

○ 'WHY DIDN'T THEY TEACH US ANY OF THIS BEFORE?': YOUTH APPRAISAL OF TURKISH PROVISION IN VICTORIA

Zeynep F. Beykont

This article examines youth assessment of the quality and success of languages provision. The discussion draws on data collected from students and graduates of Victoria's 16 secondary Turkish programs in large-scale surveys (n=858) and follow-up interviews (n=177). Surveys revealed that upper secondary Turkish classrooms serve predominantly Australian-born Turkish students. Nine out of ten respondents rated their English language and literacy skills considerably higher than Turkish despite regular Turkish exposure beyond school, an average of four years of Turkish study, and a positive orientation toward Turkish maintenance in Australia. Thematic interview analyses indicated that informants found classes beneficial in expanding contexts and purposes of Turkish use, improving Turkish fluency and understanding, broadening cultural knowledge, deepening communication with family, creating a sense of belonging to the larger Turkish community, and helping students prepare for the comprehensive language exam. Across all sites, student motivation and learning were adversely affected by increasingly heterogeneous class composition and a lack of a cohesive Turkish-as-a-second-language curriculum. Youth recommendations included redesigning the curriculum to teach Turkish language and literacy skills systematically, emphasizing literacy development throughout the program, parallel teaching of Turkish and English writing styles, enhancing professional development, improving school outreach, and establishing prerequisites to prolong student participation.

KEY WORDS: languages education, language program quality, language program benefits, languages policy implementation, languages curriculum

INTRODUCTION

Australia's languages education policy provides support to formal study of a large number of languages based on the stated goals of cultural enrichment, social harmony, equity, and economic advancement (Lo Bianco, 1987; MCEETYA, 2005). Language study is designated as one of the eight key learning areas in the mainstream curriculum (MCEETYA, 1999). Recent public and policy debates reveal increasing concern about the quality and outcomes of languages education. The paucity of previous research on learner assessment of language provision is unfortunate. Students could provide essential insights on policy implementation challenges. This article focuses on youth perspectives on teaching and learning of one community language, Turkish, in secondary programs in Victoria.

The article draws on a larger study investigating the status of Turkish teaching in the English-dominant context of Victoria. Turkish presents an interesting case for a study of community language provision. Compared to many language groups, Turkish community has been slow to shift to exclusive use of English (Clyne & Kipp, 2002). Ongoing Turkish use in the family provides youngsters authentic opportunities to hear and use the language beyond school and motivates them to pursue Turkish formally. Steadily high yearly student enrolment rates in Turkish classes indicate sustained parent support and student interest for Turkish instruction (Beykont, 2010). A study focusing on Turkish in Victoria (TIV) permits a close examination of challenges to the quality and success of provision in a well-maintained and high-demand community language.

The TIV study framework was informed by language maintenance theories that put forward a complex set of individual, family, program, and policy-related factors effecting language choices and bilingual achievements of youth (Bourdieu, 1991; Clyne, 1991; Cummins, 1983, 1989; Fishman, 1966, 1991; Giles et al., 1977; Smolicz, 1981; Snow, 1982). Theory-based studies revealed that parent support for teaching and learning of a community language in school nurtures student motivation and success (Beykont, 1994; Borland, 2006; Fishman, 1991; Hornberger, 1987; Kipp, Clyne, & Pauwels, 1995). Furthermore, student experiences and achievement in language classrooms are found to be influenced by students' language profiles and language attitudes (Beykont, 1997b; Dörnyei, 2005; Lo Bianco & Aliani, 2008; Rubino, 2009; Sayers, 1994). In addition, a well-articulated and well-communicated languages education policy appears to provide vital financial and instructional resources and attitudinal support to encourage wide student access to high quality language programs (Beykont, 1993, 1997a; Clyne, 2005; García, 2005; Ingram, 2005; Lo Bianco, 1987; Skutnabb-Kangas & Cummins, 1988). While specific characteristics of a high quality language program vary across different contexts, a prolonged and persistent curricular focus on language and literacy development may be necessary to nurture student acquisition of a community language (Beykont, 2000; Brinton, Kagan & Bauckus, 2007; Brisk, 2000; Cummins, 2000; García, Skutnabb-Kangas & Torres-Guzmán, 2009; Hornberger, 1998).

