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ABSTRACT

Australian education systems have historically and contemporaneously implemented reforms responding to, among other things, difference and diversity. These reforms routinely target real and/or perceived problems emerging from education and/or related to national interests. Often though, systemic changes to education have a raft of unintended consequences.

Through an investigation of social relations in the work of eight teachers drawn from five schools, this thesis, seeks to address the effects of changes to education on culturally and linguistically different students and their teachers. The experiences and practices of teachers are used as windows through which to see how their work has been produced and with what effects.

This research, nested in ontology, employs Institutional Ethnography to unpack each teacher's expression of being a teacher in relation to place (institution) and the historical formation of institutional practices (time). Critical Discourse Analysis is used to develop the notion of textual mediation used in Institutional Ethnography but not sufficiently developed and augment the reading of texts. The methodological approach used here guides analysis and interpretation of teacher’s work to disclose connections among and between their modes of existence, interests and influences in teaching practice and the inclusion and/or exclusion of culturally and linguistically different students and their
teachers in and/or from rich, relevant and robust teaching and learning experiences.

The research found that limits to each teacher’s awareness of difference impeded their responsiveness to the multicultural composition of their classrooms. Processes and practices of domination were not routinely recognised as prejudicial and discriminatory. Teachers, who questioned unfair practices, were unable to mount successful challenges. Experiences of disadvantage that students brought to learning and issues related to inequality were not pursued beyond the restructuring of learning events. Maintenance of host culture privilege concealed the value of the abilities, attributes and experiences culturally and linguistically students brought to learning and used to learn.

Teachers only responded ethically, culturally and linguistically to the multicultural composition of their classrooms when they could see and were curious about the people they were with, and aware of and willing to experiment with the possibilities available to them. The fact of their existence emerged as a significant influence on the responses they made to diversity.

Together, their culturally responsive practices represent an alternative to the current framework for teaching and learning. Participating teachers, in collaboration with their peers and local and education communities are well placed to examine the multicultural conditions of their classrooms and community with a view to broadening their
understanding of diversity. With greater awareness, teachers may, as agents of reform, bring about changes to teacher's work in and across local landscapes of practice.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DECLARATION</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREFACE: A REFLECTION ON TEACHING PRACTICE</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  FRAMING AN INQUIRY INTO TEACHING PRACTICE THAT IS RESPONSIVE TO THE MULTICULTURAL COMPOSITION OF CLASSROOMS</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Teaching Practice in Multicultural Classrooms</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Inquiry Focus</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 Foregrounding National Interests</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 The Problem</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4 What Counts as Nation, the Interests of the State, Difference and Education</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.5 Shifting National Interests</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.6 Challenges to Economic and Cultural Ordering</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.7 Responding to the Composition of Multicultural Classrooms</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Research Aims and Rationale</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1 Difference, Discourses, Teachers' Work, and Educational Inequality</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2 Contribution of Research to Knowledge and Practice</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Thesis Outline</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1 Clarifying Language</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2 Research Journey</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Generative Conclusion</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  NATION-BUILDING DISCOURSES, EDUCATION, TEACHING PRACTICE AND INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Economic Rationalism, and the Constitution of Economic Subjects in Industrial (1972–83) and Post Industrial Economies and (1983–96)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1 Social Justice, the Economy, Teachers' Work, and Exclusion/Inclusion</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2 Effectiveness and Efficiency, Teachers' Work, Student Subjectivities and Exclusion/Inclusion</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Reinstatement of Privilege, Social Cohesion, Global Competitiveness and Conforming Subjects</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1 Re-instating White Anglo Privilege</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.2 Education and the Constitution of Socially Deviant and Economically Defective Subjects .......................................................... 81


2.3.1 Discourses of Failure, Social Justice, and Alienation ...................... 88
2.3.2 Materialisation of Discourses in Teachers’ Work ................................. 91
2.3.3 English Language Education .............................................................. 92
2.3.4 Generative Conclusion ..................................................................... 94

2.4 A Cultural Responsive Pedagogy for Australian Classrooms .......... 98

2.4.1 It’s Time ............................................................................................ 98
2.4.2 Uncovering Key Principles ............................................................... 99
2.4.3 Challenge for Teachers .................................................................... 103
2.4.4 Framing an Alternative Approach .................................................... 104

2.5 Generative Conclusion........................................................................ 108

3 PHILosophical-theoretical Framework For Investigating The Everyday Experiences And Practices Of Teachers ................................................. 109

3.1 Theorising the Experiences and Practices of Teachers ....................... 109
3.1.1 The Possibilities Existence Offers .................................................... 109
3.1.2 The Struggle of Existence in Being a Teacher ................................. 112
3.1.3 Becoming Aware: Teaching and Circumspection ............................. 114
3.1.4 Becoming a Teacher ........................................................................ 116

3.2 Sociality in and of an Individual Life .................................................. 121
3.2.1 A Question of Awareness ................................................................. 121
3.2.2 Local and Trans-local Co-ordination of Everyday Experiences and Practices of Teachers ................................................................. 122
3.2.3 The School - Textually Mediated Practice ....................................... 124
3.2.4 The Classroom - Textually Mediated Work Process ....................... 128

3.3 Politics of Textual Mediation of Practice ............................................. 129
3.3.1 Exercise of Power ............................................................................. 129
3.3.2 Representing Teachers’ Work ........................................................... 130
3.3.3 Social Relations ................................................................................ 135
3.3.4 Discursive Reproduction of Dominance ......................................... 140
3.3.5 Texts ............................................................................................... 144
3.3.6 Control and Regulation and their Effects ......................................... 147
3.3.7 Theoretical Threads and their Application ....................................... 148

3.4 Generative Conclusion........................................................................ 149
4 RESEARCH METHOD ................................................................. 151
4.1 Generation of Data............................................................... 151
   4.1.1 Contextualising the Inquiry ........................................... 151
   4.1.2 Development of Data Collection Instruments .................. 153
   4.1.3 Recruitment of Participants ......................................... 157
4.2 Research Participants .......................................................... 163
   4.2.1 Introducing Participating Teachers ................................ 163
   4.2.2 Teachers in Local Sites of Practice .............................. 167
4.3 Developing a Plan ............................................................... 170
4.4 Analysis and Reflection ....................................................... 171
   4.4.1 Accessing and Analysing Representations of Teachers' Practices ........................................ 171
4.5 Analysis, Generation of New Data and Making Connections .... 176
   4.5.1 Cumulative Inquiry ..................................................... 176
4.6 Being and Becoming a Teacher ............................................ 184
   4.6.1 Making Sense of Experiences and Practices .................. 184
   4.6.2 Representing Teachers' Work ....................................... 187
4.7 Analysis and Recording Strategies ...................................... 188
4.8 Generative Conclusion ........................................................ 189

