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The Committee of Inquiry into Labour Market Programs commissioned a number of papers from external consultants. As the time available was brief and the resources of the Committee limited, the Committee did not commission original research requiring the gathering of new data.

The commissioned papers are intended rather to canvass issues, present options, synthesise available information, review the existing literature and provide fresh perspectives.

The terms of reference required us to consider the extent to which existing labour market programs facilitate the training, entry and re-entry into the labour market of a number of groups, including migrants. The Committee therefore commissioned a paper on English language training and labour market programs from the Centre for Multicultural Studies at the University of Wollongong. Mr Michael Morrissey, a member of the Centre's staff, was the principal contributor.

A multiplicity of English language learning resources is available for migrants and this paper provides an overview of these resources. It also comments upon industrial and vocational second language training programs conducted overseas.

In conjunction with submissions, consultations and our own research, the commissioned papers form part of the total body of information available for our consideration in writing the final Report.
MIGRANTS AND LABOUR MARKET PROGRAMMES

PART ONE: Overview and Methodology

a) Major Methodological Problems

The main task for the author of this paper was to establish the needs of migrants relative to labour market programs. On the face of it this is not a task which presents severe methodological difficulties since the question as posed appears to break down into four main areas of investigation which may be adumbrated as follows.

- To what extent has the labour market experience of migrants differed from that of non-migrants?

- To what extent has any difference in experience involved relative disadvantage for migrants?

- Have labour market programs acted to counteract this relative disadvantage to any degree?

- How may future programs be altered in order to increase their effect in attacking any relative disadvantage suffered by migrants?

This simple outline, however, conceals a large number of areas of obscurity, some of which are barely susceptible to adequate clarification within the confines of this paper. Some attempt at such clarification must be made, nevertheless, since one of our central arguments is that inadequate specification of the precise content of some of the terms in which the experience of migrants is discussed is a direct cause of many deficiencies in analysis and policy formulation. As an example of this, we may point to the term migrant itself.

Many people who write on such matters display an awareness that, as a category of social analysis, the term migrant is deficient in the sense that the variety of experiences it encompasses is almost as great as that
which it excludes. Where such awareness is lacking, as in the case of those writers who produce comparisons of (e.g.) earnings of Australian-born and overseas-born workers there is a certain implied circularity in method. Generally such studies find very little difference between the social experience of these two categories of people which is a trivial result given the heterogeneity of both categories.

Even where an attempt is made to disaggregate the term migrant however the result may not be much more informative. For example, the level to which the term is disaggregated may be quite arbitrary or it may vary in the course of a given analysis. In Part Two we criticise a number of articles for either or both of these faults.

It is also true that the form of disaggregation is important. Thus the majority of writers disaggregate along country of birth criteria. Most commonly the distinction is made between migrants who are native English speakers and those who are not: frequently categories such as "Southern European" are used in contrast to "Northern European" and so on. These country of birth analyses are not without merit since they have yielded some important insights which we discuss in Part Two. On the other hand they may be problematic for a number of reasons listed as follows:

- Country of birth versus ethnicity

It would be unproductive to go into the complexities of ethnicity theory: however it must be pointed out that the country of birth may not necessarily be the unique or even the dominant determinant of a person's ethnicity. To give an heuristic example germane to labour market programs, let us propose that under certain circumstances the experience of growing up in a non-Anglophone family produces educational (and hence labour market) disadvantage even for people born in Australia. It is then possible to argue that an analysis based on even totally accurate unemployment figures categorised by country of origin would understate the unemployment effect of "the migration process" or of "non-Anglophone background". In section Two we argue, in fact, that the use of country of birth statistics causes the statistical "disappearance" of a number of quite acute problems affecting migrant families.
Ethnicity and gender

The labour market experience of non-Anglophone women is not the same as that of non-Anglophone men nor of Anglophone women, as most analysts would recognise. On the other hand little attention has been paid to the experience of migrant women in relation to the labour market and most extant material assumes a sort of "additive" model in which disadvantage associated with gender can be distinguished from that associated with ethnicity. In reality migrant women make up a distinct labour market segment, not (as we argue in Part Two) in the sense that the majority of migrant women are in this segment but in the sense that the largest group of people in this segment are migrant women.

Period of residence

The more recently arrived migrant has almost always been the more disadvantaged and the importance of this factor has increased over the past ten years of deteriorating labour markets. While this may be reflected accurately in country of birth statistics for some ethnic groups it may not be for others. As an example we may compare South-East Asian and Polish migrants. The vast majority of the former have arrived here within the last eight years and in that sense their arrival experience has been fairly uniform: that of attempting to negotiate a more or less depressed economy. The case of Poles is very different in that there have been, in a sense, two "Polish" immigrations, that of the immediate postwar period and that of the early 1980s. An unemployment figure based on Poland as country of birth would therefore tend to conflate the problems facing two quite distinct groups of people; an ageing, generally unskilled and long-established group on the one hand and a generally young, well-educated, newly-arrived group on the other.

In addition to analytical difficulties of this sort there is the further problem that any general statement about the process of integration over time must be sharply qualified by considerations relating to the social, geographical and workplace location of individual migrants. A stark example of this is the very low degree of correlation between English language ability and length of residence in Australia for some groups of migrants. Foremost among these would be those who work in unskilled jobs.
in large industrial plants, living in areas of very heavy migrant concentration.

- Social class

The relation between ethnicity and social class in general is full of the sort of analytical difficulties illustrated by the preceding example and paralleling the complex interrelations of ethnicity and gender. Here also it is unsatisfactory to attempt a sort of partial differentiation in which class is "held constant" and the "ethnic" component is studied in isolation (although this is, in fact a commonly adopted approach). This is mainly because of the degree of segmentation which has developed in the workforce, a segmentation which has ensured that for many people class relations are experienced primarily as ethnic relations.

This is, of course, a rather abstract formulation but it has important policy repercussions. Not least of these is the question of whether migrants benefit greatly from programmes which focus on redress of disadvantage presumed to be contingent upon their ethnicity. It can be argued, for example that targetted employment programs which have quotas for people of non English-speaking background simply reshuffle the unemployed along an ethnic dimension. The basis of this is the contention that such migrants are not unemployed because they are migrants but because a variety of secular and cyclical forces have led to an abrupt contraction of the number of jobs in areas where migrant employment is concentrated. A disturbing corollary of this argument is that migrants may have been the worst affected victims of such changes but they are by no means the only ones. It may well follow from this that targetted programs with ethnicity as one criterion of positive discrimination are "paid" for (in terms of exclusion from the programmes) largely by native English speakers who are unemployed for exactly the same reasons and with the same consequences as those of non-English speaking background.

It is not so much the validity of this argument which recommends it at this stage but rather the indication it gives of some of the subterranean complexities intrinsic in focusing on migrants either as a category of social analysis or as an object of social policy.
As we argue in more detail later an appreciation of these complexities has been lacking both in the formulation of labour market policy and its implementation; and in this respect migrants, in all their diversity, have been victims of a (now widely criticised) spirit of ad hocery in policy formulation.

It is important to realise, however, that until very recently it was not only true that the problems of migrants have received very little attention from those responsible for the formulation of labour market policy. To an equal extent those responsible for more general "multicultural" policies have, for their part, tended to ignore the labour market experience of migrants also.

b) Multiculturalism and Migrants' Labour Market Experience

In order to understand why this should be the case it is important to realise that the practice of multiculturalism in the crucial period of labour market deterioration in the late 1970s and early 1980s was one which was informed by an extremely conservative model of ethnicity. It was also directed by a government which was firmly committed to residualist social policies and to denial of the existence of structural causes of group disadvantage in Australia. Thus the central strategy of conservative multiculturalism has been to define as exclusive causes of migrant disadvantage factors connected with language and cultural dissonance: and in so doing to rule out of consideration the question of social class, the most important manifestations of which are related to, or arise from, the labour market. This "ethnicity model" (Morrissey, M. & Jakubowicz, A., 1980, Eipper, C: 1983) permeated official analyses of questions affecting migrants, in particular those of the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs and the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs which between them controlled the vast bulk of research funding for these matters.

Space does not permit these assertions to be supported by anything more than a few instances, although a detailed historical treatment can be found in Jakubowicz, A., Morrissey, M., and Palser, J., 1984 and an affirmation of this point of view in the recent review of AIMA (Committee of Review of AIMA:1983). However it is worth stressing the fact that the thoroughly belated and entirely ad hoc targetting of migrants as a group with special
employment problems, described below (Part Three), is entirely explicable when one looks at some of the central policy documents relating to migrants. Thus the keynote report of the late 1970s virtually ignored the labour market, stating boldly that

"the main causes of unemployment among migrants are the same as those for Australian-born workers"

(Galbally: 1978,91)

This, it might be noted, was an astonishing statement given that evidence of sharp ethnic differences in unemployment rates were already quite visible at the time the report was being written. In fact the report itself contained some of these figures and reacted to them only with a suggestion for investigating "the special needs of migrants in the NEAT program" (Galbally: 1978,91).

Nor was this emphasis amended as labour market conditions for migrants continued to deteriorate. The AIMA evaluation of Galbally (AIMA:1982), as one commentator put it, contained "no discussion or even acknowledgement" of the deteriorating employment situation (Birrell: 1982,15). Other sources such as the Ethnic Communities Council of N.S.W. were even more condemnatory stating that

"the discussion on employment is verbal window dressing, naive, partially informed and a grossly insulting trivialisation of the working lives of immigrant workers (sic)... the Evaluation failed to assess the relevance or value of existing government training and unemployment programs for adults and youth,...(it)... almost totally ignores questions of structural unemployment, and while touching on issues of unemployment, no proposals or recommendations take these into account"...

(Ethnic Communities Council: 1982,14)

c) Summary

It will be demonstrated through this paper that migrants have not until very recently appeared as an object of labour market policy and also that the utilisation of the category "migrant" is an inappropriate framework within which to confront the disadvantage many migrants suffer. The lack of consideration of migrants in labour market policy can be explained by two main factors, as follows:
- The inappropriate specification of much analytical work and in particular failure to appreciate the complex inter-relation of ethnicity, class and gender or to confront the diversity of the migrant population.

- An ideological overlay in the production of basic policy documents which rendered them consistent with the views of the government of the day and in so doing "buried" the question of the labour market.
PART TWO: Migrants and the Labour Force - the Literature

In reviewing the available material it is necessary to ask the following questions.

- To what extent does available material suggest that the labour force experience of migrants or of significant groups of migrants has differed from that of the native born?

- If such differences are discernable, to what extent are they explicable in terms of analyses presented in current literature?

It is, of course, necessary to answer these questions since a knowledge of the degree to which the labour market experience of migrants differs from that of non-migrants and also of the forms this difference takes is an essential pre-requisite for targeting programs towards their special needs, should these, in fact, be shown to exist.