The TIV study examines these individual, family, program, and policy-related factors in relationship to youth acquisition of Turkish proficiency in Victoria. Data collection was conducted from 2005-2009. Quantitative and qualitative methods were used to offer a rich description of the student body and to reveal youth perspectives on the formal and informal language learning opportunities. Specifically, large-scale surveys gathered information on the demographic characteristics, language orientations, and self-assessment of language skills of current students and recent graduates of secondary Turkish programs. In follow-up interviews, young participants shared their appraisal of the strengths and weaknesses of Turkish provision. While the study focuses on Turkish only, it has important implications for the teaching and learning of other languages. Study findings should inform implementation of the languages education policy and ongoing efforts to improve the quality and success of languages provision in Victoria and beyond.

HISTORY AND STATUS OF TURKISH PROVISION IN VICTORIA

Turkish classes in Victoria were organized for primary years in 1970, soon after the arrival of the first large group of immigrants from Turkey. The bilateral agreement between the Australian and Turkish government intended to bring Turkish immigrants to staff Australia's factories. More than half of the group settled in Victoria (ABS, 1991). Early arrivals did not have a good command of English. In addition to the low English skills of adults, the group members' preference to live in concentrated neighbourhoods and a persistent pattern of in-group marriage reinforced ongoing reliance on Turkish at home and in the community (ABS, 1996; Akçelik & Elley, 1988; Beykont, 2007, 2010). Parents supported Turkish instruction and expected schools to improve their children's language skills. The start-up of language classes was facilitated by the fact that Turkish is a standardized language; books and instructional materials developed for native speakers in Turkey could be readily accessed and used. Language classes were staffed by community members holding credentials to teach in a variety of fields (e.g., math, English, biology) and community members with no teaching credentials (Beykont, 2006). Language instruction was expanded to cover secondary grades and the first comprehensive Turkish exam was administered in 1975.

Turkish language programs increased in numbers in the 1970's and 1980's in the favorable policy context of Victoria. As one of the most multilingual states, Victoria has had a long tradition of teaching a broad range of community languages including 52 languages that are taught across primary and secondary years (DEECD, 2010). Students are expected to study a language through Year 10. In Year 11 and Year 12, students are encouraged to pursue language study as a matriculation (VCE) subject and are offered bonus points if they succeed on the comprehensive language exam. VCE test results are critical for a student's educational career as they affect decisions on high school graduation and university entrance. Bonus points added to the university entrance score are intended as a positive policy incentive to promote student persistence in language classes. Predictably, yearly total student enrolment across primary and secondary language classes tends to be higher in Victoria than that of other states (Liddicoat et al., 2007).

Turkish has been a high-demand language. Since 1995, each year an average of 4500 students have enrolled in Turkish classes (Year 1 to Year 12) and 440 have enrolled in VCE Turkish classes (Unit 1 to Unit 4) (Beykont, 2008, 2010). These numbers indicate that approximately one of every two school-age children of Turkish background has participated in Victoria's Turkish classes and one of every three has pursued Turkish as a VCE subject each year (Beykont, 2010). Turkish remains the eighth most frequently chosen language of study in Victoria (DEECD, 2010).

Turkish classes are taught through four language providers in Victoria. Some government and independent schools teach Turkish as part of the weekly curriculum. Students who do not have access to Turkish classes in their day schools attend classes through ethnic schools and the Victorian School of Languages where instruction takes place after-school hours, generally on Saturday mornings. Since the early 1990's, there has been a noticeable decline in the number of government schools offering Turkish due to a combination of factors including a policy trend to teach a smaller number of languages as part of the mainstream curriculum, the community's geographic mobility, and low concentration of Turkish students in some schools (Beykont, 2007). Specifically, the number of primary government schools teaching Turkish dropped from eleven to four and the number of government secondary colleges offering Turkish dropped from three to one in the past two decades (Beykont, 2008). Consequently, fewer government school students have access to Turkish instruction in their day schools.

