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It is 1949. Magda and her husband are displaced persons from Poland. They are living in the Bonegilla Reception Centre near Albury. On this scorching Australian summer’s day it is too hot to stay in the airless ex-army hut that serves as their usual classroom. So they and their 20 or so classmates go outside to sit on wooden benches under a tree, while their teacher writes on a blackboard propped on an old easel.

It is 1977. Tri is 19 years old. He and his brothers and sisters escaped from Vietnam on a small boat. Now they are living in Sydney in a migrant hostel. Every day Tri goes to English classes and in the evenings he studies hard. He hopes that if he can improve his English he’ll be able to get a job in the factory where his older brother works.

It is 1998. Mirsad was a lawyer in his native Bosnia. Now he has settled in Melbourne with his young family. He has been lucky to find full time work in an office but realises that he must continue to improve his English if he wants to study in an Australian university. So he attends English classes two nights a week and also practises his English using the Virtual Independent Learning Centre that he can access via the Internet.

These three stories exemplify how more than a million new arrivals since 1948 have begun their new life in Australia. In order to be able to participate fully in the social, economic and cultural life of their new country, they need to speak its national language, English.

The Commonwealth Government has recognised the vital importance of learning English ever since the early days of large scale migration to Australia. As well as providing formal classroom tuition in a range of settings, the Adult Migrant English Program (AMEP) has, over the decades, offered new arrivals to Australia the opportunity to learn English in the way most convenient and appropriate to them: via correspondence or distance learning courses, with the help of a Home Tutor, in small groups in community settings, via television or radio programs, and in more recent years, using computers and the Internet.
But the AMEP is proud to be more than just a language program. It is a major settlement tool, enabling students to avoid the isolation which comes from being unable to communicate. You only have to visit an AMEP classroom to understand what an important role it plays in easing recently arrived migrants into their new environment – the practical advice and information provided by teachers, the lively multicultural atmosphere where tolerance is both necessary and appreciated, the opportunities for friendship during what can be a very lonely and bewildering period in a person’s life, and of course the chance to learn and practise new linguistic and cultural skills in an encouraging and non-threatening environment.

It gives me great pleasure, as Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, to be associated with this history of the AMEP, a fascinating record of the people and policies that have made the AMEP what it is today, a world leader in adult language learning. Congratulations to Shirley Martin, herself an important part of this history.

Philip Ruddock
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCESS</td>
<td>Australian Assessment of Communicative English Skills test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFEB</td>
<td>Adult Community Further Education Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACL</td>
<td>Australian Centre for Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AELS</td>
<td>Adult English Language Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEMP</td>
<td>Advanced English for Migrants Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIMA</td>
<td>Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>Australian Language and Literacy Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALPR</td>
<td>Australian Language Proficiency Ratings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMEC</td>
<td>Adult Migrant English Centre (Darwin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMEP</td>
<td>Adult Migrant Education Program (until 1990) Adult Migrant English Program (from 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMES (ACT)</td>
<td>Adult Migrant English Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMES (NSW)</td>
<td>Adult Migrant Education Service (until 1991) Adult Migrant English Service (from 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMES (Tas)</td>
<td>Adult Migrant English Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMES (Vic)</td>
<td>Adult Migrant Education Services/Adult Migrant English Services (1951–1996) Adult Multicultural Education Services (from 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMES (WA)</td>
<td>Adult Migrant Education Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMIS</td>
<td>AMEP Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOP</td>
<td>Annual Operating Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCC</td>
<td>AMEP Research Coordinating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMS</td>
<td>AMEP Reporting and Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASLPR</td>
<td>Australian Second Language Proficiency Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIMPR</td>
<td>Bureau of Immigration Multicultural and Population Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO</td>
<td>Bilingual Information Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAIP</td>
<td>Committee to Advise on Australia’s Immigration Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Commonwealth Employment Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAMES</td>
<td>Clearing House for the Adult Migrant Education Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIT</td>
<td>Canberra Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPQ</td>
<td>Committee on Professional Qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSWE</td>
<td>Certificates in Spoken and Written English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEET</td>
<td>Department of Employment, Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEETYA</td>
<td>Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETYA</td>
<td>Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIEA</td>
<td>Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DILGEA</td>
<td>Department of Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIMA</td>
<td>Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>Distance Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>English Education Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELICOS</td>
<td>English Language Intensive Courses for Overseas Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLS (SA)</td>
<td>English Language and Literacy Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELSINET</td>
<td>English Language Services Information Network (NC ELT R Resource Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELSIWEB</td>
<td>English Language Services Information on the Web</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPRS</td>
<td>Educational Placement and Referral Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERDC</td>
<td>Education Research and Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL</td>
<td>English as a Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWP</td>
<td>English in the Workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTS</td>
<td>Home Tutor Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAR</td>
<td>Interview and Referral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICEM</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IELTS</td>
<td>International English Language Testing System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILC</td>
<td>Individual/Independent Learning Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOTY</td>
<td>It’s Over To You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRO</td>
<td>International Refugee Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCSC</td>
<td>Joint Commonwealth/States Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSIA</td>
<td>Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCEETYA</td>
<td>Ministerial Council of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOVEET</td>
<td>Ministerial Council of Vocational Education, Employment and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCELTR</td>
<td>National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCP</td>
<td>National Curriculum Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCRC</td>
<td>National Curriculum Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEAS</td>
<td>National ELICOS Accreditation Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESB</td>
<td>Non English-Speaking Background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMCOT</td>
<td>Northern Metropolitan College of TAFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMIT</td>
<td>Northern Melbourne Institute of TAFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMIU</td>
<td>National Management Information Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOOSR</td>
<td>National Office of Overseas Skills Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTU</td>
<td>Northern Territory University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OET</td>
<td>Occupational English Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSDC</td>
<td>Professional Development Sub-Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSDS</td>
<td>Program Development and Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMIT</td>
<td>Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROMAMPAS</td>
<td>Committee of Review of Migrant and Multicultural Programs and Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC</td>
<td>Self-Access Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>Special Broadcasting Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDB</td>
<td>Settlement Data Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHP</td>
<td>Special Humanitarian Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>Special Intervention Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPP</td>
<td>Special Preparatory Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA P</td>
<td>Special Passage Assistance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VETAB</td>
<td>Vocational Education and Training Accreditation Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELL</td>
<td>Workplace English Language and Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translating and Interpreting Service (until 1991)</td>
<td>Telephone Interpreter Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESOL</td>
<td>Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEFL</td>
<td>Teaching English as a Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESL</td>
<td>Teaching English as a Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIS</td>
<td>Telephone Interpreter Service (until 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VETAB</td>
<td>Vocational Education and Training Accreditation Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Department</td>
<td>Minister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>A A Calwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H E Holt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A R Downer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H F Oppermann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P R Lynch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A J Grassby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J R McClelland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration and Ethnic Affairs</td>
<td>A A Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M J R Mackellar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I M Macphee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J C Hodges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C J Hurford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M J Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R F Ray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G Hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration and Multicultural Affairs</td>
<td>P Ruddock</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Acknowledgments

This book would not have been possible without the assistance and support of many people. I would like to thank Catherine du Peloux Menage for her continued patience and encouragement, Maggie Aldhamland for ensuring that the book maintained a logical progression. I must also thank Lois Carrington, officers of the Department of Immigration, and finally, my colleagues and friends in the AMEP across all the years for their willing involvement in providing me with accurate information of developments, many of them provided invaluable comments on early drafts.

The publishers have used their best efforts to contact all copyright holders for permission to reproduce artwork and text extracts and wish to acknowledge the following for providing copyright permission.

The photographs in the book are reproduced by kind permission of the following:

page 4 AMES Victoria; page 5 AMES Victoria; page 6 The Border Mail; page 8 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 13 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 17 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 20 AMES Victoria; page 25 AMES Victoria; page 27 NCELTR; page 46 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 51 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 55 AMES Victoria; page 56 AMES Victoria; page 57 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 58 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 59 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 60 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 64 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 66 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 74 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 77 (top) AMES Victoria (bottom) Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 78 Lois Carrington; page 85 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 86 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 88 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 94 AMES Victoria; page 96 W A A MES (top three pictures), AMES Victoria (bottom); page 97 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 99 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 107 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 108 AMES Victoria; page 111 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 114 AMES Victoria; page 121 AMES Victoria; page 124 AMES Victoria; page 127 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 133 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 135 Yeronga TAFE, Queensland; page 141 AMES Victoria; page 147 AMES Victoria; page 151 AMES Victoria; page 154 Yeronga TAFE, Queensland; page 161 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 165 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 166 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs.
The publishers wish to thank the following for permission to reproduce extracts from published materials:

- page 2 Commonwealth of Australia for an extract from the Immigration Restriction Act 1901.
- page 7 Commonwealth of Australia for an extract from A New Language (1950).
- page 9 Commonwealth of Australia for extract from The Good Neighbor, June 1955.
- page 30 Department of Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs for an extract from The AMEP National Plan.
- page 33 Commonwealth of Australia for an extract from the Migration Laws Amendment Act 1901.
- page 34 Department of Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs for extract from letter.
- page 56 NSW AMES for extracts from article and photo from Interchange July 1985, 4:14-15 ESL and the visually impaired.
- L Norris; page 67 NSW AMES 'Table from Bilingual provision at AMES Cabramatta', S Jeavons and S Lukabyo, Interchange 21, August 1993, p 29.
- page 75 Commonwealth of Australia for extract from English on the way (1955).
- page 76 Commonwealth of Australia for extract from the I Can Read series.
- page 81 Commonwealth of Australia for extract from A Correspondence Course for New Australians.
- page 82 NSW AMES Victoria for extract from A Correspondence Course for New Australians.
- Teaching notes. The principles of marking; page 83 Commonwealth of Australia for A New Language (1957).
- page 84 Commonwealth of Australia for extract from The Good Neighbor, June 1955.
- page 87 Commonwealth of Australia for extract from Situational English for newcomers to Australia (1965).
- page 91 AMES Victoria for Learning Pathways chart from Enterprise Centre, Springvale.
- page 102 Commonwealth of Australia for extract from It's Over to You (1987, units 3 and 9, Stage 2).
- page 104 NCELTR for extract from It's Over to You (Stage 3, Book 2, 1993).
- page 106 NSW AMES for promotional materials we need your skills in the Home Tutor Scheme.
- page 109 Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs for Home Tutor Scheme brochures (bottom).
- page 111 (bottom) Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; page 115 (top) NCELTR for extract from Teaching English in South Australia, R Bean, Prospect, 2, 2: 242-7. (bottom) NSW AMES Victoria.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A M E S for extract from W ollongong restructure, multiskilling and E W P, Chris Boddington, Margaret Herring and Hilary Gill, 15 August 1991, p 17; page 123 N S W A M E S for extract from Interchange, No. 18; page 129 Commonwealth of A ustralia for an extract from E nglish for newcomers to A ustralia, T eacher's B ook (1951); page 130 (top) Commonwealth of A ustralia for extracts from Sit uational E nglish and (bottom) E nglish... A new language; page 134 Commonwealth of A ustralia for extracts from C H A M E S catalogue 1986; page 135 N C E L T R for extract from Prospect 1, 1; page 136 D epartment of I mmigration and M ulticultural A ffairs for an extract from the C ampbell Report, 14.25, 1986; page 146 Commonwealth of A ustralia for extracts from A nnual Report 1952, C ommonwealth O ffice of E ducation; page 147 A M E S V ictoria for extracts from a lesson plan; page 150 C ommonwealth of A ustralia for extracts from E nglish... A new language (1966) 11.1 and T E F L/T E S L N ewsletter 3, 1, 1977; N C E L T R for extract from Prospect (1977) 2, 2; page 151 N C E L T R for extracts from N ews from the forum (1977) 3, 1; page 153 Commonwealth of A ustralia for extracts from E nglish for newcomers to A ustralia (1950), S ituational E nglish for newcomers to A ustralia (1976) and G eorge and N iga (1979); page 156 N S W A M E S for the covers of the following publications: T roubled waters 2, B each Street 2, M ario, J ob F ocus, T he m umberacy w orkbook, W ork awareness, T he w rong radio; page 157 A M E S V ictoria for the covers of the following publications: R omance on the r ocks; U nderstanding w ork h azards; F inding a j ob; G etting s tarted; L earning about b anking; page 158, N C E L T R for the covers of C O L T, I N T empo, T he A ustral ian L earners D ictionary, T eachers V oices 3, C hina; page 160 N C E L T R for the covers of T he s econd l anguage c urriculum in a ction, I ssues in i mmigrant s ettlement in A ustralia, T alking i t t hrough, I nvestigating l earner outcomes for l earners w ith s pecial n eeds in the A M E P, F rom p roficiency to c ompetencies, I nformation t echnology s trategy for the A M E P; page 162 Commonwealth of A ustralia for extract from S ituational E nglish for newcomers to A ustralia (1976); page 163 N S W A M E S for an extract from Interchange 17, 1991, 7-10 'W here is a ssessment g oing i n A M E S N S W ?' C. C ouper; page 164 N C E L T R for extracts from the information leaflet about the A C C E S S English l anguage t est; page 166 the A BC for extracts from W alter an d C onnie E nglish t eaching T V s eries b ook; page 167 A M E S V ictoria for cover of S how m e E nglish and N C E L T R for cover of H ello A ustralia and E nglish at work; page 169 A M E S V ictoria for extract from a S hort c ourse b rochure 1998 on C omputing courses; page 184 D epartment of I mmigration and M ulticultural A ffairs for cover of L earning E nglish at a d istance.

xi
A BRIEF HISTORY OF EARLY MIGRATION TO AUSTRALIA

Although Australia has always been a multilingual society, it was not until the mid-1940s that Government policy for adult migrant education was developed. The establishment of an English language program was part of the overall Commonwealth Government implementation of an immigration program that sought migrants from other European countries as well as from Britain.

From the beginning of human habitation, Australia has been a multilingual society. The Council for Aboriginal Reconciliation estimates that at the time of the arrival of the first British settlers in 1788, the 750,000 Aboriginal inhabitants spoke about 200 to 250 separate languages. The arrival in Sydney Cove in 1788 of a fleet of eight passenger and three store ships marked the beginning of European settlement and the addition of English to the number of languages spoken in Australia.

THE BEGINNING OF EUROPEAN SETTLEMENT 1788–1900

Of the 1030 British men and women who disembarked at Sydney Cove, 736 were convicts and 17 were children of convicts. Over the next 40 years or so the majority of new settlers were British convicts; indeed, of the 77,000 who arrived in Australia between 1788 and 1830, only 18 per cent were free settlers. From 1831 to 1840, however, free settlers comprised 56 per cent of arrivals and they introduced into the country a variety of other languages. In 1838, for example, German free settlers – mainly members of the Old Lutheran Church of Prussia – began arriving and settling in South Australia. The discovery of gold in eastern Australia in 1851 and the advent of the steamship brought a large increase in migration, and hastened the end of the policy of shipping convicts to Australia.

The flow of people coming to Australia during these years depended largely on the prevailing economic conditions. Migrants came from all parts of the world. By 1860 the total non-indigenous population had grown to 1,145,000, but in the 1890s – due to drought and depression – more settlers left than arrived.

‘WHITE’ MIGRATION POLICY

With Federation in 1901 and the establishment of the first Commonwealth Government, there was increased pressure to develop a national immigration policy. Leading New South Wales and Victorian politicians warned against anything other than a ‘white’ immigration policy, a view that was endorsed by the Trade Unions. The Immigration (Restriction) Act 1901, which was referred to as the ‘dictation test’ (Figure 1.1), guided Australia’s immigration policy for many years. This Act was soon followed by the Naturalisation Act 1903 that set the rules for Australian citizenship. Applicants could not be natives of Asia, Africa, or the Pacific Islands except for New Zealand. During World War I antagonism developed towards certain groups...
and the Act was amended in 1917 to ensure that all applicants had renounced their own nationality and could read and write English.

European immigration increased between the wars. The Empire Settlement Act 1922 provided for assisted passages for migrants from the United Kingdom. Between 1933 and 1939, 10,000 German, Austrian and other European Jews fleeing from Nazi Germany joined their ranks. However, at the beginning of World War II, migration to Australia virtually stopped.

Although all newcomers needed English to conduct their daily lives outside their homes, no official consideration was given to the provision of English lessons for people who came from other language backgrounds, although the churches offered some limited assistance in English language instruction. There was little interest in recognising the value of, or in encouraging, the maintenance of other languages.

Post-World War II Immigration
World War II revived Australia’s feelings of political and economic insecurity. The dangers to security of a small population were evident, and like many other nations, Australia was facing...
economic pressures. In 1945 the population was a mere 7,391,000. There were serious housing shortages as well as a shortage of schools and transport. Power shortages and blackouts covering whole cities were common. Coal and steel production had declined and primary industries found it difficult to obtain essential supplies.

At this time Australia’s exports were still largely agricultural, but Australians had begun to realise they could no longer rely on their traditional markets. With faster communications and technological advances in many spheres, the world was entering a new phase of industrialisation. Australia, though rich in unexploited natural resources, was prevented by shortage of manpower from taking part in this development. The country needed to make a determined bid to increase its population and develop its resources.

It was apparent that the nation could no longer rely on natural population increase or on the uncertainties of unplanned immigration to provide the millions of citizens that would be needed in the future. Australia sought greater strength, security and development through large-scale, planned immigration.

In 1945 the Labor Prime Minister, John Curtin, told his cabinet that he intended to implement an immigration program as soon as the war was over, and his successor Ben Chifley set this plan in motion with the support of all political parties. The Federal Department of Immigration and the Commonwealth Employment Service were then established.

