Community Interpreting in Australia

Language rights and language resources

A1151642 Yui Ibuki

Contents

1. Community interpreting in Australia

   1-1. Introduction

   Not being able to communicate with other people or to get necessary information can make you feel nervous, confused and anxious. When I stayed in Spain, I was pickpocketed, and had to go to a police station. My Spanish ability was so limited that I could not communicate with the police officer or understand the documents which I had to fill in. I could not even figure out where the nearest police station was on my own. Luckily, I had a friend who could speak both English and Spanish, and she helped me as an interpreter. Yet, because English was the native tongue for neither of us, I could not fully understand what the police officer and the documents meant. Not being sure about what I was told and what I was supposed to do made me feel tense, puzzled, and uneasy.

   People who possibly encounter similar situations in everyday life are those who cannot speak the major language(s) of a country they are living in, and the people who play a similar role to my friend are community interpreters. Going through official procedures or acquiring the information at public facilities sometimes seem and sound complicated even for speakers of the major language(s) of the society. For non-speakers of the major language(s), it is even more confusing and complex. In those cases, like I experienced, interpreters are useful for them to communicate with speakers of the major language(s) or to get the information for the necessities of their daily life. In particular, community interpreters are the ones who help non-speakers of the major language(s) who have troubles in gaining information and accessing social services.

   Community interpreting is one type of interpreting among others such as business interpreting and conference interpreting. Adolfo Gentile (1995) defines community interpreting as follows;

   > [c]ommunity interpreting has been characterized as interpreting done in
   > the contexts of health, social work, law, education, social services
   > (including welfare services, employment services, counselling services,
   > emergency services), police and correctional services. (Gentile 1995: 111)

   Sandra Beatriz Hale(2007) defines it as follows;

the overarching term for the type of interpreting that takes place within

one country's own community, and between residents of that country, as

opposed to Conference Interpreting, which takes place between

delegates who are residents of different countries, in the context of an

international conference or meeting. (Hale 2007: 30)

Australia, which is now known as one of the most developed countries in terms of multiculturalism is a multilingual country. As of 2011, the ten most commonly used languages in Australian homes were English, Mandarin, Italian, Arabic, Cantonese, Greek, Vietnamese, Spanish, Hindi and Tagalog[1]. While English had the largest number of speakers, the data implies that Australia has speakers of various languages[2]. Given that Australia has such variety of languages, community interpreters fill an essential role in the society.

1-2. Literature review

Here, I would like to introduce Uldis Ozolins's previous research (2001) on the development of interpreting and translating in the change of language policies in Australia. [3]

According to Ozolins, interpreting and translating (I/T) have not gained much attention in the language policies although they have been influenced by the language policies. I/T has provided language services for non-English speakers, established the Telephone Interpreting Service (TIS) and the National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters (NAATI), developed its training system and commercial use, and having been a role model for other countries. However, I/T has been in a marginalised position with a little support, and is not widely recognised as professional.

I/T in Australia started with supporting immigrants although recently, it has been developing for the commercial use as well. The border between community use and commercial use has been becoming vague, and the commercial use of I/T is estimated to grow largely.

---

[1] Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2012. "Cultural Diversity in Australia." 2071.0 - Reflecting a Nation: Stories from the 2011 Census, 2012–2013. Retrieved July 28, 2014 (http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/2071.0main+features902012-2013).

[2] According to Michael Clyne (1991), "languages other than English and Aboriginal languages employed within the Australian community" (Clyne 1991: 3) are called "community languages". In this thesis, the term community language(s) will be used according to Clyne's definition. Some of the Australian language policies refer to both community languages and indigenous languages. However, policies about indigenous languages are not discussed here as the focus of this thesis is on language policies that specifically target community languages.

[3] The detail changes made in interpreting will be introduced in the later chapter

One of the issues that Ozolins indicates is less attention to I/T in the language policies, especially in the recent ones. In the language policies, I/T used to be a significant part, but it has gradually lost its importance. In the Senate inquiry into language policy, I/T was one of the four main points. However, in *the National Policy on Languages* (NPL), it was not given grants, and since *the Australian Languages and Literacy Policy* (ALLP) in 1991, the attention to it has been low. Another issue is that I/T in Australia is "an institution-driven one" (Ozolins, 2001: 273). Because public sector plays a big role in this area, I/T is widely influenced by the national policies.

Ozolins argues that despite the issues it has, I/T in Australia is a role model for other countries. While community use of I/T does not have as high status as commercial I/T in many countries, community use of I/T is considered as professional as commercial one in Australia because the border between two is not clear. Interpreting means both use in Australia, and predicts that Australian interpreters and translators in the future in Australia will do both of community and commercial I/T.

1-3. Focus of this thesis

In his research, Ozolins indicates that the border between community interpreting and commercial use is not clear, and that I/T in Australia have been influenced by the language policies and the national policies. However, he does not give the background of the border of two different types becoming unclear. Additionally, he does not analyse immigration policies and multicultural policies although they seem to be relevant to I/T as Michael Clyne (2005) mentions that Australian multilingualism "was also firmly anchored in multicultural policy" (Clyne 2005: 151). Therefore, this thesis analyses Australian immigration and multicultural policies with the language policies and the development of interpreting, especially community interpreting to argue that Australian multiculturalism changing its main purpose from supporting immigrants to benefitting from the diversity of the population underlies the development of community interpreting, and this is one of the causes of making the border between community interpreting and commercial use of interpreting vague.

