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Introduction

This study is concerned with the significance of the role of migrant or ethnic communities in their establishment of a vast network of part-time ethnic schools in Australia. With shifts in government policy on migrants, increased interest and discussion of the issues of migrant education and multiculturalism, and migrants’ presentation of themselves as legitimate elements in their own right in Australian society, the legitimacy of the role of ethnic schools and the question of their funding by government have become issues in Australian ethnic relations. These issues are all the more salient because of lack of social knowledge about ethnic schools.

It was in this milieu of political salience and social ignorance concerning ethnic schools that our preliminary report on this project was received in 1979 (Kringas and Lewins, 1979). While the study was only partially completed at the time and the conclusions very tentative, the nation-wide media response to the preliminary report was testimony to the importance, sensitivity, and ignorance of the ethnic school phenomenon. In replying to our critics and correcting some obvious distortions, we stressed that the study was an exploratory one, not a survey but rather a short term, question raising case study. Consequently, no attempt has been made, nor should be made, to generalise to other or all ethnic schools. These and other doubts and fears which arose from our preliminary report, such as the claim that we were antiethnic schools, should be dispelled after a careful reading of this book.

The research on which this book is based attempted a detailed

---

1 The terms ‘migrant’ and ‘ethnic’ are closely related and are used interchangeably. This is in accord with their conventional use (e.g. ‘ethnic school’ and ‘migrant education’) and therefore aids ready understanding. Sociologically, the term ethnic is more appropriate because it includes non-migrants such as children and grandchildren of migrants. See Jean Martin’s distinction between ethnic and migrant (1978: 16-18). The term ‘Australians’ refers to residents of English-speaking, Anglo-Saxon background and is used in this book purely for convenience.
examination of selected ethnic schools and relied on goodwill which existed between the investigators and the ethnic communities concerned. Because of the unanticipated size and complexity of the ethnic school phenomenon and difficulty we would have encountered in gaining entry to ethnic communities where we were not already known, we had to sacrifice some representativeness in selection of ethnic schools and rely on previous contacts, especially in the Greek and Italian communities. Consequently, the study was not a survey of ethnic schools. It did not pretend to generate data which would be representative nor easily expressed in quantitative form.

Initially, we saw ethnic schools as discrete units, that is, separate classes conducted outside of school hours by migrant teachers in specific locations. However, the picture was more complex. We found that there are significant numbers of migrant children receiving migrant language instruction in both government and Catholic schools during normal school hours. As we were concerned to explore the full range of migrant contributions to the teaching of migrant languages, we decided to investigate both the formal ethnic school situation and selected instances of the teaching of migrant languages during normal school hours. Hence, in referring to ethnic schools, especially in the case of Italians who have introduced Italian language instruction in school hours on a relatively large scale, the term 'ethnic schooling' is more appropriate.

The fact that the investigators had established contacts in Italian and Greek communities was not the only reason for their decision to include Italian and Greek schools in this study. These schools comprise approximately 75 per cent of all ethnic schools in Australia, so it was essential to include them. Ukrainian and Slovenian schools were included primarily to observe possible different definitions of these schools held in small ethnic communities. The choice of the particular Ukrainian school was facilitated by one of the investigator's established contacts in that community. A particular Slovenian school was chosen for the study more for its location in a smaller city than through previous contacts. This choice of an ethnic school outside of the state capitals came to be seen as desirable.

The four Italian 'ethnic schools' investigated were in Melbourne. Through the Comitato Assistenza Italiani (Italian Assistance Association) (CO.AS.IT) and the Dante Alighieri Society, the organisations responsible for organising the bulk of part-time or after hours ethnic schools and in-class instruction, we selected two conventional ethnic schools and added two day schools — one Catholic and one government — where Italian was taught during
school hours. In the latter, interviews were conducted with school principals, CO.AS.IT organisers, Italian teachers, parents and, to a lesser extent, pupils. In the conventional ethnic schools, interviews were conducted with organisers from the Dante Alighieri Society, Italian teachers, parents and pupils. In all situations, interviews with parents were conducted by bilingual interviewers.

Two factors associated with the structure of Greek ethnic schools in Sydney led to the choice of the four schools investigated. First, most Greek ethnic schools are associated with two bodies — the Greek Archdiocese and the Greek Orthodox Community. ‘Archdiocese schools’ are affiliated with churches in various parishes and are mainly organised by the local priest and Greek community. The priest is also likely to teach in the school. On the other hand, the Greek Orthodox Community, as an organisation, is responsible for the running of its schools throughout the Sydney metropolitan area. Both bodies conduct ethnic schools in areas of different socioeconomic status. Second, Greek ethnic schools, in contrast to Italian ethnic schools, attract a large percentage of Greek children in the areas they serve. Because children at Greek ethnic schools in Sydney come from a significant proportion of the total Greek population and because of dispersal in two distinct groupings, we decided to select schools in Sydney which represented as many as possible of these variations; hence, the choice of two Archdiocese and two Community schools in areas of varying socio-economic status.

Most interviews with Greek parents and children were conducted by the Sample Survey Centre at the University of Sydney using bilingual interviewers. Because of the relationship we perceived between ethnic schools and the wider issues of multiculturalism and migrant education, we went to lengths to obtain interviews with key officials in Australian organisations concerned with migrants and/or education. A list of these organisations is contained in Appendix A and the structure of interviews for the whole study is outlined in Appendix B. Apart from tape-recorded interviews with 148 individuals (see interview guides, Appendix C), data for this study derived from numerous conversations and correspondence with a variety of individuals directly and indirectly associated with ethnic schools; observations in the classrooms of these schools; and analysis of documents, leaflets and relevant secondary sources.

To assist in grasping our approach to this book, some comment on its structure may be helpful at this point. Chapter 1 outlines the theoretical framework of the study. It sets up the main questions which we attempted to answer by locating them in the context of the
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development of ethnic schools and the latter's relationship to the wider issues of migrant education and multiculturalism. Chapter 2 sets out the data collected on migrants' definitions of the role of ethnic schools. These are examined in detail, drawing out the major variations among the Greek, Italian, Ukrainian and Slovenian schools and the internal differences in these communities between organisers, teachers, parents and pupils. In Chapter 3 we examine the implications of our findings and relate these to a detailed analysis of the place of ethnics in Australian society, migrant education, multiculturalism, and other roles ethnic schools could assume.

Finally, it is not our intention in this introduction to attempt to convey in any detail the main findings of this study. One can only do justice to this by letting the findings unfurl in the context of their supporting evidence. However, it is worthwhile to abbreviate here the main conclusions, not so much for the sake of completeness of these introductory remarks, but rather to sensitise the reader for what follows. To avoid listing a string of conclusions of varying importance, we have confined ourselves to what we consider are the three most significant:

(i) there is considerable variation among migrant communities and within migrant communities as to what ethnic schools can and should achieve and what their relationship to the normal educational system should be;

(ii) migrants and Australian officials concerned with education and/or migration generally see the role of ethnic schools as serving migrants' cultural needs, such as language maintenance, and not as relating to political questions such as equal rights, participation and opportunity. This contrasts with the vigorous role adopted by some migrant communities in the last few years to realise the latter; and

(iii) the existing curricula of ethnic schools raise serious questions about their viability as a form of migrant education and their relationship to perpetuation of migrant inequality, lack of participation and opportunity in Australian society.
In Australia today approximately 100,000 children attend a network of between 600 and 1,000 ‘ethnic schools’ each week. Also known as ‘community’ or ‘Saturday’ schools, ethnic schools operate mainly on a part-time basis from two to eight hours a week. Children who attend these schools are mainly of primary school age and are usually migrants or children of migrants whose parents want them to learn their native language and culture. There are a relatively small number of full-time ethnic schools, such as the Japanese school at Terrey Hills in Sydney, and ‘schools within schools’ where children attend foreign language classes in government schools in conjunction with their normal studies. La Petite Ecole Francaise de Sydney, which has been established as part of Bondi Primary School in Sydney, is an example of the latter (Smolicz, 1975b: 18-19).

Ethnic schools have markedly increased in number since 1970, especially among the Greek and Italian communities. Although the figures of 600 part-time ethnic schools providing instruction for 50,000 students have appeared in a number of sources e.g. Report of the Committee on the Teaching of Migrant Languages in Schools (Australia, 1976: 61) and Ethnic Affairs Commission of New South Wales (New South Wales, 1978: 147), these figures are certainly on the low side as Victoria and New South Wales have over 600 ethnic schools with an enrolment in excess of 50,000 pupils (Australia, 1979: 49). Tsounis’ (1974: 2) study of Greek ethnic schools indicates that the Greeks alone have 350 ethnic schools catering for 25,000 students. Discussions with state and commonwealth education officials indicate that there are probably closer to 1,000 such schools in Australia today (cf. Australia, 1979: 49).

The first ethnic schools in Australia were started in South Australia in 1839 by the Lutheran church. These were full-time day schools using German as the language of instruction for children of German settlers. With the spread of the Lutheran church, German schools appeared later in Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland. By 1900 there were 46 Lutheran schools in South Australia alone. During World War I these schools were either closed or their use of German suspended as legislation forbade school education in a non-English

Very little is known about ethnic schools. The sparse published literature is fragmented and confined to academic journals and a few government reports. While some ethnics have contributed to the literature, their contributions appear to be more in their capacity as academics than as interested spokespersons for ethnic communities. The bulk of this literature has appeared in the last five or six years and is generally brief, consisting of isolated paragraphs in articles dealing with other topics, such as issues of multicultural education, bilingual education and maintenance of ethnic languages. However, there are very few attempts made to link systematically ethnic schools with these wider issues. Before the 1970s, 'the only social knowledge available about ethnic schools consisted of negative comments from teachers who believed that after hours classes retarded the migrant child's progress' (Martin, 1978: 130). This claim is consistent with Harris' (1973: 47) observations of references to ethnic schools in Australian Citizenship Convention Digests during the 1960s. While the 'consensus of opinion was that they did have a place and could be of value', there were also expressions of 'lukewarm support' for ethnic schools, doubts as to their value, and claims that they 'placed too much stress on past loyalties to the detriment of new'. Apart from three reports to governments: Report of the Committee on the Teaching of Migrant Languages in Schools, (Australia, 1976); Report to the Premier, (New South Wales, 1978); and Report of the Committee on Multicultural Education, (Australia, 1979); and Tsounis' (1974) study of Greek ethnic schools, no published work attempts to deal with ethnic schools as an issue in their own right or approaches these schools in the context of the wider society in any detailed or systematic fashion.

References in education journals to the adverse responses of Australians or Australian institutions to ethnic schools have persisted into the 1970s. Other negative comments of a thematic nature centre around financial difficulties of ethnic schools, the poor quality of teachers, curricula and accommodation, and the additional burden these schools represent over and above day schools.

Financial difficulties exist because ethnic schools, unlike other types of 'private' schools in Australia, are not eligible for substantial state aid. Currently, apart from possible, indirect and limited funding through the Schools Commission, there is varying assistance from state governments in New South Wales, South Australia and Tasmania. In New South Wales, funds for ethnic schools are allocated
on a needs basis and average out at a few hundred dollars for each school. In South Australia, funding is on a per capita basis but the total amount available to any ethnic school is not substantially greater than in New South Wales. Funding for ethnic schools in Tasmania, by contrast, is not based on any particular formula and consists of grants, loans and/or teaching assistance. Unlike New South Wales and South Australia, the Tasmanian government funds only a handful of ethnic schools, which possibly explains why these schools enjoy greater assistance. According to one official, the Greeks in Hobart, for instance, were recently granted $105,000 for capital funding and ongoing teaching commitments.

The Role of Ethnic Schools

From this scant, fragmented literature it is not always easy to clarify the role of ethnic schools, for variety of definitions of their role makes generalisation difficult. Martin (1978: 130-1), for instance, describes four definitions of the role of these schools which are now being advanced. The first defines ethnic schools as 'harmful competitors for the child's time and attention' and is inferred from the fact that ethnic schools are not taken seriously. This point of view is evident in the odd newspaper article (e.g. "Homeland" Schools Run by Migrants', 1969: 3; and Skelton, 1974: 21), some government reports, such as the Recommendations to the Minister for Immigration from the Migrant Task Force Committee, Victoria, in 1973 (Bullivant, 1975: 124), and is implied in accounts of Australians' indifference and hostility to ethnic schools (see Smolicz and Wiseman, 1971: 13-14; Report on the Survey of Child Migrant Education in Schools of High Migrant Density in Melbourne, (Australia 1973: 12-13); and Tsounis, 1974: 4-5). Perhaps the clearest expression of this position is contained in a report on disadvantaged schools prepared for the Director of Primary Education in Victoria in 1974. The report noted that many migrant schoolchildren suffer severe hardships by attending lengthy after school sessions in poorly accommodated ethnic schools. It went on to say that

The present after hours ethnic school system only encourages a deep sense of independence by the migrants, drawing them further away from any form of integration with the rest of the community. It also undermines the confidence of teachers working in migrant schools because parents do not show confidence in the programmes currently available in the schools since they do not include ethnic languages and culture (Victoria, Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 321, 1974-76: 4761-2).
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The second definition of ethnic schools which Martin offers ‘acknowledges the right of ethnic communities to seek to transmit their cultural heritage through ethnic schools, but sees no place for these schools in the established educational system and denies that they have any claim on public funds’. Interestingly enough, this point of view is current among some ethnic communities. Noussair (1977: 21-2), for example, seems to convey the temporary role of ethnic schools by stressing that a ‘basic objective’ of Yugoslav ethnic schools in Sydney is ‘to promote the introduction of a regular curriculum in the Australian Educational System to teach the languages and cultures of the people of the Yugoslav origin’. Current Saturday classes are ‘inadequate to achieve the objectives’. In this view there is no long-term role for a system of separate ethnic schools. Instead, they are seen as a transitory phenomenon, a means to the full incorporation of a wide range of languages within the existing school system. It is difficult to tell from available literature how prevalent this position is among ethnic communities, although according to Bowen (1977: 364) it is ‘the publicly-expressed majority ethnic viewpoint’ (cf. Ramsay, 1978: 53).

The third definition of ethnic schools sees them as having a role alongside of day schools in teaching community languages and in multicultural education. This point of view acknowledges that financial support for these schools could be justified if their standards were improved. This definition is the most common in the existing literature. Apart from the support given by the Committee on Migrant Languages (Australia, 1976: 113), there have been numerous expressions of this position over the past five years e.g. Golding et al., 1973: 21; Tsounis, 1974: 67-8; Wiseman, 1974: 159; Smolicz, 1975a: 25, 1975b: 20, 1976: 68-9; Inquiry into Schools of High Migrant Density, (Australia, 1975: 20-1); Noble and Ryan, 1976: 43-4; Cameron, 1977: 340; Bowen, 1977: 363; and New South Wales, 1978: 149-50.

Finally, the fourth definition which Martin adopts regards ethnic schools as ‘agents of ethnic communities’ and capable of taking responsibility for ‘teaching community languages and cultures on behalf of the education systems as a whole, which implies that they should be funded’. Of the relevant seventy submissions to the Committee on Migrant Languages, only a fifth supported this position, that is, separate ethnic schools. This was ‘the policy advocated by most small ethnic groups, who saw it as the only realistic way of having their languages taught in Australia’ (Smolicz and Secombe, 1977: 18; and Martin, 1978: 131).
The explanation of this diversity of definitions of ethnic schools is not readily apparent. However, it would appear to be related to diversity in wider philosophies or definitions of the place of ethnics in Australian society. This is indicated by the change in outlook on ethnic schools by someone such as Smolicz, who has made several small, indirect contributions to knowledge of ethnic schools over the past five years. In 1971, for instance, Smolicz and Wiseman (1971: 13-16) pessimistically suggested that because of the indifference, if not active hostility of the host society to ethnic cultural pluralism and the absence of any real chance of governmental aid to ventures which could reinforce it, any hope for a large number of viable ethnic schools is doomed to disappointment.

As a practical approach to this 'problem' they suggested the introduction of courses on migrant languages and cultures in both primary and secondary schools. This position is close to Martin's second definition of ethnic schools and contrasts with Smolicz's position some five years later where he adheres to Martin's third definition by recommending funding for ethnic schools and their continued existence in cooperation with day schools (Smolicz, 1976: 68-9). If Smolicz's change in outlook to what is now the most common position in the literature on ethnic schools is any guide, then it is necessary to examine the development of thinking on the place of ethnics in Australian society to see to what extent changing and diverse viewpoints on ethnic relations are related to different definitions of ethnic schools and to their emergence as an issue in migrant, academic and political circles.

Ethnic Schools, Migrant Education and Multiculturalism

While the recent increase in the number of ethnic schools and our lack of knowledge of these schools are sufficient reasons for investigating their role in Australian society, there are no obvious guides to the questions we should ask in our research endeavours. Such questions are, however, illuminated by linking ethnic schools to two broad areas which are currently, and have been historically, of immense importance in terms of social change and its consequences. These areas are education and migration.

The link between education and ethnic schools lies in the relatively new issue of 'migrant education'. From the number of conferences and discussions in education literature it is clear that the content of migrant education is more abstract than concrete. Hence, because migrant education means different things to different people (see
Nicoll, 1977), there emerges the question of ethnic communities also having a role in contributing to and illuminating migrant education through their ethnic school systems.

It is, however, the broad area of migration which gives the question of the role of ethnic schools greater salience. Shifts in thinking on how migrants can and should fit into Australian society, from assimilationist and integrationist or 'melting pot' viewpoints to current abstract notions of multiculturalism, raise the problem of sorting out what multiculturalism means in reality. Because multiculturalism and its synonym, 'ethnic pluralism' also mean different things to different people, many definitions now compete with each other in the public arena. Three different notions of multiculturalism are clearly distinguishable, which we will refer to as 'demographic multiculturalism', 'holistic multiculturalism', and 'political multiculturalism'. These different notions of multiculturalism will be elaborated on later. What is important at this point is that in political multiculturalism there is an emphasis on 'ethnic rights' and that ethnics/migrants, through their own ethnic organisations, are capable of acting as interest groups in the political arena to achieve ethnic goals. Because ethnic schools are examples of ethnic organisations which could have a role in achieving ethnic goals, and because of the possible role ethnic schools could play in a system or systems of migrant education, we arrive at our first major question: What role do ethnics see ethnic schools playing in Australian society? This question is particularly salient because in past and most current discussions of migrant education and in policy approaches to migrant settlement, the main focus has been on problems and changes needed in existing Australian institutional structures. The Report of the Committee on the Teaching of Migrant Languages in Schools (Australia, 1976) and the Report of the Review of Post-arrival Programs and Services (Australia, 1978) — 'The Galbally Report' — illustrate this bias towards the role of existing structures and overlook the role of the migrant communities' contribution in migrant education and settlement.

Another source of significant research questions lies in the relationship between ethnic schools and the wider issue of multiculturalism. In light of the previously mentioned diversity of definitions of ethnic schools and their possible relationship to different philosophies on the place of ethnics in Australian society, it is worth examining the different philosophies of multiculturalism and their development more closely.

Philosophies, or theories and policies of how ethnics can and should
fit into Australian society are not idiosyncratic to our local situation but have been borrowed from elsewhere. Poole (1977: 5), for instance, speaks of three ideologies previously outlined by Charles Price (1966) which applied to the American scene and have relevance in Australia — 'Anglo-conformism', the 'melting pot' view and 'permanent ethnic pluralism' (cf. Gordon, 1964). The first holds that ethnics can and should cast away their language, customs and attitudes in favour of the basic Anglo-Saxon 'core culture'. The 'melting pot' view, as applied to Australia, holds that it is possible and desirable for ethnics and Australians alike to emerge from the crucible 'melted, blended and reshaped' as a brand new species. On the other hand, permanent ethnic pluralism holds that each ethnic community desiring it, be permitted to create its own communal life and preserve its own cultural heritage indefinitely, while taking part in the general life of the nation.

These three ideologies or models of Australian ethnic relations have considerable currency in Australia. It is commonplace to see in academic journals and in government reports references to Anglo-conformism and the 'melting pot' view having given way to a model of ethnic pluralism or multiculturalism. The Inquiry into Schools of High Migrant Density (Australia, 1975: 19), for example, noted that 'Acceptance of the fact of multiculturalism implies a rejection of two other common conceptions of Australian society, those of Anglo-Saxon conformity and the “melting pot”.'

