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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Australia’s bilateral relationship with Indonesia is arguably our most important. With a population of approximately 240 million, Indonesia is the world’s third largest democracy, fourth most populous nation, and is home to both a rapidly expanding middle class and the largest Muslim community of any country in the world. Given Australia’s proximity to Indonesia and our environmental and security inter-dependence, a healthy working relationship with our northern neighbour is vital to both our present and future national interest.

By some measures the relationship between Australia and Indonesia is strong. Jakarta hosts Australia’s largest embassy, our second largest defence representation and a substantial Australian Federal Police presence. Trade between the two countries has, historically, been modest – $12.9 billion in 2010 – with Indonesia ranking as only our thirteenth largest trading partner. However, it is a trade relationship that has been showing recent signs of vibrancy. Since 2006 two-way trade between the two countries has grown by an average of 9.7 per cent p.a. and, given Indonesia’s maintenance of respectable real GDP growth (6.1 per cent in 2010), trade between Australia and Indonesia is likely to continue to intensify in the years ahead.\(^1\) The International Monetary Fund projects Indonesia will achieve one of the fastest growth rates of the world’s 18 largest economies during 2009-2015, outstripping even the powerhouse economies of Brazil, Russia, India and China.\(^2\)

Recognising the advantages of intensified economic relations with Indonesia, the Australian government has been paving the way for greater economic collaboration between the two countries via a series of trade agreements – namely, the ASEAN-Australia-New Zealand Free Trade Agreement and the Indonesia-Australia Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement. If Australia is to make the most of the new opportunities that these agreements open up, being able to communicate and conduct business with our Indonesian counterparts in their own language is going to be of critical importance. This report recommends strategies to strengthen Australia’s Indonesian language skills.

Australians’ preparedness to learn the Indonesian language is a key indicator of the perceptions of Indonesia that exist within the Australian community. It is a quantifiable measure of Australians’ interest in, knowledge of, and engagement with Indonesia. It is also a measure of the community support for the idea of closer ties between Australia and Indonesia – support without which government policy efforts are unlikely to succeed. Our ability to communicate comfortably and confidently in the Indonesian language is essential if we are to continue to enhance mutual understanding and respect, facilitate the exchange of ideas and boost productive collaboration in all aspects of the bilateral relationship, including – but certainly not limited to – our economic partnership.

Over the past 15 years a series of troubling political events in Indonesia, compounded by negative coverage of these events by the Australian media, has unnerved Australians
and discouraged them from learning Indonesian. These include: the 1997 Asian Financial Crisis undermining Indonesia’s economic growth; instability surrounding the 1998 resignation of former president Suharto; the levels of violence during Indonesia’s presence in East Timor prior to its independence; bombings in Bali and Jakarta since 2002; the imprisonment of several Australian drug smugglers in Bali; and the elevated Travel Advisory maintained by DFAT for nearly a decade.

Australians lack accurate knowledge of Indonesia. A 2011 Lowy Institute survey indicates that, while 77 per cent of Australian respondents believed that it was “very important that Australia and Indonesia work to develop a close relationship”, 69 per cent still believed erroneously that Indonesia was “essentially controlled by the military”. Only 52 per cent were aware that “Indonesia is an emerging democracy”.

Indonesian language learning in Australian education is in crisis. In schools, there were fewer Year 12 students studying Indonesian in 2009 than there were in 1972. In universities, during the decade from 2001 to 2010, enrolments in Indonesian nationally dropped by 37 per cent, at a time when the overall undergraduate population in universities expanded by nearly 40 per cent. In Australia’s most populous state of New South Wales, Indonesian language enrolments during this period plummeted by more than 50 per cent. If this rate of decline continues, and assuming all other factors remain constant, by 2022 – in only 10 years’ time – Indonesian will have virtually disappeared from universities in all states and territories except Victoria and the Northern Territory.

In 2003 the Australia-Indonesia Business Council declared that “Reducing the funding [for Indonesian in Australian education] sends the signal that we are not interested in communicating with our neighbours. It also places us at a disadvantage if other countries are better able to communicate with them.” Yet between 2004 and 2009, autonomous Indonesian programs closed in six Australian universities. Only 15 of Australia’s 40 universities now have autonomous Indonesian language majors, with five others offering Indonesian majors using staff and/or materials provided by another university.

Yet Australia needs cadres of specialists in all fields of endeavour who have the linguistic ability to work productively with Indonesians, just as the majority of Australians need some understanding and appreciation of the importance of sustained bilateral collaboration. Unless Australia reinvests in Indonesian studies, we risk losing the comparative advantage provided by linguistic expertise, and the consequent economic, political and strategic benefits from our relationship with Indonesia.

This has been recognised by the Commonwealth Parliament’s Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade which recommended in 2004 “that Indonesian Studies be designated a strategic national priority and that the Australian Research Council and the Department of Education, Science and Training be requested to recognise this in prioritising funding for both research and teaching.”

Since 2006, Indonesian has been designated a “Nationally Strategic Language” in the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) funding agreements with universities. Yet no accompanying funding has been provided to
support this “Nationally Strategic Language”. Instead, universities are closing Indonesian programs.

This report recommends specific strategies for the strengthening of Indonesian language in Australian universities. It proposes an over-arching National Indonesian Language in Universities Program (NILUP), puts forward 20 specific recommendations, and suggests staged implementation priorities.

Of these 20 recommendations, nine require no particular additional Commonwealth funding, drawing only on resources already allocated within the higher education sector. Several others could be managed and funded by allocations under existing Commonwealth funding schemes. Major recommendations will require specific, though modest, government allocations. The cost of funding the recommendations in this report that directly relate to universities is only $98 million over the next decade. This average annual expenditure of $9.8 million equates to less than 0.3 per cent of the value of Australia’s current (2010) stock of direct investment in Indonesia and just 0.08 per cent of the value of current (2010) annual two-way trade between the two countries.7

Such calls upon the Commonwealth Budget at a time of stated fiscal restraint would be outweighed by the cost of permitting Australia’s expertise in Indonesian to ebb away at precisely a period of renewed economic growth in Indonesia. Now, more than ever, there is a need for collaboration and partnership across all aspects of the bilateral relationship. This investment in Indonesian language in our universities needs to commence now.

RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMONWEALTH GOVERNMENT

RECOMMENDATION 1:
That both Government and Opposition make an explicit public commitment to supporting Indonesian language in Australian universities until 2020, and that they indicate the level of financial support they will provide for this.

FUNDING: Non-specific.

RECOMMENDATION 2:
That the Governments of Australia, through the Ministers of Education, establish a National Taskforce on Indonesian Language:

- to coordinate, advocate for, promote, and stimulate Indonesian language teaching and learning across all sectors of the education system; and
- to oversee and coordinate the implementation of a National Indonesian Language in Universities Program (NILUP), including monitoring annual enrolment data for Indonesian in schools and universities as a measure of the performance outcomes of NILUP.

FUNDING: Approximately $750,000 p.a., funded by all member governments.

RECOMMENDATION 3:
- That the Government undertake a review of the wording and impact of the DFAT Travel Advisory for Indonesia, with a view to making it more nuanced, and noting explicitly that the advice is not intended to be interpreted as a ban upon educational exchanges with Indonesia; and
- that the Government collaborate with the insurance industry to assist those educational institutions wishing to travel to Indonesia to gain access to appropriate insurance cover.

FUNDING: Non-specific.

RECOMMENDATION 4:
That the National Asian Languages and Studies in Schools Program (at least for Indonesian) be maintained and extended, with a government commitment until at least 2020, at a funding level at least equivalent to, and preferably higher than, the initial triennium.

FUNDING: $20 million p.a.
RECOMMENDATION 5:

- That, in responding to the Final Report of the Higher Education Base Funding Review, the Commonwealth increase the level of base funding per place and support “nationally strategic languages” (Indonesian and Arabic) by including them in the funding cluster with an indicative relativity of 2.0, so as to better meet the actual costs of teaching nationally strategic languages in the contemporary university setting.

- That, if the Commonwealth accepts the Base Funding Review’s recommendation for a uniform 40 per cent HECS contribution across the board, the targeted compensation scholarship program (see below) be adjusted to avoid the negative impact of this HECS increase upon Indonesian language enrolments.

FUNDING: Non-specific.

RECOMMENDATION 6:

That an Indonesian Specialist Scholarship Scheme be established to support undergraduate students undertaking a major in Indonesian which includes a year of in-country study; and that the value of the scholarships be sufficient to cover the full HECS costs of the Indonesian component of a recipient’s degree.

FUNDING: $2.1 million p.a. (Assuming cluster HECS-HELP of $6,756 p.a., with 300 EFTSL p.a. opting to take a major including in-country study).

RECOMMENDATION 7:

That direct, targeted Commonwealth funding be provided for (up to) 15 new lectureships to teach Indonesian language, for a minimum of five years.

In order to maximise the benefit of such re-investment:

- universities seeking such funding must be currently offering an Indonesian language program;

- the lectureships must be in addition to any current continuing/tenured position(s), and not used to replace or fund existing positions;

- universities must agree to continue funding the lectureships for at least a further five years after conclusion of Commonwealth funding; and

- universities agree to allocate a minimum of 20 per cent of the lecturer’s workload/time for advocacy and promotion of Indonesian into schools and the community, and for the development of school “feeder” programs to encourage students to continue with Indonesian from schools to university.

FUNDING: (Up to) $10 million in total. ($2 million p.a. for five years.)
RECOMMENDATION 8:
That the government support the development of a set of contemporary university-level Indonesian teaching and learning materials.

FUNDING: $350,000 p.a. for two years, totalling $700,000.

RECOMMENDATION 9:
That the Commonwealth Government provide funding for the establishment and maintenance of an Indonesian tertiary teaching resources bank.

FUNDING: Salary and associated costs for administrative officer: $200,000 p.a. for three years, totalling $600,000.

RECOMMENDATION 10:
That the Commonwealth Government provide recurrent funding for the Australian Consortium for “In-Country” Indonesian Studies (ACICIS) to increase the number of Australians studying in Indonesia for one or two semesters by expanding quality accredited study programs in strategic fields.

FUNDING: $1.5 million p.a.

RECOMMENDATION 11:
That funds be provided for the development and maintenance of in-country programs to provide intensive Indonesian language training for postgraduate research students, and that such training be funded as part of their postgraduate program.

FUNDING: $1 million p.a., assuming $25,000 per semester for 40 students.

RECOMMENDATION 12:
That the governments of Indonesia and Australia agree on a scheme whereby:

- AusAID and the Indonesian Higher Education Directorate (DIKTI) identify from their scholarship programs up to 20 recipients annually with expertise in second-language acquisition to assist in the teaching of Indonesian in Australian universities while being mentored as part of their postgraduate experience; and
- the scholarships of these “Australia-Indonesia Postgraduate Scholar-Instructors” be extended by AusAID and DIKTI for an additional period of up to two years to support such teaching.

FUNDING: $1 million p.a. (approximately $50,000 p.a. per student at 20 students).
RECOMMENDATION 13:
That the Government (through the National Taskforce on Indonesian Language) provide a framework to encourage business support for Indonesian programs by:

- working with the relevant peak business associations to promote corporate support for the teaching of Indonesian in Australian universities; and
- including, within the Indonesia-Australia Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement (IA-CEPA) negotiations, consideration of new reciprocal working visa provisions which would allow for a freer flow of university-qualified professionals between the two countries and would eliminate the current impediments encountered by companies wanting to employ Australian staff with Indonesian language skills.

FUNDING: No specific government funding required; achievable within the framework of current ongoing bilateral negotiations.

UNIVERSITY-BASED STRATEGIES

RECOMMENDATION 14:
That universities provide incentives for Indonesian-language teaching staff to build strong links with schools in their catchment area; and recognise such duties in the calculation of staff workload.

FUNDING: Moderate university allocation required.

RECOMMENDATION 15:
That universities consider establishing specific Year 12 pathways for Indonesian along the lines of the University of Tasmania’s Colleges Language Program, to strengthen Indonesian at both senior school and university level.

FUNDING: $2.25 million to establish (Assuming $150,000 x 15 universities). Maintained by recurrent university funding for Commonwealth Supported Places.

RECOMMENDATION 16:
That universities without a Languages Other Than English (LOTE) bonus adopt one and that such LOTE bonuses be standardised across the sector and simplified.

FUNDING: No additional funding required. Initiative could be promoted by universities individually or collaborating within each state/jurisdiction.

RECOMMENDATION 17:
That universities adopt a Language Policy and promote the principle that students have a “language entitlement”.

FUNDING: Minimal; manageable within existing university budgets.
RECOMMENDATION 18:
That universities not currently doing so make concurrent Indonesian language qualifications available to students.

FUNDING: Not required. Individual universities to implement.

RECOMMENDATION 19:
That those universities that are not yet doing so maximise the visibility and effectiveness of their Indonesia-related capacity by:

- undertaking a census of staff with links to Indonesia;
- establishing an “Indonesia Interest Group” and emailing list to:
  - ensure all relevant staff are informed about Indonesia-related developments in the university;
  - maximise the cumulative benefits of their Indonesia-related expertise in teaching and research; and
- developing a specific “Indonesia window” webpage which highlights the range of their Indonesia-related activities.

FUNDING: Minimal; manageable through established university budgets.

RECOMMENDATION 20:
That, in their staff practices and policies, universities:

- ensure that faculty and departmental structures provide appropriate representation for (Indonesian) language teaching staff, with equal opportunities for professional development, academic study leave and financial support to maintain an active scholarly and research career; and
- ensure that administrators provide teaching staff with accurate information on the funding model as it relates to Indonesian teaching, and pass on the full cluster weighting to Indonesian language teaching units.

FUNDING: Minimal; manageable within existing university budgets.
SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

The Australian Learning and Teaching Council (initially named the Carrick Institute) was established by the Australian Government in 2004 to provide a national focus for the enhancement of learning and teaching in Australian higher education. In May 2009, the ALTC awarded a National Teaching Fellowship to Professor David T. Hill to review what had been identified as a dramatic decline in Indonesian language learning in Australian universities, and to “develop a national strategy for Indonesian in the Australian university sector, for presentation to government and the universities as a policy paper”.

This report presents that national strategy for Indonesian in Australian universities to government and the universities, outlining a series of recommendations to reverse the decline in Indonesian language studies in Australian universities, and to strengthen and reinvigorate Indonesian teaching and learning.¹ The report is presented in four sections: an introduction, including a review of Australia’s relationship with Indonesia; a description of the current state of Indonesian in Australian universities; a series of recommendations for component elements of a “National Indonesian Language in Universities Program” for implementation by government and universities; and a conclusion.

AUSTRALIA AND INDONESIA

Australia’s relationship with Indonesia is pivotal to our nation’s future well-being. While the expression and emphasis may have varied, for over half a century Australian governments of every persuasion have placed special significance upon this bilateral relationship.

From Australia’s early support for Indonesia’s declaration of independence from the Dutch in 1945, and subsequent co-sponsorship of Indonesia’s admission to the United Nations Organisation in 1950, Australian governments recognised (as Foreign Minister Richard Casey stated in 1954) that “[w]e have every reason to want to live in harmony with our largest and closest neighbour”.² Yet it has never been an easy relationship, for “[n]o two neighbours anywhere in the world are as different, in terms of history, culture, population, language, and political and social traditions, as Australia and Indonesia”.³

Jakarta is now Australia’s largest embassy, having overtaken Washington and Beijing. After Washington, the Jakarta Embassy has our second largest defence representation. The Australian Federal Police presence in Indonesia is substantial both in the Embassy, and in the collaborative Jakarta Centre for Law Enforcement Cooperation (JCLEC) in Semarang.⁴ Indonesia is our largest recipient of foreign aid, totalling about $500 million p.a. For its part, after both the 2009 Victorian bushfires and the 2011 Queensland floods, Indonesia responded rapidly to provide assistance to Australia, including $US1 million and police forensic teams and engineers.
Current annual total trade between Australia and Indonesia is a very modest $12.9 billion (2010). However, since 2006 two-way trade between the two countries has increased at an average of 9.7 per cent p.a. and, given Indonesia’s maintenance of respectable real GDP growth of (6.1 per cent in 2010), there is tremendous potential to expand the economic relationship. Although Indonesia was only Australia’s eleventh largest export market and eleventh largest source of imports in 2010, merchandise trade between the two countries has been growing steadily for the last decade at an average rate of five per cent per year from $7.1 billion in 2001 to $9.8 billion in 2010. More strikingly, since 2007, trade in services has increased by an average of 22 per cent per year, reaching $3.1 billion in 2010. Between 2001 and 2010, the value of the stock of Australian direct investment in Indonesia increased more than fivefold from $519 million at the start of the decade to $3.3 billion in 2010. This investment in Indonesia, however, accounts for less than 2 per cent of Australia’s overall investment engagement in Asia.