In Chapter 2, the idea of language rights, and the necessity of interpreting in Australia will be discussed. Chapter 3 analyses the development of language policies, immigration and multicultural policies and how community interpreting has been discussed in the language policies. Chapter 4 summarises the analysis in the Chapter 3, and concludes the thesis.

2. Language Rights and community interpreting

    2-1. Definition of language rights

        In the context of language policies and community interpreting, language rights are important ideas.

        One of the important points about language rights is that they are internationally recognised as human rights. Toshiki Takano (2011) discusses how international covenants of the United Nations (UN) define language rights. Article 27 of International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights states

> [i]n those States in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities exist, persons belonging to such minorities shall not be denied the right, in community with the other members of their group, to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practise their own religion, or to use their own language. [4]

Takano (2011) mentions it, and states that it clarifies that "racial and language minorities have rights to use their own languages" [5] (Takano 2011: 2).

        What are the language rights exactly? Scholars mention that it is not easy to specifically define what language rights are. According to Goro Christoph Kimura (2010: 4), it was after the 1990's when language rights started to attract attention, and the policies' contents and targets can be varied depending on the situations. Hidenori Kadoya (2006:109) also states that it is difficult to define language rights because languages are closely related to politics and power, and can trigger conflicts such as if dialects or languages used among young delinquents could be recognised as "a native language".

        Although it is complicated work to define language rights, in regards to interpreting, Ruth Rubio-Marín (2003) introduces an idea of instrumental language rights, and defines it as follows;

> [t]he idea that feeds the notion of instrumental language rights is that language should not be a liability in the enjoyment of one's general status

---

[4] Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. 1966. "International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights." United Nations Humarn Rights. Retrieved November 23, 2014 (http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CCPR.aspx).

[5] Translated by the writer

of civil, social, and political rights and opportunities in society. (Rubio-Marín 2003: 63)

Especially in countries such as Australia and the United States, there is an idea that language rights are also rights to access information and public services which are necessary for protecting fundamental human rights, according to Makiko Mizuno (2008: 7). In short, these ideas imply that language rights also refer to rights of equal access to information and social services regardless of the languages people use.

2-2. The necessity of interpreting in Australian society

The idea of language rights related to interpreting such as instrumental language rights and rights to access information, which were introduced above, implies the connection between language rights and interpreting. In order to access information and social services, we have to be able to understand and use the language in which the information and the services are provided. In case of us not being able to speak the language, interpreting is necessary. Interpreters remove language barriers, and ensure equal access, which means that they are protecting part of language rights.

In Australia, however, interpreting not only protects language rights, but also aims at aiding social inclusion. Interpreting is often discussed in the context of "Access and equity" in Australia, and it has been one of the keywords in multicultural policies since around the late 1980's. The first report on access and equity was issued in 1986 by the Australian government, and in 1998, the Charter of Public Service in a Culturally Diverse Society was made as a guideline for Australian government improving access and in 2006, the Australian government renewed the Charter, and made the Access and Equity Strategy and Framework, Accessible Government Services for All, which lasted until 2012 (Australian Government Department of Immigration and Citizenship 2013: 7).

Since the new framework started in 2006, social inclusion through ensuring equal access and social opportunities was one of the main points in the reports (Australian Government Department of Immigration and Citizenship 2009: 3, 2011: 12, 2013: 7). The Report 2010-12 states that

[a]ccess and equity is connected to other national strategic goals
including the Social Inclusion Agenda and the national multicultural policy
through the delivery of programs and services which support inclusion

6

outcomes for disadvantaged Australians. (Australian Government

Department of Immigration and Citizenship 2013: 7)

This idea that ensuring access and equity leads to social integration of minority people in Australia is an example of what Will Kymlicka (2001: 162, 171, 176) claims. According to Kymlicka, the host society's effort is necessary for fair integration of different communities. Immigrants are generally willing to integrate into the host society, and they try to accept the cultural traditions, social systems, and languages of the host society. However, immigrants and the majority are not equal to begin with. The host society should provide immigrants with special support until they get accustomed to their new life, and should respect their identity as much as the majority's identity. Hence, not only should immigrants work towards accepting their host society's culture and social systems but the host society needs also to try to create the society where immigrants can integrate as smoothly as possible.

Among various problems that immigrants face, language problems are one of the most serious ones which become barriers for their integration. Even if they try to accept the official language of the host society, it takes some time to be able to communicate well in the language, and this creates inequality between the immigrants and the majority if there is no support for them. In that case, interpreting as part of strategies to ensure access and equity can help them get information and reach social services. Australia states that it leads to social inclusion, and this is also what Australia is supposed to do as the host society according to Kymlicka's argument.

3. Community interpreting in Australian language policies

The purpose of this chapter is to give an overview of Australian language policies and immigration and multicultural policies to examine how interpreting, especially community interpreting is taken up in the language policies, and how the immigration and multicultural policies have influenced on it. The language policies are discussed according to five developmental stages of language policies suggested by Joseph Lo Bianco (2003) since it is a clear summary of what occurred in each stage.

3-1. Britishism

According to Lo Bianco's developmental stages of Australia's language policies, the first stage, which is from around 19th century, is named "Britishism", and it was the stage of

"English mono-lingualism, southern British norms and language repression" (Lo Bianco 2003: 15).

During "Britishism", immigration policies had two stages. Masami Sekine (1989: 130-137) argues that at the time of British settlement in Australia starting in 1788, there was no restrictive policy on non-white people entering into Australia. Since the late 1830's, in order to gain a steady number of cheap labourers, Australia started to seriously consider the introduction of non-white labourers such as Indians, the south Pacific islanders, and Chinese. Although the goal to introduce cheap labourers failed because of economic and humanitarian reasons, large numbers of Chinese immigrants flowed into Australia because of the gold rush starting in 1851.