Making a similar point, Birrell (1978: 133) points out that the current favour enjoyed by the notion of multiculturalism stems from the inadequacy of two pre-existing models: The Anglo-conformity (or assimilationist) approach and the “melting pot” mode' (see also Smolicz, 1971; and Cigler, 1975).

Given the taken for granted nature of Anglo-conformism in social and political circles up to the late sixties, it is not difficult to see why ethnic schools were a submerged issue. As mentioned above, Smolicz's early view on ethnic schools was closely related to his awareness of Australians' hostility to ethnic pluralism and adherence to what was then a pervasive, popular ideology of Anglo-conformism. In this milieu questions about ethnic schools did not arise because these schools were not an issue: they were not an issue because there was no place for them in a model or ideology of Anglo-conformism. When the question of ethnic schools did arise it was an unpopular one. As Smolicz and Wiseman (1971: 11) commented regarding the question of the establishment of ethnic schools, '[T]here appears to be a veil of mystery shrouding the whole issue. Indeed, it is
so rarely discussed that one could almost suspect that there is some unspoken agreement not to air such possibilities.'

The influence this assimilation oriented Anglo-conformism has had on Australian institutions and on the way in which they have defined situations involving ethnics is now perceived in official circles. The Inquiry into Schools of High Migrant Density (Australia, 1975: 1) noted in its second paragraph that

The assimilationist model has had a profound effect on the way in which Australia's social institutions have defined their role and structured their services in relation to non-English-speaking migrants. As a result, these institutions have been largely unresponsive to their special needs and problems.

Accompanying new multicultural conceptions of Australian society are certain developments which have helped bring the issue of ethnic schools out of obscurity. Many ethnic communities, which were previously defined as transient phenomena in a process of assimilation, now present themselves as legitimate elements in their own right within the wider Australian social structure. Furthermore, a significant number of ethnics (and some interested Australians) are claiming that ethnics themselves should be responsible for ethnics' welfare which can only be achieved by ethnic organisation and political participation (see Storer, n. d. 1975a, 1975b; Martin, 1976; and cf. Rodopoulos, 1976). It is the significance of the ethnic contribution to ethnic welfare, specifically in the area of migrant education, which has helped focus attention on ethnic schools (Smolicz, 1976: 60; Smolicz and Secombe, 1977: 2; and Martin, 1978: 55-8).

At this point an interesting question arises. If multicultural notions of Australian society have contributed to the surfacing of the issue of ethnic schools, why are there different definitions of ethnic schools? If it is maintained that broad conceptions of Australian ethnic relations do influence definitions of specific entities such as ethnic schools, then it is necessary to examine the notion of multiculturalism more closely.

Multiculturalism — One or Many Models?
It is clear that 'the multicultural model' (Birrell, 1978: 135) is not one model but a catchword for many conceptions of society at a broad level. Delineation of different conceptions of multiculturalism is important, not only because it may help to clarify derivative issues and concepts such as migrant education (see Matthews, 1975; Banks, 1976; Nicoll, 1977: 9ff.; and Report of the Review of Post-arrival...
Examination of current discussion of the notion of multiculturalism reveals three distinct definitions of Australian ethnic relations. Moreover, these definitions bear a strong resemblance to the four definitions of ethnic schools outlined by Martin. The first definition of multiculturalism is ‘demographic multiculturalism’. This viewpoint acknowledges the diversity of ethnic populations in Australia, often in numerical terms, by noticing but not valuing this diversity (see Steinle, 1976). It is a position found mainly in educational organisations and is indicated by the inconsistency between what is said about meeting the needs of ethnic schoolchildren and the reality of the classroom. In the ‘flurry of conferences, papers and curriculum programmes’ (Martin, 1978: 134) in educational circles and in policy statements on multicultural education (e.g. Victorian Association for Multicultural Education, 1975: 8-9), the ideas of multiculturalism and a multicultural society are accepted, but at the school level there has been less structural change than the above suggests. While it has been argued that Anglo-Australian domination of schools is not as ‘absolute’ as it once was (Nicoll, 1977: 54), ‘token gestures’ to meet the needs of ethnic schoolchildren (Inquiry into Schools of High Migrant Density (Australia, 1975: 19)), the reluctance of teacher education bodies to change their programs in response to ethnic diversity (Martin, 1978: 135-6), and ‘apathy’ and ‘obstruction’ among some educators to the development of multicultural education (Report of Review of Post-arrival Programs and Services for Migrants (Australia, 1978: 106)) suggest persistence of Anglo-conformist thinking in educational circles (see also Matheson, 1974; Commissioner for Community Relations, 1976: 33; and Ramsay, 1978: 53-4). It is demographic multiculturalism which resembles and appears to lie behind Martin’s first and second definitions of ethnic schools. Hence, it is not surprising that indifference and antagonism to ethnic schools was found among teachers in schools with large numbers of migrant children (Report on the Survey of Child Migrant Education (Australia, 1973: 12-13)).

Another view of multiculturalism can be termed ‘holistic multiculturalism’. This view regards ‘mutual understanding and tolerance . . . within a context of unity and diversity’ (Jayasuriya, 1977: 55) as characterising the sort of relationship which can and should exist between Australians and ethnics. There is often open criticism of existing ethnic relations and pleas for innovation in
Australian institutions to meet the ethnic presence. In reconciling the needs of the host society and its ethnic constituents, holistic multiculturalism stresses the value of the wholeness and the welfare of the entire society, the capacity of existing structures to meet the special needs of ethnics (sometimes in co-operation with ethnic bodies), and the problems of structural pluralism such as 'separatism' and segregated ethnic group life. Jayasuriya (1977) expresses this type of multiculturalism, as does Grassby's (1977) notion of the 'family of the nation' (see also Smolicz, 1976: 42; Zubrzycki, 1977; and Report of Review of Post-arrival Programs and Services for Migrants (Australia, 1978: 104-5)). Holistic multiculturalism closely resembles the third definition of ethnic schools presented by Martin which recognises the value of the need for ethnic schools to co-operate with existing educational systems.

'Political multiculturalism' is the third strand running through current discussion of multiculturalism. This perspective emphasises the role of political processes in Australian ethnic relations and regards ethnic groups as legitimate interest groups and as having responsibility for realisation of ethnic goals. In this approach, focus is on the political nature of relations between the parts, usually 'Australians' and various ethnic communities, rather than on the needs of the whole society. Ethnics have only recently begun to articulate this position (see Storer, n.d. (1975a, 1975b) and Piperoglou, 1977), which Martin refers to as the 'ethnic rights stand' in her discussion of 'robust pluralism' (1976, 1978: 50ff.), as have other interested scholars (e.g. Bullivant, 1976, 1977; and Cahill, 1977). It is not difficult to see that from political multiculturalism one can derive Martin's fourth definition of ethnic schools. This is not to say that all those who see ethnic schools in terms of the latter position subscribe to political multiculturalism. Rather, the correspondence goes no further than the mutual stress placed on the responsibility of ethnics themselves to achieve their goals and on the role separate ethnic structures/schools can play.

In drawing a relationship between these three senses of multiculturalism and Martin's four definitions of ethnic schools, it must be stressed that there is no firm dividing line between the former, nor do their proponents remain firmly in one category. Grassby, for instance, while illustrative of holistic multiculturalism, has expressed elements of political multiculturalism. As Minister for Immigration in 1973, Grassby articulated in A Multicultural Society for the Future (1973) his position on a number of ethnic issues. As Martin (1978: 55) notes, Grassby 'even touched on ethnic political participation, "the
only acceptable means by which disadvantaged groups may seek to reverse the forces militating against them". Furthermore, some discussions of multiculturalism reveal more than one of the above types of multiculturalism. In the Australian Ethnic Affairs Council's submission to the Australian Population and Immigration Council (Australia as a Multicultural Society (Australia, 1977: 16-17)), for example, there are expressions of holistic and political multiculturalism. Finally, it is also because of 'varying degrees of concreteness and penetration' (Martin, 1978: 56) in discussions of multiculturalism that one finds confusion and lack of awareness of the implications of structural pluralism. This leads to failure to grasp some elements of political multiculturalism (see Martin, 1976).

This relationship between broad ideology of Australian ethnic relations, such as multiculturalism, and diversity of thinking on ethnic schools, has certain implications for the widely accepted understanding of the development of the models of Anglo-conformism, the 'melting pot' and multiculturalism. One assumption in discussion of the linear development of the latter from the former is that earlier models are replaced by later ones or, in other words, are mutually exclusive. But the above discussion of types of multiculturalism indicates persistence of Anglo-conformist and, to some extent, 'melting pot' thought in current thinking on Australian ethnic relations. A more accurate picture of the development of broad ideologies of the place of ethnics in Australian society is outlined by Martin (1978: 27ff.), who posits three phases — an 'assimilationist' phase, a phase where ethnics (Martin refers to migrants) were defined as people with problems or as a 'social problem', and a current phase of 'differentiation'. The assimilationist phase in Australia lasted up to the late sixties. Around this time, 'predictions about migrant assimilability were often not borne out in reality' and 'the staff of a number of organisations were finding non-English-speakers a disturbing obstacle to the adequate performance of their job' (Martin, 1978: 33). All this, together with the sheer increase in the numbers of non-English-speaking migrants, placed considerable pressure on Australian organisations such as health and schools. As a consequence, 'there gradually consolidated a definition of migrants as a social problem' (Martin, 1978: 36). In other words, if Australian schools and hospitals, which were responsible for handling large numbers of migrants, were not able to cope effectively, then it was because of problems pertaining to individual migrants and not the organisation: it was a psychological rather than a structural problem. Around the early seventies, the 'migrants as people with problems'
phase gave way to what Martin calls the period of differentiation among definers of migrants *vis-à-vis* Australian society (Martin, 1978: 50ff.). This means, as the above discussion indicates, that migrants (and other ethnics), as well as Australian institutions, are defining the place of ethnics in Australia and the action necessary to realise it (see Martin, 1978: 141).

The significance of Martin’s depiction of the development of ideologies or definitions of ethnics in Australia is twofold: it acknowledges the persistence of early models and their coexistence alongside of recent thinking and corresponds with the above typology of multiculturalism. All this is important for understanding the diversity of definitions of ethnic schools in Australia. Just as different ideologies, such as Anglo-conformism, have lain behind diverse understanding of concepts like migrant education (Nicoll, 1977: 9f), linking definitions of ethnic schools to diverse conceptions of multiculturalism helps us to make sense of why ‘ethnic education means different things to different people’ (Piperoglou, 1977: 9). That is, because of individuals’ adherence to different conceptions of multiculturalism, ethnic schools are seen to have different roles in achieving a multicultural Australia.

This relationship between definitions of the role of ethnic schools and diverse conceptions of multiculturalism raises the second and third major questions of this study. Given the wide variation of thinking in official and non-official circles and among ethnics on ethnic schools and multiculturalism, what is the relationship between ethnics’ expectations of the role of ethnic schools and (i) what they are likely to achieve, and (ii) the role of ethnic schools envisaged by Australian education and related authorities?
In addressing the first of our major questions: What role do ethnics see ethnic schools playing in Australian society? We turn now to our case studies of ethnic schools among the Greek, Italian, Ukrainian and Slovenian communities.

Greeks
In attempting to account for Greek ethnic schools in Sydney, it is important to recognise the significance of the split among Greeks into the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of Australia and New Zealand and Greek Orthodox Communities. The first Greek ethnic school in Sydney, and most likely the first ethnic school in that city, was established in 1896 by the Greek Orthodox Community, a lay ethnic organisation which was responsible for establishing the first Greek church in Sydney in 1899. Although this organisation did not recognise the ecclesiastic authority of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, it brought priests to Australia for the purpose of providing religious instruction in both church and school. These priests provided classes in catechism and religious instruction in ethnic schools up until the period of large scale Greek migration to Australia. In the mid to late 1940s, presumably because of pressure of their regular religious duties, priests largely withdrew from teaching in these schools and were replaced by laymen. It was also during this decade and the next that Greeks in the outer suburbs of Sydney established their own independent Greek schools. Although there were a number of minor conflicts throughout the first half of the twentieth century between the Archdiocese and its ecclesiastic representatives in Sydney, on the one hand, and the Greek Orthodox Community, on the other (see Bottomley, 1979: 53), the major conflict did not occur until 1960. This confrontation was apparently over the issue of the right of the Archdiocese to take full responsibility for, among other things, ethnic schools in Australia, as well as disagreement over recognition of the Patriarch in Constantinople as the spiritual leader of the Greek church. It was as a consequence of this split that the Archdiocese began to develop its own ethnic schools. Bottomley (1979: 54) has commented on the seriousness of the split:

The fact that practising priests are regarded as uncanonical has resulted in the performance of thousands of marriages that are not recognised as legal
in Greece. This creates obvious problems for couples who may want to return, and it means that their children can be disinherit ed in Greece on the grounds of illegitimacy. These are powerful sanctions on the side of the official church. The split has caused a good deal of bitterness, and undoubtedly alienated some people from participation in either Church or Community, through suspicion of power play on both sides.

Bottomley goes on to suggest that the split is ideologically, rather than economically, based. That is, it is tension between the beliefs of equality, democracy and brotherhood inherent in Orthodoxy and the authoritarian practice of the church, brought about by historical, social, geographical and demographic forces, that has produced this schism. She concludes: 'To many supporters of the Federation of Greek Orthodox Communities, the Church-Community schism is a result of the gap between principle and practice (1979: 57).'

This political-ideological organisation among Greeks in Sydney might be expected to have implications for the expectations of Greek ethnic schools held by organisers, teachers and parents, depending on which particular body — Archdiocese or Community — these individuals identify and associate with.

The organisation of Greek ethnic schools in Sydney
Among the 45,000 Greek-born population in Sydney there are approximately 107 ethnic schools. These consist of 55 Archdiocese schools, 45 organised by the Greek Orthodox Community of N.S.W., and 7 independent schools. Schools from the latter category have not been included in this study. A distinctive feature of Community schools is that they are not attached to churches or parishes. Even though the Greek Orthodox Community has five churches in Sydney, the schools are solely operated and organised by the school committee of the Greek Orthodox Community. Organisers claimed that the Community allots approximately $150,000 annually for the operation of these schools, which operate on a financial loss. It was estimated that in 1978, for example, the Greek Orthodox Community lost $35,000 from the operation of these schools, a loss that one organiser regarded as a necessary burden in light of the important responsibility of the Community to provide this service.

Community schools cater for approximately 4,000 pupils and employ between 60-65 teachers. Enrolment figures for Archdiocese schools are reportedly somewhat higher, given their greater number, which is approximately 6,000 pupils. The schools in this study varied in the length of time they had been operating: Archdiocese schools were the oldest, both being established in 1962, the Community
school located in the western suburbs commenced in 1968, while the other, being the most recent of the four, began in 1972. Teachers and organisers spoke of increasing numbers of enrolments at their respective schools, especially over recent years. For instance, one organiser estimated that three schools on the north shore had more than tripled the overall enrolment from 70 to 250 in the last five years. The Community school situated in the eastern suburbs had an enrolment in the first year of operation of 40, which gradually increased to 180 in 1978 and declined to 160 in 1979. The reason offered for the decrease was the opening of other schools nearby. A teacher at the largest school estimated that new enrolments at her school numbered 80-90 per year, while only between 30-40 left annually. One organiser associated with the Community schools estimated the total annual increase in student numbers for all these schools at 10% of current enrolments. However, he did point out that there were considerable fluctuations in numbers from suburb to suburb on a yearly basis as a function of internal migration movements.

In general, these schools operate about 2 or 3 days a week after regular school hours and for 1½ to 2 hours at a time, with an average total of three hours a week. Greatest variation between schools in the study was in the number of enrolments and the teacher-pupil ratio. The smallest number of pupils enrolled in any school was 60, the largest 500. Difference in class size was even more pronounced. The school catering for 500 pupils employed only 5 teachers, while one other school, with an enrolment of 80, employed 8 teachers with class sizes between 10 and 24. In general, it appears that Archdiocese schools enjoy much more favourable staff-pupil ratios than do Community schools. Socioeconomic status seems important in accounting for these observed differences. For instance, schools located in the wealthier suburbs, which also tended to be Archdiocese schools, indicated the lowest staff-pupil ratios. Conversely, schools in low status areas, such as parts of the western suburbs, displayed high staff-pupil ratios. But the most noticeable difference between schools of dissimilar status was in the qualifications of teachers. Of eight teachers in one school in a high status area, all were fluently bilingual and at least half were trained teachers. This contrasts with teachers in the other three schools who had no formal training and were not as fluently bilingual in English and Greek.

Archdiocese schools tend to operate in church halls or rooms attached to the church, although some rely on public school buildings. One school in the study was located in a renovated house close to the
church, purchased for this purpose with funds provided by local Greeks. Community schools rely mainly on public school premises in which to hold classes.

The school committee of the Greek Orthodox Community is responsible for selecting texts, hiring teachers and writing the curriculum. They receive texts from Greece and modify them for the Australian situation, for example, replacing saints’ days with birthdays as an important event to be celebrated. Archdiocese schools are conducted through the local parish communities. Consequently, the local priest, usually in conjunction with the church council of the parish, is responsible for organising and overseeing operation of the school in matters such as texts and hiring of teachers. There is no uniform curriculum in these schools and there appears to be considerable variation from school to school, especially with respect to the texts used. One Archdiocese school, for instance, employed texts from America, whereas the other received its texts from Greece. However, at the time of this study, the Archdiocese was reportedly in the process of establishing a uniform curriculum. The Greek Archbishop has an adviser on education, who provides general guidelines for the curriculum, and there is also an educational committee for Archdiocese schools which meets annually to discuss various aspects related to the running of Greek schools. In addition, the Greek government has an official in Australia who is officially involved in developing a curriculum for all Greek ethnic schools.

Both Community and Archdiocese schools charge fees in order to cover expenses, mainly teachers’ salaries. Clearly these fees which, for one of the schools studied, were $35 a term, are inadequate to cover costs. However, as one organiser explained, the school committee is reluctant to raise fees for fear of exceeding what most parents are able to afford. One teacher complained about some private ethnic schools which, she claimed, were established primarily to make profit and charged exhorbitant rates. Limited funding for Greek (and other) ethnic schools is available from the N.S.W. Government on request each year and is allocated on a needs basis.

The variation in socioeconomic status between different suburban areas of Sydney in which Greek ethnic schools are located also indicates variations in cultural characteristics such as ethnic identity. For instance, in some of the schools studied the majority of pupils, like their parents, knew very little English. On the other hand, most children attending other schools were second generation Greek, born in Australia and knew very little of their native language. Their parents also probably spoke English in the home. These differences,
indicated by the behaviour, attitudes and networks of the children and their families, may be expected to have a significant effect on expectations of the role of ethnic schools perceived by organisers, teachers, parents and pupils.

The role of ethnic schools

Organisers, teachers, parents and pupils associated with Greek ethnic schools seemed to fall into two categories with respect to their familiarity with issues, problems and questions concerning the role of ethnic schools. On the one hand, organisers and teachers appeared, on the whole, to be more aware of some of the important underlying issues. On the other hand, parents and children generally showed less awareness and tended to display much less familiarity with questions about the role of ethnic schools.

Although there was general agreement among organisers and teachers that ethnic schools were formed to teach the Greek language, religion and culture, there was some diversity of opinion as to why they were initially established. In the eyes of organisers and teachers, Greek Community schools, which originated much earlier than their Archdiocese counterparts, were established for the purpose of facilitating communication among Greek families and for ensuring continuation of Greek ethnicity. The latter was seen as crucial in the 1940s and 1950s when many immigrants believed that the Australian government was pursuing an assimilationist policy by actively discouraging preservation of foreign languages. This was evidenced in legislation passed about 1945 which stipulated that 25 per cent of the content of all ethnic newspapers had to be in English. One effect of Greek ethnic schools, according to one organiser, is that they have given official recognition to this minority language and hence, have elevated its status in society. Greek children are now able to speak the language freely 'without feeling ashamed'.

