

2 Silent Voices and Unseized Spaces

2.1 Introduction

As we set out to chart the landscape for our study, particularly within the Australian higher education context, two key imperatives emerged. First, the need to articulate the way in which we conceptualise our endeavour as university language teacher-researchers (ULTRs); and second, having clearly identified ourselves – and the focus of our study as ULTRs – we also had to articulate how we see ourselves in relation to other language research/teaching professionals. This chapter addresses these key imperatives by broadly defining the field of language and culture education (LCE) – the umbrella term we chose to define our endeavour – and by profiling and positioning what we consider to be the three most visible groups of actors within it: language teaching theorists (LTTs), language teachers (LTs) and ULTRs. Articulation of these terms aims to provide the foundation for a common professional discourse which may help us creatively and productively advocate for the future of our profession.

In choosing the term “language *and* culture education” to delimit our field of action, we acknowledge that such label may be interpreted and/or used differently across the globe and, indeed, in other languages (e.g., *didactique des langues*). Furthermore, we also understand that LCE may not be considered as a discipline in its own right in all parts of the world (Schmenk, Breidbach, & Küster, 2018, p. 15). This is certainly the case in Australia, where LCE is understood to lie, by default, within the remit of the more widely recognised field of Applied Linguistics. As such, LCE does not own its own territory, not even as sub-field, whereas second-language acquisition (SLA) does, for instance. In identifying ourselves as ULTRs, we consider the relational implications and existing professional dialogues (or lack thereof) among ULTRs, LTs and LTTs. In-depth review of extant research reveals that ULTRs’ voices remain largely silent, and while they appear to hold a unique space for agentic action within LCE, such space remains largely unseized. We conclude this chapter by examining the place of ULTRs within the Australian universities’ LCE landscape, which provides, in turn, the contextual background to the data presented and discussed in subsequent chapters.

2.2 *Mise en scène*: setting the Stage, Casting the Actors

2.2.1 *Language and Culture Education*

We begin this section by unpacking each of the words deliberately chosen to describe the realm of our teaching and research endeavour as “language and culture education” (LCE). First, we tackle the word “language”, a key term that has come under increasing scrutiny (see Makoni & Pennycook, 2005, and, more recently, Saraceni & Jacob, 2018). Indeed, despite evolving debates around it (García, 2019), mainstream university language programmes in the Anglophone centre are essentially concerned with teaching standardised, “named” languages associated with specific nation-states. According to García (2019, p. 157), “these programs all have a monoglossic ideology even when they promote bilingualism”. In other words, they teach languages as discrete and separate entities and under the assumption “that legitimate linguistic practices are only those enacted by monolinguals” (García, 2009, p. 115). Although debates regarding decolonial, heteroglossic conceptualisations of language and linguistic practices are beyond the scope of our study, we recognise their emerging importance and impact on practice (Blackledge & Creese, 2014; Dufva, Suni, Aro, & Salo, 2011; Train, 2011) as well as on current political struggles for structural change, particularly in the US context (see, for instance, Flores & Rosa, 2015).

In this study, the word “language(s)” as used by colleagues and research participants within their respective institutions and departments retains its historically monoglossic underpinnings and is thus conceived as the process of acquiring so-called *second*, *foreign* or *non-native* “target” languages and cultures. Against this backdrop, LCE is understood to be concerned with the learning and teaching of an LC2 (an additional language and culture), that is, a language and culture which, in this additive bilingualism model, have generally been acquired after an LC1 (first/dominant language and culture).

As outlined earlier, our study is situated within the Australian higher education context, where the teaching and learning of these world/named languages and cultures are anchored in a similar “linguistic culture”¹ (Schiffman 1996) to that of other “inner circle” countries identified in Kachru’s (1986) well-known model of English language expansion. In these countries, English is the dominant and/or historically imperial/colonial language spoken by the majority of the population. Other countries in this Anglophone centre are the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada and New Zealand. Throughout the book, several parallels are drawn between these cognate contexts and, in particular, their entrenched “monolingual mindset” (Clyne, 2008).

The deliberate use of the word “culture” in LCE signals our understanding that the teaching and learning of any language necessarily entails teaching and learning of culture (Risager, 2006, 2007). Hereafter,

by implication, when we use the term “language” (L) in the labels that refer to the different actors in the field (i.e., LTTs, LTs and ULTRs), we also imply “culture”. Chapter 3 delves into the critical and political aspects of culture within LCE. Finally, in choosing the word “education”, as opposed to “teaching” or “teaching and learning”, we hope to emphasise a holistic view of our endeavour.

After delimiting and defining the scope of LCE as currently understood in the context of our study, we turn our attention back to the main actors involved. There appears to be no common set of labels overtly or tacitly agreed upon in the literature to refer to the main actors involved in the teaching of languages and cultures. For example, labels such as “language educators”, “language scholars” and “foreign language professionals” are often used interchangeably and so are the labels “language practitioners”, “language instructors or tutors” and “language teachers”. The literature tends to treat all these actors as one homogeneous cohort despite the differences in profiles, roles, employment status and level of agency they hold and which create, in turn, distinct power dynamics between them.

In this study, we distinguish between three categories of LCE professionals which can be found along a continuum. On the one extreme, we have “language teaching theorists” (LTTs) and, on the other, we have “language teachers” (LTs); oscillating somewhere in between we find “university language teacher-researchers” (ULTRs). These labels represent a necessary simplification, which nevertheless allows us, on the one hand, to appreciate the differences between the three groups and, on the other hand, to acknowledge that these profiles can shift and potentially become highly blended, as it is the case of many ULTRs. Indeed, LTTs tend to focus solely on research with little to no expectation of direct engagement with the language classroom; LTs, on the other hand, tend to focus solely on classroom practice with no expectation of engagement with research activities (either through conducting research themselves or through accessing and implementing published research as a way of professional learning and development) (see Marsden & Kasproicz, 2017, for quantitative data on the flow of research to foreign language educators in predominantly Anglophone contexts). While these extreme positionings are currently being challenged, they remain a relatively constant source of theory–practice misalignment in LCE, one which actually prompted our initial collaborative research.

Between these two extremes, we have ULTRs, who are expected to engage in both classroom practice and academic research activities. Yet, unlike LTTs, whose research interests fall within LCE, ULTRs’ research interests and activities (conference attendance, affiliation to professional associations, etc.) may be feeling more distant from it. Instead, ULTRs may situate their research interests and activities in the periphery of LCE, possibly through inter/transdisciplinary concerns (literary criticism, film

studies) or in other academic fields altogether (e.g., gender studies, political science). In all three groups, we also see that their affiliation and actual physical presence within their respective institutions (within specific faculties and departments) have an impact on the construction of their (collective) professional identity. The following sections articulate the differences among these three groups in detail.

2.2.2 *Language Teaching Theorists*

LTTs are scholars, applied linguists or, for a better word, “educational linguists”² whose areas of research interest and expertise include one or more of the following areas typically found under the umbrella of applied linguistics (AL): second-language acquisition (SLA); language planning and language-in-education policy; primary, secondary or adult language teacher education; language curricula development and language pedagogy in compulsory schooling or independent language institutes. LTTs conduct research that informs the goals, aims and pedagogy of LCE and, in so doing, inspire change and progress in the field. They have a clear presence and voice in the literature. LTTs may or may not have direct experience of language teaching practice. If they do, very rarely do they keep holding a language teaching practice as they become LTTs, a fact which accounts in part for the widening gaps between theory and practice commonly identified as problematic in the literature (for references spanning the past few decades, see Anwaruddin, 2019; Block 2000; Erlam, 2008; Hatasa, 2013; Kramsch, 1995; and Stewart 2006). By contrast, and as argued in later sections, ULTRs who represent a distinctive cohort of actors within LCE tend to be either applied/educational linguists or scholars in an LC2-related field (e.g., literary criticism, film studies) *as well as* language teaching practitioners. LTTs are commonly located in university departments/schools of education, linguistics and applied linguistics, rather than solely in language departments.