However, the immigration policies in 1870's, when cultural homogeneity became more important, led to the White Australia Policy. As reported by Sekine (1989: 138-141, 154, 166-201), the restriction laws on Chinese immigrants that were first passed in 1850's, but had been waning out for a while, had begun to revive around this time. Over the 20th century, the White Australia Policy gradually attracted attention from 1890's in Australia, and the immigration restriction laws, which had been applied only to Chinese immigrants started to be applied to the south Pacific islanders, Indians and Japanese. Additionally, important laws which were the foundation of the White Australia Policy were enacted when the Commonwealth of Australia was established in 1901.

Change from no restriction on immigrants to restriction on non-white people was the social background of "Britishism", and the language policies during this period of time were similar. According to Lo Bianco (2003: 15-16), in 19th century Australia, multilingualism was approved, and there was no institution to limit or control the use of languages other than English although English was the major language. As compulsory education commenced in 1870's, cultural homogeneity became more important than before, and as the 20th century came, restriction on language use became stricter. In particular, German, which was one of the dominant languages in Australia at that time was severely restricted. For example, between 1917 and 1918, laws prohibiting bilingual education were passed in many states.

Therefore, during "Britishism", both of the immigration policies and the language policies started to be non-restrictive, but in the 1870's, changed to restrict non-white immigrant and languages other than English.

3-2. Australianism

Lo Bianco (2003: 18) states that there was one more movement relevant to languages at around the same time as "Britishism". This stage is called "Australianism", and it is the stage of "dignifying local English" (Lo Bianco 2003: 17). Although "Australianism" was another movement of language happening at almost same time as Britishism, in the end, "Australianism" became the dominant movement (Lo Bianco 2003: 18).

First, let me summarise the process of the immigration program after World War II and the diversification of Australian population happening at the end of "Australianism" as described by Sekine (1989: 240-263). In 1947, the immigration program was launched by the Labor Party. Nevertheless, because the number of immigrants did not reach the number Australia was targeting, Australia started to accept immigrants coming from countries which Australia used not to accept people from, such as Southern European countries and Turkey. That was the start of Australia abandoning the White Australia Policy, which had made Australia dominated by the so-called "white" people such as British, Irish and Europeans, and of Australia changing to a country with people from non- Western backgrounds.

On the one hand, Australia was gradually becoming a multicultural society with people from various countries. On the other hand, Australian society kept trying to maintain the White Australia Policy as Sekine (1989: 334-362) states. However, from the 1950's to the beginning of the 1960's, assimilation did not work well since the immigrants' cultures were too varied, and the immigrants tended to create their own ethnic communities. Because of the failure of assimilation, people realised that the lack of support from the host society was one of the causes of issues that immigrants and refugees had been facing, and switched from assimilation to integration. Moreover, people realised that the disadvantages that immigrants and refugees were experiencing were major causes of the forming of ghettos or slums, and Australia gradually moved towards policies of multiculturalism over integration[6].

This is how Australian society was during "Australianism". Lo Bianco argues (2003: 17-18)that before World War II, an English unique to Australia developed. From the beginning of settlement to the gold rush, English was changed to suit Australian society. After the gold rush, from 1890's to after World War II, Australian English development was fuelled by nationalism relating to its independence as a state. Expressions and idioms uniquely Australian were spread through movies and medias such as magazines, and Australian English was officially recognised in the National Policy on Languages (NPL) made

---

[6] According to Sekine (1989: 453), Integration in the Australian context is to integrate the society not only by keeping Australian culture but also allowing immigrants to maintain their own cultures. However, "integration" policies were changed to "multicultural" policies since integration still held the meaning of assimilation.

in 1988. NPL states that Australian English is used in official occasions among the varied English and community languages although nothing declares English as an official language[7].

After World War II, as reported by Lo Bianco (2003: 19-20), Australia having commenced the immigration program brought not only immigrants but also diverse cultures other than British and Irish ones into Australia. In the beginning, these cultures were forced to assimilate into the existing culture. However, they gradually started to be accepted and to have an influence on Australian culture and language, thus leading to acknowledgement of multilingualism in the 1970's.

According to Ozolins (2001: 257), interpreting at this time was considered to be temporal support for recently arrived immigrants. Although Ozolins does not use the term "community interpreting", his remarks imply that interpreting discussed there had similar functions as community interpreting. While the need for community interpreting emerged as Australia accepted immigrants from various countries, it was not expected that community interpreting would be necessary for a long time because immigrants were expected to learn English and assimilate into Australian society. Thus, community interpreting at that time was just a special support for immigrants until they learned to speak English.

As examined above, "Australianism" is when the immigration policies commenced to accept non-white immigrants with expecting them to assimilate into Australian society. At the same time, English unique to Australia, which was also influenced by immigrants' cultures developed. Moreover, during this period of time, there was increasing need of community interpreting while it was expected that the need would decrease shortly.

3-3. Multiculturalism

Lo Bianco (2003) calls the following stage "Multiculturalism", and this is a stage of "linking population pluralism to public policy" (Lo Bianco 2003: 20).