Organisers of Archdiocese schools tended to see language and religion as inseparable and placed more emphasis on religious instruction in the curriculum than did organisers of Community schools. As one priest commented:

we feel it is a good education to have another language behind them, and especially as their worship is explained in the Greek culture we have received from the past, as formulated in the age of the great fathers of the church from the fourth to eighth centuries. Most part of the liturgy is still held in the biblical Greek, so we feel it's an education which enables them to understand their faith as well . . . also, I believe with those peoples who have contact with the mother country Greece, [it] would be an asset to be able to have a holiday and have the knowledge of Greek available to them.
Most teachers and organisers agreed that Archdiocese schools were established by the church rather than the impetus coming from a collection of interested parents. Another organiser expressed the view that identity is inherently bound up with language and, given the ‘marginal man’ situation of many migrants in Australian society, it is only through the teaching of Greek language to Greeks that they can discover their true identity. One teacher suggested that many migrants intend to return to Greece and hence, by sending their children to an ethnic school, they are equipping them with the linguistic requirements for life in that country. Others referred to the increased personal status to be achieved by being able to speak more than one language and the practical utility of being bilingual in a multicultural society.

The common view expressed that the role of ethnic schools was to facilitate communication in the family seemed to depend on background cultural characteristics of the pupils concerned. For instance, in one school, where most pupils were Australian-born with English as their mother tongue, both teachers and organiser commented on the difficulty of teaching Greek to children when their parents did not speak Greek in the home. These children, who, according to their teachers, did not consider themselves to be Greek but learned Greek as a foreign language, clearly did not communicate in Greek with their parents. One teacher commented:

I have noticed when grandmother comes, or an aunt, who doesn’t speak any English, the children will make an effort to speak as much Greek as they can, but, on the whole, they regard it as just another language that they are learning, it’s not part of their homelife unless the parents say ‘speak Greek, don’t speak English’. That may, in a way, be our fault because we are teaching it as a foreign language.

Why did parents of these children send them to a Greek school? According to one teacher they did so in the hope that ‘becoming more Greek in their ways’ might keep children in the family unit longer. As she noted: ‘from my experience I have found that parents are afraid that if their children cannot speak Greek then they will become too Australian oriented and flit away from the family.’

The curriculum was very similar for all schools, focusing on writing, reading and Greek grammar. Other subjects included Greek history, geography, and social aspects of life in Greece. While religious instruction formed a major part of the curriculum of Archdiocese schools, not one of the teachers or organisers associated with Community schools mentioned religion as part of their curriculum. Although the need for ethnic schools to teach language
and culture was recognised by all organisers and teachers, it was also generally agreed that education in the regular school system must have precedence because 'migrants should all speak English as a first priority'. As one teacher exclaimed, 'this is where the future success of the child lies'. To this extent, both organisers and teachers saw ethnic schools competing with the regular school system for students' time and for this reason some teachers admitted that they did not set too much homework. There was a general feeling among most teachers that the ethnic school, insofar as it was another school system, was overburdening the child. One teacher suggested this problem might be largely overcome if children were not permitted to enrol until they were at least ten years old. This view of ethnic schools was often in conflict with teachers' conscientious ideals of covering and extending the curriculum.

When questioned about the major problems of ethnic schools, organisers and teachers pointed to lack of finance, limited facilities, lack of adequately qualified teachers in both the Greek language and teaching techniques, and irrelevancy of texts. Organisers of Archdiocese schools highlighted problems posed by using texts which were produced in Greece and which required considerable explanation for pupils to understand. One organiser noted: 'we are . . . contemplating the printing of our own books. These books will contain all aspects of the children's lives and the things they are confronted with'. He saw need for more composite texts containing material on Greece, Australia, history and religion. A teacher in an Archdiocese school saw the major problem as lack of well defined aims and stressed the need for one central organisation, which could facilitate communication between all ethnic schools. Referring to her own school, she pointed to lack of any set curriculum and the emphasis placed on completion of texts with little regard for their comprehension by students. This emphasis appeared to be a response to satisfy parents who, according to most teachers, showed considerable concern about the need to cover material quickly. This same teacher saw the need for an educational committee of the school, made up of teachers, parents, organisers and people who were informed on educational techniques and philosophies. This view, or at least variations of this same theme, was common. One organiser associated with Archdiocese schools expressed the need for regular seminars with educationalists and teachers so that the latter could be informed on how to cope with problems of teaching children. It was reported that the Greek Orthodox Community had allocated between $8,000-$10,000 for payment to educationalists for assistance in
The issue of relevance of the curriculum was particularly problematical for both teachers and organisers. In response to the question: Would you like to see ethnic schools teaching something about what it means to be a migrant in Australia? Most teachers responded positively but added that there was insufficient time, while some mentioned their accountability to parents who were primarily interested in the ability of their children to speak Greek. The one teacher who opposed this idea taught in the school in a high socioeconomic area, which had predominantly second generation Greek children. She said,

at our school they don't consider themselves to be migrants nor are they looked upon as migrants in the schools that they attend, because I would say 98% of students go to a private school in which they are not considered to be migrants. I know they are going to come up against it sooner or later but they don't realise — they haven't come across it and so [this material] may be better suited in a school where there is a 'newly out from Greece' population,

and added:

I personally do not think that trying to introduce them to the fact that they are migrants or from migrant heritage will help. I think that this would be working against the whole thing of assimilating cultures into Australia.

The organiser from the same school regarded teaching what it means to be a migrant in Australian society as possibly creating divisions between groups. This in turn would cause 'friction' and hence should not be part of the curriculum. Another organiser from the Archdiocese school on the north shore regarded inclusion of this material in the curriculum as undesirable because it would result in introduction of teachers' political biases. In something of a contrast, an organiser from the Greek Community saw the curriculum of these schools as needing to focus on language, culture and the Australian way of life and added that teaching 'the glory that was Greece' had no place in the curriculum of Greek ethnic schools in Australia. These differing views on the curriculum between organisers of Archdiocese schools and Community schools probably indicate much more deep rooted beliefs about what these schools should be achieving. An organiser, associated with Community schools, pointed out the close association between church and education which exists in Greece. He claimed that 'every Greek government has a ministry
which is called the Ministry for Religious and Educational Affairs' and added:

for the first time in history... the Greek government has sent one, two or three educational experts to Australia. This has happened for the first time in 100 years of Greek immigration [and] probably means they want to direct the education of Australian-born Greek children to a Greek way, to make the Greek Greeks. In other words, to perpetuate the Greek thinking at any cost. This lay Greek community came out opposite that view and we say that if Greek is going to be taught at the level of the school system, we prefer the Australian government to do it, and not the Greek. So you see the Greek Community is much more oriented towards an Australian education system.

The issue of the role of the Greek government and the church in education is particularly contentious among Greeks and has its roots in attempts by various Greek Archbishops sent to Australia in the past to bring education under control of the church. Some of the bitterness generated by this issue was conveyed by an organiser from the Greek Community:

we say the church is to teach Christ, not Greek and the church is to preach, not read. It should confine itself to actual religious matters and leave the education to laymen. This is the crux of the matter, it has been so for the Greek Community, for eighty years since its inception.

For some schools, low levels of attendance were considered a problem. But in general, at least for the schools in this study, attendance, as a proportion of the size of the Greek population in the areas in question, seemed high. This may be partly because the teaching of Greek in these schools does not confront the problem of dialects, which poses problems for teaching other languages (e.g. see discussion of Italian ethnic schooling in Melbourne and also Bottomley, 1979). As one teacher stated, 'here we teach them the Greek language, no dialects'. An organiser claimed that about 80 per cent of Greek parents in the area served by his school sent their children to the ethnic school. The reasons offered for why these school are not used more extensively tended to focus on difficulties associated with times classes are held. For instance, one teacher commented that,

the times make it just too much for some children who have just completed 5 or 6 hours of regular schooling. But also most children are expected to work in their father's business after regular school.

One organiser involved with Archdiocese schools suggested that part
of the problem with low attendance at these schools is the low educational level of some parents:

some parents are not informed enough to understand what it means for them to send their children to the ethnic schools because perhaps their own education is not sufficient — they are not informed enough to see the importance of the ethnic schools to their lives, to their children and to their family. The more the children are informed and made to feel proud of their heritage and language and culture, the [fewer] problems we have in the families and with standards in the community.

Another reason, offered by a teacher whose school was located in an area of relatively high socioeconomic status, was that some parents would not send their children unless the school was staffed by fully qualified teachers.

In light of these problems identified by teachers and organisers, it is interesting to note their response to the question of government taking over the role now performed by ethnic schools. All wanted to see Greek taught in the regular school system, although if this eventuated they would still like to see ethnic schools continue in a slightly different role. The majority saw the teaching of Greek in government schools as a purely linguistic exercise and argued that if this were adopted, then ethnic schools could concentrate on teaching cultural and religious aspects. As one organiser of Community schools stated:

we believe that the Greek language and all the other ethnic languages can be taught better if they are under the education system and, of course, until that happens, we have the task of having our schools teach the language. When the Greek language and other languages . . . get into the education department and taught at school, then our afternoon schools can play a different role — e.g. cultural promotion, theatrical songs, etc. historical, religious and other subjects.

An organiser of Archdiocese schools suggested that ethnic schools might cater for children at primary school level while the regular educational system could teach Greek at the secondary level:

in the Greek school we are not aiming at giving the children just words, it's a mentality, an approach of coming to their own environment. I will say high school would be considered the time to be transferred to a different structure. Again, I don't have any children, but, if I did, I would like my children to learn more than a language, not just words.

A variation on this theme was offered by another organiser of an Archdiocese school who regarded language and culture as inseparable. He argued that teaching the Greek language was, in effect, teaching aspects of Greek culture and, consequently, if Greek
were incorporated into the regular school system, then the two systems would not only parallel each other but would also duplicate one another. It was this crucial connection between language and culture which he saw as the attraction of ethnic schools for parents and suggested that, in the event of Greek being systematically introduced into the regular school system, then

you could find some people who would withdraw their children from the ethnic schools but the majority, I think, would insist on sending their children to ethnic schools for identity purposes. They would feel more secure because their children would learn something other than simply the language. They would learn a little bit of the culture, their faith, their church background and so on, in the ethnic schools, which they would not learn in the Australian schools. It would be simply a linguistic approach to learning the language.

Most organisers and teachers saw teaching of Greek as the responsibility of the Australian government, at least as far as provision of funds was concerned. Some claimed it was the responsibility of government because it was better equipped financially and had appropriate facilities. A teacher suggested that the government was morally responsible for teaching 'community languages' because of its direct involvement with development of Australia as a multicultural society. Others suggested that this service was the responsibility of both the Australian and Greek governments. At the other extreme, however, was a teacher who claimed that each ethnic group was ultimately responsible, as teaching ethnic languages was for the benefit of the ethnic group itself, whereas the government's involvement with education was directed towards a system for the entire society.

Most respondents regarded limitations and handicaps under which these ethnic schools operated as preventing them from achieving their aims. Although all interviewed were optimistic about continuation of ethnic schools in the future, there was some disagreement on possible improvement in or increased success of these schools. One organiser pointed to the increased need for ethnic schools to teach Greek in light of the increased proportion of Australian-born Greeks who were under greater pressure to lose the cultural traits of their heritage.

He saw this increased need as particularly crucial in light of what he interpreted as the government's continuing cut back in immigration and thus the gradual diminishing of the pool of foreign-born Greeks. One teacher suggested that although ethnic schools will continue to exist, they will remain ineffectual unless they became organised around a central body and develop specific aims.
It was evident that there was very little contact between organisers and participants of Greek ethnic schools, let alone between these personnel and government bureaucracies or schools of other ethnic groups. In some cases educational committees were established but seemed to meet infrequently and with very little positive outcome. One noticeable exception was the school committee of the Greek Orthodox Community. This overall lack of contact and communication was generally deplored by organisers and teachers.

A somewhat different and more diverse picture emerges on examination of parents' responses to the broad question of the role of ethnic schools. While almost half the parents, like nearly all organisers and teachers, thought that Greek ethnic schools were established to facilitate communication between parents and children, these schools served other roles in parents' eyes. A quarter of the parents mentioned the possibility of Greek families or children returning to Greece, either permanently or for a holiday, and send their children to Greek schools to learn the language so as to be able to communicate adequately in Greece. Another role of these schools, mentioned by about a quarter of the parents, was provision for their children of a second language which would enhance their job opportunities in the future or at least enable them to assist others in their employment. For instance, one mother stated that, 'by going to Greek schools, then these children, if they have a professional job here, can help the Greek migrants who can't speak English, for example, if they become doctors.' A passing mention was made of the feeling of pride in Greek culture and language held by Greek parents. This prompted them to want to pass on these cultural characteristics to their children through Greek schools, and required the children to understand church services. The latter was important to one concerned mother, who claimed that if Greek children cannot follow the service, then they will not bother to go to church and churches will eventually be forced to close.

While most parents were satisfied with the curriculum of Greek school, some felt it could be improved by including a greater emphasis on teaching Greek customs and traditions and subjects such as mathematics. However, only one fifth of the parents had no complaints about organisation and operation of these schools. Among remaining parents, the most frequent complaint centred around qualifications of teachers. One mother, who sent her child to an Archdiocese school in the eastern suburbs, commented on recent improvement in the number of teachers at the school with teaching qualifications. She referred to the fact that a number of children had been taken out of the school by their parents 'because a lot of the
parents didn’t like the idea of English being spoken in the school, and the second thing was that the fees doubled.’ When asked if increased fees had improved the operation of the school, she replied:

yes, I think it did. [They have got] video tapes and . . . earphones and they listen to a lot of conversations and so on, which we didn’t have last year. This is all new, plus we have got fully qualified teachers who have studied at university and teachers’ college, whereas before we only just had mothers.

Several parents complained about the times classes were held. Although it was felt that there was not sufficient time in the hours allotted for after school classes, about a quarter of the parents highlighted a dilemma by commenting on the additional burden these after hours classes put on the child.

There were a number of other complaints raised by small numbers of parents. These included the wish to see more taught about life in Australia. However, when asked whether these schools should teach more about migrants in Australian society, most parents either opposed the idea or could not see the need for it. As one mother claimed, ‘it is not necessary to teach them about the life and culture in Australia since the children are in Australian society and learn about these things through their day at school, T.V. etc.’ Other complaints centred around inadequate texts, size of classes, the little Greek acquired by children, having to pay for texts and teachers, and schools being too far from home.

A small number of parents thought that the split between the Archdiocese and the Greek Orthodox Community retarded progress of Greek ethnic schools. As one explained, ‘the system can’t be improved until both sides unite’. Others pointed out benefits they saw to be gained by both sides uniting. This would improve the organisation of schools, result in better teaching and make the possibility of getting Greek taught in the regular school system more likely. One parent suggested that unification could also lead to formation of a Greek Department of Education which would control the organisation and operation of Greek ethnic schools. Another parent thought that all Greek schools should be united for two reasons; they could construct a better program to enable children to learn more about Greek traditions and unification would obviously mean that ‘students would not learn about the disunity that is at present existing’. Taking a more cynical view, yet another parent saw the split between Community and Archdiocese schools as unfortunate since it indicated that ‘the Greek education system’ in this country is
used as a political tool with the real aims and objectives of education playing a secondary role. He concluded: 'if they were all united, then one body of experts could be formed to draft a more constructive and adequate education system that all Greeks would conform to and benefit from'. Interestingly, none of the parents interviewed gave ideological reasons for their choice of either Archdiocese or Greek Community schools but stated that it was purely a matter of which school was more conveniently located.

Given parents' recognition of unsatisfactory aspects of ethnic schools, it is perhaps not surprising that almost all who responded to questions about whether they would prefer to see the Greek language taught in the regular school system were definitely in favour of this proposal. At the same time though, most of these parents saw that this would be impractical. One mother, whose child attended a Greek school on the north side of Sydney, illustrated the latter view:

in Greece they have to learn their own language plus French and English. My nephews and nieces are learning French at school and they have an English tutor. So they are learning three languages. The attitude here seems to be “oh, we’re right mate, its okay, English is good enough”. It’s not good enough today. If they are taught Greek, well halleluia, but I must be a realist. Perhaps on the other side of the bridge in areas that are predominantly Greek, they may, I don’t know, probably not. They are the schools that should be teaching it now. I can’t see them teaching Greek over French, or Italian, or German, or Indonesian, or Japanese because we’ve only got a small element of Greek children in our primary school.

Another parent, although recognising the possibility of the introduction of Greek into the regular school system once the Archdiocese and Greek Orthodox Community became united, foresaw considerable opposition from Greek teachers to this proposal. He said that,

if they were united they would be better organised and very possibly Greek would be taught in the English schools. Then the existing Greek teachers would be out of work since they don’t have diplomas. It is essential to have a diploma in order to teach in a government school, therefore it is not in the interest of all the Greek teachers to change the situation despite how Greek parents and children feel about it.

Isolated comments from other parents of the consequences of incorporating Greek into the regular school system included emergence of ‘better teachers’ of the Greek language, the possible closure of Greek schools, and disappearance of discord which exists between the Archdiocese and the Greek Orthodox Community.

Despite recognition of impracticalities of incorporating Greek
language teaching into the regular school system, one third of all parents regarded it as the responsibility of the Australian government to teach Greek. Other small numbers of parents differed. Some saw it as the responsibility of the Greek government, while others thought it was the Australian and Greek governments who should be responsible. Only a few parents thought that the teaching of Greek was solely the responsibility of Greeks themselves. Parents who thought that the Australian government had responsibility for teaching Greek generally thought that the Australian government owed it to the Greeks and to the Australian community. Some qualified their replies by adding that Greeks could not expect any assistance from the Australian government until they united into one organisation. Generally, because of the perceived impracticalities of introducing the Greek language into the regular school system, this responsibility was seen by parents as meaning increased funding for ethnic schools. Only one parent advocated a take over of ethnic schools by the Australian government. Of the few parents who regarded the teaching of Greek in ethnic schools as the responsibility of the Greek government, one claimed that 'the Greek government had a responsibility to Greeks everywhere in the world and should assist with Greek schools here'. Another parent, who saw Greek language instruction as the responsibility of both governments, thought that the Greek government should make a request to the Australian government for assistance.

On the basis of parents' general degree of dissatisfaction with ethnic schools, it might have been expected that the majority of children would say they disliked going to Greek schools. This was not the case. Over half the children, who ranged in age from 7 to 12 years, said they enjoyed attending ethnic schools. Only two complained that the work was too hard and attending a second school too tiring. Even allowing for the effect on these responses of parental pressure and the wish to offer desirable replies to the interviewer, the proportion of children that said they liked Greek schools was significant. This was because most students were able to indicate why they thought it was important to know Greek. The most common replies included reasons of communication with parents or future clients and the possibility of returning to Greece for a holiday. One girl referred to the usefulness of speaking Greek if she were to marry a Greek, while two boys expressed the view that it was 'good to know more than one language'.

Most children did not wish their particular ethnic school to teach anything other than what was presently taught. The few exceptions to this were some who claimed that they would like to learn more about
the geography of Greece and others who would like mathematics and chemistry included in the curriculum. Only a few children thought these schools could not be improved. Those who thought they could, saw the quality of teachers, size of classes and, to a lesser extent, hours of operation, the excessive amount of homework, and too little time spent in Greek schools, as the obvious areas of improvement.

Over two thirds of the children said that they spoke Greek at home with their parents, although about one quarter of these qualified their responses by adding that they did so ‘only sometimes’. One pointed out that she always spoke Greek with her grandparents, while two others claimed that they spoke Greek with their friends outside of Greek classes. Clearly children’s networks and social environment were significant factors in the degree to which they conversed in Greek with friends. As one boy said, ‘there are a few guys that have just come from Greece to our school, so we have to communicate with them in Greek as they don’t speak English’. Because of the important effect of friendship ties on the degree to which these children spoke Greek outside the classroom, it is interesting to note their perceptions of self-identity. Over three quarters of the children saw themselves as either ‘Greek’ or both ‘Greek’ and ‘Australian’. Half regarded themselves as ‘Greek’ and said that most of their friends were ‘Australian’ also. Two children commented that their ‘Australian’ friends thought they were ‘wasting their time going to a Greek school’. However, even in light of these negative reactions, one respondent claimed she was determined to speak Greek, especially because her teacher in regular school disallowed the speaking of Greek in the classroom.