The immigration policy had bi-partisan support. In the words of Arthur Calwell, Australia’s first Minister for Immigration:

> We may have only the next 25 years to make the best possible use of our second chance to survive… Our first requirement is additional population. We need it for reasons of defence and for the fullest expansion of our economy. (Sherrington 1980:65)

The leader of the Opposition, Robert Menzies, concurred in a speech in the House of Representatives:

> I believe that upon the possibility of our securing a substantial migration to Australia during the next 30 years will depend, not only the preservation of Australian independence, but also the true prospects of advancement of social benefits in Australia. (Sherrington 1980:65)

Agreements were signed with Britain and a number of other countries to provide free, assisted passages to ex-servicemen, and a Commonwealth Immigration Advisory Committee toured Europe to determine possible sources of migrants.

**The Early Days of the Program 1948–64**

In the post-war period the number of migrants to Australia grew, as did the range of countries from which they came. This was a direct result of Government policy to increase the labour force necessary to develop the country. From the beginning English language tuition for new arrivals was part of the immigration policy, and the first Commonwealth Government-assisted program to provide English language...
tution for migrants began at Bonegilla in 1948. In 1951 the States’ cooperation in AMEP programs was formalised by an agreement between the Commonwealth and State governments. During the period 1948–64 the AMEP grew in size, scope and expertise as the needs of new migrants were more clearly understood.

In July 1947 Australia entered into an agreement with the Preparatory Commission for the International Refugee Organisation to settle an annual quota of 12 000 persons from the displacement camps in Europe. The first ship – the US army transport, General Heintzelman – carried 843 European migrants to Australia, reaching Fremantle on 28 November 1947. The men and women on board were Latvian, Lithuanian and Estonian.

Priority had been given to people who would make the greatest contribution to national production in return for minimum assistance. Workers from the displaced persons camps in Europe were required to sign an undertaking to work wherever they were sent for a period of two years. The Australian Government undertook to provide initial reception centres, on-site hostels for workers, and special centres to accommodate the families of workers. The first Reception and Training Centre for migrants was opened at Bonegilla in Victoria, and in December 1947 the first arrivals moved in. Further centres were opened in 1948 in Bathurst and Greta in New South Wales and at Graylands in Perth, Western Australia.

In these early days, newspapers tended to focus on stories of happy migrant families enjoying their new life in migrant centres, with stories such as ‘Balt migrants happy at Bonegilla camp’ (The Sun, 17 December 1947) which described the carefree atmosphere, the enthusiasm for sport and the eagerness of the migrants to learn English. However, years later, when Catherine Panich interviewed these migrants for her book Sanctuary, she found the reality somewhat different (1988:52–7):

The very nature of the camps created problems. All reception and holding centres were former military establishments. This was also true of some of the hostels; it was only in the early 1950s that hostels were built specifically for immigrants. The chronic shortage of accommodation after the war made the military camps the obvious choice for temporary accommodation for so many people...

There were problems of access to nearby towns often eight to ten kilometres away. Immigrant communities were on the town fringes - remaining physically, ethnically, socially and culturally isolated.

The genesis of federal government support
Even before the new migrants arrived in Australia, the Government had realised that
there were no language support systems in place to assist them and that no existing education system would be able to undertake the teaching of English. In 1946, the Director of the Commonwealth Office of Education proposed a plan for the teaching of English which would provide assistance in four stages: in the country of origin; on the voyage to Australia; on arrival and after placement in Australia.

The early development of the program is described through personal accounts of the people involved at this time in Lois Carrington’s book, A real situation. These accounts describe the efforts and struggles of learners and teachers as they tried to come to grips with new challenges. In his unpublished thesis in 1954, McCusker noted that, by contrast with similar developments in the United States and Canada, the Australian plan emphasized language rather than direct teaching or compulsion for naturalisation.

With the beginning of planned migration, the Australian Government was prepared to take the responsibility for ensuring that all migrants were encouraged and assisted to become fully assimilated and to ‘blend’ into the Australian community. The teaching of English was seen as the key factor but, somewhat naively, there was a strong assumption that very little assistance would be required. There was no real understanding or appreciation of the nature or characteristics of adult second language learning or of the time required by different categories of learners to achieve satisfactory oracy and literacy skills.

In later chapters attention will be directed to the development of Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), but it is important at this point to note the policy directions being forged by the Australian Government in the 1940s. All political parties agreed to the steps being taken to provide not only accommodation and employment, but also language education.

Essentially, politicians took this approach because they were well aware of the public concern and suspicion of ‘foreigners’ – as is demonstrated by the enactment of the 1901 Immigration Discrimination Act and the 1903 Naturalisation Act described previously. The desire to lessen this suspicion is reflected in a speech to the House of Representatives in August 1945 by the Minister for Immigration, Arthur Calwell: (Hansard, 2 August 1945):

We have been too prone in the past to ostracise those of alien birth and then blame them for segregating themselves and forming foreign communities. It is we, not they, who are generally responsible for this condition of affairs.
THE HISTORY OF THE AMEP

THE FIRST AMEP PROGRAM

At Bonegilla the Commonwealth Office of Education assembled 22 language teachers from state and independent schools in New South Wales and Victoria who had volunteered to conduct classes during the school vacation. The 800 migrants were divided into 32 classes of approximately 25 students. Each class was given four hours’ instruction every day for one month.

Teachers were required to teach five hours a day from Monday to Friday and for a further two hours on Saturday morning. Each day, classes received one hour’s instruction in language; one hour for application of the language, word games, reading and general discussion; one hour on the Australian way of life; and one hour of visual education by means of documentary films.

Dr Ralph Crossley, Acting Professor of the Department of German at the University of Sydney, was appointed as Principal Instructor at the first Bonegilla Camp and then became the consultant on teaching techniques for further camps. In an article in Education News (Vol 1:6) he reflected on the unique aspects of the task:

Here was no academic project involving, as language study so often does, dilettantish juggling with words from one language to another, but an urgent problem directly associated with life. These students are learning a language to use it – immediately... The methods used would have to be direct, natural and oral in order to meet a situation which is vastly different from that of the ordinary run of language classes.

At this time the AMEP was organised through the Commonwealth Office of Education which was responsible for the development of the
program, the training of teachers and the production of materials. The first edition of a course book entitled *English for newcomers to Australia* was printed in 1948 and 42,000 copies were distributed by 1952.

The Office continued to develop materials for the rapidly expanding program, including reading material, pictorial aids, pronunciation charts, film strips, correspondence courses, radio scripts and notes for teachers.

In January of each year staff instruction was arranged in each State through vacation schools for teachers. The regular publication of *English*... A new language by the Commonwealth Office of Education offered ideas and support to teachers.

**The Program Expands**

Towards the end of 1949 the decrease in time spent in the reception centres led to a change in the program. Holding centres were established to accommodate the families of men who had been sent to work in isolated locations and experienced instructors were transferred to these centres to conduct day continuation classes for mothers while their children were at school. The classes were called continuation classes as they followed on from the initial classes in the arrival centres. These early classes endeavoured to cater for the special needs of women, but the 1951 annual report of the Commonwealth Office of Education noted that while the progress of...
regular attendees was good, it was difficult to persuade women to attend.

At the first Australian Citizenship Convention in 1950, a national Good Neighbour Council was formed to encourage Australian community groups to welcome newcomers into their local communities and a regular newsletter The Good Neighbour commenced publication in the same year. The newsletter provided stories of successful migrants, and ideas for local groups. It served to promote the Government’s efforts towards speedy assimilation.

1951 COMMONWEALTH/STATE AGREEMENT

Between 1947 and 1951 State Education Departments cooperated with the Commonwealth but had no official responsibility for any professional aspects of the program. The growth of the program meant that more formal arrangements were needed and in December 1951 agreements were made with State Education Departments that led to the States taking over all aspects of adult migrant education subject to the undertaking of the Commonwealth to reimburse the States for the expenditure incurred, with overall coordination of policy by the Commonwealth. In brief the agreement was as follows:

The States were to:
- organise, conduct and supervise continuation classes and correspondence courses and distribute material provided by the Commonwealth;
- assume full responsibility for instruction in holding centres and in reception and training centres - subject to review as provided in the agreement;
- administer the radio lesson scheme.

The Commonwealth was to:
- provide text-books and teaching aids, correspondence lessons and radio booklets;
- arrange for the preparation and delivery of radio broadcasts;
- provide vacation courses for teachers and instructors;
- conduct an advisory service.

This agreement was a tripartite system with the Department of Immigration having overall control through coordination of policy and funding, the Commonwealth Office of Education being responsible for the provision of materials and teacher training via advisory teachers and the State Education Departments selecting and appointing the staff. At this time there was limited input by the States into issues of policy as the program was seen by all parties to be of a temporary nature. Teachers were usually primary school teachers who undertook the teaching of continuation classes for two or four hours a week as an extra opportunity for employment.

In international discussions the Department of Immigration became involved – not only in issues of local policy, legislation and their implementation, but also in the development of
bilateral schemes for assisted migration and immigration policy in conjunction with international organisations such as the United Nations and ICEM (Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration).

Early Program Parameters
The practice of first conducting classes in the country of origin and on board ship, backed by radio and correspondence sessions and continuation classes, was founded on the assumption that migrants would learn English quickly, at least the amount of English they needed to survive. The level of funding available was never linked to any attempt to define exactly what might be involved in becoming fluent in English, or having adequate English language skills for economic or social purposes.

In these early years, the Government’s policy aim was to provide access to English instruction for all newcomers for a period related to a set curriculum. This approach was explicitly stated in the Commonwealth Office of Education Annual Report of 1948 (p 22):

The student may attend the class until the work set out in the book, English for newcomers to Australia, is completed or for a maximum of twelve months.

The class referred to in this statement was an evening continuation class that followed the initial four weeks’ intensive course in Bonegilla. The 1949 Annual Report went further in limiting access and proposing the alternatives (p 23):

Free continuation instruction is given for a period of twelve months to each person desiring it. After that time, should they require further courses, they are expected to avail themselves of the existing facilities in State and private educational institutions, meeting any costs themselves. (1949:23)

While no formal record of fee payments has been found at State level, the Annual Report of the Victorian Minister for Education in Victoria 1949–50 stated (p 10):

Two sessions a week, each of two hours’ duration, is the maximum amount of free tuition; the class normally continues for twelve months. Migrants desiring further tuition after this period are required to pay fees.
During the 1950s the program continued to develop options for access ranging from pre-embarkation courses and shipboard education to a variety of options on arrival. As early as 1952 courses specifically focusing on employment were being offered. For example, a three months’ pre-employment course was conducted for migrant workers in the Victorian Government Railways and by 1959 classes for employees had commenced at the Gas and Fuel Corporation, Containers Ltd, Bradford Cotton Mills and Robert Bosch Pty Ltd.

Evaluation of Immigration Policies – Pre-1960s
The initial immigration policy had focused on the economic need for Australia to increase its population. The Government was able to demonstrate the success of its strategies within the first three years. The report of the Commonwealth Employment Service in September 1948 reported that in the first seven months of 1948 about 4000 displaced persons had been placed in a wide range of industries. This comparatively small number of workers had, the Minister for Immigration, Arthur Calwell, remarked, relieved the shortage of domestic staff in hospitals, increased the output of building materials including timber, bricks, cement and roofing, helped build Australian homes, saved a big percentage of the fruit and sugar crops from being left unharvested, and made it possible to begin catching up on the backlog of maintenance on the railways.

As far as the AMEP program is concerned, the evidence of success or otherwise is more difficult to ascertain. In the early years, Commonwealth reports concentrated on the growth of the program, although State reports made some efforts to evaluate the program, drawing on comments such as the following:

There is no question but that the newcomer wishes to learn English and that the Department of Immigration has not done a good deal to place facilities organised by the Commonwealth Office of Education at the services of the New Australian. Before a judgement can be delivered on the success or failure of this attempt to instruct newcomers, more time must be allowed to give the student a chance to prove that he is earnest in his endeavour to fit himself for his citizenship. (Education News 1951:7)

Teachers’ work at times has been made especially difficult by irregular attendance due to shift work, fatigue, and in some cases, lack of appreciation of the opportunities offered. (Minister for Education in Victoria Annual Report 1948–49:14)

As late as 1964, at a combined migrant education conference convened by the Department of Education and Science in Sydney, it was reported that abandonment rates in continuation classes were high in spite of what were felt to be extensive facilities, and that many migrants showed a disinclination to learn English. An editorial comment in the Good Neighbour Council newsletter in September 1968, which sought to encourage the migrant to learn English, reflects the widespread community attitude:

In the long term, however, the newcomer carries the responsibility for helping himself. Language is as much a tool of trade as a hammer or a screwdriver. It is also the key to the mood of a society. A migrant who makes no effort to learn English isolates himself from the mainstream of the Australian community and cannot be fully aware of Australian values.
Development of AMEP Policy 1965–81

The second phase of the development of the AMEP reflected the social changes occurring as Australia moved out of a period of high employment. This period also saw the emergence of humanitarian as well as economic considerations playing a part in immigration policy. In the development of policy, the Government could no longer act unilaterally but needed to be aware of the views of a wider audience and to seek information from the findings of research studies. Society accepted the move from assimilation to multiculturalism, an idea put forward in the 70s to show the recognition and acceptance of diversity within Australia.

Changes in Immigration

In the first years of post-war migration to Australia, migrant workers from the displaced persons camps in Europe had quickly been contracted to work on such projects as the Snowy Mountains River Scheme, which soon had a multinational work force who shared hard work, danger and isolation. In such conditions, learning English was especially onerous and difficult. To their surprise, Australians found themselves to be in the minority in these locations. Far from demanding that their workmates spoke English and acted ‘Australian’, they found themselves having to acclimatise to ‘foreign ways’. On the job, the unique skills of the migrants were appreciated.

Up to the 1960s the bipartisan immigration program continued to encourage increased migration. There were no strong debates in Parliament as reports were made and changes were announced. No or was there much opposition from the general public to Government policy or its implementation, although in some local areas conflicts were emerging.

In the mid 1960s the Government commissioned reviews, sponsored by the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM), to survey such issues as the reasons for migration of workers to Australia. The selection criteria were then broadened to increase migration to Australia. The Special Passage Assistance Program (SPAP) permitted guest workers in Australia and as a result settlers arrived from countries such as Switzerland, France and the Americas. This policy review also examined the issue of immigration from non-European countries. The Government’s overall decision was to encourage well-qualified people to apply for immigration. They were to be assessed on their ability to integrate readily into the community and to contribute to Australian life. No annual quotas were proposed.

Growth in AMEP Programs

In the 1964–65 Annual Report of the Minister for Education in Victoria several changes to AMEP delivery in Victoria were noted. The report recorded that on 30 June 1965 there were 4853 enrolments in continuation classes in city, suburban and country venues, as well as 4578 enrolments in the correspondence courses. New settlers were increasingly being made aware of the instruction available to them by means of publicity material including posters, press notices in several languages, letters of invitation taken...
home by schoolchildren, brochures, and reply cards distributed by the Department of Immigration. The Good Neighbour Council, schools, newspapers and industrial organisations gave considerable help in publicity. Trained teachers were appointed and then given further specialised training in teaching ESL. Research into the reasons for learners abandoning classes was conducted and strategies for reversing this trend were trialled.

The Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 saw a new wave of refugees arriving in Australia. The Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Associations, whose members had arrived in 1948, was determined that the new wave of refugees would not have to endure the hardships of 1948. It was through their initiative and representation to the Department of Immigration that the concept of ‘crash’ or intensive courses in English was considered. The arrival of these refugees coincided with a shift in Government thinking from assimilation towards integration, and a realisation that English, certainly for these skilled migrants, could not be acquired to the level necessary to utilise their skills and qualifications without additional resources. Phillip Lynch, who became Minister for Immigration in 1969, referred to the changes in a public statement (Lynch 1971:23):

A change in emphasis from the long-term continuation class program to more specialised and accelerated forms of instruction was announced in April, 1970. This was intended to offer migrants the opportunity to settle quickly and successfully and to do the work for which they are qualified.

Intensive courses aimed at equipping educated migrants with adequate English to enter appropriate employment commenced in 1969 with the first course held in Sydney for a group of professionally qualified Czech migrants. Other courses commenced in New South Wales and Victoria in the same year.

A simmigration increased, peaking at 185,000 in 1969–70, questions were raised about the continuation of high migration levels. This reflected a growing public unease about the nation’s ability to provide employment and
services for the increased number of migrants at a time when unemployment was also increasing across Australia. Jean Martin (1978:28) claims that the Department of Immigration was oriented overwhelmingly towards migrant recruitment rather than settlement and was not well informed about migrant experiences in Australia.

During 1969 and 1970, the Liberal Government announced a number of important initiatives to provide more information on the migration program:

1. A Committee on Overseas Qualifications (COPQ) was established to consider issues related to the assessment and recognition of overseas qualifications.
2. Long-term studies on desirable future population levels began, and a National Population Inquiry was asked to develop recommendations for Australia’s population in stages to the year 2000.
3. The Government announced a $16 million allocation for English language training for migrants.

The Immigration (Education) Act 1971 was a discretionary Act, amended in subsequent years, that provided for the possible delivery of English courses and citizen ship courses to defined persons and administrative arrangements for the AMEP. It also enabled the Commonwealth to arrange for courses for children as well as adults. Previously, migrant children had been largely ignored by the Commonwealth, and State teachers were expected to manage within available resources. In the case of isolated enrolments, the migrant child was simply enrolled into a lower class and expected to learn English before being placed in a more appropriate grade. The new program was conducted in schools where there were sufficient numbers of children who required assistance in learning English before they could cope in mainstream classes. In 1976 the responsibility for this program was moved to the Schools Commission through the General Recurrent Grants Program. The increased demand for teachers with specialised skills led to a demand for teacher training which had, up to this time,
been arranged through vacation courses, evening in-service sessions or in-service courses of short duration.