It may be more appropriate to call immigration policies in this period of time multicultural policies. This part summarises multicultural polices during "Multiculturalism" stage according to Sekine (1989: 263-271). What brought a full stop to the White Australia Policy was the Whitlam Labor government, which enacted the Migration Act of 1973 and the Racial Discrimination Act of 1975, and revised the Australian Citizenship Act of 1973. Under the Whitlam government, the base of multiculturalism in the late 1970's was built by

---

[7] This resource is an extract of the original since the original is not available.
"National Policy on Languages." Making Multicultural Australia. Retrieved October 30, 2014 (anonymous) (http://www.multiculturalaustralia.edu.au/doc/lobianco_2.pdf). P. 4, 7.

preparing the relevant laws and committees although the actual number of immigrants and incoming refugees was decreasing. The Fraser Liberal Party of Australia-Country Party of Australia coalition government succeeded the administration from the Whitlam government in 1975. The Fraser government made the Department of Immigration, which had been combined with the Department of Labour, independent again in 1976, and named it the Department of Immigration and Ethnic Affairs to deal with not only immigration policies but also problems related to the settlement of immigrants and refugees. Moreover, in contrast to the decrease of the number of immigrants and incoming refugees under the former government, the Fraser government returned to recommending the acceptance of immigrants and refugees, and enthusiastically accepted non-European refugees to compensate for the lack of the number of refugees from Europe, in particular, the government decided to accept a large number of Indo-Chinese refugees after 1978, which further prompted a freeing of Australia from the White Australia Policy, and contributed to the development of multiculturalism.

According to Lo Bianco (2003: 21-22), having those social circumstances, this is when multicultural policies started to develop, and Australia started to realise that, as the host society, various language policies should be established as multilingualism was gradually accepted in the society. For example, TIS and NAATI were established during this stage.

The more immigrants came to Australia, the greater the necessity of interpreting emerged. Ozolins (2001: 258, 261) indicates that faults of language services at that time gradually became conspicuous. Also, some interpreters started to realise that protecting immigrants' rights could be their roles while their roles were not firmly set. This implies that interpreting at that time was mainly community interpreting since it focused on protecting immigrants' rights, although Ozolins does not use the specific term. In that context, NAATI was established in 1977.

However, Lo Bianco (2003: 22) also argues that interest in maintaining community languages gradually decreased by the late 1980's because it was widely recognised that each ethnic community should make efforts to maintain community languages, and that without their efforts, there was a limit to what public institutes could do. Instead, the recognition of "language and cultural retention as a 'resource' rather than a 'right'" (Lo Bianco 2003: 23) spread in the society.

To summarise, "Multiculturalism" stage was when the first multicultural policies developed while the recognition of necessity to make language policies as the responsibility

of the host society spread. With the similar recognition that immigrants' rights should be protected, some systems of interpreting were established as well.

   3-4. Asianism

   According to Lo Bianco (2003), from the late 1980's Australia experienced a stage of "Asianism", which was a period of "education for regional integration" (Lo Bianco 2003: 23).

   During "Asianism", more specifically in the 1990's, multiculturalism changed to put importance on economic efficiency. According to *the Immigration: A Commitment to Australia (*Fitzgerald Report), which was issued in 1988, advised to select immigrants carefully for Australia's national benefit. For instance, it states that

   [t]o realise its potential economic benefits to Australia, the immigration program needs a high proportion of skilled, entrepreneurial and youthful immigrants, with English and other language skills playing a part in selection. [8]

It also states

   [s]election in immigration is about rationing and choosing. That means limiting the numbers to available places annually and, in the appropriate immigration categories, choosing immigrants in Australia's national interests. [9]

The idea of productive diversity, which means that cultural diversity is useful for Australian society, spread from the 1990's as Shiobara (2010: 95) reported, and middleclass multiculturalism, which applauds middleclass and skilled immigrants and productive diversity, was spread while labour immigrants were not considered to be beneficial to Australia.

   Australian society putting emphasis on economic efficiency in accepting immigrants, Lo Bianco (2003: 24-25) states that the benefit of language education in terms of the economy and national security was emphasised, which led to promoting education of Asian

---

[8] This is an extract of the original since the original is not available.
"Immigration- A Commitment to Australia: Executive Summary." Making Multicultural Australia. Retrieved October 30, 2014(anonymous) (http://www.multiculturalaustralia.edu.au/doc/fitzgerald_1.pdf). P. 2

[9] Ibid. P. 3

languages from 1980's to 1990's because the relationships with Asian countries which were geographically close to Australia regarded important in the "Asianism" stage. In particular, the Keating Labor government enthusiastically tried to integrate Australia into the Asian region, and language education was included as part of that challenge. At this time, Asian languages were considered as beneficial resources for English speakers in Australia rather than the objects to protect as community languages, and people involved in trade, diplomacy and politics actively engaged in promotion of teaching these languages.

NPL, which was issued in this period of time, admits Australia's responsibility as a democratic country "to ensure their citizens attain the highest levels of skill in language to protect and promote the rights and enhance the opportunities of individuals and groups"[10], and some policies about English, Aboriginal languages and community languages are discussed. About community languages, NPL emphasises the idea of language as resources. For example, it describes the language pluralism as "a valuable national resource"[11]. In particular, NPL advises to additionally fund a project to enhance the Asian language education. NPL considering community languages beneficial for Australia and its special focus on Asian languages is just like what Lo Bianco indicates.

Another language policy named *Australia's Language: The Australian Language and Literacy Policy* (ALLP) was issued in August 1991. According to the companion volume of ALLP (Department of Employment Education and Training 1991a), its three goals are

> proficiency in English for all Australians; significant long-term increase in
> the number of Australians who have facility in languages other than
> English; and the special needs of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander
> languages (Department of Employment Education and Training 1991a: 1).

Here, community languages are again described as beneficial.