The flexible nature of the Victorian languages education policy also encourages wide student participation in language classes (Clyne, 2006; Liddicoat et al., 2007). Students are permitted in language classes at any point in their educational career. Students can choose to study Turkish continuously from Year 1 onwards. Alternatively, they can pursue a different language first and then join Turkish classes in Year 7 or any time after. The flexible nature of the Victorian languages education policy has implications for Turkish class composition. Throughout secondary years, Turkish classes tend to be increasingly diverse in terms of students' years of study and language and literacy skills (Beykont, 2006).

STUDY DESIGN

The TIV study sought to offer a detailed portrayal of the current student body in secondary Turkish programs and to examine youth perceptions of formal and informal language learning opportunities. Data collection was conducted from 2005 to 2009 across Victoria's 16 campuses offering secondary Turkish programs. A mixed-method study design was used. Initial focus group discussions with community leaders, students, teachers, and program administrators helped to refine the youth survey and interview questions. Site visits, informal classroom observations, analysis of school documents, and one-on-one teacher interviews revealed features of instructional models, learning resources, and professional supports needed.

Demographic, sociolinguistic, and attitudinal data were collected in large-scale youth surveys from Year 10-Year 12 students and recent graduates of secondary Turkish programs (n=858). In open-ended and closed-ended questions, surveys gathered detailed information on respondents' personal and family immigration and education history, the extent of daily Turkish exposure and use beyond school, years of formal Turkish study, and reflections on the personal significance of Turkish maintenance in Australia. Furthermore, youth were asked to assess their language and literacy skills in English and Turkish on a 10-point scale.

Survey forms were made available in both languages and participants were free to answer in the language(s) of their choice. Three of every five youth responded in English and the remaining group used Turkish when completing survey questions. On average, it took half an hour to complete the survey. The large-scale surveys permitted rich documentation of the changing student profiles in Victoria's secondary Turkish programs.

In addition, a portion of the survey respondents were interviewed by the author (n=177). A minimum of ten volunteers from each study site participated in the follow-up interviews. Background characteristics of the interviewees resembled closely the larger group of survey participants in pertinent background characteristics including the extent of Turkish exposure and use beyond school, language orientation, self-assessment of bilingual skills, and years of participation in Turkish classes. Interview questions elicited youth reflections on the benefits of class participation, strengths and weaknesses of the language program, and formal supports needed to foster students' learning experiences, motivation, and Turkish proficiency. Interviews lasted about an hour and youth were free to choose the language(s) of the interview. English was used in 38 interviews, Turkish in 46, and both languages were used in the remaining 93 interviews. Thematic interview analyses revealed common program benefits and challenges across all participating sites. In this paper, a common theme is defined as a theme that was brought up by at least half of the informants from each study site.

CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDY PARTICIPANTS

At the time of survey collection, participants were 17-23 years old, 57% female and 43% male. Years of education of their parents varied widely from 1-18 years, with an average of seven years. Regarding young informants' birthplaces, 86% were born in Australia, 13% in Turkey, and 1% in other countries including Cyprus, Germany, and Greece. Taking into consideration the immigration history of the respondents and that of their parents, 13% are first generation, 81% are second generation, and 6% are 2.5 generation having one parent born in Australia and the other born in Turkey or in other Turkish-speaking countries. Of the 858 participants only one is a third generation immigrant having both parents born in Australia. Participant profiles suggest that secondary Turkish classes today are serving predominantly Australian-born Turkish children.

Surveys revealed that participating youth have ongoing opportunities to hear and use Turkish beyond school. Respondents reported that Turkish was the main language used in 52% of their homes, while in 40% of homes English and Turkish were used equally, and in the remaining 8% of homes Turkish was used only rarely, if at all. Furthermore, close to half of the participants (49%) lived in neighbourhoods where Turkish was used frequently. A vast majority (85%) watched Turkish TV for an average of eight hours per week. Many were also exposed to Turkish when they spent at least an hour each week reading Turkish papers and books (40%) and listening to Turkish radio (22%). Nine out of ten reported using only

Turkish or both Turkish and English when speaking with their parents and relatives while they indicated using only or mostly English when speaking with their siblings and friends. It appears that participants are exposed to Turkish fairly regularly and use it with the older generation in their daily lives.