With respect to gender, we can turn to Kees de Bot’s (2015) comprehensive historical review of the AL field in his monograph *A History of Applied Linguistics: From 1980 to the Present*. In this study, prominent applied linguists were asked to complete a questionnaire ($n = 56$) and also participate in a face-to-face interview ($n = 38$) in which they discussed key leaders in AL, seminal journals and books as well as the major trends in the field. According to de Bot, both male and female informants in his study mentioned more men than women as leaders in the field. Altogether, 17 women and 41 men were included in the list of leading scholars in AL; however, as highlighted by de Bot, three out of the top five leaders listed were women. Rod Ellis’s *Becoming and Being an Applied Linguist* (2016) edited collection of the life histories of renowned applied linguists features eight men and five women, which supports the view that this group may be a male-dominated one.

2.2.3 *Language Teachers – The Practitioners*

“Language teacher” is the most commonly used label to refer to someone who engages directly in student-facing LC2 classroom practice. This includes teachers in compulsory schooling, government or independent institutes, adult education, community associations teaching heritage/community languages,³ and adjunct, casual or contracted (non-tenured) teachers at tertiary level (also called language teaching assistants or instructors in the United States and tutors in Australia). In the higher education context, LTs are considered professionals rather than active academics, as their primary duty is to teach a language and its associated culture(s), rather than researching and publishing. Within the monoglossic ideological traditions discussed in earlier sections of this chapter, LTs are typically expected to be native speakers of the language they teach. However, this profile is changing rapidly (Calafato, 2019; Kramsch & Zhang, 2018). If not born in the country (or one of the countries) where the language they teach is spoken as the dominant language, they are expected to have spent a significant amount of time there. As such, the relationship (sense of belonging and legitimacy) with the language(s) and culture(s) they teach can vary.

With respect to gender, it is important to note that the field of LCE is a heavily feminised one (see also Appleby, 2014, for a discussion of this issue in the field of TESOL). Weldon’s (2015) report on the teacher workforce in Australia noted that 75% of language teachers in compulsory schools are female. Similarly, Kramsch and Zhang’s (2018) recent study of college/tertiary level instructors in the United States showed that 75% were also female (see also Lillie, 2017, for a discussion on female university language teachers in the European Union).

Language teachers in compulsory schools are bound by national and state education policy, curricular guidelines and, to an extent, professional standards,⁴ all greatly influenced by LTTs. Their practice is also bound by the use of textbooks, not always of their own choosing. LTs in schools are usually represented by national and regional associations as well as in professional journals. By contrast, LTs in university language departments are only accountable to their discipline administrator/course coordinator, usually ULTRs who are themselves not bound by language education policy or curriculum guidelines to the same extent as LTs in schools are.

What is common to LTs in both compulsory schooling and tertiary environments is that they appear to have less agency than ULTRs, and their voices are seldom heard directly in the academic literature. Their voices are more likely to be data used by LTTs who conduct research on them and their practice rather than voices representing their own unedited perspectives on the profession and its challenges (cf. Rose, 2019, for a discussion on the field of TESOL). There are commendable exceptions of course, such as Harbon and Moloney (2017), featuring a curated

collection of Australian LTs' unedited stories directly told by practitioners in the compulsory education sector. As such, this collection gives access to seldom heard LTs' voices, and at the same time, it gives LTs the chance "to critically situate their work" for themselves. In Kramsch and Zhang's (2018) study, LTs' voices are also heard to an extent, albeit more selectively, as part of the study the authors conducted on multilingual instructors at tertiary level. Chapter 3 turns the spotlight on language teacher identity and considers in more depth the absence of individual and collective ULTRs' voices in relation to issues of status, political and social weight as well as levels of agency within LCE.

Another common factor which affects LTs in both compulsory and post-compulsory levels, particularly in predominantly Anglophone countries such as Australia, is the ongoing undervaluing of languages as a learning area. Indeed, despite the ever-increasing multicultural and multilingual diversity in Australia, languages have long been considered the "Cinderella" of the Australian curriculum, both at school (Norris & Coutas, 2014) and at university level (see similar references made by university language teachers in the "Leal Report": B. Leal, Bettoni, Malcolm, & Sims, 1991). This state of play has been linked to a pervasive and now oft-cited "monolingual mindset". This concept, put forth by renowned Australian sociolinguist and academic intellectual Michael Clyne (2004, 2008), appears to transversally underpin numerous "fallacious clichés" in Australian education – possibly applicable to cognate contexts – from the "overcrowded curriculum", competing literacies, the "unfair advantage" of students with a home background in a language which they are studying and the sufficiency of global English. Digging deeper into the insidious impact of this mindset, we also find emerging research to do with socioeconomic inequalities in the access to language education (Molla, Harvey, & Sellar, 2018; Preece, 2019) as well as a colonial hierarchy of language ideologies and overall attitudes and perceptions regarding the role of languages in the "superdiverse" world in which we live (Macedo, 2019; Pennycook & Makoni, 2019).

As a direct corollary, Swanson and Mason (2018) noted that the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Australia are affected by a nearly permanent shortage of language teachers and that one of the key factors to account for that shortage is the ongoing undervaluing of the study of languages and hence of the profession (see also Reagan & Osborn, 2019, for a discussion of the US context). In the United States, Phillipps (2007, p. 266) argues that the key underlying issue that marginalizes the study of world languages remains largely unaddressed:

...much of the public still considers foreign language study as a subject for the elite, the college-bound, a skill or talent that Europeans or the citizens of developing nations prize – not one that is needed in our English-only United States.

In the 2001 paper “Is Language Teaching a Profession?”, David Nunan considered other factors which contribute to the devaluing of language teaching as a profession. Although this paper is now two decades old and the focus was on the Teaching of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) profession, two of Nunan’s arguments are still directly relevant to world LTs today. These include the (perceived) lack of qualifications among native English speaker teachers, as well as the lack of a sufficiently identifiable “disciplinary base for a shared set of rules of the game” (p. 5). As English continues to be the most widely taught language globally, both factors contribute to the devaluing of the teaching of all languages in all national contexts as it reinforces the common public view that anybody can teach a language, especially one’s own (Block, 2016). World LTs, native or non-native speakers in compulsory schooling, are generally expected to have tertiary qualifications in the language they teach. They are also expected to have some teaching qualifications, with a specialisation in language teaching and learning. However, in many countries, because of the shortage of world LTs discussed above, many do not hold either type of qualification (see Kissau et al., 2019; Swanson & Mason, 2018). Language instructors and tutors at tertiary level commonly hold a university qualification in the language they teach (up to PhD level) but do not necessarily have any teaching qualification or a specialisation in language teaching.

Overall, LTs represent a complex cohort of professionals who commonly feel undervalued as practitioners of LCE. Despite their professional struggles, they are usually burdened with the responsibility of having to be advocates of their profession as well as “subject advocates” (Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2009). LTs operating in predominantly monolingual linguistic cultures often have to confront negative attitudes towards LC2 learning and, on a daily basis, school principals, students, parents and colleagues from other disciplines who do not see the value of learning languages other than English. Kramsch and Zhang (2018, p. 1) capture this puzzling reality with an incisive question regarding what makes LTs actually stay in such an undervalued profession:

What makes language teachers so committed to a profession that often rewards them so little and yet fulfils them enough to pursue it year after year, through the swelling tides and receding eddies of classroom practice?

We ponder on this further, wondering whether it is a sense of a global political and ethical responsibility to promote and educate for linguistic and cultural diversity and/or simply the personal joy and rewards of sharing a language and culture they love. These questions are considered further in Chapter 3.

Another factor commonly affecting LTs is the issue of legitimacy, itself linked to the issue of whether or not native speakers make better LTs as well as the issue of defining what is a native speaker of a language in the first place. There is no easy answer to feelings of legitimacy for either native and non-native LTs. Firstly, the issue of legitimacy can be linked to the symbolic capital assigned to the language variety one teaches as well as racialised perceptions associated with named languages. For example, the legitimacy of a black teacher from Senegal teaching French in Australia may be contested by students and parents, similarly “a teacher of French, whose native tongue is Japanese, might encounter similar impediments when teaching French in France to foreigners or to French people” (Derivry-Plard, 2011, p. 185). Secondly, both native and non-native LTs are active multilinguals constantly on a learning curve in order to maintain and update the language(s) and culture(s) they once learnt and practice/use or live with in some ways. Echoing this line of thought, Cook (2011, p. 153) notes that even for expatriate native speaker teachers “their native speaker’s status has a sell-by date rather than being good for the rest of their lives”. One’s first language tends to be transformed by a second or third language so that “the person no longer speaks the same way as a monolingual native speaker” (p. 153).