Some dimensions of the present position can be seen from Tables 1-9. The most significant features of these tables are:

- wide variations in unemployment and participation rates for different ethnic groups with the highest rate (for Vietnamese-born) more than five times that of the lowest (for Italian-born);

- an uncertain situation for migrant women (particularly those recently arrived due to the unknown relationship between actual and potential participation rates);

- a relatively heavy concentration of non-anglophone migrants in manufacturing industry and trades occupations but with a great deal of variation by country or region of birth;

- a heavy concentration (relative to labour force shares) of non-anglophone migrants in highly labour-intensive industries which are likely to be affected by technological change.
### Civilian Labour Force by Birthplace, March 1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time workers</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Looking for full-time work</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>Labour force</td>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-000 -</td>
<td>percent-</td>
<td>-000 -</td>
<td>percent-</td>
<td>-000 -</td>
<td>percent-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in Australia</td>
<td>2,805.6</td>
<td>3,000.6</td>
<td>254.9</td>
<td>276.8</td>
<td>3,277.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born outside Australia</td>
<td>1,026.0</td>
<td>1,080.2</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>112.9</td>
<td>1,193.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>120.4</td>
<td>128.2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>154.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>767.6</td>
<td>803.8</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>874.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>110.8</td>
<td>114.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>120.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK &amp; Ireland</td>
<td>373.8</td>
<td>392.5</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>425.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>Participation rate [%]</td>
<td>Unemployment rate [%]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in Australia</td>
<td>1,198.1</td>
<td>140.2</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born outside Australia</td>
<td>422.2</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td><strong>8.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.4</strong></td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td><strong>4.9</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>290.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time workers</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Looking for full-time work</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Labour force</td>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BORN IN AUSTRALIA</strong></td>
<td>4,003.7</td>
<td>4,932.8</td>
<td>395.1</td>
<td>484.4</td>
<td>5,417.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BORN OUTSIDE AUSTRALIA</strong></td>
<td>1,448.2</td>
<td>1,701.7</td>
<td>161.3</td>
<td>187.3</td>
<td>1,889.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AFRICA</strong></td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMERICA</strong></td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASIA</strong></td>
<td>187.2</td>
<td>214.6</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>259.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEBANON</strong></td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIETNAM</strong></td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EUROPE</strong></td>
<td>1,057.9</td>
<td>1,245.5</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>114.6</td>
<td>1,360.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GERMANY</strong></td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GREECE</strong></td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITALY</strong></td>
<td>141.1</td>
<td>162.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>171.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MALTA</strong></td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NETHERLANDS</strong></td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POLAND</strong></td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UK &amp; IRELAND</strong></td>
<td>522.4</td>
<td>628.0</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>685.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YUGOSLAVIA</strong></td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OCEANIA</strong></td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>130.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>144.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NEW ZEALAND</strong></td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>110.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>122.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) See the definition of the labour force participation rate in the Explanatory notes.
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These statistics are open to question on a number of grounds, however. The first of these has already been alluded to, namely the question of using country of birth statistics. To use these figures for our present purposes is, of course, to imply that what Jean Martin termed the "migrant experience" (Martin, 1978 passim) applied only to those born abroad. The vast bulk of literature on the education and socialisation of Australian-born children of migrants assumes that growing up with parents whose first language is not English is a factor which sharply distinguishes the experience of such children from others born in Australia. In general a category such as "non-English-speaking background" is regarded as more relevant than country of birth, particularly in relation to performance in the education system. (e.g. Meade, P. 1984) Given that the Interim Report of this Committee stressed the need to integrate thinking on education and labour market programs and also the generally presumed connections between educational achievement and employment this is a point of some importance.

Viewed in this way country of birth statistics grossly understate unemployment rates for migrant youth and in so doing help to divert attention away from an important area and also assist in reducing public awareness of the differences between the employment experience of those of non-English and English-speaking background. There have been further consequences also, in that, given the heavy historical concentration of labour market programs on youth, a reduced awareness of migrant youth unemployment meant that migrants' needs were not seriously considered. (There are, of course, many other reasons for this as we argue later.)

As an indication of what might be involved in this we might envisage a demographic correction in which the unemployed Australian-born youth of non-anglophone families are transferred from the "born in Australia" totals to appropriate ethnic categories. Not only would this increase by a considerable proportion the overall totals for migrant youth unemployment but also it would by a more than equivalent amount increase the gap between rates for those from anglophone background and those from non-anglophone background. This would occur, of course, due to the fact that youth unemployment rates are higher than those for other age groups. It is beyond the scope of this paper to pursue this since a complicated series of demographic calculations would be required. However, some idea of what
might be involved can be judged from the following crude example. For the Australian population as a whole the total number of people in the 15-19 years age group is about 27% of that in the 20-44 age group. For the "born in Italy" category the equivalent percentage is less than 7%. Thus correcting the "Italian" category of 15-19 year-olds on the basis of the all-Australia percentage would more than quadruple the total number of 15-19 year-olds who are in this sense "Italian". This would be a total increase of more than 24,000. (It is stressed that this example is for heuristic purposes only).

Another consideration in relation to these statistics is that they may understate migrant unemployment in a number of other ways, particularly such as suggested by Stricker and Sheehan (1981, Ch. 8) who have argued that migrants - and particularly migrant women have formed a disproportionate number of the "hidden" unemployed who have withdrawn from the labour force in numbers which are an increasing function of the overall unemployment rate.

In relation to our second major question, that of the reasons for differences in migrant/non-migrant employment experience we encounter a complex set of questions. Schematically we might list the following reasons which might explain the relatively poor showing of migrants.

a) In a tightening labour market employers are freer to indulge prejudicial attitudes in selecting workers.

b) Migrants are relatively deficient in educational levels and work skills, disadvantaging them in the eyes of employers who can afford to be more selective than was previously the case.

c) Technological change is having the effect of devaluing the work skills of migrants at a faster than average rate.

d) The occupational distribution of migrants makes them more vulnerable than others to the effect of structural and cyclical change.

e) The industrial distribution of migrants has a similar effect as in d).
The first of these propositions is difficult to dismiss out of hand but equally difficult to justify in terms of hard evidence. It is undeniable that extremely prejudicial attitudes towards some ethnic groups are widespread and by no means confined to socio economic groups who have no effect on hiring and firing practice (e.g. Jakubowicz and Mitchell, 1982; Morrissey, 1984). It is also argued by some writers that in this country the process of labour market segmentation has gone so far as to amount to closure on ethnic lines. Given that a degree of discrimination probably does take place in view of the undoubtedly widespread racism of Australian society it can be argued that much more comprehensive anti-discrimination legislation would be in this case an appropriate labour market program, even if not usually categorised as such. The logic for this would be that if (for example) public sector employment programs contain positive discrimination guidelines then there is, by extension, the basis of a case for working against negative discrimination in the private sector.

The second line of reasoning, relating to work skills is one which will be discussed in a separate part since the whole question of language training, from which the skills issue is inseparable, is so large and complex. At a very crude level, however, there is no great difference in published figures on possession of trade qualifications as between NES migrants and the Australian-born. Some migrant groups, indeed, had a considerably higher propensity to possess trade qualifications than the Australian-born, and in any case, inter-ethnic differences were dwarfed by the intergender difference for any ethnicity. Once again, however, it is difficult to interpret this data in terms of real life experience. The possession of a trade qualification does not necessarily mean that labour market prospects are improved if that qualification is not recognised in Australia. As we suggest in Part Four, also the qualification, even if recognised here will mean little if unsupported by a number of other skills, most notably literacy in English.

In relation to technological change, industrial location and occupational location we also approach a very complex set of questions. As we have demonstrated above, there is certainly a very pronounced degree of ethnic segmentation in the labour force and this provides the basis for supposing that a given change of industrial practice could have unequal
effects on migrants and non-migrants. The extent of such effects and their causes are problematic (in terms of current available literature) for a number of reasons, however.

First, we have the fact that in general it is difficult to disentangle the effects on the labour market of technological innovation and other structural forces such as changes in relative international competitiveness since these effects are often felt at the same time. The current situation in the steel industry demonstrates this very well with major steelmakers taking advantage of a period of depression to shed labour, alter production levels and introduce labour replacing technology.

Secondly, and more importantly in terms of planning labour market programs, there is the fact that migrant concentration in particular industries does not mean that they are necessarily more vulnerable to labour-replacing innovation. As Kriegler and Sloane (1984) point out migrants are substantially under represented in the workforce of some industries where extensive labour replacement is to be expected such as wholesale and retail trading, communication, insurance, agriculture, etc. Thus the relative inter-ethnic effect of technological change depends on the relative rates and levels of job losses in those industries such as the above where migrants are under represented and in those where they are over represented such as basic metal products, vehicle manufacture, whitegoods and construction.

Thirdly prediction is complicated by the fact that migrants may be concentrated into occupations which are more under threat than non-migrants. This may be either in the sense that these occupations are more likely to disappear and/or in the sense that experience in such occupations may be an inappropriate basis for taking advantage of opportunities arising from innovation. As Kriegler and Sloan put it in summarising one result of their investigation of technological change in the whitegoods, vehicle and construction industries,

"... insignificant numbers of Managerial or professional and technical staff were likely to resign, retire early or be retrenched...Clerical and secretarial workers were overwhelmingly the most likely to be retrained to use the new technology."
Fourthly, existing literature has been deficient in that it has not attacked the possibility that structural change may have an unequal effect on jobs from region to region. Thus is it is obvious that in areas like the Illawarra there are massive multiplier effects outside the steel industry resulting from structural change within it. To the extent that these multiplier effects are regionalised there will be an ethnic dimension to them quite simply because of the abnormally high proportion of the Illawarra's population originating in non-English-speaking countries.

Finally, existing literature, (and in particular that which attempts to measure the employment position of migrants directly) is of limited value because the bulk of it focuses on the 1970s and almost all of it utilises data from 1981 or before. This is no more than one might expect but it does mean that little can be said with certainty about any qualitative changes in the pattern of employment which might have been associated with the rapid increase in unemployment over the last two years. As an example of such a change, may present the possibility that lack of English language ability becomes an increasing liability as unemployment rates rise. Certainly the overall figures for some of the most recent arrivals bear this out. As Harrison (1983:50) states

"One surprise the data have yielded is the extent of the differences in both unemployment levels and the occupational and industrial composition of the employed between recent migrants from English speaking countries and those from non-English speaking countries. Although one may well expect unemployment to be higher for those from non English-speaking countries ... the extent of extra unemployment is staggering. For males who have been in Australia one or two years unemployment among those from non English-speaking countries was 32.2% compared with 10.1% for those from English-speaking countries."

What must be stressed here is that some migrant groups are now facing unemployment rates which, if generalised to the population as a whole, would leave us with a situation similar to the early 1930s. Newly arrived migrants have, of course, always been the most heavily disadvantaged and, as Harrison's own figures show, the tendency for new migrants to move over time towards norm is still to some extent operative. On the other hand, the possibility must be taken into account that the obstacles faced by new arrivals are now much greater than previously that in this respect one can no longer expect the
integrative processes of the 1970s and earlier to work, even to the limited extent they ever did. This should lead us to treat the results of 1970s-based research with some considerable caution in using it to interpret the present situation. Moreover, this caution should be maintained irrespective of one's conclusions about the validity of results from these studies relative to the 1970s.