Surveys indicated that informants had a positive attitude toward Turkish maintenance in the English-speaking context of Australia. In an open-ended survey question, when asked whether it was important to them personally to maintain Turkish in Australia an overwhelming majority (91%) gave a positive response citing the significance of Turkish language in Turkish identity (53%). Other reasons why these young people wanted to maintain Turkish included the opportunity to communicate with extended family (21%), to make a unique contribution to the multicultural makeup of society (14%), and to gain access to career paths (3%). The remaining group (9%) did not want to maintain Turkish because they believed that English was the main language of communication and upward mobility in Australia (8%) and because they were not convinced that Turkish would be useful once everyone in the community learned English (1%). The emphasis on the symbolic, cultural, and communicative significance over the economic value of Turkish corroborates previous research on Turkish immigrants in a variety of contexts (Akçelik & Elley, 1988; De Bot & Weltens, 1997; Vedder & Virta, 2005; Yağmur, 2004; Yağmur & Akıncı, 2003).

The language profiles and achievements of survey respondents varied. On average, young people had attended Turkish classes for four years including 28% for 1-2 years, 39% for 3-6 years, and 33% for 7-12 years. Three out of five informants studied Turkish in weekend programs, two out of five in weekday schools, and four out of five elected Turkish as a VCE subject. Despite having regular opportunities to hear and use Turkish beyond school, an overwhelmingly positive orientation toward Turkish maintenance in Australia, and an average of four years in Turkish classes, 61% reported that they felt most comfortable expressing themselves in English, while 15% were most comfortable in Turkish and 24% were equally comfortable with English and Turkish. In self-assessment of specific language skills, 772 out of 858 respondents (nine out of ten) rated their Turkish skills significantly lower than English. On a 10-point scale, on average, young people rated their skills in understanding Turkish close to two points lower than English, their skills in Turkish reading and speaking close to three points below English, and Turkish writing skills nearly four points lower than English. Current language learning opportunities do not appear to foster learners' confidence in their Turkish language and literacy skills.

PERCEIVED BENEFITS OF TURKISH LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

During one-on-one interviews, 177 young people responded to an open-ended question regarding the benefits of Turkish program participation. The most frequently mentioned benefit was that classes promoted Turkish fluency and understanding and enhanced

communication with extended family. Participants also found it beneficial that Turkish classes nurtured close peer relations and created a meaningful context for Turkish use among peers. Many also recognized that classes fostered knowledge of and pride in their cultural background and created a sense of belonging to the larger Turkish community. Other benefits mentioned by fewer participants included improved communication skills (e.g. speaking in front of a group and making a formal presentation), enhanced achievement in other courses (especially English and science), increased interest in other cultures and languages, and expanded career opportunities.

Informants noted that classes were beneficial in improving Turkish fluency and understanding (91%). They were aware of the differences between the daily Turkish spoken at home and academic Turkish taught in school and observed that *'it would not be possible to make progress based on the daily conversations in the family because Turkish that we use at home is different than Turkish that we learn in school.'* For example, in family conversations they were not expected to speak in full sentences or use a wide variety of words. These informants found it useful to hear and practice academic uses of Turkish in class discussions on varied topics. As they became more fluent, their communication with parents and extended family deepened. Interviewees frequently said that program benefits were not apparent immediately; it took a long time for them to feel confident as a Turkish speaker and many years in the program to develop Turkish literacy skills. Those who pursued Turkish as a VCE subject added that class activities in Year 12 (Unit 3 and Unit 4) were helpful in preparing them for the comprehensive Turkish exam thereby improving their chances to gain access to tertiary institutions.

Another oft-cited benefit was that classes brought together Turkish students from varied cities and countries, nurtured close peer relations, and created a meaningful context for Turkish use outside of home (73%). These young people underlined the important role of friendship in language learning. Turkish had a deeper meaning for them as they used it to *'joke around'*, play word games, and talk about relevant topics such as music, sports, and movies. Furthermore, they noted that experiencing Turkish as a peer language started a positive cycle of improved interest in Turkish history, movies, TV, news, and community events. In short, making friends was not only beneficial socially but also for their language development and engagement in Turkish learning.

