).
Challenges in the workplace

Challenges with securing a Chinese teaching position in schools

The outcome of the CLTE Programs in supplying qualified Chinese language teachers for Australian schools can be explored through the interviewed student teachers’ experiences in the job market and workplace. Though all interviewed graduates from the CLTE Programs in the three case universities are currently in teaching positions, they do not necessarily teach Chinese. Other than some personal factors, their experience with Chinese teaching after graduation is largely influenced by the attitude and extent of support from various participants towards Chinese teaching in the school environment, which are further underlined by the broader sociocultural context for Chinese teaching and learning in Australia.

In U1, the interviewed student teacher ST1 was determined not to teach Chinese after graduation. Firstly, a minor in Chinese teaching was barely his personal choice. Secondly, he did not have a pleasant history with Chinese learning and practice teaching experience, thus was not sufficiently confident or interested to teach Chinese; whereas his great experience with Japanese learning and practice teaching made him passionate about being a Japanese teacher. Therefore, though being a background speaker he is linguistically advanced in Chinese proficiency, this does not guarantee his interest in Chinese learning and teaching; particularly when the Australian students tend to have more appealing experience with learning other well-established languages.

In Region 2, as discussed in Chapter 4, opportunities for Chinese teachers in local schools have been declining since the diminished momentum promoting Chinese teaching from the Australian government in the mid-1990s. G2b and G2d, as the first graduates of the BEd degree, easily found a Chinese teaching position in local public secondary schools upon graduation, due to shortage of Chinese teachers at that time. However, G2a and G2c, who graduated in the later years of the BEd degree,
experienced great difficulties finding a Chinese teaching position in local schools. After several years of casual teaching in the region, G2a had to move to Sydney where there were more opportunities to eventually found a permanent position in a public primary school. The school G2a has been since working with locates in a suburb with high proportion of Chinese migrants and over half the students are from a Chinese background. The large enrolment in the Chinese language program could thus guaranteed G2a a full-time position teaching Chinese only to students from Chinese background in the school.

G2c, on the other hand, never had the opportunity to teach Chinese since graduation, despite having good proficiency with Chinese, and holding a university qualification in Chinese teaching.

*When I was trained, I was at a good level. I was able to communicate well, especially when living in China. I was quite confident talking to people back in Australia, for the remainder of the degree. So I was looking forward to teaching Chinese, because I really saw a future. Unfortunately in the region, there was no offer of teaching positions in Chinese, and I had to move to Sydney, looking for work to teach Chinese. But I was actually turned away from many primary schools and even high schools, because they prefer to have native Chinese speakers teach Chinese, which is a bit of double-edged sword. (G2c)*

G3’s unsuccessful experience with job seeking in Sydney raised the issue of the link between the core of the CLTE Programs at teacher education institutions, and the desirable qualities of Chinese teachers from the perspective of school decision makers. In the case of G2b and G2d, both being native English speakers, they were readily accepted by local schools to teach the students who are predominantly from an Australian background. For G2a, as a native Chinese speaker, he was also accepted to teach students that are exclusively from Chinese background, including those who are born in Australia and who have moved to Australia at different stages of life. However, In G2c’s case, there is disconnect between her background and her potential students’ background. She is a non-native Chinese speaker trying to teach
in schools in Sydney; while based on G2a’s explanation, it seems many public schools in Sydney with a Chinese language program in the 1990s would have significant number of students from a Chinese background. The university education G2c received aimed to equip graduates with a comprehensive understanding and effective strategies to teach Chinese at beginners level to the general Australian students who are totally new to Chinese language; while schools that had a notable proportion of students from Chinese background, thus more opportunities for Chinese teaching, tended to emphasise the high level of Chinese language proficiency of the teachers over an Australian teaching qualification.

Limited demand and unstable opportunities for Chinese teaching in some regions could pose challenges for graduates of the CLTE Programs in job seeking. ST2, as a native Chinese speaker, is determined to teach Chinese in regional Australia, because she enjoys the relaxed lifestyle outside big cities. She noted, “If I am to live in busy and noisy cities like Sydney, I might as well just stay in my home city.” (ST2) However, as analysed in Chapter 4, working in Australia, especially in regional schools, often requires teachers to have multiple teaching specialisations, due to likely fluctuations in enrolments of Chinese. ST2 started with great determination to teach Chinese language and culture to non-native speakers, and thus chose Chinese as her only teaching area. Based on other graduates’ experiences in regional Australia, however, it seems that unless she moves to capital cities, or has a second teaching speciality, it would be difficult for her to secure a full-time (Chinese) teaching position in schools in regional Australia.

In the retraining CLTE Program at U3, though the three interviewed teachers have started teaching Chinese courses in their schools, other than ST3a who has gained extensive support from the school committee, ST3b and ST3c were not particularly optimistic about the future of Chinese teaching in their schools. Their schools were both located outside the capital city, and the students were predominantly from English speaking backgrounds. Though part of the deal with being granted with full
scholarship for study at the retraining program is that the retrained teachers must offer Chinese in their schools, this deal could not guarantee that students will want to take the subject in their schools.

My principal had to approve me to study this, by promising that our school would OFFER Chinese, now, it didn’t say you HAD TO teach. When they say you should be teaching it, my school offered it, but if the students don’t elect to do the Chinese, then the deed is being fulfilled because we offered it. (ST3b, original emphasis)

In the school environment, according to the interviewed language professionals, many Australian students find Chinese learning hard, irrelevant and not interesting, and do not wish to choose Chinese and/or learn Chinese beyond compulsory years. This is the major reason for the common low demand and unstable positions for Chinese teachers at schools. Students’ lack of motivation to learn is directly linked with the lack of effective pedagogy from their Chinese teachers, whose teacher education experience was largely absent with specific Chinese pedagogy instructions. Orton (2008) reported that many native Chinese speaking teachers, who make up a dominant proportion of over 90% of the Chinese teacher workforce in capital cities, often struggle to relate effectively with students and participants in the wider school community.

In addition to the common linguistic challenges of Chinese language for English speakers, at school level, the identified demanding requirement for Chinese learning in the syllabus added to the students’ difficulties with Chinese learning. A good comparison is with the syllabus of Japanese, which is on the same level of difficulty with Chinese (National Virtual Translation Centre, 2007). According to Board of Studies NSW (2012), for HSC Japanese Beginners, the requirement is to use 79 characters (Kanji), and at Continuers level, use 150 Kanji and recognise 50 more. Comparatively, the requirement for HSC Chinese Beginners is 167 characters, and at Continuers level it is 350 characters. As ST1 observed, based on his over 10-year experience learning Japanese and Chinese, the study of Japanese Kanji, which
originated from and are mostly identical with Chinese characters, are equally
difficult for Australian students. However, Kanji only takes approximately one third
of Japanese vocabulary, and the study of Hiragana and Katakana are relatively easy
for English speakers. Within the same duration of study, the characters required for
Chinese is a lot less “digestible” for students (ST1).

The emphasis on mastering Chinese characters in reading and writing, as prescribed
in the current NSW syllabus for example, almost inevitably leads to the emphasis on
development of all four skills, including listening, speaking, reading and writing, in
Chinese proficiency at the beginners level. While being an ideal goal, in TE1a’s
opinion, it is not practical in encouraging the students’ learning:

Currently many Chinese teachers want the students to be excellent in
all four skills. Within limited curriculum hours, such expectation
does not match the realities. It might not necessary for the students
to read and write unless they are going to work academically in
Chinese related disciplines. (TE1a)

It is worth noticing that Chinese learning, especially the characters, is not only
challenging for the general Australian students, but also similarly challenging for
Australian students from a Chinese background, especially for those who are born in
Australia or migrated to Australia at young age. In TE3’s opinion, the background
speakers might only have an advantage in Chinese listening and speaking, if they can
speak Chinese to their families and friends outside the class. However, a significant
proportion of Chinese speaking population in Australia are not Mandarin speakers
(see Appendix 2). The distinctively different pronunciation systems, together with
some vocabulary and grammar differences in these forms of Chinese language
compared to Mandarin Chinese, have compromised the advantage of many
background speakers in listening and speaking skills of Mandarin Chinese, which is
currently taught in the Australian education system. Moreover, their reading and
writing skills, “like native English speakers...may not be as developed” (TE3),
unless they have been strictly required by their parents to continuously practice Chinese characters (TE3, G2a).

Orton (2008) expects that “BS (background speakers) students and L1 (first language user) citizens should be particularly nurtured as they comprise a future pool of professionals” (p. 5). Currently a significant proportion of Chinese learners in Australia at matriculation level nationwide are reported to be native and background Chinese speakers (G. Liu & Lo Bianco, 2007; Orton, 2008). This is a promising start to realise the official goal of preparing Chinese professionals, though the strong presence of background Chinese speakers have brought some side effects for the teaching (see Orton, 2008). However, despite all their perceived advantages and promising career pathways, because of the difficulties in learning Chinese, overall, as G2a perceived, background Chinese speakers in Australia have distinctively “uneven level of proficiency” (G2a). According to G2a, unlike the first generation of Chinese migrants, these Chinese Australians do not experience as much language and culture barrier in living and job seeking. Their parents also tend to encourage them to pursue a career with higher social status and better pay. Teaching is often not one of their priorities. As a result, based on G2a’s over 10 years’ experience teaching at Saturday School in Sydney region, the proportion of the Chinese Australian students taking Chinese courses at matriculation level has been actually very low.

Competition from other well-established languages and other non-language subjects, including the core subjects and elective subjects that appear to be relatively easy and fun, has also discouraged many students from enrolling in Chinese in the first place. Although the secondary students in NSW are required to take at least 100 hours’ LOTE class, they do not necessarily choose to study Chinese. They still tend to choose the well-established languages that usually have developed good resources and appealing strategies for the Australian students. In ST3c’ school, French and Japanese have been the traditional languages, and in ST3b’ school Italian has been the “entrenched tradition” (ST3b), taught for over 40 years. Because the operation of
an elective course is largely based on its rank of enrolments, as a result, competing with other subjects in school, Chinese seems to be at a very disadvantaged place in terms of attracting enrolments:

*Chinese is definitely the hardest subject they are doing in Year 7 now. They come in and they do everything all right. Do they choose it in Year 8, 9, 10? The very very top kids do. But you have to have 14, 15, 16 kids choose it to get a class. This is all over. Kids choose things that they think they don’t have to work in, cooking, sports, arts... We’ve got about 80 kids going through Year 11 next year. And 22 of them took languages. That’s brilliant. However, 14 of them took French, 8 of them took Japanese. Nobody took the new Chinese course I offered. I didn’t push it in a big way because I didn’t have enough support to push it in a big way.* (ST3c)

*We offered Chinese in year 8, we offered Chinese 100 hour course, a mini course, for just Year 9, and we offered in Year 11 for unit of Chinese beginners. We didn’t get numbers.* (ST3b)

*It’s all number based in government schools. They’ve got to use different criteria.* (ST3c)

*In Year 8, we’ve been competing with Theatre Arts, which is how to create a set in a theatre. We are competing with another subject, which is Hair and Make-up. 13 year-old student, you’d say do you want to do Chinese or do you want to do hair and make-up? It’s very competitive.* (ST3b)

Based on the experience of the interviewed graduates and current student teachers, it appears that the job opportunities for Chinese teachers is largely determined by the enrolment number of students, which is further underlined by the geographic structure in the region, school leaders’ attitude towards (Chinese) language teaching, the requirments of Chinese syllabus, the effectiveness of the Chinese teachers’ pedagogy, and the students’ extent of willingness to learn (Chinese) language. Unless their school is located in a suburb in a capital city where the Chinese speaking population tend to concentrate (in the case of G2a), or there is substantial support from the school (in the case of ST3a), most graduates would have to utilise their multiple teaching specialties to secure a job position in Australian schools.
Challenges liaising with other participants in the school environment

In the school environment, support from other participants, including the parents, school leaders, colleagues and peer teachers, are vital factors facilitating the Chinese teachers’ efforts to develop and grow their Chinese language programs. Overall, after nearly 200 years’ exclusion of Chinese migrants and restriction of Chinese teaching in Australia’s recent history (Sun, 2002), Australia has witnessed a gradual, and fluctuating, acceptance of the importance of Chinese speaking countries in its region, and the importance and potential value of learning Chinese language. The establishment of Chinese language programs in schools, as a newly supported but expected to be widely taught language, however, seems to require extensive support from other participants in the school environment, if it is to succeed, and overcome many of the challenges cited to this point.