In almost the reversal of responses given by their parents, most children preferred not to have Greek introduced into regular schools. One girl emphasised the separation between Greek school and regular school and argued that they should be kept separate. Another argument in favour of maintaining this separation was that the pupil often preferred to learn a language other than Greek at regular school. Another pupil thought that the Greek language and culture were taught better at ethnic school than they would be in the regular school system.

It is difficult to assess the degree to which these responses were distorted by the pupils interviewed. The young age of some children suggests that the distortion was significant and this lay behind our decision not to interview a greater number. Nevertheless, there was no evidence of any outright strong dislike at having to attend ethnic school. Furthermore, most pupils could articulate the need, as they
saw it, to retain their language and, even in an Australian context, still identify themselves as ‘Greek’.

Wider issues — migrant education and multiculturalism
Greek organisers’, teachers’ and parents’ conceptions of the role of ethnic schools were generally independent of their understanding of the wider, current issues of migrant education and multiculturalism, which were generally variable, apolitical and often contradictory. On the broader issue of multiculturalism, it is clear that when Greeks did express a view on, or employed the concept of, multiculturalism, it was used mainly in a cultural sense — maintaining language and culture — and not in a structural sense — concerning the social and political position of migrants in Australian society. That is, multiculturalism was used as a descriptive term, in most cases as a synonym for multilingualism. It is only in this sense of multiculturalism that ethnic schools were seen to have a role. As one teacher put it,

language is the base for a multicultural society. When migrants arrive in Australia it is good for their confidence to meet up with people who can speak their language. You have a greater affinity with people who can speak your language than with people who cannot.

And again:

a multicultural society means that there are many cultures in society. Since there are many cultures, there [have] to be many languages stemming from these cultures. So long as the Greeks keep pushing the Greek language and the Italians keep pushing the Italian language because they want their children to follow the customs and traditions, language is always going to be part of a multicultural society.

Given this perceived role of ethnic schools in promoting multilingualism, it is interesting to note Greeks’ views on the wider effects of multilingualism. Some parents, for instance, felt that a multilingual (multicultural) society meant greater job opportunities for people who could speak more than one language. One claimed that

other languages are important in Australia because Australia is a multicultural country. Therefore the more languages a child knows, the better off he is for himself and to obtain work . . .

while another thought that

languages can help one to communicate with others better. Also in some cases, someone who knows more than one language can get a job more easily than someone who only knows one.
Another Greek, a teacher, implied that perpetuation of migrant languages had the effect of reducing inter-group prejudices and conflict:

we are becoming a multicultural society, particularly in the cities. It is important to keep up these languages and the cultures as well. I have seen a lot of change in the twenty years I have lived in this country . . . tremendous changes for the better in the way people live here. They used to be so conservative before. They have learned to accept that there are other civilisations of this world apart from the Australian. They like to know what we eat — they have tried the food.

Although only an isolated instance, yet another Greek offered a contradictory view on multilingualism and the role of ethnic schools. He regarded ethnic schools as

damaging for students because they reinforce the attitude that their language or background has no place in Australian society and it increases the culture conflict in the child . . . never the twain shall meet.

While most Greeks equated multiculturalism with multilingualism, which they saw as a current, stable state of affairs, some others took a different view of Australia as a multicultural society. One, for instance, saw multiculturalism as a transitory phase in ethnic relations:

other languages are important in Australia as long as there are new migrants here. However, it won't remain as such. With each generation, when they integrate into the Australian ways, there won't be the need with each generation. This applies to each ethnic group in Australia. Australia is a multicultural country now, but it shouldn't remain as such. Instead, it should gradually become one culture without separate groups.

Another Greek saw multiculturalism as an objective to be achieved, but an objective which would involve something other than multilingualism, namely ethnic pride:

I think Australia is going to be very cosmopolitan in a few years' time. It won't be the old Australian way of thinking — that you are a new Australian — and that was that. I feel that you are going to be very proud that you originated from another country and you've got this background.

It is not surprising that Greeks generally did not link multiculturalism with issues of migrant inequality and lack of participation and power. Most saw the position of Greeks in Australian society as having improved considerably because of changes in Australian attitudes. However, there was room for more
improvement because the 'main problem' was still Australians' attitudes toward Greeks. One organiser thought that

the position of migrants in Australian society has, of course, become better than a few years back and, under different circumstances . . . could be better still. What is needed is a little more understanding from both parties of the role migrants should play.

Where inequality was mentioned, it was linked with Australians' attitudes. The assumption was that once Australians become more understanding and sympathetic to the existence of migrant cultures, inequalities will be reduced. As the above organiser added:

it is a fact that there isn't the equality we would like to have as Greek or other nationalities, or migrants in general to the benefits or advantages Anglo-Saxons have. It has become better in the last few years and I am hoping it will get better because people are travelling more now, more than they were travelling before.

This same theme was reiterated by one of the Greek teachers, who claimed that

a lot of migrants have a hard time in Australian society, especially males, who are forever being called 'wogs'. A lot of Australian people look down on migrants and don't have anything to do with them. On the other hand, there are a lot of Australians who have grown to accept the migrant cultures. It is inevitable because there are so many migrants in Australia now and the Australian people are starting to realise that the migrants have contributed a lot to their culture, e.g. Chinese restaurants, Italian restaurants, etc. The Australian fashion industry is influenced by the European one. In those ways, they are accepting other cultures.

However, despite the fact that at least one Greek saw perpetuation of migrant languages and hence, indirectly, ethnic schools, as reducing Australians' prejudice, Greeks generally did not see any obvious relationship between ethnic schools and alteration of perceived migrant inequality in Australian society.

On the less abstract notion of migrant education, Greeks generally had no clear or systematic viewpoint nor did they see it directly and necessarily related to ethnic schools. As to what was meant by migrant education, responses were extremely variable. They ranged from broad notions, such as helping migrants to integrate and providing for educational opportunity, to language instruction. The latter included teaching English to migrants, teaching Greek to migrants, and teaching Greek to Greek children and English to Greek adults. Some had the vaguest notions of migrant education, while at least one Greek — an organiser — had a detailed grasp of the location
of migrant education as an issue in the wider sociopolitical context. He went on to add that

migrant education is out of date. The appropriate concept now for Australia is 'education for a multicultural society'. That is, the question we should now ask is how can one educate a child in a special school?

Clearly among Greeks, migrant education also means different things to different people (see Nicoll, 1977). Only those definitions which involved teaching Greek to Greek children were in any way linked to the role of ethnic schools. In these cases, the latter were not in the forefront of migrants' thinking but rather, were brought to the surface because of the focus of this study.

In summary, it is clear that not all Greek schools were alike. Even this limited case study illuminated significant differences in such things as class size, staff-pupil ratios, teaching facilities, qualifications of teachers, and the cultural and socioeconomic background of pupils. In some cases these differences seemed to account for different responses between teachers with respect to the role of ethnic schools in Australian society. Generally, however, differences between teachers and parents were more significant. The former were, in general, more aware of some major issues underlying migrant education and multiculturalism and tended to differentiate between the role of the regular school system and the role of the ethnic school system. The regular school system, for example, teaches English and, as one teacher put it, 'this is where the future success of the child lies'.

Parents' responses, on the other hand, indicated far more confusion, lack of awareness of issues and contradictions, especially about the role of ethnic schools, equality of opportunity and multiculturalism. Whereas teachers were not likely to link ethnic schools with improving occupational opportunities, some parents stressed this possible benefit. For example, their children would have a better chance of acquiring a job in a multicultural society if they were bilingual. In other words, for these parents multiculturalism did mean structural changes, that is, in the nature of qualifications which enhance upward mobility, but they could not indicate how these changes were to be brought about or even the necessity for such changes. For these migrants, multilingualism implied greater opportunity, but no parent was able to identify or speculate as to the nature of this relationship or why a change from monolingualism to bilingualism at the individual level, or multilingualism at the level of society, would cause a change in the opportunity structure.

What was evident from responses of parents was the large degree of
diversity of what they expected ethnic schools to achieve. To the extent that we were able to categorise these responses, they tend to relate the role of ethnic schools to familial and cultural factors, facilitating communication in the family and providing linguistic competence should the family return to Greece (see Bottomley, 1979: 67-9). This view of the individual benefit to be gained from ethnic schooling was transposed to the level of society in the belief that such training either perpetuated or assisted in bringing about multiculturalism. Similarly, this diversity of responses was also present with regard to the meaning of migrant education and the connection between this and the role of ethnic schools.

Clearly, it is not possible, nor our intention, to generalise from the responses of 60 Greek migrants and their children to the Greek ethnic community as a whole. To do so would be methodologically naive and would severely distort the overall picture of the Greek population in Sydney. As should be evident from much of the preceding discussion, Greeks in Sydney are far from being homogeneous. Political-ideological affiliations, socioeconomic status, period of residence, and other social-relational aspects of life operate to produce a number of 'sub-cultures' within this and other Greek communities in Australia.

Italians

The organisation of Italian ethnic schools in Melbourne

In Melbourne, Australia's most populous 'Italian' city with over 105,000 Italian-born residents, some 10,000 school age children attend several hundred classes in Italian language and culture each week. The Dante Alighieri Society and the Comitato Assistenza Italiani (Italian Assistance Association) or CO.AS.IT are responsible for organising between eighty to ninety percent of these classes. Other organisations such as the Italo-Australian Foundation and Italian social clubs (e.g. Veneto Club) currently organise the bulk of remaining classes.

The Melbourne branch of the Dante Alighieri Society was founded in 1896 and is part of the Societa Dante Alighieri, which originated in Italy in 1889 with the aim of promoting Italian language and culture. In 1970 the Society began teaching Italian to school age children in Melbourne. There are currently two types of situation where Italian is taught — after hours or withdrawal classes and insertion classes. In after hours classes, commonly known as the part-time ethnic school, children attend on Saturday morning or after school on weekdays for around two hours per week. In Dante Alighieri Society circles these classes are referred to as Corsi del Doposcuola. By 1977 the Society
was organising 95 of these classes in Melbourne for 1,620 pupils, mainly in the northern suburbs. Insertion classes or Corsi d’Inserimento, by contrast, are those situations where Italian is taught during normal school hours. In 1978 there were 72 of these classes in government and Catholic schools, mainly in the northern suburbs, catering for 1,963 pupils.

The cost of mounting these classes is around $80,000 a year. Income is mainly from fees and other activities such as picnics, film afternoons, quiz games and competitions. While the Italian government encourages the teaching of Italian by the Dante Alighieri Society and provides financial support and elementary textbooks, such support is considered inadequate. In 1977, the Italian government’s contribution to the Society was $3,000.

CO.AS.IT, the other organisation organising Italian language classes, was formed in 1967 by a group of Italo-Australians concerned with welfare needs of migrants and their families. Originally a casework oriented agency, CO.AS.IT has diversified into areas of employment, child care and education. Since the early 1970s, CO.AS.IT has been organising language classes and had in 1977 3,000 pupils in over 100 classes in thirty suburbs of Melbourne. Like the Dante Alighieri Society, these classes were concentrated mainly in the northern suburbs. They comprised 56 after hours classes with 1,159 pupils and 59 insertion classes involving 1,848 pupils. CO.AS.IT’s budget for teaching Italian in 1977 was $50,000 of which the Italian government supplied approximately half plus elementary textbooks.

After hours classes organised by both bodies are conducted in borrowed church halls and school class rooms. Teachers generally lack teaching qualifications, being drawn mainly from the ranks of interested Italian-born parents or educated Australian-born children of Italian parents. Class sizes range from 25 to 40 pupils, who are often organised into subgroups on the basis of Italian language competence rather than age. Children, in the main, begin Italian ethnic schools with little or no fluency in the Italian language. As there is little communication between organisers, teachers and parents within these organising bodies, and certainly less communication between the latter, the only overall organisation of Italian ethnic schools is through the ‘Inspectorate of Italian Language Classes’. This consists of four Educational Advisers from Italy, who are based in Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane and who have a co-ordinator based in Canberra in the Italian Embassy. Their task involves controlling, ‘organising and supervising’ all Italian language classes in Australia, although in the course of this study there was little evidence of this.
The role of ethnic schools

Among Italians associated with ethnic schools, that is, organisers, teachers, parents and pupils, together with those involved with insertion classes, there was not only considerable agreement but also important differences in their definitions of the role of ethnic schools. One significant area of agreement among organisers, teachers and parents was on the reasons for formation of Italian ethnic schools. At the same time there was lacking among all these Italians any serious or systematic thinking about the broad relationships between ethnic schools, migrant education and multiculturalism and their implications for Australian ethnic relations.

The recurring reason offered by Italians for the formation of ethnic schools was the importance of teaching the Italian language so that children can converse with parents, grandparents and other family members. Most Italians saw the need for family communication bound up in an expressive sense with family unity. Communication between parent and child, or grandparent and grandchild, was frequently mentioned as being of utmost importance. One teacher put it this way:

if parents are prepared to spend a lot of money and time sending their children (to ethnic schools) to learn their language, their own language, it means they have found a need for it . . . even just to speak at home. To lose communication with your own children is not a small problem

A similar point of view was expressed by an Italian parent. On the value of communication in the family situation he said:

I like when they [children] grow up they not forget their language. You must try to speak Italian especially since my mum, my mother-in-law and my father-in-law they are here. I want my daughter and my son to talk in the Italian language because the old people do not understand.

Associated with this expressive need for communication was a high regard for the preservation of the Italian language and culture. In addition, there was a recurring instrumental view of ethnic schools which saw the value of children being able to act as interpreters for parents or speak Italian should they visit Italy on holidays or return permanently.

This emphasis on parent-child communication was challenged by only one Italian — a teacher. She argued that if communication between parent and child was the main reason for teaching Italian and hence, the formation of ethnic schools, then Italians would forget their dialect and speak proper Italian. She thought that families could communicate just as well in their own dialect.
Whatever the reality or extent of actual communication in Italian or dialect, something which we discuss later, language instruction to facilitate communication was seen as the main role of ethnic schools and the reason for their establishment. Organisers, teachers and parents all thought that ethnic schools were formed following ‘grass roots’ requests from concerned parents.

Despite articulation of the benefits of language transmission through ethnic schools there were important differences between organisers and teachers on the one hand, and parents on the other, on the current and future role or utility of ethnic schools. Organisers and most teachers, who clearly had had more opportunities to reflect on and discuss the question of the future of Italian ethnic schools, saw the existing system of part-time ethnic schools as inadequate. They regarded the teaching of Italian as a community language as primarily the responsibility of the government and hence, favoured the full incorporation of Italian language instruction into the existing school systems. It is for this reason that ‘ethnic schooling’ is more appropriate when referring to Italian ethnic schools, at least as far as organisers and teachers are concerned. On more than one occasion the interviewer was asked ‘what do you mean by ethnic schools? Some teachers and organisers were clearly uneasy about the term ‘ethnic school’. An organiser summed up this point of view:

I don’t like the term ethnic school. Maybe I’m wrong but when we are talking about ethnic school I have in front of me a sort of building [on which is] written . . . ‘ethnic school for Italians’.

Associated with this temporary or terminating role of ethnic schools were what organisers and teachers saw as a number of problems. The two most serious being lack of finances and inadequate teaching. Organisers associated with the Dante Alighieri Society and CO.AS.IT. all expressed concern over their inability to extend or improve their networks of classes because of limited finances. CO.AS.IT. organisers who receive greater financial assistance from the Italian government for funding Italian classes than the Dante Alighieri Society, were concerned about their limited finances and the strains on their administrative facilities but did not want to rely on the Italian government. It is therefore not surprising that the ‘Dante Alighieri geared itself to withdraw from the teaching of the Italian language and culture at primary level’ (i.e. insertion classes) in 1975 ‘because of a financial deficit . . . caused by the inadequate financial contribution received from the Italian government’ (Dante Alighieri Society, 1978).
Financial problems were clearly bound up with other problems. Limited funds had some bearing on what organisers could pay teachers and the number of hours of classes provided per week. Consequently, or partly as a consequence, it was the complaint of organisers and teachers that teachers tended to be untrained, inexperienced and sometimes lacking a comprehensive grasp of the Italian language themselves. Limited funds has meant that CO.AS.IT. and the Dante Alighieri Society can only provide an average of two hours of after hours classes each week. This was regarded by all teachers as inadequate for language transmission and was variously described as 'tokenism' and a 'drop in the bucket'. As one teacher claimed:

I try and cover a bit of geography and culture and language and grammar but that two hours is very little... you see the children for two hours so what can you do? You can’t cram a whole lot in because then nothing will go in. You have to take it slowly, hoping by the end of the year they’re going to have remembered something.

All these problems are bound up with the additional problem of poor attendance at after hours classes. According to one organiser, only 25 percent of children from Italian families attended after hours classes (see Smolicz, 1979: 311), a situation he saw in marked contrast to Greek ethnic schools, which had higher attendance rates. Low attendance at Italian ethnic schools was such a problem, because of the psychological effect of discouragement and loss of revenue, that this same organiser had undertaken a survey of Italian ethnic schools in an effort to locate solutions. Here low attendance at after hours classes is not being influenced by the proliferation of insertion classes, that is, where the latter is siphoning off pupils from the former. It was clear from accounts of several teachers and one organiser that attendance by Italians at insertion classes is not strong in relation to their overall numbers. One organiser claimed that only three percent of children from Italian families were attending Italian classes in Melbourne schools. Because of this, the existing school system was inadequate and the government had a case to answer for. However, it is difficult to say whether the situation can be summed up so easily. According to Italian teachers, insertion classes are met with some apathy by Italians. One teacher claimed, for instance, that at her school Italians were ‘the last to come in’ on the Italian classes and their children were in a minority of those attending these classes (less than one third). Another teacher noted that in the classes she teaches, in a high status middle-class suburb, almost half the children are not from Italian backgrounds. However, attendance of non-Italian children in
these classes appears to be unrelated to low attendance of Italian children. Considering one low status suburb, where one sixth of 120 children taking insertion classes are non-Italian, the significant variation across suburbs is the increasing interest and attendance of non-Italian children in insertion classes with increasing affluence of parents. As far as can be ascertained Italian attendance appears more constant.

Generally, it appears that organisers' and teachers' support for teaching Italian in the existing school system is not based so much on pedagogic or policy orientations as on need to relieve pressure on a system strained of resources. This view is supported by organisers' admissions that Italian language teaching could become 'just another language', like French and Latin, in the absence of teaching of all dimensions of Italian life and culture. Because they admit that the school can only teach the language, the family being largely responsible for transmitting Italian life and culture, it appears that there is little thought given to the consequences of successful incorporation. This is also related to organisers' and other Italians' views of migrant education and the place of migrants in Australian society, which will be discussed later.

This _ad hoc_ response to incorporation is also supported by organisers' and teachers' admissions of little or no communication with day school teachers, education officials or with other people involved with ethnic schools in either CO.AS.IT. or the Dante Alighieri Society. It is not surprising that these Italians' definitions of the role of ethnic schools, or ethnic schooling, are more a result of their own day to day circumstances regarding the teaching of Italian, than as a result of any overall outlook or combined voice of CO.AS.IT. or the Dante Alighieri Society. Hence, organisers have more in common with each other, as do teachers, than other officials in the same organisations or those associated with the same school. A brief illustration of this was organisers' limited stress on the value of ethnic schools for language transmission for those Italians who were potential returnees to Italy. Given the funding of CO.AS.IT. and the Dante Alighieri Society by the Italian government, and in the light of the former's awareness of an Italian government act restricting funds to language instruction for Italian citizens abroad and not to naturalised Australians or Australian-born children of Italian citizens, it is not surprising that organisers should be concerned about future funding and should link language maintenance to issues involving Italy and the Italian government. By contrast, teachers, especially those involved with insertion classes where there was a mix of Italian
and non-Italian children, were in agreement on the benefits of 'culture contact' in the insertion classroom situation.

Parents, by contrast, had sharply differing definitions of the current and future role of ethnic schools. Almost all parents stated that existing ethnic schools were the most practical method of teaching the Italian language and were achieving their aims. Half the parents interviewed saw these schools as having no problems, the other half mentioned problem areas such as the early hour of starting on Saturday morning, lack of teachers and insufficient hours of instruction. Almost all felt that ethnic schools would and should continue to grow in the future and operate in addition to the normal school systems.