Australia’s tremendous potential for an economic partnership with Indonesia is, to an extent, a consequence of the fact that the two economies are essentially complementary. Apart from a few sectors, such as minerals and energy, Indonesian and Australian companies are rarely in direct competition. A 2009 DFAT-commissioned report concluded that, because of this complementarity, a reduction in the barriers to trade and investment between the two countries – either through bilateral or multilateral arrangements – would produce output and welfare gains to both countries.

Figure 1: Summary of Australia’s economic relationship with Indonesia: 2001-2010 (A$m)

Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics Cat. No. 5352.0; Cat. No. 5368.055.004 – Tables 5.13 and 7.13; and Cat. No. 5368.0 – Tables 14a and 14b

Indonesia is often excluded in government and media attention, which largely focuses on the importance of economic growth in China and India to Australia’s future. Yet the International Monetary Fund projects Indonesia will achieve one of the fastest growth
rates of the world’s 18 largest economies during 2009-2015, outstripping even the powerhouse economies of the so-called BRICs (Brazil, Russia, India and China).

**Figure 2: Comparative Projected GDP Nominal Growth: 2009-2015**

Source: International Monetary Fund, World Economic Outlook Database, September 2011.

In addition, the strengthening of Indonesia’s economy is indicated by the dramatic reduction of its debt-to-GDP ratio from 85 percent in 1999 to a projected 25 percent in 2011, thus now lower than most European countries and the USA. Indonesia’s debt-to-GDP ratio now compares favourably to that of Australia’s, which stood at 28.8 percent in 2010.

**Figure 3: Comparative Debt to GDP Ratio: 2011**

Source: International Monetary Fund, World Economic Outlook Database, September 2011.
The Australian government has recognised the potential benefits of Indonesia’s growth. As the Australian Minister for Trade observed in November 2011,

“if Indonesia continues to grow at the rate used in the IMF’s latest five-year forecast, its economy will roughly double in size over the next decade. This means that from half the size of Australia’s economy just three years ago, Indonesia’s economy will match Australia’s by around 2025. By 2030, Indonesia will have a place in the Top 10 economies in the world, with private sector projections putting it at between fifth- and eighth-largest in the world.”

Under the ASEAN–Australia–New Zealand Free Trade Agreement (AANZFTA), signed in February 2009 and coming into effect from January 2012, Australia is eliminating duties on all tariff lines for all signatory trading partners by 2020. Indonesia, meanwhile, will eliminate duties on 93.2 per cent of its tariff lines by 2025, covering 93.4 per cent of Australia’s exports. Negotiations are underway for an Indonesia–Australia–Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement (IA–CEPA) that would eliminate many of the remaining barriers to trade between the two countries that have not been addressed by the AANZFTA.

As Prime Minister Julia Gillard has urged, “Our challenge is to make our nation the winner in this Asian Century. [...] The economic opportunities of this century are in our neighbourhood and we already have firmly established trade links with Asian countries, not just the export of our minerals, but also of education. [...] But Australia being the winner and grabbing the incredible opportunities in our region won’t just happen naturally. [...] We need to hone our skills by investing in our people. This is the high road to productivity gains.”

However, just as there is huge potential for a stronger economic partnership to bring mutual benefits, there are numerous examples of the cost – political and economic – of failing to work productively with Indonesia or to understand the two countries’ shared challenges and complementary assets and skills. In 2011, the implementation of a (temporary) ban on live cattle exports to Indonesia exposed the Australian government’s poor knowledge of, and ability to work with, Indonesian counterparts, risking a major export industry worth some $320 million annually. Strengthening Australia’s Indonesian language skills will contribute significantly to building the understanding that would minimise such pitfalls in the future. It is a key component in this “need to hone our skills by investing in our people”. Without adequate linguistic and cultural knowledge, such ruptures in the Australia-Indonesia relationship will continue to hinder us, for after half a century the bilateral relationship still periodically reveals “a thin foreign policy crust covering a disappointingly hollow core”, which “needs to grow not only in the statements of governments but in the attitudes and actions of ordinary Australians and Indonesians”.

As Prime Minister Julia Gillard has urged, “Our challenge is to make our nation the winner in this Asian Century. [...] The economic opportunities of this century are in our neighbourhood and we already have firmly established trade links with Asian countries, not just the export of our minerals, but also of education. [...] But Australia being the winner and grabbing the incredible opportunities in our region won’t just happen naturally. [...] We need to hone our skills by investing in our people. This is the high road to productivity gains.”

However, just as there is huge potential for a stronger economic partnership to bring mutual benefits, there are numerous examples of the cost – political and economic – of failing to work productively with Indonesia or to understand the two countries’ shared challenges and complementary assets and skills. In 2011, the implementation of a (temporary) ban on live cattle exports to Indonesia exposed the Australian government’s poor knowledge of, and ability to work with, Indonesian counterparts, risking a major export industry worth some $320 million annually. Strengthening Australia’s Indonesian language skills will contribute significantly to building the understanding that would minimise such pitfalls in the future. It is a key component in this “need to hone our skills by investing in our people”. Without adequate linguistic and cultural knowledge, such ruptures in the Australia-Indonesia relationship will continue to hinder us, for after half a century the bilateral relationship still periodically reveals “a thin foreign policy crust covering a disappointingly hollow core”, which “needs to grow not only in the statements of governments but in the attitudes and actions of ordinary Australians and Indonesians”.
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However, just as there is huge potential for a stronger economic partnership to bring mutual benefits, there are numerous examples of the cost – political and economic – of failing to work productively with Indonesia or to understand the two countries’ shared challenges and complementary assets and skills. In 2011, the implementation of a (temporary) ban on live cattle exports to Indonesia exposed the Australian government’s poor knowledge of, and ability to work with, Indonesian counterparts, risking a major export industry worth some $320 million annually. Strengthening Australia’s Indonesian language skills will contribute significantly to building the understanding that would minimise such pitfalls in the future. It is a key component in this “need to hone our skills by investing in our people”. Without adequate linguistic and cultural knowledge, such ruptures in the Australia-Indonesia relationship will continue to hinder us, for after half a century the bilateral relationship still periodically reveals “a thin foreign policy crust covering a disappointingly hollow core”, which “needs to grow not only in the statements of governments but in the attitudes and actions of ordinary Australians and Indonesians”.

As Prime Minister Julia Gillard has urged, “Our challenge is to make our nation the winner in this Asian Century. [...] The economic opportunities of this century are in our neighbourhood and we already have firmly established trade links with Asian countries, not just the export of our minerals, but also of education. [...] But Australia being the winner and grabbing the incredible opportunities in our region won’t just happen naturally. [...] We need to hone our skills by investing in our people. This is the high road to productivity gains.”
Australians’ preparedness to learn Indonesian language is arguably the most fundamental barometer of the health of the bilateral relationship. It is a quantifiable measure of Australians’ interest in, knowledge of, and engagement with, Indonesia. It should be an urgent concern to both governments that this barometer has been trending downwards for more than a decade, despite assurances of a healthy government-to-government relationship.

Central to Australia’s future well-being is our capacity to work collaboratively with Indonesia in virtually every aspect of national and international policy: economics and finance, conventional and non-traditional security, public health and veterinary welfare, global warming, environmental health and sustainability, new technologies, cultural production and protection, education, and ethics. In every aspect of this complex and multi-faceted relationship we require Australians with the linguistic, cultural and social knowledge to facilitate clear and effective communication with, and understanding of, Indonesian counterparts.

While much of the discussion about the Australia-Indonesia relationship focuses on economic and security aspects, there are extensive links with equally significant potential for expansion in a myriad of other fields, including but not limited to: agriculture, education, sports, science, cultural and artistic production, youth issues, and religious affairs. Yet in culture and the arts, for example, despite the fine work done by institutions like Asialink and the Australia-Indonesia Institute to stimulate and support cultural, artistic and youth exchange, the thinness of such relations is evident in the absence of Indonesian invitees to Australia’s many arts festivals, and the rarity of Indonesian movies in our cinemas or on television (despite the booming Indonesian media production industry). This absence is both an indication and a result of Australia’s lack of knowledge of Indonesian contemporary arts and cultural production beyond circles of cognoscenti. To generate such awareness, and to add depth and breadth to the relationship, Indonesian language and studies will need to permeate the Australian community much more effectively.

As the Foreign Minister Kevin Rudd advised Australian students studying in Indonesia recently, “We need a new cadre in Australia of Australian Indonesianists who understand this country comprehensively. My generation has been lazy on Indonesia. Your generation has no alternative but to be energetic on Indonesia.”

We need this new cadre of specialists in all fields with the ability to work productively with Indonesians, just as we must ensure that the majority of Australians have an understanding and appreciation of the importance of such sustained collaboration. We need fluent speakers of Indonesian across all these specialist areas, and more generally an “Asia-literate” – an “Indonesia-literate” – community at large. Indonesia will forever be our neighbour, and we need the ability to “chat with them over the back fence” (as one businessman expressed it) about every aspect of our interaction to keep the relationship, in all its aspects, healthy and strong.
While there are a multitude of personal and social reasons for learning a foreign language, the strategic and commercial importance of Indonesian particularly needs to be emphasised. This is particularly the case given government and media pre-occupation with Australia’s economic engagement with China and India, which is so often to the exclusion of the emerging Indonesian dynamo.

Ironically, just as Indonesia’s economic potential offers unique opportunities for Australia and our economic relationship is poised for growth at unprecedented levels, we are at risk of losing a comparative advantage in expertise. Australia has been recognised for several decades as a world leader in expertise and research on Indonesia, a competence based on our scholars’ Indonesian language skills. For example, an international 2009 study analysing the abstracting and indexing databases employed in bibliometric research benchmarking exercises, identified Australia playing a disproportionate role globally, second only to the USA, and preceding even Indonesia. Yet, this advantage is potentially undermined by “the current declining numbers of Indonesian language and studies students” and “the potential reduction of scholarship about Indonesia, as the ranks of Indonesia specialists thin” with retiring senior scholars frequently not replaced by their universities.

This coincides with a major shift that is taking place in Indonesian studies internationally. Colonial ties over centuries had embedded Indonesian (and the related language of Malay) studies in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. Post-World War II strategic interest in Southeast Asia by both the USA and Australia had led to strong academic expertise being fostered in those two nations. Yet disinvestment in all four of these states in recent decades is allowing their expertise in Indonesian to wane. By contrast, new interest and expertise in Southeast Asian studies is developing elsewhere. There are reportedly now more students studying Malay/Indonesian in Azerbaijan than in the UK or the Netherlands. More applications are received for Indonesian government scholarships (Dharma Siswa) from Poland than from the USA or Australia. Without reinvesting in Indonesian studies, Australia risks losing our comparative advantage and the consequent economic, political and strategic advantage that our previous expertise gave us in our relationship with Indonesia.

As Professor Damien Kingsbury has argued, “One obvious aspect [of Australia’s relationship with Indonesia] that requires remediation is the rapid decline in support for Indonesian language education” as “Australia’s universities are struggling to maintain Indonesian language courses, which have a direct impact on ‘Indonesia literacy’”. He advocates greater support for Indonesian language at all educational levels to enhance our ability “to engage closely with Indonesia across a spectrum of activities.” This report presents such a national strategy to support Indonesian in our universities.

DATA COLLECTION

PREVIOUS STUDIES

There have been a number of previous reports which relate, in various ways, to Indonesian language in Australian universities. Several have examined languages in
general, or Asian Studies as a broad field of study. Since an excellent synopsis of these is readily available elsewhere, they are not summarised here, with the exception of the two most germane.\textsuperscript{25}

Of specific relevance to Indonesian is the “National Strategy for Indonesian Language Teaching and Learning” report prepared in 1991 for the Asian Studies Council by Colin Brown and Elaine McKay on behalf of the Indonesian Studies Group of the Asian Studies Association of Australia.\textsuperscript{26} Brown and McKay include in their focus primary and secondary schools, TAFE colleges, and universities. Produced 20 years ago when the government was funding an Asian Studies Council to advise on such matters, the Brown and McKay report included 33 recommendations, many of which remain relevant for university teaching of Indonesian today, and which have informed this current report.

Similarly, the 1994 study by Peter Worsley of Australia’s Indonesian language potential provides rich data on the language up to that year, for schools and higher education.\textsuperscript{27} While some of its key recommendations have been acted upon (such as the establishment of a consortium of Australian universities to administer in-country Indonesian study programs), others – such as the recommendation that all primary and secondary teachers of Indonesian spend at least one year in an approved program of study in Indonesia – remain unimplemented and still highly relevant.

The current report differs from those preceding it in several key respects. Firstly, it concentrates exclusively on the university sector, referring to the school system only at the point of intersection with Year 12. It does so primarily because universities face specific challenges that require tailored strategies. But it is also relieved of the responsibility of including an analysis of Indonesian in the school system because this has been so recently and competently executed by Michelle Kohler and Phillip Mahnken.\textsuperscript{28}

Both Brown and MacKay’s 1991 report and Worsley’s 1994 review were conducted at a time when Indonesian in the university sector was either still expanding or, at worst, levelling off. New programs were still being launched; the University of Tasmania, for example, only commenced its Indonesian program in 1991. This current report takes place in an entirely different educational and political climate, following 15 years of contraction. It proposes below a strategy designed to buttress and support current programs, and to maintain “supply” in readiness to expand when the current impediments to “demand” have weakened.

**UNIVERSITY VISITS AND INTERVIEWS**

Support from the ALTC enabled the Fellow to visit every university in Australia teaching Indonesian in 2010, and to meet with and interview a selection of teaching and administrative staff and students, along with a range of business, community and government stakeholders.\textsuperscript{29} Comparisons were then made during visits to select universities abroad.
ENROLMENT STATISTICS

The Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations was not able to supply detailed data on university student enrolment in Indonesian language. To determine the overall enrolment trends for the period 2001-2010, universities teaching Indonesian at any period during that decade were invited to provide their data for all students enrolled in Indonesian language units in standardised form (known as Equivalent Full-Time Student Load or EFTSL). In a very small number of cases (such as when an Indonesian program had been closed, or where degree structures had altered) universities were not able to supply precise enrolment data. It was possible in some of these instances to collect reasonably reliable statistics from current or former teaching staff, or to make informed projections where there were gaps for particular years. There were occasional inconsistencies in whether a unit was a pure “language” unit or a “content”/“area studies” unit in which some Indonesian was used in instruction. While the statistics presented in this paper therefore have some limitations, they nonetheless constitute the most accurate and comprehensive record compiled for Indonesian language enrolments in Australian universities for the period 2001-2010. This second edition provides more accurate statistical detail than the earlier edition.

DISCUSSION PAPER

On the basis of university visits, broader consultations, and bibliographic research the Fellow produced and circulated a Discussion Paper in early 2011 outlining a wide variety of proposals for the reinvigoration of Indonesian.30

NATIONAL COLLOQUIUM

To consider the Discussion Paper and seek additional strategies, a three-day National Colloquium on the Future of Indonesian in Australian Universities was convened at Murdoch University, Perth in February 2011. In addition to teaching staff from Indonesian programs around the country and Indonesian teachers’ professional organisations, the colloquium was attended by representatives from the Commonwealth Departments of Education, Defence, and Foreign Affairs and Trade, as well as several state departments of education, the ALTC, and the Australia-Indonesia Business Council (AIBC).31

DISCLAIMER

This report is based upon widespread consultation with individuals in universities, government, professional organisations, community interest groups, and business. While drawing from such input, the Fellow is solely responsible for the contents of this report.

2 Quoted in Richard Woolcott, The Hot Seat: Reflections on Diplomacy from Stalin’s Death to the Bali Bombings, HarperCollins, Sydney, 2003, p.120.