Parental support is often the primary drive for introducing Chinese language programs in Australian schools. Support from parents who are predominantly from a Chinese background, according to G2a, is the main reason why Chinese is introduced in schools in metropolitan Sydney. As G2a explains, these parents usually encourage their children to learn Chinese, especially at younger age, partly due to the well understood reasons of maintaining their children’s’ relationship with their home culture, country, and with themselves as Chinese speakers (see also Smith et al., 1993). In addition, they may also expect that their children could achieve satisfactory Chinese skills more easily than those without a Chinese background, and thus gain an edge in their overall school performance and future career, particularly when the Chinese speaking market has been significantly expanding in the past half century (see statistics in Chapter 3).

Some participants noted such strategic approach used by some Chinese parents. They clearly focus on maximising their children’s performance in the ‘high-stakes’
subjects in schooling, and so adjust their expectations with respect to their learning of Chinese language accordingly. As G2a noted:

The parents are realistic. They would think their children have already been conversant with basic Chinese by Year 5. That’s enough. The next goal is to focus on preparing for the exams for selective schools. Parents are not that supportive on the Chinese study any more. (G2a)

This attitude of not considering Chinese (or indeed other LOTE) as one of the ‘serious subjects’ seems to be shared by non-Chinese background parents. A main reason could be identified as the cancellation of language subjects as a matriculation subject in 1968. As Lo Bianco and Slaughter (2009a) observed, this decision impacted on the shape of languages education both in schools and at tertiary level dramatically. The perceived importance of the subject is considered as a major factor impacting on the demand for it, and hence the demand for trained teachers. The majority Australian parents’ neglect of language learning, because of its apparent lack of ‘usefulness’, was summarised by TE3 as follows:

There are the arguments between the basics and the frills. And language would be seen, by many people, as frills. Not basic, not necessary, and in fact, complicating. So that’s the battle...[For example], Latin used to be taught for the upper classes in all public and private schools. And then it lost favour and was seen as a dead language. Partly because in the earlier days, if you want to do certain degrees, like medicine, you had to have Latin for the high school certificate. Then they [the university entrance examinations] dropped that, and then Latin gradually dropped...Some of them might see the strategically important languages for Australia, but most of them will not. (TE3)

The contemporary Australian parents’ attitude is presumably underlined by a lack of language study in their own education experience, which is an outcome of neglecting the education of languages other than English by the Australian government before the adoption of a multicultural policy in the 1970s. On this point, ST3c noted:
Even parents who are now in their 30s, their kids are in high school, they probably didn’t have such great language learning experiences at school. And opportunities with languages then were limited. (ST3c)

As a result, among the interviewed practicing Chinese teachers, only in G2a’s school were Chinese courses provided from kindergarten to Year 4, this being in response to an extensive appeal from the Chinese parents. In comparison, in the other schools mentioned in this research where they are all located within suburbs or regions with low proportion of Chinese speaking population, the operation of Chinese classes is reported as largely reliant on the principals’ support. This support is often directly responsive to the Australian governments’ promotion of Chinese teaching and allocation of funding in schools.

Support from people at leadership position in the school environment is another important factor in facilitating the Chinese teachers’ work in developing Chinese language programs, in terms of securing a position for Chinese in the curriculum and the level of funding available to develop the Chinese program. In G2b’s school, upon the principal’s decision, the Chinese language program was replaced by an Indonesian language program in the early 2000s due the the declining enrolment. In comparison, in G2d’s school, support from the principal facilitated the operation of Chinese class, even in years it could not recruit the required numbers.

In addition, a general sense of sympathy for language education from the school decision makers is vital for schools to proactively introduce Chinese language program and, more generally, LOTE program in schools. As TE3 noted:

*You really need a leadership, you really need a headmaster or headmistress, principal, who is convinced of the value of languages, who has had some good language learning themselves, some good travel and some good international experience, and who is convinced, because if you don't have someone within those top positions, head or deputy, it’s very difficult. (TE3)*

Particularly in primary schools where language teaching is not compulsory, an interest for languages from the school leaders will be more influential on the
decision to introduce language programs. Coming from a Chinese background, ST3a’s compassion for Chinese learning and his influence in the school community nicely illustrates TE3’s comment above:

*I am the assistant principle in the school, it’s lucky because I can get a bit of saying, I have a little bit influence. If I want to drive something, if I want something to happen, it’s possible. Unless other schools have someone who feels the same way with Japanese, or Indonesian, or Chinese, then it may not happen, because they don’t have to teach a language.* (ST3a)

ST3a’s influence led to the introduce of a “proper” (ST3a) Chinese language program to all the 700 students in his school, in that Chinese is currently taught once a week for kindergarten to Year 3 students, and twice a week for Year 3 to Year 6 students. A native Chinese speaker is also employed on three days a week basis to facilitate the teaching. Sufficient funding is located to develop Chinese resources. This extent of devotion to Chinese teaching at primary school level, according to ST3a, is rare in the area.

School’s overall financial status also affects the amount of funding available for teachers of Chinese to develop language program. Particularly, the good financial status in ST3a’s and ST3b’s schools leaves them more space to develop suitable teaching resources, organising excursions and even in-country experiences; whereas the not so optimistic financial situation has limited the teachers’ effort in developing the language program in ST3c’s school.

*We are lucky in this community, because it’s a rich neighbourhood. Our school is a public school, but it has a lot of money because the parents fund-raise a lot of money, like LOTS of money for a public school. We are like a private school almost. So it’s fortunate that we can spend money on extra things. But a lot of schools are not in our situation. Then they can’t decide they are going to teach Mandarin, if they don’t have the resources.* (ST3a, original emphasis. Note: It is interesting that even school leaders and Chinese teachers may subconsciously consider language teaching as an ‘extra thing’.)
In (ST3b’s) high school, you have kids who come from wealthy backgrounds, my high school is in very low economic area, makes a big difference. Her kids come from families where they can afford 6000 dollars to go to Italy for 2 weeks; she can get 20 to 25 going on those trips. If I try 6000 dollars take my kids anywhere, I might get not many kids. (ST3c)

In the larger school community, the extent of assistance from the relevant organisations is a third factor affecting the outcome of Chinese language teachers’ efforts in developing the Chinese language program. The development and share of suitable Chinese teaching resources, the network with peer Chinese teachers, and targeted and effective professional development are considered by the interviewed participants as the particularly important factors supporting Chinese teachers in the school community.

Though currently there is growing volume of Chinese teaching resources in Australia, the shortage of what students may experience as fun, relevant and engaging teaching resources is arguably one of the most pressing issues that practicing Chinese teachers face. As frequently quoted by the interviewed Chinese teachers, this is particularly the case when other well-established languages have already developed a substantial reservoir of attractive and proven effective resources to readily share among the teachers. This reality may work against Chinese teaching as it competes with other languages to attract students in schools.

There are lots of textbooks on the market. I’m obligated to use one, but I don’t feel it is a good one. I realised very quickly that it is not interesting. It’s really dry, very dry. What the kids like is the stickers, okay, but really, how much learning are you doing with that. Not a whole lot, I don’t think. And some stuff take you 5 seconds to do, it’s not really requiring a lot of the child. And as soon as I started using this, I hated it. I go really hated it. (ST3a)

I spent so much time on the internet, looking for resources. There are so many resources, but 99.9% of it is not relevant to me. I wouldn’t use it. (ST3a)
A lot languages, French and German, even Japanese to a degree, there is a lot of resources, easy to get and do, there is a lot support for you. But I didn’t find so much in Chinese, because it hasn’t been a long time. And Indonesian too. It’s very difficult. You can’t just go online and easily find as many things as we can in other languages. There are languages they don’t even have to look, they will get emails say, well, we are doing this, let’s go. For us, we are going to have to think of the idea, create it, and invite people along. (G2b)

Conferences and workshops organised by supportive Chinese organisations have offered great opportunities of network for Chinese teachers in Australia. Though such initiatives are appreciated by teachers, as with many professional development programs for in-service Chinese teachers, some interviewed teachers are doubtful of the effectiveness of such activities.

Where are the consultants? They are always up there. They talked about many theories, and envisioned the developments of Chinese teachings. That is good. But when it comes down to instructing my classroom teaching, facing my 20 students today, how can these consultants solve my direct problem in my class? (G2a)

To conclude, what we see here is a sense of the complexity of the problem of attracting schools students and broader school communities to Chinese language programs, alongside the multiple challenged faced by teachers of these language programs in their establishment and development. The uncertainties of government initiatives and funding for Chinese language programs, together with competition from more established languages, a general climate of indifference toward the ambiguous status of second language learning, and the linguistic difficulties and pedagogical inappropriateness of Chinese teaching, all impact on the demand for Chinese language programs and so for Chinese teacher graduates of the CLTE Programs under study. Graduates of the CLTE Programs tend to face difficulties finding a Chinese teaching position in schools and/or staying in a (full-time) Chinese teaching position. It is clear that in the school community, support from parents and school leaders is vital in establishing and maintaining the operation of the Chinese
language programs, that in turn can provide secure careers for Chinese teachers. Effective networks with peer teachers and supportive organisation are also vital in sharing with updated and practical teaching resources.

**Summary and conclusion**

This chapter has explored student teachers’ experiences in the CLTE Programs in the three case-study Universities, with a particular focus on both Chinese language courses and professional training within these Programs, as well as the experiences of graduates in the job market and workplace. Based on interviews with students and teacher educators, and prior research, the chapter identified and elaborated some of the major challenges experienced by student teachers. Some are characteristic of student teachers from particular linguistic, cultural, and educational backgrounds; and some can be seen to be more generalised.

Generally speaking, student teachers who are English speakers, including those with a Chinese background, encounter significant linguistic difficulties studying Chinese language courses. Partly, this is due to the innate Chinese linguistic difficulties for English speakers. However, we have shown that this is also attributed to an inappropriate arrangement of Chinese courses provided by the CLTE Programs that overly focusing on imparting comprehensive Chinese knowledge, but not in ways that effectively consolidate student teachers’ basic Chinese proficiency. Existing resources provided by the language department are also not adjusted by the CLTE Programs to cater for the particular needs of student teachers. Though teacher educators from the education department seek to maintain their student teachers’ Chinese language proficiency, it would be not as effective as when the study of Chinese courses was integrated with professional studies, such as practiced in the BEd degree in U2. Therefore, most interviewed English speaking student teachers suggest for a set of Chinese language courses that address their linguistic difficulties,
and provide basic and communicative contents suitable for classroom teaching in Australian schools.

Comparatively, student teachers who are native Chinese speakers and have received most of their education in Chinese speaking countries, tend to face particular difficulties dealing with dominant pedagogical approaches in Australia. This is largely due to the different education practices linked to cultural traditions. The most frequently discussed manifestation of this is the contrast between a teacher-centred approach that is popular in China and many Asian countries, and the student-centred approach in Australian classrooms, which impacts on teachers and students when the preferred approach is not shared. Though there are national criteria regarding the level of professional studies by (language) teachers, we can see here the benefits of teacher educators having a greater understanding of the intercultural differences between China and Australia, for example, to better prepare teachers for their work in the diverse contexts of Australian schools.