Here let's examine how community interpreting is dealt with in NLP and ALLP respectively. Both of them do not talk about community interpreting specifically, but mention it in the section dealing with interpreting and translating with other types of interpreting. NLP states that ways for non-English speakers or non-native speakers of English

---

[10] This is a quote from an extract of NPL acquired from Making Multicultural Australia since an original copy was not available.
"National Policy on Languages." *Making Multicultural Australia*. Retrieved October 30, 2014 (anonymous) (http://www.multiculturalaustralia.edu.au/doc/lobianco_2.pdf). P. 1

[11] Ibid. P. 8

to access information and social opportunities should be guaranteed, and this is one of the bases of the Australian language policies[12]. ALLP (Department of Employment Education and Training 1991b) recognises the significance of interpreting and translating for non-English speakers, and states as follows:

> [i]nterpreting and translating services ensure that lack of English is not a barrier to people's access to information and services, nor to the satisfactory development of their social and economic potential (Department of Employment Education and Training 1991b: 98)

At the same time, ALLP (Department of Employment Education and Training 1991b: 98) also mentions the significance of interpreting and translating for business scenes. It is considered that interpreting and translating are important for Australia to compete against other countries in business and industry. Ozolins (2001: 267) also mentions this tendency saying that around 1985, the idea of language resources spread in the field of interpreting and translating as well.

As discussed above, the recognition that the diversity in population and languages in Australia were resources for Australia spread in the society during "Asianism" stage, even in the field of interpreting and translating.

3-5. Economism

Following "Asianism" stage, Lo Bianco (2003) states that the "Economism" stage developed from the late 1990's, and is known as the stage of "human capital and English literacy" (Lo Bianco 2003: 25).

Australian multicultural policies developed even further during the "Economism" stage. As reported by Shiobara (2010: 93, 97), from the late 1990's, the Howard government placed emphasis on neoliberalism, where middleclass and skilled immigrants were more welcomed, and middleclass multiculturalism took priority over welfare multiculturalism. Shiobara (2010) states that this is how "neoliberal multiculturalism" developed, and defines it as follows;

> Multiculturalism going along with neoliberalism which is induced by selectiveness of immigration policies justified by strengthened middleclass

---

[12] Ibid. P. 6

multiculturalism and the result of it, "change" of welfare multiculturalism justifying each other (Shiobara 2010: 99)[13]

It can be said that this neoliberal multiculturalism was caused by globalisation. What neoliberalism means in the first place is that it "aims at maximising benefits in the global market" (Shiobara 2010: 110). Namely, middleclass immigrants were favoured and immigrants were accepted selectively because of neoliberal policies which arose in order to survive in an age of globalisation.

Lo Bianco (2003: 25-26) states that in this stage, English education regained attention in order to strengthen Australia economically. As globalisation progressed, Australian society felt threaten by the high unemployment rate of young people, and it was widely realised that it was necessary to have a proper ability to use English, a lingua franca, to survive in the globalising society, which led to English education to regain attention.

The needs of proper English ability were already mentioned in ALLP. The companion volume of ALLP (Department of Employment Education and Training 1991a) states that all people in Australia "need to have effective literacy in English" (Department of Employment Education and Training 1991: 9) for their own sake and for Australia's national benefits.

During the "Economism" stage, a strong focus was placed on survival in the global society, and in that context, English education regained attention. This tendency of focusing on the survival through globalisation continues into recent policies.

3-6. Recent policies

Although Lo Bianco's stages of the development of the language policies went only up to "Economism", Australia continues to develop multicultural policies.

Multicultural Australia: United in Diversity (Commonwealth of Australia 2003: 7-9) was issued in 2003 under the Howard government, and it emphasised two points. One was "Community Harmony" and the other was productive diversity. Community harmony was considered to be significant for national security, especially after 9.11, when people started to feel more threats of terrorism. Productive diversity was still considered to be one of the keys, and the Government set up the Productive Diversity program to make the most use of Australia's diversity.

---

[13] Translated by the writer

During the next administration, the Kevin Rudd government did not eagerly commit to multicultural policies as an article from *the Australian* indicates "[w]e have heard little in this year's political debate about immigration and multiculturalism"[14].

Under the Julia Gillard Government, *Australia in the Asian Century* was issued in 2012, and *the People of Australia: Australia's Multicultural Policy* was issued in 2014. In *the Australia in the Asian Century* (Commonwealth of Australia 2012), Asia was described as "our region" (Commonwealth of Australia 2012: 1), which implies that Australia considers herself as part of Asia, and this White Paper is about how Australia can flourish as part of Asia in this coming Asian century.

In terms of languages, *the Australia in the Asian Century* (Commonwealth of Australia 2012) clearly focuses on education of Asian languages. Chinese (Mandarin), Hindi, Indonesian and Japanese are chosen to be "priority Asian language" (Australian Government 2012: 16) and students are encouraged to study one of them. This suggests that these four languages are considered to be useful and beneficial for Australia.

While *the Australia in the Asian Century* has more than 300 pages, *the People of Australia: Australia's Multicultural Policy* is short and is consisted of only 16 pages. One of the main points is "Strengthening Access and Equity" (Commonwealth of Australia 2014: 8), which was discussed above.

4.   Language rights and language resources

4-1. The change of the multicultural policies and community interpreting

The examination of the language policies above implies that the development of interpreting reflects the change of the immigration and multicultural policies (Chart 1[15]).

Later of "Australianism" stage was when the immigration program brought immigrants and refugees who had diverse cultural backgrounds. Australia still tried to force immigrants and incoming refugees to assimilate into Australian culture and society. During that stage, an increase in the number of immigrants through the immigration program led the development of community interpreting. However, because immigrants and refugees were expected to assimilate, the needs of community interpreting was expected to be short.