5 DISCOURSE, POWER AND TEXTUALLY MEDIATED PRACTICE ................................................. 192
5.1 Introducing Two Teachers and their Teaching Contexts .......... 193
5.2 Constitution of Teaching Practice in and Across Two Diverse Landscapes of Practice ........................................ 200
   5.2.1 Representing Work Processes ........................................ 200
   5.2.2 Composite Analytical Description of Text-Structured Work Process Model ........................................ 202
   5.2.3 Levelling of Difference ............................................... 206
   5.2.4 Standardisation and Narrowing the Curriculum ............. 212
   5.2.5 Classification of Students and Differentiated Practices .......... 216
   5.2.6 Production of Human Subjects .................................. 220
   5.2.7 Responsiveness to National Interests and Effects ............ 223
   5.2.8 Social Organisation of Teachers' Work .......................... 228
5.3 Politics of Textual Mediation ................................................ 234
   5.3.1 Managing Minds ......................................................... 234
5.4 Generative Conclusion ........................................................ 241
6 TEACHERS CLAIMING THEIR TERRAINS OF PRACTICE ......242
6.1 Experiences and Practices of Primary School Teachers ..........243
   6.1.1 Teachers in Local Sites of Practice ..............................243
   6.1.2 Findings of Institutional Ethnographic Analysis ................244
   6.1.3 Dialogical Learner-Centred Responsive Practice ...............249
   6.1.4 Tactical Learner-Centred Practice ...............................254
   6.1.5 Topic Based Learner-Centred Practice ............................262
6.2 Teachers’ Culturally Responsive Practice ..........................268
   6.2.1 Building Blocks ......................................................268
6.3 Limits to Agency and Activism in New Times .......................275
   6.3.1 Silencing the Voices of Agents of Reform .......................275
   6.3.2 Setting Limits to Agency ............................................280
6.4 Teachers’ Contributions to Pedagogy Responsive to the Multicultural Composition of Australian Classrooms ..........282
   6.4.1 A Composite Analytical Description of Culturally Responsive Practice .......................................................282
   6.4.2 Illuminating the Omissions ...........................................283
   6.4.3 Principles and Practices .............................................285
6.5 Generative Conclusion ......................................................286

7 DISCOURSES, NEW POSSIBILITIES AND TRANSFORMATION
.....................................................................................................287
7.1 Teaching Practice, Responsive to the Multicultural Compositions of Classrooms .................................................................287
   7.1.1 Introducing Colleges, Teachers and their Practice ..........287
7.2 Experiences and Practices of Secondary School Teachers ......293
   7.2.1 Exploring Ava’s Hands-on Approach to Practice and Students’ Experiences of Learning .............................................293
   7.2.2 Exploring Dialogical Engagements and Students’ Experiences of Learning ..........................................................305
   7.2.3 Skill-based Personalised Learning ...................................311
7.3 Broadening Opportunities for Teaching and Learning ..........320
   7.3.1 Languages and Cultures as a Site of Transformation ..........320
   7.3.2 Languages, Dialogue and Transformation .......................325
7.4 Contributions of Teachers to Culturally Responsive Pedagogies326
   7.4.1 Composite Analytical Description ...................................326
   7.4.2 Building a Culturally Responsive Pedagogy .......................327
7.5 Generative Conclusion ......................................................329
8 EDUCATION AND MULTICULTURALISM ............................................. 330

8.1 Instrumental Education ................................................................. 330
  8.1.1 Eve’s Views on Education and Multiculturalism ......................... 330
  8.1.2 Sophia’s Views on Education and Multiculturalism .................... 332
  8.1.3 Instrumentally-motivated Education and its Effects .................. 334
  8.1.4 Education in the National Interest ............................................ 336

8.2 Professional Education ............................................................... 341
  8.2.1 Layla’s Intercultural Education ................................................. 341
  8.2.2 Jennifer’s Multicultural Education ........................................... 343
  8.2.3 Helen’s Socially Just Education ............................................... 346
  8.2.4 Grace’s Ethical Education ........................................................ 349
  8.2.5 Ava’s Participatory Education .................................................. 350
  8.2.6 Horizons of Understanding ...................................................... 351

8.3 Towards Transformative Education ............................................. 353
  8.3.1 Stepping Stones Towards Lucinda’s Transformative Education .......... 353
  8.3.2 Discourses and Teaching Practice ........................................... 355

8.4 Conclusion: Contributions and Concealments ............................ 356
  8.4.1 Education and Multiculturalism ................................................ 356
  8.4.2 Redefining Education ............................................................... 358

8.5 Generative Conclusion ............................................................... 360

9 A CRITICAL RESPONSE TO INEQUALITY ........................................... 361

9.1 Concealments in Teachers’ Work ................................................ 361
  9.1.1 Prejudicial and Discriminatory Acts ........................................... 361
  9.1.2 Challenges to Prejudice and Discrimination ............................ 362
  9.1.3 Denial of Sociocultural Resources ........................................... 363
  9.1.4 Retreat from Addressing Disadvantage and Inequality .............. 363

9.2 Limits to Vision ........................................................................... 365
  9.2.1 Discipline and Punish .............................................................. 365
  9.2.2 Teachers’ Discourses ............................................................... 368
  9.2.3 Using Students’ Sociocultural Resources .................................. 369
  9.2.4 Responsibility to Students and Experiences Brought to Learning .................................................. 371

9.3 A Proposal ................................................................................. 373

9.4 A Critical Response to Inequality ............................................... 374
  9.4.1 Professional Learning Approach ............................................. 374
  9.4.2 Analytical Description of a Learning Event .............................. 378
  9.4.3 Adoption of Critical Culturally Responsive Pedagogies .......... 380