Orton (2008) has reported how the limited demand for Chinese teachers has contributed to a loss of certified Chinese teachers. The analysis in this chapter confirms this, and highlights the importance of ongoing efforts to raise public awareness about the importance of leaning Chinese language, to create climates in which parents and school leaders actively promote the study of Chinese language among the students. It is also necessary for the supportive organisations to cooperate and provide targeted support, including resources developing and sharing, and networking, to facilitate the Chinese teachers’ teaching outcome and efforts developing Chinese language programs.

In response to Orton’s (2008) report, this chapter (and this study) highlights multiple challenges, and dimensions of these challenges, including particular challenges for Chinese speaking teachers, and for English speaking teachers, as well as a set of challenges particular to Chinese teaching and teachers of Chinese in Australia. Given Australia’s decades of input in preparing Chinese teachers at national teacher
education institutions, the loss of these university-educated teachers, accredited to national teacher education standards, is perhaps a major factor impacting on the documented issue of the limited “availability of qualified teachers” in Orton’s report (2008, p. 19). The lack of qualified Chinese teachers in the workforce is also widely identified as a major issue constraining the development of Chinese teaching in the global context (see Chapter 2). This chapter has provided a fuller picture of the multiple factors that lie behind this central issue of the supply of Chinese language teachers.

Based on the investigation of the sociocultural factors that shape the CLTE Programs in the three case-study Universities in Chapter 4 and the common challenges encountered by student teachers with the curriculum study and workplace experiences in this chapter, the next chapter will draw together the major conclusions of this project, in relation to the central research question, and propose some constructive guidelines for preparing Chinese language teachers in Australia and the global context.
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Introduction

This study has explored the supply and pre-service education of Chinese teachers in teacher education institutions in New South Wales, Australia. It has consciously situated this study in the global context of Chinese teaching, informed by Vavrus and Barlett’s (2006) vertical case study approach. Australian practice was thus investigated in reference to its sociocultural and historical context. Chapters 2 and 3 reviewed Chinese teaching and teacher education in the global context and the Australian context respectively, while Chapters 4 and 5 investigated the design, implementation and outcomes of the CLTE Programs at three identified case-study Universities at the local level. In doing so, this study has sought to answer the key research question. *How can the Australian practice of pre-service CLTE Programs contribute to the preparation of TCSOL teachers in local teacher education institutions in English speaking countries and on a wider global scale, in the current context of the expansion of international Chinese education?*

This project has identified that CLTE Programs in Australia, having emerged from the domestic multicultural context, are facing growing challenges with curriculum design and delivery, due to the increasingly diverse source of student teachers in the global age and the lack of support for LOTE in relation to the wider use of English internationally. It is necessary then for governments to provide sustained support for CLTE Programs over a significant period, with tailor-made courses targeting the particular needs of the student teacher cohort, and efforts to raise public awareness of the importance of LOTE in the current, global age. Based on this finding, several recommendations are put forward in this concluding chapter to improve the CLTE Programs in Australia. These recommendations will also contribute towards the improved preparation of Chinese language teachers in the global context.
Chinese teacher education in NSW, Australia, and globally

Specific and unique features of the Australian case

At the global level, as detailed in the review of Chinese teaching internationally in Chapter 2, three major tendencies in Chinese teaching and teacher supply were identified.

Firstly, the shifting location of the teaching of Chinese language, from inside China to outside China, contributed to the growth of both researchers of Chinese found in overseas countries, and later of visiting Chinese professionals from China. Ancient merchants and missionaries first visited China and returned to their home countries with authentic Chinese scripts. They learned practical Chinese for daily use in an immersive Chinese environment, while later Chinese language learners from a wider range of professions learned about China through the imported authentic and/or translated works in their home countries. Interest in China’s history, geography, society, philosophy, customs and other cultural aspects saw the creation of the academic discipline of ‘Sinology’, most often found in elite European universities. Over time, developments in modern transportation facilitated increased opportunities for cooperation and exchange. In modern times, overseas or international students can quite readily undertake in-country study in China, and in other Chinese speaking countries and regions. Similarly, a growing number of Chinese scholars and teaching professionals in China are dispatched by the Chinese authorities, and/or invited by overseas organisations to assist with Chinese teaching in an expanding range of overseas countries.

A second major tendency in the supply and training of Chinese language teachers, identified in the review of international literature, is the growth of the teaching of Chinese language in school systems within non-Chinese speaking countries. In the post-World War II and Cold War period Chinese language was widely offered at the tertiary level, as a part of the ‘area studies’ approach and Sinology discipline.
Together with modern China’s opening up to the world politically and economically, the Chinese authorities have been actively promoting International Chinese Education (language and culture). At the same time governments in English speaking countries like the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada and Australia, have increasingly acknowledged the growing importance of modern China in the world-economy, and geopolitically. Part of the response has been to extend and promote the learning of Chinese in school systems, producing a demand for professional Chinese language teachers. The expansion of Chinese language learning, and preparation of Chinese language teachers, in New South Wales, can be understood as part of a broader, international trend, responding to the ‘rise of China’ in the world-economy, as a major world power.

A third major tendency relates to the attention given to Chinese language pedagogical practice, as a consequence of the expansion of Chinese teaching and learning, and the historical nature and character of traditional Chinese learning. Changes in the student cohort, to English speaking students in western contexts, required a change to the conventional pedagogical practices traditionally used by Chinese language teaching professionals. The traditional Sinology discipline emphasised the use and understanding of authentic Chinese scripts, and was focused on developing adult learners’ reading and writing skills. Chinese teaching strategies in these contexts were largely based on the then popular grammar-translation approach to second and foreign language teaching and learning. The expanded and modern Chinese learning into Schools in English speaking countries demanded a more functional use of Chinese, and so the focus shifted towards communicative language skills. The emphasis here, in contrast to the traditional Sinology approach, is on the development of the learners’ communicative listening and speaking skills, and an understanding of Chinese sociocultural aspects that provide a context for the use these skills. The associated teaching strategies align with the innovative second
language teaching strategies, including audio-lingual and communicative approaches, requiring greater levels of interaction between the teacher and the students.

These international shifts in the nature of Chinese teaching and learning brought new challenges for teachers of Chinese. For native speakers who had been educated and trained to teach Chinese within China, and subsequently worked overseas, their own experience of learning foreign languages (usually English) was largely a traditional grammar-translation approach. As a consequence, these teachers often found it difficult to fully appreciate and apply more interactive approaches in second language teaching. As native speakers, it was arguably more difficult for them to fully understand and empathise with the difficulties that their students in English speaking countries experienced when learning Chinese. More specifically, the professional training they received at CLTE Programs in China did not include sufficient induction to the education systems and practices in overseas countries in which they would be teaching. Partly in response to this phenomenon, and to a larger shortage of accredited Chinese language teachers for school systems, local institutions and organisations in overseas countries have sought to prepare teachers of Chinese domestically through existing institutions and in accordance with their procedures and accreditation standards of second language teacher education.

These efforts to prepare teachers of Chinese through local university systems is a promising move towards the supply teachers who are well versed in the particular context and pedagogy of local education systems. It is also a necessary measure to address the heavy reliance of accessing Chinese language teachers supplied from China that is the case in some English speaking countries. The policy of preparing domestic teachers of Chinese language has, in turn, brought its own challenges, which this study has taken up. These challenges relate to the insufficient range of pre-service CLTE Programs and in-service teacher accreditation courses required to meet the staffing needs of the expanding number of Chinese language programs in
schools. Due to funding and resource constraints, there has generally been a lack of language specific curriculum content in English speaking countries.

In the case of Australia, and specifically the three case-study Universities investigated in the State of New South Wales, we have seen a general alignment with the international tendencies. Chinese learning was first incorporated at higher education institutions in Australia as part of the wider international development of Sinology research. Domestic multicultural tendencies in Australia, coupled with shifting international relations with China, led to increasing official attention on Chinese language teaching and learning. Chinese teaching thus shifted from research to more functional and pragmatic purposes, and expanded to include a wide range of learners across the education systems. Professional Chinese teachers are accordingly prepared at national teacher education institutions. The shifts in educational environment, student groups, appropriate pedagogies, and the professionalisation of Chinese teachers in Australia, closely align with the identified tendencies of international Chinese education.

This is not simply a case of Australia, and NSW, replicating what has occurred internationally. The particular Australian context, and history, has contributed to some particular practices within this global context, as explored in detail in Chapter 3. The particular Australian conditions, impacting on Chinese language teaching and teacher preparation, begin with the long history of Chinese migration to Australia, following British occupation and settlement of Australia in 1788, and how this relates to the relatively short history of the development of formal Chinese education in Australia. Compared with the emergence and development of Sinology studies in Europe and North America, dating back to the 18th century, Chinese studies were introduced in Australia’s higher education institutions at a relatively late stage, and on a relatively small scale. Chinese teaching in Australia at the school level was mainly restricted to schools located in Chinese communities and experienced a slow development, due to the relatively small number of Chinese speaking migrants to Australia during the 1870s to the 1970s period. It is also influenced by the Australian policy of assimilation of migrants that did not encourage maintenance of languages
other than English. This situation did not change until the adoption of a multicultural policy in 1978 and the consequent official support of (Chinese) community schools from the Commonwealth government in 1981.

Since the 1980s, however, Chinese teaching in Australia has received significantly more attention, including significant levels of funding from different levels of government. This development is largely shaped by Australia’s geographical position in the Asia-Pacific region, and changes to Australia’s trade relationships with the world and its region. Due in part to geographical proximity, the historical fear of Asian migration that was a factor in the White Australia Policy of the early 20th century, has morphed into a multicultural policy context and official efforts at engagement with regional neighbours. As is well known, in post-Mao China, the Chinese economy has gained growing importance as export market for Australian resources and supplier of manufactures. This brought extensive recommendations from scholars, followed by intensifying attention from Australian governments, to promote and gradually prioritise Chinese language learning in its education systems. The learning of Chinese language was made available to students in all of Australia’s systems of school education in 1987.

It was under these particular conditions in Australia that Chinese language as a teaching specialisation came to be widely included in national teacher education programs in the 1990s, and gain significant financial incentives from several major national initiatives promoting Asian language education. Particularly, a major government initiative, the NALSAS Strategy (1994-2002), provided over $208 million, followed by $62 million in the continuing NALSSP program (2008-2012), to promote teaching, teacher education and research of the four prioritised Asian languages, including Modern Standard Chinese. While Australia lagged behind other countries in the earlier part of the century with respect to the study of Chinese, with initiatives like this, tied to its geographical and changing geopolitical position, Australia arguably led the way, compared with other major English speaking countries, in the creation of fully-fledged Chinese teacher education programs in the University sector.

In addition, we can conclude that the introduction of Chinese courses in Australian education systems has been influenced by domestic social trends. As a typical
migrant country, Australia’s demographic landscape is extremely multilingual and multicultural. Having accepted immigrants from a wide range of countries under different selection criteria in its successive immigration waves historically, there is now, no major, single, dominant ethnic group in Australia’s demographic structure. There are significant numbers of migrant groups who use LOTE at home, with Chinese speaking population being an important component. The implementation of multicultural policy from the 1970s saw Chinese, together with over a dozen other languages, explicitly supported in Australia’s education systems. These domestic efforts were aimed at promoting equity and social justice for those from non-English speaking backgrounds, boosting cultural and intercultural enrichment, and more effectively utilising Australia’s multilingual resources for its external economic and political relations (Lo Bianco, 1987). What we can see here is a convergence of Australian domestic social policy, and foreign policy, driving an initial impetus for Chinese language learning, preceding China’s active policy of promoting the same internationally. Australian developments in the early 1980s were also well ahead of the massive and rapid rise of the Chinese economy internationally, which in turn added to the impetus to further promote Chinese language learning, suggesting that domestic social conditions, and social policy, were important drivers of this change.