Despite these developments the AMEP – along with all emerging settlement services – was struggling to keep abreast of the needs of earlier waves of migrants as well as those of newer arrivals. In 1971, at the 37th Summer School of the Australian Institute of Political Science, Walter Lippmann, a member of the Immigration Advisory Council, said (1971:143):

Migrant education and social work programs were initiated in recent years, at a time when they were long overdue, and they are gathering momentum. It is essential in this talk of cutting back of expenditure to make the point that these programs, irrespective of future incoming migration, must be continued and expanded rather than be stifled in their very early years. We are dealing with the lives of people and we must ensure that the migrants already here have a full opportunity of learning English and of adjusting to our society.

**Immigration Policy Reform – Abandonment of the ‘White Australia’ Policy**

The fight against the ‘White Australia’ policy was a long one and the changes gradual. During World War II many non-white refugees had entered Australia. While the majority left at the end of the war, many had married Australians and wanted to stay. In 1949 the Government allowed 800 non-European refugees to stay and also admitted Japanese war brides. The revised Migration Act 1958 introduced a simpler system of entry permits and abolished the infamous dictation test.

The Immigration Reform Group, which had been set up by a group of interested people in Melbourne, had been outspoken on the issue of the ‘White Australia’ policy since 1960, but the strongest momentum came from the Australian Labor Party when it came to power in 1972 after 23 years in opposition. The new Government carried out a number of reforms that impacted on services to migrants. An Immigration Advisory Council to overview the work of a Community Relations Committee was established and this led to an inquiry into all aspects of discrimination. This committee also realised the enactment of the Australian Citizenship Act 1973 which allowed all migrants to apply for citizenship after living as permanent residents in Australia for three years. (It must be noted that Aboriginal Australians – Australia’s original inhabitants – did not achieve this status until 1975.)

Policy statements ordering the total disregard of race as a factor in the selection of migrants were issued to overseas posts, and all international agreements relating to immigration and non-discrimination on the grounds of race were ratified.

**Towards Multiculturalism**

Al Grassby became Minister for Immigration in the new Labor Government in 1972 and played a major part in the enactment of a number of reforms to assist migrant settlement, including the establishment of an emergency telephone interpreter service (TIS) in Sydney and Melbourne. The TIS system allowed migrants to seek information and assistance in their first language as well as giving assistance to non-English speakers needing telephone interpreting in situations such as an appointment with a doctor, applying for a job or enrolling in the AMEP.
In Australia’s decade of decision (Grassby 1973), a report tabled in Parliament in October 1973, A I Grassby spoke of a new phase in Australia’s history – the search for a national identity. In the report he spoke about the AMEP and announced the introduction of the Home Tutor Scheme to be staffed by volunteers and aimed specifically at migrant women in their homes. The Scheme was initially organised through the State offices of the Department of Immigration, and in the late 1970s responsibility was transferred in most instances to the State Migrant Education Centres, known in later years as AMES.

Another new initiative mentioned in this report, was the marketing of the new television series, You say the word, which was being developed in cooperation with the WIN Channel 4 in Wollongong, New South Wales. The objectives of the program were to help migrants to learn English, to make them aware of citizenship issues and to give Australian viewers some appreciation of migrant life. In addition, the report referred to the continued development of migrant education centres – in Australia as well as the pre-embarkation courses in countries of origin. These classes were seen as playing an important role especially after shipboard education ended with the last shipboard arrivals to Australia in 1977. From this time on newcomers arrived by plane without the chance to accommodate to change during the long sea voyage.

A special six-week course was developed for migrant workers in industry in 1972–73. While there had been classes in work places before this time, they had been continuation classes conducted on site but out of work time. In 1973 the program was designed with the cooperation of management and unions and negotiations took place to allow the classes to be held during work time. The 36-hour workplace courses included components on work-related issues such as industrial safety as well as basic English language instruction. This development took place at a time when there was growing concern that migrant labour was synonymous with cheap labour.

In his paper A multi-cultural society for the future which he presented at the ‘Strategy 2000: Australia for Tomorrow’ symposium, A I Grassby presented his preferred view of immigration. Having summarised Charles Price’s thesis that three distinct philosophies of immigration exist – the Anglo-conformist view, the melting pot view and the permanent ethnic pluralism view – Mr Grassby expressed the opinion that the term, ‘family of the nation’ was his preferred description for the Australian situation. He announced the move away from the concept of total assimilation and introduced the concept of multiculturalism. It signalled a time when the Government was ready to accommodate increases in budgetary requests in order to develop new directions.

In June 1974 the responsibility for immigration was transferred from the Department of Immigration to the Department of Labour and Industry. Maggie Gray, who was in charge of AMES NSW at that time, recalled the change in an interview with Shirley Martin:

‘the family of the nation’ ought to convey an immediate and concrete image to all. In a family the overall attachment to the common good need not impose a sameness on the outlook or activity of each member.

Grassby 1973
I was informed by the State Government that the change had taken place, with no prior indication of such a change and certainly no consultation. We expected that there would be significant implications for the program but very little changed and, in December 1975, the departmental responsibility shifted back to the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs.

A conference to discuss migrant education issues was held in Melbourne in September 1974. Opened by the Minister for Immigration, Al Grassby, the Migrant Education Action Conference was attended by delegates from organisations representing teachers, parents, ethnic communities, trade unions and cultural, religious and welfare organisations. Topics discussed included English language education for all migrants, adequate trained teachers and multicultural and multilingual curricula for schools.

The consensus reached at the conference was that:

♦ schools in Australia, by and large, make migrant children fail;
♦ Australia's immigration policy was designed to provide migrants as unskilled and low-paid workers of industry;
♦ Australian society via its legal, social and educational institutions was trying to destroy migrants' national heritage by promoting an assimilationist policy.

Similar conferences had also been held in other fields, such as social welfare. A report published by ACOSS in 1973, Focus on migrants: A social work perspective, included the following recommendations in regard to education and training (p. 137):

1. That facilities for teaching English as a second language in schools be extended to meet the educational needs of all age levels.
2. That special facilities be developed for newly arrived adolescents with language problems who wish to continue their education.
3. That more alternatives to the existing program of evening English classes be developed to complement these classes.
4. That special language facilities be developed for elderly migrants.
5. That existing apprenticeship schemes be extended to allow for the inclusion of those arriving in Australia beyond the age at which they can now be included in such training.
6. That retraining and upgrading facilities be developed for those migrants who have received training overseas which does not permit them to work within their field in Australia such as special courses or scholarships.

Multiculturalism Policy Under the Fraser Government

The policy of multiculturalism was espoused in 1973 by the Fraser Government. The acceptance of Australia as a multicultural society was not only a recognition by the society itself of a changing society but was also related to the emergence of the ethnic vote as a potential political force (as evidenced in the work of the Migrant Task Groups and the Migrant Education Action Conference).

The Department of Immigration was enlarged in 1977 when an Ethnic Affairs Branch was established to implement policies on migrant integration. At this time the responsibility for adult migrant education was returned to this portfolio from the Commonwealth Office of Education where it had been located for three
years. The Government set up an ethnic broadcasting service in the same year and also sponsored a fourth series of Migrant Education Television programs which were shown on 12 commercial stations around the country.

The Australian Council of Population and Research produced a discussion paper in 1976, Multiculturalism for all Australians – our developing nationhood, and a series of public forums were held in the capital cities. The paper contested the idea that cultural diversity posed a threat to the Australian identity and advanced the idea that multiculturalism was about the rights of all Australians to equal treatment regardless of race, religion or birthplace.

Indo-Chinese Refugees

In June 1975 the first Vietnamese refugees arrived in Australia, the majority of them accommodated in Wacol migrant hostel in Brisbane. In August 1975 refugees from Timor arrived in Darwin and many were subsequently moved to migrant hostels in New South Wales and Victoria. As the numbers of Indo-Chinese refugees increased, they were moved into available hostel accommodation in all states. The Commonwealth Department of Education recognised that teachers required assistance in meeting the needs of different client groups and produced for teachers’ guidance a series of Asian Language Notes that delineated areas of difficulty likely to be encountered by new arrivals.

In 1979 the Government established the Australian Refugee Advisory Council, chaired by Justice J Gobbo, to provide advice to the Minister for Immigration. The Council recommended a comprehensive program specifically designed to assist refugees, and as part of this the Community Refugee Settlement Scheme (CRSS) was established to allow ethnic and local community groups to provide direct assistance to refugees post arrival. The function of the CRSS was outlined in the Department of Immigration 1986-87 Annual Report (p 122):

Under the Community Refugee Settlement Scheme, volunteer community groups, including ethnic community groups, offer personal settlement support to fare-assisted refugees and special humanitarian entrants assessed by selection officers at overseas posts as being in need of, or likely to benefit from, such support. The support groups assist with information about life in Australia, arrange housing, schooling for children and English
classes for adults, assist with finding jobs, introduce the new arrivals to ethnic and general community services and help in any other way they can.

Throughout the years, migration policy continued to make references to the value of community involvement such as the Good Neighbour Council (1950–1979), the Home Tutor Scheme (1974) and the Victorian Welcome Group to name but a few.

THE GALBALLY REPORT: 1978
In 1977, the Government commissioned a review of migrant services and programs and the report, known as the Galbally Report, was tabled in Parliament by the Prime Minister, Malcolm Fraser, in ten languages in May 1978. In his address to Parliament he praised the report’s thoroughness (Hansard, 3 May 1978):

This is the most thorough review of services to migrants that this country has ever undertaken. I believe that if it had been undertaken a considerable time ago the position of many migrants would be much better now.

Lidio Bertelli, a member of the editorial committee of Migrant Action (published by the Ecumenical Migration Centre in Melbourne and active in commenting on migrant affairs) commented that, as the preceding ten years had seen an explosion of studies on ethnic relations, the real impact was not from the originality of the findings but from the fact that the Government was willing to commit real funding to the implementation of the recommendations.

The report contained 57 major recommendations that spanned a wide spectrum of matters related to the needs and concerns of migrants. It also set out a number of principles that guided the development of the recommendations. One of these principles was that services and programs should be designed and operated in full consultation with clients, and that self-help should be encouraged as much as possible with a view to helping migrants become self-reliant as quickly as possible. This was an important shift in that it sought to identify a time when the migrants would be independent and able to access mainstream services.

The Galbally Report recognised that knowledge of the English language was a critical factor in enabling successful settlement in Australia and gave special attention to the teaching of English. Among the important issues addressed were:

♦ English classes as part of a comprehensive initial settlement program;
♦ the continuing need for the special programs for certain groups and for the ‘backlog’ of migrants in the community whose English was not adequate;
♦ extension of the availability and coverage of full-time courses of instruction and the range of advanced courses;
♦ wider use of ‘on-the-job’ English instruction and the Home Tutor Scheme;
♦ replacement of present continuation classes for certificate courses at different levels of difficulty;
♦ establishment of the AMEP as a rolling three-year program.

... the Government was willing to commit real funding to the implementation [of the Galbally Report].
The adoption of the Galbally proposals signalled the beginning of a period of active growth for the AMEP. It marked the recognition of adult migrant education as a professional, continuing program and its transition from a predominantly part-time operation, unresponsive to the varying needs of particular migrant groups and lacking policies or resources for the professional development of its staff, its curriculum or its teaching philosophies.

Further Immigration Policy Shifts

The 1978–79 Annual Report of the Department of Immigration identified the importance of considering the migrant within the whole Australian community as the following passage shows (p 27):

Most migrants show great enterprise in building a new life but the process of adapting can raise problems. Lack of English aggravates all other problems, often even simple, everyday situations. It can affect job opportunities, job safety and occupation levels.

There is no migrant stereotype. Many communicate easily and fit quickly into an Australian lifestyle. Many have relatives who can ease the transition.

Others may lack education which makes the learning of English and of Australian social usage even more difficult. For some, Austraian laws and customs, Australian credit and hire purchase, Australian family life-styles all cause problems. Adapting the migrant to Australia, one cannot overlook the importance of adapting Australians to the migrant. The kind of culturally diverse but cohesive society now being pursued requires all elements in our society to aim for better understanding, for cross fertilisation of cultures.

Shifts in migration policy were also evident in the changes to the migrant selection system in 1981 as the Government endeavoured to meet the shortage of skilled labour for the expected economic advance in the 1980s – a concern that had been raised at the 1980 meeting of Commonwealth and State Ministers of Immigration. At the same time, the entry system for family reunion was facilitated by lower pass requirements in regard to economic factors.

Development in the AMEP Following the Galbally Report

Due to Government allocation of funds for implementation of the Galbally recommendations, considerable development took place in the AMEP. Enthusiastic and committed people at Commonwealth and State level were ready and willing to take on the tasks. It was the opportunity that teachers within the AMEP were looking for, and their commitment to the field of ESL led to a number of significant changes as they worked to implement the recommendations.

A Joint Commonwealth/States Committee (JCSC), originally known as the Overview Committee, was established late in 1978. It was chaired by officers from the Department of Immigration, led by Bruce Machin, and consisted of representatives from AMES in each State, a representative from the Commonwealth Department of Education, a senior research officer from the Australian Council for Educational Research and an academic member. The role of the Committee was to develop the on-arrival component of the program, to

Most migrants show great enterprise in building a new life but the process of adapting can raise problems.
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consider aspects related to methodology, assessment and evaluation and to develop an approach to course content. The central features of the methodology developed were:
- focus on the learner;
- focus on use;
- focus on social interaction;
- respond to the learner’s felt needs.

The Australian Language Proficiency Ratings (ALPR), later to be known as the Australian Second Language Proficiency Ratings Scale (ASLPR), was developed for use in assessing placement, evaluation of progress, setting realistic goals to guide course design and delivery, referral and guidance of clients and the setting of longer-term English language objectives within which the AMEP might operate.

The language content of the new programs was developed from a nation-wide survey to establish priority theme areas. Fifteen major themes were identified. They were:
- Personal identification
- Shopping
- Transport
- Orientation
- Health
- Safety
- Housing
- The law
- Socialising
- Employment
- Banking services
- Child care
- Postal and communication services
- Education
- Leisure and entertainment

Language specifications, aligned with the ALPR, were then developed prior to the development of curriculum frameworks consistent with the philosophy of an integrated, functional approach that included community involvement.

The introduction of the new on-arrival education program was of great significance. It went back to its roots and re-focused on the needs of the new arrivals. As stated in the summary statement on professional aspects of the AMEP, from the Education branch of the Department of Immigration (1979), it also acknowledged the need to:

- provide learning opportunities for large numbers of earlier arrivals with little English and with limited previous instruction in English, to provide opportunities for special purpose courses for professionals, sub-professionals and others and to recognise throughout the program the special needs of women.

Within the AMEP, there was a shift to a learner-centred curriculum in which teachers focused on individual needs, and abandoned the idea of one, set curriculum.
As AMEP services expanded, it was inevitable that additional accommodation was required and space was leased in Wapet House, Perth; in The Village, Adelaide and in Phoenix House, Brisbane. Classroom space was leased in Brunswick, Melbourne and new centres were developed in Cringila, south of Wollongong, and at Bankstown, NSW. In addition, further space was obtained on a course to course basis by arranging classes at Monash and La Trobe universities and at Taylor’s Coaching College in Melbourne.

**Criticisms of the New AMEP Services**

Although the AMEP services changed and grew rapidly and offered new curricula and services to a wider community than ever before, there was apparently still room for improvement. The rapidity of the expansion of the program and the unexpected increase in refugee intake meant that program planning was out of step with what was happening on the ground.

A study of the problems of adult migrant education undertaken in 1983 found that the Government-funded English language program was often inappropriate to meet the needs of certain migrant groups and that the classes were too centralised to be of use to migrants in isolated areas, especially women, the unskilled and the elderly.

Dr Afendras, a visiting lecturer from Greece, attended an ESL class in a community venue in 1980 and his reactions later appeared in Community languages (1981:183):

> The rationale of the class was ‘to teach English and integrate senior migrant citizens into broader social networks’. I watched, amused, a group of Italian ladies follow the lesson of a lively, highly motivated teacher. Many presumably expressed the hope they would pick up enough English to talk to their children and grandchildren...

When in most situations around the world the grand-parent to grand-child dyad constitutes the last bastion of ethnic language maintenance, the implications are rather grave. I also observed that throughout the lesson and between shots at the English sentences on the blackboard, they freely chatted with each other in Italian or read the Italian newspaper.
THE HISTORY OF THE AMEP

THE GENESIS OF NEW DIRECTIONS
IN THE AMEP 1981–90

Changes in AMEP services need to be seen in the context of changing beliefs about the needs and rights of migrants and changes in Australia's economic situation. The 1980s was a period of reviews and reports on ESL provision as the State and Federal Governments attempted to discover the most effective means of delivering English language tuition.

MIGRATION AND MULTICULTURAL ISSUES DEBATED

Multiculturalism had first been placed on the Australian political agenda by the Whitlam Government (1972–75) and was further encouraged and developed by the Fraser Government (1975–1983).