4 On JCLEC, see http://www.jclec.com/, sighted 30 November 2011.


17 Mugliston,
18 Julia Gillard, “Our skills and innovation provide leg-up for future”, The Australian, 23 January 2012, p.10
20 Kevin Rudd, ‘Transcript of speech by Minister Rudd to participants of the Australian Consortium for
21 Arndt Graf, “Indexing a field: the case of Indonesian and Malaysian Studies”, RIMA, Vol. 43, No. 2
    (2009) pp.191-221. Employing an “Indonesia” country search with the ISI Web of Science “Social
    Science Citation Index” and “Arts and Humanities Citation Index”, on articles spanning 1995-2008, Graf
    identifies the major producers as: USA (31.1661%), Australia (15.2707%), Indonesia (11.5456%),
    England (7.0106%) and Germany (5.599%) (p.201).
22 Barbara Hatley, “Encountering Indonesia as a student, then and now”, RIMA, Vol. 43, No. 1 (2009),
    pp.95-103. Quotation p. 102. Hatley is Professor Emeritus at the University of Tasmania and adjunct
    Professor at Monash University.
23 I thank Professor Arndt Graf for these observations in his presentation to National Colloquium on
    the Future of Indonesian in Australian Universities, Murdoch University, 9 February 2011.
24 Damien Kingsbury, Two steps forward, one step back: Indonesia’s arduous path of reform
25 Julia E. Read, “Innovation in Indonesian Language Teaching: An Evaluation of the TIFL Tertiary
    Curriculum Materials”, PhD thesis, University of Wollongong, Faculty of Arts, 2002, pp.64-101
    excellent summary of previous reports.
26 This report, together with others going back to 1966, may be downloaded from the Resources page
    %20and%20Learning%201991.pdf, sighted 8 September 2011.
27 Peter Worsley, Unlocking Australia’s language potential: Profiles of 9 key languages in Australia.
    Volume 5 Indonesian/Malay, NLLIA, Melbourne, 1994, downloadable from
28 Michelle Kohler and Phillip Mahnken, The Current State of Indonesian Language Education in
    Australian Schools, ESA, Carlton South, 2010.
29 The list of institutions visited and individuals interviewed is provided in Appendix A.
30 David T. Hill, Indonesian in Australian Universities: A Discussion Paper, Asia Research Centre,
    Murdoch University, Working Paper No. 170, February 2011
31 Apart from Deakin University (whose invitee was unable to attend) every university that teaches
    Indonesian in Australia was represented at the Colloquium. For a list of participants and a selection of
    videoed presentations at the Colloquium are available on the ALTC Fellowship website
SECTION 2: THE STATE OF INDONESIAN IN AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITIES

THE COMMENCEMENT OF INDONESIAN IN AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITIES

The teaching of Indonesian language in Australian universities commenced in 1955. Its beginnings at the Universities of Sydney and Melbourne, and subsequently the ANU, were modest. By 1969, only four of Australia’s then 15 universities offered Indonesian. With Australia’s greater appreciation of the importance of Asia during the 1970s and 1980s, the popularity of Indonesian language increased, with its gradual adoption by universities across all states; Tasmania, the last state to commence teaching Indonesian, began in 1991. While the early 1990s saw strong growth, enrolments began contracting by the end of that decade and have continued to decline ever since. That enrolments grew during the Suharto dictatorship only to fall as Indonesia began democratising after his fall in 1998 is ironic, and indicates a lost opportunity for engagement with a society opening up to the world.

CURRENT GOVERNMENT POLICY

In May 2004, the Commonwealth Parliament’s Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade responded to evidence of the decline of Indonesian in universities by recommending “that Indonesian Studies be designated a strategic national priority and that the Australian Research Council and the Department of Education, Science and Training be requested to recognise this in prioritising funding for both research and teaching.” Since 2006 the Commonwealth has formally recognised the strategic importance of Indonesian, by designating it a “Nationally Strategic Language” in Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) funding agreements with universities. The only languages so designated are Indonesian and Arabic. Such university funding agreements include a clause governing “nationally strategic languages”, which states that “the University must consult the Commonwealth and obtain the Commonwealth’s approval for the closure” of strategic language programs. However, the funding agreements also stipulate that “[i]n making a decision regarding a Course Closure, the Commonwealth will:

13.5. seek to reach a mutually agreeable arrangement with the University regarding the Course Closure;

13.6. have regard to student demand for the Course, the financial viability of the Course, the justification provided for a proposed Course Closure by the University and other relevant factors;

13.7. assist the University to explore options to retain the Course, including
through cooperation with another provider or the movement of Commonwealth supported places to another provider (where applicable); and

13.8. not unreasonably withhold approval for a Course Closure so as to place an unreasonable financial burden on the University or place the University in a financially unviable position in regard to the University’s overall financial status.”

Despite Indonesian’s status as a “Nationally Strategic Language”, the Commonwealth Department of Education provides no specific supplementary funding for it, nor has the designation prevented it from being closed in several Australian universities.

REVIEW OF INDIVIDUAL STATES AND TERRITORIES

Between 2001 and 2010, enrolments in Indonesian in Australian universities declined in every state and territory. While the rate of decline varied between jurisdictions, Indonesian language enrolments (EFTSL) fell nationally by 37 per cent (see Figure 3 and Table 1). The decline is even more worrying given that, over this same time period, total undergraduate load in Australian universities increased by 39.8 per cent.

Figure 4: Indonesian Language Equivalent Full-Time Student Load (EFTSL): 2001-2010

![Graph showing Indonesian Language Equivalent Full-Time Student Load (EFTSL) from 2001 to 2010 for different states and territories.]}
The following table indicates the trends in individual states:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% change from 2001 to 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>181.5</td>
<td>186.1</td>
<td>176.8</td>
<td>172.3</td>
<td>172.6</td>
<td>151.5</td>
<td>149.1</td>
<td>142.3</td>
<td>131.4</td>
<td>129.9</td>
<td>1593.4</td>
<td>-28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>547.9</td>
<td>-52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>497.8</td>
<td>-37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>370.6</td>
<td>-37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>295.1</td>
<td>-46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>277.6</td>
<td>-36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>213.1</td>
<td>-49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>149.5</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Total</td>
<td>481.9</td>
<td>470.0</td>
<td>455.1</td>
<td>444.0</td>
<td>418.3</td>
<td>372.8</td>
<td>356.8</td>
<td>339.1</td>
<td>302.2</td>
<td>304.9</td>
<td>3945.1</td>
<td>-37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As evident in Figure 4 and Table 1, Victoria has by far the highest student load throughout the decade from 2001 to 2010, teaching roughly 40 per cent of all university learners of Indonesian, with a relatively modest 28 per cent decline. By contrast, in New South Wales which has a larger state population overall, Indonesian language enrolments have dropped by 52 per cent – the largest fall of any state, to the point where only 0.02 per cent of total university EFTSL in New South Wales is accounted for by students enrolled in Indonesian. After New South Wales, the next greatest percentage decline in Indonesian study has occurred in Tasmania, with Indonesian EFTSL falling by 49 per cent, closely followed by Queensland with 46 per cent. The Northern Territory has remained virtually stable, with a decline of only 5 per cent over the decade, yet with the smallest total enrolment of any jurisdiction. Compared with all states the Northern Territory has, however, maintained the highest rate of Indonesian EFTSL as a percentage of total university EFTSL (see Table 2).
Table 2: Indonesian EFTSL as a percentage of total undergraduate EFTSL by state, 2001-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>% change from 2001 to 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIC %</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW %</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA %</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT %</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD %</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA %</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS %</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>-61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT %</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National total</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Projected Indonesian EFTSL 2011-2021, based on 2001-2010 trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>122.4</td>
<td>113.5</td>
<td>106.2</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National trend</td>
<td>272.7</td>
<td>247.3</td>
<td>222.5</td>
<td>198.6</td>
<td>177.8</td>
<td>158.1</td>
<td>134.4</td>
<td>111.3</td>
<td>89.0</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the current trend continues unabated, and assuming all other factors remain constant, by 2022 – in only 10 years from now – Indonesian would disappear from universities in all states and territories except Victoria and the Northern Territory.

These statistics compiled during the ALTC National Teaching Fellowship confirm the trajectory of earlier data sets. For example, White and Baldauf showed a national EFTSL fall of 12 per cent between 2001 and 2005 (from 641 to 540 EFTSL),\(^6\) while the Asian Studies Association of Australia (ASAA) found EFTSL declined from 628 in 2001 to 478 in 2007, a fall of 23.8 per cent.\(^7\)

EFTSL represent a standardised measure of student load. However, it is illustrative, and salutary, to convert EFTSL to approximate the number of actual individual students who are studying Indonesian. This is achieved by converting the EFTSL according to the relevant weighted value of the units (which varied across institutions and course years).
This calculation indicates that in 2010 there were only approximately 1067 individuals studying Indonesian at an Australian university. It would be reasonable to assume very broadly, on the basis of the pyramid pattern of enrolments, that the majority of these would be in first year of university, with only about 30 per cent in second year and only 15 per cent in third year completing their major. Thus only approximately 160 students would be graduating with three years of Indonesian language study at university level in any given year. Only about 10-15 annually would include a year’s study in Indonesia (through the ACICIS program – to be discussed later in this report) as part of their university degree.

Table 4: Students studying Indonesian language in Australian universities (approximated): 2001-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>5577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>1464</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>1249</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>13808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This report does not seek to identify or critique the performance of particular universities. While the overall trend between 2001 and 2010 has been a dramatic decline, some universities have managed to sustain relatively level enrolments, with one institution even achieving a slight increase during that decade. Yet, first year enrolments of more than 30 individual students are now a rare phenomenon in any Indonesian program. Upper levels units commonly fall into single figures. As financial pressures have increased upon universities and consequently upon Indonesian programs, in most programs all but core units of the Indonesian-language major sequence have been discontinued, with Indonesia-related content of degrees thinning dramatically. Student contact hours have frequently been reduced in order to lower staff costs.

In 2010, there were some selective signs of renewed growth. At the end of 2011, the University of Melbourne reported a 29 per cent increase in Indonesian enrolments compared to 2010 (as a consequence of the “Melbourne model” requiring students enrolled in a Bachelor’s degree to take a “breadth” subject outside their major.) Likewise, the University of Western Australia had a 39 per cent increase in Indonesian enrolments, after having undertaken a specific campaign to promote Indonesian in feeder high schools 2009. The Australian National University reported student load rose 12 per cent in 2011 after a 25 per cent growth the previous year. Murdoch University bucked the dominant trend, with its 2010 load 4 per cent higher than its enrolment in 2001. Yet such individual instances are the exception to the national trend over the
previous decade, as noted above. Statistics illustrate that enrolments across the board in every university (except Murdoch University) were lower in 2010 – in most cases very drastically – than they had been in 2001.

UNIVERSITIES OFFERING INDONESIAN

Fifteen universities currently offer autonomous Indonesian language majors; that is, they do not depend on collaboration with another university to provide the staff or materials for their courses. Additionally, five others include Indonesian in their degrees through established arrangements under which staffing and/or materials are provided by another university. In Brisbane, the Indonesian units at the University of Queensland (UQ) are available under a broader collaborative arrangement (known as the “Brisbane Universities Languages Hub”) to students from Queensland University of Technology (QUT) and Griffith University who attend combined classes at UQ. The University of New England (UNE) provides Indonesian in what is dubbed a “blended model” to the University of Southern Queensland and the University of Wollongong. The University of New South Wales offers Indonesian both at its main Sydney campus and at the Australian Defence Force Academy (ADFA) in Canberra.⁹

At least one university in every state and territory offers Indonesian. In addition, Open Universities Australia (OUA) and several universities, such as Charles Darwin University, Deakin University, Murdoch University, and the University of New England, offer Indonesian units by distance or external mode. In the jurisdictions of the Northern Territory, Australian Capital Territory, and Tasmania there is only a single university teaching Indonesian. Melbourne is the city with most individual programs with four universities offering the language.

Since 2004, autonomous Indonesian programs have closed in six universities: Curtin, Queensland University of Technology and Griffith (in 2009); Charles Sturt University’s Bathurst campus (in 2006); and the University of Technology Sydney and the University of Western Sydney (in 2004).

In most of the 15 universities in which Indonesian survives, staffing levels have been greatly reduced in recent years. In five, there is only a single tenured staff member attempting to offer three (or four) years of Indonesian language instruction, sometimes together with associated area studies (or “content”) units about Indonesia. Such staffing arrangements are unsustainable in the long term. Across all of the Northern Territory and Queensland in 2011, there were only three tenured staff members (and a single fixed-term contract position) catering for the entire population of these two jurisdictions.¹⁰
INDONESIAN IN SCHOOLS

Higher education does not exist in a vacuum and declining enrolments in Indonesian are not just a feature of tertiary education. A major 2010 report in Indonesian language in Australian schools11 noted that:

- while approximately 191,000 students currently study Indonesian in Australian primary and secondary schools (making it the third most studied language at school level) Indonesian has become an “at risk”, low candidature language at senior secondary level, with only 1,167 students in Year 12, which represents fewer than one per cent of all Year 12 students (2009 figures);

- since 2001, school enrolments in Indonesian programs across the country have been declining by at least 10,000 each year.

The serious fall in Indonesian enrolments in schools is illustrated by the alarming fact that there are fewer Year 12 students studying Indonesian in 2009 than there were matriculating in the language in 1972.12

FACTORS ERODING DEMAND FOR INDONESIAN

Subject selection by university students is influenced by a myriad of factors. Career expectations, restrictive degree structures, subject availability, life experience, peer or parental suggestions all play a role.

Read identifies factors contributing to the rise and fall of interest in Indonesian in Australian education as including “government initiatives, demographic changes, attitudes in the Australian community towards foreign language learning, events in Indonesia, attitudes in the Australian community towards Indonesia and other contributory factors specific to Indonesian, such as native speaker competition in Year 12 examinations and the popularity of Indonesia as a tourist destination”.

For more than a decade, major Indonesia-specific factors – all well beyond the capacity of Indonesian language-teaching staff to influence – have combined to erode demand for Indonesian right across our education system, by undermining interest in learning the language. Together with the retirement of Australia’s senior generation of Indonesianists – most not replaced by their universities, therefore reducing our available expertise – these factors combine into what Professor Tim Lindsey calls, the “perfect storm”: while Indonesian studies could have survived any of these factors individually, together they have proved insurmountable.14

They include: the impact of the 1997 Asian Financial Crisis upon Indonesia’s economy; televised images of violence and instability leading up to the resignation of former president Suharto in May 1998; negative Australian community attitudes to Indonesia’s prolonged attempted integration of East Timor and particularly the very visible levels of violence against the pro-independence movement leading up to, and immediately after, the August 1999 referendum; the deaths of Australians in the Bali bombings of 2002 and 2005, together with the bombing of the Australian Embassy (2004) and hotels...
(2009) in Jakarta; the trials and imprisonment of several Australian drug smugglers in Bali, most notably Schapelle Corby (2005) and the “Bali Nine” (2006); continuing communal and religious violence; and (drastically curtailing many educational exchanges with Indonesia) the elevated Travel Advisory issued by DFAT.

The DFAT Travel Advisory (which since 2002, has advised Australians to “reconsider the need to travel” to Indonesia) have had little – if any – impact upon tourists going to Bali, who constitute the vast majority of Australians travelling to Indonesia. Overall numbers have grown significantly, with an average year-on-year increase of 33 per cent between 2007-2011.

**Figure 5: Australian short-term visitors to Indonesia: 2001-2011**

Data Source: Australian Bureau of Statistics: 3401.0 Overseas Arrivals and Departures, Australia: Table 9: Short-term Movement, Resident Departures - Selected Destinations: Original.

However, such figures hide the fact that the Travel Advisory has had a disastrous impact upon educational links. The advisories are frequently misinterpreted by state education departments, schools and universities as a “ban” on travel, despite various explanations to the contrary by DFAT staff. Schools find they cannot get travel insurance for student language study trips, and have little choice but to cease school exchange visits.

Observing this adverse impact of the Travel Advisory, Professor Lindsey noted “It is deeply ironic that Australian educational travel to Indonesia, the sort that will build the knowledge base necessary to manage the bilateral relationship in the future, is now effectively dead.”

The fragility of that knowledge base in Australia about developments in Indonesia is palpable. Recent surveys by the Lowy Institute indicate that, while 77 per cent of Australian respondents believed that it was “very important that Australia and Indonesia work to develop a close relationship” – 13 years after the fall of President’s Suharto’s New Order and after three cycles of national democratic elections in 1999, 2004, and 2009 – 69 per cent of Australians still believed that in 2011 Indonesia was “essentially controlled by the military”. This, despite the military being effectively removed from...
politics by sweeping legal and constitutional reforms. Such statistics indicate the resilience of out-dated images of Indonesia. The momentous and transformative process of democratisation that has taken place in Indonesia since 1998 appears to have passed largely unnoticed. Only 52 per cent of Lowy’s respondents were aware that “Indonesia is an emerging democracy”.