Similarly, we can conclude that particular local conditions were a major driver of the move to supply pre-service Chinese teachers in Australia in the 1980s. In response to the official support for Chinese and other languages in Australia’s schools in 1987, national teacher education institutions started to prepare LOTE teachers and ESL teachers under the framework of second language teacher education. Student teachers of Chinese, together with those of other languages, were trained and assessed in accordance with State and Territory teacher accreditation criteria (national criteria since 2010), to become qualified and registered school teachers. In other English speaking countries the supply of Chinese teachers continued to be largely reliant on exchange programs that invite native Chinese teachers from China, and on the in-service training and accreditation of local Chinese speaking / Chinese background residents. It was noted that the policy of inviting Chinese teachers trained in China also occurred in Australia in recent years, in line with the trend of TCSOL teachers trained in China working overseas under cooperative channels between Hanban and overseas institutions. However, in the case of Australia, the
independent preparation of Chinese teachers began nearly two decades ahead of this broader global trend. The selective migration policies during post-World War II period brought Australia abundant resources of Chinese intellectuals with higher education qualifications and international education experience. This was followed by the expansion of national programs providing full-fledged pre-service CLTE Programs in Australia since 1980s, making it less reliant on both inviting overseas Chinese teachers and in-service training of resident Chinese speakers. The national pre-service CLTE Programs in Australia are significant and rare among the major English-speaking countries.

**Enabling and hindering conditions in the Australian context**

This study’s investigation into the experience of CLTE Programs in Australia has provided some particular insights into the preparation of Chinese language teachers through local institutions in English speaking countries. Chapter 4, using the top-down approach, explored how the three case-study Universities in Australia have interpreted and implemented government initiatives, and how the international and national tendencies have influenced the development of the CLTE Programs over the past three decades. This work identified major factors affecting the outcome of the CLTE Programs, as follows.

Shifts in government policy for language education over the past three decades, with associated financial implications for particular initiatives, have meant that some CLTE Programs have not been maintained or sustained. This instability of dedicated public funding for specific programs, like the provision of an in-country (China) component of Chinese language teacher programs, necessarily impacts on their provision. In the Australian case, the governing Australian Labor Party (ALP) in the late 1980s responded to regional demands for university trained Chinese language teachers across Australia, by providing fully-sponsored studies for student teachers, especially the inclusion of special Chinese methodology courses and in-country experience. Since the mid-1990s, however, diminished financial support for LOTE
in general from the governing Liberal government saw the withdrawal of financial incentives. Renewed efforts of the ALP in government in 2008, promoting the four key Asian languages, resulting in the establishment of new and/or special CLTE Programs in some universities (such as the re-training program at U3 in this study).

The return to power of the Liberal/National Coalition government in 2013 saw a de-emphasis on the former government’s 2012 white paper, *Australia in the Asian century*, which had advocated the teaching of Chinese language in schooling nationally.

The regular shifts in government policy, linked to the policies of major political parties and their time in government, are an inevitable part of liberal democratic political systems. In the case of language policies in Australia, a consequence has been regular uncertainty amongst practitioners in Schools, and Universities, about the ongoing operation of Chinese language programs among school leaders. This has extended to discontinued language programs, and thus the reported unachieved goals of enrolment in relevant policies. The time lag for CLTE Programs in catering for the changing demands for Chinese teaching in school systems has exacerbated the problem of providing a regular supply of Chinese teachers. Enrolments in CLTE Programs experienced an overall decline over the past two decades, following the growth of the 1980s and 1990s, and eventually dropped back to current small numbers. The demand from school systems, which is in turn linked to government policy, and to student demand, plays a significant role in determining the supply of Chinese teachers from pre-service CLTE Programs.

What was found in this respect, in the Australian case, was a negative cycle whereby falling enrolments in CLTE Programs, linked to falling job prospects for Chinese teacher graduates, leads to reduced funding being allocated to the CLTE Programs. Availability of funding, in turn, impacts on the capability of the teacher education institutions to develop courses that adequately meet the particular needs of students in the particular programs. In the case of Chinese language teachers, these needs are
largely influenced by the language and culture backgrounds and education experience of students. Teacher educators of CLTE Programs in different universities in Australia have, to varying degrees, designed the curriculum structure and content to address the particular purpose and features of the student teacher cohorts. For example, the funding incentives provided by the Commonwealth and State governments aiming to promote Chinese teaching in the early 1990s made it possible for the teacher educators in U1 and U2 to develop a set of curriculum that was tailor made for groups of student teachers from certain language, cultural and education background and dealt with specific Chinese teaching issues. Conversely, reduced funding for CLTE Programs, together with the declined number of student teachers in each language group, resulted in a rationalisation of courses and reliance on a generic curriculum for all language groups.

Sociocultural tendencies in Australia, which are closely influenced by the relationship between Australia and China, also impacted on Chinese teaching and teacher education. The rapidly increasing volume of Chinese migrants in Australia since the 1990s has brought significant change in the demographic structure of Chinese learners and student teachers in established CLTE Programs. Particularly in schools located in capital cities, students from various language and culture backgrounds are very likely to learn Chinese in the same class. This research affirms the opinion raised in P. Chen’s (2013) study that native and background Chinese speaking students in Australian classrooms should be considered as valuable resources for developing Chinese-literate talents for Australia more broadly. However, there is evidence that suggests their presence can discourage students without this language background from taking up the study of Chinese in schooling. This phenomenon is linked to the competitive nature of Schooling as students compete for tertiary entrance scores. This has been another factor behind a fall in demand (or falling growth in demand) for Chinese language in schooling.
Similarly, CLTE Programs have witnessed a complicating demographic structure of students. In the 1990s, there was a distinctive separation of native Chinese speakers with overseas qualifications at the graduate level, and native English speaking school leavers at undergraduate level (such as the provision of DipEd degree in U1 and BEd in U2). This research found that the current student teacher cohorts are diverse, including second generation Chinese migrants who grew up in Australia, international students who have received some (Chinese) language teacher education and wish to further their study in Australia, experienced Australian school teachers who are retraining in Chinese language specialisation, and other possibilities. The presence of student teachers from diverse language, cultural and educational backgrounds within CLTE Programs has further exacerbated issues associated with the need for curricular materials that address the particular needs of these groups. At the same time, the mix of student teacher backgrounds in the current LOTE teacher education programs in Australia also helped to reinforce the trend towards generic language pedagogy/methodology courses. The ideal of student teachers of Chinese being trained in specific Chinese language pedagogical practices thus remains difficult to achieve.

The shifting political imperatives for language teaching, unstable economic conditions for curriculum design and delivery, and the complex knowledge structures of student teachers in the CLTE Programs, have all impacted on the success of government initiatives to prepare Chinese teachers over the past three decades. Chinese teaching and teacher supply in Australia has been influenced by international trends, interacting with domestic contexts and sociocultural conditions, with some particular effects. These issues necessarily align, more or less, with the teaching and teacher supply of other languages in Australia. They can, in turn, be understood by reference to the phenomenon of Chinese teacher supply globally.
Voices from participants of the CLTE Programs

Chapter 5, based mainly on the student teachers’ personal experience with the CLTE Programs in the three case-study Universities, further explored the effectiveness of the government initiatives in preparing professional Chinese teachers, from a bottom-up approach. In order to expand Chinese language learning in schools, by attracting Australian students who are new to Chinese, student teachers of CLTE Programs need to be equipped with effective Chinese pedagogical strategies that can effectively deliver Chinese language at beginners level. However, participants in this study confirmed that the curriculum of current CLTE Programs does not sufficiently prepare the student teachers linguistically or pedagogically. In this study, student teachers from a variety of backgrounds consistently want more instruction on specific Chinese pedagogy, and some consider the education foundation courses and methodology courses provided by the current CLTE Programs to be overly generic and not targeted to their needs. Student teachers who use English as their main language expressed some seemingly contradictory positions, such as considering the Chinese courses as having an excessive emphasis on advanced grammar, reading and writing skills, and Chinese cultural knowledge. At the same time they claim to have received insufficient instruction, in terms of elementary and intermediate Chinese that is suitable for school teaching, with a focus on communicative speaking and listening skills. Due to personal learning style, some student teachers positively evaluated the traditional Chinese approach of instructions, while others expressed a preference for a more interactive and engaging approach. In summary, support for courses that were targeted at their particular challenges of professional training and future teaching needs, within teacher education programs, was strong.

Other than the innate linguistic difficulties of Chinese language for English speakers, some systematic characteristics of the CLTE Programs added to the difficulties experienced by English speaking student teachers. Chinese language courses provided by the language departments as a major/minor were generic to candidates...
of various disciplines, and types of programs, across the University, rather than being specifically targeted for candidates from certain discipline. They focus on developing the four skills of the Chinese language – reading, writing, listening and speaking – together with a deep understanding of Chinese culture and society. An emphasis on reading and writing skills in the University Chinese language courses, determined by the nature of Chinese written form and, to certain degree, influenced by the Sinology tradition, was seen as not effectively preparing candidates training to teach communicative Chinese language to school students, in ways that are relevant to the school students’ daily lives. English speaking student teachers in particular expressed this concern, and cited difficulties in passing exams in Chinese language that they perceived as not being directly applicable to their immediate teaching needs upon graduation.

The current separate responsibilities between University language departments and education departments are clearly a factor in this perceived separation between language learning and language teaching needs. While this holds in many institutions for other disciplinary studies that teacher education students undertake, participants cited particular needs for greater cooperation in the case of language teaching. A need to adjust language courses to consolidate the student teachers’ expected study of basic, conversational Chinese, and link such language proficiency with quality Chinese pedagogy in the professional training, was articulated. This type of arrangement was found in the BEd degree of the CLTE Program at U2, which had sufficient financial and education resources to have developed a set of tailor-made curricula that integrated the Chinese language studies with the professional training, delivered entirely through the education department. The availability of teacher educators with both Chinese expertise and quality pedagogy for Chinese teaching in Australian schools, and sufficient financial support, is vital for overcoming the linguistic challenges for English speaking student teachers in CLTE Programs.
Lacking sufficient quality educational resources for Chinese teaching is considered as another major challenge by the student teachers in this study. Though Chinese teaching has gained increasing official support in securing a curriculum space, and at different times has enjoying targeted financial resources, it continues to experience difficulties maintaining enrolments at school and tertiary level due to a lack of appropriate Chinese pedagogy teaching English speakers. At teacher education institutions, being a relatively new language means that appealing resources for language and pedagogy study, for student teachers of Chinese, are more limited. Chinese language courses tend to rely heavily on textbooks imported from Chinese speaking countries, which are considered by the participants as lack relevant and engaging topics and practice activities that can relate well to Australian learners. A lack of dedicated Chinese language pedagogy courses received by these student teachers themselves added to difficulties experienced in developing and applying suitable Chinese teaching strategies in schools. Student teachers also reported receiving less support from the local school communities in terms of pedagogy studies and practice teaching, than student teachers of well-established languages, due to a lack of experienced teachers with quality Chinese teaching pedagogy available for tutoring and/or supervision at local schools.

It is clear from this study that, albeit with often significant fluctuations in response to particular policy shifts, emphases, and political conditions, Australian governments have been actively supporting Chinese and other LOTE teaching for decades. There is reason to argue, however, that despite this support, the general English speaking public in Australia has not fully embraced the importance of learning LOTE generally, and Chinese language in particular. It is clear that this is shaped by the dominance of the English language as a de-facto international language, reflected in English language being the only language subject included as a key learning area in the Australian curriculum (ACARA, 2013). In the school environment, this translates as many principals, parents, teachers of other subjects and the larger school
community not taking up the study of Chinese, and other LOTE, as useful subjects, thus do not readily support the work of Chinese subject teachers. In comparison with other European countries, where the overwhelming majority of their populations are multi-lingual and learn other languages in school, the case of Australia remains characteristically low in this respect.