The issue of language and culture knowledge (maintenance) is a complex one, and we explore it further in Chapter 3. Suffice to say for now that perhaps more so than in any other educational area, teachers engaged in LCE not only have to be advocates of their profession and of their teaching subject, they also have to deal with their own doubts and insecurities regarding their very sense of professional legitimacy.⁵

2.2.4 ULTRs: Silent Voices and Unseized Spaces

There are several reasons that warrant distinguishing ULTRs as a distinct cohort of actors within the field of LCE. Unlike LTs and LTTs, ULTRs wear two hats in that they are clearly both (as part of their professional duties) practicing language teachers and scholars actively involved in research. In their great majority, ULTRs are as a matter of fact (and not always by choice) language teaching practitioners, as they must be involved in student-facing teaching of languages and cultures as part of their position description and professional duties. But they must also conduct academic research and publish.

ULTRs have a lot in common with LTs in terms of their multilingual and multicultural profiles and the dominance of the female gender in both cohorts. In her study on women teaching languages in higher education across several European countries, Lillie (2017) noted, for instance, that they represented the majority of teachers in this area, but it is not clear whether or not they were also actively involved in research.

Even though, historically, a concern with gender issues in general has not been central to second language learning and teaching research (Kramsch & von Hoene, 1995), numerous studies are now emerging in this area – for recent studies, see, for example, Feery (2008), Jones (2016) and, more recently, Rowlett and King (2017) and Leal and Crookes (2018). Specifically, the gendered experiences of teachers in the language teaching profession have received increased attention. Many of these studies have emerged from Japan and have focused on the teaching of English as a foreign language. One of the earliest examples is Lin, Kubota, Motha, Wang and Wong's (2006) research on Asian women faculty members and language teachers, which "theorised the ways in which ideological and institutional conditions impacted their experiences of marginalisation and discrimination in terms of gender, race, and social class" (Rowlett & King, 2017, p. 91). More recently, Appleby (2014) turned the spotlight on the study of masculinities in global English language education and specifically on why Western men outnumber Western women amongst foreign English language teachers in present-day Japan (cf. Yoshihara, 2017). Overall, however, with the exception of Ryan-Scheutz's (2012) examination of the language programme director role as a feminised profession in the US context, research focusing on ULTRs and gender matters remains scarce, particularly in the teaching of world languages in predominantly Anglophone countries.

To sum up, both ULTRs and LTs are affected by the linguistic and cultural milieu in which they live and practice teaching, issues around professional and subject area advocacy as well as issues of legitimacy. However, this is where the overlap between the two groups ends. Unlike LTs, ULTRs hold more agency with respect to decision-making regarding the orientation and actual practice of LCE in their departments and institutions. ULTRs' curricula are loosely bound by graduate attributes, which must be reflected in their teaching in a general way, but they are not bound by state language education policy nor any curriculum guidelines as LTs are. Liddicoat (2016) recently pointed out that explicit language planning in universities is an emerging field prompted by the increasing internationalisation of the tertiary sector of education globally. As an emerging field, the impact of such planning has not yet affected the delivery and practice of LCE at local levels. For the most part, ULTRs are entirely free to decide on the content and pedagogical approach in their language programmes.

Typically, ULTRs are programme directors and coordinators of language courses with language instructors under their supervision and with whom they co-teach. As such, they decide on the content of language courses, textbooks and pedagogical approaches, regardless of whether or not they hold tertiary qualification in language pedagogy and practice. At this point our argument, it is necessary to divide

ULTRs into two sub-groups according to their primary area of research specialisation within either applied and/or educational linguistics or areas such as literary criticism, gender studies, film studies, food studies as well as, more broadly, cultural studies, migration studies, political sciences and history.

ULTRs who identify as applied linguists may have a specialisation in, for example, cross-cultural pragmatics with some interest or not in educational linguistics. As such, a ULTR whilst teaching a world language may research in SLA for that language but with no great interest in language and culture pedagogy as a sub-research area. Conversely, the research background of a ULTR with a specialisation in literary criticism may inform the content of their teaching of language and culture at more advanced levels, rather than the pedagogical approach for it. The intersection between teaching and research in the professional lives of ULTRs is therefore a grey area and very much driven by the individual. Given the lack of a common theoretical frame of references in LCE (cf. Byrnes, 2012), the complexity and diversity of research backgrounds and interests can make it difficult to work in a teaching team and to reach consensus on the content and pedagogy of a new language/culture course, for example. It can also make a shared ideological positioning towards LCE not impossible but more difficult.

In the past, ULTRs' research backgrounds were more homogenous, commonly including a specialisation in literary studies in the language taught (VanPatten, 2015). By contrast, the presence of ULTRs who are applied/educational linguists in university language departments is, historically, fairly new, dating back to the 1990s in countries like Australia. This sub-group of ULTRs (language teaching practitioners as well as scholars in LCE) typically sits at the bottom of the academic hierarchy, as both language teaching practice and its associated scholarly discipline (LCE) tend to be undervalued as academic fields in their own right, including in many foreign language departments which internal culture "still has difficulty accommodating this new area of knowledge in their midst" (Kramsch & Zhang 2018, p. 18). The argument put forth by Galisson (1989) three decades ago remains valid today in many national contexts. Galisson argued that what in Europe is called "language didactics", not quite but closely related to what we call "foreign language teaching",⁶ should have uncontested credibility given the social, economical, political and ideological weight that the knowledge of languages has. This fact alone, according to him, should give "language didactics" autonomy and legitimacy in its own right and above the "cumbersome supervision" of the disciplines from which it draws inspiration (e.g., SLA).

As argued by Pauwels (2011), it is incumbent upon ULTRs as a special cohort of actors within LCE to seize the unique space they hold as both practitioners and scholars, despite the diversity of their research

backgrounds and different levels of interest/commitment to LCE. However, seizing the space ULTRs hold within tertiary LCE involves them wanting it in the first place, which in turn implies seeing themselves for what they are and represent as well as owning it. It involves them acknowledging more forwardly the important roles and responsibilities they hold as actors in LCE. These roles and responsibilities entail clear political and ethical positioning, advocating for tertiary LCE as a fully fledged humanistic discipline as opposed to orienting towards more utilitarian approaches to language and culture study, a point that Phillipps (2007) alludes to and that we revisit in Chapter 3.

Finally, unlike LTs, both ULTRs and LTTs are also expected to engage in the supervision of higher degree research (HDR) students. Indeed, many tenured ULTRs, applied/educational linguists in particular, are called upon to supervise students from a variety of linguistic and cultural backgrounds, sometimes outside their primary language/culture area of expertise. This adds to the multilingual and intercultural complexity of the professional space they hold, for example, a ULTR based in Spanish studies or French studies in an Australian university may supervise a PhD candidate who researches a TESOL-related topic in Vietnam, Pakistan or Saudi Arabia. Arguably, the level of academic multilingual and intercultural versatility this requires is unequalled in other disciplines and redefines the nature and boundaries of what academic expertise really entails for at least some ULTRs.

2.3 Do LTTs, LTs and ULTRs Relate, and If So, How?

Insights into the relationship between the three groups of actors discussed so far can help us to situate further the actual space ULTRs hold within LCE. This relationship touches on issues of knowledge base, hierarchical status, interests and affiliation with different research areas and/or professional associations (Wheeler, 2018), which, in turn, explains the different languages and discourses used by the three concerned groups. We first look at the interaction between LTTs and LTs as this is the most widely discussed in the literature. We then consider ULTRs as they relate to LTTs, on the one hand, and LTs, on the other.

2.3.1 *LTTs and LTs*

The gaps between theoretical knowledge produced by LTTs (particularly in SLA and psycholinguistics theory) and its practical applicability in real classroom context has been widely acknowledged and discussed in the literature – see, for example, Lightbown (1985), Spolsky (1990), Clarke (1994), Crookes (1997), Stewart (2006), Cook (2002) and Ellis (2010). In this vein, Spolsky (2008, p. 1) – making a case for what he termed “educational linguistics” – contended that applied linguistics as a

field had been “soulless” in its offer of solutions to “a quite narrow range of problems, especially in teaching foreign languages”. Block (2000) also made the point that SLA publications often focus on issues of no particular interest to LTs and highlighted (with Crookes, 1997) the difference of status between SLA researchers and LTs, the former being perceived as the producers of higher knowledge and the respected, expert voices:

...SLA researchers have relatively higher status than teachers because as academics they occupy the upper echelons of the knowledge chain. They are the makers of knowledge which teachers are expected to process and use. On a more practical level, researchers are the plenary speakers at language teaching conferences who are meant to be listened to by most of those attending.