Lowy Institute polling since 2006 indicates Australians’ ambivalent attitudes to Indonesia. Asked to rate their feelings towards countries (with 100 being very warm and zero meaning very cold), only in 2010 did Indonesia rise above 50 per cent (to 54 per cent), remaining well behind other ASEAN countries like Singapore (69 per cent) and Malaysia (60 per cent). 

The Lowy Institute concluded “Public perceptions of Indonesia present the Australian government with one of its most pressing foreign policy problems.”

The dominance of negative televised images of Indonesia over more than a decade has proved particularly corrosive. The Fellow’s discussions with young adults studying in Australian universities revealed the image of Indonesia (and therefore Indonesian language) among their peers was unflattering, and outmoded. This contrasted with the vibrant, innovative and popular contemporary images of comparator countries like Japan, Korea and China. These students suggested Indonesian language and culture needed to be “re-branded” to capture and communicate to their contemporaries its relevance to global youth culture, new technologies, and the region’s economic dynamism.

No statistics are available on employment rates specifically for Indonesian language graduates. There is some evidence that they can find it difficult to gain employment solely on the strength of their Indonesian language skills, with additional skills in another discipline, such as law, accounting, or journalism often more immediately attractive to prospective employers. This experience, however, appears common for graduates with any foreign language; the employment rate for language graduates appears similar initially to those without a language. Anecdotally, however, perseverance is rewarded, and Indonesian language graduates very frequently migrate into jobs that recognise and reward their special language skills, with a salary loading paid by some employers (such as DFAT and Defence) for Indonesian language skills. Some business leaders regarded Indonesia’s policy of limiting long-term employment visas for foreigners as a disincentive for businesses to recruit Australians on the basis of their Indonesian language skills because they would be unlikely to be able to specialise in Indonesia-based operations and work there for extended periods. If such employment constraints were relaxed by the Indonesian government, they argue, it may be easier for Indonesian-speaking Australians to have these skills valued and to find work there.

In certain areas, such as defence, security and intelligence, Indonesian language skills are particularly sought after, and demand may exceed supply for those graduates with particularly high-level Indonesian language skills, extensive experience of Indonesian society, and specialist expertise across the range of fields relevant to Australia’s political, economic, environmental, and cultural future. To produce such graduates,
extended periods of “in-country” study of one or two semesters is generally required to enable students to achieve the desired levels of language and cultural competence.

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS AND “IN-COUNTRY” STUDY

One of the most striking imbalances in the Australia-Indonesia relationship is in the valuable area of educational exchange and “in-country” study. According to DFAT, there are currently about 14,000 Indonesians enrolled in Australian educational institutions, on either government scholarship programs (since the post-war Colombo Plan) or as fee-paying students. Apart from generating about $500 million annually for the Australian economy, these graduates return to Indonesia with a deep and personal knowledge of Australian society and practice. They constitute a reservoir of good will and influence, with many moving into key positions in fields such as politics, business, education and community development. During his March 2010 visit to the Australian Parliament, President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono pointed out that three members of the Indonesian cabinet, including the Vice President, had degrees from Australian universities.

While it appears that no member of the Australian Cabinet has studied in Indonesia nor speaks Indonesian, the imbalance is far more serious than that. Virtually no Australian (of non-Indonesian descent) has graduated from an Indonesian university, and (prior to the establishment of the Australian Consortium for “In-Country” Indonesian Studies in 1994) the number spending even a semester studying at an Indonesian university was negligible. Between 2007 and 2011 an average of only 53 Australian students per year enrolled in an Indonesian university for a study program of one semester or more (facilitated by ACICIS). This constitutes only an infinitesimal fraction – only 0.38 per cent – of the number of Indonesians studying in Australia. Consequently, the Australian community largely misses out on the tremendous assets in language competence, and political and cultural awareness brought back by students returning from “in-country” study in Indonesia. Such experience can contribute enormously to our capacity for strategic engagement with Indonesia in all its aspects.

CONSEQUENCE OF UNDERGRADUATE ENROLMENTS UPON POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH

The decline in undergraduate enrolments in Indonesian language, and consequent fall in the language competence of the student population has an inevitable impact upon the number of aspiring postgraduate research students, and their level of Indonesian language skills.

It is in our national interest to ensure, firstly, that there remains a strong and constant flow of students into postgraduate research on Indonesia and, secondly, that their Indonesian language skills are sufficient for that task.

With the contraction of Indonesian in Australian universities, high standards of Indonesian skills are increasingly difficult to incorporate into an undergraduate degree. It
is imperative, therefore, that provisions be maintained for postgraduates to achieve advanced levels of Indonesian language competence either prior to, or immediately on, commencing postgraduate research.

**FRATERNAL ORGANISATIONS**

There are a variety of organisations and entities that currently play, or have a potential to play, a role in supporting the promotion of Indonesian language learning in our universities.

The Asian Studies Association of Australia (ASAA) is the professional association of academics working in the field of Asian Studies. It has produced various reports and provided moral encouragement to members in their efforts to promote Indonesian. Specifically, the more informal aggregation of Indonesia-specialists within the ASAA, known as the Indonesia Council, runs biennial open conferences and hosts a monthly email newsletter on academic activities relating to Indonesian studies.27

Since 1994 Indonesian language teachers from primary school to tertiary level have gathered together for biennial conferences under the banner of the informal Australian Society of Indonesian Language Educators (ASILE). It has survived without a secretariat, any structure of office-bearers or membership formalities, providing a valuable forum for language education issues, but being largely inactive between such conferences.28 As a major initiative in 2012 it will convene its conference in Indonesia, synchronised with the conference of its Indonesian counterpart, APBIPA (The Association of Teachers of Indonesian Language to Foreign Learners).

Established in 2007, the Regional Universities Indonesian Language Initiative (RUILI) was a collaboration linking the University of the Sunshine Coast, Charles Darwin University, the University of New England and the University of Tasmania, aimed at developing common course materials and an in-country Indonesian language program based at Mataram University, Lombok. While the goal of sharing course materials encountered impediments because of incompatible digital platforms, the in-country program has blossomed, and is open to cross-enrolling students from other universities too.29

The Australian Consortium for “In-Country” Indonesian Studies (ACICIS), hosted by Murdoch University, was established in 1994 to facilitate the placement of Australian students into Indonesian universities where they study for credit back to their home universities.30 Having placed more than 1500 students in Indonesian universities, ACICIS has grown into Australia’s largest and most comprehensive university collaboration in Indonesian studies. ACICIS has 25 universities as members, mainly from Australia but including key institutions in the UK, Netherlands, Canada and New Zealand.31 It has developed a suite of in-country study programs much broader than the initial Indonesian language and studies options, with offerings in Journalism, Development Studies, International Relations, Islamic Studies, Fine Arts, Field Studies, and Indonesian Language Teacher Education. It maintains a permanent secretariat at
Murdoch and employs an Australian academic as the Resident Director living and overseeing its activities in Indonesia.

Asialink at the University of Melbourne, together with the Asia Education Foundation (AEF) – a joint activity of Asialink and Education Services Australia – have been advocating for and supporting “Asia literacy” in Australian schools, engaging the business community and government, for decades. By “Asia literacy” they mean “knowledge, skills and understandings about the histories, geographies, societies, cultures, literature and languages” of Asia. These organisations have been active in campaigning for increased support for Asian – including Indonesian – studies, and deserve particular praise here for their various initiatives to promote Asia literacy in schools, such as the “Call for a National Action Plan for Asia Literacy” and collaborative work with business and government, to keep these issues in the public eye.

Outside academe, DFAT’s Australia-Indonesia Institute (AII), established by the Australian Government in 1989, has a brief “to contribute to a more broadly based and enduring relationship between Australia and Indonesia and to project positive images of Australia and Indonesia in each other’s country”. With annual base funding of approximately $750,000, it operates a small grants program supporting individuals, institutions, and community organisations that propose projects aligned with the AII’s goals. The AII’s funding levels have decreased significantly in absolute terms over the past 15 years, and continue to decline in real terms each year, despite repeated requests for increases. As one of the only government-funded bodies that exclusively funds Australia-Indonesia cooperation, the AII is now under considerable pressure, and is not able to meet demand for funding in any field. It has long expressed concern about the decline of Indonesian language skills in Australia and established the BRIDGE program as a partial response. This is an on-line e-twinning programme that links schools in Indonesia and Australia to support language studies in both countries. It is operated in a partnership between DFAT (AII), AusAID, the Asia Education Foundation (AEF) and the Myer Foundation. Based on evidence that participation in BRIDGE strengthens school Indonesian language enrolments in Australia, particularly in remoter areas, the AII is piloting a university-level BRIDGE program through Charles Darwin University.

The Australia Indonesia Business Council (AIBC) is the national business association promoting bilateral trade and investment. Operating in various forms since the early 1970s, the AIBC has a sister organisation in Indonesia, the Indonesia Australia Business Council (IABC). The AIBC’s usual activities promote business and social networking, for a diverse – mostly corporate – membership, including several universities with educational interests in Indonesia. The national leadership of the AIBC has expressed its concern at the decline in Indonesian language learning in our universities, noting the negative impact this loss of linguistic skill will have on Australia’s ability to invest in, and do business with, Indonesia.
In responding to reduced funding for the teaching of Indonesian in Australia, the AIBC declared in 2003 that “Reducing the funding [for Indonesian in Australian education] sends the signal that we are not interested in communicating with our neighbours. It also places us at a disadvantage if other countries are better able to communicate with them.”

The newest bilateral organisation to emerge promoting the Australia-Indonesia relationship is the Australia-Indonesia Youth Association (AIYA), a “youth-led organisation that connects Australian students and young professionals with opportunities to develop Indonesia-related careers”. The association was established in late 2011 by four Australian National University ACICIS alumni seeking to assist recent graduates to find satisfying careers using their Indonesia-skills, by publicising job opportunities, career tips and internships in Indonesia.

Various organisations promote and support the teaching and learning of languages in general. Of particular relevance to this report is the Languages and Cultures Network for Australian Universities (LCNAU), established in 2011 with ALTC support to raise the profile of language educators and public awareness of the cultural, strategic and economic importance of language education for Australia. LCNAU was one response to the 2007 report “Languages in Crisis” which highlighted how critical the learning and teaching of languages other than English had already become in Australian universities. It had noted that, of the 66 languages offered at Australian universities in 1997, only 29 remained in 2007. Nine languages are offered at only one university, and only seven are well represented. The LCNAU network aims to link staff across the languages sector, to increase systematic and regular collaboration and exchange.

A comprehensive strategy for strengthening Indonesian in Australian universities would sensibly engage with, and seek support from, all such organisations and stakeholders in the process.

---

3 Read 2002: 64-99 provides an excellent overview of the history of Indonesian language teaching in Australia.
5 This particular quotation is from the “Funding Agreement between the Commonwealth of Australia as represented by the Minister for Tertiary Education and Murdoch University regarding funding under the Commonwealth Grant Scheme in respect of the 2012 grant year”, specifically “Part C: Other conditions and requirements, Clause 13.5”, but similar wording is standard in such agreements with universities. The document states that “Nationally Strategic Language” means Arabic or Indonesian and any other language notified in writing by the Commonwealth” (p.10).

A. McLaren, “Asian Languages Enrolments in Australian Higher Education, 2006-7”, unpublished report, dated 10 April 2008 (http://www.asaa.asn.au/docs/Asian%20Languages%20Report%202008.pdf, sighted 18 January 2009). McLaren notes such studies are marked by incomplete statistics and high “fail to return” rates (likely due to the increasing staff workload levels). In 2007, of the 20 Indonesian-teaching universities only 13 responded (p.2)


Appendix A lists all universities offering Indonesian in Australia.

UQ’s fixed term contract will be replaced in 2012 by a continuing Lectureship in Indonesian, raising the number of such positions in Queensland and NT to four.

Kohler and Mahnken 2010:5-6.


Read, 2002:64.


A UK study found that the unemployment rate (6 months after graduation) for graduates in Modern Languages (2007-8) was 8%, “approximately the same as that for all students across all subjects”. http://www.cilt.org.uk/home/research_and_statistics/statistics/higher_education/graduate_employment_numbers.aspx, sighted 19 January 2012.

The ACICIS website, for example, provides extensive detail on the employment successes of graduates with in-country language experience, both in “ACICIS alumni profiles” (http://www.acicis.murdoch.edu.au/hi/profiles.html) and “Careers after ACICIS” (http://www.acicis.murdoch.edu.au/hi/alumni.html).


In the current Indonesian cabinet, Vice President Boediono completed his first degree in economics at UWA followed by a master’s degree at Monash. Minister of Tourism and Creative Economy Mari
Pangestu obtained her Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees from the ANU, and Foreign Minister Marty Natalegawa has a PhD from ANU.


For background to ASILE see: http://your.usc.edu.au/wacana/wacana.html#ASILE, sighted 22 September 2011.

RUILI does not have a website, but its in-country program details are at: http://your.usc.edu.au/wacana/lombok/lombok_information2012.html#top, sighted 22 September 2011.

The author is founder and Director of ACICIS.


The LCNAU website is: http://www.lcnau.org/, sighted 11 January 2012.
SECTION 3: STRATEGIES

In order to enable Australia to optimise the potential of our comprehensive partnership with Indonesia, this report recommends the Commonwealth Government reinforce its designation of Indonesian as a “Nationally Strategic Language” by the adoption of a National Indonesian Language in Universities Program (NILUP) as an urgent priority.

NILUP would consist of various components as recommended below. Of these, the major recommendations are the responsibility of government, but a number are already within the purview of universities. Taken together these NILUP recommendations are designed to strengthen Australian university Indonesian programs so they can survive the current “perfect storm”. If thus enabled, these programs have the capacity to rebound (as they did in the mid-1980s) when current impediments beyond their control weaken.

COMMONWEALTH GOVERNMENT

Read (2002:103) observes “that Indonesian as a discipline has thrived when it has received government support” and that “government initiatives have a powerful effect on language programs in universities”. Yet recent governments have shown little interest. There have been neither explicit statements, nor policies, from current or recent governments detailing their position on, or valuing of Indonesian language teaching in universities.

BIPARTISANSHIP AND LONG-TERM COMMITMENT

The success of strategies to strengthen Indonesian in particular and languages in general in Australian universities depends on a bipartisan long-term commitment by Government and Opposition to these goals. Piecemeal approaches, truncated schemes, and the politicising of language policy amidst domestic inter-party rivalries will not serve community educational interests.

RECOMMENDATION 1:

That both Government and Opposition make an explicit public commitment to supporting Indonesian language in Australian universities until 2020, and that they indicate the level of financial support they will provide for this.

FUNDING: Non-specific.

NATIONAL TASKFORCE ON INDONESIAN LANGUAGE

The proposed strategy receiving the strongest endorsement at the February 2011 National Colloquium was the formation of a national body to coordinate, advocate for, promote, and stimulate Indonesian language teaching and learning right across the education system. The concept expands the Indonesian Language Education in
Schools (ILES) working party recommended by the Kohler-Mahnken report into Indonesian in schools.  

One of the greatest challenges for Indonesian language teaching in Australia at all levels of the education system is to successfully stimulate demand. The national body could work with industry, government, media, fraternal organisations (such as those mentioned in the previous section) and the community to generate just such a stimulus. It could, for example, challenge negative images of Indonesia in Australia, a major contributing factor in the decline in enrolments, through positive promotion and advocacy. It could promote Indonesian across all educational sectors (School, VET and University) and jurisdictions.

There are several options for the constituting of such a body. The Indonesia Council, which exists within the Asian Studies Association of Australia, could be strengthened and, with appropriate resourcing by government, may fulfil this role.

However, potentially more responsive to the broad educational sector, and with greater access to government policy procedures, would be a body established by, and reporting to, national and state Ministers of Education directly, or through the Ministerial Council for Education, Early Childhood Development and Youth Affairs (MCEECDYA) and/or Ministerial Council for Tertiary Education and Employment (MCTEE). It is envisaged that the National Taskforce would be headed by a full-time Director, with a small Secretariat, and exercise primary responsibility for overseeing and monitoring the implementation of NILUP.