In 1984 Geoffrey Blainey precipitated intense public discussion on immigration policy and multiculturalism. He questioned both the size of the immigration program and the pace of immigration from Asia, as well as criticizing the Government's multicultural policies. The following passage from Blainey's A shorter history of Australia (1994:233), although published some time after these initial criticisms, illustrates the nature of his attack.

Called multiculturalism, the policy was almost the reverse of the old policy of tolerant assimilation. Australia now was said to be a noble experiment for the world to observe, an example of strength through diversity, a celebration of human differences, a nation of all nations. There is merit in the internationalist idea in a shrinking world, but the penalty is high if the formula should ultimately fail. The world has too many nations bitterly divided on ethnic grounds. Indeed, many people fleeing from such nations chose Australia because it seemed united and stable. It will be many decades before the experiment can be safely announced as a triumph, or a moderate success, or the begetter of a nation of tribes.

Among Blainey's critics was Professor John Ingleson of the University of New South Wales who felt that part of Australian society would have its prejudices and fears reinforced by Blainey's comments which would also provide ammunition to fringe groups.

The ensuing public debates heightened community unease and in 1984 the Prime Minister Robert Hawke, in a major statement on immigration policy, endeavoured to answer the public criticism. The following is an extract from that speech (Australia and Immigration 1988:78).

One of Australia's greatest achievements has been our acceptance of people from widely diverse nationalities around the world... The Government does not consider that a balance, or mix in our migration program development on racial grounds can have any place in our society. It categorically rejects any proposals to introduce covert racialism through differential standards in selection criteria.

AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS REVIEW 1981

While debates on migration captured public interest, the AMEP had continued to expand. In 1981, three years after the Galbally Report was officially adopted by the Commonwealth...
Government, a review by the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs (AIMA) was carried out. The review revealed that 48 of the 57 recommendations of the Galbally Report were in various stages of development. Within the AMEP a number of significant changes had been trialed, including the establishment of:

- committees bringing AMEP colleagues from all States and Territories together to discuss management functions (Joint Commonwealth/States consultative committee), professional issues (Professional development sub-committee), research (AMEP research coordinating committee) and information systems (Data management committee);
- the National Curriculum and Research Centre (NCRC) in Adelaide;
- English courses for specific purposes;
- a three-year funding cycle.

The AIMA review produced a discussion paper on most of the major problems that had arisen during the implementation of the Galbally recommendations and stressed the need for the AMEP to set realistic objectives and priorities. It recognised that the changes had made a major contribution to the welfare of migrants and to multiculturalism. However, it was critical of the AMEP's failure to collect adequate data on which its planning could be based. The AIMA Evaluation of post-arrival services (p 84–5) reported:

The most basic elements necessary to effective planning have not been collected on a systematic basis. Information on student numbers, course numbers... Student entry and exit proficiency is deficient... To provide a reliable estimate of the cost per student for each activity is impossible... We have found no mechanism by which the needs of migrants for learning English may be continually assessed.

The AIMA criticism, while it failed to recognise that under-achievement in some areas was inevitable due to the level of existing resources, did serve to highlight the need for the program to develop a computerised information management system.

Policymakers had never had come to grips with the length of time needed to learn English and were unable to find real answers from the statistical program data of AMEP providers. The pre-Galbally full-time courses and the post-Galbally on-arrival courses were intended by the policy makers to be intensive and long enough to allow migrants to learn enough English to gain employment or to be able to access mainstream options for further study. It was the apparent lack of hard data that led to the continued support from reviewers for the development of the AMEP Management Information System (AMIS) in 1985.

While supporting the new intensive program for new arrivals, the AIMA review had queried whether such programs perpetuated the neglect of migrant needs by general service providers. The role of mainstream services was one that recurred throughout the development of the AMEP. Questions such as: When does a migrant stop being a migrant? When does the settlement process end? When is it the responsibility of other departments to provide language training services? were asked not only in the area of education, but in translating and interpreting services and information provision.
Recommendation 18 of the review advocated the transfer of English for specific purposes courses to the Technical and Further Education (TAFE) area, in effect limiting the AMEP services. The TAFE sector already provided English language courses through its access program which was funded by the State Education system. These courses were not aimed at new arrivals but provided classes, such as conversation classes, in the local community. Some of the State AMEP providers, such as New South Wales and Victoria, who had been conducting English for Specific Purposes courses since the allocation of funding in the implementation of the Galbally Report, argued that changes of providers without appropriate consultation between the AMEP and TAFE would mean a loss of valuable experience in the area.

The position was different in those States such as Queensland, Western Australia and South Australia where the AMEP providers were part of TAFE. In these States the AMEP providers were well placed to continue conducting such courses in conjunction with TAFE.

Teachers were active in responding to the AIMA review. The AMES Association of Victorian Teachers' Union, for instance, responded vigorously to the report which they believed would directly affect the quality of the services provided to migrant students. In a response prepared for the Union and the Director of AMES they pointed out that:

- the recommendations that allowed for 20 per cent of students being enrolled in full-time courses of 240 hours and 80 per cent in part-time courses of 180 hours replaced the educational judgement of teachers with a mathematical formula and would create iniquities and inconsistencies both between and within education centres;
- the recommended changes to student/teacher ratios impacted on the current timetabling arrangements that allowed for smaller tutorial groups within full-time courses;
- the move of advanced courses to TAFE mainstream courses required careful consultation;
- while an increase in funding for materials and teacher development and a computer information base was welcome, the withdrawal of support for bilingual information officers working with teachers to provide an integrated program was not;
- the cessation of the printing of the correspondence course pending the development of a new course would disadvantage students.

THE CAMPBELL REPORT: 1985

The next planned review of the AMEP was discussed at a meeting of the Joint Commonwealth/States Committee in June 1984 and members proposed that any review should not be a narrow one concerned only with the implementation of the AIMA recommendations. Peter Eyles and Hugh Ramsay from the Department of Immigration indicated that the Government was committed to a review and sought agreement on issues that should be covered. The review took place in 1985 and the Report of the Committee of Review of the Adult Migrant Education Program, Towards active voice (The Campbell Report) noted the significant changes that had occurred since the Galbally Report (1986:4):
... from goals of assimilation to integration to multiculturalism; from centralised curriculum planning to decentralised planning; from a content-based structural curriculum to a needs-based one; from a single language learning methodology to methodologies; from texts to 'authentic' materials; from teacher-centred to learner-centred activities.

While the Galbally Report could be said to have been more concerned with extending access, the Campbell Report was more concerned with the quality of program delivery. Learners' views were also sought and they testified to the over-riding need for 'adequate' rather than token or limited courses. Newsletter No 4 from the Committee of review noted that 740 submissions had been received, including 352 from clients.

The Report included a review of the past and an assessment of how well the goals were being achieved, but the focus was on how the AMEP might function most effectively in the future. The reviewers were able to draw on more concrete data than had been available to past reviews and were able to describe those who were accessing the program in some detail. A comparison of participants with the distribution of the 300,000 potential learners by length of residence showed the concentration of learners was in the early post-arrival years. The figures showed that 79.6 per cent of AMEP learners had lived in Australia for less than five years, some 8.4 per cent for between five and ten years and the remaining 12 per cent, for ten years or more.

The Report strongly endorsed the move by the Department of Immigration to convert what was essentially a service staffed by part-time, casual teachers to a more professional one by providing funding to enable 65 per cent of the teaching hours to be offered by teachers employed on a permanent basis. The Campbell Report noted its commitment to a fully professional AMEP service and its belief that Australia should not settle for less. It also noted that:

All Australian residents should develop and maintain a level of spoken and written English which is appropriate for a range of contexts, with the support of education and training programs addressing their diverse learning needs.

Childcare provisions established: 1983

During 1983–84, the importance of providing childcare was recognised when free childcare arrangements were established for the AMEP in over 40 locations throughout Australia. The objectives of these provisions were set out in the AMEP National Triennial Plan for 1985–87 which stated: 'Childcare provided through the AMEP should go beyond passive child minding,
it should provide a positive developmental experience for the child and should take account of the special needs of non-English speaking parents and children. Childcare Consultative Forums were established and childcare experts were involved in the planning.

AMEP MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES

Reports, reviews and discussion papers during the 1980s indicate the way in which governments obtained feedback before developing policy statements. Governments no longer took the authoritative actions they had in the 1950s when a within-systems approach meant that public support for the implementation of policy was taken for granted. In the 1980s, these reports were part of the metapolicy-making stage of processing values, reality and problems via broad consultations. Feedback was sought from a wide number of sources and affected the final policy decisions as well as the subsequent resource allocations and directions of the implementation process.

The AMEP further developed a number of unique management strategies through the series of meetings and committees of representatives from the Commonwealth and State offices of Immigration and representatives of State Education Departments and AMEP providers in all States and Territories. No other educational program had developed this strong sense of partnership between providers and Commonwealth managers.

The relatively small size of the program, its administration within the Department of Immigration, and the commitment of all personnel in the AMEP to the program’s objectives ensured that information was collected, shared and discussed by all levels of management. Efforts were made by provider representatives to ensure that all views put forward represented the reality of program delivery, and teachers were informed of the work of the committees through staff newsletters, local meetings and workshops.

Research within the AMEP extended

Research had been a part of program development since the early 1970s but was extended in the 1980s. Some projects were commissioned by the Department of Immigration, some by the States and some by the program providers themselves. The National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research (NCELTR), which had replaced the NCRC, was located within Macquarie University in Sydney. Speaking on behalf of the Department’s Language Planning Section, Don Plimer was reported in Migration (1988) as saying that the centre would enhance the development of English language-learning processes in Australia. He went on to add (1988:4):

Over the last few years, AMEP people have been leading speakers at international conferences and have been asked to go overseas and talk about the AMEP. Experts from overseas who came here were constantly astounded by our ESL program. One of the reasons, and it is a real strength, is that this is the only national adult ESL program. We’re in a pretty unique position. Over time, because of that national character, developments and improvements that take place in one state will be automatically picked up in other states. Commitment to this Centre is very important because to run a successful AMEP, it’s not just a...
matter of throughput of students. That has to be underpinned by professional teaching and practice and up-to-date research.

Under the direction of Professor Chris Candlin, N CELTR provided leadership and expertise in the development of program research. The outcomes of these projects were available not only to teachers but also to management, and provided hard data that could be added to external findings. Further details of research projects are given in Chapter 5.

THE JUPP REVIEW: 1985
In 1985 the Committee of Review of Migrant and Multicultural Programs and Services (ROMAMPAS), chaired by Dr James Jupp, undertook a review that aimed to ensure that migrants and their families were able to participate in Australian society. The Review considered the process of successful settlement into a new society at various stages in order to assess participation. In regard to settlement services, the Jupp Review again raised the question of the responsibility of mainstream services. In its conclusion the Review stated (1985:89) that:

From the time of arrival, an immigrant is as much a resident of a local government and state government area of jurisdiction, as she or he is of the Federal Government.

The Department of Immigration was concerned that its limited resources were expected to cover the needs of an ever increasing number of clients. The review placed English language proficiency at the centre of effective settlement, stating in paragraph 15.19 that ‘access to English language learning opportunities should be available to people at any stage of their lives, and certainly not limited to the first few years after arrival’.

Paragraph 15.19 echoed the predictions that had been made in the Campbell Report (1985:4):

The Review Committee can foresee the day when, as other agencies accept a greater responsibility in the adult migrant education field, the AMEP will be able to strengthen its coordinating, consultancy and advisory roles, assume greater responsibility for the counselling of all NESB persons who have ESL needs, and retract a little from its present wide-ranging responsibilities associated with delivery.

NATIONAL LANGUAGE POLICY: 1987
In 1986, the Government appointed Joe Lo Bianco to develop a National Language Policy following an assessment of a report by the Senate Standing Committee on Education and the Arts that recommended that language policies be
developed and coordinated at national level. The publication in 1987 of the National policy on languages also reflected, in part, the growing pressure from educationalists and ethnic groups for a greater understanding of the role of English and other languages both within Australia and in Australia’s relationships with other countries.

**FITZGERALD REPORT: 1988**

The continuing dilemma to define the extent of Government responsibilities for funding migrant services was addressed in the report of the Committee to Advise on Australia’s Immigration Policies (CAAIP). Known as the Fitzgerald Report, it was not centrally concerned with settlement issues per se, as it considered that factors related to successful settlement had already been discussed and clearly identified. The report argued that Australia would benefit from an immigration policy that was based on Australia’s economic needs and was supported by the community as a whole. Immediate settlement priorities needed to achieve effective settlement were seen as accommodation, English language proficiency, useable occupational skills, income, information and support networks.

The report recommended that the Department of Immigration be responsible for settlement services to migrants who had been in Australia less than two years, and that the needs of migrants who had been in the country longer than two years become the responsibility of other service delivery and policy departments, such as Social Security, Health and Community Services, Employment, Education and Training, Industry, Technology and Commerce, and Industrial Relations. As reported in papers tabled at the AMEP Management sub-committee meeting, 20–21 April 1989, the Department of Immigration redefined its settlement role as being to:

- concentrate its settlement programs on the needs-based provision of services for immigrants, the aim being to convert migration program objectives into related social and economic outcomes;
- re-focus its settlement activities, paying particular attention to the targeting of its programs to the priority needs of the annual intake associated with the circumstances of their migration;
- clarify its strategic role in settlement through phasing out duplications with other agencies having regard to their access and equity commitments and to examine the appropriateness of its programs.

At national and State levels officers in charge of the AMEP were aware of the emerging shifts in policy as reflected in the commissioned reports and departmental statements and sought to be pro-active in developing strategies to accommodate change in future developments.

A subsequent investigation of existing program participants carried out by Census Applications in 1988 (with accompanying consultations with teachers, data analysis and analysis of entry procedures), entitled Setting priorities: Measuring need in the AMEP – Report to the Department of Immigration, stressed the need to develop clear priorities of access.

**GROWING FOCUS ON EMPLOYMENT TRAINING**

A growing convergence of social justice themes such as multiculturalism, and economically driven themes such as the workplace reform and training was evident in policy development from the mid-1980s. This was reflected in the AMEP where the developing expertise of teachers...
within the English in the Workplace Program (EWP) in turn influenced other AMEP teachers to recognise the needs of students to be prepared for job seeking.

During 1986 discussions were undertaken between the Department of Immigration and the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations (DEIR) on the issue of ESL as a component of labour-market training programs. Meetings were then arranged at State level involving the Commonwealth Regional Offices and AMES to facilitate coordination. The minutes of the meeting in Melbourne recorded that a number of issues were raised including the need for a more formalised referral mechanism between Commonwealth Employment Service (CES) and English language teaching providers, and the availability of up-to-date course information for CES offices. An important difference between courses offered by the AMEP and by other institutions was that AMEP providers had to enrol all applicants while mainstream institutions advertised courses for potential applicants and selected students.

Towards New Systems for AMEP Provision: 1990–97

From the early 1990s, the parameters in the field of English language training for adults irrevocably changed as governments sought to define areas of responsibility. Until this time the AMEP had provided ESL learning opportunities for all who required and applied for assistance. This growth had led to an ever increasing demand for services, and providers struggled to meet it. At the same time, State adult education systems had developed access programs which also included the teaching of English as a Second Language.

AMEP National Plan 1990–1992

Planning program delivery targets had been an important part of the annual discussions held by departmental officers with all AMEP providers as stated in the terms of Commonwealth/State or Commonwealth/Institution arrangements. The AMEP National Plan 1990–1992 had its origins in the Campbell Report (1985) which highlighted pressures on the program in its attempt to provide equitable access to English for all. It provided a national overview statement of the specific results that were to be achieved within the set period. The results were expressed as objectives that reflected the Government’s expectation and set the context for the development of State plans. It was prepared by the Department of Immigration in consultation with the Joint Commonwealth/States Consultative Committee and the Management Sub-Committee of the AMEP. The Plan was formally adopted by the Government as part of its National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia in July 1989. Detailed standards of service, performance indicators and evaluation priorities were stated. The Plan also provided a proposal for distribution of resources (Figure 1.2).

Sections of the Plan drew strong criticism, for example the exclusion of people over 55 years which was later changed in acknowledgment that age is not a significant factor in the assessment of ability to learn; however, overall the Plan was welcomed as a long-overdue step towards focusing on those employed or seeking employment.
In December 1990 a discussion paper, The language of Australia, was issued by the Department of Employment, Education and Training. This paper drew away from the earlier documents and placed the prime focus on literacy and the economic arguments for a skilled workforce. Australia was facing an economic recession, and the training and re-training of the workforce was becoming an imperative.

At the same time, the report from the Working Party on post-secondary English language training (1990), commissioned to advise the Minister for Employment, Education and Training and the Minister for Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs, confirmed the findings of the Fitzgerald Report (1988) that, while the AMEP had the principal role in the provision of general English as a foundation for settling into Australia, there was considerable under-provision.
The report identified options to address the under-resourcing, including expanding English language training provision; introducing fee-for-service principles; transferring some responsibility, such as EWP, to the Department of Employment, Education and Training, and improving client information systems.

Proposal to introduce a tendering process: 1990

In 1990 the Joint Commonwealth/States Committee (JCSC) reviewed the proposal from the Department of Immigration that a system of tendering should be introduced into the AMEP with 10 per cent of tuition funds being taken up for this in 1990–91 and up to 30 per cent in 1991–92. A tendering system had been proposed to allow the private English Language Intensive Courses for Overseas Students (ELICOS) sector to bid for AMEP funds to deliver services, the aim being to create an opportunity to compare the cost and effectiveness of traditional AMEP providers with private providers. The Committee representatives argued strongly against the introduction of tendering, and the review panel found that such a proposal would be in breach of the spirit, if not the letter, of Commonwealth/State arrangements. The panel also concluded that to expand tendering beyond the existing level of funding would actually reduce the funds available for the basic level of service which was already stressed.