---

[14] Wood, Alan. 2007. "Multiculturalism Becomes Poison for Social Capital." *The Australian*, September 26. Retrieved October 28, 2014 (http://www.theaustralian.com.au/archive/news/multiculturalism-becomes-poison-for-social-capital/story-e6frg76o-1111114501368).

[15] The chart is made by the writer referring to Lo Bianco (2003) , Ozolins (2001) , Sekine (1989) and Shiobara (2010).

Over "Australianism" stage to "Multiculturalism" stage, the cultural diversity of immigrants and incoming refugees led to the failure of assimilation policies, and to a realisation that problems related to the settlement of immigrant and refugees could not be solved unless the host society also took part in solving the problems. This realisation brought on the stage of integration, and Australian society moved into a stage of multiculturalism with strong support. During the "Multicultural" stage, as the host society's responsibility to support immigrants was realised, the fault of the language services was realised as well, and the Australian government decided to make language policies to be responsible for speakers of community languages as the host society. At the same time, community interpreting developed to protect immigrants' right, too.

	Immigration and multicultural policies	Language policies	Interpreting
Britishism (around 19C –)	From no restriction to restriction	From no restriction to restriction	
Australianism (around 1788 –)	Immigration program/ From assimilation to integration	Development of Australian English influenced by immigrants' cultures	Community interpreting as a short term special treatment
Multiculturalism (the early 1970's – the late 1980's)	Maintaining multicultural policies	Maintaining language policies as the responsibility of the host society	Community interpreting for protecting immigrants' rights
Asianism (the late 1980's – the late 1990's)	Productive diversity and middleclass multiculturalism	Language education for the economic benefits and the national security	Increasing importance of business interpreting
Economism (the late 1990's –)	Neoliberal multiculturalism	Putting importance of English education	

Chart 1: The movements of the immigration and multicultural policies,
the language policies and community interpreting in each stage

In the "Asianism" stage, from the 1990's, the Australian government shifted emphasis on economic efficiency, which caused middleclass and skilled immigrants being more welcomed than labour immigrants. Australia preferred immigrants who were advantageous to the economy, and productive diversity became regarded as important. Similarly, the idea which recognised language maintenance as resources or benefits for the

nation rather than as rights gradually spread, especially education of Asian languages was enthusiastically promoted because Australia was building close relationships with Asian countries at that time. When the values of diversity in population and languages were recognised, and middleclass multiculturalism spread, that tendency of utilising language resources brought the increased attention to business interpreting.

Thus, the movement of the nation has been always the background of the development of interpreting in Australia, and interpreting has been influenced by the national immigration and multicultural policies.

4-2. The border between community and commercial interpreting

The language policies discussed above does not use the term "community interpreting", as Gentile indicates (1995: 117). For example, NPL and ALLP both do not distinguish community interpreting and commercial interpreting, and discuss both of them in the same section.

Additionally, the Code of Ethics does not specifically refer to community interpreting, but includes all kinds of interpreting. The Australian Institute of Interpreters and Translators (AUSIT) is in charge of organising opportunities for interpreters and translators to develop their abilities through workshops, meeting each other etc.[16], and AUSIT also made the Code of Ethics. The first Code of Ethics was issued in the early 1990's, the revision commenced in 2010 reflecting the change in the field of interpreting and translating[17], and the revised version was issued in 2012[18]. In the revised version, even the word "community" is not used at all (The Australian Institute of Interpreters and Translators 2012).

Moreover, the revision of the Code of Ethics may have made the border even less clear. When the first Code of Ethics was issued was right after the idea of language resources was claimed in NPL and ALLP, and the attention to the commercial interpreting which utilised language resources started to grow, as mentioned in Chapter 3. According to Pinkerton (1996: 137-138, 145), the first Code of Ethics was made mainly for community

---

[16] The Australian Institute of Interpreters and Translators. 2014a. "About." *The Australian Institute of Interpreters and Translators*. Retrieved November 9, 2014 (http://www.ausit.org/AUSIT/About/AUSIT/About/About.aspx?hkey=cd34ab73-25c9-4c38-bfbc-9b6b9b4a895e).

[17] The Australian Institute of Interpreters and Translators. 2012. *AUSIT Code of Ethics and Code of Conduct*. Retrieved March 13, 2014 (http://ausit.org/ausit/documents/code_of_ethics_full.pdf).

[18] The Australian Institute of Interpreters and Translators. 2014b. "AUSIT Code of Ethics." *The Australian Institute of Interpreters and Translators Inc.* Retrieved November 9, 2014 (http://ausit.org/AUSIT/About/Ethics___Conduct/Code_of_Ethics/AUSIT/About/Code_of_Ethics.aspx).

interpreting, and it did not suit for commercial use. Since the revision took the changes in the field into account, the revised version could reflect the increasing attention to the business interpreting, and could be more suitable for both community and business interpreting. In other words, it may have made the border between community interpreting and other types of interpreting in the Code of Ethics unclear.

However, on the other hand, according to NAATI's accreditation system[19], community interpreting and commercial interpreting are not the same. There are four accreditation levels from Level 2 to Level 5, and Level 2 is the lowest. Conference interpreters have to have higher level than Level 4, while interpreting for community use such as health and law only need Level 3. This does not directly mean that the border between community interpreting and commercial interpreting is clear. However, it can be assumed that community interpreting is not considered to be the same to conference interpreting in terms of interpreting skills.