In addition to the specific recommendations that follow, the National Taskforce on Indonesian could fund and facilitate activities such as:

- Small-scale Indonesian Teaching and Learning innovations;
- Annual national Teaching and Learning workshops for Indonesian-teaching staff, to encourage sharing of “best practice” between teachers (perhaps integrated into ASILE conferences);
- Facilitation of benchmarking, through staff collaboration or exchanges between universities.
REVIEW OF DFAT TRAVEL ADVISORY FOR INDONESIA

As noted above, the current level and wording of the DFAT Travel Advisory for Indonesia has proved a major impediment to educational exchanges. While recognising the importance responsibility the government has in advising citizens travelling abroad, there appears considerable scope for the wording to be more nuanced, and to state explicitly that the advisory is not intended to be interpreted as a ban on educational travel to Indonesia.

Given that educational institutions wishing to facilitate student travel to Indonesia often encounter difficulty in gaining satisfactory insurance, there would be considerable benefit in the government assisting to overcome this impediment, through negotiation with the insurance industry.

RECOMMENDATION 3:

➢ That the Government undertake a review of the wording and impact of the DFAT Travel Advisory for Indonesia, with a view to making it more nuanced, and noting explicitly that the advice is not intended to be interpreted as a ban upon educational exchanges with Indonesia; and
➢ that the Government collaborate with the insurance industry to assist those educational institutions wishing to travel to Indonesia to gain access to appropriate insurance cover.

FUNDING: Non-specific.

NATIONAL ASIAN LANGUAGES AND STUDIES IN SCHOOLS PROGRAM

Significantly, in February 1994 the Prime Minister, Premiers and Chief Ministers at the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) meeting endorsed a Working Group report\(^2\) to establish and fund the National Asian Languages and Studies in Australian Schools (NALSAS) Strategy as a cooperative initiative of the Commonwealth, State and Territory Governments.\(^3\) NALSAS aimed to improve participation and proficiency levels in the four
targeted Asian languages – Japanese, Modern Standard Chinese, Indonesian and Korean – and to support the studies of Asia across the curriculum. Although initially projected to run until at least 2006, the program was terminated prematurely by the Howard Government in 2002, by which time the Australian Government had provided over $208 million to support NALSAS, and doubled enrolments in the target Asian languages.

In 2008 then Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Education Julia Gillard announced $62.4 million (over 2008-12) for a revived National Asian Languages and Studies in Schools Program (NALSSP). The Program was instituted in response to concerns that “less than 14 per cent of Australian Year 12 students are studying a foreign language. Only 5.8 per cent are studying Asian languages in Year 12. And at university the proportion studying Asian languages is even lower – at 3 per cent.” NALSSP aimed to have at least 12 per cent of students exit Year 12 by 2020 with a sufficient competence in one of the target Asian languages (Mandarin, Japanese, Indonesian and Korean) to enable them to participate in trade and commerce in Asia and/or in university study. With no new government funding allocated for NALSSP in the 2011-12 Budget and the disbanding of the Program’s Reference Group, it would appear NALSSP will cease operations in 2012, eight years before the target year of 2020.

If Australia is to achieve the NALSSP goal of having at least 12 per cent of students exit Year 12 by 2020 with appropriate competence in one of the target Asian languages, NALSSP must be adequately funded until at least 2020.

While NALSSP was not targeted at universities, several benefited from NALSSP grants to stimulate language learning in the schools sector, and most would benefit from increased flow-on of post-Year 12 enrolments in the designated languages supported by NALSSP.

**RECOMMENDATION 4:**

That the National Asian Languages and Studies in Schools Program (at least for Indonesian) be maintained and extended, with a government commitment until at least 2020, at a funding level at least equivalent to, and preferably higher than, the initial triennium.

**FUNDING:** $20 million p.a.

**BASE FUNDING REVIEW**

Under DEEWR’s current funding model for Commonwealth Supported Places (CSP), the level of funding provided for each Equivalent Full-Time Student Load (EFTSL) varies according to specific discipline clusters, and consists of two components: (a) the Commonwealth Contribution under the Commonwealth Grants Scheme (CGS) and (b) the Student Contribution administered through the Higher Education Contribution Scheme (HECS).
As a foreign language, Indonesian falls within a cluster funded at the level of 1.6 times that of general Humanities subjects, or $16,274 for each equivalent full-time student load (EFTSL).

Table 5: CGS funding clusters and maximum student contributions for an equivalent full-time student load, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline/Funding Cluster</th>
<th>Commonwealth Contribution</th>
<th>Maximum Student Contribution</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Maximum HECS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law/Accounting/Economics/Administration/Commerce</td>
<td>$1,793</td>
<td>$9,080</td>
<td>$10,873</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>$4,973</td>
<td>$5,442</td>
<td>$10,415</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics*/Statistics*</td>
<td>$8,808</td>
<td>$4,355</td>
<td>$13,163</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing/Built Environment/Other health</td>
<td>$8,808</td>
<td>$7,756</td>
<td>$16,564</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Science/Social Studies</td>
<td>$8,808</td>
<td>$5,442</td>
<td>$14,250</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education†</td>
<td>$9,164</td>
<td>$5,442</td>
<td>$14,606</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Psychology/Foreign Languages/Visual &amp; Performing Arts</td>
<td>$10,832</td>
<td>$5,442</td>
<td>$16,274</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Health</td>
<td>$10,832</td>
<td>$7,756</td>
<td>$18,588</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing†</td>
<td>$12,083</td>
<td>$5,442</td>
<td>$17,525</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science*</td>
<td>$15,398</td>
<td>$4,555</td>
<td>$19,953</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering/Surveying</td>
<td>$15,398</td>
<td>$7,756</td>
<td>$23,154</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>$19,542</td>
<td>$7,756</td>
<td>$27,298</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine/Dentistry/Veterinary Science</td>
<td>$19,542</td>
<td>$9,080</td>
<td>$28,622</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1687</strong></td>
<td><strong>1645</strong></td>
<td><strong>1593</strong></td>
<td><strong>1554</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Current National Priority Disciplines
† Includes funding for clinical placements and teaching practicum


In October 2010 the Minister for Tertiary Education, Senator Chris Evans, commissioned a review of the current university funding model chaired by former South Australian Education Minister Dr Jane Lomax-Smith and known as the Base Funding Review. Several of the submissions to the Review noted that funding provided for foreign languages was insufficient. The ANU’s College of Arts and Social Sciences submission, for example, argued that “languages” was one of “four discipline areas [in the Arts and Social Sciences] in which the relative costs of delivering undergraduate education is not adequately covered by the current funding”.  

The Review’s final report, presented to the Minister in October 2011, made a number of very positive recommendations. It argued the “average level of base funding per place should be increased to improve the quality of higher education teaching and to maximise the sector’s potential to contribute to national productivity and economic
growth” (p.xix). It further noted that unless funding provided to universities matched the costs of course delivery “it is conceivable that there may be pressure to reduce or abolish underfunded disciplines”. While recommending a simplification of clusters, it retains the 1.6 loading for foreign languages (p.61).

Table 6: Indicative new clusters (Stage 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative new clusters</th>
<th>Indicative relativities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law, accounting, administration, economics, commerce, humanities</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other health, education, behavioural science (including social work), social studies</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built environment, mathematics, statistics, computing, clinical psychology, allied health, foreign languages, visual and performing arts, nursing</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering, science, surveying, environmental science</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry, medicine, veterinary science, agriculture</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Higher Education Base Funding Review: Final Report, p.61

However, if adopted as government policy, the Report’s recommendation that students pay a uniform 40 per cent of the cost of their degree would have a potentially very negative impact on Indonesian, increasing by 20 percent the HECS (Higher Education Contribution Scheme) fee paid (from $5,648 to $6,756). To avoid undermining language enrolments, the government will need to implement compensatory initiatives in areas of strategic importance. Having designated Indonesian (and Arabic) as a “strategically important language”, the Commonwealth should adjust the Base Funding model to include “strategically important languages” in the new cluster with an indicative relativity of 2.0.

RECOMMENDATION 5:

- That, in responding to the Final Report of the Higher Education Base Funding Review, the Commonwealth increase the level of base funding per place and support “nationally strategic languages” (Indonesian and Arabic) by including them in the funding cluster with an indicative relativity of 2.0, so as to better meet the actual costs of teaching nationally strategic languages in the contemporary university setting.

- That, if the Commonwealth accepts the Base Funding Review’s recommendation for a uniform 40 per cent HECS contribution across the board, the targeted compensation scholarship program (see below) be adjusted to avoid the negative impact of this HECS increase upon Indonesian language enrolments.

FUNDING: Non-specific.
SCHOLARSHIPS TO STIMULATE DEMAND

When seeking to meet a national strategic need for particular expertise, it would be sensible to encourage students to select such studies by providing a range of incentives.

One frequently suggested strategy to stimulate student demand for Indonesian is a HECS waiver for such language units. The danger in such a model is that funding is then unlikely to flow through to universities for such HECS-free places, with universities effectively teaching such students for free. In noting there was “no compelling evidence that lowering student contributions for the purpose of increasing enrolments in areas of skills shortages has any significant impact” (p.xiv) the Base Funding Review argued for “more targeted measures to address skill shortages”.

However, Professor Ian Chubb, the nation’s Chief Scientist and former Vice Chancellor of the Australian National University, has taken a diametrically opposed view of the benefits of targeted student support to strengthen strategic disciplines. He urged the government to offer scholarships, for example, to encourage more undergraduates to study science because not enough are choosing to follow scientific careers.

While a HECS waiver alone may be insufficient to stimulate demand, an integrated package of more focussed measures could, and should, be applied to stimulate demand for Indonesian through the development of an Indonesian specialist scholarship scheme. This could:

- Cover the full HECS-fees for the Indonesian component of the degree over three or four years;
- Require a one or two semester period of study in-country to ensure high levels of fluency are achieved by graduation;
- Include a component to compensate students who are required to relocate from their home in order to undertake an Indonesian language major (if, e.g., Indonesian is not available in their home town or region because of the closure of a local program);
- Be adjusted in amount to compensate for any increase in Foreign Languages HECs fees that may flow from the Base Funding Review.

RECOMMENDATION 6:

That an Indonesian Specialist Scholarship Scheme be established to support undergraduate students undertaking a major in Indonesian which includes a year of in-country study; and that the value of the scholarships be sufficient to cover the full HECS costs of the Indonesian component of a recipient’s degree.

FUNDING: $2.1 million p.a. (Assuming cluster HECS-HELP of $6,756 p.a., with 300 EFTSL p.a. opting to take a major including in-country study).
LECTURESHIPS TO SUPPORT A “NATIONALLY STRATEGIC LANGUAGE”

The 2008 *Review of Australian Higher Education: Final Report*, chaired by Professor Denise Bradley, recommended that government funding for higher education follow student demand, effectively allowing student demand to determine funding priorities. Such a position ignores the importance of the government identifying and supporting national priority areas and strategic needs, and consequently risks undermining Australia’s expertise in Indonesian at a time when Indonesian economic and strategic importance to Australia are profoundly evident. In the case of an identified area of national strategic priority, specific initiatives need to be funded to stimulate student demand.

Despite the recognition in DEEWR funding agreements with Australian universities that Indonesian is a “nationally strategic language”, no dedicated funding support is provided to assist the maintenance and development of Indonesian language programs.

In virtually all Australian universities teaching Indonesian the number of teaching positions has contracted, with retiring or departing staff not being replaced. In five of the current 15 universities with autonomous Indonesian programs, staffing has dwindled to a single continuing staff member.

Such a staffing pattern is unsustainable. It leaves no capacity to build numbers by promoting and advocating on behalf of Indonesian on campus, in feeder schools, or in the community at large to create increased demand. The rebuilding of Indonesian nationally must be based upon re-staffing Indonesian programs in our universities so that staff are able not only to supply the teaching, but also have the capacity (with appropriate time, strategies and support) to promote and market Indonesian language studies actively into schools and the community, thereby stimulating demand.

RECOMMENDATION 7:
That direct, targeted Commonwealth funding be provided for (up to) 15 new lectureships to teach Indonesian language, for a minimum of five years.

In order to maximise the benefit of such re-investment:

- universities seeking such funding must be currently offering an Indonesian language program;
- the lectureships must be in addition to any current continuing/tenured position(s), and not used to replace or fund existing positions;
- universities must agree to continue funding the lectureships for at least a further five years after conclusion of Commonwealth funding; and
- universities agree to allocate a minimum of 20 per cent of the lecturer’s workload/time for advocacy and promotion of Indonesian into schools and the community, and for the development of school “feeder” programs to encourage students to continue with Indonesian from schools to university.

FUNDING: (Up to) $10 million in total. ($2 million p.a. for five years.)
COMMONWEALTH DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING FUNDING IN THE 1990S

Commonwealth Department of Education funding in the 1990s supported the development of the most innovative package of Indonesian teaching materials used in Australia, known as the National TIFL (Teaching Indonesian as a Foreign Language) materials, under the direction of Associate Professor David Reeve. The incorporation of these innovative TIFL materials into classroom teaching is regarded as one factor stimulating demand for Indonesian during the 1990s. While some TIFL components remain useful, the development of a package of new contemporary materials, employing the full repertoire of technologies now available, would be extremely valuable and timely.

The limits of the market mean commercial publishers are reluctant to invest in the development of a university-level text or teaching package. No such suitable commercial package for Australian university learners is available. Several universities use unpublished materials, called The Indonesian Way, being developed by Dr George Quinn (available through the RUILI website) and being adapted for online delivery by Professor Uli Kozok (University of Hawai’i). This might form the basis of a comprehensive national package. An informal working group called IRIT (Indonesian Resources Initiatives at Tertiary level) including staff from UNSW@ADFA, the Australian National University, the University of Tasmania, Charles Darwin University, and Flinders University has begun working collaboratively to further develop this Quinn material but support would be required to optimise this initiative.

Supporting and expanding this into a national collaborative project, blending linguistic and pedagogical research, with the practical outcome of a package of adult university teaching and learning materials would be extremely valuable. Ideally this would involve a team of specialists with skills in socio-linguistics, information technologies, language pedagogy and current teaching methodologies, along with consultants with skills in contemporary Indonesian culture, politics, and society.

RECOMMENDATION 8:

That the Government support the development of a set of contemporary university-level Indonesian teaching and learning materials.

FUNDING: $350,000 p.a. for two years, totalling $700,000.

NATIONAL DIGITAL LEARNING RESOURCES NETWORK (NDLRN) FOR INDONESIAN

One of the strongest recommendations to have emerged from the February 2011 National Colloquium was the establishment of an Indonesian teaching resources “bank”, into which university staff could deposit materials and from which they could also extract materials for use in their teaching.

Most practically, this could be achieved by its adoption and incorporation into the National Digital Learning Resources Network (NDLRN) being undertaken, with
Commonwealth support, by Education Services Australia (ESA). While ongoing maintenance of such a network bank would then be covered by the routine funding of the ESA which has offered in principle in-kind support to this initiative, its initial establishment would require specific support for such activities as initial customising, categorisation, meta-tagging, and uploading of existing collections of materials, training workshops for all tertiary Indonesian language teachers, and the production of a “manual” to assist these users.

It is proposed that a dedicated officer, with appropriate technical and administrative skills, be appointed to establish the Indonesian tertiary teaching resources bank, funded separately from, but liaising closely with, ESA.

Technically, such a resources bank could be achieved by the NDLRN hosting an Indonesian Tertiary Materials group on “Scootle” as a jurisdiction, onto which could be uploaded content through the NDLRN’s Sharing Exchange (SHEX). This could be viewable by the group or, preferably, content could be shared with schools nationally. The NDLRN could provide training on how to use SHEX.

**RECOMMENDATION 9:**
That the Commonwealth Government provide funding for the establishment and maintenance of an Indonesian tertiary teaching resources bank.

**FUNDING:** Salary and associated costs for administrative officer: $200,000 p.a. for three years, totalling $600,000.

**SUPPORT FOR “IN-COUNTRY” INDONESIAN STUDIES**

The 1994 Worsley Report recommended government support for in-country studies of Indonesian in the form of “a greatly expanded system of scholarships, staff/student exchange programs, work experience, temporary employment, subsidised travel and the allowance of reasonable travel costs for taxation purposes” (Recommendation 2.1). This recommendation failed to stimulate a government response. It remains highly relevant today.

Long duration in-country studies – of a semester or a year – are particularly valuable in providing deeper cultural experience, knowledge, and language competence, with ACICIS the national provider of such programs. The February 2009 DFAT Australia-Indonesia Conference in Sydney recommended that the countries “build on existing programs like ACICIS to allow students from Australia to study – and obtain academic credit from – a semester or two in Indonesia”. In his opening address to the conference then Foreign Minister Stephen Smith said “We’d very much like to see [ACICIS] expand to include more universities in eastern Indonesia and more fields of study”.