Between March and early July 1991, the Minister for Immigration met with over 4000 service providers, community representatives and users of Government settlement services. Difficulties relating to access to, and the appropriateness of, English language arrangements were highlighted.

Australian language and literacy policy: 1991

The Australian Language and Literacy Policy (ALLP) in 1991 crystallised the Government's major commitment to the area. The policy described the parameters of the status, learning and use of languages in Australia and was underpinned by four broad strategies. These were (1991):

- the conservation of Australia's linguistic resources;
- the development and expansion of these resources;
- the integration of Australian language teaching and language use with national economic, social and cultural policies;
- the provision of information and services in languages understood by clients.

In order to implement this policy, a joint Commonwealth/States consultative process was established. This resulted in the publication in November 1993 of the National Collaborative Adult English Language and Literacy Strategy (NCA ELLS) which looked at the commitment of all levels of Government and sought to develop a broader perspective for the current provision, and the identification of duplication and/or gaps in the provision.

In August 1992 a joint statement was issued by the Minister for Immigration, Gerry Hand and the Minister for Employment, Education and Training, Kim Beazley, which took up issues raised in the consultations and announced new initiatives. This statement recognised that there was an ‘ESL backlog’ which had become worse as a more sophisticated economy demanded a labour force with greater fluency in English and higher levels of literacy.
Following the formal acceptance by the Commonwealth Government of the Australian Language and Literacy Policy in 1992, changes in the direction of the AMEP were significant. Prior to the 1992-93 budget the vast majority of Commonwealth funds for adult ESL were administered through the Department of Immigration, with a small component being funded through the Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET). The 1992-93 budget saw a significant increase in the overall level of funding and a greatly increased role for DEET.

A media release from the Minister for Employment, Education and Training, and the Minister for Immigration on 18 August 1992 listed the following new initiatives:

- The Department of Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs would remain responsible for incoming migrants and recent arrivals.
- All incoming migrants who do not have functional English will receive up to 510 hours of tuition within a set time frame after arriving in Australia.
- Some categories of future migrants will be expected to make a financial contribution towards the cost of ESL training.
- The Department of Employment, Education and Training would take responsibility for assisting job seekers with ESL needs and included in the Special Intervention Program (SIP).

For the AMEP these initiatives meant that 90 per cent of teaching resources was available for initial settlement programs while the remaining 10 per cent was available to longer term residents who were not job seekers. Providers were contracted to provide a further program for clients with Newstart Activity Agreements from the Department of Employment, Education and Training. These clients, who were identified as job seekers with less than A SLPR 2 English proficiency level, were referred to the providers by Commonwealth Employment Services (CES). For the first time AMEP providers had the task of liaising and cooperating with CES staff in the assessment and placement of clients.

In an article for Prospect, Annie Sturgess described the rationale behind the changes by the Department (1996:16).

In addition to the steady flow of new non-English speaking migrants and refugees into Australia, it was recognised that there was an ever growing ‘backlog’ of former migrants whose English language skills were not sufficient for their current needs. Many of these people would have entered Australia during economically easier times, when employment was more readily available. They were able to survive with relatively low levels of English. However, as the economy became more sophisticated and employment generally more demanding, it was becoming clear that people needed much greater fluency of English and higher levels of literacy in order to obtain and retain a job. The AMEP was over-stretched, trying to cater to the needs of this group of people, as well as the steady stream of new arrivals. With the budget changes, DEET became responsible for the English
language needs of job-seekers (other than newly arrived migrants) so that the needs of NESB job seekers could be addressed in a labour market context and so that English language training for this group could be more closely linked to other vocational training and employment outcomes.

**Migration Laws Amendment Act (No 2): 1992**

Because the Australian Language and Literacy Policy initiatives impacted on the delivery arrangements in the AMEP at State level, the State Ministers had been informed of these on 13 August, prior to the budget announcement. Lengthy and complex bilateral discussions were undertaken in all States and Territories. The major issues discussed by senior officers were:

- 1992–93 levels of funding;
- implementation of changes;
- 510 hours of tuition limit;
- charging clients;
- processes for the collection of any charges;
- impact on provision for learners above ASLPR 2;
- tendering;
- impact on community provision for non job seekers.

The legislative basis for the changes were contained in the Migration Laws Amendment Act (No 2) 1992. The basis for the entitlement of 510 hours (Figure 1.3) was on selective data collection and analysis of the averages for spoken language gains of a small sample of students and was disputed by teachers and managers. The Department defended its view and also stated that it was a substantial increase over existing levels of service for migrants as the majority of students withdrew prior to accessing this number of hours.

**Australian Assessment of Communicative English Skills Test**

To assess whether incoming clients had functional English, an overseas English test, developed by NCELTR, was taken by migrants prior to embarkation. The Australian Assessment of Communicative English Skills test (ACCESS) was regularly administered in 15 offshore locations by December 1993.

User charges were intended to provide revenue for the program as well as to encourage greater client commitment and provider responsiveness to the needs of clients. The thrust...
was for the Commonwealth to achieve value for money and maximum client outcomes from the investment in ESL programs. The Commonwealth perceived itself to be the ‘purchaser of ESL services from quality providers’.

ESL Training Programs Transfer to DEET: 1993

The administration for the transfer of responsibility for ESL training programs for job seekers from the Department of Immigration to the Department of Employment, Education and Training on 1 January 1993 was taken up by the Ministerial Council of Vocational Education, Employment and Training (MOVEET). At a meeting in October 1992, Ministers agreed to a transitional arrangement guaranteeing AMES 60 per cent of DEET’s additional ESL funding for the period January to June 1993. At the MOVEET meeting in April 1993, it was agreed that the AMES providers would be guaranteed 25 per cent of the funds provided under the Special Intervention Program for ESL provision over the next three financial years.

These were significant changes for the AMEP. Up to this time the program had endeavoured to cater for all applicants, and program managers had sought funding to meet these demands. Now the AMEP was to focus only on new arrivals. The English in the Workplace Program and ESL training programs for job seekers were to be funded through DEET. At policy level this was perceived as clarifying the educational issues, but at State level managers of AMES were faced with the need to reassess existing structures and to re-orientate the program in the light of the changes. Teachers were concerned that, following the completion of 510 hours, students had limited pathway options; they were very aware of the time needed to develop sufficient skills to access existing mainstream services. Through the auspices of MOVEET the AMES providers were able to gain time through transitional arrangements, but
other AMEP providers, such as the tertiary institutions, were forced to reduce their programs accordingly.

The expansion of ESL programs through the involvement of DEET reduced the level of predictability of student numbers for AMES providers. The number of students had increased, but the funding arrangements had shifted from Commonwealth/State negotiations to a position where some decisions were made at a local level by DEET staff whose area of expertise was operational delivery of Government policies affecting the unemployed rather than determining the suitability of training providers for the delivery of English language training.

By 1993–94 DEET’s involvement, as well as concerns about the tendering process itself, led to the need to review the process. In a study that considered issues related to accreditation and registration of providers, Plimer identified particular problems (1994:4) including:

... potential loss of job security for permanent ESL teachers... in addition there were other concerns about the effectiveness of using the tendering process to purchase ESL training; in particular perceptions about the potential loss of quality control, the short term timeframes involved (both in terms of workload and the planning of staff requirements), the lack of consistency in tender specifications and the loss of articulation between the various sectors.

Plimer also identified other problems (1994:50):

... it has led to a situation where some lower quality providers were funded and client and other feedback has suggested less than satisfactory delivery and deteriorating relationships between providers and funding agencies... [also] concerns about the capacity of non-educationalists to make qualitative decisions, particularly as the amount of information sought in tendering submissions has increased dramatically... each provider now has to deal with a range of funding agencies... providers are required to prepare the same detailed information numerous times per year for a range of funding agencies. This not only takes time but diverts considerable resources from actual tuition.

As a result of the findings, all providers submitting tenders to DEET were required to complete selection criteria and standards under the following headings:

- staff competencies, qualifications and experience;
- appropriate course delivery;
- learner pathways;
- learning resources;
- access and equity;
- organisational management, funding environment;
- quality control;
- legal status.

Under the National Reform Agenda, Government and industry set major reforms in place. These were to ensure the immediate relevance of training to the needs of industry and to set the policy context for changes to the provisions of English language programs. It focused on curriculum development, competency-based training, credit transfer, formal recognition of providers, assessment, the recognition of prior learning and a national consistency in skill standards and recognition. In the AMEP, following on from long-term research.
into learning pathways and the impetus for a more planned approach to course design as stated in the AMEP National Plan 1990-92, AMES NSW had developed the national accredited Certificate of Spoken and Written English (CSWE) and this was implemented nationally in 1993.

In June 1993, at a meeting of the Council of Australian Governments (COAG), all parties adopted a set of guidelines as the basis for a Protocol for Developing, Implementing and Reviewing Programs funded by Commonwealth Specific Purpose Payments to the States and Territories.

REVISED COMMONWEALTH/STATE ARRANGEMENTS
Revised contractual arrangements for the AMEP in each State and Territory were developed in 1993-94 through a series of bilateral discussions with senior officers from the Department of Immigration and State Education Departments. The renegotiated ‘Memoranda of Understanding’ were to remain in effect until the end of 1996, by which time DIMA had announced that it would be seeking to develop alternative purchasing arrangements. At a national AMEP meeting in May 1994, Des Storer from the Department of Immigration, emphasised the importance of reviewing the experience of AMEP policy and program implementation in 1993 prior to further actions being taken.

SEPTEMBER 1995 CHANGES
In response to an ongoing Commonwealth review of adult ESL programs, the Minister for Immigration, Nick Bolkus, announced the introduction of further policy changes on 1 September 1995. The key features were:
♦ access to more than 510 hours for those not immediately seeking employment, with the highest priority being given to those with learning difficulties or those who were survivors of torture and trauma (these additional hours were to be made available by providers from spare capacity);
♦ streamlining of deferral request procedures and delegation of decision making on deferrals to service providers;
♦ more flexibility in administering time limits for take-up and completion of tuition entitlements set by legislation;
♦ tuition provisions for young migrants who were not at school, but who were unable to access Department of Employment, Education and Training and Youth Affairs programs and who have previously had no entitlement to the AMEP.

HILMER REPORT: 1995
In 1995, the Hilmer Report was tabled in Parliament. The report was based on an economic rationalist approach and recommended the implementation of a national competition policy. The report explained this approach in the following extract from the report:

Competition policy is not about the pursuit of competition per se. Rather, it seeks to facilitate effective competition to promote efficiency and economic growth while accommodating situations where competition does not achieve efficiency or conflict with other social objectives.
At meetings of Heads of AMEP providers, issues related to changes in purchasing arrangements and the introduction of tendering were discussed. Some of the issues raised included (Masters and Martin 1995):

- change management;
- ensuring any new arrangements support and sustain a cost effective and viable operating environment within which quality program provision can be achieved;
- ensuring program standards incorporate quality, integrity and flexibility in provision;
- adequate program support structures and amenities;
- cooperation between providers to ensure appropriate and consistent practices for pathway planning and the articulation of clients between Commonwealth and State language programs, vocational education and training or further study;
- equity and access;
- adequate and appropriate professional development and curriculum development and implementation;
- adequate information dissemination to clients and providers.

The Department of Immigration commissioned a discussion paper to canvass issues related to new purchasing arrangements based on the COAG principles which emphasised the importance of program accountability with a focus on assessing service delivery in terms of outcomes. The conclusion of the report drawn up by Allen Consulting Group Pty Ltd stated (1995:86):

If the new purchasing arrangements lock into place existing work practices and infrastructure arrangements, little is likely to be gained in terms of either cost efficiencies or effectiveness.

Tendering of the AMEP: 1997

At the end of two years of consultation and continuing discussion with State Education senior officers from providers and State education departments, the Department of Immigration proceeded to develop detailed specifications and commenced the tendering of the AMEP in 1997 with the aim of having new contractual arrangements in all areas in place in 1998. These significant developments promised considerable changes to the management and delivery of the AMEP in the years ahead.

In its Annual Report 1996–97, the Department of Immigration stated its belief that open tendering of the program would (1997:86):

- optimise learning outcomes for clients;
- attract the highest quality service providers;
- allow clients to choose the service providers most likely to meet their needs;
- provide greater flexibility for the AMEP to respond to changing conditions;
- ensure value for money.

In November 1997, the Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, Philip Ruddock, announced the awarding of contracts worth a total of $90 million for the delivery of AMEP services in Victoria for the following five-year period. This was seen as signalling a new era in service delivery. By the beginning of the financial year 1998–99 contracts had been signed in all States for the delivery of the AMEP under the new arrangements.

In a speech at the launch of the celebrations of the 50th anniversary year of the AMEP, Philip Ruddock gave public acknowledgment of the fact...
that the AMEP has won worldwide respect as a migrant settlement program:

Both as a language program and as a settlement program, the AMEP has been an outstanding success. Today, it enjoys an unrivalled reputation for innovation and excellence. I believe that no other country can claim equal success in providing programs like the AMEP for new settlers.

Renewed public debate on multiculturalism and the role of the AMEP

In 1996 publicity given to Pauline Hanson MP caused intense community discussion and action on racism. Teachers within the AMEP sought to empower students to deal effectively with racist comments, actions and attitudes. (The program had long graduated from the teaching of socially accepted formulae where politeness was the key to seeking to empower students so that they could understand and be understood.)

Throughout its history the AMEP has always existed within a political context and has therefore been affected by policy shifts, party priorities and social and economic factors. For the most part, migration policies have been founded on bipartisan support and have not been strongly debated in Parliament. This lack of debate may have led to the wider community being less aware of the importance and extent of migration policy. The fact is that Australia is multicultural and only the misinformed are unaware of the reality.

In a letter to *The Age* on 10 August 1997, Robert Chong, a migrant, gave his views on multiculturalism:

Multiculturalism not only provides the cement for a strong nation, but also enriches the host nation with cultural diversity, resulting in a stronger nation. It might not be perfect but it should not be sabotaged by scapegoating or personal insecurity.

Laurence, writing in *Interchange*, reports that researchers have found a fund of goodwill among migrants from non-English backgrounds towards Australia. This was enhanced by participation in the AMEP, which helped migrants gain the language skills they needed to settle successfully in Australian society.

The AMEP plays an important role in the Government’s multicultural strategy. Through its range of programs, it introduces the new arrivals to Australian ways of life within the multicultural context of the classroom where students learn about each others’ experiences before and after arrival in Australia. AMEP staff recognise, through first-hand contact, the contribution that migrants have made and will continue to make to Australia.
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Since the AMEP’s beginnings in 1948, the program has assisted over 1.5 million clients to learn English. The changing profile of these clients since 1948 reflects the changes in Australia’s immigration policy over the decades and the changes in political and economic circumstances throughout the world. The challenge for the AMEP has been to remain sensitive to these changes and to adapt the program as necessary to meet its clients’ evolving needs and circumstances.

The statistics available identify those migrants arriving from countries where the predominant language was not English. However, for the earlier years at least, very little is known about how many of these settlers already knew at least some English, and we can only estimate the numbers of potential AMEP clients. Without a doubt, the richest source of information about those who have taken advantage of AMEP provisions over the years lies in the personal stories of the clients themselves. While each migrant’s story is different, a collection of such stories creates a vivid impression of those who made learning English an important part of their settlement process.

Migration Patterns

As statistics have been collected in various ways over the years, using different categories and with varying degrees of accuracy, it is not possible to give a definitive overview of migration patterns. Also, because of the lack of early statistics indicating how many settlers already spoke English, it is impossible to say definitively how many migrants did not need the services of the AMEP.

The impact of migration on the program varies with the size of annual settler intakes, the major source countries, the mix by migration category, the proportion of adults, average English proficiency and alternative employment, education and training programs available on arrival. For example, migrants in the Skilled or Business categories from Hong Kong have higher English proficiency levels and would have less impact on the AMEP than settlers in the Humanitarian category from the former Yugoslavia or the Horn of Africa. Even the United Kingdom figures are deceptive as for some years they include the families of ex-servicemen from Poland and other European countries who were stationed in Britain during World War II.

Intakes averaged 1105 000 per annum through the 50 years to June 1998, remaining above the long-term average through the 1950s, 1960s and most of the 1970s. Intakes peaked in excess of 170 000 in 1969–70 before declining to only 53 000 in 1975–76, returning to more than 140 000 in 1987–88 and 1988–89 and averaging around 82 000 per annum through the six years to June 1998.

While this chapter will not give extensive statistical information, it is interesting to look at general trends to form some idea of the nationality and first language of the majority of AMEP learners over the years, and to trace the change in the ethnic mix of these clients. Table 2.1 overleaf summarises numbers and percentage of migrants from the top five countries from
which they arrived during three separate periods: 1946–58, 1959–75, 1975–95. Resettlement of refugees and displaced people from Europe characterised settlement in the decade following World War II. The United Kingdom and Europe remained the major source of settlers through the long period of economic growth as both a source of manpower and through increased demand for goods and services. Humanitarian and family reunion from Vietnam and other Asian countries, combined with skilled migration from the Philippines, Malaysia and Hong Kong, have been major features of the two decades to the mid-1990s.