(Block, 2000, p. 134)

Despite the higher status attributed to it, knowledge produced by LTTs can nonetheless be perceived as lagging behind practice. For example, one respondent (an education consultant for independent schools) quoted in the *Australian Review of Teacher Education for Languages Teachers* (Kleinhenz, Wilkinson, Gearon, Fernandez, & Ingvarson, 2007) strongly laments not only the negative effects of the lack of communication and collaboration between university lecturers involved in language teacher education and language teachers in schools but also LTTs’ lack of current knowledge in what should be their area of expertise:

There is not enough connection between the universities and what is happening in classrooms. They (university teaching staff) don’t work with teachers or discuss what’s current. Why aren’t they contacting, communicating, asking? Where are university people getting their methodology? Who are they (universities) employing? What are their credentials? Do they design courses around state curriculum? Maybe they need in service education themselves.

(Kleinhenz et al., 2007, p. 73)

The reasons behind LTTs lack of up-to-date knowledge – particularly, in relation to language teaching pedagogy and practice – are no doubt complex. They are also puzzling as they cannot be solely attributed to issues of casualisation of staffing or teaching, administration and service overload as suggested in the report cited above. Could it be too that some LTTs at least are not motivated enough by LCE to stay up to date with its associated research areas? Can one imagine a lecturer in engineering or medical sciences not being up to date in their field? Could it be that the lack of expertise in language teaching pedagogy and practice is “part and parcel” of the devaluing of LCE being so widespread and pervasive that it plays out negatively within its own ranks?

More generally, distance between LTTs and LTs can be explained in part by what Labaree (2003) noted as “differences of cultural orientations” splitting the two groups apart as later also discussed by Hatasa (2013). Along this divide, researchers’ orientation would be more valued because it is perceived to be more “analytical, intellectual, universal and theoretical whereas teachers’ orientation is perceived to be more normative, personal, particular and experiential” (Hatasa 2013, p. 3). This problem could be more accurately reframed as an error of “scholasticism” as conceptualised by Bourdieu (2000). This type of error refers to scholars’ tendency to legitimatise abstract knowledge/theory as a form of symbolic power over practical knowledge and experience, accentuating in this case the potential for unequal power dynamics between LTTs and LTs.

Ultimately, the kind of binary distinction underpinning these “cultural orientations” can obscure the fact that language teachers are not atheoretical practitioners nor are they blind consumers of the research LTTs present them with (see Mckinley, 2019; Medgyes, 2017; Paran, 2017; Rose, 2019; Sato & Loewen, 2018, for debates around this issue in the field of TESOL). Practice of any kind includes generalising thinking (i.e., theorising) at some level. Here, Richards’ (2002) distinction between three basic conceptions of theory of language teaching: science-research conceptions (research applied to teaching), theory-philosophy conceptions (common sense or ideology/value based) and art-craft conceptions (constructed by individual teachers) is particularly useful in exploring LTs’ theoretical sources. In addition, the concept of *praxis* envisaged by Critical Pedagogy as a synergistic combination of theory and practice (Adkins, 2014) is also relevant as fruitful grounds to engage with the political dimension of our practice and, thus to support emancipatory language teaching practices.

Kramersch’s (1995) paper “The Applied Linguist and the Foreign Language Teacher: Can They Talk to Each Other?” identified four “discourse communities” within LCE: researchers in SLA and psycholinguistics (the scientific perspective), scholars in the social sciences or in the humanities (the critical perspective), foreign language educators (the corporate perspective) and the methodologists and teacher trainers (the institutional perspective). Kramersch argued that the first two groups focus on the learner and the last two on the teacher and that because of their different interests and theoretical frameworks of reference, these groups also speak differently, leading to a problem of discourse specificity and lack of mediation between them.⁷ While Kramersch does not consider LTs (nor ULTRs) in the same way that we define them in this study, her call for these different discourse communities to engage more proactively with each other remains valid today, more than 20 years later. This is particularly important if we are to effectively confront the lack of recognition for the field which emerges from both internal and external disciplinary hierarchies (Warner, 2018).

Reflecting further on the discrepancy between theory and teaching practice Kramsch and Zhang (2018, p. 16) noted what they described as a paradox in some language instructors who know and endorse theoretical knowledge in a particular area but do not apply it in their classroom. These instructors justified such discrepancies in their practice by citing issues such as the demands of their institution, assessment requirements, students' expectations and simply the fear of jeopardising their position. LTTs in many ways sit in a privileged position within LCE as they do not have to implement theories of language teaching in the classroom, including their own. LTs, on the other hand, are hit with reality constraints when it comes to implementing new theoretical knowledge, in particular, knowledge which calls for innovation-in-practice. Consciously engaging with how to navigate one's institutional demands as well as students' expectations is a matter of political stance and will. "Political" is understood in this case as relating to the power dynamics underpinning these tensions as well as being willing to enact change in the status quo. However, historically, LCE and its actors have not actively engaged with the political dimension of their work.

2.3.2 *ULTRs and LTTs*

As argued above, LTTs and ULTRs represent two distinct groups within LCE, with the most visible overlap between the two being those ULTRs who may consider themselves LTTs due to their research interest and activities within LCE. The key difference between the two groups is that even ULTRs whose main research interest falls within educational linguistics typically have to engage in LCE classroom practice whereas most LTTs do not. As such, the two groups share a common body of literature and academic discourse but no common knowledge from direct classroom experience. This key difference forms the basis of our argument regarding the unique place held by ULTRs within LCE and their potential to inform LCE *praxis* through their involvement in both theory production and everyday practice in the field. The study presented in this book provides insights into why ULTRs, in an Australian context at least, do not always seize this space and what they could do with it if they did.

2.3.3 *ULTRs and LTs*

ULTRs and LTs share the practice of LCE. However, and as already implied, many ULTRs do not see or identify themselves as LTs, a fact which does not help the nurturing of closer professional relationships between the two groups. Furthermore, even when ULTRs identify as LTs, it is usually to describe the somewhat daily aspect of their professional identity as they are also researchers with substantial pressure to favour

the latter as a more prestigious dimension of their professional activity rather than teaching. Some ULTRs (the sub-group interested in educational linguistics) tend to interact directly with LTs when commissioned with the provision of professional development workshops. However, such interactions foreground their role as “experts” in a particular domain of LCE, thereby reproducing the imbalance of power noted between LTTs and LTs.

In summary, the relationship between LCE’s key groups of actors (LTTs, LTs and ULTRs) is complex and layered with differences regarding working context, status, professional discourse and avowed professional identity. It is also affected by particular power dynamics between them, greatly affected by perceptions of what constitutes valuable knowledge as well as the value of language teaching as practice. As such, we argue that LCE as a field would undoubtedly gain in visibility, recognition and validation if its actors worked more closely together and shared a stronger sense of belonging to the same field in the first place, despite their different roles and ambitions. In the next section, we turn to the specific context of LCE and ULTRs in Australia in order to frame the study presented in subsequent chapters.

2.4 ULTRs in the Australian Higher Education Context

Much like other Anglophone countries such as the United Kingdom and the United States, Australia has historically had an ambivalent relationship with the teaching and learning of languages other than English (Scarino & Papademetre, 2001). At various points in time Australia has been a pioneer in language-in-education policy amongst many English dominant, multicultural societies (Djité, 2011; Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2017). Yet, despite the steady succession of policy documents, declarations and nationwide initiatives stressing and affirming the significance of language studies over the last 30 years, “languages continue to struggle to achieve recognition” (Norris & Coutas, 2014, p. 45) as a learning area, making the recruitment and retention of language learners across sectors ever more challenging. Overall, the current state of language program provision nationwide remains fragmented and fragile, largely due to a weak language policy environment and the loss of collaborative language policy processes across sectors, states and territories (Lo Bianco & Slaughter, 2017). The latter has been exacerbated by shifts in educational emphases proposed by government and ministers⁸ and the structural tensions between federal and state levels of government. In addition, “the persistence of a monolingual mindset” (Clyne, 2005; Hajek & Slaughter, 2014) has been a palpable force in the unsupportive decisions and attitudes towards language learning, all of which keep impeding the implementation of various policies’ despite their vision and best intentions.