9.5 Conclusion ................................................................................. 380
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Representation - Field .......................................................... 132
Table 2: Social Relations between Human Subjects – Tenor ............. 137
Table 3: Discursive Reproduction of Dominance ............................. 141
Table 4: Texts ..................................................................................... 145
Table 5: Features of the Research Method ........................................ 153
Table 6: Data Sources ........................................................................ 162
Table 7: Participating Teachers Working in Primary Schools .......... 164
Table 8: Participating Teachers Working in Secondary Colleges ...... 165
Table 9: Level 1 — Accessing Experiences and Practices ............... 172
Table 10: Text Analysis .................................................................... 177
Table 11: Questioning Texts .............................................................. 178
Table 12: Textual Mediation and Social Relations ............................ 180
Table 13: Questioning Processes ....................................................... 180
Table 14: Textual Mediation, Relations of Power and Teachers’ Work ........................................................................ 182
Table 15: Questioning Existence ....................................................... 184
Table 16: Making Sense of Practice and Learning ............................ 185
Table 17: Eve and Sophia’s Representation of Practice .................... 194
Table 18: Grace, Jennifer and Helen’s Representation of Practice .... 245
Table 19: Building Blocks of Teachers’ Responsive Practice ........... 269
Table 20: Features of Ava’s, Layla’s and Lucinda’s Approach to Teaching to Difference ....................................................... 292
Table 21: Discipline and Punish ........................................................ 367
Table 22: Teachers’ Discourses .......................................................... 368
Table 23: Using Students’ Sociocultural Resources ......................... 370
Table 24: Responsibility to Students and Experiences Brought to Learning ........................................................................ 372
Table 25: Critical Template ............................................................... 376
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Values Poster for Australian Schools ........................................ 83
Figure 2: Structure of the Methodological Approach ................................. 148
Figure 3: Eve’s Experiences and Practices ................................................. 196
Figure 4: Eve’s Practices ........................................................................ 197
Figure 5: Sophia’s Experiences .................................................................. 198
Figure 6: Sophia’s Practices ..................................................................... 199
Figure 7: Representing Teachers’ Work ..................................................... 201
Figure 8: Trans-local Relations and the Test Scores .................................. 203
Figure 9: Trans-local Relations and the Term Planner ............................... 205
Figure 10: Production of the Human Subject ........................................... 219
Figure 11: Acceptability .......................................................................... 229
Figure 12: Discourse Production ............................................................... 230
Figure 13: Power ..................................................................................... 231
Figure 14: Accountability Measures .......................................................... 232
Figure 15: Materialisation of Discourses ................................................... 233
Figure 16: Grace’s Experiences ................................................................. 247
Figure 17: Grace’s Practices ...................................................................... 248
Figure 18: Jennifer’s Experiences and Practices ......................................... 253
Figure 19: Helen’s Experiences ................................................................. 260
Figure 20: Helen’s Experiences and Practices ............................................. 261
Figure 21: Grace’s Responses to Conditions of Practice .......................... 272
Figure 22: Jennifer’s Responses to Conditions of Practice ....................... 273
Figure 23: Helen’s Responses to Conditions of Practice ........................... 274
Figure 24: Shared Goals .......................................................................... 291
Figure 25: Ava’s Experiences ................................................................. 294
Figure 26: Ava’s Practices ........................................................................ 295
Figure 27: Layla’s Experiences ................................................................. 303
Figure 28: Layla’s Practices ...................................................................... 304
Figure 29: Lucinda’s Experiences .............................................................. 310
Figure 30: Lucinda’s Practices ................................................................. 314
Figure 31: Changing Cultures ................................................................. 319
Figure 32: Lucinda’s Reflections ............................................................... 324
PREFACE: A REFLECTION ON TEACHING PRACTICE

When I left teaching I did not expect to study again let alone teach. Like many other teachers that I know I often thought about my practice. This was especially so when I would meet past students as I often did in the regional city where we all lived. They would recount hilarious memories and not so funny ones. My recollections were not quite so memorable because I worried, from time to time, about some of the things I had done. I decided that I would open my landscape of practice to interrogation.

Memories of my experiences and practices are used to highlight common threads that stitched together different aspects of my practice during periods of significant social, economic, political and technological change. The years 1965 to 2015 represent my investment in post school education from my initial teacher education, through the period of my professional practice and my more recent involvement in further study and research in education.

By taking excerpts from my practice over time I can demonstrate my retreat from critical practice in the early years and show some of the ways that many students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds were excluded from learning and alienated from education. I bring into view discourses and texts that concealed the character of students and covered over the resources students used to learn. I illustrate how these presences destabilised my aspiration for learner-
centred practice. What I hope to draw from my interrogation are insights that will guide my thinking about an investigation into teaching practice that is culturally and linguistically responsive to the multicultural conditions of classrooms.

This journey rests on a desire to better understand the decisions that I made, or failed to make, throughout my teaching career spent primarily in New South Wales. These reflections, I believe, mirror those of many other teachers. I am no different. This research project is designed to uncover conditions and/or relations that are impediments to realising equality and offer solutions to the tensions that they create.

Some of the things that I did crystallised quite abruptly in 2008 when I entered a Victorian secondary college for the first time.

Walking across the playground I saw Them. I recognised Them as they sat together — a group of about ten senior boys. The ritualised markers — some evident, others partly concealed, told me who they were. They occupied a tiered structure vying for attention from passers-by. Walking towards them the call came “we didn’t do nothing, Miss”! It echoed through the guttural groans that accompanied the call. I introduced myself, and after some informal banter, we began a conversation that continued in both informal and formal contexts over the next eighteen months. They were energetic and engaging young men, but when they talked about their learning experiences — their struggles — I experienced a sense of sadness and felt a measure of discomfort.

I had participated in the education of students who were very much like the boys I met that day. I had brought to that education a complex and
contradictory web of attitudes, beliefs, histories, knowledges, understandings, and values (Fairclough, 2005) that were revealed in my teaching practice. It seemed to me in those very first moments of recognition and engagement that things had not changed.

Their sense of alienation was evident in the acts of resistance these young men displayed. They share these feelings with many children and other young men and women from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, not only in Australia (Mansouri et al, 2009) but elsewhere (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Gillborn, 1990; Meer & Modood, 2012; McDowell, 2000). That these conditions exist today is troubling given the significant investments that have been made to education during the years of my professional practice.

By opening up my landscapes of practice to interrogation, I show some of the ways that I became alienated from my professional learning and demonstrate the effects of this estrangement on students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. At the same time I reveal places from where I could see more clearly the students I taught. It is these understandings that have led me to search for pedagogies that are culturally and linguistically responsive to the multicultural composition of classrooms in which we teach.
I remember when I was first recruited, in 1974, to teach English as a second language. Fifty eight per cent of the student population, in the primary school where I would teach, spoke English as a first language while the majority of the remaining students spoke Italian, Arabic, or Vietnamese at home. But I was not to be involved in the education of all of these students. Prior classifications had already been made. Forty students from Kindergarten to Year four, of the one hundred eligible children over all had already been assigned, to the ‘needy’ group based on their perceived inadequacies.

The assembled group was marked, not only by cultural and linguistic differences but also by tags like the dehumanising one — ‘the remedials’. It was used to highlight what students could not do, which was to use English and behave in culturally appropriate ways in the same way that ‘natives’ do. Their fate was in the hands of teachers charged with their refinement and remediation. Discriminatory social processes and practices like labelling and classification permeated my site of practice even before I arrived.

Before I could begin working with the students who had been selected for the ESL program, ‘training’ in teaching ESL began. I was introduced to a formal structural syllabus. My professional learning was an initiation into one way of teaching English in a period when the shift from assimilation to integration was still in play.

The older students that I taught had all been to school and some of them had experience of bilingual — Arabic and French — education.

English language syllabuses covered over the languages they used to learn and the knowledge and ways of thinking that they had at their disposal. It also obscured the usefulness of French that I had learned at school. In the pursuit of successful integration, differences would be eradicated or made less noticeable by replacing existing sociocultural resources with new ones and in doing so, levelling difference. The idea that students had resources that they could use for learning was concealed from me (Benjamin, 1997). It would take, in Freire’s (1990) estimation, a critically alert teacher to confront the conditions of practice and one with sufficient courage to question actions that deny rights and cover up responsibilities.