Table 2.2 provides a snapshot of settler arrival patterns. These mark ten-year intervals and may not be representative of the size or composition of the migration program in intervening years. The four years represented illustrate variations in the size of the intakes from around 140,000 in 1967–68 and 1987–88 to around 75,000 in 1977–78 and 1997–98. The changing composition of the intakes have greater impact on the A M EP. There were more than 5000 settlers from Vietnam in 1977–78 and 1987–88, but only 2300 in 1997–98. The latter number includes more settlers in the Family category and fewer settlers in the Humanitarian category, with a corresponding reduction in A M EP client numbers. Migrants from China (excluding Hong Kong and Taiwan) increased from 3300 in 1987–88 to 4300 in 1997–98, but

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October 1946 to June 1958</th>
<th>Number of arrivals</th>
<th>Percentage of total arrivals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom and Ireland</td>
<td>506,296</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>208,891</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>193,491</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>102,491</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>58,451</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January 1959 to June 1975</th>
<th>Number of arrivals</th>
<th>Percentage of total arrivals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom and Ireland</td>
<td>925,675</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>177,684</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>151,755</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>150,454</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>65,531</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>July 1975 to June 1995</th>
<th>Number of arrivals</th>
<th>Percentage of total arrivals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom and Ireland</td>
<td>401,714</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>212,746</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>158,507</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>82,918</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>82,107</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>57,972</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2.2
Top Ten Countries from Which Immigrants Have Arrived For Selected Years in the Period 1967–98 (Immigration Update June Quarter 1998:16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom⁹</td>
<td>62308</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>21011</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>24591</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>9193</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>15042</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia⁸</td>
<td>9345</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>3266</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>8750</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>5417</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>8122</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>20910</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>14723</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>3900</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2466</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2262</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>2129</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2786</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2554</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>4229</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VietNam</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>5981</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2311</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>2463</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3792</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>4281</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>2118</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>6265</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5577</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3194</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1462</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>10427</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>2769</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3282</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4338</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia-Herțegovina⁸</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2135</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SubTotal</strong></td>
<td>113298</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>47994</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>88320</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>47647</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>24227</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>25177</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>55170</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>29680</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Settlers</strong></td>
<td>137525</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>73171</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>143490</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>77327</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Immigration Update June Quarter 1998 (adapted from Table 1.7)

⁹ United Kingdom included Ireland in 1967/68
⁸ Former Yugoslav Republic
Table 2.3 summarises annual data from 1982–83 to 1997–98 by major source countries, together with summaries for 1982–86, 1986–90, 1990–94 and 1994–98. The four-year summaries exclude settler arrivals from New Zealand due to changes in reporting. As well as declining from 120,000 per annum between 1986 and 1990, the proportion of settlers from the United Kingdom and Ireland declined from 21.5 per cent to 16.2 per cent between 1994 and 1998. When the USA, Canada and South Africa are excluded, the mainly non-English speaking settlers increased to 67.7 per cent in 1982–86, 69.8 per cent in 1986–90, 75.7 per cent in 1990–94, with a slight decrease to 73.8 per cent in 1994–98. The non-English speaking component includes many settlers from Hong Kong, India/Pakistan, Malaysia and Singapore who would not require AMEP classes.

Major events affecting migration

Historical events in both Australia and the wider world account for the changing profile of potential AMEP clients during the past 50 years. While political and economic factors impacting on Australia were dealt with in Chapter 1, a brief summary of some of the events influencing migration from various countries is also included in this chapter. Both assisted and self-funded migrants have settled in Australia over the years, as well as refugees from over 40 countries.
The first recipients of English tuition from the AMEP were those arriving by ship under the Australian International Refugee Organisation (IRO) scheme from displaced persons camps in Europe. Between 1947 and 1951 some 170,700 refugees, mainly from eastern Europe, arrived in Australia under this scheme. They included 63,394 Poles, 25,543 Yugoslavs, 19,421 Latvians, 14,464 Ukrainians and 11,919 Hungarians. During the same period over 300,000 assisted settlers arrived. These were mostly British, but also included 10,500 Maltese and many Dutch citizens who had been forced out of Indonesia. About 30,000 Italians arrived privately to join family and friends who had settled in Australia before the war, 10,000 Greeks and Cypriots arrived independently and 10,000 Dutch citizens arrived either independently or with assistance from the Dutch Government.

In 1952 the Displaced Persons scheme was terminated and assisted migration agreements were made with the governments of Austria, Belgium, Greece, and later West Germany. In 1953, following an approach from ICEM (Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration), Australia agreed to accept refugees from Trieste.

By the mid-1950s the economic situation in Europe was improving while Australia was experiencing economic problems which reduced the level of migration. By 1956, however, a new initiative to attract migrants was under way. Called ‘Operation Reunion’, this scheme sought to reunite citizens of eastern European countries with their families in Australia. Over the next ten years, 16,000 exit visas were granted by Yugoslavia, 9,500 by Poland, 2,500 by Hungary and about 1,400 in total from the USSR, Rumania, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria. After the October 1956 uprising in Hungary, a further 14,000 Hungarians found refuge in Australia and in 1968, following the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, an unexpected intake of about 5,500 Czech refugees joined them.

Towards the end of the 1960s, migration from Greece and Malta fell, partly because economic conditions in these countries were improving and partly because of the guest worker schemes in north-western Europe. Italian migration also slowed. Thus, Australia began looking elsewhere to increase its population. In 1966 government policy was changed to allow entry to ‘well-qualified’ people from non-European countries. Immigrants from Turkey were admitted under the same provisions as migrants from Europe and by 1967 the assisted passage scheme was extended to Asia Minor. The Special Passage Assistance Program (SPAP) introduced in 1966 facilitated migration to Australia for guest workers who had finished their European work contracts. An unexpected flood of migrants from Sicily followed an earthquake there in 1968. By this time Australia had immigration offices in London, Madrid, Paris, Brussels, The Hague, Copenhagen, Stockholm, Vienna, Cologne, Geneva, Rome, Athens, Beirut, Cairo, Valetta, Nairobi and Hong Kong.

Following another period of reduced migration in the early 1970s, due to economic factors in Australia, migration was increased again in 1976. A migration office was established...
in Nicosia, Cyprus, to help people affected by the civil conflict in Lebanon and in 1976–77 Middle East arrivals reached 16,477 or 23 per cent of total migrant intake for that period. During 1975–76, 1037 refugees from Indo-China were admitted to Australia. These Indo-Chinese refugees represent the first large group of Asian refugees to arrive in the country. In November 1976, Australia announced that it would accept more Indo-Chinese refugees from camps and small boats in Thailand. Between July 1975 and June 1995, 158,507 people, or 8.4 per cent of the total intake, arrived from Vietnam with a total of 385,154, or 20.5 per cent, from the whole of Southeast Asia. In 1997–98 there were 5437 settlers from the former Yugoslavia, including 2135 from Bosnia-Hercegovina. This was more than double the number of migrants from Vietnam.

Table 2.4 shows settlers arriving from selected countries over the period 1982–83 and 1997–98. Over the four years to June 1998, these countries accounted for 40 per cent of all settler arrivals.

The impact on the AMEP of changing Humanitarian and other settler arrivals are summarised in Figure 2.1 on page 48 in terms of the following patterns since 1982.

**Table 2.4 (on opposite page)**

Settlers arriving in Australia from 1982–83 to 1997–98:

| Region/Birthplace: National total (BIMPR Statistical Reports 5, 8, 11, 16 for years to 1994–95; Immigration Updates and Settlement Database Unit record data from 1995) |

**Vietnamese Youth Study a Map of Australia as They Await a Flight to Adelaide After Arriving at Melbourne in 1976.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1261</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Yugoslavia</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>2645</td>
<td>3266</td>
<td>2885</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>2521</td>
<td>4210</td>
<td>4854</td>
<td>6665</td>
<td>7837</td>
<td>5744</td>
<td>5437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>4102</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>1274</td>
<td>1337</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>1601</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>1586</td>
<td>1852</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former USSR</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>1730</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>2067</td>
<td>3204</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>2340</td>
<td>1589</td>
<td>2167</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>1118</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>1148</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1407</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>2539</td>
<td>2743</td>
<td>2136</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>1413</td>
<td>2397</td>
<td>2751</td>
<td>2857</td>
<td>4229</td>
<td>2785</td>
<td>2225</td>
<td>2840</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>1064</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>1445</td>
<td>1428</td>
<td>1335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>1226</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>1017</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampuchea</td>
<td>4052</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>1356</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>554</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td>1083</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>1241</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>1244</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>2171</td>
<td>2450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>8677</td>
<td>9512</td>
<td>8493</td>
<td>7168</td>
<td>6628</td>
<td>5981</td>
<td>7971</td>
<td>11155</td>
<td>13143</td>
<td>9592</td>
<td>5651</td>
<td>5434</td>
<td>5097</td>
<td>3834</td>
<td>3316</td>
<td>2561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>1647</td>
<td>3159</td>
<td>3137</td>
<td>2690</td>
<td>3282</td>
<td>3819</td>
<td>3069</td>
<td>3226</td>
<td>3388</td>
<td>3046</td>
<td>2740</td>
<td>3708</td>
<td>12594</td>
<td>9936</td>
<td>6042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>1550</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>1666</td>
<td>1378</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td>929</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>1146</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>3055</td>
<td>3456</td>
<td>3172</td>
<td>1434</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>1580</td>
<td>2044</td>
<td>1558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>1539</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>1486</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total settlers</td>
<td>93173</td>
<td>69622</td>
<td>78001</td>
<td>92335</td>
<td>113212</td>
<td>143327</td>
<td>145221</td>
<td>121133</td>
<td>120655</td>
<td>107391</td>
<td>76330</td>
<td>69768</td>
<td>87428</td>
<td>96316</td>
<td>87436</td>
<td>74559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected share total</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REASONS FOR MIGRATION

The reasons why people uproot themselves from their country of birth and travel to the other end of the world to start a new life are complex. There are usually a number of factors, though one reason may be dominant.

Historically, Australia has been an attractive destination in terms of economic growth, education and employment opportunities, economic and social stability, reunion with former migrants and social tolerance. Some people may migrate to escape war, persecution and discrimination, natural disasters or economic insecurity in their home country. Others may migrate to seek professional advancement, gain material improvements in income and employment prospects, or to find a better life. The prospect of a healthier climate attracts some, while others look forward to more space and better housing. Others come to a new country seeking a challenge or from curiosity or restlessness. Some travel in order to be married, having met their future spouses in their home town or village. Some migrate in order to join family or friends.

Some migrants have taken years to come to their decision, while for others there is very little time or very little option. George Bartley, a migration officer in Vienna in 1956 at the time of the Hungarian uprising, recalled how in the huge camps in Austria refugees applied for all countries that were offering a migration program. Typically, these people settled in whichever country was quickest to organise their departure (Bartley 1995:30):

You’d go out with your dossiers and travel documents with visas and you’d discover a convoy of buses taking people for Canada or other countries. People would be running up and down between the buses calling out to their friends saying: ‘Come with us, come to America’ or ‘Come to Australia, come with us.’ Friends were torn which way to go. It was only when the motors started and there was about to be movement that there’d be a decision.
Some would go one way and some would go another, and that's the way their new life would start – with a decision made in a split second when the bus was about to move off.

Table 2.5 lists the reasons for immigrating to Australia as cited by migrants in the Longitudinal Survey of Immigrants to Australia (LSIA) conducted in 1995.

**DECIDING WHERE TO LIVE**

Just as reasons for deciding – or for being forced – to migrate are often complex, so too are reasons for choosing to settle in a certain location. Government policies to attract immigrants and to provide services for them have to some extent influenced choice of location, but more often the location of relatives and friends, availability of jobs and housing and information about certain areas has had more influence. Even climate and lifestyle play a part in some migrants’ decisions. The first large-scale study to examine reasons for choosing certain locations was not conducted until 1996, but it is probable that the reasons influencing later arrivals are similar to those arriving in the early years of the AMEP.

To some extent, government decisions to locate migrant hostels in certain areas has affected settlement patterns. For example, the percentage of overseas-born Australians living in the area of Wodonga, where Bonegilla Reception Centre was located, is still higher than average, even in the 1990s. Similarly many Indo-Chinese now live in New South Wales where three large migrant hostels were located.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for immigrating to Australia</th>
<th>Preferential Family</th>
<th>Concessional Family</th>
<th>Business/skilled</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Humanitarian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better employment opportunities in Australia</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To join family/relatives in Australia</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get married</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake studies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better future for family in Australia</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other aspects liked about Australia**</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of employment in former home country</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike of economic conditions in former country</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike of social conditions in former country</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape war or political situation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LSIA, Wave 1, 1995

Notes: Multiple answers were allowed, so percentages do not add up to 100.
* Sample size too small
** For example: lifestyle, climate and political stability.
In the late 1940s and early 1950s, when migrants under certain schemes were contracted to work where directed, many migrants initially settled in rural areas and some have stayed. The majority of migrants, however, choose to settle in cities. In 1967, following pressure from rural centres, the Commonwealth offered rent incentives for country settlement, but this proved ineffective in attracting migrants.

Researchers for LSIA interviewed 5193 principal applicants and their families who had arrived in Australia between September 1993 and August 1995. Their findings offer an important insight into choice of location in the 1990s. (However, it should be noted that migrants from English speaking countries were also represented in this survey.) Murphy (1996), in her report of the findings showed that, while an overwhelming majority of respondents gave location of family or friends as the main reasons for settling in a certain location, percentages varied from State to State. In Victoria, for example, location of family and friends was by far the most often cited reason for settlement, while employment reasons were stated more often in New South Wales, Tasmania, the ACT and South Australia than they were in Victoria, as Table 2.6 indicates. Lifestyle and climate were more likely to be given as settlement reasons by residents in Queensland and Western Australia than elsewhere, and in the Northern Territory a higher proportion chose this location because their spouse already lived there.

Other reasons for choosing a location included having information about a particular State/Territory, visits to a location prior to immigration, and availability of housing. Murphy also speculated that distance from country of origin may have some influence on decisions, and this would explain why Perth is a major destination for South East Asian migrants and why Western Australia has a disproportionate representation of migrants from Malaysia, Singapore, Burma, Indonesia and South Africa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Spouse or partner lived here</th>
<th>Employer is located here</th>
<th>Job opportunities</th>
<th>Family living here</th>
<th>Friends living here</th>
<th>Preferred climate</th>
<th>Lifestyle</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Capital Territory</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LSIA, Wave 1, 1995
* Sample size too small
There are no coherent statistics on participation of eligible settlers in the AMEP. The Commonwealth/State nature of the program produced different client measures from the various State departments responsible for the AMEP, leading to the creation of the AMEP Management Information System (AMIS) from 1984 onwards. Queensland continued to report AMEP enrolments data via its own systems. Clients averaged between two and three enrolments per annum and service providers continued to report a mixture of client and enrolment data. With the Commonwealth decision in August 1992 to focus the AMEP on immediate settlement needs, the AMEP Reporting and Management System (ARMS) was developed. ARMS provided an eligibility system through links to the DIMA Settlement Database (SDB).

ARMS holds comprehensive data on settler arrivals and their participation in the AMEP. Data on existing clients was converted from AMIS but data such as migration category was only available for clients with a valid visa number in AMIS. Comprehensive data has been maintained from the SDB and ARMS databases from the beginning of 1996. This enables analysis of AMEP participation by age, gender, birthplace, migration category and reported English proficiency. Table 2.7 overleaf summarises client data by birthplace for the decade to 1998.

Other major characteristics of AMEP clients through the 1990s include:

- Females were 57 per cent of AMEP clients from 1991 to 1998, increasing from around 55 per cent at the beginning of the decade to 60 per cent or more from 1996 onwards. Chinese family migration, particularly spouses and parents, contributes to this increase in the female share of clients.
- The AMEP has an increased focus on the settlement of recently-arrived settlers. With changes to eligibility policy from 1993, the proportion of clients arriving in the current or previous year increased to 71 per cent in 1993 and 1994, to 79–80 per cent in 1995 and 1996, and was under 70 per cent in 1997 (data for 1998 is incomplete).
- Approximately one-third of AMEP clients enter under the Humanitarian category.
- NSW accounts for around 44 per cent of all AMEP clients over the decade, with the Chinese family migration increasing the NSW share to 49 per cent in 1997.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>10771</td>
<td>10134</td>
<td>6475</td>
<td>5126</td>
<td>4137</td>
<td>3863</td>
<td>3567</td>
<td>3088</td>
<td>38863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>4038</td>
<td>5924</td>
<td>4575</td>
<td>4158</td>
<td>6408</td>
<td>10043</td>
<td>9982</td>
<td>7442</td>
<td>35489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Yugoslavia</td>
<td>1861</td>
<td>2143</td>
<td>3340</td>
<td>4711</td>
<td>5762</td>
<td>7110</td>
<td>5928</td>
<td>5037</td>
<td>24756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe (nei)</td>
<td>5821</td>
<td>5140</td>
<td>2817</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>1444</td>
<td>21819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central/South America</td>
<td>4708</td>
<td>4084</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>13959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former USSR</td>
<td>1357</td>
<td>2083</td>
<td>2653</td>
<td>2490</td>
<td>2290</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>10524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>2443</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>1192</td>
<td>1056</td>
<td>9705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>1253</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>7708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>2139</td>
<td>2195</td>
<td>1782</td>
<td>7137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1591</td>
<td>1376</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>6197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East (nei)</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>763</td>
<td>821</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>5496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>1247</td>
<td>1228</td>
<td>1022</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>5439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampuchea</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>5041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>4733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Speaking*</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>4469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia, Somalia etc</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>4399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>4335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India, Pakistan, Bangladesh</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>4204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>4096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>3653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>3274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>3172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>2875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>1482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>45990</td>
<td>46458</td>
<td>34624</td>
<td>32107</td>
<td>34250</td>
<td>40288</td>
<td>38899</td>
<td>31609</td>
<td>236839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other birthplaces</strong></td>
<td>308</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMEP clients</strong></td>
<td>46298</td>
<td>46757</td>
<td>34867</td>
<td>33230</td>
<td>34476</td>
<td>40565</td>
<td>39304</td>
<td>31980</td>
<td>238699</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AMEP AMIS and ARMS databases. *English speaking includes Malaysia, Singapore, Fiji etc
1998* data incomplete. Clients counted each year of enrolment. 1991/98 total is a distinct client count.
A round 40 per cent of AMEP clients had been assessed as having little or no English on arrival.