Challenging this monolingual mindset is difficult in a country where national identity tends to be associated to English language ability more than birthplace (Burke, Thapliyal, & Baker, 2018). In their study on language ideologies in education evidenced in the Australian print media, Mason and Hajek (2018) advocate for an ideological shift towards the recognition of the value of languages beyond utilitarian and economic driving forces in support of their intrinsically humanistic drive. Against this backdrop, they argue for a conceptualisation of language studies as a human right, enabling heritage language learners to remain connected to their language communities but also enabling access to speech communities within glocal reach to all Australians:

To bring balance to the public discourse concerning language education, and to potentially encourage more young Australians to study a language, more attention needs to be given to the multiple ways in which language can be used as a resource not only for utilitarian purposes but also humanistic purposes. Further, there needs to be a recognition of language a human right for others to retain their connection to the communities to which they belong, but also a right for monolingual Australians to connect more fully to a global world and global Australia.

(Mason & Hajek, 2018, p. 17)

The unravelling decline of university language studies in Australia can be traced back to one particular policy measure effected more than 50 years ago (see Baldwin, 2019, for a comprehensive historical exploration of language offerings in Australian universities from the colonial period to the present). This was the decision made in the late 1960s by most Australian universities to remove the study of languages as a prerequisite for accessing tertiary education (Lo Bianco, 2001). This decision has had a profound and irreversible effect on all levels of education. A clear example of its effect is reflected in the steep decline in the range of languages offered and in the number of high school students graduating with a language. The latter, which was around 40% in the 1960s, has not risen above 15% in the past 30 years (Mason & Hajek 2018). This also explains the bottom heavy enrolment trends in language departments, that is, the large number of enrolments in ab initio courses which decrease drastically in more advanced ones, even in languages such as French, which boasts a well-established teaching tradition in Australia (Brown & Caruso, 2016). In recent years, some universities have tried to remedy this situation by providing incentive bonus points to students who studied a language up until the end of high school, helping boost their overall Australian Tertiary Admission Rank (ATAR).⁹ However, as highlighted by Caruso and Brown (2017), the implementation of this initiative has not been without challenges: from lack of awareness about

the scheme to issues of equity in access to language study in high school, all point to the need for more scaffolded approaches to the promotion of language studies.

Engagement with the promotion of language studies in Australia can be traced through a number of key government commissioned reports. Already in 1966, the Wykes Report had predicted that the phasing out of language requirements for university entrance would alter the very nature of university language teaching, and noted the lack of interest by heads of language departments at the time to provide languages for trade/practical purposes only. In 1970 the interest in the teaching of Asian languages was foregrounded by the “Auchmuty Report” (see Commonwealth of Australia, 1970), which highlighted their potential to enhance trading in the region. By 1975, the “Report of the Australian Academy of Humanities” had identified a state of crisis in language studies in the tertiary sector, noting Australian’s monolingual tendency and potential for “cultural and intellectual insularity” (p. 41). The Hawley Report (1982) noted some students’ demand for a higher focus on oral and written proficiency in their target language over literary studies. The Ingleson Report (1989), “Asia in Australian higher education”, “Report of the inquiry into the teaching of Asian studies and languages in higher education”, marked the beginning of a renewed emphasis on the teaching of Asian languages and cultures which may provide Australia with a greater Asia-literate population. Set against the backdrop of the newly developed Australian National Policy on Languages (NLP) (1987), this report helped kick off a period of intensive exploration of what LCE could mean for Australia. Most of the commissioned studies that followed focused on the implementation of recommendations made in the NPL, either through the Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education (AACLAME), the body implementing the NPL before the National Languages and Literacy Institute of Australia (NLLIA) was set up, or through the NLLIA after 1991.

These studies were nevertheless driven by political interventions that had tied LCE very closely to knowing foreign, mostly Asian, cultures specifically for the purpose of trade and access to markets, through their languages, understood as foreign and not community languages, and as languages to be favoured over European languages (Lo Bianco, personal communication, August 18, 2019). In a nutshell, these reports give insights into themes within Australian LCE which remain relevant today: the goals of LCE, the languages that should be given priority, Australia’s complex relationship with Asia, students’ demand for language skills over traditional cultural/literary content and the overall damaging effects of monolingualism.

More recent studies such as Nettelbeck et al. (2007), Go8 (2007), Lo Bianco and Gvozdenko (2006), Nettelbeck et al. (2009) and Høj (2010) continue to point to the decline and ongoing state of crisis of

languages at tertiary level. In the 2007 position paper authored by scholars in the Group of Eight leading, research-intensive Australian universities “Languages in Crisis: A rescue plan for Australia”, one interviewee points to the need to recover the vision of what LCE in higher education ought to be: “we need to reassert that our prime function is in sophisticated teaching of a whole language/culture/society/history complex” (Go8, 2007, p. 35). The Lo Bianco and Gvozdenko’s (2006) research on innovation and collaboration is broad-ranging and particularly telling beyond the two topics it investigated. It is based on the review of 36 years of Australian public policy for language education and submissions from six Australian universities. Its key findings show the links between coherent national policy and the sustainability of innovative practices for languages in higher education, noting that Australia now lags behind in that respect, compared to the United States and even the United Kingdom. Their study also points to the importance of permanent academic staff in initiating and maintaining innovation; the damaging government and institutional focus on overly precise language outcomes; as well as their support for specific languages of value for trade, security and diplomatic advantages at the expense of other languages. Nettelbeck et al.’s study (2009) reiterated the need for explicit institutional support and “serious commitment at the highest levels” for the success of language programmes at tertiary level. It also called for the formation of the first network of university language teachers and researchers. LCNAU (mentioned above) was created in 2011 marking the historic birth of the first national association bringing together ULTRs across the country. Its key aim being “to strengthen the tertiary languages sector in Australia through advocacy, collaboration, research and support”. The fact that LCNAU was only established a decade ago is quite telling of Australian ULTRs’ lack of a shared professional identity.

Although language teaching staff within tertiary LCE contexts are mentioned in numerous studies and reports, they are usually not the focus of particular attention nor are they treated as a special cohort amongst other language professionals. The earliest, most comprehensive report on the profile of LCE teaching staff in Australia can be traced back the so-called Leal Report from 1991. This report, which was, in turn, driven by the impetus of the studies emerging at the footsteps of the NLP was commissioned by the Minister for Employment Education and Training to provide an extensive, in-depth review of the teaching of modern languages in Australian higher education. Data presented in this report included universities’ modern language departments, their structures, their objectives, their personnel (staff and students) and their activities. Some key findings in these reports are worth noting. The profile of teaching staff was based on the data drawn from $n = 377$ questionnaires spanning 25 different languages. The majority of respondents (63%) were senior lecturers or lecturers.

The Leal Report highlighted the “precariousness” of conditions faced by many untenured and part-time staff in smaller and then “newer” language programs. A precursor publication to the Leal Report had already established the unfortunate widespread perception regarding the status of language teaching within language departments at Australian universities. Despite representing the core, “bread-winning” activity in language departments, according to Bowden, Starrs and Quinn (1989), language teaching was considered by many to be the “Cinderella” of staff duties (pp. 136–137), often allocated to the most junior staff and/or staff specialising in language teaching, the relative minority compared to the ones focusing on literature, particularly in certain departments. Against this backdrop, the Leal Report underscored that “literature was viewed as most highly valued, and teaching in non-language areas at least as highly valued” (p. 135).

The segregation between staff whose research interests centred on literature and those focused on language teaching has long existed, and not just in the Australian context. In the US context, the pervasiveness of this division was the subject of several publications following the 2007 Modern Language Association (MLA) Report (Kramsch & Zhang, 2018; VanPatten, 2015; Warner, 2018). These publications highlight the “two-tiered” configuration of most language departments.