The literature in question tends to fall at two extremes represented, on the one hand, by Strieker and Sheehan (1981, Ch.8) who argue for a position of acute and worsening labour market disadvantage for migrants relative to the Australian-born and on the other hand a group of analysts who argue that labour force experience (relative to unemployment) has shown little variation across ethnic lines (Miller, P., 1982, Bonnell, S. and Dixon, P., 1982 and 1983, Cook, L. and Dixon, P., 1982).

In outlining this literature it is important to realise that some of the questions raised in Part One of this paper are at the heart of the unresolved contradictions posed by this debate. In particular the looseness of specification about what particular social process is under examination resulting from vagueness about what migrants are the subject of discussion and also a certain tendency to vagueness about time-scales. It is also interesting to note that the debate is entirely posed in terms of relative disadvantage as exemplified by relative unemployment rates (as, indeed was the authors' stated intention). Other forms of disadvantage such as the likely duration of unemployment for groups of workers with radically different main-language ability, geographical concentration etc. are not mentioned.

Strieker and Sheehan's argument is, in brief, that in the period 1974-79 "a major shift took place in the occupational structure of the employed workforce in Australia and this created a dismal situation for migrants" (1981:167). The reason was the concentration of non-anglophone migrants in contracting occupations and of anglophones in expanding ones. This was manifest in two ways, namely: the fact that in Australia 1979 unemployment rates by age group were in each case higher for those born outside Australia than for those born here (1981:158); and (they argued) "in a major reversal in migrant participation rates" (1981:169) reflecting a withdrawal of migrants from the labour force and into the ranks of the hidden unemployed.
This argument was contested in a number of articles, most notably Bonnell and Dixon (1982) who used an econometric model to assess the effects described by Strieker and Sheehan and came to the conclusion that

"Apart from the statistics for 15-19 year olds, we found little evidence suggesting a deterioration in the labour market position of migrants relative to non-migrants"

(91982:19)

There have been a number of criticisms of this paper on technical grounds, but these seem less relevant to evaluating the paper than consideration of the categories and time scales within which it operates. Thus the only section of the paper which deals with the period after 1976 is that which examines changes in participation rates and here the comparison is of Australian versus non-Australian born. Given that "migrants" in this sense includes British and other anglophone migrants whose labour market performance has largely paralleled that of the Australian-born, it is unsurprising to find that the results do not bear out the Stricker-Sheehan hypothesis since this related to non-anglophones specifically and to Southern Europeans in particular.

The other part of the Bonnell-Dixon paper deals with a direct evaluation of the effects of structural change on employment by ethnicity. Here, again, it is difficult to evaluate the results. Apart from the fact that, as they admit, Bonnell and Dixon's results "qualitatively" support the idea that migrants had, in fact, suffered relatively badly from structural change there has to be a great deal of doubt about accepting results from the period 1971-76 as a "test" of the Stricker-Sheehan findings which referred to the period 1974-79. Thus in relation to the first point, Bonnell and Dixon actually did find that 5.96% of Yugoslavs, (for example), had been displaced by structural change in five years. Their conclusion that this is not "spectacular" should be judged by asking what adjective one would apply to such a change if it took place across all ethnic groups, in particular since their own figures demonstrated substantial offsets to job losses in blue-collar occupation by increased in white collar occupations for anglophones. The second point is probably the more serious however. In 1971 the labour market position of non-anglophone migrants in the groups investigated by Bonnell and Dixon (Italian, Greek, Yugoslav) had only begun the slide it later took. In addition, the ethnic composition of the
The workforce has changed considerably since 1976 with a much higher proportion now falling into groups not separately treated in these papers due to demographic changes such as the ageing of the longer-established groups such as Italians, and also due to high levels of immigration in the last eight years of ethnic groups such as the Indo-Chinese whose unemployment relates are far in excess of those of native anglophones.

The Bonnell and Dixon paper has been dwelt upon at some length since it exemplifies some of the difficulties and contradictions inherent in talking about the labour market position of "migrants" and also because it brings into focus the absurdity of making judgements about the present position on the basis of evidence which is almost a decade out of date. Certainly some of the more recent studies bear out the proposition that the labour market for non-anglophone migrants is deteriorating absolutely and relatively. (See, e.g. VEAC:1983).

**SUMMARY**

The most relevant points arising from this literature review are:

(i) The Australian labour market exhibits a pronounced degree of segmentation on ethnic lines.

(ii) The industrial concentration of non-anglophone migrants will mean that they will be particularly vulnerable to job loss in manufacturing industry but relatively unaffected by losses in the service sector.

(iii) The occupational concentration of non-anglophone migrants indicates that they have been, and will be, relatively badly affected by structural change. This is partly because of a relatively rapid rate of job loss in the occupations in question and partly because people in such occupations are less likely to receive retraining.

(iv) The experience of different groups divided along different dimensions such as ethnicity and gender has been diverse. By far the worst affected are the recently arrived. On the other hand virtually all non-anglophone groups have higher unemployment rates than native anglophones and in some cases the relative rates are enormously different.

(v) Although the literature is by no means unanimous the evidence suggests a relative as well as absolute worsening of non-anglophone migrants' labour market position.
PART THREE: Migrant's Experience of Labour Market Programs

In attempting to assess migrants' experience of labour market programs, we must rely to a great extent on more or less informed guesswork and inference. The reason why may be seen from an attempt to find explicit references to migrants in the available literature relating to these programs. An entry point may be given by the proceedings of the Conference on Youth Employment, Education and Training held in 1981. The keynote paper, an overview of youth employment and unemployment (Gregory, R. & Stricker, P., 1981) did not once mention migrant youth and neither did the discussants of the paper rectify this omission. In fact only one of the otherwise comprehensive papers at this conference paid any reference to problems of migrant youth (Keeves, J., 1981) and, significantly, this related specifically to the school system which, for reasons discussed below has been a more intensively studied area than the labour market in matters relating to migrants. Even papers referring to countries other than Australia with high recent levels of immigration did not address this topic. (Smith, R., 1981, Pankhurst, K., 1981. See also Connell, W. & Musgrave, P., 1981, Kirby, P., 1981, Scherer, P.: 1981, Dixon, D.: 1981).

In citing the proceedings of this conference it is not with the intention of criticising the participants for lack of thoroughness in their approach. Rather, the purpose is to illustrate a general point: that if, for reasons already discussed, we have only a cursory knowledge of migrant labour force experience in general terms, we have both for these and additional reasons virtually no knowledge of their experience of labour market programs.

One reason for this, of course, is that until the inception of Wage Pause, no program identified migrants or any migrant sub-group as a particular object of policy implementation. This may have been a function of the overall pressures in what one might term the "migrant research industry" to ignore labour market or - more broadly - class factors and also it may reflect the haziness of analytical procedures, both of which detailed above; but there are other reasons also.

First, as the Bureau of Labour Market Research points out, until very recently over 75% of expenditure on labour market programs has been on youth training and assistance (BLMR, 1983, 2). Given that there have been a num
of statistical and methodological disjunctures which may well have led to an underestimation of the seriousness of migrant youth's labour market problems it is entirely probable that concentration on youth has compounded the tendency for migrants not to emerge as an object of policy in this respect.

Whatever the reason for this invisibility, however, the evidence for it is fairly plain. Thus a careful reading of the BLMR report quoted above shows that the word migrant does not appear once, a fact we highlight without any intention of pillorying the BLMR since the report in question is probably a fairly accurate description of what actually happened. One might even sharpen this point by reference to another; that even though (and justifiably) the 1980/81 programs contained reference to "special groups" only ex-prisoners are nominated in this category. This should be seen in the context of the fact that large numbers of refugees were arriving at the time, including a high proportion of young people likely to experience employment difficulties of a magnitude that requires no elaboration.

A further demonstration of lack of awareness of the migrant dimension is provided by a recent publication of the Department of Education and Youth Affairs, Youth Policies, Programs and Issues (1983). This 250 page study presents, among other things a mass of statistical information in the form of over sixty tables ranging in content from school retention rates to the marital status of cohabitants yet not one of these tables contains any information on country of birth, parent's country of birth or any other aspect of ethnicity. The first 21 pages of the report, a synopsis for the benefit of a visiting OECD team, does not mention migrants at all (pp xiii-xxxiv) and in the lengthy chapter an "Employment and Training Programs" (pp. 110-187) the only indications of awareness of the ethnic composition of the Australian population are a few passing references to ethnicity. Not one paragraph deals specifically with migrant youth.

These omissions were to some extent corrected by a short report by the Ethnic Liaison Officers' Working Party on immigrant and refugee youth (DEYA: 1983 (b)) which was able to present some statistical information, reproduced in Table 10. These statistics taken mainly from the Department of Employment and Industrial Relations "are not claimed to be accurate" (DEYA: 1983 (b), 39) and would be of only limited value even if they were. For reasons we have already discussed comparisons based on Australian as opposed to overseas birth
Table 10: Persons Receiving General Training Assistance through DEYA 9a in 1980-81 by Type of Program and Selected Characteristics of Trainee Approvals
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted disadvantaged groups</th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>MALES</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. ABORIGINALS</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ABORIGINALS</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. DISABLED</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PERSONS WITH LANGUAGE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFICULTY</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. OUT-OF-TRADE</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPRENTICES</td>
<td>(1.8)</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Targeted disadvantaged groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. SINGLE BREAD</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINNER WITH DEPENDENTS</td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
<td>(3.1)</td>
<td>(2.2)</td>
<td>(0.5)</td>
<td>(3.1)</td>
<td>(1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. EX PRISONERS</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.6)</td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>(0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. FIRST JOB SEEKER</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.3)</td>
<td>(0.0)</td>
<td>(0.6)</td>
<td>(4.5)</td>
<td>(0.1)</td>
<td>(3.1)</td>
<td>(2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. LABOUR MARKET RE-ENTRANT</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.1)</td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
<td>(0.9)</td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. BORN OVERSEAS</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4.0)</td>
<td>(10.1)</td>
<td>(7.5)</td>
<td>(5.7)</td>
<td>(14.0)</td>
<td>(8.3)</td>
<td>(4.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER GROUPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'OTHER'</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>1.745</td>
<td>3.192</td>
<td>1.108</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISADVANTAGED</td>
<td>(38.2)</td>
<td>(33.1)</td>
<td>(35.2)</td>
<td>(39.2)</td>
<td>(28.6)</td>
<td>(35.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO SPECIFIED DISADVANTAGE</td>
<td>1.538</td>
<td>2.021</td>
<td>3.559</td>
<td>1.187</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>1.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40.6)</td>
<td>(38.4)</td>
<td>(39.3)</td>
<td>(42.0)</td>
<td>(38.7)</td>
<td>(41.0)</td>
<td>(41.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reveal very little. We can, however, draw a limited conclusion from the fact that major programs such as the CRAFT scheme are not included in the above table, and that people with language difficulties were virtually excluded from the SYETP which accounted for 25% of spending on manpower and training in 1980/81 (BLMR: 1983,1). In a separate section on apprenticeship training the working party found that virtually no information exists at present on migrant's access. However, it is a fairly reasonable assumption that the exclusion of migrants in general (and of those with English language difficulties in particular) from workplace-based programs such as SYETP would be replicated in the case of apprenticeship programs such as CRAFT (which in 1980/81 accounted for over 38% of total expenditure on relevant training programs. (BLMR: 1983,1).