Additionally, the purpose of each type of interpreting is also different. Community interpreting started based on the idea that languages should not be a barrier for people to access necessary information and services, which means that it is based on the idea of protecting people's language rights. On the other hand, business interpreting gained attention based on the idea of making the most use of language resources. Business interpreting can also help removing language barriers just like community interpreting. However, the main purpose of it seems to be to gain benefits from language resources, not protecting the language rights of the speakers.

4-3. Conclusion

The border between community interpreting and commercial interpreting has been becoming unclear partly because the change of the purpose of multicultural policies, but still they are not completely same. In the policies and the Code of Ethics, there seems to be no border, while in terms of skills and the purposes, a clear border still remains. In addition to aspects given above, if interpreters identify themselves as community interpreters, commercial interpreters, or both can be used as a powerful support for the discussion, although it has not been widely studied yet. Or if recipients of interpreting services consider interpreters as community or commercial intepreters can be studied as well. Thus, this issue should be studied from varied perspectives including weather it is a positive or negative

---

[19] "Outlines of NAATI Credentials." National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters Ltd. Retrieved December 3, 2014 (anonymous) (http://www.naati.com.au/PDF/Misc/Outliness of NAATI Credentials.pdf).

change, and this implies it is controversial that Ozolins states that interpreters in Australia will mean both community and commercial interpreters in the future from the examination mainly of the language policies.

References

Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2012. "Cultural Diversity in Australia." *2071.0 - Reflecting a Nation: Stories from the 2011 Census, 2012–2013*. Retrieved July 28, 2014 (http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/2071.0main+features902012-2013).

Australian Government Department of Immigration and Citizenship. 2009. "Introduction." Pp. 5–12 in *Access and Equity in Government Services: Report 2006-08*. Retrieved November 4, 2014 (https://www.dss.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/02_2014/access-equity-report-2008_0.pdf).

Australian Government Department of Immigration and Citizenship. 2011. "Overview." Pp. 10–15 in *Access and Equity in Government Services: Report 2008-10*. Retrieved November 4, 2014 (https://www.dss.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/02_2014/access-equity-report-2010.pdf).

Australian Government Department of Immigration and Citizenship. 2013. "Introduction." Pp. 7–10 in *Access and Equity in Government Services: Report 2010-2012*. Retrieved November 4, 2014 (https://www.dss.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/02_2014/access-equity-report-2010-12.pdf).

Clyne, Michael. 1991. *Community Languages: The Australian Experience*. Cambridge University Press.

Clyne, Michael. 2005. *Australia's Language Potential*. University of New South Wales Press.

Commonwealth of Australia. 2003. *Multicultural Australia: United in Diversity*. Australia. Retrieved October 24, 2014 (https://www.dss.gov.au/sites/default/files/files/settle/multicultural_australia/united_diversity.pdf).

Commonwealth of Australia. 2012. "Executive Summary." Pp. 1–27 in *Australia in the Asian Century*. Retrieved September 7, 2014 (http://pandora.nla.gov.au/pan/133850/20130914-0122/asiancentury.dpmc.gov.au/sites/default/files/white-paper/australia-in-the-asian-century-white-paper.pdf).

Commonwealth of Australia. 2014. *The People of Australia: Australia's Multicultural Policy*. Australian Government. Retrieved October 27, 2014 (https://www.dss.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/12_2013/people-of-australia-multicultural-policy-booklet_print.pdf).

Department of Employment Education and Training. 1991a. "Introduction." Pp. 1–32 in *Australia's language: the Australian language and literacy policy: companion volume to the policy information paper*. Australia, Camberra: Australian Government Publishing Service. Retrieved June 26, 2014 (http://www.google.co.jp/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=0CCYQFjAB&url=http://vital.new.voced.edu.au/vital/access/services/Download/ngv:37015/SOU

RCE2&ei=oImrU_b9O8KQkwWdkYDoBw&usg=AFQjCNFRTb8DpI4MujGGAec5l8gpNYY3-
Q&sig2=Cljtf2tp1tCSTShQLvWu3Q&bvm=bv.69837884,d.dGI).

Department of Employment Education and Training. 1991b. "Language and Literacy in
Interpreting and Translating, Libraries and the Media." Pp. 97–103 in *Australia's
language: the Australian language and literacy policy: companion volume to the
policy information paper*. Australia, Camberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
Retrieved June 26, 2014
(http://www.google.co.jp/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&ved=0CCYQFj
AB&url=http://vital.new.voced.edu.au/vital/access/services/Download/ngv:37015/SOU
RCE2&ei=oImrU_b9O8KQkwWdkYDoBw&usg=AFQjCNFRTb8DpI4MujGGAec5l8gpNYY3-
Q&sig2=Cljtf2tp1tCSTShQLvWu3Q&bvm=bv.69837884,d.dGI).

Gentile, Adolfo. 1995. "Community Interpreting or Not?: Practices, Standards and Accreditation."
Pp. 109–18 in *The Critical Link: Interpreters in the community*, vol. 1, edited by E. Carr
Silvana, Roda Roberts, Aideen Dufour, and Steyn Dini. John Benjamin Publishing
Company.

Hale, Sandra Beatriz. 2007. "Overview of the Field of Interpreting and Main Theoretical
Concepts." Pp. 3–224 in *Community Interpreting:*. Palgrave Macmillan. Retrieved
November 1, 2014
(http://210.45.212.38/english/elang/resource/extend/%E5%BA%94%E7%94%A8%E8%A
F%AD%E8%A8%80%E5%AD%A6/Community Interpreting Research and Practice in
Applied Linguistics.pdf).