In the Australian context, both Bowden et al. and the Leal Report provide some contextual perspectives on the perpetuation of ULTRs’ low status in higher education. The Leal Report (1991) in particular provided some useful information about the profile of all teaching staff (tenured and casual) in language departments; though now quite outdated, anecdotal evidence suggests it remains fairly representative of language staff profiles in general. This report also highlighted the vulnerable position of staff holding higher, senior positions in language programmes across the country which ultimately leads to “under-representation on policy-making bodies” (p. 132). However, the report also noted that there is extreme variability for different languages in different universities and the fact that smaller languages attract more untenured and part-time staff. One common trait amongst all language departments in Australia, also noted and still valid today, is that they are usually rather small, which means that staff are required to teach in a variety of areas or language levels, adding to their teaching and administrative load which ultimately also impacts on their research production. Most language staff also research in more than one area. A great majority of respondents in the Leal’s research also mentioned that they taught a language but “very few teach how it is taught and learned” (p. 134). This situation has persisted until today as the pedagogy and practice of language teaching, as an academic area, is commonly handled by faculties of education and not language departments. Finally, findings confirmed the commonly held perception that in Australian universities, research

is more highly valued than teaching and that research in non-language-related areas such as literary studies is also regarded more highly.

These early reports suggest that perhaps part of the problem has to do with the heavy teaching workload involved in language-focused courses and the low status of teaching-related activities in the larger university context, particularly vis-à-vis research-related activities. This is still true today. Around 30 years later, several scholarly publications support the fulfilment of many of the bleak predictions made in the Leal Report. Some of these publications hone in on the casualisation of language teachers and “the systemic (if not systematic) de-professionalisation, through erosion of senior leadership, and widespread juniorisation and casualisation of staff” (Nettelbeck, Hajek, & Woods, 2012).

What are some of the implications of this dependence on casual teachers? As mentioned earlier in this chapter, understanding the complexities underpinning ULTRs’ profiles can ultimately help us better understand our workplace environment and power dynamics underpinning the interactions among our colleagues. Here, it is important to mention that casualisation trends affect the higher education sector at large, not just language departments. The Coates et al. report (2009) provides an analysis of the Australian academic profession, specifically, the insidious trends in the casualisation of staff. These data complement research conducted by Lazarsfeld-Jesen and Morgan (2009, p. 54), who reflect on the perceived privileged perspective of full-time, tenured staff and the vulnerable condition of casual academics:

Casualisation has a profound impact on tenured staff. They must recruit and manage teachers who in turn have no access to [paid] training or support, and whose role is constrained by a minimalist contract system. Last minute recruitment was often based on prior relationships, which casuals felt opened them up to excessive demands and bullying because of their financial vulnerability. There is insecurity on both sides with neither feeling able to create parameters for the relationship or the work. It is not unusual for a full time academic to work exclusively with casuals, and for casuals to have no relationships within the university beyond their immediate supervisor and the person who handles their pay.

This quote highlights the emotional burden that casualisation creates for both casual and so-called permanent or continuing (tenured) staff. Overall, LTs, whether tenured or casual, find themselves in “survival mode”, trying to cope with employment uncertainty, increasing teaching workloads and conflicting demands made by universities in relation to research outputs and teaching standards (Nettelbeck et al., 2007; White & Baldauf, 2006).

Against this bleak backdrop, there is room for optimism. The “perennial state of crisis” of language education has been regularly offset

by the resilient commitment of LCE professionals. In addition to the continuing search for innovative practices and ideas to increase the chances that the language they teach will survive in the current slippery state of play, several grassroots research and actions promoted by language teachers associations around the world give us reasons to remain hopeful. Examples of these movements are evident most notably in the United States, with the MLA's report "Foreign Languages and Higher Education: New Structures for a Changed World" (Modern Language Association of America, 2007) and Levine and Phipps' edited volume *Critical and Intercultural Theory and Language Pedagogy* (Levine & Phipps, 2012) but also in the UK context, in the face of *Brexit* (see Kelly, 2018; Lanvers, Doughty, & Thompson, 2018), and in Australia, with the establishment of LCNAU (2011). Nevertheless, given current trends in internationalisation and high mobility among academics, many staff currently employed in Australian universities' language departments lack this shared historical knowledge and understanding of LCE, which, ultimately, acts as yet another obstacle in the development of a collective professional identity.

2.5 Concluding Remarks

The aims of this chapter were twofold: first, to establish a common understanding of what we have conceptualised as our field of action in teaching and research, namely, LCE; and, second, to distinguish among three key cohorts of actors within LCE: LTTs, LTs and ULTRs. While much of the extant literature makes a distinction between LTTs and LTs – albeit under other guises – we distinguished ULTRs as a distinctive cohort of actors. We argued that, while lacking a shared professional identity, ULTRs hold a unique space with significant potential for innovative agency and leadership within LCE. In exploring the relationship between these three groups of actors, we highlighted the various factors which impinge on closer and more fruitful interaction between them. Finally, the last section of the chapter commented critically on key features of LCE and ULTRs in the Australian context as background for the data presented in subsequent chapters.

Notes

- 1 Schiffman (1996) defines "linguistic" culture as the sum of dominant ideas, values, beliefs, attitudes, prejudices and myths that speakers bring with the language from their *culture*.
- 2 "Educational linguistics" was first coined by Spolsky (1978) as a sub-field of applied linguistics to designate research with a particular focus on the teaching and learning of languages; yet, as Ellis (2016) highlights in his edited volume on the life histories of educational (applied) linguists, "educational linguistics" "never really established itself as a label for this kind of work" (p. 6).

- 3 In the United States, the term “heritage language” (HL) is used “as a neutral and inclusive alternative to the terms minority, indigenous, immigrant, ethnic, second or foreign language”, while in Australia the term “community language” (CL) is used “to refer to this same range of language resources in their national context” (Hornberger, 2005, p. 102).
- 4 See, for example, NBPTS (2001) *World Languages Other Than English: Standards for Teachers and Students Ages 3–18+* in the United States and the Australian Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations (DEST, 2005) *Professional Standards for Accomplished Teaching of Languages and Cultures* in Australia.
- 5 See Kramsch and Zhang (2018) for further discussion on LTs and issues of legitimacy.
- 6 Kramsch, Lévy and Zarate (2010, p. 4) note that “language didactics” translated from the original French “*didactique des langues*” overlaps but is not quite equivalent to terms like “foreign language teaching” but is more closely linked to the teaching of French as a foreign language and so not quite equivalent to foreign language (FL) education, methodology, pedagogy, SLA or applied linguistics.
- 7 The recent initiative by the reputable journal *Language Learning* in offering “Open Accessible Summaries” is a clear example of attempts to bridge this gap (Marsden, Trofimovich, & Ellis, 2019).
- 8 See Mason and Hajek (2018, p. 11) quoting Joe Lo Bianco, writer of Australia’s first National Policy on Languages,

It’s not that we haven’t had good or even inspirational policy [...] it’s just that it’s become a political football, so that each time there’s a change in government, and sometimes just a change of minister, there’s a new emphasis.
- 9 See ULPA (Universities Languages Portal Australia) website at <https://www.ulpa.edu.au/why-study-languages/> for the list of universities which offer these bonus points to prospective students.

References

- Adkins, T. (2014). Critical pedagogy. In D. Coghlan & M. Brydon-Miller (Eds.), *The SAGE encyclopaedia of action research* (pp. 212–215). London, UK: Sage Publications.
- Anwaruddin, S. M. (2019). How language teachers address the crisis of praxis in educational research. *Oxford Review of Education, Ahead of print*.
- Appleby, R. (2014). *Men and masculinities in global English language teaching*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Australian Academy of the Humanities (AAH). (1975). *Survey of foreign language teaching in the Australian universities (1965–1973)*. Canberra, Australia: AAH.
- Baldwin, J. J. (2019). *Languages other than English in Australian higher education*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Blackledge, A., & Creese, A. (Eds.). (2014). *Heteroglossia as practice and pedagogy*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Block, D. (2000). Revisiting the gap between SLA researchers and language teachers. *Links & Letters*, 7, 129–143.