In addition to this positive orientation by parents, they differed from organisers and teachers in their expanded accounts of why ethnic schools were formed and why Italians send their children to these schools. Like organisers and teachers, parents frequently cited the importance of communication within the family and value of preserving the Italian language and heritage for its own sake in answering these questions. However, only parents stressed the important role the Italian language will have in enabling their children to obtain better jobs in the future. This instrumental response was more specific and went beyond any instrumental responses of organisers and teachers. As one parent responded, when asked why he sent his children to Saturday school,

well, if I know a second language I be in a different position from where I am now in the factory ... I could be a salesman, I would work in an office, but I can't write very well. The boss he tell me, Joe, he says, we love you here but sorry I can't get you to go higher — because that's my fault, because I never went to school, I can't write very well in Australian language. That's why I think you go to school, the better for you ... that's why I send my son and daughter to Italian school so they learn that also.

Another parent expressed the same sentiment more briefly:

the child, when he grows up, he wants to get a job and knowing two languages is very important.

Another distinctive characteristic of parents' attitudes and understanding of ethnic schools is their unawareness of the issues, history and extent of these schools. Apart from the school their own children attended, most parents were largely uninformed and, in some cases, had erroneous impressions of the ethnic school situation. A few parents, for instance, thought that all Italian children attended ethnic
schools. One couple thought that 'the government' provided all ethnic schools, while another thought that the Italian community had not provided anything in terms of Italian language instruction. Similarly, most parents could not offer any certain reason for Italians' lack of interest and participation in ethnic schools. The most frequent explanations were couched in uncertainty: 'maybe it's lack of money', '... possibly child resistance', and '... maybe they're not interested'.

Apart from the occupational spin off of the role of ethnic schools, the other distinctive element in Italian parents' responses was the significance of dialect. In Italy, while Italian is the official language in government and educational circles, it is not the day to day language of many Italians, especially those in rural areas. Many of the latter speak only their local dialect, which means that for many Italians Italian is a foreign language. Almost all parents interviewed spoke their local dialect at home and, to a lesser extent, also Italian and/or English. The extent of use of any one of these three languages depended largely on parents' facility with Italian and English and whether grandparents, who often spoke only dialect, lived with the family. The implications of this situation for Italian children was evident in one child's comment. Replying to the question 'what language is spoken at home?' she noted, 'with grandmother — dialect; with my parents mixed Italian and dialect; among ourselves (other children) — English'.

The link between Italian, dialect and English and the role of ethnic schools only emerges from parents' understanding of ethnic schools. Except for one teacher, organisers and teachers generally did not mention dialect or its significance at all. Parents who spoke mainly dialect at home generally felt that they should speak Italian. As one woman stressed,

at home we speak Italian and dialect... we should speak Italian (but)... it is difficult to speak just Italian.

It was at this point that parents felt that ethnic schools could teach their children Italian, something which parents either could not do or saw themselves as not having responsibility for. One Italian mother summed up this sentiment by saying 'that she sent her children to ethnic school on Saturday, 'so that they can write and read proper Italian. We cannot teach them that'.

It would be easy to assume that those parents who speak only dialect are those Italians who do not send their children to ethnic schools, the rationale being that their children speaking Italian at
home would not be understood. While insufficient numbers in this study prevents any generalisations, the situation appears to be not so simple. Parents who speak mainly dialect and a little Italian at home still want their children to speak 'proper Italian' even though there is little likelihood of it being used at home. This means that the desire for communication within the family would appear too simplistic as an explanation for Italians establishing ethnic schools. The reasons for the latter are anything but straightforward, as one interview with Italian parents indicates:

Q: What language do you speak at home?
Wife: Dialect.
Q: What language do you think you should speak at home?
Wife: Well, really we should speak the proper Italian.
Husband: We should, but we not know the real Italian because I never go to school to learn the real Italian language.
Q: Why do Italian people send their children to Saturday schools?
Husband: To learn to talk in Italian, to write in Italian.

The teacher mentioned earlier seemed to capture this confusion among Italian parents in their attitudes towards dialect, Italian and the role of ethnic schools:

parents, when they send their children to these classes, what they hope their children are going to achieve at the end of the year, is that they’re going to be able to speak fluent Italian, which is the wrong idea to have because most of the children at home speak dialect. At the end of the year they’re going to know something about the language and be able to speak it a bit more but a lot of the parents send their children with this idea that, probably, within a month even, these kids are going to be able to speak very fluently . . . they’re very proud, I suppose, of being Italian and they want their children to speak Italian which doesn’t always make sense, because at home they speak dialect. The parents speak dialect to the children and the children have learned the dialect and are going to speak dialect too. There are also other cases too where the children can’t even speak dialect because they’ve gone out to school. They speak English at home, so they’re a mixture of dialect and English, and in the end you don’t know what you’re talking. So that doesn’t always made sense, the parents wanting their children to speak Italian. Why do they want them to speak Italian when they themselves at home don’t speak proper Italian? . . . I don’t know whether I’m dwelling too much on this dialect business but . . .

Finally, regarding Italians’ definitions of ethnic schools, it is difficult to be conclusive about Italian children themselves. While parents often mentioned child resistance as a possible reason for low attendance at ethnic schools, a claim corroborated by a couple of
teachers, the children interviewed generally gave favourable accounts of their experience at ethnic school. One older Italian girl claimed that she attended ethnic school 'only to help me pass HSC Italian', while another teenager admitted that,

not that [because] Italian is taught in the weekday schools the Saturday schools are not worth the trouble, or I should rather say, it is still important that they should continue with Saturday schools, but you know how it is, a lesson is a lesson.

As mentioned above in our discussion of Greek children, because we felt younger children were inclined to say what they thought the interviewer might want to hear, we abandoned our plan to interview a substantial number of Italian pupils who attended ethnic schools.

Wider issues — migrant education and multiculturalism
These different definitions of the role of Italian ethnic schools have implications for the Italian community itself and for the wider issues of migrant education and multiculturalism. Regarding the Italian community, absence of a coherent, thought-out policy position on the role of ethnic schools means that Italians have a long way to go before they can effect political pressure or influence educational authorities and governments on questions of funding ethnic schools, establishing community language courses and adopting educational innovations such as bilingual programs. Instead of being organised, like-minded and aware of the need for cooperation in the area of education of Italian children, Italians tend to be locked into their own immediate situations having little or no communication with each other. The different bodies organising ethnic schools, for instance, have no routine communication with each other or with Italian parents and very little with teachers. Their principal concern regarding ethnic schools is at the systems level — getting the teaching of Italian into the existing educational systems. Parents, on the other hand, do not see the role of ethnic schools going beyond their own individual family needs. It would appear, on the basis of organisers’ and teachers’ reservations about the effectiveness of ethnic schools, that parents’ enthusiasm and support for these schools is largely based on their children’s very limited command of Italian — in some cases only a few words, in most cases anything but fluency. The general enthusiasm and support for ethnic schools among parents suggests that, to a varying extent, they are satisfied only with the appearance of their children speaking Italian. Such limited focus on the issue is very reminiscent of Italians’ family centredness conveyed by Banfield
(1958), especially in his notion of 'amoral familism'. While all this has implications for the Italian community, that is, in the nature and success of future education of Italian children, there are also implications for the specific issues of migrant education and multiculturalism.

Like the Greeks, Italian organisers', teachers' and parents' understanding of the role of ethnic schools are not clearly related to their conceptions of migrant education and multiculturalism. Taking the broadest issue first — the place of migrants in society, encompassed by notions of multiculturalism — there are two main dimensions. First, there was widespread agreement that 'Australians' are still prejudiced towards Italians and discriminate against them, a viewpoint ranging from bland articulation of this claim to charges of racism. Most Italians believed that the lot of the migrant in Australia is better than it was, say, twenty years ago, but to say that migrants are now accepted was simply to say that there is less prejudice and discrimination. However, given this awareness of structural change and the process of ethnic stratification, no Italians incorporated these dimensions in their conceptions of multiculturalism. Instead, the latter were, like the Greeks, painted in cultural terms, that is, the coexistence of many languages and cultures in Australia.

It is this cultural view of multiculturalism which lies behind the second dimension in Italians' views of the place of migrants in society. Italians interviewed generally believed that improvement in Italians' relations with the wider society has come about through communication, which in turn has resulted from culture contact and language instruction. It is this belief in the value of culture contact, especially among organisers and teachers, which was used to justify incorporation of the Italian language into the school system and avoidance of perpetuating separate autonomous Italian educational organisations. This emphasis on the role of Italian language instruction in relation to the whole society was best illustrated by one organiser who, commenting on the introduction of migrant languages into schools, noted that,

they're just coming into schools now and if they were already in schools, the Australian parents would get feedback from their children and there would be a lot more interaction between indigenous parents and migrant parents and a greater climate of acceptance will be created.

He went on to say that Anglo-Australians' gaining acceptance of community languages would help them (Anglo-Australians) in their careers,
and will stop the ghettoisation of an Italian always going to an Italian welfare agency or to an Italian doctor or an Italian lawyer and that's what creates a non-harmonious society.

However, while belief in the value of culture contact may be sincerely felt by many Italians, their different social locations possibly explain different conceptions of the future role of ethnic schools, especially as they relate to their understanding of multiculturalism. While organisers and parents, for example, are generally aware of the over representation of Italians in the lowest paid jobs and the cultural dominance of Anglo-Australians in the Australian media, their interests differ. Organisers have to run ethnic schools on limited financial resources and negotiate with Australians or Australian authorities on a day to day basis. In the case of the Dante Alighieri Society these negotiations are with Australian members of the Society itself; with CO.AS.IT. there is frequent contact with state government departments and other bodies in its role as a welfare body. Given the antagonism in the wider society to encouragement of separate migrant structures, an issue which will be discussed later, it is not surprising that because of organisers’ interaction with Australians and/or working relationships with Australian authorities they should want to incorporate ethnic schools into existing educational systems. Parents on the other hand have little or no contact with Australians and because of their regard for the priority of the family and hence, the value of even limited spoken Italian among their children, are more inclined to support the existing system of ethnic schools and to relate Italian language maintenance to the question of good jobs for their children in the future.

Finally, on the issue of migrant education, Italians were similar to Greeks because migrant education also meant different things to different people. It was only where Italians saw migrant education involving teaching Italian to children of Italians that ethnic schools had any role. Generally though, in diverse conceptions of migrant education there was, as in the case of multiculturalism, no systematic or obvious role for ethnic schools or ethnic schooling.

In summary, it is obvious that diversity of Italian ethnic schooling prevents any articulation of a typical Italian ethnic school. Existence of after hours classes, or the part-time ethnic school, alongside of insertion classes during school hours represents two phases of a process for organisers and teachers, where the desired goal is the incorporation of the role of the former by the latter. This view of organisers and teachers of the role of ethnic schools contrasts with the view of parents, who were generally happy with the current situation.
On the wider issues of migrant education and multiculturalism, Italians' responses were like those of the Greeks — variable and apolitical. Italians' understanding of multiculturalism was at a cultural level — the maintenance of the Italian language — and was not used to conceptualise structural dimensions such as Italians' inequality of participation in the workforce and lack of political power. The important point here is that whatever strategies Italians had for changing their structural location in Australian society, they did not include ethnic schools. The only exceptions were organisers and teachers, who saw language teaching as leading to understanding and acceptance between Italians and Australians; and many parents, who thought that the Italian their children acquired in ethnic school would enable them to obtain better jobs. In both cases there was no systematic view as to how the acquisition of Italian would lead to these respective ends. More important was a confounding of structural ends with cultural means, an issue which will be taken up in the final part of this book.

Ukrainians
Ukrainian ethnic schools are among the best organised in Australia. In New South Wales they appear to have the most systematic approach to the overall organisation of classes, curriculum design, teacher recruitment and training. As one of the smaller national communities providing ethnic schools, Ukrainians are relatively active and cooperative in their pursuit of goals concerning ethnic schools. The experience of the Ukrainian community as Ukrainians, their size, and their systematic approach to and objectives of ethnic schools contrast sharply with the situations of Italians and Greeks and therefore have different implications for migrant education and the wider issue of multiculturalism.

The Board of Ukrainian Ethnic Schools is the central body responsible for coordinating monitoring and the curricula, programs and standard of teaching of the six Ukrainian ethnic schools in New South Wales. In addition, it has representatives on the Ethnic Communities Council of New South Wales and the recently formed New South Wales Federation of Ethnic Schools. Formed in 1953, this Board is an arm of the Federal Ukrainian Council which has a national role in establishing curricula and programs.

While there is a historically important religious cleavage between Ukrainian Orthodox and Ukrainian Catholics (see Lewins, 1978: 108ff), this does not appear to influence significantly the organisation, curricula and day to day workings of Ukrainian ethnic schools in New
South Wales. Even though one school is organised by the Ukrainian Catholic Church at Lidcombe, a western suburb of Sydney, and even though most children who attend are Ukrainian Catholics, it is not a Catholic school. Orthodox children can and do attend although most of the near 400 attending Ukrainian schools use the nondenominational ethnic schools organised by the Ukrainian community as a whole. In addition, Ukrainian Catholic organisers have frequent contact with Ukrainian ethnic schools and through their representation on the Board of Ukrainian Orthodox, through their active role in organising workshops on teaching the Ukrainian language and culture on behalf of the Board. Contact also occurs among teachers, for while all Ukrainian schools teach the same curriculum and syllabus in language, history, geography and so on, Ukrainian Catholic clergy teach religion to Catholic children attending the community schools. Because of the extent of uniformity of structure, organisation, curricula and syllabi of Ukrainian schools, together with the significance of a cohesive Ukrainian identity among Catholics and Orthodox (see Lewins, 1978: 108ff), the picture uncovered through a case study of the ethnic school organised by the Ukrainian Catholic Church is not idiosyncratic but reasonably indicative of the structure of all schools and sentiments of all Ukrainians in Australia.

The ethnic school organised by St Andrew's Ukrainian Catholic Church at Lidcombe is one of few which has its own buildings set up as a permanent school. The 150 or so children who attend are broken up into a kindergarten, 7 primary and 3 secondary levels. In addition, there are classes for teacher training. The kindergarten and primary classes operate from four to five hours on Saturday and the secondary and teacher training classes run for three hours on Friday night. All classes operate for the normal school year, that is, from early February to the end of December. Of the eleven teachers, five are already teachers in the Australian educational system. Some of the remainder were trained as teachers in Europe. Teachers and priests, assisted by nuns of the Basilian order who take the kindergarten, teach a curriculum of language, geography, history, singing and scripture. Running costs, which are around $15,000 per year, are met largely from fees. These are supplemented by a small grant from the New South Wales government calculated on a needs basis.

One notable feature of Ukrainians' definitions of the role of ethnic schools was the high degree of consensus among organisers, teachers and parents associated with these schools. This consensus is not surprising given the relatively small size of the Ukrainian community and the fact that their social contacts are confined almost entirely to
other Ukrainians (see Bott, 1957). The greatest consensus was in responses to questions centred on the reasons for formation of Ukrainian ethnic schools, why they were important, whose responsibility were they, how much was known about what Ukrainians had provided in terms of ethnic schools, their future, and the importance of transmission of the Ukrainian language.

All Ukrainians interviewed stressed that the main factor in formation of Ukrainian ethnic schools was the need to preserve 'the Ukrainian heritage' — the language, religion and culture. Strong undercurrents in this sentiment of preservation, especially among clergy and older Ukrainians, were the love of homeland, anti-Russian feelings and a desire to return to a 'free Ukraine' someday. Ukrainian schools were important and existed, as one priest-organiser put it,

because we want to impart to our children all this national and religious heritage just to see in them the culmination of our aims, our culture, our religion — to be good Australians and good Ukrainians in order that they might help the country of their parents to achieve political independence . . . because now it is occupied by the Russians . . . nothing Ukrainian, nothing religious could be kept there. Therefore, we want our children to get these things from us in order that they may continue them and freely give them back to Ukraine one day.

Younger Ukrainians did not stress to the same extent this sense of oppression and beleagueredness in their elevating the worth of the Ukrainian heritage. A few merely conveyed the value of the Ukrainian language and culture for their own sake. As one articulate organiser said,

my view (on maintaining our Ukrainian heritage) is perhaps a bit different from the older generation. Some would agree on the human rights issue, others would see it on the issue of maintaining and developing things that they have brought with them, that our ancestors have had for thousands of years and they don't want to see die.

However, most younger Ukrainians, irrespective of whether they were teachers, organisers or parents, linked maintenance of the Ukrainian language and culture to the value of preservation of Ukrainian family life within the Ukrainian community. In interviews, Ukrainians frequently mentioned the word 'community' in discussing the importance of language maintenance through ethnic schools. One teacher, for example claimed that Ukrainian ethnic schools were different from other ethnic schools because of Ukrainians' 'sense of community'. This was why some finish their ethnic schooling and go on to become teachers in the same ethnic school; not for 'pin money'
but out of commitment to the community. Whatever their degree of commitment to the Ukrainian community, organisers', teachers' and parents' obvious conviviality, cooperation and ease of interaction indicate the value to them of their sense of belonging to this community. One parent even suggested that, as a consequence of 'having a sense of a place' within the Ukrainian community, he did not question the need to send his children to an ethnic school; he had no choice if he wanted to remain in the 'Ukrainian fold'.

Other areas of consensus in Ukrainians' understanding of the role of ethnic schools centred around the related issues of the future of Ukrainian schools, which are the locations of responsibility for providing the teaching of Ukrainian, the extent of knowledge of the ethnic school situation, and the role of Ukrainian language maintenance. Unlike Greeks and Italians, all Ukrainians interviewed were knowledgeable of what Ukrainians had provided in the way of ethnic schools. Even parents, who were generally removed from the day to day decision making concerning these schools, appeared to have reflected on specific issues, such as funding and language incorporation in the existing school system. All had a spontaneous, thought out view on the future of ethnic schools. The teaching of Ukrainian was the responsibility of the Ukrainian community and the New South Wales government. Hence, existing Ukrainian schools should work in cooperation with the existing system, where the ideal would be more widespread teaching of Ukrainian in normal school hours and recognition by the Education Department of the work done by ethnic schools in preparation for HSC Ukrainian. Currently, Ukrainian is taught as an HSC language at only one high school in Sydney — Parramatta High.

Even if Ukrainians were introduced in many more schools, Ukrainians generally believed that the continued role of ethnic schools would be vital. Their feeling was that normal school classes could not convey the culture and religious heritage which only Ukrainians themselves could do. There is considerable evidence for the strength of these sentiments for, again, unlike Greek and Italian ethnic schoolchildren, where language competence is more symbolic and of token value respectively, Ukrainian children are generally bilingual before they begin ethnic school. From observations in several classes and in the kindergarten, children were conversing with their teachers, answering questions and reading from Ukrainian textbooks with considerably more than token ability. It is of interest to note that children from 'mixed marriages', that is where one parent is non-Ukrainian, had considerably less competence in speaking Ukrainian.
According to teachers and organisers, there has been an increasing number of these children appearing among the lower primary and kindergarten classes. In summing up the importance of ethnic schools centring around maintenance of the whole Ukrainian heritage and community life, one priest-organiser captured the sentiments of other Ukrainians:

"to some extent they get a knowledge of Ukrainian language from their parents and the language itself doesn't make someone Ukrainian — or English or French — if you know such a language. Our aim is not just to teach the language as such but also to give them their own package. Language is only a part of it."

This limited stress on the role of language and the total absence of any mention of instrumental benefits to be gained from learning Ukrainian, such as the likelihood of being able to get a 'good job', contrasts sharply with accounts given by Italian and Greek parents on the benefits of their children learning Italian or Greek. This is explained by a number of factors. First, Ukrainian is spoken by relatively few people in Australia, hence Ukrainians would not be inclined to think of it as a community language in which competence is equated with careers. Second, Ukrainians generally do not perceive themselves to be disadvantaged in the occupational structure. While those who were interviewed were from a variety of occupations (solicitor, tertiary teacher, clerk, taxi driver, etc.), it was claimed by one apparently well informed teacher that 83 per cent of Ukrainians' offspring are in or have been through tertiary education. The prominence of tertiary educated Ukrainians among organisers, teachers and those with links outside the community, such as the Ethnic Communities Council, is consistent with this isolated claim.