This legacy contributes to students having limited interest and motivation to devote to the learning of Chinese language, exacerbated by a lack of relevant, engaging and interesting learning resources and classroom activities provided by their teachers of Chinese. As a result, the retention rate of existing Chinese language programs is very low beyond compulsory years. This means that teachers of Chinese cannot work in a well-supported environment, and cannot easily find and/or secure a stable teaching position, thus cause a loss of some university certified teachers of Chinese at the workforce. This is a downward spiral, contrasting a context of heightened importance of China and Chinese language.

In order to deal with the identified major issues with Chinese teaching and teacher supply through local teacher education institutions in the Australia case, and more broadly in the English speaking world and the global context, some major areas of reform can be identified. In what follows, this concluding chapter will set out some general principles for an approach to CLTE that may contribute to overcoming some of the identified problems, and to addressing any downward spiral. The principles are put forward as moderate but key strategies to consolidate and extend the effective preparation of Chinese teachers in Australia in the global context.
Recommendations for the enhancement of Chinese language teacher education

Recommendations for current CLTE Programs

- **Recommendation 1:**
  The first major principle for CLTE Programs is to design special Chinese language courses that provide subject matter courses, and professional training that directly address the specific issues of Chinese teaching and particular challenges experienced by different cohorts of student teachers (with varying linguistic, social and cultural backgrounds). We have seen that, aside from some specific cohorts when there was sufficient funding for the CLTE Programs in the early 1990s, the shifting language policy imperatives by different Australian governments have not been able to provide sustained financial and educational resources that are necessary to develop tailor-made courses. Facing this constraint in local teacher education institutions, Australia should entail the assistance of all possible channels, including official and unofficial, to provide some necessary financial and educational supports to reinstate and secure these courses within the CLTE Programs. Therefore, it is recommended that:

  The curriculum design of pre-service CLTE Programs in Australia and in other overseas countries needs to acknowledge the distinctive challenges faced by different student teachers cohorts, and design distinctive courses that address their specific challenges.

- **Recommendation 2:**
  Based on insights of the interviewed Chinese professionals in Australia, this study proposes that Chinese teaching at school level should focus on prioritised language (communicative competence) skills. At the beginners level, development of listening, speaking and reading (mainly, character recognition) skills should be emphasised, in order to build the students’ confidence and a sense of success in Chinese learning.
Inter-cultural awareness that is closely linked with the learners’ daily life should also be developed among the students, so that they can better access and participate in multicultural life in Australia and contribute to maintaining a harmonious relationship with local Chinese speaking population in Australia. More broadly, methods of (language) learning should be achieved through learning Chinese language, so as to contribute to the broader goal of cognitive development and other education values of language learning.

With the progress of Chinese learning, once basic conversational skills are developed, reading, writing (perhaps mainly in the form of typing with keyboard), and deeper cultural and social aspects of Chinese speaking countries should be progressively introduced. In this way, the learners’ vocabulary base can be substantially expanded through reading authentic Chinese materials, which will further enhance their listening and speaking skills. Meanwhile, in the broader sense, their functional Chinese skills and deepening understanding of the Chinese society can qualify the school students as Chinese literate Australians, with the potential to contribute in the future to national economic goals through trade relations with China and other Chinese speaking countries.

Such a proposed pathway of Chinese teaching requires changes to the current curriculum structure and content of the CLTE Programs. The linguistic challenges for English speakers are determined by the nature of Chinese language, in that the reading and writing form of Chinese language does not directly link to listening and speaking skills. The usual 3 to 5 years of study of Chinese courses, often focusing on reading and writing skills, therefore, may not prepare English speaking student teachers with a satisfactory level of proficiency in communicative Chinese skills. Chinese language courses that provide course content specifically targeted at beginners level for (Australian) schooling, are needed in CLTE Programs. Therefore, it is recommended that:
Chinese language courses within CLTE Programs need to focus on consolidating the student teachers’ basic Chinese language conversational competence, centred on its classroom teaching.

• Recommendation 3:

The absence of specific language pedagogy courses is a common problem facing current LOTE teacher education in Australia. The major constraint is the declining enrolment of student teachers in each language group over the past few decades. Under the banner of multiculturalism, though LOTE are supported by the governments, the extent of funding remains limited (see DEET, 1991). LOTE enrolment in schools have experienced consistent decline, including in traditional European languages (French and German) and the two established Asian languages (Indonesian and Japanese) (Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2009b). The dominance of English, insufficient funding and withdrawal of LOTE subjects as requirement for matriculation examination have all contributed to limited demand for LOTE learning in mass schooling, impacting negatively on the demand for LOTE teachers and provision of language specific pedagogy courses at teacher education institutions. These impacts are arguably intensified in the case of student teachers of Chinese language when Chinese is newly established in Australian schools, hence lack a resevoir of appropriate teaching resources, but urgently need to attract the general Australian students to the learning. Therefore, it is recommended that:

Special Chinese language pedagogy courses should be included in the curriculum of CLTE Programs, in order to link student teachers’ Chinese language knowledge with the needs of English speaking school students’ language learning.
Recommendations for professional development

- **Recommendation 4:**

  We have documented limitations of current CLTE Programs in terms of effectively preparing them with suitable Chinese pedagogies in Schools. These, along with similar limitations of importing teachers from China and/or accrediting local Chinese speaking residents for language teaching in English speaking countries, make the need for professional development in education and pedagogy studies important.

  One form of life-long professional development can be attending the regular training sessions organised by Chinese teacher associations or modern languages teacher associations at different levels. This work underscored the need for Chinese language teachers to remain up to date with current progress with Chinese language teaching in contemporary Australian contexts, including the effective use of new technologies in the classroom, and innovative strategies of language teaching. Such conscious reflective practice is vital to build up a resource repository for Chinese teaching, when practicing Chinese teachers often identify themselves being at a relatively disadvantaged position in terms of availability of excellent teaching resources, compared with other well-established languages in Australia. Therefore, it is recommended that:

  **Graduates of CLTE Programs need access to systematic professional development that is focused on specific pedagogical practices and theory studies related to the teaching of Chinese language in local context.**

- **Recommendation 5:**

  Practicing Chinese teachers need to identify and address their particular challenges during their professional development. English speaking student teachers demand for basic competence level of language learning for direct use in their future school teaching. Through preparing and delivering basic Chinese lessons in daily classroom
teaching, their Chinese proficiency is potentially consolidated and improving along with their students. However, it is worth noting that these teachers need to commit to expand their Chinese knowledge and improve their Chinese proficiency, to avoid the situation where their linguistic knowledge and proficiency is “barely two pages ahead of their students” (Orton, 2011, p. 158). This is particularly important when the Chinese classes, especially those in capital cities in Australia, are often mixed with students who use Chinese at home. The difficulties in teaching these native and/or background Chinese speakers and marking their assignments are common challenges for these English speaking teachers in school teaching. It thus requires ongoing further language learning to raise the English speaking teachers’ proficiency levels and understanding of Chinese culture.

Student teachers who have not experienced Australian schooling often need to deepen their understanding of the Australian education context to better relate their Chinese knowledge with their students. An important component involves deepening their cultural understandings, through actively learning about a wide range of social aspects of the host society. Tang (2013) argued that in the context of Chinese people making efforts to spread their language and culture to speakers of other languages, in order to convince the students to respect and learn Chinese culture, the Chinese teachers have to learn about the culture of the host country first. They need to know about the popular social topics in the host country, particularly those of politics, sports and teenagers. Moreover, knowledge of the popular culture in the host country can provide native Chinese teachers with substantial contents to talk about in Chinese teaching and topics of conversation with other participants in the school environment.

Intercultural understanding should be developed in all practicing teachers of Chinese. Four aspects of culture are considered by Tang (2013) to be essential part of a Chinese teacher’s culture knowledge base, namely culture of the world, culture of China, culture of the host country and culture of the region. Such cultural aspects
cannot be deeply understood within the limited period of pre-service teacher education, but a foundation can be set for future, ongoing, professional development. A good understanding of these four aspects of culture can provide the teachers of Chinese with both various forms of substantial Chinese learning contents, and innovative, engaging and popular teaching strategies that are adapted from other (language) subject teaching. Therefore, it is recommended that:

**Practicing Chinese teachers need to engage with systematic, professional learning that directly improve their particular linguistic, pedagogical and intercultural knowledge, skills and competencies.**

- **Recommendation 6:**

A feeling of isolation is a common issue identified by practicing Chinese teachers in Australia. One reason is that Chinese is often at a relatively disadvantaged place in terms of available education resources, as a newly prioritised language, and securing a curriculum space, as the most difficult language for English speakers. Feelings of isolation can be exacerbated if Chinese teachers cannot relate well to the students and other participants in the school community. In addition, the likely absence of other Chinese teachers within a school can further contribute to a sense of isolation. Hence, it is vital for the practicing Chinese teachers to reach out to their peers to seek help, share resources, and keep updated with the teaching.

It is particularly important for Chinese teachers from different language, culture and education backgrounds to interact and learn from each other, and thus gain some support. Systematic, in-service sessions should be organised in ways that benefit English speaking Chinese teachers with their communicative Chinese skills and higher levels of linguistic development, and Chinese speaking teachers with their understanding of the English speaking students’ needs and popular teaching strategies in local schools. These sessions should take place regularly, in concise
forms, and target topics that are closely related with the practicing teachers’ classroom teaching challenges.

Supporting organisations should devote more efforts organising opportunities for such interactions among practicing Chinese teachers. Considering the current shortage of Chinese teachers with quality Chinese pedagogy, it is necessary to bring practicing Chinese teachers in the region together to share good teaching practices that may be applicable for many Chinese classrooms. Local teacher associations, Confucius Institutions and organisations in Chinese speaking countries need to collaborate to make these opportunities happen. Therefore, it is recommended that:

**Systematic opportunities for interaction among practicing Chinese teachers and related associations are needed to form a supportive network for professional development.**

*Recommendations for research on Chinese language teacher education*

- **Recommendation 7:**

Attention on the importance of quality Chinese teacher supply in the globalisation of CLLT has been a focus of recent research. In China, it has only been since the First International Chinese Conference held in 2005 in Beijing, that the importance of CLLT on the global scale was put on research agenda by Chinese authorities. Quality Chinese teachers were recognised as a major link in the chain in promoting international Chinese education (L. Xu, 2007). In English speaking countries, similar attention on CLLT and Chinese teacher preparation is also a relatively recent phenomenon. In the United States the report by Asia Society (2005), in the United Kingdom the report by CILT, The National Centre for Languages (2007), and in Australia the report by Smith et al. (1993) and Orton (2008), are recent examples of research into CLLT at the national level. Therefore, it is recommended that:
Research into CLLT as a global phenomenon is needed to raise the profile, and research base, of this area of educational study and practice.

- **Recommendation 8:**

Despite the expectation of widely promoting CLLT in the English speaking countries, the limited supply of qualified Chinese teachers is universally considered a major hindrance for the development of existing Chinese language programs, and the expansion into more schools. One of the major hindrances of preparing quality Chinese teachers is the lack of effective development of intercultural capabilities among the student teachers. There are some conscious study in this area (Moloney & Xu, 2013; Scrimgeour, 2010), raising the issue of absent link between Chinese course studies and professional training with the student teachers’ individual challenges underlined by their different cultural values. Further large scale of research exploring this phenomenon and how to develop intercultural awareness and capabilities among Chinese teachers from different cultural backgrounds are imperative. Therefore, it is recommended that:

**Research agenda needs to place exploration of effective approaches to develop intercultural capability as one of the priority areas.**

- **Recommendation 9:**

A need for greater research into effective Chinese language pedagogical practice, in particular contexts, should be a priority in the CLLT research agenda. This issue is linked to the absence of specialist Chinese pedagogy courses in the current CLTE Programs, due to the short period of and thus lack of experience teaching Chinese language in the global context. This research centres on the factors identified by this study – the need to combine Chinese teachers’ language learning and competence with the needs of school students, in ways that can engage these students’ intrinsic interest in Chinese language and culture. Further research is needed to explore what
a suitable and effective Chinese pedagogy for schools should be like in the Australian and other global contexts. Therefore, it is recommended that:

**Quality Chinese pedagogy should be another priority area included in the research agenda for Chinese teacher education in the global context.**

- **Recommendation 10:**

This study has explored the preparation of Chinese teachers in the global context, via a vertical case study approach of the Australian case. The universal significance of this work is evident in the sense that, to effectively prepare Chinese teachers under global conditions, any country and any institution will need to consider factors at multiple levels. The design and delivery of the curriculum of CLTE Programs must cater for the differentiated needs of student teachers of Chinese teaching from different language, culture and education backgrounds.