I did not name discrimination. I understand now that this is a challenge that Kristeva (1991) maintains “few among us are apt to take up” (p. 42). I did not see this opportunity since I was the privileged white, English speaking subject befitting citizenship in the imaginary homogenous nation-state (Hage, 1998). The shields against intrusions into national space are, the evaluations people make “I am not like you” (Kristeva, 1991, p.42), the questions that do not really demand an answer — “what are you doing here” (ibid) and the exclamations of rejection — “this is not where you belong” (ibid.).

Discourses of cultural conservation and ownership of national space informed some of the practices that I participated in and arguably caused me to accept exclusion through categorisation of who is in and who is out.
It was not long before perceptions of Others, like the ones I couldn’t shake, were challenged by Al Grassby’s colourful articulations of something he called multiculturalism. His presence on television was a regular occurrence. While people talked about his polka dotted ties and purple shirts I started reading about cultural recognition. I discovered that people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds were ‘allowed’ to maintain their cultural practices.

This time I spoke up and challenged the school to re-think the welcome it would extend to students and parents from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. After a couple of informal meetings with parents one mother offered to work with me in the classroom. But in many places festivals of food, folklore and other features of cultural engagement excluded the very people they were designed to recognise because they were built on understandings of culture and identity as static and unchanging (Hall, 1997).

An alternative discourse entered my practice.

I questioned evaluations that misrepresented what students brought to learning and institutional arrangements that isolated students. New possibilities were glimpsed when I realised Arabic-English and/or French encounters responded to the languages, cultural knowledges and understandings that students brought to learning. Energy and excitement, features of these engagements saw previously excluded students appropriate a place for themselves from which to learn.

Responsiveness to Arabic speaking students without similar provisions for Italian and Vietnamese students and subsequent arrivals from Poland and Uruguay meant this arrangement was both empowering for some but exclusionary for others. I did not ask how all the languages of

2 Hon A. Grassby, Minister for Education (1972-1974)
the classroom could be used. Sometime later and in a different context my desire to be responsive was similarly tempered.

I did not explicitly appreciate the importance of using the full suite of sociocultural resources students brought to learning in a more inclusive way. When multicultural funding became available I applied, with the best of intentions, for a grant to translate reading materials into the languages represented by students in the New Arrivals Program. What I discovered during conversations with translators was that parallel versions of the stories I had selected existed in their cultures — it just hadn’t occurred to me to enter into this conversation with the students I taught.

My privileging of the stories of my culture exposed me and showed the conditions of my existence that I carry with me. The site of struggle, drawing on Kostogriz and Doecke (2007), is in shifting from English language education as a tool of assimilation to one that offers a broader scope for enfranchisement. I was able to make this place my own when I attended the Australian Reading Association conference in Adelaide and heard Jerry Harste speak about the impact of exclusion on culturally and linguistically different student’s experiences of learning.

I was finally able to see some of the sociocultural resources each of my students brought to learning and used these in more thoughtful and meaningful ways. A view of teaching and learning, framed, through a multicultural lens brought more inclusive approaches to English language education but it was not free from forces of destabilisation.
Kristeva (1991) would argue that when the presence of the ‘foreigner’ is perceived as a threat, relations move from indifference to possibilities that are more extreme. Schatzki (2005) suggests that distress, for example, causes the hosts to “leap in [to] other lives” (p.238) often with a view to changing and/or regulating what Others are permitted to do.

On one occasion (2009) I was invited to help prepare some Year 10 students for an upcoming formative assessment. It would count towards their final assessment in English at the end of the compulsory years of schooling. The task was to present, orally, an exposition that addressed the claim of the Australian Government that the impost of a tax on alco-pops would reduce the consumption of alcohol by teens.

Culturally and linguistically different students knew about alcohol consumption but their understandings like those of people generally, were culturally bound. They knew that if adults were apprehended with alcohol, without a licence to buy and transport it there were serious consequences. In less liberal contexts, they understood the severity of the penalties that would befall the offenders. When they spoke of prohibitive slogans it was with a conviction I had not seen before. Their engagement was palpable as they considered the application of a tax to limit consumption of alcohol by teenagers that appeared to be ludicrous to them.

This presented a problem because the assessment task did not accommodate a discussion of different ways of curbing alcohol consumption. To help students prepare for this performance they had
been given a set of newspaper articles. Scaffolding of the task in this way might be understood from a Vygotskian (1986) orientation but the articles were not a scaffold to support learning. Students who struggled with the task were given material resources designed to provide the cultural knowledge necessary to answer the question in the way that had been intended. Giddens (1979) suggests that these material interventions regulate the actions people can take. I was to remediate perceived inadequacies by inculcating new knowledge into their repertoires of understanding. My own experiences of dwelling in their communities told me that what they brought to this activity were not deficiencies but strengths exemplified through a different way of understanding the subject presented for discussion.

In my mind’s eye I can see quite clearly the winding road glued tightly against a rocky cliff face. Tufts of spiky dry grass and sturdy trunks, and not so study ones, provide scant defences against the weight of an almost unyielding monolith. At the seaside edge crusty cracks catch hardy particles as loose gravel slips silently from the rim sinking into the ocean below. But the silence is shattered by the bang and clatter of different bits that can be heard from rocky shelves where they have landed, somewhat precariously. And amongst the detritus littered along the way are boulders marking out the border between inclusion and exclusion.

Much of what happened in the classroom in which I worked can be tied to social and economic discourses, policies and other texts and my relation with them. These constructed boundaries around what I could teach. I was not confronted with the dilemma of choice (Derrida, 1995). I simply did what was expected of me to achieve the outcomes that had
been anticipated by the school, region, system, state authorities, and the Federal Government and its agencies that had invested in me. Discourses promoting English performances and associated with that, beliefs about homogeneity and cultural conservation, contributed to my misunderstandings about recognition and hid from me my obligations with respect to recognition and, the maintenance of cultural practices associated with liberal multiculturalism.

Other discourses like the ones that re-directed my approach to English language education, framed more critical readings of my work. Shifts towards a more transformative multicultural education practice (May, 1998) made my work more responsive and opened my eyes to the conditions in which my engagements were situated. I was able to change what I did by investing in whole of school reform and advocating more broadly for changes in local and regional contexts. The challenges, in these new times, are before us but the question is:

How should we respond to the multicultural composition of our classrooms?

Generative Conclusion

In this preface, I opened my teaching practice to interrogation in order to demonstrate that my practice was rarely my own. I showed some of the interests and influences that had settled in my work and disclosed pedagogical relations that showed up in the ways I included and excluded culturally and linguistically different students in and/or from learning.
Connections were made between what I did in relation to what was happening in national and global spaces (Massey, 2008). These associations prompt an investigation of teachers’ work to disclose whose interests are being represented in education and what this means for culturally and linguistically different students and their teachers in multicultural classrooms.