Indonesian language in Australian universities: Strategies for a stronger future
IN-COUNTRY POSTGRADUATE STUDY

While a few Asia Endeavour Awards to support periods of study and research in Asia are available for particularly high-performing postgraduates, the number potentially requiring such in-country up-skilling is increasing, and exceeds the number of Endeavour Awards available. In 2011, for example, of the 20 Prime Minister’s Australia-Asia Outgoing Postgraduate Awards were given, only two were allocated for studies in Indonesia, with four in 2012.

RECOMMENDATION 10:
That the Commonwealth Government provide recurrent funding for the Australian Consortium for “In-Country” Indonesian Studies (ACICIS) to increase the number of Australians studying in Indonesia for one or two semesters by expanding quality accredited study programs in strategic fields.

FUNDING: $1.5 million p.a.

AUSTRALIA-INDONESIA POSTGRADUATE SCHOLAR-INSTRUCTORS

There are currently two major scholarship programs assisting Indonesian nationals undertake postgraduate training in Australia:

- The Australian Development Scholarship (ADS) program is a major component of Australia’s aid program to Indonesia managed by AusAID. About 11,000 scholarships have been provided to Indonesians over more than 50 years, with 400 scholarships now offered annually (2012), normally for a maximum of two years for Masters students and four years for Doctoral students.¹⁴

- The Indonesian Ministry of National Education’s Higher Education Directorate (DIKTI) provides an average of 250 Masters and Doctoral scholarships each year to support Indonesian university staff undertaking postgraduate study in Australia.

Priority areas for such scholarships include Education and Training, and Education Management, and English language competence is required for all further studies. Recipients of both AusAID and DIKTI scholarships include those undertaking postgraduate studies in second-language acquisition and pedagogy.

RECOMMENDATION 11:
That funds be provided for the development and maintenance of in-country programs to provide intensive Indonesian language training for postgraduate research students, and that such training be funded as part of their postgraduate program.

FUNDING: $1 million p.a., assuming $25,000 per semester for 40 students.
The governments of Indonesia and Australia could mutually support Indonesian language teaching in Australia and provide valuable “work-integrated learning”, by enabling postgraduates specialising in second-language acquisition to gain experience as a language teaching assistant (or scholar-instructor) while on scholarship. This would be possible if the funding bodies would extend their scholarships (e.g. for up to two years) while integrating into their postgraduate program periods of time teaching Indonesian in Australian universities under the mentorship of their postgraduate supervisors or senior Indonesian-teaching staff.

Such experience as a scholar-instructor would enhance their practical skills in second-language acquisition while simultaneously improving their academic English skills in the Australian university context. Such recipients would then return to Indonesia with enhanced capacity to improve second-language acquisition programs in Indonesia. Funding would be required to provide appropriate pedagogical skills, mentoring, and training.

RECOMMENDATION 12:
That the governments of Indonesia and Australia agree on a scheme whereby:

- AusAID and the Indonesian Higher Education Directorate (DIKTI) identify from their scholarship programs up to 20 recipients annually with expertise in second-language acquisition to assist in the teaching of Indonesian in Australian universities while being mentored as part of their postgraduate experience; and

- the scholarships of these “Australia-Indonesia Postgraduate Scholar-Instructors” be extended by AusAID and DIKTI for an additional period of up to two years to support such teaching.

FUNDING: $1 million p.a. (approximately $50,000 p.a. per student at 20 students).

COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND BUSINESS SPONSORSHIP

While the primary responsibility for NILUP lies with the Commonwealth Government and with universities, there are important roles for other stakeholders.

Increasingly Australian universities are having to find sources of income beyond that provided by government, with public finding as a share of university revenue falling from about 60 per cent in 1996 to 40 per cent in 2006. The Final Report of the Higher Education Base Funding Review noted that in 2010, base funding from the Government contributed only about 35 per cent of universities’ total revenue with other important sources including “income from full fee–paying domestic and international students, income for research activity (from both government and non-government sources), contracts and consultancies, property and investment income, and donations and bequests”.15 Universities are more assertively seeking, and relying upon, private and corporate contributions and sponsorships for research and teaching positions.
While some language communities in Australia endow or sustain teaching positions for their particular community language, there are no such positions in Indonesian. Indonesian programs rarely if ever benefit from any philanthropic support from either the Indonesian government or the local Indonesian community. While such circumstances are unlikely to change in the immediate future there may be a role here for the Indonesian Embassy in diplomatically encouraging community support.

Given that businesses involved in the Australia-Indonesia economic partnership derive a benefit from the experience, skills and training brought to them by recruited employees, it may be a sound business decision to provide financial support to the teaching of Indonesian in Australia. Statistics on current levels of corporate financial support for educational institutions (together with the related sphere of corporate and individual philanthropy) are imprecise. Yet it is not uncommon for mining companies, as an example, to support a Chair in mining or mineral engineering as these positions are seen to improve the quality of graduates available to the industry and the recruits available to the company. By contrast, there are currently no positions in Australian universities in the field of Indonesian language or studies supported by corporate sponsorship.

Australian business needs to be convinced of the value of building Indonesian literacy into the human resource profile of Australian staff (just as they build English and Western business culture into the development of their local personnel in Indonesia). The business case may vary according to the sector of the economy. This process of convincing business of its role in supporting language education would involve a range of stakeholders – governments, peak industry associations, business groups like the AIBC – and the evidence of successful participating businesses which provide the model for other companies, demonstrating the business rationale for such investment.

Some Australian business executives have highlighted Indonesia’s policy of limiting the number and duration of Australian staff they were permitted to employ in Indonesia (even if they were competent Indonesian speakers). While designed to encourage the employment of locals, this was regarded as discouraging businesses from investing in Indonesian-speaking Australian recruits, and by extension may deter companies from sponsoring Indonesian programs in Australian universities. In its submission to IA-CEPA, the AIBC flagged that “the free movement of skilled personnel between the two countries and their legal right to work in each country” is essential to the Agreement’s success. To the extent that such immigration policies represent an implicit barrier to trade and investment – and hence become a disincentive both to students learning Indonesian and to companies investing in Indonesian language programs – business may seek to include such issues in the IA-CEPA negotiations.
For its part, the Indonesian government could indirectly encourage Australian companies to support Indonesian language programs in Australia by offering companies that demonstrate such support more latitude in employing (Indonesian-speaking) Australian staff in Indonesia.

**RECOMMENDATION 13:**

That the Government (through the National Taskforce on Indonesian Language) provide a framework to encourage business support for Indonesian programs by:

- working with the relevant peak business associations to promote corporate support for the teaching of Indonesian in Australian universities; and
- including, within the Indonesia-Australia Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement (IA-CEPA) negotiations, consideration of new reciprocal working visa provisions which would allow for a freer flow of university-qualified professionals between the two countries and would eliminate the current impediments encountered by companies wanting to employ Australian staff with Indonesian language skills.

**FUNDING:** No specific government funding required; achievable within the framework of current ongoing bilateral negotiations.

**UNIVERSITY-BASED STRATEGIES**

University teaching of Indonesian does not take place in isolation from, but relates directly to, the learning of languages in schools and other educational institutions. Many universities have already implemented a range of strategies to support and encourage the learning of Indonesian and other languages, but several of those strategies could productively be adopted in other universities where such support may not yet be available. Some of the suggestions that follow could be applied equally to all languages; they are tagged here specifically for Indonesian because that is the particular focus of this report. In many cases, if universities wished to implement the strategy it would require the provision of increased administrative support for those teaching the language.

**COMMUNITY AND SCHOOL LIAISON**

University Indonesian-teaching staff who build strong links into the secondary school system in their catchment area generally attract a larger flow of post-Year 12 students (or students who have had some prior learning of Indonesian even if not through to Year 12). These links might take the form of occasional visits and motivational talks to local schools; inviting school groups to campus for “Indonesia Day” activities (such as Indonesian traditional arts like gamelan and angklung, or more contemporary popular culture, games, language activities, or supplementary classes); providing Year 12 students with formal language instruction as part of a first year undergraduate language cohort on campus.
Staff often feel there is little incentive to put time into building such connections with schools and the general community because these tasks are not recognised in the calculation of university workload or career promotion.

**RECOMMENDATION 14:**
That universities provide incentives for Indonesian-language teaching staff to build strong links with schools in their catchment area; and recognise such duties in the calculation of staff workload.

**FUNDING:** Moderate university allocation required.

**IMPROVED YEAR 12 PATHWAYS**

In addition to general community and school liaison, specific academic programs to strengthen learning pathways into Indonesian at university are proving productive in encouraging more students into particular universities.

UTAS, for example, is piloting an innovative program by which senior high school students undertake Indonesian language studies through the University, with such studies subsequently creditable to a UTAS degree. The UTAS Colleges Language Program (CLP) “provides college students with concurrent enrolment at UTAS, and enables them to gain a result in first year Level 100 units in the Associate Degree in Arts [which] can also count towards a number of other degrees at UTAS and at other universities.” The permitted two Level 100 units equate to 25 per cent of a first year UTAS load.19

**RECOMMENDATION 15:**
That universities consider establishing specific Year 12 pathways for Indonesian along the lines of the University of Tasmania’s Colleges Language Program, to strengthen Indonesian at both senior school and university level.

**FUNDING:** $2.25 million to establish (Assuming $150,000 x 15 universities). Maintained by recurrent university funding for Commonwealth Supported Places.

**LANGUAGE (LOTE) BONUS**

As noted above, there are currently declining numbers of students studying Indonesian in Year 12, of whom a relatively small number continue with Indonesian at university. Those who do continue with Indonesian language studies at university are generally placed into the second year of a university major. Acknowledging substantial variations between universities, commonly a second year unit of about 15 students would include only about two who have entered directly from a Year 12 course. However, these numbers will rise if Indonesian becomes more popular in upper secondary years. The challenge is to encourage students to maintain their language studies into Year 12 and provide incentives for them to continue to higher levels of competence at university.
While the situation for Indonesian language is more grave than most, the teaching and learning of non-English languages in general in Australian universities has been regarded widely across the sector as under threat. The Group of Eight universities and the Australian Academy of the Humanities, for example, convened a National Languages Summit in Canberra on 7 June 2007 in response to “the urgent need for policy leadership and action on Australia’s language capability”. The Summit echoed the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry’s April 2007 policy paper, *Skills for a Nation — A Blueprint for Improving Education and Training 2007-2017*, which recommended “to effectively participate in a globalised world there should be the compulsory learning of a foreign language from seven years of age or earlier.”

Recognising the particular difficulties of advanced language study, some universities add “bonus” marks to Year 12 University entrance scores for passes in Languages Other Than English (LOTE). For example, students applying to UQ through the Queensland Tertiary Admissions Centre (QTAC) are awarded two bonus points (on a 1-99 scale, to which all Australian Year 12 results can be converted) towards their entry rank for passing an approved LOTE (with a similar two bonus points also available for passing the relevant Mathematics exam). Such a LOTE bonus is widely regarded as making language studies more attractive at upper school level, and encouraging students to continue their language studies into university. At least 8 (of 15) Indonesian-teaching universities have some variant of a LOTE incentive scheme or were introducing one in 2011. The Go8 have declared particular support for a Language Bonus (although the specific form of “bonus” adopted varies considerably).

**RECOMMENDATION 16:**

That universities without a Languages Other Than English (LOTE) bonus adopt one and that such LOTE bonuses be standardised across the sector and simplified.

**FUNDING:** No additional funding required. Initiative could be promoted by universities individually or collaborating within each state/jurisdiction.

**“LANGUAGE ENTITLEMENT”**

Particular international universities such as the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), London, have a policy that all students are entitled to include a language in their undergraduate degree, whatever their specialisation. As an incentive, under SOAS’ language entitlement, undergraduate students may take one term’s language classes free of charge. Similarly, since 2010 the London School of Economics and Politics (LSE) has a Language Policy which stresses “the importance of language skills not only for employability but also for intellectual value”, includes an exhortation to learn a language by the LSE Director, “clear statements of support for languages in all relevant promotional materials”, and commitment to being “not just a multi-national university but also a multi-lingual one”.

The concept of a “language entitlement” establishes the principle that language learning is the right of any student and requires the university to enable this. As Lowy Institute
Executive Director Dr Michael Wesley has argued, “universities should be encouraged to present multilingualism as basic to education as literacy, numeracy or computer skills”.26

**RECOMMENDATION 17:**
That universities adopt a Language Policy and promote the principle that students have a “language entitlement”.

**FUNDING:** Minimal; manageable within existing university budgets.

## CONCURRENT LANGUAGE QUALIFICATION

As enrolments in specialist Indonesian language degrees decline, it is sensible to ensure students from the widest possible array of disciplines and faculties are able to incorporate Indonesian language studies into their degrees. Business leaders, for example, stressed that the employability of Indonesian-speaking graduates would be greatly enhanced if they had a major in Business. In practice, professional degrees such as Business are often very rigidly structured with little capacity to incorporate a double major in a language (for example). If there is insufficient space to incorporate a language as part of a non-specialist degree, one strategy used effectively in many universities is a concurrent language qualification (often called a Diploma/Graduate Diploma of Indonesian/Languages).

Staff at one Go8 university reported that the concurrent diploma was a particularly valuable method of supporting high-performing students with Year 12 LOTE to maintain their language study despite undertaking a high-demand degree with little space for electives.

If not currently doing so, universities could encourage greater enrolments in languages by offering a concurrent qualification so a student may complete their particular degree together with an Indonesian language sequence. An “in-country” semester or “between semester” units may offer a study format which would be particularly suited to a concurrent language diploma.

**RECOMMENDATION 18:**
That universities not currently doing so make concurrent Indonesian language qualifications available to students.

**FUNDING:** Not required. Individual universities to implement.

## MAXIMISING THE VISIBILITY AND IMPACT OF INDONESIA-RELATED CAPACITY

Universities already have at their disposal a variety of methods to improve the visibility and effectiveness of their Indonesia-related capacity. Some universities have found it valuable to have a specific “Indonesia Interest Group” linking all academic staff teaching Indonesian.
about, or conducting research in or about, Indonesia. (An excellent example of this the Melbourne University Indonesia Forum which publishes a comprehensive annual report listing Indonesia-related activities at the university.) Such a Group might meet periodically for discussions or academic seminars, or simply share news and information about staff and student activities via a dedicated Indonesia emailing list. In some universities, the Group receives support funding (e.g. from the International office, or Chancellery) to assist its activities.

Such an Indonesia Interest Group could facilitate the routine updating of staff on developments within the university relating to Indonesia, thereby assisting the university to implement a more coherent and integrated “Indonesia engagement” strategy, drawing on expertise and interest right across the institution. Specifically in relation to Indonesian-teaching staff, an Indonesia Interest Group and emailing list might raise their visibility and make them more available to, and hence more valued by, their colleagues with Indonesia interests residing elsewhere in the university.

Experience suggests the visibility and consequent viability of an Indonesian language program within a university was enhanced by the university featuring a webpage providing details of all the university’s collaborative links and activities associated with Indonesia, including its language programs. An Indonesian language program with strong collegial links with other sections of the university engaged in Indonesia – including research or teaching about/in Indonesia – was generally regarded as enhancing the overall benefits to the university of its engagement with Indonesia.

The web page might include such things as: teaching units; research linkages and projects relating to Indonesia; staff working mainly on Indonesia; visiting fellows or postgraduates from Indonesia; visits to Indonesia by staff, or to the university by Indonesian visitors.  

Indonesian language units were less vulnerable if senior decision-makers in the university agreed that language units formed an integral part of comprehensive linkages with Indonesia, which benefited the university overall.
STAFFING PROFILE AND REPRESENTATION

Respondents had varying views on the ideal staffing profile for an Indonesian language program. Some believed only language specialists with linguistic and specialised pedagogical training (and ideally doctorates) should be employed to teach at tertiary level. Others argued that scholars who were fluent in Indonesian but whose academic expertise was in another discipline could be very effective language teachers, providing valuable social and political context to classroom learning. A mix of both backgrounds and skills was generally regarded as beneficial.

Evidently staff solely teaching Indonesian language (particularly those who were not “research active”) were frequently regarded poorly by their colleagues as “just teachers” rather than “real academics” or “scholars”. This tended to apply irrespective of whether the individual had postgraduate (or even doctoral) qualifications in linguistics or language teaching, or not. Such attitudes to language teachers have been exacerbated by the increased emphasis on research productivity measurement within universities generated by various external benchmarking exercises (such as the Australian Research Council’s Excellence in Research for Australia, ERA).