In relation to other programs, the Working Party found that no informal was available on migrant participation in the Community Youth Support Scher although the investigations of the Australian Institute of Multicultural Affairs had led them to believe that it was "quite low", particularly in the case of young women (AIMA:1982, para 11.40). A similar pattern emerged the Education Program for Unemployed Youth where "with a few notable re exceptions activities and programs funded under transition have not been directed at ESL skills or at education programs compensating for earlier education in another language and with a different curriculum (DEYA: 1983, 38).

The major differences between previous schemes and the Wage Pause Pr. were, in the present context, a heavier emphasis on older workers and a specification of migrants as a target group. The record of the program in terms of placements is summarised by the BLMR (1984, 128) as follows in T. 11. On the face of it this seems a fairly dismal record relative to migrants since "Persons with language difficulties" received only 0.6% of placements (as opposed to 0.5% for ex-prisoners, for example). Those born overseas are recorded as receiving only 7.8% of placements which greatly under-represents their presence in the labour force and gives no clue as to the percentage of non-Anglophones in this group.

There are severe difficulties of interpretation here, however. First, migrants may have been present in any of the remaining target group places except one (Aboriginals). Secondly, this is equally true of people
classified as having language difficulties. Thirdly, the CES has no statistical classification of "migrants with language difficulties" (the guideline target) but two separate classifications: "born overseas" and "persons with language difficulties". It is an open question how many of the former have language difficulties and how many of the latter are migrants. Generally speaking, ABS data on language competence is of little help here since it is highly suspect and at variance with a number of intensive studies. Notwithstanding these difficulties the BLMR's conclusion was that

"the target disadvantaged groups of Aborigines, disabled persons, migrants with language difficulties and out-of-trade apprentices are represented but their limited share of the jobs created does not compensate for their over-representation among the unemployed" (1984, 143).

This, of course, is a heavy criticism if we accept the proposition, based on a theoretical analysis, which Sloan and Woden advance, that

"to achieve the equity objectives of manpower policy, it is essential that ... (labour market programs) ... be targetted on those groups in society who are considered genuinely disadvantaged in the labour market. Further, targetting on groups whose market power is weak should generate lower wage pressure than if the expenditure were not targetted. Finally "windfall gains to the employer are less likely to accrue if employers are impelled to recruit from a group which they would normally exclude"

(1984, 52, see also Smith, R: 1984 and 1983).

The question of participation is, of course, only one aspect of the relevant picture; equally important is the question of what people participate in. Thus Sloane and others place a great deal of emphasis on training which, she says

"offers the possibility of reversing potentially life-long disadvantages faced by certain groups in the labour market"

We have already noted the strong possibility that migrants have not benefitted in this respect, merely on the grounds that they have participated in programs far less than their labour market position would seem to merit. There are additional causes for concern, however, in that, apart from the question of targetting for inclusion, there has been little thought given to
the question of targetting for needs.

If we assume that some migrants have both different and additional handicaps in securing employment relative to native anglophones, it follows that they will have different needs: primarily (although not exclusively) language-related. It has already been shown that programs preceding Wage Pause engendered responses to this in only a few instances. Under subsequent public sector job creation programs, it has been the practice to favor projects which involve an element of "training" but no systematic guidelines exist describing what, for particular disadvantaged groups, such training should actually be. In practice, also, it will be extremely difficult to monitor what training has actually taken place. The essence of the problem is that the labour market handicap of a person with poor language skills will scarcely be improved by a limited period of employment which does nothing to enhance those skills.

This raises an important question about the logic of targetting, a question particularly relevant to migrants, although not exclusively so. Generally targetting has involved concentration on a number of categories which may, as we argue in Part One, encompass an extremely heterogeneous collection of people. If, as seems to be the case, the equity objective is seen as more important (and feasible) than the job creation objective of current programs, then there is a strong argument for targetting programs towards other manifestations of disadvantage than mere location in a more or less arbitrary category like "migrant". It can also be argued that simply placing a person in a job for six months is not necessarily the best way of alleviating disadvantage.

The preceding account of labour market programs may be interpreted to support the following proposition; that the broader the targetting categories of job creation programs and the greater the degree of potential employers' discretion in selecting individuals from within those categories, the more are the most disadvantaged excluded from the program and the less will the cause of disadvantage be attacked. As an example, let us cite the BLMR's finding on "demographic concentration" in youth training programs that;

"in employment-based assistance females were more likely to be placed in lower skilled jobs provided under the flat rate subsidies of SYETP whereas males were more likely to be assisted under age-
tiered subsidies of GTA on-the-job training. Access to skilled trades training was almost exclusively for very young males who were new entrants to the workforce" (1983:24).

In other words gender-based occupational segregation was actually reinforced, and it is probably unnecessary to ask the additional question of how many of the relatively small number of females gaining access to skilled trades training were migrants. Similar questions with regard to "employer discretion" can be raised by the gender breakdown of Wage Pause placements by state which varied from the three lowest female employment rates of the Northern Territory, South Australia and Queensland (12.8%, 15.9% and 17.6%) to the highest three of 41.4%, 41.7% and 53% for Victoria, Tasmania and the A.C.T.

The main concern in this respect is that the programs under review have catered to a great deal of employers' discretion and have utilised extraordinarily broad target categories. In such a situation it is likely that potential employers will tend to cream off applicants who will be least in need of training and whose employment will necessitate the least alteration of established work routines. It is to be asked for example, whether the migrant women actually employed under existing schemes are employed primarily because of their membership of a category or because they genuinely do exhibit the characteristic features through which the social penalisation of many migrant women is demonstrated; i.e. lack of English, relative poverty, social isolation, low education levels, unfavourable geographical location and so on.

The general point is that where a program whose major objective is equity is fed through a system which has massive institutionalised inequalities, then we shall tend to find those inequalities perpetuated within (and by) the program itself. Although it is difficult to establish just what these programs have done for migrants with any degree of precision, the indicators from available literature are that migrants have suffered a degree of exclusion and that possibly the most disadvantaged have been the most thoroughly excluded. This raises important questions about the relevance for migrants of both current targetting philosophies and programs whose major area of operation is actually in the work force. Before working through these questions, however, it is necessary to provide some discussion of the role of English language learning and its relation to skills training, as well as
giving some background material on the situation in some other countries relative to these and other questions.

SUMMARY

1. It is doubtful whether non-anglophone migrants have benefitted to any great extent from labour market programs up to and including Wage Path. These programs have been deficient in three ways, viz:

   a) the structure of some programs has probably discriminated indirectly against participation by non-anglophones

   b) in no case has there been an attempt to integrate measures cater for non-anglophones special needs into the program.

2. Simple "targetting" on broadly-defined categories is ineffective in relation to any equity objective.

3. To increase effectiveness the specific needs of particular migrant groups must be investigated and built into specific training schemes.

4. It is highly unlikely that those most in need will benefit from workplace-based schemes, particularly in relation to English language competence.
PART FOUR: The Question of English

It is, of course, part of the conventional wisdom that the major nexus through which migrants experience disadvantage in Australia is through lack of command of English. The real world is, however, more complex than this simple statement. The real questions in the present context are to do with the ways in which workforce experience has tended to perpetuate disadvantage of this sort and the ways in which the labour needs of the Australian economy - now changing rapidly - have institutionalised it.

Before turning to these questions it is necessary to look at the extent to which linguistic disadvantage affects migrant groups. This is, in fact, a rather vexed question. Most ABS data on this subject is open to serious criticism since it is widely suspected that ABS sampling methodology tends to understate the number of non English-speakers and in any case relies on self-assessment of listening/speaking skills only.

Probably the most useful alternative source is a series of micro studies commissioned over the past few years to examine the tasks facing the Adult Migrant Education Program and its present working. Some of these studies undertook fairly extensive sample English testing, mostly based on the Australian Second Language Proficiency Rating scale (ASLPR), the results of which are summarised in Table 12, together with a resume of the ASLPR criteria.

The most obvious conclusion from these studies is that, whatever may be the extent of second language deficiency in aggregate, it is undeniable that it was an enormous problem in the areas covered by all of the AMEP studies: areas, it may be noted, which were very diverse in terms of population composition, economic structure and so on. It can also be seen that the problem of second language deficiency is likely to be grossly understated if no attention is paid to literacy since the frequency of sub-survival rates in the reading and writing skills was very much greater than for hearing and speaking. In an area of very heavy migrant density the effects of this could be quite staggering. For example the authors of the Illawarra study, on the basis of sample results, made the (conservative) estimate that over 17,000 adults in a region of less than 250,000 people were for most purposes illiterate in English. (Morrissey, M. and Palser, J: 1983, 17). Other
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Listening % (a)</th>
<th>Speaking % (a)</th>
<th>Reading % (a)</th>
<th>Writing % (a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debney Park</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodwood</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illawarra</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karatha</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mareeba</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria/Western Suburbs</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Refers to percentage of sample in each study at or below minimum survival. Defined as: Able to satisfy all survival needs and limited social needs. Can write a simple letter (e.g. to accompany a cheque or a completed job application form). Can write a note to school explaining a child's absence. Can take down a simple message in note form.
relevant and disturbing results from those studies were as follows.

- Length of residence in Australia tended to be associated positively with English language proficiency but there were a great many other variables affecting proficiency levels with the result that substantial numbers of people who have been here more than a decade still have second language skills which range from poor to non-existent.

- Level of education in the country of origin was generally a better predictor of English language competence than length of residence.

- Women generally had lower levels of English language competence than men.

- There were large inter-ethnic and intra-ethnic variations in second language competence; and also the rank ordering of mean ASLPR scores by ethnicity varied from study to study.

A number of conclusions should be drawn from these studies without further elaboration. The first is that illiteracy is a major source of disadvantage. When labour is in demand it locks people into the lowest skilled jobs, locks them out of training programs and so on. When there is mass unemployment of literate people it acts as a virtual employment ban.

The second conclusion is that people who are disadvantaged by lack of English are liable to be disadvantaged in a number of other ways also: by lack of non-linguistic skills, by recency of arrival, by gender and, most ominously, by vulnerability to technological change.

This vulnerability arises from the structural position of migrants alluded to earlier. Obviously the vast bulk of jobs open to people with severe second language deficiencies will be manual and unskilled and will also entail very low levels of linguistic communication. Non English-speakers were fed into such jobs for three decades and the nature of the jobs tended to ensure that they remained non English-speakers. Moreover, whatever conclusion one comes to on the question of relative numbers of technologically-related job losses for white and blue-collar workers, it is virtually certain that large
inroads are already being made into a labour market segment in which migrants form the majority of workers. (e.g. Colley, L, 1982 passim).

In other words, low second language proficiency is being increasingly penalised, as are some of the factors commonly associated with it such as low levels of non-linguistic skills and recency of arrival.