Kadoya, Hidenori. 2006. "Gengoken kara keikaku gengo e [From Language Planning to Language
Rights]." Pp. 107–30 in *Kotoba/kenryoku/sabetsu gengoken kara mita jouhou jakusya no
kaihou [Languages/Power/Discrimination releasing Information Illiterate from the
Perspective of Linguistic Rights]*, edited by Hidenori Mashiko. Sanegensha.

Kimura, Goro Christoph. 2010. "Nihon ni okeru "gengoken" no juyo to tenkai [Adoption and
Development of 'Language Rights' in Japan]." *Sykai gengo kagaku [The Japanese Journal
of Language in Society]* 13(1):4–18. Retrieved March 13, 2014
(https://vpngw.cc.sophia.ac.jp/+CSCO+1h756767633A2F2F70762E6176762E6E702E7763
++/els/110009570190.pdf?id=ART0010020505&type=pdf&lang=en&host=cinii&order_n
o=&ppv_type=0&lang_sw=&no=1406600502&cp=).

Kymlicka, Will. 2001. *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturlaism, and Citizenship*.
Oxford University Press.

Lo Bianco, Joseph. 2003. *A Site for Debate, Negotiation and Contest of National Identity:
Language Policy in Australia*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Retrieved June 6, 2014
(http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/Linguistic/Source/LoBiancoEn.pdf).

Mizuno, Makiko. 2008. *Komyunithi Tsuyaku Nyumon [Introduction to Community Interpreting]*.
Osaka kyouiku tosho.

National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters Ltd. 2014. "About NAATI."
National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters Ltd. Retrieved
November 9, 2014 (http://www.naati.com.au/about_naati.html).

Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. 1966. "International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights." *United Nations Humarn Rights*. Retrieved November 23, 2014 (http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CCPR.aspx).

Ozolins, Uldis. 2001. "Inventiveness and Regression: Interpreting/translating and the Vicissitudes of Australian Language Policy." Pp. 255–77 in *Australian Policy Activism in Language and Literacy*, edited by Joseph Lo Bianco and Rosie Wickert. Language Australia Ltd. Retrieved September 6, 2014 (http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED471603.pdf).

Pinkerton, Yoko. 1996. "Are Interpreters Allowed to 'edit'?A Comparison of Interpreting Principles between Japan and Australia." *Interpreting Research* 11(6):137–48.

Rubio-Marín, Ruth. 2003. "Language Rights: Exploring the Competing Retionales." Pp. 52–79 in *Language RIghts and Political Theory*, edited by Kymlicka Will and Alan Patten. Oxford University Press.

Sekine, Masami. 1989. *Maruchikarutyuraru osutoraria [Multicultural Australia]*. Seibundou.

Shiobara, Yoshikazu. 2010. *Henkaku suru tabunkasyugi osutoraria kara no tenbou [Changing Multiculturalism a Vision from Australia]*. Housei Daigaku shuppnankyoku.

Takahashi, Masaaki. 2009. "Tsuyaku no yakuwari [The Role of Interpreters]." *Shirizu tagengo tabunka kyoudo jissen kenkyu bessatsu [An Extra Series of Studies of Cooperation and Practice of Multilanguage and Multicultural]* 2:50–62. Retrieved February 28, 2014 (http://repository.tufs.ac.jp/bitstream/10108/63687/1/mlcj502003.pdf).

Takano, Toshiki. 2011. "Gengoken no imi to kouzou-kihonteki jinken to shiteno mainorithi no gengoken no hosyou [The Meanings and Structure of Linguisitic Human Rights-Assuring Lingusitic Human Rights as Basic Human Rights for the Minorities]." *Sophia Junior College Faculty Journal* 31:1–15. Retrieved March 13, 2014 (http://www.jrc.sophia.ac.jp/courses/pdf/20110824.pdf).

The Australian Institute of Interpreters and Translators. 2012. *AUSIT Code of Ethics and Code of Conduct*. Retrieved March 13, 2014 (http://ausit.org/ausit/documents/code_of_ethics_full.pdf).

The Australian Institute of Interpreters and Translators. 2014a. "About." *The Australian Institute of Interpreters and Translators*. Retrieved November 9, 2014 (http://www.ausit.org/AUSIT/About/AUSIT/About/About.aspx?hkey=cd34ab73-25c9-4c38-bfbc-9b6b9b4a895e).

The Australian Institute of Interpreters and Translators. 2014b. "AUSIT Code of Ethics." *The Australian Institute of Interpreters and Translators Inc.* Retrieved November 9, 2014 (http://ausit.org/AUSIT/About/Ethics___Conduct/Code_of_Ethics/AUSIT/About/Code_of_Ethics.aspx).

Wood, Alan. 2007. "Multiculturalism Becomes Poison for Social Capital." *The Australian*, September 26. Retrieved October 28, 2014 (http://www.theaustralian.com.au/archive/news/multiculturalism-becomes-poison-for-social-capital/story-e6frg76o-1111114501368).

"Immigration- A Commitment to Australia: Executive Summary." *Making Multicultural Australia*.
Retrieved October 30, 2014(anonymous)
(http://www.multiculturalaustralia.edu.au/doc/fitzgerald_1.pdf).

"National Policy on Languages." *Making Multicultural Australia*. Retrieved October 30, 2014
(anonymous) (http://www.multiculturalaustralia.edu.au/doc/lobianco_2.pdf).

"Outlines of NAATI Credentials." National Accreditation Authority for Translators and
Interpreters Ltd. Retrieved December 3, 2014 (anonymous)
(http://www.naati.com.au/PDF/Misc/Outliness of NAATI Credentials.pdf).