In spite of this contribution, this study is limited in a number of ways. Firstly, the scope of this study is restricted to one State in Australia. Ideally, the different local conditions for CLLT and CLTE in different States should be included. The issues discussed would be more comprehensive, and the phenomena investigated could generate a broader range of reference. Secondly, the numbers of participants recruited in in-depth interviews in this study are limited. This is mainly due to the fact that there is only a small number of student teachers and practicing teachers of Chinese with a university qualification in Australia. If more universities had participated in this study, a greater number of participants would be recruited. Consequently, more representative and significant findings might be generated. Finally, in terms of research methodology, critical document analysis and interviews are conducted to collect qualitative data, in order to gain the participants’ insights of the issues with CLTE Programs. Considering the limited number of participants, only small scale in-depth interviews were conducted. If a greater number of universities in more states are included, mixed methods with surveys, observations
and so on might provide a more comprehensive understanding of the supply and training of Chinese teachers in Australia. Therefore, it is recommended that:

**Research into CLTE Programs involving a greater number of cases and participants, and a greater variety of methods, need to follow as an ongoing and systematic part of building Chinese language education.**

**Conclusion**

This study has identified a number of important characteristics of CLTE Programs in the Australian context, and their relationship to global tendencies. The growing influence of China politically and economically on the world stage, the growing reliance on Chinese economic development by overseas countries, and the overt agenda in English speaking countries of learning LOTE to gain a competitive edge in the global economy, have brought increasing attention on promoting and prioritising CLLT.

We have seen that Chinese teachers prepared in CLTE Programs in China often cannot effectively address the education needs in the local context when they are invited overseas to assist with CLLT. Consequently, there is growing attention in overseas countries on training Chinese teachers in local teacher education institutions, where the training abides by local teacher education procedures, and assessment and accreditation criteria.

Nationwide pre-service CLTE Programs in Australia are a rare case in English speaking countries, in that the preparation of Chinese teachers at teacher education institutions was initiated in the early 1980s to staff Chinese teaching in Chinese community schools and mainstream schools. This local impetus was directly linked to the domestic context of promoting LOTE teaching to achieve social justice in a multicultural Australia. These CLTE Programs, however, were also influenced by shifting global tendencies of CLLT and domestic political imperatives for LOTE
teaching. Moreover, shifts in financial and education resources, the demographic structures of student teachers, and in the job markets, mediated the global influences in terms of the design, delivery and outcome of the CLTE Programs.

There are several key, and inter-related, conclusions from this project, based on the review of global, national and local tends, in historical context, coupled with the empirical work in the case study sites in Australia. The first of these is that local domestic governments need to provide continuous, focused and substantive support for CLLT, including financial resources, especially by sponsoring various forms of CLTE Programs, over time. The outcome of governmental promotion of national Chinese language programs in schools is likely to be put in jeopardy if the lack of sufficiently qualified Chinese teachers is not addressed. Within CLTE programs, it is clear that the design of curricula should not be language generic, but rather should acknowledge the challenges of particular languages, and of student teachers from different cultural groups.

Moreover, in the context of the wide and expanding use of English as an international language, the realisation of government policies for Chinese language education, in Australia and more broadly, clearly requires initiatives that can influence public attitudes towards the study and acquisition of Chinese language (and other LOTE). The creation of strong career paths for Chinese language teachers is one part of the response required here, which may in turn support and boost interest in learning Chinese language. Efforts at the other end of the equation, promoting broader social and cultural acceptance of multilingualism and the broad social, cultural and economic benefits of learning the languages of community groups and regional powers, are similarly required.

By proposing a series of recommended guidelines for current pre-service CLTE Programs, in-service training and research agenda, this project has developed some viable, and specific, responses to the question of how the Australian practice of pre-service CLTE Programs might inform the preparation of TCSOL teachers in local
teacher education institutions, in the contemporary era of globalisation, the rise of China, and the accompanying expansion of international Chinese education.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1: List of policies, reports and initiatives of Asian (Chinese) language education in Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of document</th>
<th>Title of policy/report</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>National Policy on Languages (NPL, 1989)</td>
<td>A LOTE for all; listed 9 languages of wider teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies</td>
<td>The Australian Language and Literacy Policy (ALLP, 1991)</td>
<td>English literacy and listed 14 strategically important LOTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports on Asian language education in HEIs</td>
<td>Report by the Commonwealth Advisory Committee on the Teaching of Asian languages and Cultures in Australia (The Auchmuty Report, 1970)</td>
<td>Recommends adding Japanese, Indonesian/Malysian and Chinese in language courses in HEI and the culture studies of these languages in schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports on Asian language education in HEIs</td>
<td>Asia in Australian education (The FitzGerald Report, 1980)</td>
<td>Investigates the implementation of the Auchmuty Report, and raise the issue of lacking career opportunities for many students of Asian languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports on Asian language education in HEIs</td>
<td>Asia in Australian Higher Education: Report for the Inquiry into the Teaching of Asian Studies and languages in Higher Education (The Ingleson Report, 1989)</td>
<td>Follows up with the development of Asian languages in HEIs, and recommends combing Asian studies with career development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports on Asian language education in HEIs</td>
<td>Maximizing Australia's Asia knowledge: Repositioning and Renewal of a National Asset (The Jeffrey Report, 2002)</td>
<td>Emphasises the importance of acknowledging and maintaining Australia’s Asian languages resources brought by migrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>National Asian Languages and Studies in Australian Schools</td>
<td>Invests AUD 208 million over 8 years on teaching, teacher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiatives</td>
<td>Strategy (NALSAS, 1994-2002)</td>
<td>and research of Asian languages and studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Asian Languages and Studies in Schools Program, (NALSSP, 2008-2012)</td>
<td>Invests AUD 62 million over 4 years teaching, teacher education and research of Asian languages and studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
## Appendix 2: Information of participants in the in-depth interviews

### Appendix 2.1: Information of the interview sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Interview conducted in</th>
<th>Interview duration</th>
<th>Interview conduct date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Educators</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE1a</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>40 minutes</td>
<td>2012.04.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE1b</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>55 minutes</td>
<td>2012.04.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE1c</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Session 1: 48m, Session 2: 32m</td>
<td>2012.04.12, 2012.04.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Session 1: 1h42m, Session 2: 1h44m</td>
<td>2012.05.02, 2012.05.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1h04m</td>
<td>2012.06.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>2h15m</td>
<td>2012.09.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3a</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1h49m</td>
<td>2012.08.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3b</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1h16m</td>
<td>2012.08.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3c</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>1h29m</td>
<td>2012.08.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2a</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Mandarin</td>
<td>1h05m</td>
<td>2012.08.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2b</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>32 minutes</td>
<td>2012.10.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2c</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>2012.11.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2d</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>19 minutes</td>
<td>2012.11.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number 1, 2 and 3 indicate the participants are/were with the CLTE Programs in U1, U2 and U3, and the alphabet a, b, and c indicate the number of teacher educators, student teachers and graduates interviewed in the CLTE Programs in one case-study University.
# Appendix 2.2: Information of participants’ language specialties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant code</th>
<th>Main language</th>
<th>Language teaching specialty / specialties*</th>
<th>Experience as language teacher educators **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TE1a</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Asian languages in the 1990s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE1b</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>German, Indonesian</td>
<td>LOTE since early 2000s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE1c</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>LOTE since late 2000s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE2</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Chinese language in the early 1990s, and LOTE since then</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE3</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>LOTE since 1990s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant code</th>
<th>Main language</th>
<th>degree enrolled in</th>
<th>Language teaching specialty / specialties</th>
<th>Currently teaching Chinese?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST1</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>BA/BTch</td>
<td>Japanese, Chinese</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST2</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>MTch</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3a</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>DipLang</td>
<td>Chinese, English</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3b</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>DipLang</td>
<td>Italian, French</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3c</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>DipLang</td>
<td>French, German, Indonesian, Japanese, Chinese</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2a</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>BEd</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2b</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>BEd</td>
<td>Japanese, Chinese, Indonesian</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2c</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>BEd</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G2d</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>BEd</td>
<td>Chinese, French</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*An ESL (English as Second Language) is built in the teaching specialties of the interviewed participants, when they gain a language teaching qualification in Australia.

**’Currently’ refers to the time when the interviews were conducted in 2012. By March 2014, there are some changes to the situation. ST1 has been working as a Japanese teacher upon graduations, while ST2 has not been able to find a Chinese teaching position since graduation.
Appendix 3: Guiding interview questions for teacher educators

1. Would you please briefly introduce your experiences as a Chinese teacher educator in Australia?
   
   Probe for:
   
   • language and cultural background
   • experiences as a language teacher educator
   • experience with training Chinese language teachers

2. Would you please introduce the development of the CLTE Program in your university?
   
   Probe for:
   
   • program development in the past decades
   • factors shaping these developments
   • position compared with other language teacher training programs

3. How do you evaluate the outcome of this Program in your university?
   
   Probe for:
   
   • distinctive features (staff expertise, students background, aim, content, delivery…)
   • contribution to Chinese teacher supply in Australia (number/quality of graduates, support to the local schools…)
   • development trend in the near future

4. How is the curriculum designed to meet the social needs in Australia?
   
   Probe for:
   
   • courses reflecting the needs of multicultural society
   • considerations for choosing and proportioning the subjects in the curriculum
   • considerations for curriculum innovations

5. How is the curriculum designed to cater for the needs of student teachers based on their cultural backgrounds?
   
   Probe for:
   
   • courses that cater for particular needs of certain student teachers
   • considerations for including/excluding such courses
• considerations for curriculum innovations

6. **How is the curriculum designed to meet the specific needs of student teachers of Chinese teaching?**

   Probe for:
   
   • courses designed specifically for student teachers of Chinese teaching
   • rationale of including/excluding such courses
   • opinions on balancing between Chinese elements and second language teaching elements in the curriculum

7. **How are the course studies delivered in your university?**

   Probe for:
   
   • Chinese language courses
   • education foundation courses
   • extent of cooperation between language and education departments

8. **How is the teacher training part implemented in your university?**

   Probe for:
   
   • specific Chinese methodology training
   • practice teaching experience
   • link with course studies

9. **How do you cope with challenges to curriculum implementation?**

   Probe for:
   
   • major challenges in curriculum
   • contributing factors to these challenges
   • measures and constraints dealing with these challenges
Appendix 4: Guiding interview questions for senior student teachers

1. Can you please introduce yourself?
2. Why are you interested to choose teaching languages (including Chinese)?
3. Why did you choose to study in the University ***?
4. Would you please tell me how you studied and get trained during your candidature, in the following three aspects?
   - Chinese language proficiency and culture understanding
   - educational theories study
   - methodology training
   - practice teaching experience
5. How do you evaluate your professional experiences in the above three aspects?
6. Do you think are there any factors facilitating/hindering your progress in these aspects? (Possible factors are listed below. You are welcome to talk about the factors that you think are important for you)
   - personal--your language/culture/education background and experience
   - institutional--the university system and program structure
   - regional--local resources for language (including Chinese) teaching and learning in Sydney
   - national--social-cultural context for language (including Chinese) study in Australia
7. Which of the mentioned factors do you think influence you more closely? Why so?
8. In your opinion, what can be done, or should have been done, to further improve your learning and training experience during your candidature?
9. Are you planning to teach Chinese when you graduate? What are your considerations?
Appendix 5: Guiding interview questions for graduates and retrained teachers

1. Can you please introduce yourself briefly?

2. Why did you choose to teach languages (including Chinese) in Australia?

3. Why did you choose to study at the University ***? Was there anything in particular that attracted you to study there?