Major source countries over the decade were Vietnam (16 per cent), China (15 per cent), and the former Yugoslavia (ten per cent), followed by the former USSR and Lebanon with around five per cent. The birthplace mix has changed markedly from more than 22 per cent from Vietnam in 1991 and 1992 to only ten per cent in 1996, 1997 and 1998. Chinese migrants increased from under ten per cent in 1991 to 25 per cent in 1996 and 1997. Settlers from the former Yugoslavia increased from five per cent in 1991 and 1992 to more than 15 per cent each year during 1994–98.

Home language mirrors birthplace, with Vietnamese averaging 15 per cent over the period, followed by Mandarin and Cantonese (each ten per cent), Arabic (nine per cent), Spanish (six per cent) and Russian (four per cent).

Even with major changes in source countries, migration categories and English language proficiency on entry, the median age of AMEP clients has fluctuated between 33 and 35 years.

Meeting clients’ needs

Despite the AMEP's many policy reviews and program changes over the years, there has been only one nationally focused survey undertaken, by Tait, Harrison and Thomas in 1990, which can provide comprehensive evaluation information from an ESL client perspective. NSW AMES has undertaken in-house evaluations and tracer studies of AMEP graduates, which are generally not publicly available. (In future years, DIMA intends to carry out a client satisfaction survey which will form part of an evaluation of service provider performance in the third year of the initial contracts developed when the program was tendered in 1997-98. The survey will cover a representative sample of clients of all AMEP service providers and will be administered in late 1999 and again in mid-2000.)

In Gateway to Australian society: Migrants’ experience of the AMEP, Tait et al sampled 1200 clients in Australia’s mainland states in 1990, focusing on the outcomes of English language activities for AMEP clients. Key findings included:

- Migrants who study English through the AMEP showed a high level of satisfaction with the program:
  - 63 per cent of clients were ‘satisfied’ with the quality of the teaching, while 31 per cent were ‘partly satisfied’
  - 58 per cent were ‘satisfied’ with classroom activities while 34 per cent were ‘partly satisfied’.

- AMEP courses were important in helping clients achieve some of their personal objectives:
  - 89 per cent said the course helped them improve their spoken English
  - 60 per cent said the course helped them improve their reading and writing skills
  - Altogether, 90 per cent said the course helped them achieve one or more of their personal objectives.
Labour market outcomes were important for a majority of AMEP clients:
- 50 per cent of clients improved their English ability enough to inquire about jobs on the phone
- 66 per cent improved their understanding of job advertisements
- altogether, over 80 per cent of clients looking for work reported improvement in at least one job-seeking skill
- 40 per cent of those who already had a job said that their most recent AMEP course had helped them 'work better' in the job.

In summary, the survey confirmed the important role the AMEP plays in the settlement of migrants to Australia. Survey participants felt that English language courses also increased their job-seeking and employment skills, and provided information about social activities and community services. Most migrants felt that their personal goals had been fulfilled, at least in part.

Some clients reported obstacles to participation, related to childcare, transport and inadequate levels of provision. However, most were using a wide range of services, taking part in a range of activities and immersing themselves in situations where English is used. Taking a wider view, they were participating in the 'economic and social life of Australia' – the single stated objective of the Department's settlement program at the time of the study.

A later study, by AMES NSW in 1993 (which returned 587 questionnaires from clients in Sydney) found that overall, AMES was providing a valuable service to a group of customers who were happy with what they were getting. The critical question in this survey was the one which challenged students to single out the single most important benefit, for them, of studying with AMES. Interestingly, an overwhelming view emerged from those taking part that, above all else, learning English meant they were able to avoid feeling excluded from life in Australia. That sense of wanting to belong, to be included, to be able to make their way in the community independently was very strong.

**Client Stories**

*Who were they? Where had they come from? How did their lives turn out? More or less accurate statistics can tell us the bald facts about the thousands of people who have arrived in Australia every year since 1948 - how many there were and where they came from. For some of these years we know details about educational background, intended place of settlement and profession; but this kind of information provides only a small part of the total picture. To really know who the AMEP clients have been, what their aspirations were, how they fared in their new country and what role the AMEP played in their lives, we need to meet the clients themselves. Although each migrant has his or her own story, the following extracts help to form a picture of the wide variety of settlers to Australia. Some of these extracts are written in the first person, others are written by those who were in close contact with them.*
Hmong Community

Xiong Thaow and Badi Rohmani, Hmong community leaders in Australia, tell the story of how the Hmong community developed in Tasmania.

There are many success stories about the Hmong people, who seem to have the ability to adapt and settle very well. Vue Thaow and his family are typical examples: Vue Thaow was the first Hmong to arrive in Tasmania in 1974. A Colombo plan student at Hobart High School, he had left behind, in Laos, his wife Chue and two young children who had fled to Thailand following the fall of Vientiane during the Indo-Chinese war. Hearing of their plight, Vue's fellow students responded with a fund raising appeal that saw the arrival of Chue and the children under the family reunion program the following year.

On arrival, Chue found herself isolated by lack of language and total cultural unfamiliarity. She joined an AMES English class in 1979, and subsequently, the family acted as sponsors and mentors for succeeding waves of new arrivals.

The first Hmong refugees to settle in Tasmania were Vue's parents, brother, sister and brother-in-law, who arrived in 1977. The following 15 years saw a steady increase in numbers as more people came to join family members. These years were very rewarding ones for Hmong people - they bought properties and developed two extremely successful market gardens on the outskirts of Hobart. Currently, there are about 260 Hmong living in Hobart.

Vue and Chue have since had two more children. Their older son has completed his medical degree and their older daughter is completing her surveying degree. The younger daughter hopes to enter medicine and the younger son has recently embarked on an overseas holiday with his parents.

Haissam

The teacher of a blind student from Lebanon tells the story of Haissam 'courageous enough to venture into a new language learning environment'.

When 25 year old Haissam came to AMES Bankstown in 1984 he was assessed as 00 on the AMES NSW language proficiency scale. A recent arrival from Tripoli in Lebanon, the teachers were informed that he was blind, and were asked if they could accommodate such a student within the normal low level on-arrival class. 'There was really nowhere else for him to go except perhaps learning via a home tutor for one or maybe two hours a week. We reasoned that if he was courageous enough to venture into a new language learning environment and its potential

Xiong Thaow and Badi Rohmani.
linguistic, social, emotional and psychological consequences, then who were we to deny him,’ said Lloyd Norris, one of his teachers.

The class in which Haissam was placed was fortunate in having a large number of Arabic speakers. It was decided to use these people as translators rather than bring a bilingual instructor to be Haissam’s ‘eyes’. ‘We felt that it would encourage an interdependence, responsibility and independence in both the sighted students and Haissam if there was real interchange,’ said Lloyd, ‘and in fact, this proved to be the case, and spread to the students from other countries who displayed a real concern and interest in Haissam’s learning process’.

According to Lloyd, when Haissam first came to class he had no clear concept of a future apart from his family, no concept of employment or independence. He wanted Australian friends but had no concept of where they would come from. ‘After 20 weeks,’ said Lloyd, ‘Haissam had changed from the nervous, shy man he was to one who was eager for new challenges. He began using a brailler and writing short stories using self-correction techniques. His attitude to the outside world became one of qualified eagerness to explore, both physically and conceptually. He also began attending lessons with the Royal Blind Society, learning with a braille teacher who was also blind – without the use of an interpreter. As he said: ‘I understand everything, no problems’.

As a consequence of Haissam’s new-found confidence, his vision shifted to seeing himself as being independent in the future. ‘He began thinking about perhaps going to technical college, getting a job, getting married... possibly gaining employment as a telephonist or electrician. We even talked about him becoming a teacher for visually impaired students from non-English speaking countries,’ said Lloyd. ‘Whatever the outcome, at this point, it appears to be only optimistic.’

GLORIA
When Gloria Formas Miranda arrived in Brisbane from Chile in 1988 with her husband and two children, settling into their new home in the early days was very difficult. ‘We had no place of our own, no friends, and the worst – no communication with other people – due to limited knowledge of the English language. My husband and I began working three weeks after we arrived, in jobs that were completely different from the ones we had in our home country,’ she said.

In Chile, Gloria had been an early childhood teacher with ten years’ teaching experience and was director of a government-funded infants’ school. On arrival in Australia, she found work as a cleaner and factory worker by night. During the day, she attended AMEP English classes. It was during her course that her class teacher told her about a position as a teacher aide within the Salisbury Migrant Education Unit and
encouraged her to apply for it. ‘I applied for the job without any confidence, due to my poor spoken and written English skills,’ said Gloria. Nevertheless, she was successful in getting the part-time job, and thus decided to further her English studies at night, undertaking an English course for overseas trained professionals at the Brisbane College of Advanced Education. She then decided to apply for a Master of Education course at the Queensland University of Technology, from which Gloria graduated in April 1995.

‘Two years ago, my family and I bought land and built a house,’ said Gloria. ‘We are still working on it, and are very happy. This has also contributed to help me feel that I belong. It took a long time for me to get to this point. It hasn’t been easy and I still haven’t attained all my goals, but I think that if one has an objective to pursue, it is necessary to work hard and be persistent. But overall, to have a family as supportive as mine.’

Maria and Marko

In 1991, life looked rosy for Marko and Maria Jankovic. They were completing their university degrees in Sarajevo, had good jobs to go to, and plans for their future.

‘When we heard the first rumours of war, we didn’t really believe it would happen,’ recounts Marko. ‘We couldn’t imagine what war would be like.’

Over the next two years, all normal life was destroyed. ‘My house was only about 500 metres from the front line. When we tried to escape from Sarajevo, it took us six days to travel only 200 kilometres. There was constant shelling – we saw people being killed in front of us. I myself was injured in a bomb attack. Finally, we managed to cross the border to Serbia where we were able to apply for a visa to come to Australia.’

When the couple arrived in Canberra, they found it strange that people were living a ‘normal life’. From finding it impossible to imagine what war would be like, they found it impossible to understand what normal life was. The next big shock was language. ‘We had literally no English,’ says Marko. ‘Here, “normal life” was lived in a language we didn’t understand. It can be difficult to start learning as a child again, and in the beginning you can be sensitive, with little things making a big difference. But the AMEP gave us a lot of encouragement and support. The class became like a family, and that was what we needed at that time.’

Marko reports that the information sessions – in which staff from Government and community organisations came to classes with bilingual interpreters – were extremely valuable. ‘Without English, you just don’t ask about services, or try to find information,’ he explains.

When Maria left class to have her first child, she was able to continue her studies through the AMEP’s Home Tutor Scheme. A volunteer

Maria and Marko Jankovic, who fled the ruins of Sarajevo in 1993, have been able to rebuild their lives in Australia with help from the AMEP.
visited Maria at home every week to help her with her English. Later, thanks to childcare provided through the AMEP, she was able to return to class to complete her course. She now cares for the couple’s two young children and is completing a banking and finance degree part-time.

On his graduation from the AMEP, Marko was presented with the Freemasons’ Prize for Excellence. He currently works at the Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs and is undertaking an accountancy degree part-time.

‘I have thought about what life would be like if there were no English classes,’ sums up Marko. ‘The pictures that come to my mind are of isolation, of a manual job in my ethnic group, or being unemployed long-term – pictures of depression, a life of relying on others, and a growing distance between us and the world of our English-speaking children. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the AMEP changed our lives.’

Quan Tien arrived in 1988 from Vietnam and credits the AMEP for helping him get his current job.

Quan is a Technical Officer at the Faculty of Science, Northern Territory University. ‘I enjoy it very much,’ he reports. ‘I use the skills I gained in my biology degree. It’s a good job with good pay.’

English language skills, Marina didn’t imagine she would ever be able to work again. Now, two years later, Marina is employed as a research scientist at the National Serological Laboratory.

With a PhD in Biochemistry, Marina had held the post of senior scientist of the biochemistry laboratory of the Scientific Institute of Infectious Diseases in Kiev. Her specialist area was biochemistry of liver disease in which she had been developing biochemical methods to detect the early diagnosis of liver cancer.

When she arrived at the AMES centre in Malvern in 1994, her English language skills in reading, writing and listening were assessed at a low intermediate level but her spoken language was rated at the beginner level. Marina recalled, ‘I could not speak English at all’.

After a carefully planned educational pathway, Marina studied general English followed by pre-employment and finally a job-seekers course. As Marina said, ‘The skills [of biochemistry] are quite transferable. In Australia research methods are quite different from methods used in the Ukraine but the knowledge and skills can be adapted quite easily. I first learned computer skills at Malvern AMES, then more extensively at the AMES centre in Melbourne. With this I was able to use the software programs necessary for the job.’

Quan Tien arrived in 1988 from Vietnam and credits the AMEP for helping him get his current job.

Quan is a Technical Officer at the Faculty of Science, Northern Territory University. ‘I enjoy it very much,’ he reports. ‘I use the skills I gained in my biology degree. It’s a good job with good pay.’
After he graduated in Vietnam, Quan’s prospects weren’t so bright. Although he had some experience in the workforce, he couldn’t find a job. So Quan decided to migrate to Australia to find work.

Language was the first hurdle. He had studied English in Vietnam, but had no opportunity to practise his new skills with native English speakers. ‘When I arrived, it was a little difficult to understand people,’ he laughs. ‘Everyone here speaks so fast!’

‘The AMEP teachers taught us that the most important thing is to adapt and look for a job,’ he says. ‘We learnt how to look for work, how to write a job application, and how to behave in a job interview. This was all new to me – looking for work is very different in Vietnam.’

He says he definitely made the right decision to migrate to Australia. ‘I am better off here than I would be in Vietnam,’ he says. Life in Australia has also turned out well for Quan on a personal level. He recently married Songyen, who has been here for two years, and is encouraging her with her English studies through the AMEP.

TERESA

Teresa Reec Ajang arrived from Sudan in 1996. She says learning English has been one of the key factors in helping her to focus on her new homeland and forget the horrors of civil war in the Sudan. ‘We come from Christian southern Sudan and my three brothers were killed by the army in the fighting there,’ Teresa says. ‘Another 15 members of my family have also been killed,’ she adds.

Teresa, of the Perth suburb of Girrawheen, came to Australia two years ago with her husband, Michael Majok Gureec. Michael is also a Christian from southern Sudan and has had 11 members of his family killed in the fighting.

‘We have very close extended families in the Sudan and found that concentrating on our English classes and our children were big factors in helping us to get over the horrors of our past and the killing of our family members,’ says Teresa.

Before coming to Australia, Teresa and her family were refugees for ten years in Ethiopia and Kenya. ‘The Australian High Commissioner in Kenya came to our refugee camp in 1995 and we were interviewed for a new life in Australia through the United Nations,’ she says.

‘Our life in the refugee camp was very hard and we were segregated from the general Kenyan community.’ Before the civil war, Teresa had been a community health worker with the International Rescue Committee (IRC) in Kenya. ‘The IRC helped me because of my work for them and because my husband was a social worker with the Lutheran World Federation organisation, World Food.’

Both Teresa and Michael have completed the 510 hours of free tuition the Adult Migrant
English Program provides for humanitarian entrants. Teresa had learnt English in the refugee camps as it is spoken in many parts of Africa. ‘But African English is a lot different from Australian English,’ she says with a smile. ‘Although we could speak African English when we first arrived, we couldn’t understand Australians. Our AMEP classes were very good in helping us with Australian pronunciation.’

Teresa now works part-time in a creche in Perth and is working with the WA Department of Community Services and Health to have her childcare qualifications recognised in Australia. She plans to study further and pursue a career in community nursing.

Michael is doing a human services course through the Mount Lawley College to upgrade his social work qualifications.

The couple plan to stay in the WA capital. ‘Perth is a very good place in a very peaceful country – the people are friendly and we have been made very welcome,’ says Teresa. She reports that her sons, Riak, 13, Gureec, ten, and daughter, Luel, four, have settled well in Australia. ‘They are fine little Australians, with better English than their parents!’

NELLY

When Nelly Virag came to Australia in 1992 her only knowledge of spoken English was what she had picked up from American and British films. Perhaps not surprisingly, Nelly found Australian English a lot different!

Nelly, of the Adelaide suburb of Parafield Gardens, comes from a small town in Hungary. ‘Hungarian is regarded as one of the most difficult European languages to learn. But English, being such a rich language, is just as difficult –
particularly when the Australian accent is added,’ she explains.

Currently taking time off to care for Emily-Jane, six-months, Nelly intends to return to teaching and to improve her English. ‘My English is fine for everyday use, but I want to improve my grasp of technical words and terms, and complete my associate diploma in information systems for computers.’