LCNAU has been very critical of increased casualisation and what it termed the “juniorisation” of language-teaching staff. Low professional status tends to make language teachers ineffective lobbyists for their field, and relatively vulnerable within a university’s structures of power. Small class sizes for Indonesian often result in longer hours in front of a class than might be the case in more popular subject areas. Some staff complain they are excluded from decision-making and from such professional benefits as academic study leave or conference funding.

A major factor in the perceived viability of an Indonesian language program – and the regard in which it was held by colleagues – was the extent to which teaching staff were effectively represented by a senior academic advocate within faculty and university

RECOMMENDATION 19:
That those universities that are not yet doing so maximise the visibility and effectiveness of their Indonesia-related capacity by:

- undertaking a census of staff with links to Indonesia;
- establishing an “Indonesia Interest Group” and emailing list to:
  - ensure all relevant staff are informed about Indonesia-related developments in the university;
  - maximise the cumulative benefits of their Indonesia-related expertise in teaching and research; and
- developing a specific “Indonesia window” webpage which highlights the range of their Indonesia-related activities.

FUNDING: Minimal; manageable through established university budgets.
decision-making processes. It is not uncommon – even in Arts Faculties and certainly it is often the norm at university level – to find senior administrators and decision-makers who are monolingual with little appreciation of the benefits of languages other than English.

Indonesian-teaching staff frequently felt confused about how the cluster funding filtered down to the actual budget allocated by their university to the teaching of Indonesian. Suspicions were common that the full cluster loading (currently 1.6) did not flow through to language teaching.

**RECOMMENDATION 20:**

That, in their staff practices and policies, universities:

- ensure that faculty and departmental structures provide appropriate representation for (Indonesian) language teaching staff, with equal opportunities for professional development, academic study leave and financial support to maintain an active scholarly and research career; and
- ensure that administrators provide teaching staff with accurate information on the funding model as it relates to Indonesian teaching, and pass on the full cluster weighting to Indonesian language teaching units.

**FUNDING:** Minimal; manageable within existing university budgets.

**STRATEGIES DISCOUNTED**

In evaluating and selecting the recommendations for NILUP, a range of other possible strategies were considered and rejected. The Discussion Paper produced for the February 2011 National Colloquium on Indonesian language in Australian Universities proposed a variety of possible strategies for consideration at that meeting. Several proposals failed to gain general support; they warrant comment here as examples of strategies which are therefore not endorsed by this report.

The concept of a Key Centre for Indonesian (language) Studies was regarded by respondents as likely to attract government support (following the funding of comparable centres for China at the ANU and India at Melbourne). However, more convincing was the counter-argument that the establishment of a single national centre risks undermining the strength of existing Indonesian programs at a time when Australia’s strength in Indonesian studies lies precisely in our diversity and geographical spread.

The negative experience of the Netherlands was relevant. In the 1980s the Dutch government encouraged the closure of small Indonesian studies programs in universities around the country in order to centralise offerings in a single – but then well-staffed – program at Leiden University. Ultimately, even in a country as compact as the Netherlands the number of additional students from other locations attracted to the Leiden Indonesian program was insufficient, with the result that it contracted over time. Staff numbers declined from about 12 to a low of 3.5 FTE in two university
restructurings in 2004 and 2007-8, until rising slightly to approximately 4.5 FTE with the appointment of Dr David Henley as Professor of Contemporary Indonesia Studies in 2010. Indonesian has been broadened to Southeast Asian studies and amalgamated with South Asian Studies. The Netherlands now produces only a handful of Indonesian language graduates, with first year Indonesian language enrolments in 2009 dropping to only five students.

By contrast, Germany has fostered a diverse range of Indonesian language courses, with more than ten state-funded universities teaching Indonesian spread throughout the country. It has maintained a steady stream of graduates from each program (usually about 20 joining first year in each institution), and has turned this diversity into a strong comparative advantage internationally.

The Colloquium did not consider developing a national core curriculum for Indonesian a priority. The associated concept of a national proficiency scale for Indonesian, while of some benefit, was regarded as requiring considerable staff input without stimulating language uptake. Similarly, while designating a single national provider for external Indonesian courses might be a cheaper way to teach externally, it would have the effect of weakening certain smaller universities that are currently able to boost their student load through external teaching. Limiting the number of such external providers would imperil some current programs, and reduce the current geographical spread of Indonesian programs.

**EVALUATION OF COLLABORATION MODELS**

Collaboration between universities to offer common language courses is frequently proposed by university administrators as a logical strategy for greater efficiencies. However, problems abound and successful examples are rare.

The Brisbane Universities Languages Hub (BULH) whereby the University of Queensland (UQ), Griffith University and Queensland University of Technology (QUT) rationalised the provision of a variety of languages, was a bold experiment. Under this collaboration Indonesian language in Brisbane is concentrated solely at UQ with students from Griffith (which had ceased new Indonesian enrolments around 2008) and QUT (where it had previously been available) now undertaking classes through UQ. After a clear drop in total Indonesian enrolments in the first year of BULH, there has been a rebound, with total enrolments rising from 7.13 EFTSL in 2009 to 16.25 EFTSL in 2011, of which about 20 per cent were cross-enrolments from outside UQ. However, despite this growth, the 2011 enrolments do not yet appear to equal those achieved separately by the various programs prior to the collaboration. While staff have strived to make the enrolment processes as seamless as possible, anecdotal responses suggest initial interest from non-UQ students wanes when they face timetable clashes, and time-consuming administrative and cross-enrolment procedures. Nonetheless the results for Indonesian were encouraging and across all languages were sufficient to encourage participating universities to continue the BULH when it was reviewed at the end of 2011.

The University of New England provides staffing and teaching materials to enable the University of Southern Queensland (USQ) and the University of Wollongong (UoW) to
offer Indonesian to their students in what is referred to as a “Blended Model”. While this collaboration has had the benefit of enabling Indonesian to be retained at USQ and (re-) started at UoW, with minimal investment in (only casual) staffing, the “blended model” is not an adequate substitute for a properly staffed self-sufficient Indonesian program. It can be a stop-gap strategy that sustains an offering in the short term, or a final line of defence when a program is threatened with closure or unable to attract sufficient students to warrant a full-time appointment. However, fundamentally language teaching programs require concerted and continuous staff advocacy and promotion to grow. The “blended model” alone is not sufficient for this.

Perhaps the most successful model involves Flinders University Indonesian language staff also teaching on Adelaide University campus. A Flinders University staff member is provided with an office at Adelaide University in an arrangement which has worked satisfactorily for more than 15 years. The elements for its success included: continuity of staffing and staff presence in an Adelaide University office, leading to familiarity and acceptance of the Flinders staff member, and the ability to provide on-campus student consultation and support.

Overall, evidence suggests language collaboration is extremely difficult, especially if adopted primarily for economic rather than pedagogic and academic benefits. Effective collaboration requires a confluence of institutional interests, and usually sustained Commonwealth support.

Conversely, while some administrators appeared to believe that the closure of an Indonesian program at a rival university would result in students moving to a continuing Indonesian program elsewhere, evidence suggests this is rare. More commonly, if a university closes its Indonesian program those students tend to stop learning Indonesian. Only a small minority of highly committed students will cross-enrol or relocate to continue their studies.

Students in small and struggling Indonesian programs generally indicated a considerable reluctance to move cities if their local Indonesian program closed. While some would consider continuing their studies in the external/distance mode, the high cost of relocating and the need to be close to family or employment meant many would drop Indonesian, albeit reluctantly, rather than move to attend a university offering the language.

In contrast to the difficulties noted in collaborations above, consortia of universities providing in-country studies have been remarkably successful. Both ACICIS (since 1995) and RUILI (since 2007) have proved very resilient, providing in-country Indonesian-language courses both for their member universities as well as for students in non-member universities and members of the general public. Such collaborations offer students much more than might be available if individual universities were working in competition.
IMPLEMENTATION SEQUENCING AND PRIORITIES

This report recommends that the National Taskforce on Indonesian Language oversee the implementation of NILUP, but suggests the following priority ranking of recommendations.

**Government Strategies for immediate implementation:**

- Government and Opposition explicit public commitment to Indonesian language [Recommendation 1]
- National Taskforce for Indonesian Language [Recommendation 2]
- Review of DFAT Travel Advisory [Recommendation 3]
- Continuation of National Asian Language and Studies in Schools Program [Recommendation 4]
- Increased cluster funding for Languages [Recommendation 5]
- Support for “in-country” Indonesian studies [Recommendation 10]
- Scholarships to stimulate undergraduate demand [Recommendation 6]
- National Digital Learning Resources Network for Indonesian [Recommendation 9]

**Strategies for implementation within three year period:**

- Lectureships for “nationally strategic language” [Recommendation 7]
- Australia-Indonesia Postgraduate scholar-instructors [Recommendation 12]
- National teaching materials development [Recommendation 8]
- In-country postgraduate studies [Recommendation 11]
- Government framework for business to support Indonesian teaching [Recommendation 13]

**University-level Strategies for immediate implementation:**

If they wished, individual universities already have the capacity to implement most if not all of the institution-specific recommendations in the course of their usual forward planning. The following recommendations are primarily dependent on university decision-making procedures with minimal funding required:

- Staff issues and workloads [Recommendations 14 and 20]
- Language policy and language entitlement [Recommendation 17]
- LOTE Bonus [Recommendation 16]
- Concurrent Indonesian language qualification [Recommendation 18]
Indonesia-related visibility maximisation [Recommendation 19]

The development of special Year 12 pathways [Recommendation 15] may require longer planning and funding considerations.

---

1 Kohler and Mahnken 2010:6 recommended the establishment of “an Indonesian Language Education in Schools (ILES) working party, as an expert group, to develop a detailed action plan to support Indonesian over the next three-to-five-year period, and a renewed rationale for Indonesian language study”.


5 Universities may also receive additional Regional Loadings, dependent on the institution’s size and distance from the nearest state capital, and Socio-Economic Status (SES) Loadings for students from low SES.


16 There are only two endowed positions relating to Indonesia in Australian universities: Monash University’s Herb Feith Chair for the Study of Indonesia, established in January 2007, and the yet-to-be-filled James Riady Chair for Asian Economics and Business, announced by the University of Melbourne in February 2010, reportedly established with a donation of $1.5 million from Dr James Riady.

17 A report on individual and corporate giving and volunteering in Australia (commissioned by former Department of Family and Community Services) found Australia gave 0.68% as a proportion of Gross Domestic Product.


23 These are: UNSW, UoW, Flinders, Adelaide, UQ, USQ, UWA, ANU.
27 As an example, see CDU’s http://www.cdu.edu.au/itl/index.html, sighted 23 September 2011.
29 These staff figures cover not only language but Indonesian economic history and art history.
30 Some, however, attract substantially more, with the BA in Languages and Cultures of Southeast Asia (focusing on Indonesia and Malaysia) at Goethe-University of Frankfurt, launched in October 2010, attracted about 150 students within 18 months (pers. com., Arndt Graf, 20 January 2012).
31 Joanne Winter, Collaborative Models for the Provision of Languages in Australian Universities (DASSH/CASR, February 2009) lists problems including: financial agreements; formalisation of administrative procedures across institutions including streamlining student enrolment processes; maintaining an active promotion of languages; attitudes of teaching staff to such practical components as workload calculation and even parking provisions at the host university (p.108).
SECTION 4: CONCLUSION

Many of the challenges facing Indonesian illustrate starkly the potential fate of Languages in general in our universities, and several of the recommendations made above may be applied beneficially to other languages. Yet, Indonesian throws up specific difficulties, with the various forces that operate to promote, or undermine, Indonesian in our education system frequently unique and changing. Any national Languages policy needs to be grounded upon the recognition that particular languages require specific national strategies, tailored to the individual contexts – linguistic, geo-political, socio-cultural, temporal – of the language concerned.

Even with regard to the four NALSSP languages, as a recent evaluation concluded, each faces a very different circumstance. In “History, scale of operation, support base, nature of the student group, rationale, teacher profile ... there are many marked differences across the four languages”, differences which must be taken into account in developing strategies for growth.

This report recommends a national strategic policy for Indonesian, to support the Government’s designation of Indonesian as a “nationally strategic language”, and enable Australia to realise the outcomes the Government is seeking to achieve in its partnership with Indonesia.

If the prevailing trend in enrolment data for Indonesian language within Australian universities over the past decade is projected forward – without universities and governments implementing counter-measures such as those recommended in this report – tertiary-level Indonesian language programs would disappear from Queensland by as soon as 2017. In rapid succession it would disappear by 2022 in virtually every other state in Australia with the exception of Victoria (where it would struggle on until 2027) and the Northern Territory (where its decline has been less pronounced but total enrolments are the least of any jurisdiction).

The adoption and implementation of the recommendations in this report would ensure that Indonesian language teaching and learning in Australian universities survives the current “perfect storm” and returns to growth. It would significantly enhance our national Indonesia-skills base and enable our universities to continue to compete internationally as a world leader in Indonesia-related expertise (outside of Indonesia).

Some of the recommendations put forward require specific additional Commonwealth funding. Others might be covered by current university funding, or existing grant programs. For example, while the closure of the ALTC by the Commonwealth in 2011 was regrettable, the Australian Government’s Office for Learning and Teaching (now within the Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education) continues to support innovations in tertiary learning and teaching. For 2012 at least, the core programs, awards and grants of the ALTC continue in some form
under the OLT,\(^1\) providing a potential source of support for Indonesian language initiatives.

In addition, the Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA), the independent authority developing the new national curriculum, is including LOTE in the Australian Curriculum for schools.\(^2\) In that context, while it appears NALSSP will be terminated and while ACARA’s brief is for the school (not university) sector, some limited funds may be available to universities undertaking programs relevant to the Australian Curriculum (including through Education Services Australia\(^3\)).

Major recommendations will need specific Commonwealth investment at a time of declared fiscal restraint. A compelling argument can be made, however, that such expenditure would be strategic, and repaid handsomely through our enhanced economic relationship with Indonesia, where our unique national expertise in Indonesian language offers a powerful advantage.

Over the past decade the Australia-Indonesia economic relationship has been characterised by a steady increase in merchandise trade, strong growth in Australian direct investment in Indonesia since 2004, and most recently the rapid expansion in the trade in services since 2007. Given the recognised lag between graduation and a graduand achieving a level of influence in business decision-making, it could be argued that this strengthening of Australia’s economic relationship with Indonesia was enhanced by the flow of Australian graduates from the 1990s with strong Indonesia-specific skills. Maintaining this growth into the future with a diminishing number of such Indonesia-skilled graduates may be a serious challenge, warranting immediate government intervention.

With the exception of mining and extractive ventures, this recent growth in Australia-Indonesia economic involvement has largely flowed through Jakarta. Since English is spoken by a small percentage of the elite in Jakarta (though rarely used on a day-to-day basis and even more rarely used well), Australian business people have often sought to operate in English. To maintain the levels of growth of the past decade, Australian companies will increasingly have to operate well beyond Jakarta in diverse provinces and regions that have been empowered by Indonesia’s post-1998 policy of regional autonomy in economic and administrative affairs. In these less developed regional environments, English competence is still a great rarity. To be successful there, Australian companies will need deeper Indonesia-knowledge and Indonesian language skills.

In essence, to this point, our economic partnership has been largely based upon “low-hanging fruit” in the capital rather than in the more complex, but more extensive, markets of regional Indonesia, where knowledge of Indonesian and Indonesian language will be essential. An expansion and deepening of the trade and investment relationship is going to require a greater level of engagement with Indonesia’s cultural and linguistic particularities.

Given the economic benefits of our trade relationship with Indonesia, growing at nearly 10 per cent p.a., and the centrality of Indonesia to our future regional security, it is
crucial that Australia has a strong and steady supply of Indonesian-speaking graduates for business, government and the broader community. If we are to produce sufficient graduates with high-level Indonesian language proficiency to meet these needs in the face of the past decade’s decline, Commonwealth investment is essential.

In May 2009, outlining his 30 year “Australian Strategy for Asian Languages Proficiency”, Michael Wesley (now Executive Director of the Lowy Institute for International Policy) estimated an investment of $11.3 billion would be required over three decades to achieve desired levels of national proficiency in several key Asian languages (with in-country scholarships alone for the first five-year phase warranting $10.8 million). Indonesian, as one of these key Asian languages, would thus require significant investment if it is to be embedded effectively as a language of strategic priority in Australian education.