Provocations, such as these, invite interrogation of the experiences and practices of other teachers to disclose all the presences informing their work. They can be used to show the constitution of a teacher’s work and its effects on culturally and linguistically different students and their teachers.

This is the direction that my thesis will take. Its answer should, in Gadamer’s (1997) estimation, bring me greater understanding of relationships in teaching practice and their effects and provide the impetus for action.
PART 1

Illuminating the Inquiry

There are four chapters in this part. The relationship between national interests in education and the experiences and practices of teachers provides a starting point for an examination of social relations in the work of individual teachers and their impact on the inclusion and/or exclusion of culturally and linguistically different students in and/or from rich, relevant and robust learning. These two key concepts — national interests and the experiences and practices of teachers also act as organising principles that structure Part 1 of this thesis.

Chapter 1 provides the reasoning behind approaching an investigation of social relations in teachers’ work and their effects from the perspective of national interests. An examination of nation, the interests of the state and systems of domination and subordination is nested in Critical Race Theory to disclose some of the ways culturally and linguistically different students are excluded from rich relevant and robust learning.

This focus is developed in Chapter 2. It has two sections. The first section is used to show connections between shifts in national interests, changes to education policy and implementation texts and the opportunities for learning offered to culturally and linguistically different students. Teachers’ work is considered in the context of competing and/or complementary understandings of education used by state and
territory governments to inform the work of education. Culturally responsive pedagogies and practices are presented in the second section of Chapter 2 as these represent an alternative to the current management and accountability agenda.

The experiences and practices of teachers are theorised in Chapter 3 to demonstrate, the challenges teachers face in being and becoming a culturally responsive teacher. Key themes — existence, textual mediation and, language and semiosis — drawn from the philosophical-theoretical research framework, are used to structure the research method (Chapter 4) and guide the analytic processes.
1 FRAMING AN INQUIRY INTO TEACHING PRACTICE THAT IS RESPONSIVE TO THE MULTICULTURAL COMPOSITION OF CLASSROOMS

1.1 Teaching Practice in Multicultural Classrooms

Introduction

In this chapter, I set out the focus of this qualitative inquiry and explain why I have foregrounded national interests. Following these explanations I employ Critical Race Theory (Rollock & Gillborn, 2011) to interrogate the ways discourses of nation operate to dominate and subordinate culturally and linguistically different students and/or ameliorate their disadvantage. Challenges faced by teachers in adopting culturally responsive pedagogies are explored. The contributions this research will make to the field of teaching practice in multicultural classrooms are elaborated. I clarify my understanding and use of particular terms and disclose the directions my research takes.

1.1.1 Inquiry Focus

This qualitative inquiry is concerned with understanding relationships that exist between national interests, the experiences and practices of teachers and the inclusion and/or exclusion of culturally and linguistically different students in and/or from rich, relevant and robust learning. It rests on interrogating the experiences and practices of teachers working in metropolitan Melbourne. The selection of Melbourne as the site of recruitment is based on scrutiny of Local Government Area (LGA) social and demographic profiles, which confirmed a significant presence of
students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds across the metropolitan area.

By entering everyday experiences and practices of teachers I propose to locate the actualities of a teacher’s practice, show connections among and between the things that reside in a teacher’s work, explain, following DeVault & McCoy (2001), how it has been produced and show the effects on culturally and linguistically different students and their teachers. The first research question has been articulated in such a way to enable access to experiences and practices through standpoint that reflects “a particular standpoint, a particular point d’appui [that] structures the representation of other relations from this perspective” (Smith, 1988, p.171). The first of five research questions responds to this focus. This research asks:

1. How do teachers perceive, imagine, articulate, and, enact teaching practice?

Analysis of the space located in the transition between a teacher’s perceptions, imaginings, and articulations of practice and their enactments is where I can isolate the actualities of their practice. These can be used to show connections between experiences and practices and disclose the processes, interests, influences, pedagogical relations, discourses and modes of existence that inform their pedagogical work. The second question responds to presence when it enquires:

2. What do the social relations that reside in a teacher’s practice reveal about their work?
This involves searching for connections among and between texts, processes, interests and influences to reveal pedagogical relations, discourses and teacher’s mode/s of existence that will be used to explain the constitution of teaching practice and its effects and disclose (or not) its social organisation. This leads to the next two questions.

3. In what ways is teaching practice responsive to the multicultural composition of their classrooms?

Chapters 5, 6 and 7 respond to this question by showing the effects of a teacher’s responsiveness to difference. Accompanying this question is one that addresses agency in institutions as it relates to both subject agents working the interests of the institution and agents of reform initiating and/or sustaining culturally responsive practices that sit outside authorised work practice and processes. It asks:

4. What potential for agency exists for teachers’ intent on changing practice in their local landscapes of practice and/or beyond?

Agency is considered in Chapters 5, 6 and 7. The other aspect of investigation addresses education and multiculturalism. Interests and influences in their work provide a window through which to view their beliefs about education and the relevance of multiculturalism to practices in multicultural classrooms. I ask:

5. What do the interests and influences that teachers’ reveal suggest about their views on education and the positioning of multiculturalism in education and practice?

Chapters 8, responds to this.
These five questions enable the inquiry to extend beyond local representations of teaching practice with a view to uncovering relationships among and between a teacher’s modes of existence, being (and becoming) a teacher, global conditions and national and other interests and influences, experiences and practices of teachers, the learning opportunities offered to culturally and linguistically different students and their inclusion in and/or exclusion from rich, relevant and robust learning.

1.1.2 Foregrounding National Interests

Approaching an investigation of social relations in teachers’ work and their effects from my vantage point of national interests, offers a way of disclosing interests and influences associated with shifts in national interests across time and place. These disclosures will give me the clues I need to comprehend the production of teachers’ work and its effects because each of the horizons of understanding that are revealed “expresses the superior breadth of vision that a person who is trying to understand must have” (Gadamer, 1997, p.305).

The hermeneutic assignment becomes an investigation of the nature of understanding that the many horizons will present (Gadamer, 1997). These will give me the best opportunity of capturing conditions that, in Gadamer’s view, make it possible to understand the meaning of what has been spoken, written or enacted. It responds to Gadamer’s challenge of finding ways to see things better “within a larger whole and truer proportion” (p.305). Outcomes of such an inquiry should offer fresh
perspectives on the responses educators make to the multicultural conditions of classrooms and their effects.

1.1.3 The Problem

Despite the attempts of successive governments over four decades to respond to changes to the growth and diversity of culturally and linguistically different students educational inequality remains a feature of education in Australia today (MCEETYA, 2008). Many students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (among others) are disproportionally disadvantaged (Commonwealth of Australia 2013; Australian Human Rights Commission (AHRC), 2008). Research in Australia has confirmed Indigenous students and Australian Muslims are “amongst the most deprived” (Pe-Pua et al., 2010, p.23).