Turkish classes also taught students about the history, cultural values, and contributions of Turkish people (67%). At the same time, classes broadened their understanding of Turkish culture by teaching them about the diversity in traditions across different cities and regions in Turkey and beyond. In their own words, interviewees welcomed the opportunity to *'consider what family and friendship means to us'*, *'discuss why we live the way we do'*, *'compare wedding traditions, celebrations, customs in different cities'*, and *'learn about past and*

present Turkish contributions'. These learning experiences helped them get to know themselves and their parents better and feel a part of the larger Turkish-speaking community.

In short, interviewees found Turkish program participation beneficial. The social, affective, and communicative benefits they identified are in line with the stated goals of Australia's languages education policy (Lo Bianco, 1987; MCEETYA, 2005). Program benefits can be expanded by addressing youth concerns about formal language learning opportunities that are discussed next.

PERCEIVED CHALLENGES TO TURKISH PROGRAM QUALITY AND SUCCESS

Interview participants responded to an open-ended interview question regarding the weaknesses of Turkish provision. The most frequently mentioned program challenge was a lack of access to a cohesive and relevant Turkish-as-a-second language curriculum. Furthermore, many noted that widely varied language and literacy skills of students in secondary Turkish classrooms had a negative effect on student motivation and learning. Other issues that were emphasized by informants in some sites but not others included a lack of access to Turkish classes in day schools, low teacher quality, inactive classroom delivery, large class size, multigrade teaching, inadequate school outreach to parents, and insufficient contact time in Year 12.

A majority of interviewees maintained that the Turkish curriculum was not designed to develop students' language and literacy skills systematically across grade levels (79%). General participant impression was that there was insufficient curricular emphasis on reading, writing, grammar, translation, and vocabulary development throughout the program, serious language study was left to the end, and VCE exam preparation was rushed and inadequate. In the words of a Year 12 student:

I spent six years in Turkish classes...Last week the teacher told us that we should know how to write an essay by 12th grade. We are supposed to write persuasive essays before we learned to write a correct sentence or a paragraph. Why didn't they teach us any of this before? If we had written every year, our writing would have improved a great deal.

Informants noted that curricular progression and depth differed in Turkish and English classes. Compared to Turkish classes, a wider range of novels and articles were read and analysed in English classes, the meaning and effect of words were discussed, work on writing styles in English started in Year 9, and writing skills were reinforced via regular assignments. The general youth impression was that the Turkish program was not rigorous and language teaching was not systematic.

An oft-cited recommendation was that a cohesive and relevant Turkish-as-a-second-language curriculum should be adopted to help students develop all language skill areas systematically. Specific suggestions included a persistent focus on vocabulary development, reading comprehension, writing, and translation skills throughout the program and a close alignment between the Turkish and English curriculum to permit parallel teaching of writing styles in both languages. Another common recommendation was that Turkish teachers should be offered professional development to teach Turkish as a second language by deliberately building on students' English skills. These young people noted that Turkish teachers could help students make a connection between the two languages by explaining similarities and differences between English and Turkish sentence structure, writing, and punctuation. Informants who pursued Turkish as a VCE subject added that all teachers should be familiar with the level of proficiency expected on the comprehensive language exam and should hold students to higher literacy standards throughout secondary years.

A large group of interviewees identified class composition as another challenge to Turkish program quality (56%). They observed that students joined Turkish classes throughout secondary grades and increasingly diverse language and literacy skills adversely affected student motivation and learning opportunities. Experienced students lost interest, inexperienced students felt discouraged when they were not challenged at their level of proficiency. Furthermore, informants found that it was misleading to admit students into Year 11 (Unit 1 and 2) or as late as Year 12 (Unit 3 and 4) with no prerequisites. A recent graduate explained:

It was difficult for me to prepare for the Turkish VCE test in one year...The system should change. Students should be advised to attend Turkish classes for a minimum of four years...I studied biology since 8th grade and did well on the VCE test. I believe that it would take just as long to prepare for the Turkish test.

In the absence of clear school guidance, a lack of prerequisites for participation in senior secondary Turkish classes may be contributing to a general student perception that preparation for the comprehensive Turkish test is quick and easy.