- Block, D. (2016). Journey to the center of language teacher identity. In G. Barkhuizen (Ed.), *Reflections on language teacher identity research* (pp. 31–36). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian meditations* (R. Nice, Trans). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Bowden, J. A., Starrs, C. D., & Quinn, T. J. (1989). Modern language teaching in Australian universities. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 8(2), 129–146.
- Brown, J., & Caruso, M. (2016). Access granted: Modern languages and issues of accessibility at university—A case study from Australia. *Language Learning in Higher Education*, 6(2), 453–471.
- Burke, R., Thapliyal, N., & Baker, S. (2018). The weaponisation of language: English proficiency, citizenship and the politics of belonging in Australia. *Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis*, 7(1), 84–102.
- Byrnes, H. (2012). Reconsidering graduate students' education as scholar-teachers: Mind your language! In H. Willis Allen & H. H. Maxim (Eds.), *AAUSC 2011: Educating the future foreign language professoriate for the 21st century* (pp. 17–42). Boston, MA: Heinle, Cengage Learning.
- Calafato, R. (2019). The non-native speaker teacher as proficient multilingual: A critical review of research from 2009–2018. *Lingua*, 227, 102700.
- Caruso, M., & Brown, J. (2017). Continuity in foreign language education in Australia. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 40(3), 280–310.
- Clarke, M. A. (1994). The dysfunctions of the theory/practice discourse. *Tesol Quarterly*, 28(1), 9–26.
- Clyne, M. (2004). Trapped in a monolingual mindset. *Principal Matters*, 59, 18–20.
- Clyne, M. (2005). *Australia's language potential*. Sydney, Australia: University of New South Wales Press.
- Clyne, M. (2008). The monolingual mindset as an impediment to the development of plurilingual potential in Australia. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, 2(3), 347–366.
- Coates, H., Dobson, I., Edwards, D., Friedman, T., Goedegebuure, L., & Meek, L. (2009). *The attractiveness of the Australian academic profession: A comparative analysis*. Melbourne, Australia: LH Martin Institute, University of Melbourne & Australian Council for Educational Research & Educational Policy Institute.
- Commonwealth of Australia. (1970). *The teaching of Asian languages and cultures in Australia. Report by the Commonwealth Advisory Committee on the Teaching of Asian Languages and Cultures in Australia (known as the Auchmuty Report)*. Canberra, ACT: Commonwealth of Australia.
- Cook, V. (2011). Developing the links between second language acquisition research and language teaching. In K. Knapp & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Handbook of Foreign Language Communication and Learning* (pp. 139–161). Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Crookes, G. (1997). SLA and language pedagogy: A socioeducational perspective. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19(1), 93–116.
- de Bot, K. (2015). *A history of applied linguistics: From 1980 to the present*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Derivy-Plard, M. (2011). Native and non-native teachers: Two types of professionals competing on the language market. In G. Zarate, D. Lévy, &

- C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Handbook of multilingualism and multiculturalism* (pp. 185–188). Paris, France: Éditions des Archives Contemporaines.
- DEST (2005). *Professional standards for accomplished teaching of languages and cultures*. Canberra, Australia: Department of Education, Science and Training.
- Djité, P. (2011). Language policy in Australia: What goes up must come down. In C. N. Norrby & J. Hajek (Eds.), *Uniformity diversity in language policy: Global perspectives* (pp. 53–67). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Dufva, H., Suni, M., Aro, M., & Salo, O. P. (2011). Languages as objects of learning: Language learning as a case of multilingualism. *Apples-Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 5(1), 109–124.
- Ellis, R. (2010). Second language acquisition, teacher education and language pedagogy. *Language Teaching*, 43(2), 182–201.
- Ellis, R. (Ed.). (2016). *Becoming and being an applied linguist: The life histories of some applied linguists*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins.
- Erlam, R. (2008). What do you researchers know about language teaching? Bridging the gap between SLA research and language pedagogy. *International Journal of Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 2(3), 253–267.
- Feery, K. (2008). Current perspectives on the role of gender in second language acquisition (SLA) research. *The ITB Journal*, 9(1), 32–51.
- Flores, N., & Rosa, J. (2015). Undoing appropriateness: Raciolinguistic ideologies and language diversity in education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 85(2), 149–171.
- Galisson, R. (1989). Enseignement et apprentissage des langues et des cultures. *Français dans le Monde*, 227, 40–50.
- García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- García, O. (2019). Decolonizing foreign, second, heritage, and first languages. In D. Macedo (Ed.), *Decolonizing foreign language education: The misteaching of English and other colonial languages* (pp. 152–168). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Go8. (2007). *Languages in crisis: A rescue plan for Australia*. Retrieved from https://www.aftv.vic.edu.au/resources/whylearnfrench/Languages_in_crisis.pdf
- Hajek, J., & Slaughter, Y. (Eds.). (2014). *Challenging the monolingual mindset*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Harbon, L., & Moloney, R. (Eds.). (2017) *Language Teachers' Stories from their Professional Knowledge Landscapes*. Newcastle upon Tyne (UK): Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Hatasa, Y. A. (2013). The gap between theory and practice: Problems and possibilities. *Journal CAJLE*, 14(1), 1–17.
- Hawley, D. (1982). *Foreign language study in Australian tertiary institutions 1974–1981*. Wollongong, Australia: University of Wollongong.
- Høj, P. B. (2010). Can we afford to be without multilingualism? A scientist's lay perspective. *Humanities Australia*, 1(1), 44–53.
- Hornberger, N. H. (2005). Heritage/community language education: US and Australian perspectives. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 8(2–3), 101–108.
- Ingleton, J. (1989). *Asia in Australian higher education, Report of the inquiry into the teaching of Asian studies and languages in higher education*. Vols. 1 & 2. Canberra, ACT: Asian Studies Council.

- Jones, L. (2016). Language and gender identities. In S. Preece (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of language and identity* (pp. 210–224). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kachru, B. B. (1986). *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions, and models of non-native Englishes*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Kelly, M. (Ed.). (2018). *Languages after Brexit – How the UK speaks to the world*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Kissau, S., Davin, K., Wang, C., Haudeck, H., Rodgers, M., & Du, L. (2019). Recruiting foreign language teachers: An international comparison of career choice influences. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 14(2), 184–200.
- Kleinhenz, E., Wilkinson, J., Gearon, M., Fernandez, S., & Ingvarson, L. (2007). *The review of teacher education for languages teachers: Final report*. Canberra, ACT: ACER.
- Kramsch, C. (1995). The applied linguist and the foreign language teacher. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 18(1), 1–16.
- Kramsch, C., Lévy, D., & Zarate, G. (2010). General introduction. In G. Zarate, D. Lévy, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Handbook of multilingualism and multiculturalism* (pp. 3–11). Paris, France: Éditions des Archives Contemporaines.
- Kramsch, C., & von Hoene, L. (1995). The dialogic emergence of difference: Feminist explorations in foreign language learning and teaching. In D. C. Stanton & A. J. Stewart (Eds.), *Feminisms in the academy* (pp. 330–357). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Kramsch, C., & Zhang, L. (2018). *The multilingual instructor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Labaree, D. F. (2003). The peculiar problems of preparing educational researchers. *Educational Researcher*, 32(4), 13–22.
- Lanvers, U., Doughty, H., & Thompson, A. S. (2018). Brexit as linguistic symptom of Britain retreating into its shell? Brexit-induced politicization of language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 102(4), 775–796.
- Lazarsfeld-Jensen, A., & Morgan, K. (2009). *Overload: The role of work-volume escalation and micro-management of academic work patterns in loss of morale and collegiality at UWS: The way forward*. South Melbourne, Australia: National Tertiary Education Union.
- Leal, B., Bettoni, C., Malcolm, I., & Sims, G. (1991). *Widening our horizons: Report of the review of the teaching of modern languages in higher education (Leal Report)* (Vols. I & II). Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Leal, P., & Crookes, G. (2018). “Most of my students kept saying, ‘I never met a gay person’”: A queer English language teacher’s agency for social justice. *System*, 79, 38–48.
- Levine, G., & Phipps, A. (Eds.). (2012). *AAUSC 2010: Critical and intercultural theory and language pedagogy*. Boston, MA: Heinle, Cengage Learning.
- Liddicoat, A. J. (2016). Language planning in universities: Teaching, research and administration. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 17(3–4), 231–241.
- Lightbown, P. M. (1985). Great expectations: Second-language acquisition research and classroom teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 6(2), 173–189.
- Lillie, E. (2017). Women teaching languages in higher education: Voices from the European Union. In H. Eggins (Ed.), *The changing role of women in higher education* (pp. 243–266). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