Race, ethnicity and social class emerge as a contributing factors in participation differentials that exist between students from different backgrounds. This is evidenced in the early withdrawal of Indigenous students from education and poor performance outcomes (COAG Reform Council, 2013; AHRC, 2008). Many students from culturally and linguistically different backgrounds who are socially and economically disadvantaged have not been able to demonstrate the same improvements in learning outcomes as those from socially and economically advantaged groups (Windle, 2016). Low levels of academic achievement and lower retention rates for Pacific Islanders compared to the student population are shared by students from Middle Eastern language backgrounds, particularly in South Western Sydney.
(Lamb & Teese, 2005). Turkish students who continue with education in the post-compulsory years have not been able to achieve the same outcomes as students who are better prepared for senior study (Windle, n.d.).

Furthermore, antipathy to diversity is demonstrated by people who connect heritage to lack of worth to justify vilification and racialisation of others (Dunn & Nelson, 2011). According to Mansouri et al. (2009) classrooms are places where many teachers engage in, condone and/or ignore racism. The relationships between student hostility, resistance, detachment from learning and alienation from education have been explored (Mansouri & Trembath, 2005; Poynting & Noble, 2004). Research substantiates links between racism and its negative impacts on the physical and psychological well-being of students and their identity formation (Mansouri et al., 2009).

Cultural and linguistic responsiveness to difference in education has the capacity to address the disadvantage experienced by many students from culturally and linguistically different backgrounds (Sleeter, 2011). In Australia, cultural responsivity has been tempered, according to Brennan and Reid (2009), by discourses related to political economy and culture that constitute education in the national interest. The work that many teachers do today is directed towards showing evidence of improvement in students’ outcomes (Thompson & Harbaugh, 2013). This emphasis on student improvement and school performance was articulated by Rudd and Smith (2007), to political interest in changing
system settings. These changes were intended to secure Australia’s economic growth, prosperity and competitiveness in a globalised world.

The alignment of education with national interests has, according to Sleeter (2011), presented particular problems for many students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds and their teachers. Sleeter associates the marginalisation of “culturally responsive pedagogies, multiculturalism and bilingual approaches to teaching” (p. 12) to the neoliberal model of education. Exclusions such as these represent the consequences (intended or otherwise) of systemic changes to education.

To achieve the goal of improved performance, teaching practices in many schools respond, according to former Minister of Education Peter Garrett, to tests and test results that emanate from the National Assessment Program for Literacy and Numeracy (Garrett, 2012, ABC News Breakfast, 26 November). Foci such as these change what education is and who people in education will become (Schatzki, 2001). Caught up in this milieu are teachers who have been distanced, in Thompson & Harbaugh (2013) estimation, from the breadths of their professional learnings. Many students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds struggle to show what they can do if culturally responsive pedagogies, principles and approaches are marginalised (Sleeter, 2011) and their knowledges and languages disavowed (Youdell, 2006). When students are detached from learning and alienated from education, social and economic disadvantage crosses
intergenerational lines and life time chances for these students are bleak. (May & Sleeter, 2010)

I use memories of a conversation I had recently and my diary entry for that day to highlight the challenges both students and teachers face in multicultural classrooms.

**Reminiscence 1**

_I remember talking, recently (2009), to a woman from Nigeria who had just arrived in Australia. Her two daughters were playing nearby but the older of the two — Akira — edged closer, looking at us intently. Midway through our conversation she ran over to the bookshelf, grabbed a very large book, and dropped it on the table in front of us. She flicked through the pages until she found a full page map of Africa. Her English was limited but she showed me, first, the scarred soles of her feet. Pointing, then, to the location in Cameroon tapping fingers danced across the page demonstrating their journey.

These fingers traversed three central African countries to reach their destination, Nairobi that would lead them finally to Melbourne. What she knew and understood cannot be assumed but her resourcing of the atlas, in an unfamiliar place, and in recounting/demonstrating her experiences she drew on concepts of time, distance, communication, negotiation, environment, food, climate, the body’s potential, a sense of community and place, survival and living safely in a city under siege. All the while she looked at me for reassurance that I understood and negotiated the language she would use with her mother. Through a personal narrative this young girl represented a world view well beyond that of most eight year olds._

Akira has funds of knowledge and cultural capital (Moll, 2009) that she brings to learning. Teaching practice, informed by the current
management and accountability regime, is unable, in Thompson’s (2012) view, to situate, meaningful learning in inclusive environments nor engage thoughtfully with difference. For other students it is their experiences of disadvantage they bring to learning (Daniel Haile-Michael in Ryan, (2012), The Age, 14 May). Daniel, speaking of the challenges young Ethiopian-Australian students faced, maintains that schools were unable to adequately support young Australian-Ethiopian men. He goes on to say that both community and nation fell short on the support they offered (ibid.). He and his friends who were caught up in this education were, in his words, “set up for failure” (p.13). He observed the transformation of many of his friends and associates from children with hope for a better future to disenfranchised homeless, drug dependent young adults many of whom were involved in criminal behaviour and others already incarcerated (ibid.).

This discord between aspirations for a better future and the institutional arrangements made for them interrupted students’ identity formation as they tried to make sense of themselves in the place where they have landed – a place they had not had a hand in making (Dreyfus & Wrathall, 2005). Students like Daniel’s friends were left with a sense of loss and hopelessness (Mansouri et al., 2009). When Haile-Michael argued that schooling failed to educate many young Ethiopian-Australians he spoke of the effects of inadequate English language education opportunities and their subsequent placement in mainstream classrooms for which they and their teachers were ill prepared and for which there were few accommodations.
He raised important issues that this thesis seeks to answer: Whose interests are being served in education? Why are culturally and linguistically different students’ needs, not being met? What role does the education system play? What responsibility do educational actors have in the increasing alienation of some students from learning and their subsequent social, economic and political disenfranchisement? How can these circumstances be explained?

1.1.4 What Counts as Nation, the Interests of the State, Difference and Education

Critical Race Theory offers an approach to deconstruction that engages with racism, ethnicity, identity, social class, exclusion, and inequality (Rollock & Gillborn, 2011). It is used here as a lens to examine and critique relationships that emerge between discourses of nation, teaching practice and the opportunities for learning offered to culturally and linguistically different students. In that respect, critical race theory is able to bring into view power relations in the nation and its institutions including schools to show how people are positioned in particular relations and challenge structures, processes and discourses that maintain disadvantage and inequality.