Once again, also, we can see the complexity of this problem being compounded if we take the gender dimension into account. Migrant women generally have both lower second language skills and lower marketable non-linguistic skills than men. They have lower levels of education in the country of origin, spend more time in the most non English-speaking contexts and are far less likely to possess trade qualifications.

The complexity of this situation brings us back to a theme outlined in the previous section. This is that the nature of labour market disadvantages suffered by migrants can be very diverse. This is true even if put specifically in the context of English language ability. Thus, even if we ignore concomitant factors affecting some groups and not others (such as industrial location), the English language learning needs of a recently-unemployed unskilled long-term settler are very different from those of a recently-arrived refugee with a good educational background. Just as in the field of labour market programs generally, the question of targeting on specific types of disadvantage (rather than categories, ethnic or otherwise) becomes one of central importance.

The above relates to the question of adult migrant education. In view of the Committee of Review's previously mentioned desire to integrate examination of labour market problems with that of the school system, it obviously become important to examine the extent to which migrant children are disadvantaged in the school system and hence in the labour market, and also to examine the extent to which this disadvantage is associated with linguistic factors.

There is a very large literature on this subject which it is beyond the scope of this paper to do more than summarise in brief and it should be stated by way of caution that a brief summary may have the effect of glossing over the ambiguities, complexities and contradictions of available research findings.
As an example of this it is instructive to quote a 1975 study of schools with high migrant densities that both children of non English speaking background and those of English-speaking background in these schools showed, on average, very low academic standards, and in particular retardation of reading ability, relative to state norms. (Department of Education: 1975, passim). This is indicative of the complex interaction of ethnicity and class, an interaction whose investigation has not been assisted by the sort of "additive" model to which we have already alluded and of which the following is a good example:

"Published research confirms that in addition to universal factors such as sex, education and socio-economic background of family, place of residence, access to good schooling and so on, the success of youth whose first language is not English is markedly influenced by their ability to acquire English competence and adjust to Australian education and training curriculums, living and working styles".

(DEYA: 1983, 126. Emphasis added)

There is a neat circularity in this statement which is evident from two reflections. First, that the "universal factors" are, for the most part, far more "universal" for some groups in Australian society than others. Secondly that the list of "universals" probably subsumes the major causal variables affecting second language acquisition.

These considerations for the moment apart, however there is an accumulating weight of evidence of educational disadvantage for migrant children, including some longitudinal studies reporting non English-speaking background as a factor in reduced educational achievement. Thus, in a study of 5,000 children in transition from school to work conducted in 1975/79 it was found that students from non English speaking backgrounds performed worse than others in reading and numeracy tests (Williams, T., 1981). The qualifier to this was that an average migrant stayed on at school three months longer than others should be viewed both in the light of the fact that this might reflect poor job prospects as much as anything else (Gregory, R., and Stricker, P., 1981) and also of Martin and Meade's finding that

"Large numbers of children from non English-speaking groups reject the Institutional Ideology by clinging to high aspirations and staying at school despite a low level of performance as the schools assess it"
A number of other large-scale studies both support these findings on unachievement and isolate linguistic factors as most important (e.g. de Lemos, M: 1975, Keaves, G. and Bourke, S. 1977) but a significant number of caveats can be found both in these and other studies about the dangers of over-generalisation or even ethnic categorisation. Thus Martin and Meade stressed that:

"differences among migrants of different non English-speaking background are so great that to pool all the students together in a single background is often very misleading ...We can ... give some indication of the pervasiveness of these differences by stating that on virtually all our measures of performance... the category of students of non English-speaking background has higher standard deviations than have students of English-speaking backgrounds"

(Martin, J. and Meade, P. 1979,15)

Recent studies of Greek, Italian, Turkish and Lebanese youth all support this picture of inter ethnic and intra-ethnic diversity (Young C. et al 1980 and 1983).

SUMMARY

1. Low levels of English language ability are by no means confined to the recent settler groups. They are widespread, affect a considerable backlog of long-term residents and are particularly acute in relation to literacy skills.

2. Low levels of second language competence are likely to be associated with other types of disadvantage such as poor general educational background, occupational status and gender.

3. Workers with language problems are concentrated in unskilled blue-collar occupations most vulnerable to structural change.

4. Given these effects and an expectation of continuing high levels of unemployment, poor second language ability will be an increasingly penalising factor in seeking employment.
Although there is a great deal of variation, a large proportion of migrant children will be penalised in seeking employment as a result of their performance in the school system.
PART FIVE: English language learning resources for adult migrants

The situation with regard to these services in Australia is extremely diverse, being essentially the result of a long period of ad hoc development; and although in recent years some progress has been made, it is still the case that the relative lack of development of adult migrant education in this country reflects the marginalisation of migrants. There is no overall scheme or philosophy evident, services have been very largely under-resourced, and for a researcher faced with providing an overall picture on the basis of published literature, there is a severe problem of pulling together the fragments on the basis of scattered and insufficient data. In part of what Jean Martin was able to describe as "the only serious public examination ever made of the adult migrant education service" (1978:68), the Victorian Migrant Education Staff Association had the following to say about their service experience.

"The MED staff have never known if they were really state or federal employees, nor to where to turn to demand improvements in the program and in their conditions of employment for brick walls abound. From one authority one may meet dumb silence, from another an ignorant shrug of the shoulders, from a third a 'tut-tut' from another the suggestion that things aren't so bad and from everyone, but everyone a rapid 'passing of the buck'."

(Victorian MEDC, 1976:11)

This was not an isolated viewpoint as this refrain was taken up in the same year by the NSW Association of Adult Migrant Teachers (Migration Act, 1976) and the NSW government (NSW Department of Education, 1977). Essentially the burden of these complaints was not only about the confused distribution of responsibility between the states and the Commonwealth (to which might have been added confusion of responsibility between state departments) but also the overall isolation of migrant education from general education provision, the dominant philosophy of migrant education as a transient need located mainly in the immediate post-arrival period and the general under-resourcing of the program, particularly in relation to income support for students wishing to take full-time courses. This point of view was again backed up by a report by the Victorian Good Neighbour Council in 1978 (Wilkinson; 1978) and by some of the reports commissioned by the DIEA examine English Language learning needs on a local basis in the early 1980s. (see, e.g. Morrissey, M. & Palser, G., 1983, King, R. & Palser, J., 1983).
Although there have been a number of improvements recently, such as a large increase in the number of funded full-time permanent positions in the AMES, it is still difficult to discern any overall policy and certainly there has been no concerted response to the sort of long-term, structural problems we have described as emerging. One of the more recent documents describes the following situation in South Australia, which is probably quite representative.

"...the programs goals and funding do not permit everyone who needs further English to participate immediately and therefore creates a demand for further English courses and other bridging arrangements into the mainstream of adult education. Migrants with limited educational background are at a particular disadvantage and migrant women are most seriously affected.

(Blesing, R: 1981)

The 1983 NSW TAFE report on multiculturalism in TAFE echoes Blesing's conclusion and specifies lack of co-ordination by responsible bodies as the main flaw in the current system. Thus,

"...there needs to be a more co-ordinated approach to the provision of English language learning opportunities that is well-publicised and extensive enough to make personal contact with small groups in dispersed locations. It is apparent that most of the learning needs identified could be addressed by either AMES, TAFE or BAE ... but these needs at the moment are either unmet or not addressed specifically enough to be of significant assistant to the learner"

(NSW TAFE: 1983, App.2, 1)

In terms of vocational English training, two main trends appear to be emerging; namely the development within TAFE of English for Special Purposes (ESP) courses, together with necessary support services, and the development within the AMES of the Classes in Industry (CII) program.* An attempt has been made to delineate responsibilities in this respect through the use of second language test procedures. Thus, for example, the NSW Department of TAFE in 1983 received $1.5 million for provision of ESP courses, the guidelines stating that these resources should be mainly aimed at students who had gained a proficiency equivalent to ASLPR level 2 in all four skills. The stated objectives were.

* The DIEA has recently commissioned a full review of the CII program but this was not available at the time of writing.
"1. To increase English proficiency to a level where a migrant seeking to obtain training can achieve entry into courses in TAFE or other post secondary institutions; ...(and)

2. To help migrants who already have skills develop an adequate command of English for occupational purposes or obtain recognition of their overseas qualifications

(NSW TAFE 1983,1)

The implied pattern is, then, that up to attaining ASLPR 2, the student should rely on AMES and that subsequently TAFE should provide ESP courses to bridges into mainstream trade and technical courses. Outside this, the AMES (in NSW) seems to have the main responsibility for running industry-based classes aimed at upgrading employed workers' English and general industrial performance. Between states, however, practice varies. In South Australia where AMES is a branch of TAFE, the Industrial Language Training Service (INLS) has been set up and has, since 1972, organised over 300 classes in industry affecting over 4,000 workers (INLS n.d.) In NSW no such separate structure exists, there being simply a separate co-ordinator and support staff for the industry program.

Whatever these variations, there has been a general proliferation of courses along these two lines, particularly ESP. Thus in Sydney alone, over 100 courses are planned for 1984, ranging from English for Further Study to English for Home Care Service Aides (TAFE Migrant Education/ESP Update, Jul 1984). Industry classes, also, have been receiving increasing support although they are far fewer in number and subject to more severe constraints than college-based ESP. Thus the Victorian Ethnic Affairs Commission recently recommended expansion of such courses in public instrumentalities and the NSW Labor Council has also advocated that the right to paid time off for on-the-job English tuition should be written into all state government employers' awards. This, in fact, represents a long term concern of the labour movement and, in particular, of migrant activists, as demonstrated by the resolutions of the 1976 and 1982 Migrant Workers' Conferences which have been taken up by the ACTU. Thus at the 1981 Congress the following resolution was passed

"Congress further calls upon the Federal Government to adopt a comprehensive policy which will provide that

(i) at least 900 hours of professional instruction
in the English language should be available in the first two years of arrival of non-English speaking immigrants

(ii) that the instruction should take the following form:

(a) 300 hours immediately on arrival whilst the immigrant will be entitled to a minimum wage;

(b) a further 600 hours of English instruction to be provided over a two year period on the job on full pay. Immigrants who are unemployed would be provided with equivalent hours of free instruction; ...

The present government, too, has adopted a position of support for industry classes with its 1983 election policy statement containing a commitment

"c) To act in conjunction with employers to seek the establishment of English courses for non-English speaking persons at the workplace during working hours.

The Labor Party and major sections of the trade union movement agree that English tuition for workers is an industrial right ...A Labor government would work closely with trade unions and employers to establish industry-based and occupationally relevant English courses for migrant workers."

In spite of this, however, it must be stressed that the coverage of industry courses is very low indeed and tends to be confined to the larger establishments since small firms do not have the resources to organise such classes. Thus the initial processing of the BAS survey of technological change summarised in Kriegler, R., and Sloan, J., 1984:114-) showed that only 6.8% of firms surveyed conducted English classes and only 3.9% provided retraining in languages other than English even though 23% perceived language difficulties making technological change more difficult and 49% saw the same cause impeding worker retraining. This impression of limited coverage is borne out by other results. Almost invariably a small group of large, often public service employers have dominated industry programs. Thus the South Australian programs over the last thirteen years has covered only thirty separate employers (ILTS:1984,3) and there has been a similar concentration in Victoria and NSW (Palser, J., 1984, Parer, S; 1982.) Plimer's figures for NSW in 1982/83 show that thirty-three organisations participated in the
industry programs of which sixteen, accounting for 64% of total courses, were government organisations (Plimer: 1984).