4. Would you please tell me your study experience during your candidature, in the following three aspects?
   - Chinese language proficiency and culture understanding
   - educational theory study
   - methodology training
   - practice teaching experience

5. Were there any special challenges/difficulties facing you and/or the other candidates in the same program during your study and training? If so, can you please tell me about them?

6. Can you please tell me your work experiences as a Chinese teacher?

7. Based on the current requirements and needs from your work, how well do you think your professional training experiences have prepared you for your career?

8. In your opinion, what can be done, or should have been done, to further improve your learning and training experience during your candidature?

9. Can you please tell me about the situation of Chinese teaching in the *** area?

10. Based on your professional experience, what do you think are the major achievements and what are the major issues hindering the efficiency of Chinese teaching in your school?

11. Considering the resources and limitations for Chinese in Australia and in the *** area, do you have some suggestions regarding the supply and training of Chinese language teachers?
## Appendix 6: Language spoken at home in Australia — a profile of Chinese

(C: Cantonese; M: Mandarin; O: Other dialects; T: Total number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State (Type)</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW (Sydney)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>107,259</td>
<td>102,368</td>
<td>120,578</td>
<td>116,298</td>
<td>129,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40,651</td>
<td>38,974</td>
<td>65,665</td>
<td>63,661</td>
<td>100,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>20,722</td>
<td>19,751</td>
<td>15,037</td>
<td>14,503</td>
<td>13,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>168,632</td>
<td>161,093</td>
<td>201,280</td>
<td>194,462</td>
<td>243,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC (Melbourne)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>53,887</td>
<td>52,372</td>
<td>60,494</td>
<td>59,257</td>
<td>66,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25,636</td>
<td>24,864</td>
<td>38,741</td>
<td>37,957</td>
<td>64,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>17,169</td>
<td>16,751</td>
<td>13,656</td>
<td>13,404</td>
<td>13,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>96,692</td>
<td>93,987</td>
<td>112,891</td>
<td>110,618</td>
<td>144,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD (Brisbane)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>15,964</td>
<td>12,071</td>
<td>17,461</td>
<td>13,674</td>
<td>19,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11,406</td>
<td>9,240</td>
<td>15,934</td>
<td>13,174</td>
<td>24,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>3,428</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>2,227</td>
<td>2,163</td>
<td>2,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>30,798</td>
<td>23,871</td>
<td>35,622</td>
<td>28,511</td>
<td>46,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT (Canberra)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2,403</td>
<td>2,399</td>
<td>2,459</td>
<td>2,459</td>
<td>2,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1,373</td>
<td>1,364</td>
<td>2,091</td>
<td>2,091</td>
<td>3,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4,309</td>
<td>4,295</td>
<td>4,856</td>
<td>4,856</td>
<td>6,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA (Adelaide)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6,593</td>
<td>6,343</td>
<td>6,772</td>
<td>6,603</td>
<td>7,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2,984</td>
<td>2,864</td>
<td>3,908</td>
<td>3,821</td>
<td>8,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1,799</td>
<td>1,747</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1,132</td>
<td>1,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>11,376</td>
<td>10,954</td>
<td>11,840</td>
<td>11,556</td>
<td>18,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA (Perth)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>14,542</td>
<td>13,880</td>
<td>15,280</td>
<td>14,871</td>
<td>16,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>9,031</td>
<td>8,836</td>
<td>11,062</td>
<td>10,858</td>
<td>16,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>4,726</td>
<td>4,569</td>
<td>3,369</td>
<td>3,297</td>
<td>3,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>28,299</td>
<td>27,285</td>
<td>29,711</td>
<td>29,026</td>
<td>35,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS (Hobart)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>1,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1,347</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>2,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT (Darwin)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>2,068</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>1,956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 7: Curriculum structure of the CLTE Programs at U1 (2012)

Bachelor of Education (Secondary) and Bachelor of Arts (5 years full time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Structure</th>
<th>Credit Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bachelor of Arts components</strong></td>
<td>108 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Studies*</td>
<td>48 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Studies</td>
<td>24 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective Studies</td>
<td>36 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bachelor of Teaching components</strong></td>
<td>132 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Foundation Courses**</td>
<td>46 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Studies</td>
<td>52 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Experience (75 days)</td>
<td>10 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective education courses</td>
<td>24 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>240 cps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Master of Teaching (Secondary) (2 years full-time or 4 years reduced load)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Structure</th>
<th>Credit Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Foundation Courses***</td>
<td>24 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Studies</td>
<td>40 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Experience (89 days)</td>
<td>20 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Research Project</td>
<td>12 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>96 cps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Chinese can be chosen as either a major or minor in U1.

**Education Foundation Courses (EFC) include 8 courses at the BEd/BA degree in U1. Such courses include: 1) Education, Teachers of Teaching (6 cps); 2) Human Development and Education (6 cps); 3) Education Psychology (6 cps); 4) Social Perspectives of Education (6 cps); 5) Indigenous Education: Secondary Schools (6 cps); 6) Positive Approaches to Special Education (6 cps); 7) Language, Literacy and Diversity (6 cps); and 8) Information Technology in Schools (4 cps).

***Education foundation courses include 5 courses at the MTch degree in U1. Such courses include: 1) Introduction to Teaching and Learning (7 cps); 2) Special and Inclusive Education (3 cps); 3) Teachers and Learners: School Communities (6 cps); 4) Schools and their Communities (5 cps); and 5) Special Education: Inclusive Schools (3 cps).
## A sample curriculum of BA/BTch (Sec) degree for the CLTE Program at U1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Semester 1 (cps)</th>
<th>Semester 2 (cps)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Junior unit from Major (6)</td>
<td>Junior unit from Major (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior unit from Minor (6)</td>
<td>Junior unit from Minor (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior unit from any curriculum area (6)</td>
<td>Junior unit from any curriculum area (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFC 1 (6)</td>
<td>EFC 2 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Senior unit from Major (6)</td>
<td>Senior unit from Major (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate or senior unit from Minor (6)</td>
<td>Intermediate or senior unit from Minor (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFC 3 (6)</td>
<td>EFC 4 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Studies 1 (6)</td>
<td>EFC 5 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Curriculum 1 unit of Major (6)</td>
<td>EFC 6 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 senior units of Major (12)</td>
<td>Professional Studies 2 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum 1 unit of Minor (6)</td>
<td>Professional Experience A (20 days) (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum 2 unit of Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum 2 unit of Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>EFC 7 (6)</td>
<td>EFC 8 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Studies 3 (6)</td>
<td>Elective education study (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Experience B (25 days) (2)</td>
<td>2 senior units of Major (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum 3 unit of Major (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum 3 unit of Minor (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 intermediate or senior units of any curriculum area (24)</td>
<td>Internship (30 days) (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elective education study (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education unit study (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## A sample curriculum of MTch (Sec) degree for the CLTE Program at U1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Semester 1 (cps)</th>
<th>Semester 2 (cps)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EFC 1 (7)</td>
<td>EFC 3 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFC 2 (3)</td>
<td>Professional Studies 2 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Studies 1 (2)</td>
<td>Professional Experiences 1 (22 days) (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum 1 for Major (6)</td>
<td>Curriculum 2 for Major (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum 1 for Minor (6)</td>
<td>Curriculum 2 for Minor (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EFC 4(5)</td>
<td>Internship (45 days) (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFC 5 (3)</td>
<td>Professional Research Project (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Experiences 2 (20 days) (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum 3 for Major (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum 3 for Minor (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 8: Curriculum structure of the CLTE Programs at U2 (2012)

**Bachelor of Teaching (Secondary)/Bachelor of Arts** (4 years full time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Structure</th>
<th>Credit Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bachelor of Arts components</strong></td>
<td>160 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Studies*</td>
<td>80 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Studies</td>
<td>40 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective, Second Major or Minor,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education, or Honours</td>
<td>40 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Bachelor of Teaching components</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core courses**</td>
<td>160 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Foundation Courses</td>
<td>80 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Studies</td>
<td>40 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Experience (80 days)</td>
<td>0 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directed courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Studies</td>
<td>40 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>320 cps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Master of Teaching (Secondary)** (2 years full time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Structure</th>
<th>Credit Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core courses***</td>
<td>110 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directed courses</td>
<td>50 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Experience (60 days)</td>
<td>0 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160 cps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Chinese is provided as either a major or a minor at U2 in 2012 (But since 2013 Chinese started to be provided only as a minor at U2).

**Core courses include 8 Education Foundation Courses, and 3 Professional Studies at undergraduate level in U2. They are: 1) Foundations of Primary & Secondary Education (10 cps); 2) Knowledge and Communication Technologies (10 cps); 3) Introduction to Specialist Studies (10 cps); 4) Learners, learning & Teaching (10 cps); 5) Schooling, Identity & Society (10 cps); 6) Special Education (10 cps); 7) Extended Studies in the Humanities (10 cps); 8) Aboriginal Education, Policies and Issues (10 cps); 9) Managing the 7-12 Learning Environment (10 cps); 10) Pedagogy & Inclusion (10 cps); and 10) Teachers, Ethnics & Professionalism (20 cps).

***Core courses include 11 courses at graduate level, which are essentially the same with those provided at undergraduate level. These courses are: 1) Introduction to Specialist Studies; 2) Literacies, Language and learning; 3) Quality Teaching in Secondary Classrooms; 4) Learners, Learning and Teaching; 5) The Reflective Secondary Teacher; 6) Knowledge and Communication Technologies; 7) The Adolescent Learning Environment; 8) Aboriginal Education; 9) Schooling, Identity
and Society; 10) The Practicing Professional; and 11) Students with Special Needs in Diverse Contexts. Each course is 10 cps.

**A sample curriculum of BTch (Sec)/BA degree for the CLTE Program at U2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Semester 1 (cps)</th>
<th>Semester 2 (cps)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Junior unit from Major (10)</td>
<td>Junior unit from Major (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior unit from Minor (10)</td>
<td>Junior unit from Minor (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFC 1 (10)</td>
<td>EFC 3 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFC 2 (10)</td>
<td>Specialist Studies 1 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Intermediate or senior units from Major (20)</td>
<td>Intermediate or senior units from Minor (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFC 4 (10)</td>
<td>Specialist Studies 2 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Studies 1 (10)</td>
<td>EFC 5 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EFC 6 (10)</td>
<td>EFC 8 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFC 7 (10)</td>
<td>Intermediate or senior units from Major (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate or senior units from Major (20)</td>
<td>Professional Studies 2 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Specialist Studies 3 (10)</td>
<td>Professional Studies 3 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist Studies 4 (10)</td>
<td>Double Major/Minor Pathway (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Double Major/Minor Pathway (10)</td>
<td>Double Major/Minor Pathway (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Double Major/Minor Pathway (10)</td>
<td>Double Major/Minor Pathway (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A sample curriculum of MTch (Sec) degree for the CLTE Program at U2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Semester 1 (cps)</th>
<th>Semester 2 (cps)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EFC 1 (10)</td>
<td>EFC 5 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFC 2 (10)</td>
<td>Specialist Studies 1 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFC 3 (10)</td>
<td>Specialist Studies 2 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFC 4 (10)</td>
<td>Specialist Studies 3 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EFC 6 (10)</td>
<td>EFC 8 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFC 7 (10)</td>
<td>EFC 9 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist Studies 4 (10)</td>
<td>EFC 10 (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist Studies 5 (10)</td>
<td>EFC 11 (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 9: Curriculum structure of the CLTE Programs at U3 (2012)

Bachelor of Arts/Bachelor of Teaching (Secondary) (4 years full-time, or up to 10 years part-time; on-campus/off-campus study)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Structure</th>
<th>Credit Points*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bachelor of Arts components</strong></td>
<td>96 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two curriculum areas**</td>
<td>72 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective courses</td>
<td>24 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bachelor of Teaching components</strong></td>
<td>96 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Foundation Courses ***</td>
<td>48 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Experience (80 days)</td>
<td>0 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Studies</td>
<td>24/36 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Elective Teaching Units</td>
<td>12/24 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>192 cps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Master of Teaching (Secondary) (2 years full-time, or up to 5 years part-time; on-campus/off-campus study)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Structure</th>
<th>Credit Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Foundation Courses ***</td>
<td>48 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Experience (60 days)</td>
<td>0 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Studies</td>
<td>12-36 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Elective Teaching Units</td>
<td>12-36 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96 cps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduate Diploma in Education (Secondary) (1.5 years full-time, or up to 6 years part-time; on-campus/off-campus study)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Structure</th>
<th>Credit Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Foundation Courses ***</td>
<td>48 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Experience (50 days)</td>
<td>0 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Studies</td>
<td>12-24 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Elective Teaching Units</td>
<td>0-12 cps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72 cps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Every course equals to 6 cps in the education degree at U3.