The additional cost of funding those recommendations in this report which directly relate to universities – that is, excluding NALSSP, which funds the school sector – is only about $98 million over the next ten years. This average annual expenditure of $9.8 million equates to less than 0.3 per cent of the value of Australia’s current (2010) stock of direct investment in Indonesia and just 0.08 per cent of the value of current (2010) annual two-way trade between the two countries. But this investment in Indonesian language in our universities needs to commence now. The opportunity cost of not investing in Indonesian in our universities would most certainly outweigh such strategic investment.
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APPENDIX A: AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITIES TEACHING INDONESIAN

Australian universities with independent self-supporting Indonesian language programs:

- The Australian National University
- Charles Darwin University
- Deakin University
- Flinders University
- La Trobe University
- Monash University
- Murdoch University
- The University of New England
- The University of New South Wales, including ADFA in separate Faculty
- The University of Queensland
- University of the Sunshine Coast
- The University of Sydney
- University of Tasmania
- The University of Western Australia
- The University of Melbourne

Australian universities which offer Indonesian through arrangements with another university:

- Griffith University (through UQ/Brisbane Universities Languages’ Hub)
- Queensland University of Technology (through UQ/BULH)
- University of Southern Queensland (through UNE “Blended Model”)
- University of Wollongong (through UNE “Blended Model”)
- University of Adelaide (through agreement with Flinders)
- Open Universities Australia (taught through Charles Darwin University)

Australian universities which have closed their Indonesian language programs:

- Curtin University of Technology (2009)
- Queensland University of Technology (2009) subsequently offered via BULH
- Griffith University (c. 2008) now available via BULH
- Charles Sturt University (Bathurst campus) (c. 2006)
- University of Technology Sydney (UTS) (2004)
- University of Western Sydney (UWS) (2004)
- James Cook University (JCU) (1997)
## APPENDIX B: LIST OF UNIVERSITIES VISITED AND INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED

### Australian universities visited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
<td>The University of Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deakin University</td>
<td>The University of Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flinders University</td>
<td>The University of Western Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith University</td>
<td>The University of Western Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
<td>University of New England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monash University</td>
<td>University of South Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murdoch University</td>
<td>University of Southern Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Australian National University</td>
<td>University of Tasmania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Adelaide</td>
<td>University of the Sunshine Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
<td>University of Wollongong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University of New South Wales</td>
<td>UNSW@ADFA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### International universities visited

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goethe University Frankfurt</td>
<td>The University of Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt University of Berlin</td>
<td>The University of Naples – L'Orientale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leiden University</td>
<td>University of Cologne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Oriental Languages and Civilisations (INALCO), Paris</td>
<td>University of Copenhagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), University of London</td>
<td>University of La Rochelle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Individuals Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kathe Kirby</td>
<td>Asia Education Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Kurt Mullane</td>
<td>Asia Education Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. K. Hughes</td>
<td>Australia Indonesian Business Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Roger McDaniel</td>
<td>Australia Indonesian Business Council (QLD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Juris Austrums</td>
<td>Australia Indonesian Business Council (VIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Sigi Zidziunas</td>
<td>Australia Indonesian Business Council (VIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Anita Patel</td>
<td>Canberra Indonesian Teachers Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Richard Curtis</td>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Gary Davis</td>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Barney Glover</td>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sally Hodgetts</td>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/Prof. Bill Wade</td>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Marshall Clark</td>
<td>Deakin University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Philip Clarke</td>
<td>Deakin University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Ismet Fanany</td>
<td>Deakin University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Damien Kingsbury</td>
<td>Deakin University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Alistair Welsh</td>
<td>Deakin University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Carole Egan</td>
<td>Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (VIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Rini Sarwo Kristien</td>
<td>Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (VIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Julie Newnham</td>
<td>Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (VIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Firdaus Isi</td>
<td>Flinders University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Dean Forbes</td>
<td>Flinders University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Liz Morrell</td>
<td>Flinders University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Linda Seymour</td>
<td>Flinders University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Rosslyn von der Borch</td>
<td>Flinders University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/Prof. Julie Howell</td>
<td>Griffith University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Reni Isi</td>
<td>Humboldt University of Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brent Blofwitch</td>
<td>Indonesian Language Teachers Association of South Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Etienne Naveau</td>
<td>Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jerome Samuel</td>
<td>Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Sandy Gifford</td>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Zane Goebel</td>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Nicholas Herriman</td>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Cucu Juwita</td>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Tim Murray</td>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dirk Tomsa</td>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Bernard Arps</td>
<td>Leiden University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof. David Henley</td>
<td>Leiden University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Anita Das Gupta</td>
<td>Lenah Valley Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Michael Wesley</td>
<td>Lowy Institute for International Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Kristyn Paul</td>
<td>Modern Language Teaching Association of South Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Stephanie Fahey</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Rae Frances</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Penny Graham</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Brett Hough</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Yacinta Kurniasih</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Julian Millie</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/Prof Marko Pavlyshyn</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Paul Thomas</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Ben Paul Thomas</td>
<td>Monash University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Kent Anderson</td>
<td>The Australian National University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Robert Criib</td>
<td>The Australian National University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Timothy Hassall</td>
<td>The Australian National University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/Prof Ariel Heryanto</td>
<td>The Australian National University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Andrew MacIntyre</td>
<td>The Australian National University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr George Quinn</td>
<td>The Australian National University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Urip Sutiyono</td>
<td>The Australian National University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Amrih Widodo</td>
<td>The Australian National University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Andrew Bain</td>
<td>The University of Adelaide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Andrew Rosser</td>
<td>The University of Adelaide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Xianlin Song</td>
<td>The University of Adelaide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof John Taplin</td>
<td>The University of Adelaide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Marion Campbell</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Nigel Cossar</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Susan Elliott</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Michael Ewing</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Vannesssa Hearman</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Stuart Hibberd</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Tim Lindsey</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Katharine McGregor</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/Prof Anne McLaren</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Elisabeth Riharti</td>
<td>The University of Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/Prof Peter Collins</td>
<td>The University of New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Rochayah Machali</td>
<td>The University of New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/Prof Helen Creese</td>
<td>The University of Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Robert Elson</td>
<td>The University of Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Alfredo Martinez Exposito</td>
<td>The University of Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Richard Fotheringham</td>
<td>The University of Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/Prof Greg Hainge</td>
<td>The University of Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Annie Pohlman</td>
<td>The University of Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Debbie Terry</td>
<td>The University of Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Linda Connor</td>
<td>The University of Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Novi Djenar</td>
<td>The University of Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof Stephen Garton</td>
<td>The University of Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ORGANISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/Prof</td>
<td>Lesley Harbon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Duncan Ivison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Jeffrey Riegel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Adrian Vickers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>Peter Worsely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/Prof</td>
<td>David Bourchier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Bill Louden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Ian Saunders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>John Ingleson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>Philippe Grange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>Chandra Nuraini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Untung Waluyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>Antonia Sorente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>Zifirdaus Adnan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/Prof</td>
<td>John Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Jennie Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>Giancarlo Chiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>Jonathon Crichton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Michelle Kohler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/Prof</td>
<td>Angela Scarino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Peter Goodall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>Rhoderick McNeill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Kathryn-Anne Symmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/Prof</td>
<td>Pam Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>Barbara Hatley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs</td>
<td>Risa Magnusson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Stephen Miller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Carmencita Palermo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Sian Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prof</td>
<td>David Rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>Phillip Mahnken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A/Prof</td>
<td>Tim Scrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Trish Tindall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>David Lovell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Ida Nurhayati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Yvette Soedarsono</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: An additional 26 people were interviewed during the consultation phase of the Fellowship but elected not to have their identities made public.
## APPENDIX C: INDONESIAN EFTSL DATA: NINETEEN AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITIES: 2001-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NSW</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>TAS</th>
<th>QLDP</th>
<th>VIC</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>ACTUAL EFTSL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>12.875</td>
<td>7.375</td>
<td>14.500</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>35.000</td>
<td>13.375</td>
<td>12.250</td>
<td>9.750</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>35.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>8.250</td>
<td>13.778</td>
<td>5.146</td>
<td>2.332</td>
<td>29.506</td>
<td>8.875</td>
<td>5.478</td>
<td>5.976</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>20.329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EFTSL (ACT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EFTSL (SA)</td>
<td>14.500</td>
<td>8.333</td>
<td>8.083</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>30.916</td>
<td>14.250</td>
<td>8.500</td>
<td>5.167</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>27.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EFTSL (QLD)</td>
<td>4.610</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>2.965</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>14.575</td>
<td>2.850</td>
<td>3.865</td>
<td>6.120</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>13.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EFTSL (QLD)</td>
<td>15.360</td>
<td>12.250</td>
<td>10.090</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>38.700</td>
<td>13.600</td>
<td>11.615</td>
<td>14.370</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>40.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EFTSL (WA)</td>
<td>7.875</td>
<td>7.500</td>
<td>3.833</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>19.208</td>
<td>8.125</td>
<td>8.667</td>
<td>3.833</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>20.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EFTSL (WA)</td>
<td>6.750</td>
<td>5.625</td>
<td>8.500</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>20.875</td>
<td>5.875</td>
<td>5.875</td>
<td>7.375</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>19.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EFTSL (NT)</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>5.625</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>15.250</td>
<td>7.375</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>4.875</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>18.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EFTSL (NT)</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>5.625</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>15.250</td>
<td>7.375</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>4.875</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>18.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EFTSL (ACT)</td>
<td>11.380</td>
<td>10.390</td>
<td>10.030</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>32.300</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td>6.130</td>
<td>6.630</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>24.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EFTSL (TAS)</td>
<td>11.380</td>
<td>10.390</td>
<td>10.030</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>32.300</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td>6.130</td>
<td>6.630</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>24.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EFTSL (AUS)</td>
<td>481.857</td>
<td>470.013</td>
<td>455.061</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1,409.931</td>
<td>447.857</td>
<td>430.013</td>
<td>395.061</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1,273.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First year EFTSL</td>
<td>Second year EFTSL</td>
<td>Third year EFTSL</td>
<td>Honours EFTSL</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>First year EFTSL</td>
<td>Second year EFTSL</td>
<td>Third year EFTSL</td>
<td>Honours EFTSL</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>3.625</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>5.375</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>13.000</td>
<td>2.375</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>3.375</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>19.847</td>
<td>17.789</td>
<td>21.771</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>59.407</td>
<td>22.875</td>
<td>15.292</td>
<td>21.680</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>59.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>5.625</td>
<td>4.625</td>
<td>2.375</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>12.875</td>
<td>7.250</td>
<td>4.625</td>
<td>4.875</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>17.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL EFTSL (NSW)**

<p>|<strong>TOTAL EFTSL (AUS)</strong> | 444.033 | 418.260 | 372.758 |
|----------|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| QLD      |                      |                        |                       |                   |                 |                      |                        |                       |                   |                 |                      |                        |                       |                   |                 |
| 11       | 2.000                | 2.125                  | 3.250                 | 0.000             | 7.375           | 2.500                | 2.000                  | 2.250                 | 0.000             | 6.750           | 2.750                | 1.875                | 1.750                | 0.875             | 5.250           |
| 12       | 4.125                | 1.625                  | 4.625                 | 0.000             | 10.375          | 2.125                | 1.625                  | 2.875                 | 0.000             | 6.625           | 2.750                | 0.875                | 4.000                | 0.000             | 7.625           |
| 13       | 3.625                | 1.750                  | 1.625                 | 0.000             | 7.000           | 3.875                | 3.000                  | 0.375                 | 0.000             | 5.250           | 3.500                | 1.500                | 0.625                | 0.000             | 5.625           |
| TOTAL EFTSL (QLD) | 9.750               | 5.500                  | 9.500                 | 0.000             | 24.750          | 8.500                | 4.625                  | 5.500                 | 0.000             | 18.625         | 9.000                | 4.250                | 6.375                | 0.875             | 20.500         |
| WA       |                      |                        |                       |                   |                 |                      |                        |                       |                   |                 |                      |                        |                       |                   |                 |
| 14       | 7.875                | 3.833                  | 7.000                 | 0.000             | 18.708          | 9.500                | 5.833                  | 6.000                 | 0.000             | 21.333         | 8.125                | 6.000                | 6.167                | 0.000             | 20.292         |
| 15       | 1.750                | 3.000                  | 5.750                 | 2.000             | 12.500          | 1.600                | 3.900                  | 4.200                 | 1.000             | 10.700         | 5.200                | 2.700                | 2.000                | 0.000             | 9.900          |
| 16       | 2.000                | 3.250                  | 8.750                 | 0.000             | 14.000          | 3.625                | 1.137                  | 6.750                 | 0.750             | 21.875         | 4.125                | 11.125               | 5.625                | 0.000             | 20.875         |
| TOTAL EFTSL (WA) | 11.625              | 10.083                 | 21.500                | 2.000             | 45.208          | 14.725               | 11.108                 | 19.700                | 1.000             | 46.533         | 13.325               | 8.700                | 8.167                | 0.000             | 30.192         |
| NT       |                      |                        |                       |                   |                 |                      |                        |                       |                   |                 |                      |                        |                       |                   |                 |
| ACT      |                      |                        |                       |                   |                 |                      |                        |                       |                   |                 |                      |                        |                       |                   |                 |
| 18       | -                    | -                      | -                     | -                 | -               | -                    | -                      | -                     | -                 | -              | -                    | -                      | -                     | -                 | -              |
| TOTAL EFTSL (ACT) | 34.00               | -                      | -                     | -                 | -               | 34.00                | -                      | -                     | -                 | -              | 31.400               | -                      | -                     | -                 | 22.900         |
| TAS      |                      |                        |                       |                   |                 |                      |                        |                       |                   |                 |                      |                        |                       |                   |                 |
| 19       | 5.500                | 4.880                  | 5.380                 | 0.750             | 16.510          | 4.250                | 5.750                  | 6.750                 | 2.000             | 18.750         | 4.250                | 6.000                | 4.880                | 0.630             | 15.760         |
| TOTAL EFTSL (TAS) | 5.500               | 4.880                  | 5.380                 | 0.750             | 16.510          | 4.250                | 5.750                  | 6.750                 | 2.000             | 18.750         | 4.250                | 6.000                | 4.880                | 0.630             | 15.760         |
| TOTAL EFTSL (AUS) | 356.844            | 339.095                | 302.246               |                   |                 |                      |                        |                       |                   |                 |                      |                        |                       |                   |                 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First year EFTSL</th>
<th>Second year EFTSL</th>
<th>Third year EFTSL</th>
<th>Honours EFTSL</th>
<th>TOTAL EFTSL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>4.625</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>16.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.375</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>8.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.125</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>4.875</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>14.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EFTSL (NSW)</td>
<td>17.500</td>
<td>8.917</td>
<td>10.125</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>40.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.250</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>4.167</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>10.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.375</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>9.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EFTSL (SA)</td>
<td>10.625</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>5.542</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>19.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.625</td>
<td>7.500</td>
<td>3.833</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>20.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.625</td>
<td>7.500</td>
<td>3.875</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>21.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.500</td>
<td>8.250</td>
<td>6.625</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>29.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EFTSL (VIC)</td>
<td>129.948</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.875</td>
<td>2.875</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>9.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>4.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.250</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EFTSL (QLD)</td>
<td>12.375</td>
<td>4.750</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>20.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.375</td>
<td>6.333</td>
<td>6.333</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>20.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.600</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>14.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EFTSL (WA)</td>
<td>12.975</td>
<td>10.333</td>
<td>10.333</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>34.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.250</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>4.750</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>14.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EFTSL (NT)</td>
<td>4.250</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>4.750</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>14.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EFTSL (ACT)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.130</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>6.380</td>
<td>1.750</td>
<td>16.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EFTSL (TAS)</td>
<td>6.130</td>
<td>2.250</td>
<td>6.380</td>
<td>1.750</td>
<td>16.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EFTSL (AUS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>304.933</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* University 4 only began offering Indonesian language in 2002.  
† University 7’s Indonesian language EFTSL total for 2010 has been extrapolated using sum of least squares regression.  
‡ University 8’s Indonesian language EFTSL totals for all its campuses for years 2001-2003 are imputed from single campus enrolments only.  
§ University 9’s “Honours” EFTSL figures include Indonesian language units taken at both Honours and postgraduate levels.  
** University 10’s “Honours” EFTSL figures include Indonesian language units taken at both Honours and postgraduate levels.  
†† Indonesian language EFTSL loads disaggregated by year-level were unavailable for University 18. Total annual Indonesian language EFTSL across all year-levels are provided instead.
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