Apart from minor disagreements among parents over whether their children resented giving up Saturday to attend Ukrainian school and uncertainties about circumstances leading to formation by the Ukrainian Catholic Church of their own ethnic school, Ukrainians generally gave coherent accounts of the emergence, operation and significance of ethnic schools in their community. When asked to link these schools to the wider issues of migrant education and multiculturalism, however, Ukrainians were obviously less articulate and informed. Clearly, for most Ukrainians, the role of ethnic schools and the issues of migrant education and multiculturalism were perceived as separate and unrelated domains. This is not to say that Ukrainians were unaware of the issues of migrant education and multiculturalism. Tertiary educated Ukrainians frequently discussed
areas such as prejudice towards migrants, inequality, the Anglo-Celtic slant on Australian history, and the need for migrants to take more responsibility for their own future. The point is that even among these more articulate Ukrainians, ethnic schools had no role in changing any structural disadvantage of migrants in general, and Ukrainians in particular. Ethnic schools served cultural needs — identity formation, family consolidation and reinforcement of community life. They were not means of achieving social change. As one organiser expressed it: 'ethnic schools are not going to change Anglo-Celtic viewpoints. Ethnic schools are there for language maintenance and development'.

While the role of ethnic schools and issues of migrant education and multiculturalism were generally perceived to be unrelated areas, an implicit relationship was evident in some Ukrainians' responses. One organiser, for instance, claimed that the maintenance of Ukrainian heritage through Ukrainian ethnic schools served not only the Ukrainian community's interests but also those of the wider society:

we have found from experience that a person from an ethnic background can best suit the community that he lives in by identifying himself with his heritage, with his parents, being proud of that heritage; and he has two cultures under his belt and he is in a better position to help the community at large in which he lives and works. That's one aim of the ethnic schools — that we have to make our children good Australian citizens, by making them aware that they're Ukrainians and they have something to be proud of through their parents.

In adding a comment on the 'mechanics of making this nation into a multicultural society', he pointed to changed attitudes, including those towards migrants, which have 'all come about slowly by (everyone) becoming aware of the different mentalities within the community'. The apolitical nature of this diffusion process of change contrasts with the views of another organiser, who was atypical in his political awareness of the place of migrants in the wider society. When questioned on the broad issue of multiculturalism, specifically how he thought equality for migrants would come about, he replied:

it is one thing to have equality on the surface . . . with languages being taught (in a community language program). It would appear to be equal but I support the view that we will not have equality until we have people in decision-making places. People who can express a point of view and say, look, you've also left out this factor, that's also important . . . not on a consultative basis . . . the final decision often takes more than consultation.

Even when the political dimension of the place of migrants in Australian society was perceived, as the latter indicates, it was not
accompanied by any actual organisation or action in the political arena. More important, in redressing inequality and lack of participation and access migrants have in Australia, no direct role for ethnic schools, specifically Ukrainian ethnic schools, was envisaged by any Ukrainians.

Slovenes
Like the Greek ethnic community, Slovenians in Australia also have to live with a major ideological schism. This schism centres around pro- and anti-Tito sentiments and cuts across Slovenians' sense of community, providing many difficulties in establishing and maintaining institutions such as ethnic schools. It was estimated that there were between 300-400 Slovenian-born migrants in the city in which this study of the Slovenian ethnic school was conducted. One difficulty in determining more precise figures is that these migrants are classed as Yugoslav for census purposes.

This split within the Slovenian community, which occurred about 1972 and which was primarily politically based, was felt by the organiser of the school to be the major difficulty facing the school. He claimed that, although the school functioned well because of participants' similar ideological orientations, it suffered through lack of support and numbers. This particular school was organised in the Slovenian Club which was retained by 'the majority' after the split of 1972. It was access to these premises which enabled establishment of an ethnic school in 1974. The school, which uses texts imported from the US, has three teachers who are volunteer parents with high school education and is organised into three grades — up to age ten, age ten to fifteen, and high school students. Approximately twenty students attend classes, which are held one night a week for two hours and for which no fees are charged.

The impetus for the establishment of the school appeared to come from a need felt by the parents for such a school. The organiser expressed it this way:

well . . . the Slovenians have always sort of given quite a significance to education, and we have always been convinced that we are bound to and under an obligation to pass our heritage on to our sons. It was never really discussed why we needed it, but it was just a general feeling that there should be a school.

The curriculum consists mainly of language and grammar. The Slovenian language differs from the Yugoslav in a similar fashion to the difference between Spanish and Portuguese. It is also different
from the Serbian and Croatian languages and it is this uniqueness of language and national feelings among Slovenians which lay behind their need to establish their own school. In general, the organiser would like the curriculum expanded to include areas such as history and geography, but saw teachers' lack of qualifications hindering this. He also suggested that moving into these areas could possibly introduce difficulties concerning ideological differences. When asked whether he would like to see part of the curriculum devoted to study of Slovenian migration to Australia, he responded positively but thought it could not be done satisfactorily because dispersion of Slovenians throughout Australia made it difficult to refer to 'a group concentration'.

Major problems with the school were seen as, first, the unsatisfactory situation where a number of children, because of political-ideological views of their parents, were being deprived of the opportunity to learn Slovenian; and second, maintaining motivation and willingness of teachers. Being voluntary, it was felt that teachers may be less committed to teaching than qualified teachers. The organiser also commented on inadequate facilities as the classes had to make use of various halls and offices within the Slovenian Club. He thought the school was achieving its aims in so far as most children seemed to be picking up the language. On the future of the school, he stated: 'so I feel that if the school can give the basic confidence to the students, so that they are not ashamed of their language, I think that is all I can expect'. On the question of wider issues covering use of Slovenian outside the home and the importance of ethnic languages in Australian society, this same organiser pointed out that, given the small size of the Slovenian population in Australia, one could not realistically expect the language to be used outside the home or be introduced into the regular school system. However, he pointed to the fervent nationalism inherited by Slovenians as a result of their geographical location in Europe, and that this sentiment would, in his opinion, ensure perpetuation of the language from generation to generation.

The reason offered as to why promotion of other ethnic languages in Australia was desirable, emphasised once again the general view held by migrants in this study that multilingualism was synonymous with multiculturalism. It was suggested that 'it would be a good thing for Australians to realise that there are other languages in the world as well respected as English'. When asked about how he saw the position of migrants in Australian society, this organiser commented on improvement in the position of migrants over the last 20 to 30 years
because 'the migrant today has some self-respect'. He did not think that this position could be improved because to attempt to do so would cause a 'backlash'.

The other wide issue — migrant education — was defined as improving the educational level of migrants. However this was seen as more a problem of selecting migrants with adequate educational backgrounds than raising the educational levels of migrants in Australia.

The one parent interviewed had two children who attended the school. These children were sent to school mainly so that they could converse with their grandmother who did not speak English. Although these children used Slovenian at home, their parents also encouraged the use of English - 'it's their main language'. Major problems identified with the school concerned the curriculum, which this parent thought should be extended to include history, geography and 'more about the culture', the teachers and the hours. She thought that employment of paid teachers would improve teaching in the school. Class times were seen as unsatisfactory because children were 'often tired and can't take in very much'. Other times, such as Saturdays, had been experimented with but were found to be unsuitable because of the clash with sport and other family activities.

*  *  *

These accounts of Greek, Italian, Ukrainian and Slovenian ethnic schools illuminate the difficulty of conceptualising a typical ethnic school. Given the close relationship between the organisation and definitions of the role of ethnic schools and the idiosyncratic nature of each community (e.g. the Greek church split and the existence of pro- and anti-Tito groups among Slovenians), an intriguing question arises concerning the extent of organisation among ethnic communities, that is, across ethnic lines, on behalf of all ethnic schools.

The only noticeable and significant instance of the latter is the NSW Federation of Ethnic Schools. Formed in 1977, the Federation has its own constitution and is registered under the NSW Charities Act. It is a three-tiered structure, consisting of a seven member executive (the 'administrative arm') a fifteen member council (the policy making body) and an assembly of members (delegates from individual schools and organising bodies), which elects both the executive and council. The official aims of the Federation include speaking with a united voice on ethnic schools and language maintenance, exerting pressure on Australian and State governments for funding, monitoring
developments of interest to member schools, and being an independent body able to accommodate diversity of views in a pluralist society.

According to one official, the Federation currently has problems of political infighting and internal divisions centred around definitions of the role of ethnic schools. In addition, the relatively small representation of ethnic schools in New South Wales and lack of knowledge of the Federation prevents it speaking with a united voice. It was only when the Federation was united, according to this same official, could it venture into areas such as politicising the curriculum (see part three). At the moment, such moves would represent ‘indecent haste’.

While the above discussion indicates that there is considerable variation among ethnic communities and within ethnic communities as to what ethnic schools can and should achieve and what their relationship to the normal education system should be, there were other more general and somewhat speculative findings of a thematic nature common to all communities. These findings are significant because they could impinge on the future of ethnic schools. First, behind claims in all groups that ethnic schools were formed and continue to exist to facilitate communication in the family and to preserve aspects of ethnic culture, was the underlying theme of the prime importance of family unity and cohesiveness and the goal of its preservation. While all this was not immediately apparent nor challenged in Greek, Ukrainian and Slovenian circles, simply because wider responses towards ethnic schools in these communities were consistent with these underlying values, the latter were more obvious in Italian circles because of inconsistencies in parents’ responses towards teaching Italian alongside of their family’s use of regional dialect. The link between maintenance of family unity and cohesion and Italian ethnic schools among parents was also indicated by the latter’s indifference towards and lack of knowledge of moves elsewhere to incorporate teaching of Italian into existing school systems. Added to this was Italian parents’ support for the continued role of ethnic schools despite their children having token competence in Italian or, where there was some fluency, the possibility of it not being used for communication because dialect (and/or English), not Italian, was the language of communication in the family.

If this tentative analysis of the role of ethnics’ regard for family is accurate, then it has wider implications for the future of ethnic schools. It is possible that, through increased funding of ethnic schools and more pan-ethnic organisation, better methods of language
teaching to aid 'communication in the family' could be introduced which would undermine parents' values of family unity and cohesion. This would be a fruitful avenue to explore in a survey of all ethnic schools.

Another important general dimension worthy of comment and further exploration centres around the variable attendance rates at ethnic schools. While it would appear that attendance rates are related to the degree of overlap between participation in ethnic schools and participation in other ethnic organisations, where the more dense the ethnic network, the greater the obligations to attend ethnic schools (see Bott, 1957), other possible explanations need exploration through survey analysis. For instance, we do not know to what extent varying attendance rates are a function of different generations providing pupils for ethnic schools. Combined with this is the possible effect on attendance rates of 'mixed marriages'. While we know that the Italians are the longest settled of the four communities studied, with third generation children forming a significant pool of potential ethnic school pupils, we could not measure the generation and/or mixed marriage effect in our case study. This possible explanation is worth investigating because if it were demonstrated that attendance rates at ethnic schools were merely a function of generations, then the future of ethnic schools is not assured (cf. Smolicz, 1979: 137f, especially 141n).

As a final comment, the findings of this study indicate that no generalisations can be made about ethnic schools as a whole. While there are some common problems, viewpoints and underlying themes, variation between communities is so significant that any consideration of these schools, particularly in policy formulation, must be confined to the specific communities and, in some cases, to sub-categories in these communities. This is important to realise given the growth of ethnic schools, limited attempts to organise across ethnic lines (e.g. NSW Federation of Ethnic Schools) and the consequent likelihood of their becoming a political issue with increased demands for government funding.

Given the exploratory nature of this study, the above findings are wide ranging and of interest to both educationalists and sociologists. Chapter 2 has focused on those findings of sociological significance. Any educational insights, such as the content of curricula, teaching techniques and materials, and the bearing of these on bilingual education, are largely unintended consequences of the study and their exclusion here is because of limited space rather than their lack of significance.
3 Ethnic Schools and Their Wider Implications

Summary of Findings
The major finding from these case studies is that it is impossible to define a typical ethnic school. Similarities in their organisation, such as the number of hours per week these schools operate and the format of the curriculum, were outweighed by the differences between them.

Greek ethnic schools in Sydney were established much earlier than their Italian, Ukrainian and Slovenian counterparts. But neither the length of time these schools have been established nor the size and period of main migration to Australia of the respective ethnic communities are directly related to the degree of consensus among organisers, teachers and parents on the aims, role and operation of ethnic schools. Whereas the largest groups, the Greeks and Italians, displayed considerable internal variation in the organisation and definition of the role of ethnic schools, the Ukrainians were much more united. These variations were a function of political, ideological, geographical, and linguistic differences related to experiences or events in the country of origin. Although the Slovenians, for example, were relatively small in number, which should have facilitated their co-ordination, a severe ideological-political split seriously affected success of their school. On the other hand, unification of Ukrainians against a common enemy 'back home' did a lot to strengthen the organisation of their ethnic school system in Sydney, even to the point of training their own teachers.

All participants agreed that ethnic schools were established to teach ethnic languages. But there were differences between ethnic communities and between teachers and organisers, on the one hand, and parents, on the other, within the same community, as to why it was necessary to perpetuate the language. Greek and Italian organisers and teachers emphasised the family and community function of language whereas parents also stressed communication and improved chances of getting a good job. At the other extreme was consensus among Ukrainians that their schools existed to promote a sense of Ukrainian community and to keep Ukrainian children 'within the fold'.
Although it was generally agreed that ethnic languages should be introduced into the regular school system, there were differing views between, as well as within, communities as to the role of ethnic schools once this objective had been achieved. Teachers in Italian ethnic schools saw their schools as temporary institutions which would no longer be necessary once Italian had been made part of the curriculum in regular schools. On the other hand, teachers and organisers in Greek ethnic schools argued for maintenance of their schools to teach aspects of Greek culture which they felt would not be taught adequately within the normal school system. The organiser of the Slovenian school suggested that he could not realistically expect Slovenian to be introduced into the regular school system as the number of Slovenians was small. Once more at the other extreme were the Ukrainians, who agreed that their ethnic school system, because of its role as an integral part of their community, would continue once Ukrainian was incorporated into the curriculum of government schools.

Teachers and organisers were much more informed than parents about issues relating to ethnic schools and regarded their schools as not achieving their aims because of inadequacies in the system. The major limitation teachers saw was the short time available in which they had to teach language and other aspects of culture, such as history, geography and customs. These teachers suggested other areas they would like to introduce into the curriculum (e.g. life in Australia) but could not possibly do so given time restrictions. Parents, on the other hand, often complained about lack of progress their children were making with the language and attributed this to inadequately trained teachers.

Although teachers frequently complained about low attendance rates, these varied considerably between the four communities. Not surprisingly, Ukrainian ethnic schools showed very high attendance rates, as did Greek schools. The organiser of the Slovenian school saw low attendance rates as a function of the ideological-political split in the community. Low attendance at Italian schools was, in part, related to existence of many dialects within the Italian community. That is, while Italian parents (along with organisers and teachers) generally agreed that their children attended ethnic schools to learn Italian so that they could communicate with their families, in many cases they themselves could not and/or did not speak Italian in the home. Instead they spoke their regional dialect or a mixture of dialect, Italian and/or English. Lack of awareness of the significance of dialect among organisers and teachers and moves to incorporate the teaching
of Italian into the normal school system are both related to the fact that Italians organising ethnic schools along 'Italian' lines is somewhat contrived. Italians, unlike Greeks and Ukrainians, do not normally identify themselves with national ties, that is, as 'Italians', but instead see and organise themselves along regional lines, associated with which are their various dialects (see Lewins, 1975; 1976 and 1978). The absence of pervasive 'Italian' ethnic ties, Italians' relative lack of participation in 'Italian' organisations, and their attenuated, regional ethnic identification (e.g. Calabresi, Friulani) and organisation means that organisation of ethnic schools lacks the support of associated networks, such as that found among Greeks in their Orthodox Church. These facts have a bearing on the future of Italian ethnic schools.

Among a small community such as the Ukrainians, support for the continued role of Ukrainian ethnic schools was bound up inextricably with what it was to be Ukrainian. While there was the occasional suggestion from organisers and teachers that the existence of a separate ethnic school organised by Ukrainian Catholics was a reflection of internal divisions in the community, there was no convincing evidence of a divided community. Instead, Ukrainians' participation in Ukrainian activities, that is, neither Orthodox nor Catholic, their frequent mention of the importance of their children marrying Ukrainians, even across religious lines, their obvious committed approach to a well organised system of ethnic schools, and the high degree of language competence among pupils in Ukrainian ethnic schools, all point to a cohesive community in which ethnic schools are only one of many mutually supporting activities. The future of these schools is assured irrespective of whether the Ukrainian language is introduced into more high schools other than Parramatta High School and independent of future shifts in government funding. It was felt by organisers, teachers and parents that there should be greater recognition by the New South Wales Education Department of what Ukrainian ethnic schools were doing in preparing students for HSC Ukrainian. Some organisers and teachers thought this recognition could extend to Ukrainian ethnic schools taking responsibility for all teaching of the Ukrainian language, although they realised the immense practical difficulties in what they were suggesting.

Among the Slovenians, another small ethnic community, responses to the role of ethnic schools were closely related to wider issues peculiar to the Slovenian community as a whole. While the school we examined was associated with and ran from the local Slovenian Club,
lack of finances and competent teachers meant that successful operation of the ethnic school depended on commitment and devotion of those associated with the school. What was needed, according to those interviewed, were paid teachers and greater communication among members of the Slovenian community. However, in the eyes of the organiser, the latter was hampered by the ideological split among Slovenians — those for and against the Tito regime in Yugoslavia — which manifested itself in Australian Slovenian circles in 1972.

The most significant difference between views of teachers and organisers, on the one hand, and parents, on the other, was in the advantages to be gained by children who attended ethnic school. Parents, notably Greek and Italian, pointed to greater job opportunities which would be available to bilingual children in a multicultural society. Teachers and organisers did not see the benefit of ethnic schooling linked to issues of migrant success in the opportunity structure, but rather to other instrumental functions such as helping children to find their identity and enabling them to help other migrants who do not know English. Ukrainian parents were an exception. They did not see their ethnic schools in any way linked to the career of the child but, instead, saw them solely as maintaining the Ukrainian community.

To the extent to which a general picture of migrant definitions of ethnic schools can be drawn from these case studies, the picture is one of *ad hoc* responses to apparently ‘new’ questions. One possible exception were the Ukrainians who, on most issues, displayed a great degree of organisational unity and consensus. But the degree of unrelatedness increased, even among Ukrainians, when migrants were asked to link ethnic schools with wider issues of multicultural education and multiculturalism. For most respondents, irrespective of ethnicity, the role of ethnic schools was seen as distinct from anything to do with multicultural education and multiculturalism. Multicultural education, according to the Greeks, was teaching English to adult migrants, while a multicultural society referred to a culturally diverse one. For many of the migrants, multiculturalism was equated with multilingualism and this conceptualisation provided the link for some between ethnic schools and multiculturalism. That is, ethnic schools would ensure the perpetuation of ethnic languages, which would in turn foster multiculturalism.

Consistent with this view of multiculturalism was the common perception of ethnic stratification and migrant disadvantage as referring to Anglo-Australians’ attitudes of discrimination and prejudice towards migrants. These sentiments were seen to be caused
by lack of contact and communication between Australians and minority ethnic groups. Some Greek parents claimed that ethnic schools would help reduce discrimination and prejudice by spreading ethnic languages and cultures and hence, develop awareness among Australians of these ethnic cultures. Italian teachers and organisers, while also desiring the same end, differed from parents in so far as they thought that culture contact and communication would be better served by introducing Italian into the regular school system. For the Ukrainians, ethnic schools were seen as serving no role in changing the disadvantaged position of migrants: they served the cultural needs of Ukrainians.