- Lin, A., Kubota, R., Motha, S., Wang, W., & Wong, S. (2006). Theorizing experiences of Asian women faculty in second-and foreign-language teacher education. In G. Li & G. H. Beckett (Eds.), *“Strangers” of the academy: Asian women scholars in higher education* (pp. 56–84). Stirling, Scotland: Stylus.
- Lo Bianco, J. (1987). *National policy on languages*. Canberra, ACT: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2001). From policy to anti-policy: How fear of language rights took policy-making out of community hands. In J. Lo Bianco & R. Wickert (Eds.), *Australian policy activism in language and literacy* (pp. 13–44). Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Lo Bianco, J., & Gvozdenko, I. (2006). *Collaboration and innovation in the provision of languages other than English in Australian Universities*. Melbourne, Australia: Faculty of Education, University of Melbourne.
- Lo Bianco, J., & Slaughter, Y. (2009). *Second languages and Australian schooling*. Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Lo Bianco, J., & Slaughter, Y. (2017). Language policy and education in Australia. In T. L. McCarty & S. May (Eds.), *Language policy and political issues in education* (pp. 449–461). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Macedo, D. (Ed.). (2019). *Decolonizing foreign language education: The misteaching of English and other colonial languages*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (2005). Disinventing and (re) constituting languages. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, 2(3), 137–156.
- Marsden, E., & Kasprovicz, R. (2017). Foreign language educators’ exposure to research: Reported experiences, exposure via citations, and a proposal for action. *The Modern Language Journal*, 101(4), 613–642.
- Marsden, E., Trofimovich, P., & Ellis, N. (2019). Extending the reach of research: Introducing open accessible summaries at language learning. *Language Learning in Higher Education*, 69(1), 11–17.
- Mason, S., & Hajek, J. (2018). Language education and language ideologies in Australian print media. *Applied Linguistics, Ahead of print*, 1–20.
- Mckinley, J. (2019). Evolving the TESOL teaching–research nexus. *Tesol Quarterly, Ahead of print*.
- Medgyes, P. J. (2017). The (ir) relevance of academic research for the language teacher. *ELT Journal*, 71(4), 491–498.
- Modern Language Association of America. (2007). Foreign languages and higher education: New structures for a changed world. *Profession*, 2007(1), 234–245.
- Molla, T., Harvey, A., & Sellar, S. (2018). Access to languages other than English in Australian universities: An educational pipeline of privilege. *Higher Education Research & Development, Ahead of print*, 1–17.
- NBPTS (2001). *World languages other than English: Standards for teachers of students ages 3–18+*. National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.
- Nettelbeck, C., Byron, J., Clyne, M., Dunne, K., Hajek, J., Levy, M., ... Wigglesworth, G. (2009) *An analysis of retention strategies and technology enhanced learning in beginners’ languages other than English (LOTE) at Australian Universities*. Canberra: Australian Academy of the Humanities.
- Nettelbeck, C., Byron, J., Clyne, M., Hajek, J., Lo Bianco, J., & McLaren, A. (2007). *Beginners’ LOTE (Languages other than English) in Australian*

- Universities: An audit survey and analysis*. Canberra: Australian Academy of the Humanities.
- Nettelbeck, C., Hajek, J., & Woods, A. (2012). Re-professionalizing the profession: Countering juniorization and casualization in the tertiary languages sector. *Local-Global: Identity, Security, Community*, 9, 60.
- Norris, L., & Coutas, P. (2014). Cinderella's coach or just another pumpkin? Information communication technologies and the continuing marginalisation of languages in Australian schools. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37(1), 43–61.
- Nunan, D. (2001). Is language teaching a profession? *TESOL in Context*, 11(1), 4–8.
- Paran, A. (2017). “Only connect”: Researchers and teachers in dialogue. *ELT Journal*, 71(4), 499–508.
- Pauwels, A. (2011). Future directions for the learning of languages in universities: Challenges and opportunities. *Language Learning Journal*, 39(2), 247–257.
- Pennycook, A., & Makoni, S. (2019). *Innovations and challenges in applied linguistics from the global south*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Phillips, J. K. (2007). Foreign language education: Whose definition? *The Modern Language Journal*, 91(2), 266–268.
- Preece, S. (2019). Elite bilingual identities in higher education in the Anglophone world: The stratification of linguistic diversity and reproduction of socio-economic inequalities in the multilingual student population. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 40(5), 404–420.
- Reagan, T., & Osborn, T. A. (2019). Tiem for a paradigm shift in US foreign language education? Revisiting rationales, evidence and outcomes. In D. Macedo (Ed.), *Decolonizing foreign language education: The misteaching of English and other colonial languages* (pp. 73–110). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Richards, J. C. (2002). Theories of teaching in language teaching. In J. C. Richards & W. A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching – An anthology of current practice* (pp. 19–25). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Risager, K. (2006). *Language and culture: Global flows and local complexity*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Risager, K. (2007). *Language and culture pedagogy: From a national to a transnational paradigm*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Rose, H. (2019). Dismantling the ivory tower in TESOL: A renewed call for teaching-informed research. *Tesol Quarterly*, 53(3), 895–905.
- Rowlett, B., & King, B. (2017). Language education, gender, and sexuality. In T. L. McCarty & S. May (Eds.), *Language policy and political issues in education* (pp. 85–97). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Ryan-Scheutz, C. (2012). Foreign language program direction: Reflections on workload, service, and feminization of the profession. In M. A. Massé & K. J. Hogan (Eds.), *Over ten million served: Gendered service in language and literature workplaces* (pp. 89–102). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Saraceni, M., & Jacob, C. (2018). Revisiting borders: Named languages and de-colonization. *Language Sciences, Ahead of print*.
- Sato, M., & Loewen, S. (2018). Do teachers care about research? The research–pedagogy dialogue. *ELT Journal*, 73(1), 1–10.

- Scarino, A., & Papademetre, L. (2001). Ideologies, languages, policies: Australia's ambivalent relationship with learning to communicate in "other" languages. In J. Lo Bianco & R. Wickert (Eds.), *Australian policy activism in language and literacy* (pp. 305–323). Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Schiffman, H. P. (1996). *Linguistic culture and language policy*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Schmenk, B., Breidbach, S., & Küster, L. (2018). Slogonization in language education discourse: Introduction. In B. Schmenk, S. Breidbach, & L. Küster (Eds.), *Slogonization in language education discourse: Conceptual thinking in the age of academic marketization* (pp. 1–18). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Spolsky, B. (1990). Introduction to a colloquium: The scope and form of a theory of second language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24(4), 609–616.
- Spolsky, B. (1978). *Educational Linguistics: an introduction*. Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.
- Spolsky, B. (2008). Introduction: What is educational linguistics. In B. Spolsky & M. F. Hult (Eds.), *The handbook of educational linguistics* (pp. 1–9). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Stewart, T. (2006). Teacher-researcher collaboration or teachers' research?. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(2), 421–430.
- Swanson, P., & Mason, S. (2018). The world language teacher shortage: Taking a new direction. *Foreign Language Annals*, 51(1), 251–262.
- Train, R. W. (2011). Postcolonial complexities in foreign language education and the humanities. In G. Levine, A. Phipps, & C. Blyth (Eds.), *Critical and intercultural theory and language pedagogy* (pp. 141–160). Boston, MA: Heinle, Cengage Learning.
- VanPatten, B. (2015). "Hispania" white paper: Where are the experts? *Hispania*, 98(1), 2–13.
- Warner, C. (2018). Transdisciplinarity across two-tiers. *AILA Review*, 31(1), 29–52.
- Weldon, P. R. (2015). *The teacher workforce in Australia: Supply, demand and data issues*. Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research (ACER).
- Wheeler, G. (2018). The history of language teacher associations. In A. Elsheikh, C. Coombe, & O. Effiong (Eds.), *The role of language teacher associations in professional development* (pp. 3–12). Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- White, P., & Baldauf, R. (2006). *Re-examining Australia's tertiary language programmes – A five year retrospective on teaching and collaboration*. Retrieved from Brisbane: http://altcfellowship.murdoch.edu.au/Docs/white_baldaufreport2006.pdf
- Wykes, O. (1966). Survey of foreign language teaching in the Australian universities. Canberra, Australia: Australian Humanities Research Council.
- Yoshihara, R. (2017). *The socially responsible feminist EFL classroom: A Japanese perspective on identities, beliefs and practices*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.