Nelly says the AMEP teachers were particularly helpful in explaining Australians’ love of slang and idiomatic speech. ‘Commonplace expressions often puzzle the new arrival because such words are not always found in textbooks.’

One such puzzle for Nelly was the word ‘hubby’. ‘Women trying to make me feel at home in Australia were always asking, “And how’s your hubby?” I had to get one of the teachers to explain what a hubby was!’

Supporting the learners
As the stories above attest, to be successful in a new country takes courage, determination, flexibility and sheer hard work. While the greatest credit for making a success of a new life in a new country is due to the migrants themselves, the Australian Government has set up services and programs to assist them with their settlement.

Classroom accommodation
One of the most basic support requirements is, of course, classroom accommodation. Throughout the years, emphasis has been placed on ensuring that classes are available in places of high migrant population density and where there is convenient access by public transport. At certain times over the years, a shortage of accommodation and facilities has been experienced. In the 1940s and 50s, many migrants would have had their first AMEP lessons in the migrant camps; ensuing decades saw a shift from tuition in migrant hostels to community-based provision.

In the immediate post-War period, newly arrived migrants were housed in reception or ‘holding’ centres and hostels. Because of housing and materials shortages, most were former military camps, remote from capital cities and industrial areas, chosen because they could accommodate large numbers of people. The first classes were run at Bonegilla, near Wodonga in Victoria. Other centres followed at Bathurst and Greta in NSW and at Graylands near Perth, WA. In these founding years of the program, the major difficulty in providing instruction was the lack of adequate classrooms: the ‘Nissen’ huts where teaching took place were generally of corrugated iron and unlined, barely heated in winter and roasting hot in summer. When accommodation was tight, lessons might be improvised outdoors under trees, in the recreation rooms of accommodation blocks – even the tennis shed at Bonegilla doubled as a classroom when required. After migrants moved out of the camps, classes were accommodated in holding centres or, in the case of continuation classes, in community buildings, church halls or schools near migrants’ places of employment, provided there was a minimum of six or more people wishing to receive instruction at any one centre.

Women were always asking me about my hubby. I had to get one of the teachers to explain what a hubby was!
At the time of the Commonwealth/State handover in 1951, classes were operating in the following centres:

- New South Wales – Bathurst, Greta, Cowra, Parkes, Wallgrove, Scheyville
- Victoria – Bonegilla, Somers, Rushworth, Mildura, West Sale, Toorak Nurses’ Hostel
- South Australia – Woodside
- Queensland – Wacol, Enoggera, Stuart, Cairns
- Western Australia – Holden

A major renovation program in the 1960s led to a change of accommodation to modern brick hostels with blocks of flats and communal dining rooms and recreational facilities. Assisted passage migrants were eligible for accommodation in these hostels. In January 1971, as a direct extension of the pre-embarkation and shipboard program, education centres were established at the Westbridge (NSW) and Enterprise (VIC) migrant hostels. These centres were built in the grounds of the hostels and provided readily available day and evening classes. In the following year, further education centres came on stream in Cabramatta, East Hills and Fairy Mawson in NSW, and Midway in Victoria. As in the early founding period, aside from the instruction provided in the hostels, other full- and part-time day and evening classes were accommodated in schools and other buildings.

In recognition of the need to increase the capacity of education centres at hostels and to improve their educational facilities, $965,000 was approved in the 1977–78 Budget to develop classrooms and associated facilities at hostels. These classrooms were mainly to accommodate on arrival and English orientation courses for refugees. Demountable buildings were used to give flexibility of use in future years. At this time, centres were also operating at Wacol in Queensland, Pennington in SA and Graylands in WA.

By the end of the 1970s, the increased refugee intake, together with the decision to implement the Galbally recommendation to establish community-based settlement centres to provide programs for migrants who move directly into the community on arrival, led to significant demands for additional education accommodation. A further $1.2 million was spent on classroom accommodation in 1978–79, and additional space was borrowed or rented in the community for on-arrival classes. Various ad hoc arrangements were also made, for example, some students were transported by bus from migrant centres to classrooms in the community.

During the 1980s, the emphasis shifted from the expansion of education centres and hostels to the further development of accommodation in the community.

Table 2.8 provides an indication of the shift...
from hostel to community based tuition in this period.

The 1985 Campbell Report noted that AMEP teachers were very conscious of the inappropriateness of much of the accommodation available to support the program. In his submission to the report, Watts (1985:141) commented:

Many teachers feel hampered in their professional duties by present facilities... The most unsatisfactory position is to be found in the case of storage facilities. The problem is exacerbated for those who teach classes in rented or borrowed premises which are used by other groups as well and for teachers of courses-in-industry who, like travelling salesmen, must frequently carry materials/equipment with them as they move from one industry base to another.

In the mid-late 1980s, AMEP classroom accommodation underwent substantial change. With the closure of several migrant centres due to declining numbers of migrants requiring this type of accommodation, English classes were relocated to meet the needs of migrants now settling directly into the community. At this time, there was a rapid growth in the number of commercially leased multi-class centres at which a range of courses at different language levels were offered.

During the 1990s, classes are conducted in Commonwealth and State-leased properties, Commonwealth and State owned demountables, TAFE colleges and community venues.

Childdcare
Right from the establishment of the AMEP, one of the reasons for low participation of women in English classes was the lack of childcare assistance for mothers with young children. In the early days some centres partially solved the problem by holding special mother and children classes. Older children could learn alongside their mothers, and younger children could be nursed while their mothers attended to their lessons.

In 1971, after a review of the reasons for non-attendance of women in AMEP classes, it was proposed to Commonwealth Hostels Ltd that migrant mothers should have their children cared for in hostel childcare centres while they attended classes. This important decision heralded the beginning of the Department of Immigration’s official support for childcare for AMEP students.

In 1984 the Department of Immigration commissioned an investigation into the need for childcare in the AMEP in NSW (DIEA 1984a). The study demonstrated that the unavailability of childcare was a major barrier to participation.

Table 2.8: Accommodation 1978–83 (DIMA Review 1983:80)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centres</th>
<th>Early 1978</th>
<th>June 1983</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community education and settlement centres</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Centre (hostel) education centres</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.8: Accommodation 1978–83 (DIMA Review 1983:80)
in the AMEP for women with pre-school-aged children. It questioned the adequacy of some of the provision in community locations and recommended the systematic extension and improvement of the provisions, including the need for bilingual staff and training to develop an understanding of, and sensitivity to, the needs of the non-English speaking mothers. In 1985 the Campbell Report noted the need for continued provision of childcare, and in 1986–87 funding for childcare in the AMEP was set at $1.75 million, allowing childcare to be provided in more than 60 AMEP locations. A variety of childcare arrangements developed around Australia, including the funding of community groups to establish services at or near AMEP centres.

The commitment of Government to the provision of childcare not only acknowledged the need to support access to classes, but also recognised the fact that the settlement process involved the whole family. In the special childcare facilities, efforts were made to employ staff with appropriate language skills, and training sessions were held to discuss aspects of issues such as childcare, cross-cultural communication, and early childhood education. A AMEP centre staff worked closely with childcare staff to maximise the available places and arrange class timetables to fit with childcare provisions. Others in the wider community also acknowledged the role of childcare in settlement provision. Dr Priscilla Clarke is a long-time advocate of access and equity to quality childcare for families from non-English speaking backgrounds, and is Director of the Free Kindergarten Association of Victoria. This association supports the notion that the provision of quality, culturally sensitive childcare is an essential element in ensuring equal access to English classes as a prerequisite for a competitive position in the workforce. The Department of Immigration funded the Free Kindergarten Association to provide specialised consultancy staff for those working with children and families of students enrolled in AMEP classes in Victoria. In a report to the AMEP in July 1998, Dr Clarke stated:

Children from recently arrived families have specialised needs. Any change of country and of culture entails a massive upheaval for both parents and children. If an immigrant's background involves war, political upheaval, and trauma, as it does for many people, the impact on both parent and child is immeasurable. This has been identified in families from former Yugoslavia, particularly Bosnia; Central America, East Africa and Iraq. Typically children from these immigrants may show signs of distress and an inability to settle into childcare.
BILINGUAL SUPPORT
The question of when and how to offer bilingual support in the AMEP is one that has been discussed in every decade of the development of the AMEP. It has never been successfully answered to the satisfaction of all client groups.

In the early years the migrant program grew so quickly that the focus was simply on maintaining a modicum of services wherever possible. Although teachers in pre-embarkation classes were often bilingual and were able to offer support, this was rarely the case on arrival in Australia. Because the language groups in the AMEP changed as new waves of migrants arrived from different countries, bilingual teachers and administrative staff were often in situations where their particular second language skills were of no use. The AMEP methodology was based on all instruction being given in English and any support in languages other than English came through specially developed materials, such as the introductory section of the Correspondence Course which was available in a number of languages.

As settlement assistance is the AMEP’s major focus, there has always been a need to provide information as well as language tuition. This has been done in several ways: dissemination of information through brochures, ‘Welcome to Australia’ guides, ethnic newspapers, radio services and television have all been tried by the Department at national and state levels, as well as by individual providers, with varying degrees of success. A special initiative, which was developed following the Galbally Report (1978), was the introduction of bilingual information officers (BIOs). The Galbally report acknowledged that the problems of settlement were intensified by lack of English and by lack of information about Australian society, its institutions and services. It was originally intended that the BIOs’ function would be to provide information about a particular topic immediately before that topic was developed in the classroom. Information topics to be covered were:

- money management
- government
- housing
- law
- shopping
- health
- welfare services
- education
- community services
- safety
- employment
- immigration
- motoring
- socialising
- religion
- geography
- communication and transport
- recreation and entertainment

While the logistics of the timetabling was difficult, it was recognised that the provision of accurate information by specially trained staff was an improvement on the practice of a speaker with a number of translators. The Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs (AIMA) review in 1983 recommended that the BIOs provided a week of information prior to the commencement of English classes.

In the early 1980s NSW AMES, following on from information gained by a number of internal research studies and requests from students and migrant communities, moved to provide bilingual programs as part of the AMEP provisions in the State. The position of bilingual assistant was created in 1984 in order to provide...
bilingual support at the local level where there were no bilingual teachers available for identified bilingual programs. In an article in Interchange Joan Masters (1993) outlined the development of a Bilingual Programs Strategy for AMEP. The focus areas and tasks included management and planning, role definition, educational placement and referral services and other counselling services, cross-cultural training, and curriculum initiatives to support bilingual provision. Table 2.9 outlines the bilingual provisions in the Cabramatta Region of Sydney between 1988 and 1992.

**Educational Placement, Referral and Counselling Services**

Clients who come to the AMEP have extremely diverse cultural, language and socioeconomic backgrounds. For this reason the initial interview with a new client is extremely important as the interviewer must assess eligibility according to Government regulations, background information and level of English language skills.

The aim of the program's Educational Placement and Referral Service (EPRS) is to assess accurately clients' English language proficiency, diagnose their learning needs and develop learner pathways within and beyond the program to help them achieve their educational, vocational and social goals.

In 1985 the AMEP Professional Development Sub-Committee (PDSC) sought endorsement for the development of a comprehensive counselling function within the AMEP. In the same year the Campbell Report in its recommendations relating to continued professionalisation of the AMEP, recommended the appointment of additional full-time counsellors. Additional funding was provided for this purpose in 1986–87.

In 1989 the Department of Immigration commissioned a study into AMEP practices in regard to the initial placement, referral and counselling of students. Economou and Masters (1989) noted that these services were at various stages of development among different providers and made a number of recommendations to address common concerns and issues in order to develop an effective and efficient EPRS. This is detailed in Chapter 6.

The AMEP National Plan 1990–92 put strategies in place to provide educational and cross-cultural counselling to clients as required and to ensure that all EPRS staff were trained in interviewing, assessment, referral and cross-cultural counselling techniques. Other strategies included ensuring re-assessment opportunities were available to students at the end of each course; the establishment in each State and Territory of coordinated referral arrangements between AMEP venues and service providers and between the AMEP and other educational services; and the establishment of databases on...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bilingual Program</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To end 1988 (4 hours per week) | Chinese | Bilingual teacher | ● Bilingual Curriculum Project draft curriculum  
● need obvious  
● community focus program |
| 1989 (4 hours per week) | Chinese (OP 0-0.5)  
Chinese (OP 1.0)  
Vietnamese | Bilingual teacher | ● community focus  
● demand from Vietnamese students  
● bilingual teacher available  
● no clear student pathway developed  
● top-ups each term |
| 1989 | Khmer | Monolingual teacher with L1 assistant | |
| 1990 Semester 1 (6 hours per week) | Vietnamese  
2 x Chinese | Bilingual teacher | ● Regional Bilingual Working Party  
● development of minimum competency requirements for student entry to mainstream classes  
● some students progressed to mainstream at the end of the year |
| 1990 Semester 2 (6 hours per week) | Chinese  
Vietnamese | Bilingual teacher | |
| 1990 Semester 2 | Khmer | Monolingual teacher with L1 assistant | |
| 1991 Semester 1 (T1 - 6 hours  
T2 - 8 hours) | Chinese  
Khmer | Monolingual teacher with L1 assistant | ● bilingual module completed which included oral and written language, classroom language and behaviour, competencies and self-assessment recommendations were made, cultural awareness issues were documented  
● limited bilingual provision, ie 6 month module  
● development of resource file |
| 1991 Semester 2 (8 hours per week) | Chinese  
Khmer | Monolingual teacher with L1 assistant | ● Bilingual Program Band  
● Khmer Community links  
● issues were Pathways, role of bilingual assistant  
● clear target group developed  
● active recruitment of students through community liaison |
| 1992 Semester 1 (10 hours per week) | Chinese  
Khmer | Monolingual teacher with L1 assistant | ● objectives linked to Certificate in Spoken and Written English  
● all Stage 1 competencies included |
| 1992 Semester 2 (10 hours per week) | Khmer  
Laos | Monolingual teacher with L1 assistant | ● objectives refined  
● bank of assessment tasks established  
● student competencies assessed and recorded |

Table 2.9 Overview of Bilingual Provision in the AMES Cabramatta Region. (Reproduced by permission of NSW AMES)
exit opportunities (employment, education and training) for students.

**Special Needs Services**

With the growing expertise of staff over the years it has been possible to continually improve the services offered to AMEP clients. As new groups arrived, teachers and administrative staff adapted to new demands.

Following the Galbally Report (1978), the Department of Immigration instigated a survey and research program consisting of 25 studies to look at the AMEP. The objective of one of these studies was to determine the extent to which the AMEP was meeting the English language learning needs of the physically disabled adult migrant in metropolitan Melbourne. The study concluded that (DIEA 1984b:28):

… the potential market for specially developed English language training programs for both the visually impaired and the hearing impaired migrant from non-English speaking countries was somewhat limited; that the development of appropriate programs would be costly in terms of necessary expertise, and in terms of preparing programs for different language groups and that teaching such programs would involve high costs with a teacher-student ratio of 1:1. However, the reality was that when a student enrolled in a centre, regardless of any disability, teachers accepted the situation, and found ways to help the student achieve his or her goals within normal AMEP programs (see, for example, Haissam in the client stories in this chapter.)

**Torture and Trauma Support**

In recent years, staff have identified the special needs of clients who were survivors of torture and trauma. Paris Aristotle from the Victorian Foundation for Survivors of Torture and Trauma, speaking at an NCELT R National Working Forum in March 1996, stated that as many as 80 per cent of Humanitarian arrivals might also be survivors of torture and various degrees of trauma. In partnership with AMES Victoria, the Foundation developed a professional development program which trained a number of AMES teachers to provide support for students affected by events in their own countries of origin, or countries of first asylum, and to peer teachers.

With the introduction of tendering in 1997, AMEP service providers must, under the terms of their contracts with DIMA, take special steps to meet the needs of torture and trauma survivors. This means offering appropriate tuition options, including community-based language and orientation programs as needed. As part of their counselling service, service providers must identify clients whose pre-arrival experiences (including torture and trauma) may have affected their learning and refer them to the appropriate agency for assistance. Service providers are required to work with agencies such as the Victorian Foundation for Survivors of Torture and Trauma, and its equivalents in other States and Territories, so that they are properly equipped to recognise and help torture and trauma survivors.

In addition, the Government has provided an extra $17.6 million over the four years from 1997 to meet the special learning needs of refugee and humanitarian clients. Under this additional
funding, service providers are able to offer Special Preparatory Programs (SPPs) to clients whose learning needs have been affected by their experiences of torture and trauma. Through the SPPs, refugees can be given up to 100 hours of AMEP tuition, in addition to the normal 510 hours entitlement, before they join a mainstream AMEP learning arrangement. The preparatory classes are small (around 7–12 students), are less than full-time and are held in settings in which the clients are comfortable. This may be with others of similar English language skill level, or ethnic background, and will probably be in a community setting. SPP clients are given bilingual support and, if they choose, Home Tutor support.

The SPPs are linked into other support services, including counselling services, which are provided under DIMA’s Integrated Humanitarian Settlement Scheme (IHSS) arrangements. These may include case coordination through a DIMA Settlement Officer and a range of services available through DIMA-funded community grants and grant-in-aid workers.

**Conclusion**

An important feature of the AMEP has been that all personnel involved in the program, including administrative staff, teachers and support staff, have endeavoured to consider the needs of the migrants, sometimes with limited success but always with a desire to ensure that the services provided were appropriate. As has been described in this chapter, the changes in the waves of migration meant that the program has had to continually change to accommodate the different cultural and educational backgrounds of the new arrivals. Each personal account contains examples of the ways in which migrants have started a new life with a new language.
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