A common recommendation was that schools should improve student outreach to explain the cumulative nature of language development in classroom settings and to encourage student participation in language classes from junior secondary, if not primary, years. Conversely, these informants argued that students should be discouraged from enrolling in senior secondary classes unless they had acquired basic Turkish literacy skills. Another oft-cited suggestion was that schools should offer students clear guidance on both the level of language proficiency required and the length of time that it takes to develop the competencies for success on the VCE exam. Those informants who sat for the VCE Turkish exam added that the school policy for VCE classes should be changed and successful completion of Unit 1 and Unit 2 should be required as a prerequisite to enrolment in Unit 3 and 4. They

explained that establishing prerequisites would not only help to reduce the range of language and literacy skills in VCE classes but would also communicate a clear message that language study should be taken as seriously as any other subject.

CONCLUSIONS

The TIV study described the language profiles, language orientations, and language achievements of current students and recent graduates of Victoria's upper secondary Turkish classes. A detailed depiction of the student body should permit teachers and program administrators to tailor program design and the curriculum to the changing characteristics, interests, and language learning needs of students. Furthermore, the study revealed youth appraisal of Turkish provision, concerns about program quality, and recommendations on changes needed to improve policy implementation.

It would be incorrect to assume that study participants are representative of the entire student body in secondary Turkish programs. The study focus on upper secondary years eliminated all those who left Turkish classes in earlier grades. For a complete picture, a follow-up study would be necessary to look at the characteristics of learners who drop out of Turkish programs, their specific reasons for leaving, and the instructional changes that they recommend to improve student retention, motivation, and learning opportunities in secondary Turkish classes.

Based on the self-assessment of language skills of a large group of predominantly second generation Turkish youth in Victoria, it is important to note that even those who persisted in upper secondary grades tended to rate their Turkish language and literacy skills considerably lower than English. Despite their regular Turkish exposure and use at home and in the community, an average of four years of formal study of Turkish, and a remarkably positive attitude toward Turkish maintenance in Australia, 772 of 858 survey respondents reported that they were more confident of their English competencies, including understanding, speaking, reading, and writing skills. Current language learning opportunities do not appear to be optimal in promoting youth confidence and perceived achievement in Turkish on par with English.

Informants offered important insights on current challenges to successful implementation of the languages education policy. Across all study sites, student motivation, experiences, and learning were negatively affected by a lack of access to a cohesive Turkish curriculum and increasingly heterogeneous class composition in secondary Turkish classrooms. Commonly-voiced youth recommendations in the TIV study (including a continued emphasis on Turkish literacy skills across grade levels, a close alignment of the Turkish and English curriculum, parallel teaching of writing styles in both languages, explicit class discussion on similarities and differences of English and Turkish grammar, and improved guidance and prerequisites to extend student participation in Turkish classes) corroborate with international research on bilingual and biliteracy development in school settings. Case studies of exemplary community language

programs across diverse contexts revealed the cumulative benefits of a prolonged and persistent focus on language and literacy development and the importance of offering similar conditions of literacy acquisition in both languages (Beykont, 1994, 1997a; Baker, 2001; Clyne, 2005; Cummins, 1983, 1989, 2000; Garcia, 2005; Kwong, 2000; Moll, 1992).

Turkish programs have been in operation for over four decades and are now catering to students most of whom were born, raised, and educated in Australia (Beykont, 2006, 2010). Unfortunately, there has not been a comprehensive effort to develop a sequenced and relevant curriculum that would teach Turkish language and literacy skills by building on students' English skills. Such an effort is under way in the context of Australia's ongoing educational reform initiative to develop a national curriculum for all key learning areas including languages. ACARA has been charged to develop language-specific curricula for selected languages including Turkish. Furthermore, a recent collaboration with the Turkish government has proven productive and two curriculum specialists have been appointed and sent from Turkey to help schools develop reading materials in support of the Victorian learning standards and address students' language learning needs and areas of interest.