Overall, these migrants were not aware of any deep rooted, structural ethnic stratification. However, teachers' and organisers' views of the position of migrants in Australian society differed from those of parents. The former were more aware of the disadvantaged position of migrants, possibly because of their greater involvement with Australian authorities and relevant information. Consequently, they were able to point to educational, occupational and economic inequalities between Australians and migrants. Parents, on the other hand, when asked to comment on the position of migrants in Australia stressed the improvements which had taken place over the last 'ten or twenty years'. These improvements were seen as a consequence of increasing awareness and understanding among Australians of different cultures. Greek organisers saw the best avenue for further major improvements in the position of migrants as the process of consultation and discussion and claimed that establishment of various ethnic committees and the co-opting of migrants on to other bodies had clearly paved the way for such improvements. Some concern was expressed over radical views put forward by migrant activists, who, it was argued, could produce an Australian backlash against migrants. One notable exception to the strategy of consultation was the view expressed by one organiser that 'structured changes' would only result from

ethnic groups organising themselves on a political basis ... to get change requires a shift in power. Power doesn't fall in front of you, you have to go out and get it. The pluralist approach is becoming the more popular approach. If we can get parents to articulate their position, then this articulation will lead to bureaucratic changes.

This overview of the major findings of migrant definitions of ethnic schools certainly lends support to the general comment that 'ethnic schools mean different things to different people'. Variations in
organisation and views, both within and between the communities studied, outweigh similarities. Having considered migrants' definitions of the role of ethnic schools, it is important to consider the relationship between these definitions and the role of ethnic schools envisaged by Australian educational and related officials.

Ethnic Schools and Australian Officials

The most important conclusion to be drawn from interview data gained from a selected number of officials in educational and related organisations is that there was a close correspondence of their views on ethnic schools, migrant education and multiculturalism with those of Greeks, Italians, Ukrainians, and Slovenians (a list of these officials' affiliations appears in Appendix A).

Generally, these officials regarded ethnic schools as filling a gap in the education of migrants not provided for by existing educational systems. They saw the dominant role of ethnic schools as agencies of language maintenance among migrant communities and, to a lesser extent, purveyors of culture and religion. No official saw the future role of ethnic schools independent of existing educational systems. While some officials saw these schools as serving a worthwhile purpose and therefore, worthy of government funding, others saw them as harmful structures not deserving of government assistance. In the long term, all thought the eventual incorporation of the role of ethnic schools into normal day schools as desirable (cf. Martin's definitions of ethnic schools in chapter 1).

While these views of ethnic schools were clearly discernible, officials generally had little up to date information about, nor reflected on, issues surrounding these schools. The degree of awareness and knowledge of these schools varied directly with officials' day to day contact with migrants and/or migrant issues.

At a broader level, ethnic schools had no clear place in officials' views of migrant education. Given the degree of variation of migrants' views of the role of ethnic schools, it was surprising to see even greater variation in officials' conceptions of migrant education. Even those directly concerned with education defined the latter in diverse ways (e.g. native language maintenance, bilingual education, teaching English as a second language, teaching English, and teaching information of Australian institutions and migrants' rights in relation to these; cf. Nicoll, 1977: 10). Again, while the depth of thought and clarity of the picture of migrant education varied directly with officials' contact with migrants and/or migrant issues, the overall impression is one of their having no systematic approach to this area
nor great concern for anything other than language teaching, that is, English or migrant languages. One official seemed to sum up what was implicit in all but a few of these interviews: 'I'm not terribly clear on my ideas about this [migrant education]. I don't suppose I've thought it through.'

In the context of wider thinking on the issue of multiculturalism, there was a similar absence of the role of ethnic schools. Despite officials' degree of involvement with migrants and/or migration issues and agreement on the level of migrants' inequality in Australian society, the solutions proposed or implied to achieve a multicultural Australia and/or to correct this inequality were in the context of existing Australian organisations and institutions (e.g. educational system and legal system). Only two officials pointed to what could be regarded as political awareness of the place of migrants in Australia and the means to change this. One, for instance, argued that there was a place for migrant education which equipped migrants with knowledge of their rights and how Australian institutions functioned. All other officials saw the path to a multicultural Australia in cultural terms because of their stress on the beneficial effects of language maintenance programs and 'culture contact' in the process of changing prejudiced attitudes. As one official put it, in reply to a question about the role of language in achieving a multicultural Australia, 'language is very important. In fact it is almost the only factor involved'.

The inability of officials to articulate a clear role for ethnic schools, the omission of these schools in their thinking about migrant education and multiculturalism, and the absence of political solutions to remedy migrants' inequality, are all consistent with an outlook of 'holistic multiculturalism'. Apart from isolated comments from officials, such as their stressing the value of 'social cohesion' and the needs of the 'total community', the words of one official seemed to sum up the outlook of all. In saying that ethnic schools should be incorporated into the existing educational system, he went on to say that this was because 'education is a total community responsibility involving politicians and governments and schools and communities — total communities'.

Wider Issues: Ethnic Schools, Multicultural Education and Multiculturalism
The contradictions and confusions in migrants' and officials' conceptualisations of the role of ethnic schools in a multicultural society became most apparent when the concepts of inequality and ethnic stratification were introduced. Among migrants, ethnic schools
were seen as not only promoting multiculturalism by perpetuating ethnic languages, but also promoting ethnic equality by means of such processes as making Australians more aware and tolerant of different ethnic minorities. Contradictions arose because of the apolitical framework of multiculturalism, and ethnic relations in general, in which these views were located. That is, they present ethnic relations in Australia as a one dimensional, horizontal structure based on cultural differences, which ignores the hierarchical structure of ethnic stratification in general, and educational inequality in particular. So, for example, although there was consensus among migrants and officials that it was desirable for ethnic languages to be taught in the regular school system (which would be the achievement of an important ethnic goal), there was little awareness of social, political, economic and legal inequalities between English and other languages in Australia.

It is clear that in order to make sense of the role of ethnic schools in the wider context of ethnic relations, it is necessary to spell out important aspects of the nature and structure of this wider context. It is only by such systematic, theoretical analysis that we can hope to understand the popular view of ethnic schools as fulfilling cultural needs and unrelated to political questions such as equal rights, participation and opportunity. Such analysis should also make it possible to ask questions about the viability of existing curricula of ethnic schools. What alternative form of curricula could be introduced into ethnic schools and what alternative roles could these schools play? Finally, given the implications of the possible roles of ethnic schools for multiculturalism and the location of these schools in a society in which the Anglo-Australian educational system is dominant, questions concerning these possible roles need to consider consequences they would have for the existing educational system.

It seems obvious that ethnic relations not only constitute material and social relations between ethnic categories/groups/individuals (e.g. differential access to resources), but also cultural relations. What is not quite so obvious is that cultural relations are also relations of control. That is, to restrict the concept of culture merely to descriptions of different languages, beliefs and primordial attachments, in a multiethnic society is to overlook the cultural control of one dominant culture.

This form of control is based on the relationship between ‘truth’ (the process of constructing knowledge), ‘statements’ (knowledge) and ‘power’ (Foucault, 1977). The late Jean Martin (1978: 21) has used these concepts to provide the framework for her analysis ‘of the way
in which knowledge about migrants and their place in Australian society has been affirmed and constructed, denied and destroyed, over the past thirty years'. But clearly not all sub-groups in society have the legitimate right to produce knowledge and truth about migrants. Consequently, with respect to ethnic relations in this country, certain government apparatuses have power to define the nature of these relations. The dominant concept at present is 'multiculturalism'. Multiculturalism, with its popular usage is a 'buzz word' or, in Mehlman's terms (1973), a 'floating signifier'. That is, its popularity lies in its usage as a rhetorical and ideological device. Its specific meaning is of little importance to politicians and others who use it as a rhetorical device. It is the connotation that this word invokes that is the important point and, because it is an ambiguous concept that 'everybody knows' and has positive connotations, it is often suited to the purposes of politicians and well meaning 'migrant activists'. It is only when the signifier is subjected to rigorous scrutiny, as in these interviews, that the contradictions and inconsistencies in meaning and usage emerge.

The three distinct meanings of the concept multiculturalism presented by Lewins (1979) and introduced in Chapter 1 have gone a long way in clarifying the use of this term. Demographic multiculturalism simply acknowledges diversity of ethnic populations in Australia. Holistic multiculturalism emphasises tolerance and understanding between Australians and ethnics and stresses the wholeness and welfare of the entire society over its parts. The third meaning is referred to as political multiculturalism:

This process emphasises the role of political processes in Australian-ethnic relations and regards ethnic groups as legitimate interest groups and as having the responsibility for the realisation of ethnic goals. In this approach, the focus is on the political nature of relations between the parts (usually Australians and various ethnic communities) rather than on the needs of the whole society (Lewins, 1979: 4).

Martin (1976: 25) was one scholar who recognised the political nature of ethnic relations:

Ethnic pluralism in Australia is not, then, the safely cultural, apolitical phenomenon that some bland interpretations would lead us to think. Nor is there any reason to wish that this is what it should be. When every other group in our society claims the right to be politicized — from women at the most inclusive end of the scale to convicts, perhaps at the most exclusive — it is hard to justify denying this right, or thinking it can be denied to ethnic groups.
The theme of the first two perspectives on multiculturalism is that ethnic relations are regarded, implicitly and ideologically, as apolitical. Insofar as they recognise ethnic pluralism as a permanent state, it is only in the sense of ethnic diversity and need for inter-ethnic understanding. It is fair to say that the majority of migrants and officials interviewed for this study defined multiculturalism in the demographic or holistic sense. To attempt to explain why these migrants did not perceive multiculturalism in the political sense would involve an analysis of the cultural control mentioned earlier (see Connell, 1977), as well as an understanding of the connection between consciousness and social structure (see Sharp and Green, 1975: Ch. 2), both of which are beyond the scope of this analysis. However, any conception of multiculturalism, migrant education and the role of ethnic schools which ignores ethnic stratification must be inadequate, at least when applied to Australian society. Ethnic relations in this country are the result of many competing interests and the consequence of various political, economic and social forces which date back to 1788 and before. But before we can consider the role of ethnic schools and their implications for Australian ethnic relations in particular, and Australian society in general, it is necessary to take a closer look at ethnic stratification in Australia, especially the structure of opportunity.

**The Structure of Opportunity**

The most common model of the opportunity structure consistent with the apolitical view of multiculturalism (and multicultural or migrant education) is that represented by the metaphor of the ‘social ladder’, which implies that anyone, regardless of background factors, can ‘make it to the top’. This model is described by Wiley:

> the ladder is a straight one and no rungs are missing. Secondly, it can be climbed and the means of climbing are the same at all levels. It is implicit that ability and hard work determines one's place on the ladder (1967: 148).

This model is often used as a justification for the social system or the state of society as a whole.

To what extent does the social ladder model of the opportunity structure represent reality as far as ethnic groups in Australia are concerned? It was the Melbourne poverty studies of the mid-sixties that probably provided the first piece of large scale systematic evidence that ethnic communities were, collectively, a sociological minority and that Australian society constituted an ethnically
stratified society, not simply an ethnically heterogeneous one. For instance, Henderson’s inquiry in 1966 found that

30 per cent of Greek migrants were earning less than thirty dollars a week (either ‘very poor’ or ‘poor’ in Henderson’s terms), half though married with children, were living in rooms and sharing bathrooms and lavatories; 98.5 per cent were uninsured under any medical or hospital scheme (the native Australian figure was 29 per cent) (Western, 1977: 15).

The figures are similar for Italian migrants. In contrast,

only 15 per cent of U. K. migrants were earning less than thirty dollars per week, only 10 per cent were renting rooms and only 26 per cent were uninsured (Western, 1977: 16).

Zubrzycki (1960) and Borrie (1964) among others, have illuminated the over-representation of migrants in occupations at the lower end of the socioeconomic hierarchy. Martin, recognising this relationship, has also pointed out that,

to the extent that ethnic culture becomes associated with socioeconomic inferiority, we will develop a culturally as well as structurally stratified society (1972: 18).

O’Malley has recently commented:

There is little room for doubt that in Australia there exists a ‘sub-proletariat’ of socially and economically disadvantaged migrant workers and their families. These workers, particularly from Mediterranean countries of origin, occupy a range of roles in the workforce which have largely been abandoned by the Australian-born and migrants from English-speaking countries. In this case, these non-English-speaking migrants are performing ‘dirty-work’, i.e. work which is low paid, has poor job security and which involves poor work conditions — work which the relatively advantaged members of the workforce avoid (1978: 47).

To put this ‘social fact’ of ethnic stratification into perspective, it would be expected that recently arrived migrants, given their background occupational and educational experiences would be over-represented at the lower end of the socioeconomic hierarchy. However, given what we know about inter-generational occupational mobility, especially the noticeable lack of upward mobility out of unskilled and semi-skilled occupations (Broom and Jones, 1976), a major concern is with the extent to which children of newly arrived migrants do not have equal opportunity relative to children of Australian parents.¹ Martin has supported this claim by showing that

¹ This notion of migrant ‘deprivation’ needs to be elucidated to avoid confusion. Alan Matheson has put forward what he regards as a number of myths about migrant
non-English migrants are over-represented at the lower end of the socioeconomic scale and have not the same degree of upward social and occupational mobility as other groups (Martin, 1972). The report of the Australian Population and Immigration Council, titled *A Decade of Migrant Settlement* (1976), stated that

the migrant's disadvantage often persisted well past the initial settlement period and that there are many migrants long resident in the country whose welfare is cause for concern and action (quoted in O'Malley, 1978: 49).

A number of other studies point out this subordinate status of migrants in Australian society. These include Martin, 1975; Zubrzycki, 1976; Lever, 1975; Hearn, 1975; Davies, 1966; Wilson, 1973; Storer, 1975b; Gilmour and Lansbury, 1978.

Australia, then, is not the open society that the social ladder metaphor would have us believe. In most cases ethnicity, especially in the case of Southern Europeans, is one of the attributes in our society which hinders movement up the ladder. Yet this model of the opportunity system is the dominant ideology which is projected in many of our society's institutions. Althusser has shown how social institutions, for example, the family, the media and especially the school, socialise individuals into this 'ideological hegemony' (1972). In other words, the school, as an ideological state apparatus, is responsible for perpetuating this social ladder model of the opportunity structure. The logical connection between this model and holistic multiculturalism is the exclusion of any notion of structured inequality, of ethnic stratification.

One model of the opportunity system which does recognise the link in the social structure between ethnicity and stratification is Wiley's concept of the 'ethnic mobility trap'. In this model the opportunity system is visualised as

a tree and mobility as tree climbing . . . The limbs are like (sic), leading gently upward but primarily outward and away from all chance of serious ascent. Normally the climber who wants to hit the top will avoid the limbs as much as possible and concentrate on the trunk (Wiley, 1967: 148-9).

The trunk of the tree represents the superordinate opportunity system of the dominant (Anglo-Australian) group while the limbs represent education, the first of which is the myth 'that migrants alone need a special educational focus' (Matheson, 1973: 11). As Matheson conceptualises ethnic group relations as cultural pluralism and thus locates 'migrant education' within this same conceptualisation, his notion of 'special educational focus' is with respect to 'cultural deprivation'. We would partly agree with Matheson that this is an expression of 'Anglo-Australian chauvinism' (Matheson, 1973: 11), but the deprivation that we are referring to is not cultural, it is social, and the consequence of ethnic stratification.
the respective subordinate opportunity systems of minority groups. In order to advance in the majority's system, an ethnic would need to throw off his or her ethnicity, descend the limb to the trunk and advance up the trunk of the tree. In the context of this representation of the opportunity system, the essence of the mobility trap is that the means for moving up within a stratum are contrary to those for moving to the next higher stratum. In other words there is a conflict between intra- and inter-stratum mobility norms (Wiley, 1967: 149).

The ‘conflict’ which Wiley refers to can be represented as the problem of trade-off between ethnicity and social mobility. That is, consistent with the mobility trap model, in order to be upwardly mobile, a member of a minority ethnic group would need to relinquish his or her ethnic traits and adopt the normative and relational characteristics of the majority group. Any attempt to achieve an egalitarian multicultural society entails the development of a model in which ethnicity and equality are not mutually exclusive but can co-exist. Metaphorically, this would mean replacing the ‘tree’ model with a candelabrum in which the opportunity system of the ethnic groups parallels the trunk of the Anglo-Australian group. Even though Wiley's model recognises ethnic stratification as an important component of the opportunity system and the resultant constraint on social mobility for members of minority groups, it is clearly located within the view of holistic multiculturalism. That is, it focuses on dominant group cultural characteristics while ignoring the political, ideological, economic and legal dominance of the trunk and, to this extent, suffers from the one dimensional limitation of holistic multiculturalism. Thus there is an inherent logical inconsistency with any theoretical attempt to combine ethnicity and equality in a framework of ethnic relations constituted by holistic multiculturalism. This inconsistency which we call 'the ethnic dilemma', arises because of the contradiction between achievement and ascription criteria for the evaluation of individual performance. In the conceptualisation of ethnic opportunity systems as presented by Wiley, upward social

2 'Majority' and 'minority' in this context are used in the sense that Schermerhorn has applied them to refer to status, not size (Schermerhorn, 1970).
3 Wiley's metaphor can be extended so that the location of the limbs on the trunk and the angle the limbs make with the trunk indicate the degree of difference between the respective ethnic opportunity systems (i.e., the higher the limb on the trunk, the higher the status; the smaller the angle between the limb and the trunk the greater the similarity between the normative and relational aspects of the minority group and the majority group). So, for example, the angle the limb, representing the Jewish occupational system makes with the trunk would be relatively small compared with the angle of the limb representing the Italian and Greek opportunity systems.
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mobility is seen as a function of achievement on certain criteria, for example, education, occupation and income. For an egalitarian society, it is maintained, these criteria ought to be achievement and not ascription, as the latter, by definition, results in ethnic and racial discrimination.

The ethnic dilemma is basically a function of the contradiction between holistic multiculturalism and achievement criteria. Academic writings in the area of ethnic relations, as well as various government reports, emphasise the right of ethnic groups to preserve their ethnicity and to have this ethnicity recognised as a legitimate component of Australian society. The basic assumption underlying this view is that members of ethnic minorities have the right to maintain their identity and hence a ‘multicultural society’ is the desired alternative to an ‘Anglo conformist’ or ‘melting pot’ product. But, on the other hand, this view also stresses that individuals in an egalitarian society, which is free from ethnic and racial discrimination, should be judged on what they do, not on who they are. The ethnic dilemma can be represented in diagrammatic form.

**The Ethnic Dilemma**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Society Desired</th>
<th>Criteria for Personal Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ascriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural (pluralist)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnically homogeneous (assimilationist)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the diagram, cells 1 and 4 represent the logical couplings: a multicultural society, by definition, recognises the ascriptive characteristics of individuals and attempts to maintain and take account of these characteristics (just what this means in practice is one of the big questions for ethnic relations). In a culturally homogeneous society ethnicity is no longer an important factor for either the constitution of that society or the criteria of evaluation of individuals in that society. The ethnic dilemma emerges when an egalitarian multicultural society is represented by the situation in cell 2. In other words, evaluating all individuals by achievement criteria in a culturally plural society, that is, applying ethnicity as the basis for constituting a pluralist society but ignoring this criterion in the
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evaluation of the performance of members. Consequently, in holistic multiculturalism equality and ethnicity are incompatible. Where one group has effective control over major social institutions it appears that equality and ethnicity are mutually exclusive. The alternatives seem to be either multiculturalism with inequality or homogeneity (assimilation) with equality.

Where does this dilemma leave us? How can it be resolved? Part of the answer to these questions has to do with the concept of equality. It is assumed that a truly multicultural society is one in which all ethnic groups have equal access to the resources of society. In the words of McKinnon (1975: 22-3): 'we might agree that a society can only be truly said to be culturally plural if all groups are equal in access to power, status and wealth'. But what does equality of access mean? This concept has two components: equality of opportunity and equality of outcome (Gilmour and Lansbury, 1978: ch. 1). These two components are not synonymous and the difference between them highlights the possible resolution of the ethnic dilemma.

It is possible to legislate for equality of opportunity for migrants by controlling the proportion of migrants who enter prestige schools, universities, etc., but such legislation, other things being equal, would not be likely to alter significantly the opportunity structure of ethnic groups (Glazer, 1979). Such legislation would amount to a token recognition of the migrant presence, but would be ineffectual because it is the structure of the institutions and the consciousness of migrants, which is a function of their location in the social system, that produces ethnic stratification. Gilmour and Lansbury (1978: 11-12) have presented an apt example of how these forces operate:

Parents from higher socio-economic backgrounds are more familiar with the education system. They have a greater understanding of how bureaucratic government structures work. They are typically more political, more vocal and more articulate. They have the time to organise and campaign in order to try and influence the school system. Parents from lower socio-economic backgrounds, especially those who do not speak English well, do not realize the extent to which they can change the system; they do not understand the rules of the game. Rather than insist that it is their right to have their children taught their own language and culture in the government primary schools, the Greek parents, for example, pay substantial amounts to have their children taught these subjects after school. But the agitation for the school to hire at least one Greek-speaking teacher or teacher's aide came from non-Greek professional parents, not from the Greek parents (emphasis added).