In any evaluation of the industry program, three points should be taken into account, namely, first, the likelihood of extending the program under present circumstance; secondly, the general question of whether an industrial location is an appropriate one for delivering vocational training and, finally, the question of whether English classes on the present model are a sufficient response to the needs of migrant workers.

In relation to the first point, it must be stressed that the present system is based entirely on the volition of the employer. In other words, it is the employer's perception of gain from courses which will govern the decision to "invest" in industry classes or not. Generally the attempt to sell courses to employers has revolved around supposed gains in terms, mainly, of increased productivity, reduced accident rates or greater job satisfaction for employees. It has never been established that any of these benefits generally accrue to employers, however, and, judging by the very small coverage of industry classes it would seem that the vast majority have decided they do not. Thus, the occupational segmentation which affects many workers has meant a relatively low emphasis on linguistic communication and in such areas workers often adapt by the development of "factory pidgin" which enables them to perform their job quite adequately. (Clyne, M.) Again, it has never been demonstrated satisfactorily that non-English speaking workers have higher accident rates than occupationally-equivalent anglophones (Morrissey, M. & Jakubowicz, A: 1980). Finally with high unemployment rates in existing employers may judge that job satisfaction consists largely in having a job. Certainly, it is highly unlikely that in the present context worker satisfaction will figure very largely in expenditure decisions.

Another factor which will affect management decisions about industry classes is the past experience of such classes in terms of employers' perceptions. This is a subject upon which there has been little empirical research to date, apart from the 1980 AIMA Review of Multicultural and Migrant Education which surveyed employers sponsoring language programs, finding that 78% were generally satisfied (AIMA: 1980,101). It is to be hoped that the forthcoming DIEA review of the Classes in Industry Program may provide the basis for a general statement. Such detailed research as has been performed
certainly does not indicate an unblemished success story. Thus interviews in Port Kembla with Australian Iron and Steel management in 1981 indicated concern about the apparent difficulty of assessing whether any significant improvement in workers' English had, in fact, resulted from attendance at courses. (Morrissey, M. & Palser, 1982). Palser's recent research on NSW's State Rail Authority classes found that

"Those managers and supervisors interviewed were generally not enthusiastic about the potential benefits that English classes ... would bring to the workplace ... In general the problems associated with running English classes tended to out number the perceived benefits. (1984)

In general, also management did not feel that the (admitted) poor English competence of the workforce seriously impeded the efficient performance of work.

The VEAC (1984) study of industry classes also had some disturbing conclusions about the adequacy of existing classes which will, of course be the major factor affecting management and worker attitudes. We quote their finding in full

"Once the magnitude and complexity of the numbers and needs research emerged (and this was very early in the project), it became clear that funds and time would not permit any searching critical evaluation of existing provisions for Industrial English. In addition, certain basic facts about the A.M.E.P. made it clear that the programme as presently planned and funded by the D.I.E.A. could not possibly be adequate. We refer to the following facts.

(1) No funds are provided for pre-course research and development.

(2) Funding is provided on the assumption that no Industrial English course will be longer than 40 hours.

(3) The programme is heavily dependent on casually-employed teachers, many of whom do not have specialist qualifications in the teaching of English as a second language.

(4) The funding level for Industrial English is based on a target number of students. No-one could give us any indication of how the target number is established each year. It is certainly not derived from any survey of needs.
Given this state of affairs, any level of adequacy of existing provisions would be either accidental or miraculous. In fact, we heard a good deal of negative comment from workers who had attended courses or who had observed the experiences of those who did: they referred to such things as courses within appropriate levels and irrelevant content; a lack of variety of approach; high drop-out rates; the inability to take further courses once one had been attended; lack of information about the availability of courses; and total lack of co-ordination and commitment by supervisors. (We were told of specific instances where the supervisor alone had made the decision of who should attend English courses, often on apparently arbitrary grounds.) Given the facts about policy and funding set out above, such statements of dissatisfaction are hardly surprising.

The reference to supervisors selecting students is not an isolated case. In one of the longest established industry classes in NSW (AIS Port Kembla) this has been the general practice since 1974! (Morrissey, M., & Palser, J.: 1983).

Another important point in this respect is the likely work destination of new migrants. In present circumstances it seems unlikely that small firms would provide an adequate habitat for industry classes for obvious reasons such as resources, worker concentration and so on. The work force in the larger industrial establishments in which migrants have previously concentrated is, however, likely to stabilise or even contract in the foreseeable future. To the extent that last-on, first-off policies apply any contraction will obviously affect newly-arrived workers and in any recovery it seems reasonable to suppose that English-speaking workers will be given preference in re-employment. As examples of these trends, Kriegler and Slo\afort (1984:54) found that Mitsubishi (SA), one of four firms studied in depth did not find it necessary to hold English classes, even though the firm placed a great emphasis on management-lineworker communication and even though the lingua franca in parts of the plant was Italian. This was because all but a small minority of workers had been at the plant for over seven years. Whether workers with poor English tend to be pushed first when labour is being shed is a question on which there is no hard evidence. Where there is an ethnic concentration in recruiting, however, this can happen. For example, South-East Asians in the Illawarra steel industry have, over the last three years, lost most of their jobs due to having few years of service (Bowen, M.: 1984). Most of these trends seem to indicate that employers in the larger concentrations will tend to attach a declining importance to questions of
language competence since employment practices will permit them to do so. In relation to smaller firms where, if anywhere, the newer migrant will find employment, it has never been the case in the past that these have figured substantially in the coverage of industry classes and there is no indication that this will change in the future.

This, of course, raises the question of subsidies to (particularly) small employers to encourage upgrading of the English language competence of the workforce and we believe that the current DIEA review of industry classes will, in fact, address this possibility. Such a proposal should be viewed in the light of answers to the second question raised above, however; that is, whether the workplace is, in fact, an appropriate location for such activity and, in particular, whether a small workplace is.

Apart from the question of the viability of classes in small workplaces - (and Plimer (1984:5) estimated that over 30% of workers in need of classes in NSW would be eliminated from industry classes on these grounds alone) - there are a number of questions to be raised about the efficacy of industry classes, mostly related to the workplace environment.

This seems to be a question which has received only limited attention at any level. The most immediately obvious answer to it would be based on pre- and post-course testing but this is a procedure fraught with ambiguities and difficulties. Thus, extensive testing has not been conducted in the past since it would have entailed a large diversion of resources away from actual teaching and in any case would have been of problematic value given the relatively small improvements in language ability expected to eventuate from what are generally fairly short courses. Testing is, in any case, a relatively new and still unresolved concern in AMES. (AMES n.d. passim), and, moreover, even efficient testing of results from workplace classes would not say very much about results which might have been achieved had classes been held in some other environment.

Generally the arguments in favour of industry classes have been a high preference for such classes on the part of the target group and relatively low drop-out rates. Neither of these arguments are particularly weighty, however. The target group has never been presented with the choice of full-time paid courses outside the workplace and tends, in any case, to have
very little experience of adult education and the opportunities it might afford in general. Moreover, there are a number of reasons to believe that the rhythms and pressures of the workplace are inimical to successful language learning.

One such concern is whether workers in industry classes have the opportunity for sufficient re-inforcement of lessons learned at classes, particularly when these classes are for a limited daily period interspersed with time spent back in what is very often a non-English speaking environment (Clyne, M. Jupp & Stern, H:1984). This is a particularly acute problem when taken in the context of shiftwork where, in extreme cases, workers may receive instruction over the whole course for only the one week (or other roster period) in three when they are on day-shift. These, are not the only factors which constrain attendance or successful performance, however. Palser (1984) listed the following as affecting her sample:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraining factor</th>
<th>% of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workmates complaints about special treatment for migrants</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from supervisors</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridicule from workmates</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption to workplace</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too tiring to study and do job</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have to work harder to catch up with work not done in class time</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question obviously raised here is whether it might not be better in the majority of cases to take the process of language learning out of the workplace altogether. Whether, in fact, people might not benefit far more from "immersion" style courses in an environment designed specifically for language teaching. At the moment this is an unresolved question but it is an important one and relates back to a similar question raised in relation to labour market training schemes.

The basic point is that by locating language training (or any other sort) in the workplace one is locating it in the primary area of disadvantage for the group of migrants who are most in need of this type of training. The point can be expanded best by another lengthy quote from the VEAC survey.
Care should be taken in course design to ensure that a narrow definition of "English on the job" is avoided. "English on the job" may or may not be taken as meaning English for the job; it is certainly not solely English of the job. In other words, the language material needed to improve a worker's English competence and hence the capacity to do his/her job more effectively - need not necessarily be English about the job situation.

They then locate this statement in the following context.

A range of "needs analysis" techniques should be used in course preparation, with an awareness that all the current techniques have their limitations. A Munby type of needs analysis will reveal a great deal of the language of work, but little else. Recording of authentic work situations will reveal abundant "extraneous" material, which may be very valuable. Discussion with supervisors ("What sorts of things do these workers need to be able to say?") will produce a narrow and usually unreliable distortion of natural communication. Although each of these techniques can contribute something, all of them should be balanced by a process of negotiation of course content and feasible objectives, conducted in such a way that all parties (workers, supervisors and teachers) are committed to the content and objectives determined.

The questions which arise from this quotation are, firstly, why should an activity like English-language teaching be located in an area where success is reliant on the goodwill and co-operation of people who are not familiar with his activity nor even necessarily sympathetic towards it? Secondly, assuming the workplace is to be the site of language teaching, how is this process of negotiation to be conducted and by whom? The experience of the National Council for Industrial Language Training in Britain certainly suggests the need for more developed structures in this area than are currently available here. (See Appendix One).

If these criticisms are relevant only to one "leg" of current responses to vocational English teaching, then there are other criticisms of the other "leg", namely the proliferation of ESP classes in TAFE. On the surface, these courses have a great attraction. They have, apparently, a tightly-defined aim, they have the appearance of integrating vocational and language training and they are student-centred rather than teacher-centred. This may account for the fact that there has been very little questioning of the value of these courses, whereas ESP has been at the centre of a quite
spirited debate elsewhere.

The main points at issue in this debate are over what exactly constitute a student's language learning "needs". On the one hand such theorists as Wilkins and Mumby stress the importance of goal-oriented teaching in which courses are programmed towards specified situations in which the students are placed. This is essentially the philosophy, informing TAFE and AMES courses in ESP and is an approach being heavily criticised by many theorists formerly in favour of it. Most notable of these is Widdowson who sums up the options as follows.

"the expression 'learner needs' is open to two interpretations. On the one hand it can refer to what the learner needs to do with the language once he or she has learnt it. This is a goal-oriented definition of needs and relates to terminal behaviour, the ends of learning. On the other hand the expression can refer to what the learner needs to do to actually acquire the language. This is a process-oriented definition of needs and relates to transitional behaviour, the means of learning"  
(Widdowson, H:1981,2).