Discourses and processes associated with the constitution of nations present particular challenges for different groups of people who find themselves together in the same place (Kristeva, 1991). The problem, according to Kristeva, is that a group of people who share the same culture and inhabit a territorial space are confronted by the presence of
different people or groups. This is based on their perception that the Other represents a challenge to the authority of the dominant group (ibid.). They recognise features and attributes of ‘intruders’ that are different to theirs: “those eyes, those lips, those cheek bones, that skin unlike others, all that distinguishes him” (p.3). Difference “reminds one that there is someone there” (ibid.). Recognition of foreign-ness shakes the foundation of reason and the people of a nation assert “I am not like you” (ibid.). Intrusions are met, according to Kristeva, with antagonism, or annoyance. The people of the nation assert “What are you doing here [...] this is not where you belong” (p.6)!

The “domination/exclusion fantasy” (Kristeva, 1991, p. 24), sorts out who is in the nation and who is out. Dominance and exclusion emerges in the site of affirmation when people who claim a common culture, histories and practices recognise themselves as a part of a nation and reject the threatening other (Hall, 1997).

In Australia, nation and territory merged, post colonisation, to create a political entity. Dominance in the nation state is aligned with different constructions of the ideal citizen (Green & Cormack, 2008). In the early years of federation (1901) the ideal citizen was an adventurer, always male and a servant of the empire (ibid.). Hage (1998) has more recently aligned representations of national identity with white nation fantasies even though neither nation nor culture has even been homogenous (Burnley, 2001). Australian governments have responded to increases in the cultural and linguistic diversity of the nation through political
interventions into migration and settlement. Multiculturalism is one such intervention.

In Parekh’s (2006) opinion, multiculturalism is concerned with “the proper terms of relationships between different cultural communities (p. 13). Multiculturalism in Australia has concentrated on managing relations among and between different cultural communities and the nation (Gunew, 2004). In this respect, multiculturalism emerges as both complex and contentious, in that it speaks, in different ways, to issues of national identity, citizenship and dominant society privilege (Forrest and Dunn, 2006). The ways in which it has spoken about depends on the political orientation of people, governments and policy makers (Sleeter, 1996).

Liberal multiculturalism, expressed in the National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia (1989) made explicit the rights of people from culturally diverse backgrounds to maintain their culture within the rule of law in exchange for duty, loyalty, obligation and responsibility to and for the nation (ibid.). In practical terms, liberal multiculturalism responded to issues, such as migrant disadvantage, social cohesion and cultural recognition, (Kalantzis et. al., 1990) but multiculturalism’s focus shifted to a more celebratory form of multiculturalism (ibid.). Meer and Momood (2012) are of the view that “the politics of recognition” associated with liberal multiculturalism “divert[ed] attention from the struggle for economic equality and social justice, dissipates moral and political energy, and leaves the prevailing social order more or less in tact”
A view that adjustments should be made by newcomers not by those already here emerged and continues to be expressed in national multicultural discourses (see Australian Multicultural Advisory Council (AMAC), 2010).

There were possibilities for liberal multiculturalism to move beyond liberal ideals of recognition and respect to equal treatment (Meer and Momood, 2012). Endeavours to promote cross cultural understanding were challenged when cultural differences were trivialised, “wider structural constraints” like discrimination ignored (May & Sleeter, 2010, p.7) and relations of power, subordination/domination and inequality were not addressed (Giroux, 1994; May & Sleeter, 2010). The difference between liberal multicultural and critical multiculturalism is that liberal multiculturalism represents the interests of the state whereas critical multiculturalism is concerned with changing the conditions experienced by disadvantaged groups (Kalantzis et. al, 1990).

One critical approach to multiculturalism, designed to achieve socially just outcomes for culturally different groups rests on bringing cultures into dialogue with one another (Parekh, 2006; Giroux, 1994). May and Sleeter (2010) affirm the importance of dialogue but 1) urge people and governments to retreat from setting “the limits of ethnicity and culture, nor act to undermine the legitimacy of other, equally valued forms of identity” (p.10); 2) encourage teachers to target institutional relations of power by engaging students and others in analysis of unequal power relations; 3) promote collective action as the means for bringing about
change in community and institutional relations. Critical approaches have been mediated by the current emphases placed on citizenship and interculturalism.

Multi/intercultural education is concerned with efforts designed to “improve relations between immigrants and non-immigrant groups” (Leeman & Reid, 2006, p. 64). Interculturalism has been adopted by the Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) as the vehicle for building a culturally diverse but cohesive society in Australia (MCEETYA, 2008; ACARA, 2013). In Meer and Modood’s (2010) view, political interculturalism moves beyond liberal multiculturalism’s co-existence in that it can engage with issues of identity and challenge illiberal cultural practices through dialogue but, in their view interculturalism, is “not yet able to offer a distinct perspective” (p.) but remains complimentary to multiculturalism (ibid.).

Against this backdrop of management of cultural and linguistic difference and diversity, nation states like Australia affirm “the right [of Others] to assimilate into the majority/dominant culture in the public sphere” (Momood, 1997, p. 358) whereas difference will be tolerated, only, if it is confined to “the private sphere” (ibid) where it remains out of site. Jones-Díaz (2003) found evidence of this phenomenon in “a split between children’s English-speaking public domains of mainstream Australia, and the Spanish-speaking private domain of the family” (p. 324). Limits placed on the use of national space raises issues with
regard to the ownership, control and regulation of space and questions who is in the nation and who is out.

Perger and Kostogriz (2014) argue that the consequences of “political interventions into immigration and multiculturalism” are “that the practice of managing explicitly different others, through oppression, has become a part of the nation’s narrative of exclusion” (p.160). Grounded in the constitution of nation and policies and practices of the State, these narratives, control and regulate “the terms of presence, and the nature of our relations with others” (ibid.). Acts of inclusion and exclusion are played out, not only in immigration and multiculturalism policies and practices, but more broadly in education (ibid.).

Nation building, a primary concern of the State is driven, according to Brennan and Reid (2009), by discourses that promote particular national interests. Green and Cormack (2008) show how the State’s capacity to meet particular challenges, are advanced by powerful discourses. These are used to construct the ideal citizen suited to the economic and social needs of the state in particular historical epochs (ibid). The authors relate books used to teach reading, in New English (1906), to discourses of imperialism and nationalism (ibid). Bureaucracies of the state, in disseminating readers carrying images of the ideal citizen, set in motion, the inculcation of expressions of imperial subjects with particular attributes in the imagination of students (ibid.). These “national formations”, in Green and Cormack’s estimation (p.258), are a component of nation building. People, according to Youdell (2006),
“come to be who they are by being intelligible within discourses, the bodies of meaning that frame social contexts” (p. 2). It is against such national formations that culturally and linguistically different people are measured (Green & Cormack, 2008). Students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds face significant challenges in realising idealised national formations (Luke, 1997a). Systems of domination act, to regulate, subordinate, silence, remove and/or eradicate difference (hooks, 2008).