**Chinese can be chosen as either a major or a minor.

***Education Foundation Courses at U3 include 8 courses at undergraduate and graduate levels respectively. These courses at different degree levels are essentially identical. They are titled as: 1) Aboriginal Education; 2) Curriculum and the Social Context of Schooling; 3) Literacies in Context; 4) ICT in Education; 5) Planning for
Effective Learning; 6) Inclusive and Special Education; 7) Classroom Behaviour Management; and 8) Teaching for Cultural Diversity – NESB (Non-English speaking background) Students.

A sample curriculum of BA/BTch(Sec) degree for the CLTE Program at U3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Timester 1 (cps)</th>
<th>Timester 2 (cps)</th>
<th>Timester 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Junior unit from Major 1 (6)</td>
<td>Junior unit from Major 1 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior unit from Major 2 (6)</td>
<td>Junior unit from Major 2 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior unit from Minor or Any Curriculum Area (6)</td>
<td>Junior unit from Minor or Any Curriculum Area (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFC 1 (6)</td>
<td>Unit from Major 1 or Major 2 or Minor (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EFC 2 (6)</td>
<td>EFC 3 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate or senior unit from Major 1 or Major 2 (6)</td>
<td>EFC 4 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate or senior unit from Major 1 or Major 2 (6)</td>
<td>Intermediate or senior unit from Major 1 or Major 2 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate or senior unit from Minor or Any Curriculum Area (6)</td>
<td>Intermediate or senior unit from Minor or Any Curriculum Area (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EFC 5(6)</td>
<td>Specialist Studies2 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist Studies1 (6)</td>
<td>Elective Education Course (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate or senior unit from Major 2 (6)</td>
<td>Senior unit from Major 2 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior unit from Major 1 (6)</td>
<td>Senior unit from Major 1 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Experience 1(20 days) (0)</td>
<td>Professional Experience 2 (20 days) (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>EFC 6 (6)</td>
<td>EFC 8 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist Studies 3 (6)</td>
<td>Specialist Studies 4 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFC 7 (6)</td>
<td>Elective Education Course (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elective Education Course (6)</td>
<td>Elective Education Course (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Experience 3 (20 days) (0)</td>
<td>Professional Experience 4 (20 days) (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A sample curriculum of MTch(Sec) degree for the CLTE Program at U3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Trimester 1 (cps)</th>
<th>Trimester 2 (cps)</th>
<th>Trimester 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EFC 1 (6)</td>
<td>EFC 3 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFC 2 (6)</td>
<td>EFC 4 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist Studies 1 (6)</td>
<td>Specialist Studies 3 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist Studies 2 or Elective teaching unit (6)</td>
<td>Specialist Studies 4 or Elective teaching unit (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Experience 1 (20 days) (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EFC 5 (6)</td>
<td>EFC 7 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFC 6 (6)</td>
<td>EFC 8 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist Studies 3 or Elective teaching unit (6)</td>
<td>Specialist Studies 4 or Elective teaching unit (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elective teaching unit (6)</td>
<td>Elective teaching unit (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Experience 2 (20 days) (0)</td>
<td>Professional Experience 3 (20 days) (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A sample curriculum of Grad DipEd(Sec) degree for the CLTE Program at U3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Trimester 1 (cps)</th>
<th>Trimester 2 (cps)</th>
<th>Trimester 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EFC 1 (6)</td>
<td>EFC 3 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFC 2 (6)</td>
<td>EFC 4 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist Studies 1 (6)</td>
<td>Specialist Studies 3 or Elective teaching unit (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist Studies 2 (6)</td>
<td>Specialist Studies 4 or Elective teaching unit (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Experience 1 (10 days) (0)</td>
<td>Professional Experience 2 (20 days) (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EFC 5 (6)</td>
<td>EFC 6 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFC 7 (6)</td>
<td>EFC 8 (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Experience 3 (20 days) (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 10: Examples of fun, relevant and engaging resources and activities in Chinese teaching

As an experienced teacher of English and PE subjects, ST3a, from the retraining CLTE Program at U3, has been actively utilising resources from the school environment. The resources and activities in his Chinese classes are largely benefitted from ST3a’s rich teaching experience in other subjects and cooperation with other subject teachers. Some examples of the innovative Chinese resources and activities ST3a designed are presented here, to illustrate some welcomed pedagogies for Chinese teaching in Australian schools.

Example 1: In the class learning the topic of sports, the teacher would first teach the students some basic vocabulary and sentences, such as “你[xǐ]欢[huān]什[shén]么[yùn]动[dòng]?” (What sports do you like?)”, “我喜欢游泳。(I like swimming.)”. After that, using the interactive white board, the teacher puts up famous athletes, for example, Roger Federer, the Swiss professional tennis player. Then the teacher covers these people up, only having their eyes shown to the students. Boys are grouped to compete against girls. One group would ask the question, “他[tā]/她[tā]喜[xǐ]欢[huān]什[shén]么[yùn]动[dòng]?” (What sport does he/she like?)”. The other group would have to firstly guess who the person is, and then answer “他[tā]/她[tā]喜[xǐ]欢[huān]打[dǎ]网[wǎng]球[qión]。 (He likes playing tennis.)”. According to ST3a, this kind of game for speaking practice “works really well, because the students all have to say it and they can get a guess, and they all love the competition...and it is fun because they recognise the person...and they get really excited because they know who it is. They have worked it out just from the eyes!”

Example 2: Another example is teaching the topic of asking people’s names. The students learned the sentence “你[jiào]什[shén]么[míng]字[zi]?” (What is your name?)” “我[jiào]... (My name is...)”. Then the teacher got the baby photos of all the teachers in the school, and played the same type of games with the sports lesson. The students need to guess who those babies are, are they the principal, or the Year 4 teacher, etc. They kept guessing using sentences “他[tā]/她[tā]叫[jiào]什[shén]么[míng]字[zi]?” (What is his/her name?)”, “她叫Dora老师吗?[lǎo]师[shī]吗?[ma]?” (Is she Miss Dora?)” “不对,(Wrong.)”“When they finally guessed correctly, they got really excited and surprised, and they were like ‘OHHHHHHH! Is that really Mrs Wilson??’” The game is “really relevant to them, because they were picture of teachers they knew.” Furthermore, because ST3a found that the students “struggle with pronouns”, and many times they “get confused”, the games designed talking about others proved to be “good practice for them to keep using pronouns”. Compared with new Chinese teachers in schools, as a retrained teacher, ST3a’s
experience working in his school has also made it a lot easier to for him to liaison with other school teachers to get their personal photos.

Example 3: Stimulated by the popular “Bingo game”, ST3a designed more applications to it. He made a lot of laminated cards, which are “either a picture, or pinyin (Chinese pronunciation), or the hanzi (Chinese character)”, and distribute 9 cards to each student. Then the teacher will be the caller, saying such as “第一个是网球。 (The first one is tennis.)” Then students have “网球 (tennis)” in any form (picture, pinyin or hanzi) can put it on the board. So far this game “does SO much”, because the students can get as many as they have onto their board to bingo have that match the teacher’s call. “It is a game where it’s an advantage if you recognise the things.”

This first Bingo game was ST3a’s original intention to play when he created the cards. Then “when I started teaching, I realised there were more ways to use it”. Instead of just going “第一个是游泳 (The first one is swimming)”, the teacher can combine the words in a sentence. For example, the teacher will say “他喜欢游泳吗? (Does he/she like swimming?)”, if the students hear “游泳”, they can put the cards on the board. “And they can always hear it, because they are so tuned to listen to these sports now, everyone could do it.” Then there is a bonus round where the students who can translate the sentence will put an extra card on. “So it’s a little bit of extension for the kids who are better” and “it’s really good, they love it. They really like attempting to translate.”

Based on the idea of board games ST3a’s sons play at home, he designed another variation for the Bingo game. The students are playing in small groups, usually in pairs or threes. The teacher gives each student 10 random cards to put face down, and gets the students to put something that stands up so they can snatch, usually a glue stick, in the middle of the group. Then the students in the same group will reveal the first two cards at the same time. If the pictures, pinyin or hanzi match, and the students realise that, they can snatch the glue stick. If the cards don’t match, they would keep revealing the next cards. Further, if the students can say the cards in Chinese, such as “游泳 (swimming)”, they get to win the cards. The game is “so engaging for them, because they are…looking, and trying to work out what is that. And it really makes them work hard…and they really enjoy that.”

In ST3a’s perspective, it is important to design a set of activities that work well with his own students, and adapt these activates to practice different topics. As he explains, although it takes a long time to search for good pictures, cut up and
laminate the large number of cards, it is worth the effort. Creating his own teaching material is “like just creating a type of lesson that works well”, and it can be used “with different topics” for the future. “If I come up with something good…I can use that for the rest of my life. I can use that in any topic, I can change it a little bit to challenge them more, or challenge them less.”

When playing these games, the students have already met the criteria for the language study, in terms that they “are using the language a lot”, because “everyone has to say it, and you get to answer”. When the students are hearing it, “it is listening and speaking”. Also the students are “really engaged” because they are talking about the celebrities that they like or dislike, or people who are “so relevant that it’s within their school”. When they are playing Bingo, it is “a game where it’s listening, and it’s reading, and it’s pinyin and it’s everything all at the same time.” “That is the main thing, isn’t it? Are they using the language? Are they engaged?” The answer is “Yes!”

Always putting the students in group work, there is a lot of cooperation and competition going on in the classroom. Some students might work out the pinyin because of its sound, but they may need more work to recognise the hanzi, therefore in ST3a’s teaching, he describes that “I never have them playing by themselves. I have them play with a partner, because I understand it’s a hard game, and they can help with each other.” Also “it’s full of competition”, “it is the competition that makes them learn, and it’s not unpleasant competition.” When there is an argument, they would go to the teacher to check for the answers, “because they want to win…so it makes them learn.” And again these kinds of games are expected to be applicable to other topics in the Chinese class.

From ST3a’s illustration, we can summaries some essential qualities of Chinese teachers and features of suitable pedagogies teaching in Australia:

1. Passion and dedication, especially in designing and making innovative resources;
2. Understand the school culture and the students’ likes and dislikes;
3. Keep good relations with colleagues to gain support with resource development;
4. Be mindful of combining daily events with Chinese teaching;
5. Make Chinese learning relevant to the students themselves;
6. Combine substantial learning with games;
7. Encourage listening, speaking and character recognising skills at the beginners level; and
8. Encourage competition and cooperation amongst groups.