This is not the place to go into the intricacies of this debate. It has only been mentioned to point up the fact that, essentially, Australian practice has came down firmly in favour of goal-oriented ESP without this debate happening. We feel that this is a reflection of the piecemeal and ad hoc approach which has characterised vocational English training and we relate this to proposals made in Part Six. First, however we provide same international comparisons.

**International Comparisons**

a) Although no European country has, in the postwar period, increased its population through immigration to the same extent as Australia in percentage terms, nevertheless, in terms of sheer mass, international migration has been a central feature of postwar European development. In fact it has been calculated that over 30 million people have migrated for various periods into North Western Europe between 1950 and 1975 and that the net migration into the area was over 10 million (UNECE:1979, 272). As in Australia, every industrialised country in the region has acquired a substantial foreign-born element into its population.
Similarly this foreign-born element has tended to be concentrated disproportionately into the industrial working class (Castles: 1984 passim). Other aspects of labour market behaviour contingent on immigration have also paralleled the Australian pattern in that "certain groups of workers ... (are) ... more readily eliminated from the labour force at times of recession and structural change... The rates of unemployment of foreign or minority workers are higher than those of indigenous workers and in periods of recession their unemployment rate rises faster." (Castles: 1984,147-8).

With inevitable variations of timing and degree, also, the causes of general unemployment have been very similar over the countries of western Europe to those in Australia involving a complex of short and long-term factors but in each case including structural change as a central process and, at the level of policy, an increasing tendency by governments to accept that "while much unemployment is of a demand-deficient type, structural unemployment will not disappear simply because demand increases at some time in the future... (so)...greater financial and personal resources ... (should) ... be allocated to meet particular structural requirements"


Thus virtually all countries of Western Europe have adopted labour market programs and in most cases the main emphases (training, employment subsidies, job creation) have been similar to this country. In fact, most of these countries have considerably more experience of such programs, either because general unemployment rates (or those of particular groups) took off earlier than here (Creigh, S. & Sloan, J.:1982, 43ff); or because of a tradition of much more interventionist policies in such matters as retraining than has traditionally pertained in Australia (see, e.g. Greenberg, K: 1983).

To this list of similarities should be appended three important dissimilarities as between Australia and Europe. First, it must be stressed that nowhere in Europe is the overseas born population as large a fraction of the labour force: secondly that Australia is, in this context, unique in continuing a policy of substantial legal immigration: and thirdly we must note the prevalence of the guestworker system over much of Europe.

Where the guestworker system has been most pronounced, the Australian
emphasis on assimilation of migrants has been reversed. With some exceptions such as, (for different reasons) Sweden and Britain, the general practice has been to discriminate against migrant workers in a variety of ways but with the general aim of ensuring their confinement to a secondary labour market. Thus the process of segmentation which took place in this country in a partial way and largely through the mechanisms of the labour market alone, was reinforced over much of Europe quite deliberately by legal measures. In such countries this has meant that official acceptance that ethnic minorities in the labour force are permanent has been recent, partial and grudging. It has also meant the continuation of a wide range of measures which marginalise migrants and their children such as highly restrictive citizenship laws, wide powers of arbitrary deportation and government programs aimed at voluntary (or semi-voluntary) repatriation.

Two important consequences flow from this. First, over most of Europe there are few special provisions for migrants in labour market programs and, secondly, until very recently, there has been little concerted attack on the question of main-language training. Even now that the problem of main-language training is to some extent being addressed, the motivation is in some respects totally different from Australia in that facilitating return to the country of origin is still, in France and Germany at least, a major policy objective.

In a sense, the major lesson of studying such material as is available on the systems relating to migrants in Europe is not so much lessons about what might be done here but warnings about what might happen if a policy of "benign neglect" is followed. Thus the OECD study on "young foreigners" concluded that

"In the host countries as a whole the various causes which help to handicap young foreigners in the process of integration in working life tend to favour a certain "reproduction" of the labour force from generation to generation; that is to say, to fix second generation migrants in a socio-professional situation akin to their parents"

(OECD: 1981, 98)

Until very recently all language teaching in France, and Germany was done on a voluntary or local authority basis, or by private employers and although some movements towards a more centralised approach took place during the
In the 1970s, this has mainly taken the form of government funding of voluntary organisations. These may be of highly uneven quality and in any case probably reach only a small fraction of those in need. In fact, as late as 1979, government initiatives in the field of language training in France and Germany still had the status of "pilot projects" (Council for Cultural Co-operation (CCC): 1979).

The major state interventions (apart from finance) appear to have been to attempt needs identification for particular groups of adult workers and to develop model curricula for these workers for utilisation by the organisations engaged in main-language teaching. Thus, in Germany there has been in existence since 1974 the state-financed Sprachsverband-Deutsch fur auslandische Arbeitnehmer (Language Association-German for Foreign Workers) which is a peak organisation of bodies concerned with language education, most notably the Jugendsozialwerk, an institution connected with the Red Cross (Castles & Kosack: 1973, 185). In addition there are in progress state-directed research projects financed by the Federal Ministry for Education and Science whose main objective is the "consistent gearing of instruction to the language learning needs and experience of foreign workers". However, in 1979, this project was still at an early stage and some valid conclusions about the context in which it operates can be drawn from the statement by the project director that

"the German project arises from the changed status of migrant workers who are no longer birds of passage ... but semi-permanent members of the community"


Overall the main stress in German policy has been a response to the impact of migrant children on the school system. Thus the 1980 revision of policy towards "foreigners" is set almost entirely in terms of the needs of young people (Federal Government of Germany, 1980, Kuhn, H: 1979) and a great deal of attention has been paid to the problem of "integrating the second generation". Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (Germany) November, 1979). In one of these documents is language training for adults a concern and the main emphasis on language training for youth was a proposal to institute four-month intensive classes for newly-arrived adolescents (Federal Government of Germany: 1980, 12).

In France a similar pattern prevails. Basically, the state makes funds available to voluntary and other organisations concerned with literacy and
French language teaching, the biggest of which was the Amicale pour l'Enseignement Francais. At the government level the Ministry of Education is collaborating with the German and Swedish governments through the Council of Europe to produce teaching materials which is based on standardised language approaches and strongly needs-oriented. These, such as preparatory modules for people wishing to take various examinations, will be made available to the various organisations involved in French language instruction. As with the German project, however, this is still in its early phases.

The rudimentary nature of the main language instruction system in the two major European countries of immigration should be contrasted to the relatively sophisticated and institutionalised system of vocational training in other respects, and in particular that of France. Under a 1971 law called "The Organisation of Further Vocational Training in the Framework of Permanent Education" firms with more than fifty employees are required to set up worker-management councils who are to be furnished with a training plan drawn up in accordance with nationally-agreed guidelines. Annual reports of progress in implementing the plan, (which must involve expenditure of at least 1.6% of the firm's wage costs) must be lodged with the appropriate authority under penalty of a fine of 0.5% of wage costs. For its part, the state provides resources for developing training methods and also its own training courses for retrenched workers, who may attend them for up to a year while receiving their full former wages. No information could be found on the participation of migrants in these programs, but given their very high illiteracy rates, about which the French system does little (Castles & Kosack: 182ff), it is unlikely that participation is high. In Germany also, this is the case, particularly with regard to apprenticeship and vocational school (Berufsschule) attendance (Castles, S: 1984, 183, Keisewalter, D: 1978).

By contrast with the foregoing examples, main language teaching in Britain is relatively well-entrenched although the form of organisation is extremely complex as, indeed is the organisation of the education system in general. Moreover, there is a degree of integration of second language teaching and more general labour market programs and possibly a more systematic theoretical approach to second language teaching.*

* Most of the following is from a collection of information booklets and working papers from the National Council for Industrial Language Training (NCILT).
Essentially, there are five levels of service provision, as follows:

1. Part-time classes of between 4 and 16 hours a week. These are run by a variety of adult education, further education and community colleges.

2. A voluntary home tutor scheme similar to Australia's.

3. Full-time courses financed by the Manpower Services Commission. Students are paid an attendance allowance and are expected to proceed to other government training courses for specific skills. The most common of the full-time courses is the Preparatory Course which concentrates on ESL, numeracy and basic learning skills.

4. Refugee schemes, similar to programs in operation in Australia.

5. Industrial Language Training (ILT) funded by the Manpower Services Commission.

The last of these is, from an Australian perspective, the most interesting since it has no equivalent here. Essentially the Industrial Language Training Service is a national network of around thirty specialist units co-ordinated by the National Centre for Industrial Language Training (NCILT). Broadly its work falls into three areas. The first of these is an assessment service which, upon negotiation with individual employers, assesses language and communication problems in the particular workplace and then prepares a package incorporating two other services. These are, first, workplace-based and work-related language training for people whose first language is not English. The courses are structured around the specific circumstances of these workers in terms of their past (formal and informal) English language learning and workplace needs including non-linguistic skills. At the same time courses take place for native English-speakers whose work involves contact with migrants, dealing mainly with communication skills, cultural awareness, examination of prejudicial attitudes and so on.

The function of the training centres themselves is to liaise with a wide group of migrant, employer, trade union and training organisations where as the National Council is charged with staff development within the service and also with a program of continuing curriculum development. In 1981 over 200 workplaces were involved in the scheme including a large number in the private sector and in the period 1975-1981 over 20,000 people had gone through ILT courses. As an example of their work we reproduce in Appendix 1 three case histories published by NCILT.
If the example of NCILT represents the most coherent approach to industrial language training at an organisational level, the Swedish system represents the most comprehensive set of provisions for second language learning generally. Like most other European countries actual delivery of teaching is through a variety of educational, voluntary and other bodies and it is still admitted that standards vary a great deal and that teaching performed by voluntary bodies is probably least satisfactory.

Nevertheless research into educational needs and the development of standardised courses started much earlier in Sweden than in France or Germany and implementation is further advanced. (Sandstrom, B: 1979). The most distinctive feature of the Swedish system, however, has been the provision since 1973 of a legal right for most non-Nordic migrants of 240 hours paid leave to attend classes in Swedish language and "social education". Originally it was envisaged that this would cover between 10,000 and 40,000 new migrants annually and would also cater to a backlog of over 50,000 established migrants. In fact only just over one-fifth of this number passed through courses set up under the Swedish Language Act in the period 1973-83 (Statistics Sweden: 1983) with about 42,600 people receiving the full 240 hours and about 8,500 receiving 160 hours instruction. In addition to provisions under the Swedish Language Act however, there is extensive provision also throughout the programs administered by the National Labour Market Board and the County Employment Boards, and, in fact, more students are currently enrolled in such courses than in courses under the Language Act. These are essentially vocational courses concentrated in 48 centres which aim at training unemployed people or those in danger of retrenchment (Marklund, S. & Bergendal, G: 1979). Finally mention should be made of the system of part-time secondary school education for adults wishing to acquire leaving certificates or other qualifications leading to further education. This is provided free by all municipalities and it often includes language courses, "supportive teaching" and study guidance for migrants. In addition, the guidelines for this wide-ranging program state that

"Special attention should be paid to persons who are under-educated, unaccustomed to educational activity and socially disadvantaged. In all groups, special consideration should be given to the needs of disabled persons and migrants"
(Stats. Sweden: 1985-88)

In 1983 over 50,000 migrants were enrolled in labour market language
programs and over 24,000 in KOMUUX programs. Official statistics estimated that over 25% of all non-Nordic migrants were enrolled in language as vocational training programs (Stats. Sweden: 1979,82).