Consequently, positive or affirmative discrimination, at least as it is put into practice, as equality of opportunity will not resolve the ethnic
dilemma. It appears that any attempt to resolve this dilemma (assuming that assimilation is not an alternative) must focus on the consciousness of migrants and the nature of the structure of Australian institutions, especially education. Education, as Freire has pointed out (1972: 13-14), is not politically neutral, but functions as 'an instrument which is used to facilitate the integration of the younger generation into the logic of the present system and bring about conformity to it'. But Freire has also recognised the possibility of using schooling to bring individuals to a deeper critical awareness of the way the social system is constituted and the consequences which flow from this structuring. This process he calls 'conscientization'. As Lally (1978: 14) says of this process:

Reaching this critical level of awareness is an essential first step on the road to freeing those groups who are oppressed by the system. It enables such groups to come to the realisation that they are considerably constrained by the system but that their situation is historical, not eternal, and that it can therefore be changed.

Consciousness raising, then, is only step one in Freire's strategy. The second step involves what he refers to as 'continuous revolutionary practice' — action on aspects of the structure in order to change it. With respect to equality of outcomes and the position of migrants in Australian society, this means changing the structure of institutions. As one of the respondents in our study said:

multicultural education means a change in the structure of education departments, schools and, in some cases, governments. To get this means a shift in power. Power doesn't fall in front of you. You have to go out and get it.

Spelling out the necessary and sufficient changes to institutions which would ensure equality of outcomes is, of course, the really complicated part. With respect to true multiculturalism, would these changes involve the establishment of new institutions (e.g. ethnic language medical schools), or changes within existing institutions (e.g. introducing community languages into the regular school system) or both? But given that our substantive concern is with the education system and ethnic schools, to what extent do conceptualisations of multicultural education come to terms with these structural aspects of ethnic relations outlined above?

Given the nature of holistic multiculturalism and its apparent predominance as the framework for ethnic group relations, it is not surprising that sub-areas within this field (e.g. multicultural education) also have limitations and inadequacies. For instance, the
five definitions of migrant education presented in a recent government report on this area all dealt solely with language and culture. One of the assumptions underlying the recent popular proposals for the teaching of community languages in government schools was that bilingualism is one of the necessary and sufficient conditions for multiculturalism and consequently, it becomes a desired objective. To achieve multiculturalism then, these proposals make the further assumption that bilingualism can exist as a stable state (Ozsoy, 1973: 35), which ignores the social context of language and the fact that language is not politically neutral. Bilingualism exists as a stable state in border areas, such as regions of Germany and Denmark, and in the Balkan states, for the sake of convenience. In societies like Australia, where one language is dominant, not simply in the numerical sense but in the sense of class, status and power (English is the language of the economy, the polity, etc.) bilingualism tends to be a stage in the process of language shift from foreign mother tongue to the dominant language. As Weinreich has pointed out, 'language shift, defined as the change from the habitual use of one language to that of another is almost invariably preceded by bilingualism' (Weinreich, 1970: 68, 94). So long as the economy, the political, legal and educational systems remain dominated by the language of one dominant group, then bilingualism as a stable state is not likely. The maintenance of non-English mother tongue is not a viable permanent state without these structural supports. The political nature of language relations has not yet been incorporated into conceptualisations of multiculturalism in this country as it has in others, like Canada, for instance (see Lieberson, 1970).

Some writers, however, in the area of multicultural education have commented on the lack of clearly identified issues (Martin, 1978: Ch. 4) and have recognised that questions about ethnic minorities in respect of education would entail questions about participation in the power structure as well as socio-psychological questions. Claydon, for instance, says that questions of this kind are uncomfortably productive of 'hot potatoes'. They cannot be cosily isolated as 'purely educational'. The temptation

*The five definitions of Migrant Education presented were:
(i) Migrants instructed in the English language of Australia.
(ii) Migrants instructed in the language and culture of Australia.
(iii) Migrants instructed in the language and culture of Australia, and the language and culture of their, or their parents', homeland.
(iv) Migrants instructed in the language and culture of Australia and the language and culture of their, or their parents', homeland.
(v) Migrants and Australians instructed in the language and culture of Australia and the migrants' homeland (Nicoll, 1977: 10).
within the system must be to shelve the issue which engenders them and to hope that neglect will dissipate it (1975: 53).

With the logical connection between this conceptualisation of multicultural education and holistic multiculturalism, it might be expected that discussions of ethnic schools would reflect the same uncritical, apolitical, cultural-linguistic approach. This is certainly the case, as indicated by Martin's typology of the popular definitions of the role of ethnic schools now being advanced (Martin, 1978). What these definitions have in common is that they are concerned with the location of ethnic schools and their relationship to the dominant educational system rather than to their specific function, which is taken for granted as the transmission of culture and language (Wiseman, 1974: 147; Smolicz, 1976: 68-69; Smolicz and Wiseman, 1971: 8-9; Grambs, 1979).

Ideas about the role of ethnic schools in a multicultural society held by participants, officials and the majority of academics and the role that these schools could play are constrained by their location within the conceptualisation of holistic multiculturalism. What most proposals and recommendations about the role of ethnic schools in a multicultural society argue for is that these schools essentially duplicate the teaching of migrant languages and culture in government schools (Report of the Committee on the Teaching of Migrant Languages in Schools, (Australia, 1976)), or supplement the teaching of languages in government schools.

Toward a Theory of Political Multiculturalism

One reason why holistic multiculturalism conceptualises ethnic relations as a horizontal structure and ignores the vertical dimension is that it accepts as its basic assumption the idea that pluralism and stratification must be kept analytically distinct. This is simply misleading. Cultural cleavages, as emphasised earlier, denote power relationships, such that majority-minority concepts used to designate the nature of the relationships refer to class, status, power and social control and not simply to numerical superiority and inferiority. Given the need for any view of multiculturalism to take these aspects of ethnic relations into account, then the view of the role of education

---

5 Smooha, for instance states: the nonranked divisions of pluralism must be kept separate from the ranked divisions of stratification — neither set of factors should be reduced into the other nor be assigned a priori precedence (1975: 69).

6 It should be clear that ‘majority’ refers to Anglo-Australians, while ‘minority’ refers mainly to Southern European ethnic groups.
for a multicultural society should also go beyond considerations of simply transmission of culture. Some writers have proposed education programs for a multicultural society which do go beyond superficial levels of culture transmission. However, some of these proposals ignore the majority-minority nature of ethnic relations and consequently, do not recognise the political dimension of these relations. A good example is the program which has been put forward by Matthews, which contains five areas concerned with

- fostering values which support multiculturalism;
- reducing intergroup tensions, prejudices and discrimination;
- showing particularly in history, geography, social studies, and the like, the reality of multiculturalism in Australia;
- showing the unique contributions that all ethnic groups have made to Australia; and
- developing in the child a sense of security and personal worth in being a member of a culturally plural society (1975: 20).

Given the inherently political nature of ethnic relations and also the desirability of developing a truly multicultural society, where ethnicity and equality are not mutually exclusive, then true multiculturalism is dependent, in the first instance, on the need to educate migrants about structured inequality and how the social system constrains their life chances as a function of their particular location in the social structure. To supply migrants with the 'necessary skills' to be able to compete for society's resources is no solution as, on the one hand, this has the effect of perpetuating the mystification about the opportunity system as a 'social ladder' and, on the other, as far as ethnicity is concerned, if taken to its logical conclusion, suggests that the best way to equip migrant children to compete is to remove their ethnicity.

One program for multicultural education which does appear to recognise the minority status of migrants is Bullivant's 'polyethnic survival curriculum'. Bullivant sees the need for survival knowledge to be taught to migrant children but locates it in a model of holistic multiculturalism. For example, he states:

belonging to society signifies that one is in a group of people who are dependent upon one another for survival within their habitat . . . and the more effectively a person's behaviour has been programmed or patterned to carry out roles in such action systems, the greater the share of resources he can obtain . . . Survival knowledge about competing for social and economic resources should be taught to children from ethnic groups if they are not to be deprived of competitively fair life chances (1977: 29).
The survival curriculum developed by Bullivant has five basic components:

1. communicative competence
2. numeracy skills
3. political and economic competence
4. moral and social competence

Bullivant’s curriculum suffers from the failing that the social system is taken as a given and is seen as ‘justly competitive’ — all that is necessary is to equip deprived individuals, such as migrant children, with the necessary skills.

Having made the distinction between the cultural and structural dimensions of ethnic relations, on the one hand, and the different forms of multiculturalism as desired outcomes, on the other, it is possible to relate these two aspects in a diagramatic representation of Australian ethnic relations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural</th>
<th>Structural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holistic/Demographic</td>
<td>Multicultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cell 1:** This position on ethnic relations, depicted by an exclusive concern with cultural aspects, such as language maintenance, and an apolitical view of ethnic relations, which emphasises the whole society, typifies the majority of migrants’ and officials’ expectations of ethnic schools as presented in this study.

**Cell 2** This approach differs from the first in so far as inequalities between ethnic groups, usually Anglo-Australians and migrants, are recognised but this recognition is limited to apolitical aspects such as
attitudes of intolerance and the lack of culture contact. This was also a
common theme expressed by migrants, that is, the position of
migrants would improve once Australians become more aware of
migrants' contributions to Australian society. The policy equivalent
to this position can be summed up as equality of opportunity.

Cell 3: While the focus of attention in this approach is the cultural
dimension, it differs from the position depicted in Cell 1 in that the
concern is for respective ethnic groups rather than the whole society.
The establishment of ethnic media and pleas for government funding
for ethnic schools would be examples of this approach.

Cell 4: This position depicts ethnic relations as inherently political
relations between dominant and subordinate groups and locates
ethnic stratification as a deep rooted structural aspect of Australian
society. In order for the position of migrants to improve, according to
this approach, it would be necessary to alter existing Anglo-
Australian dominant structures. The establishment of medical and law
schools in ethnic languages and equality of outcome exemplify this
approach. Notions of 'consciousness raising' as a first step to
structural changes would also belong in this cell.

We suggest that the most common views about the role of ethnic
schools fall into one of the first three cells. Furthermore, we argue that
any significant change in the position of migrants in Australian
society, as a consequence of the role of ethnic schools and
multicultural education, must involve components of ethnic relations
as projected in Cell 4.

We are now in a position to introduce three scenarios for the role of
ethnic schools in the future:

1. The continuation of the present separate system with possibly
some minor modifications, such as more government assistance,
trained teachers, better books, etc. as depicted by Cells 1 and 2.
Perpetuation of this system has the effect of maintaining ethnic
inequalities by institutionalising ethnic relations as relations of,
what Martin has called, 'non-confrontation' (1971: 106). That is,
'encouraging ethnic groups to do their own thing', which
completely removes the need for governments to concern
themselves with issues of migrant participation in Anglo-
Australian dominated structures. It does not put any pressure on
these institutions to change to accommodate migrants and, hence,
does not confront questions of structural changes necessary to
achieve equality of outcomes. In the same vein, separate
development of ethnic schools assists in preventing recognition of
political-structural processes involved in migrants gaining more
equality. In other words, separate development is most likely to
foster the belief that ethnic relations are apolitical — it fosters holistic multiculturalism. It removes migrants from the milieu in which change must take place for them to have more equality (e.g. Australian educational institutions). Insofar as separate development institutionalises different structures, the potential for ethnic conflict is likely to decrease rather than increase.

2. The introduction of ethnic languages and cultures as part of the curriculum of the regular school system. This raises many other issues, but it introduces the possibility of migrants having a significant input into changing Anglo-Australian dominant structures and the position of migrants in Australian society. But, insofar as this scenario brings groups together with possibly different vested interests, the potential for ethnic conflict increases rather than decreases.

3. The introduction of a new curriculum into ethnic schools. One that stresses the societal/structural side of ethnic relations, rather than the cultural. In Bullivant’s words, a curriculum which stresses ‘the implications of what it means to be a member of an ethnic group, which is itself within a wider society’ (1977: 29). Such a curriculum could have two main components:
   - Australian minority group relations
   - Language maintenance

The purpose of such a curriculum would be to inform migrants of the location of migrants in the Australian social structure and the way in which the social system constrains the opportunity structure for various ethnic groups. In short, bringing migrants to a new level of awareness as the first step in changing the disadvantaged position of migrants in Australian society.

Conceptualisations of Australian ethnic relations and the role of ethnic schools which are located in the first three cells of the diagram above perpetuate a ‘false consciousness’ of the nature of these relations and roles. Any significant progress of migrants in Australian society needs to be based on an articulation of the components, processes and strategies in Cell 4. Consequently, as far as the role of ethnic schools is concerned, we need to concentrate our attention on the issues raised in scenarios two and three. In what ways would the curriculum and organisation of the regular school system need to be altered to provide equality of outcome for migrant children? Would more be achieved for migrants by ethnic communities retaining their ethnic school system but changing the curriculum? These are the sorts of questions which future research on ethnic schools and the wider issues of Australian ethnic relations needs to confront.

One important consequence of this analysis is the realisation that
cultural and holistic views of multiculturalism and ethnic schools, which mean, in practice, separate institutions, do not pose any threat to the dominant culture and institutions. Consequently, without confrontation there is minimal ethnic conflict. But without confrontation in the opportunity structures of society, ethnic equality is not possible. As the ethnic mobility trap model indicates, there is only one dominant system of opportunity structures. It is misleading to suggest that migrants can or should create their own. Scenarios two and three briefly sketched out above are more likely to promote conflict between minority ethnic groups and the dominant Anglo-Australian group. Some might regard this as sufficient cause to abandon these scenarios in favour of holistic multiculturalism and separate ethnic schools. But when we have institutionalised procedures to deal with 'legitimate' confrontations and conflicts in areas such as industrial relations, how can we justify ignoring this inherent component in dominant-subordinate ethnic relations?
Appendix A

Affiliations of Officials in Australian Educational and Related Organisations

Australian Ethnic Affairs Council
Commonwealth Department of Education
Community Relations Office
Curriculum Development Centre
Education Research and Development Committee, Advisory Group on Education for a Multicultural Australia
Schools Commission
Victoria Department of Education (Primary school principal)
Victoria Catholic Schools (Primary school principal)
### Appendix B

**Structure of Interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>140</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Individuals in Australian Educational and Related Bodies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>148</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*also a teacher*
Appendix C

Interview Guides

(a) Migrants

Nature of Migrant Education:

1. What do you understand by the term 'migrant education'? (Definition of? What does it look like?)
2. Whose responsibility is it to provide for migrant education? (Is it responsibility of Government or migrants?)
3. Does the existing education system adequately cater for migrant children? (What is Education system doing? Is it enough?)

The Role of Ethnic Schools

4. What has your community provided in the way of ethnic schools? (No. of Schools Where No. Children Type of school — in class, etc.)
5. Are ethnic schools the best form of migrant education? (Is provision of ethnic schools the ideal or most practical?)
6. How important are ethnic schools to the migrant community? (What are they for — culture transmission or equipping migrants for life in Australia?)
7. Why were ethnic schools formed? (” ” ” )
8. What do ethnic schools teach? (Language only?)
9. Where is it important for migrant children to speak their native language?
   (a) home
   (b) school
   (c) workplace
   (d) other settings
Why Ethnic Schools?

10. Why do people send their children to ethnic schools?

11. Who are the people who send their children to ethnic schools? (Middle class? Proportion)

12. Why aren't ethnic schools used more extensively? (Is it lack of funds? Lack of interest?)

13. What is the growth rate and the drop out rate of children? (Situation over last few years.)

14. What are the main problems/issues facing ethnic schools?

15. Are ethnic schools achieving their aims?

16. What is the future of ethnic schools?

Ethnic Schools in Relation to the Wider Australian Society:

17. What part does language play in the formation of a multicultural society?

18. As a migrant or coming from a migrant background, what do you see as the wider Australian view of ethnic schools? (Views on ethnic pluralism, multiculturalism, equality.)

19. What is your view of the current position of migrants in Australian society? (Has anything altered your view in recent times?)

20. Has this viewpoint changed in recent times?

21. Is the position of migrants in Australia related to Australians' views of ethnic schools?

22. What do you think the position of migrants in Australian society should look like?

23. Are you doing anything to change the current situation regarding migrants?

24. What contact do you have with other migrants or migrant groups in relation to ethnic schools?
25. Do these other migrants share the same perspectives as you re ethnic schools?

26. What contact do you have with Australians or Australian bureaucracies re ethnic schools?

27. Does this contact affect your views of ethnic schools?

(b) Australians

Nature of Migrant Education:

1. What do you understand by the term 'migrant education'? (Definition of?
What does it look like?)

2. Whose responsibility is it to provide for migrant education? (Is it responsibility of Government or migrants?)

3. Does the existing education system adequately cater for migrant children? (What is education system doing? Is it enough?)

The Role of Ethnic Schools:

4. Are ethnic schools the best form of migrant education? (Ideal or most practical?)

5. How important are ethnic schools to the migrant community? (What are they for? . . . culture transmission or equipping migrants for life in Australia?)

6. Why were ethnic schools formed? (” ” ”)

7. What do ethnic schools teach? (Language only?)

8. Where is it important for migrant children to speak their native language? (a) home  
(b) school  
(c) workplace  
(d) other settings

9. Why do people send their children to ethnic schools?

10. Who are the people who send their children to ethnic schools? (e.g. ‘middle class’ only)
Why Ethnic Schools?

11. Why aren't ethnic schools used more extensively? (Lack of funds? Lack of interest?)
12. What is the growth rate and the drop out rate of children (Situation over the last few years?)
13. What are the main problems/ issues facing ethnic schools?
14. Are ethnic schools achieving their aims?
15. What is the future of ethnic schools?

Ethnic Schools in Relation to the Wider Australian Society:

16. What part does language play in the formation of a multicultural society?
17. As an Australian what do you see as the wider Australian view of ethnic schools? (Ethnic pluralism? Multiculturalism? Equality with all Australians?)
18. What is your view of the current position of migrants in Australian society? (Has anything altered your view?)
19. Has this viewpoint changed in recent times?
20. Is the position of migrants in Australia related to Australians' views of ethnic schools? (Pluralism? Equality? Other?)
21. What do you think the position of migrants in Australian society should look like?
22. Are you doing anything to change the current situation regarding migrants?
23. What contact do you have with migrants in relation to ethnic schools?
24. Does this contact affect your perspectives re ethnic schools?
25. What contact do you have with other Australians or Australian bureaucracies re ethnic schools?
26. Does this contact affect your views of ethnic schools?
The Child and the Greek/Italian School:

1. How old are you? What class are you in at Greek/Italian school?
2. How long have you been going to ... ?
3. Do you like going to ... ? If not, why not?
4. What do they teach you at ... ?
5. Is there anything else you would like them to teach you?
6. How much Greek/Italian have you learnt? Can you speak Greek/Italian with your parents? Do you? If not, why not?
7. Would you like to be taught Greek/Italian in your regular school rather than a Greek/Italian school?
8. Why do you think your parents send you to ... ?
9. Do you have any problems coping with the Greek/Italian school and the regular school you attend?
10. How do you think the Greek/Italian school you attend could be improved?

The Greek/Italian School and the Wider Society:

11. Are you 'Greek'/'Italian' or 'Australian'?
12. Do your Australian friends think of you as Greek/Italian or Australian?
13. Are your friends mainly Greek/Italian or Australian? Do many of them attend Greek/Italian schools?
14. What do your Australian friends think about you going to a Greek/Italian school? What about your Greek/Italian friends?
15. Do you speak Greek/Italian with any of your friends?
16. How do you think the Greek/Italian school will benefit you later? (Probe for importance in Australian society)
17. Do you think it is a good idea for children to speak other languages in Australia? Why?
18. Where do you think children should speak these other languages?
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