Turkish youth in Victoria have the potential to expand Australia's language resources. Due to a unique set of socio-historical, demographic, and attitudinal reasons, they continue to hear and use Turkish beyond school and have shown sustained interest in pursuing Turkish formally. The TIV study uncovered important benefits of current program offerings that are in line with the stated goals of Australia's languages education policy. Study participants found Turkish classes valuable in improving Turkish vocabulary and understanding, expanding the contexts and purposes of Turkish use, broadening cultural understanding, deepening communication with extended family, creating a sense of belonging to the larger Turkish community, and helping them prepare for the VCE exam. Informants' reported level of confidence and perceived achievement in Turkish and specific program quality concerns suggest that additional measures are needed to help young people develop a high level of Turkish proficiency and enrich Australian society as fully bilingual and bicultural individuals.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank colleagues at RUMACCC, Horwood Language Centre, and Language and Literacy Education at the University of Melbourne for hosting her during study visits; Denis Cunningham for his active involvement and collaboration in data collection from all campuses of the Victorian School of Languages; Atilla Akgüner for his support in data collection in independent and ethnic schools; the Australian Turkish Student Association for organizing interviews with the program graduates; the Ethnic Schools Association for organizing focus group meetings with community leaders, teachers, and parents; and finally, the young people, teachers, and administrators in all participating schools for generously sharing their views, experiences, and recommendations.

REFERENCES

- ABS. (1991). *Census of population and housing*. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics.
- ABS. (2006). *Census of population and housing*. Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics.
- Akçelik, R. & Elley, J. (Eds.).(1988). *Turkish community in Australia*. Melbourne: Australian-Turkish Friendship Society Publications.
- Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*, (3rd Ed.). New York: Multilingual Matters.
- Beykont, Z. F. (1993). The choice of language policies and programs, *Special Studies in Comparative Education*, 31, 125-190.
- Beykont, Z. F. (1994). *Academic progress of a nondominant group: A longitudinal study of Puerto Ricans in New York City's late-exit bilingual programs*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Harvard University: Cambridge, USA.
- Beykont, Z. F. (1997a). School language policy decisions for nondominant language groups. In H. D. Nielsen & W. K. Cummings (Eds.), *Quality education for all: Community-oriented approaches* (pp. 79-121). New York: Garland.
- Beykont, Z. F. (1997b). Refocusing school language policy discussions. In William K. Cummings & Noel F. McGinn (Eds.), *International handbook of education and development* (pp. 263-282). New York: Pergamon.
- Beykont, Z. F. (Ed.). (2000). *Lifting every voice: Pedagogy and politics of bilingualism*. Cambridge: Harvard Education Publishing Group.
- Beykont, Z. F. (Ed.). (2002). *The power of culture: Teaching across language difference*. Cambridge: Harvard Education Publishing Group.
- Beykont, Z. F. (2006). *Substantiating success and improving quality in secondary Turkish programs: Teacher perspectives*. (Final research report). Melbourne, Australia: Turkish Teachers' Association.
- Beykont, Z. F. (2007, April). "We can't learn Turkish by osmosis": Youth reflections on language programs. Paper presented at the School of Languages and Linguistics Seminar Series, University of Melbourne, Australia.
- Beykont, Z. F. (2008, December). *Heritage language maintenance in an English-dominant context: A study of Turkish youth in Victoria*. Paper presented at the Heritage Language Learner Conference, Cape Town University, South Africa.
- Beykont, Z. F. (2010). "We should keep what makes us different": Youth reflections on Turkish maintenance in Australia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 206, 93-107.
- Borland, H. (2006). Intergenerational language transmission in an established Australian migrant community: What makes the difference? *International Journal of Sociology of Language*, 180, 23-41.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Brinton, D. M., Kagan, O. & Bauckus, S. (Eds.). (2007). *Heritage language learners: A new field emerging*. London: Routledge.