**SUMMARY**

1. Adult English language learning has been an under-resourced activity, unintegrated with the general education system and has developed in an ad hoc way involving confusion about ultimate responsibility.

2. **Vocational** English has placed a small part of the total program.

3. There are two main programs; industry classes in AMES and ESP classes in TAFE.

4. Both of these programs are open to serious criticism in terms of scope, organisation and practice.

5. International comparisons reveal a situation in general no better than Australia, but some individual features of other systems are of interest, particularly the Swedish Language Act and the British industrial language training system.
PART SIX: Conclusions

Our major conclusions are the following.

1. Trends in the Australian economy will increasingly disadvantage a large section of the labour force since the number of jobs which can be performed by people with low levels of main-language competence and low or unrecognised levels of skill has been declining and will continue to do so.

2. In order to meet this situation there will be a need for integrated retraining programs in which full prominence will be given to English language learning, particularly in the area of literacy.

3. Existing provisions have been inadequate to meet this need. Over the last decade major labour market programs have failed to take account of these emerging structural problems for two main reasons, namely;

   a) lack of adequate organisational structures and,

   b) lack of an adequate conceptual basis.

4. The visible symptoms of this have been;

   a) the disorganised, partial and ad hoc way in which a variety of bodies have developed responses to the current situation, particularly in relation to vocational English training;

   b) failure to define the needs of the migrant working class beyond the broadest categories; and

   c) the exclusion of the most disadvantaged people from programs ostensibly aimed at rectifying disadvantage.

5. The lack of relevance to migrants of existing labour market programs has also been a result of confusion between competing and possibly incompatible objectives of these programs, such as job creation, retraining and affirmative action in the form of "targetting".

6. Even had this confusion not existed, the training component of existing schemes would have been of limited value since it is difficult to see how the training needs of the "migrant" or "people with language
difficulty" target categories could have been met in the total absence of any specification of what these needs actually are.

7. Workplace-based training for people with poor English is an unsatisfactory option either in the area of linguistic training or in relation to training in other skills, but it will probably be necessary to maintain a workplace program in some cases.

8. Vocational English training on any scale within TAFE is a relatively recent development and courses are proliferating with no clear direction and along pedagogic lines which are questionable but unquestioned.

9. Industrial English classes are a small fraction of AMES activity, and can be expected to reach only a relatively small proportion of the workforce.

It follows from the above that the major needs in relation to vocational English training are co-ordination, integration, extension and development.

Co-ordination

It is proposed that a body should be set up similar to the British organisation, the National Council for Industrial Language Training but with extended functions. It could be called, for example, the Language Training Service and have the following functions.

a) To act as a resource to AMES and the Departments of TAFE in developing curricula and materials for vocational courses based on needs.

b) Where appropriate to do preliminary research, individual course design and back-up work for industry classes on the model of NCILT.

c) To liaise with bodies responsible for any future labour market programs. (See below)

d) To act as a consultant to employers who may be considering workplace-based classes.

e) To assist in securing employers' co-operation in non-workplace training courses. (See below)
Such an organisation as this would, of course, need to be adequately resourced and should be a national organisation.

Integration

The task of vocational English teaching can only be integrated into future labour market programs if the objectives of these programs and target groups are more clearly specified than in the past. One way (relative to migrants) of achieving this is to build into future programs the requirement that a proportion of the time a person is employed on the programs should be devoted to training in a recognised course and off the job. Ideally for migrants such training would consist of courses based on identified needs prepared by the Language Training Service proposed above and having three basic components, namely:

a) general English language training including literacy
b) remedial general education
c) basic trade training conducted in simplified English (where appropriate).

These courses would be based on needs in terms of both content and pedagogy, recognising the different learning needs of different groups of migrants as argued earlier in this paper. The Language Training Service would also act in a liaison capacity with the CES and appropriate education authorities to ensure efficient targeting and placement in training. Obviously such a program would require far more precise targeting guidelines than has been the case in the past. Such targeting would have to take account of the fact that migrants are not a homogeneous group; that young people in transition from school to work have different learning needs from retrenched manual workers and that working class migrant women will require totally different forms of instruction from refugees with professional qualifications.

Extension and Development

A period of fully paid time off work for all migrant workers with inadequate English should be provided as of right and financed by the Commonwealth government on the model of the Swedish Language Act. The period should be sufficient to permit significant improvement in second language
competence, should place an emphasis on literacy and should include a measure of general remedial education.

As a final point, this report has confined itself to the question of language training. This, it should still be stressed, is one aspect of a much wider problem, namely the question of how to develop responses to a period of rapid structural change in which the nature of skills required in the workforce is also changing rapidly. We have argued that one aspect of this has been an increasing necessity to speak and write English well. This is not the only aspect of the problem, however. Migrant workers, like native anglophones, will need to acquire a whole range of new skills. Ultimately, decisions will have to be made about the whole structure of continuing education and, for migrants as for others, language education will be only one aspect of this.
APPENDIX ONE: NCILT Case Studies

Workplace One

The ILT unit was asked to discuss communications in this company at the suggestion of an Industrial Training Board training adviser and of the training organisation used by the company.

The company makes aluminium die castings. It has a workforce of around eighty. Almost all the shop floor workers are Punjabi Indians. All work long hours (sometimes seven days a week).

The company was concerned about the level of scrap and also about quality control inspectors from customer firms who visit the company and wish to discuss with the quality control staff the work that is being done for their firm. Several younger men work on quality control in the inspection department. It was decided that suitable quality control training needed to be organised for these men. Doubts then arose as to whether some of the men had sufficient English to cope with this technical training.

The ILT team interviewed employees whose mother tongue was not English from both the inspection department and other sections of the works. Time was also spent with key foremen, managers, technical staff etc. After discussion with the company a group of five trainees was selected for a language training course. Three of these were from inspection. Two were from other areas but might be expected to move into inspection. The language training started well ahead of the quality control training. It is planned for the ILT staff to sit in on the quality control training once it begins.

The trainees are all under thirty. All have at some time attended evening classes but have given up because of long work hours. All are motivated to improve their English. They have little contact with English speakers other than in shops or the pub. All watch television. One of the first aims of the course was to help people assess their use of English and think how they could extend their contacts and make the most of the limited resources available. Also, since the training was only three hours a week, the trainees were introduced from the outset to independent learning materials and methods. The syllabus and methodology were planned to prepare the trainees for technical training and to give more general help with English. The company's
quality control supervisors were involved in the training from the beginning, coming into the training room, making tape recordings, demonstrating equipment etc. the ILT team is now going through the company's written instruction material, advising on translations and on clearer ways of passing on information.

Workplace Two

A full-time union official suggested a company where he felt there was a language training need. He was particularly interested in training for two Asian shop stewards, and arranged for contact with the company.

The company manufactured hygiene and hospital products and employed a number of Asian workers who were concentrated in certain sections of the company.

The company was interested in improving communication in general and was in the process of a fairly significant re-organisation of staff because of a major redundancy programme. The angle that initially interested them was safety. Also they became aware that new legislation on sterilisation requirements and on sickness benefits would need to be conveyed to all employees and that the usual written notice would be inadequate.

It was agreed that a survey would be conducted involving interviews with managers and supervisors and a language assessment for those employees whose mother tongue was not English. The ILT unit asked to assess all employees who fitted into the latter category but the company decided to limit the assessment to the sections where there was a high percentage of Asian employees.

Employees with a fairly wide range of language competence were assessed and were divided into four groups. The supervisors interviewed generally saw the potential language training programme as designed to deal with "problems" only, that is with employees with whom they could not communicate rather than as related to equal opportunities - as the ILT staff did. Their reactions at this stage were very much that the need for training had existed 10 years previously but that now there was no great problem.

The unit submitted a report suggesting that there were training needs at all levels. Interestingly, at this point an incident occurred with an employee
who had not been included in the assessment which suggested that because of
the re-organisation of jobs immigrants who appeared to have sufficient Eng-
to cope with the well-known routines of their jobs were quite unable to cope
with communication when a change was required. The supervisor concerned
very shocked to find how little communication was possible outside the
familiar routine.

The company at this point nominated some more employees for assessment
asked that the first course should be run for employees with a very limited
command of English. A group of seven was selected: five men who spoke
Mirpuri, a variation of Punjabi, a woman who spoke Punjabi and an Italian
woman. Only one of the group was literate in the mother tongue and all were
completely illiterate in English. They had all been working for the company
for at least eight years and had worked alongside English speakers.
Nonetheless none of them had acquired more than a skeleton knowledge of
English. Three had a fairly extensive passive vocabulary but none had any
control of syntax. The youngest member of the group was in the early 40s a
four were over 50. Only one had had any education in the country of origin.
All had children who had been at least partially educated in this country and
all possessed televisions, tape-recorders and, in some cases, videos. The
members of the group came from four different sections and therefore had
different job-training needs, some of which would have to be tackled by the
ILT staff on the job rather than in the training room.

It was with all this background in mind that the industrial Language trainers
set about planning the first course.

An Example of Training for Native English Speakers
The following example is one from the work programme of a West Midlands
unit in 1982. The training lasted one full day and was aimed at supervisors and
managers. Training for social workers or speech therapists or trade union
officials has some of the elements described here and other elements more
specifically related to the particular field of work (e.g. family
relationships, going into people's homes, an examination of Punjabi phonology
etc.)

Ten trainees from different workplaces attended the training course. In
several cases ILT had already run language projects in the work-places but the
size of the company had made it difficult to organise on-site training for a group of managers and supervisors; in other cases the employers were considering using the service.

The programme was designed to encourage trainees to work together and so allow discussion to arise as naturally as possible. It was also designed not to intimidate trainees by appearing to demand some sort of academic background. The programme consisted of eight sections, each section beginning with an exercise to help trainees think themselves into the situation and decide what they wanted to find out. For example, the section on names started with leading questions for trainees to try and work out a description of how the British system operates. After the complexities and illogicalities of the system had been explored the trainees both knew what they wanted to find out about, say, Pakistani muslims' names and were well prepared to find that the Pakistani system of addressing other people was very different from their own and for clear reasons. The programme was set out below. Use was made of tape-recordings, slides, video material, hand-out training notes etc.

"Communications in a Multi-Racial Workplace"

1. How Much do you already Know about Immigrant Workers in the West Midlands?
2. Arriving in Britain and Starting Work - first hand accounts.
3. How Important is a Shared Culture? - What assumptions do we all make?
4. Names - What's in a name?
6. Interpreting - a work study exercise.
7. Be Thankful you Learnt English Early - In what respects is it difficult to learn?
8. How Can You Make Your English Easier to Follow?
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