- Brisk, M. E. (2000). Good schools for bilingual students: Essential conditions. In Z. F. Beykont (Ed.), *Lifting every voice: Politics and pedagogy of bilingualism* (pp. 209-220). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.
- Clyne, M. (1991). *Community languages: The Australian experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clyne, M. (2005). *Australia's language potential*. Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.
- Clyne, M. & Kipp, S. (2002). Australia's changing demography. *People and Place*, 10(3), 29-35.
- Cummins, J. (1983). *Heritage language education: A literature review*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.
- Cummins, J. (1989). *Empowering minority students*. Sacramento: California Association of Bilingual Education.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- De Bot, K. & Weltens, B. (1997). Multilingualism in the Netherlands? In T. Bongaerts & K. DeBot (Eds.), *Perspectives on foreign language policy* (pp. 143-156). Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- DEECD. (2009). *Languages other than English in Victorian government schools*. Melbourne, Victoria: Department of Education.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Fishman, J. A. (1966). *Language loyalty in the United States*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- García, E. (2005). *Teaching and learning in two languages: Bilingualism and schooling in the United States*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- García, O., Skutnabb-Kangas, T. & Torres-Guzmán, M. (Eds.) (2009). *Imagining multilingual schools: Languages in education and glocalization*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Giles, H, Bourhis, R. Y., & Taylor, D. M. (1977). Towards a theory of language in ethnic group relations. In H. Giles (ed.), *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations*, (pp. 307-348). London: Academic Press.
- Hornberger, N. (1987). Bilingual education success, but policy failure. *Language in Society*, 16(2), 205-226.
- Hornberger, N. (1998). Language policy, language education, language rights: Indigenous, immigrant, and international. *Language in Society*, 27, 439-458.
- Ingram, D. (2005). Looking back, looking forward. In D. Cunningham & A. Hatoss (Eds.), *An international perspective on language policies, practices and proficiencies* (pp. 133-168). Belgrave: FIPLV.
- Kipp, S., Clyne, M. & Pauwels, A. (1995). *Immigration and Australia's language resources*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Kwong, K. M. (2000) Bilingualism equals access: The case of Chinese high school students. In Z. F. Beykont (Ed.), *Lifting every voice: Pedagogy and politics of bilingualism* (pp. 43-53). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing.

- Liddicoat, A. J., Scarino, A., Curnow, T. J., Kohler, M., Scrimgeour, A. & Morgan, A. M. (2007). *An investigation of the state and nature of languages in Australian schools*. Research Centre for Languages and Cultures Education, University of South Australia/Canberra: Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations.
- Lo Bianco, J. (1987). *National policy on languages*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Lo Bianco, J. & Aliani, R. (2008). *CeLOTE executive summary and recommendations*. Victoria: Department of Education and Early Childhood Development.
- MCEETYA.(1999). *Adelaide declaration on national goals for schooling in the 21st century*. Adelaide: The State of South Australia, Department of Education and Children's Services.
- MCEETYA. (2005). *National statement for languages education in Australian schools: National plan for languages education in Australian schools 2005–2008*. Adelaide: The State of South Australia, Department of Education and Children's Services.
- Moll, L. C. (1992). Bilingual classroom studies and community analysis: Some recent trends. *Educational Researcher*, 21(2), 20-24.
- Rubino, A. (2009). Language maintenance strategies and language attitudes of new migrants from Italy. In A. Mahbood and C. Lipovsky (Eds.), *Studies in applied linguistics and language learning* (pp. 203–223). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.
- Sayers, D. (1994). Bilingual team-teaching partnerships over long distances: A technology-mediated context for intra-group language attitude change. In R. DeVillar, C. Faltis, and J. Cummins (Eds.), *Cultural diversity in schools: From rhetoric to practice* (pp. 199-219). Albany NY: State University of New York Press.
- Smolicz, J. J. (1981). Core values and cultural ethnicity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 4, 75-90.
- Snow, Catherine E. (1992). Perspectives on second-language development: Implications for bilingual education. *Educational Researcher (Special Issue on Bilingual Education)*, 21(2), 16-19.
- Vedder, P. & Virta, E. (2005). Language, ethnic identity, and the adaptation of Turkish immigrant youth in the Netherlands and Sweden. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29(3), 317-337.
- Yağmur, K. (2004). Language maintenance patterns of Turkish immigrant communities in Australia and Western Europe: The impact of majority attitudes on ethnolinguistic vitality perceptions. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 165, 121–142.
- Yağmur, K. & Akıncı, M. A. (2003). Language use, choice, maintenance, and ethnolinguistic vitality of Turkish speakers in France: Intergenerational differences. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 164, 107-128.