Regulation

One way that relations between different groups in Australia have been regulated, is through neglect of the nation’s linguistic resources (Lo Bianco, 1987). Historically, Australia’s track record in acknowledging the importance of languages and cultures has been wanting (ibid). This has been the case, in Lo Bianco’s view, with respect to languages and dialects that are different to Standard Australian English. Exclusion of languages other than English, in the national interest, is exemplified in practices; the eradication of many Indigenous languages, silencing and/or marginalising of community languages and promotion of monolingualism by Government intervention restricting and even suppressing the use of other languages (ibid.).

Phillipson (2013) points out, that English dominance is reinforced through discourses promoting fallacies related to the ‘effective’ teaching and learning of English. One such deception suggests that English standards will be diminished if people are able to use other languages
Fallacies, such as this one, are used to cover over the contributions that other languages make to inclusion (ibid.). Creation of a hierarchy of languages emerges, according to Phillipson, when the dominant language is glorified and other languages are stigmatised. Power of the dominant language is realised through its naturalisation in policy and practices and the neglect of languages other than English (ibid).

The state’s interest in eradicating and/or silencing other languages is evident in English language education programs offered to culturally and linguistically different students (Kostogriz & Doecke, 2007). These programs, while emancipatory in their intent, have concentrated on replacing students’ existing linguistic and cultural resources with English language (ibid.). Jones-Díaz (2003), drawing on the 1996 census, explains that even though 248 languages are spoken in Australia “as few as 31 community languages and 16 Indigenous languages were taught in Australian primary schools for a minimum of 2 hours per week” (p. 315). This researcher found that home languages were used as tools of transition. They were not, in the views of participants in Jones-Díaz’s research, directed at retention of first language. The subtractive aspect of bilingualism was complicit in a shift from home language/s to English (ibid). This replacement agenda reflects Phillipson’s (2013) argument with respect to the creation of language hierarchies.
Mediation and Domination

Schools in Australia since the late seventies, a time synchronous with early developments in multicultural education, have been encouraged to recognise cultural and linguistic differences and respect the rights of people to maintain existing cultural practices including languages (Galbally, 1978). Teachers were advised, for example, to thread multicultural perspectives through existing curriculum (Department of School Education NSW, 1992). However, the purpose was not to advance the recognition and rights agenda but rather to raise awareness of the cultural diversity of schools and promote ethnic harmony (ibid.). Instead of addressing myths about culturally and linguistically different people one of the more recent approaches to using multicultural perspectives in learning has been to introduce “lessons of tolerance and respect” (Leemann & Reid, 2006. p.66). The nation state’s interest in protecting “the cultural space of natives” (Kostogriz and Doecke, 2007, p. 7) emerged in the harmony discourses that are designed to address issues related to the maintenance of social order (ibid.).

Schools that embraced liberal multiculturalism’s cultural recognition and rights project provided audiences with a chance to see and participate, in what Said (1978), has referred to as ‘exotic’ features of cultures. The value of cultural knowledges as entry points for learning have been obscured through non substantive engagements with cultural knowledges and practices that are critical to learning (Sleeter, 2011). These knowledges that students bring to learning (Gillborn, 1990) are
the ones that are disavowed (Youdell, 2006). Au and Apple (2009) have found that standardised curriculum privileges knowledge that supports “nationalism, patriotism and common culture” (p.109) at the expense of “multiculturalism, difference and structural inequalities” (ibid.). The authors link neoconservative politics of inclusion and exclusion to the struggles of disenfranchised students.

**Subordination**

Gillborn (1990), drawing on his UK study of the relationships between white teachers and black students’ experiences of schooling, demonstrates how systems of white domination are used to validate the imagery of a homogenised white English speaking nation and subordinate difference. Beliefs and understandings white teachers brought to school were found to be connected to the evaluations they made with regard to the abilities and behaviours of students of Afro-Caribbean and South Asia origin (ibid.).

Similarly, Malin (1997) in reporting on her Australian study of the experiences of Indigenous students in a class with a white teacher, associates the teacher’s misinterpretation of the skills and demeanour Indigenous students brought to learning to the teacher’s acceptance of negative stereotypes that are used to represent Indigenous Australians in prejudicial and discriminatory ways.

In both studies (Gillborn, 1990; Malin, 1997), researchers reported that teachers took exception to demonstrations/celebrations of cultural
identities. Gillborn (1990) found teachers’ interpretations of and responses to “styles of walking […] and dress” (p.50) to be racist and shows Kristeva’s (1991) domination/exclusion fantasy at work.

In the same vein, racist responses emerged in Malin’s (1997) study. On one occasion, during a tracing and colouring activity Malin observed the determination of the older Indigenous student – Naomi - to be self-sufficient. Naomi’s behaviour involved monitoring other students’ strategies to work out what needed to be done and helping other students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Her delay in starting the activity was judged by the teacher as a disciplinary issue (ibid.). Naomi and Tran, a student of Vietnamese origin, were both reprimanded for their tardiness (ibid.). Malin notes that “over the entire year, she [teacher] did not make one unambiguously positive statement about Naomi” (p. 154). Naomi’s self-sufficiency and care for others, attributes valued by her community, were ignored. Subsequent withdrawal of the teacher’s support of these students was associated with their marginalisation in both social and academic situations (ibid.).

The same discipline and punishment regime flourished at City Road School (Gillborn, 1990) where Afro-Caribbean students were directed to the study of subjects at the lowest level and hybrid/creole Englishes that Afro-Caribbean used were rejected (ibid.). Denial of the contributions of the students who used them show how the English spoken by ‘native’ speakers is privileged compared to the Englishes of non-native users (Phillipson, 2013).
There are consequences for students when discipline and punishment regimes are enacted (Gillborn, 1990). Naomi’s vulnerability was exposed because racially based understandings caused the teacher to misinterpret the student’s behaviour. In Malin’s (1997) view, the only mistake Naomi made “was not deferring without delay to the authority of an adult” because “such a deferral [...] would mean abandoning a considerable degree of her autonomy” (p. 147).

Eventually, Naomi was classified and labelled when the teacher reprimanded her and eventually said “you’re so slow” (ibid.). The consequence is that “when we name or interpellate another we in fact do not describe that person but rather, contribute to the marking of them in the terms of the name we have used” (Youdell, 2006, p.75). For this student, ‘slowness’ clearly had been attributed to her (Malin, 1997). This marker infiltrated assessment and is demonstrated by the teacher’s decision to further marginalise Naomi by recommending she repeat her first year of schooling (ibid.).

Systems of domination such as racism and ethnically based discrimination are complicit, in hook’s (2008) opinion, in evaluations that are employed to devalue others. When young adult Afro-Caribbean pupils in Gillborn’s study (1990) found themselves in disciplinary structures, these students, in the view of the research observer, were “denied any legitimate voice of complaint” (p.50). Arab-Australian students in Mansouri & Trembath’s (2005) Australian research tell a similar story. These students were disproportionally represented in the
school’s discipline system. As one student pointed out, “I was suspended 17 times because of her and for the stupidest reasons too. And I didn’t get to say anything that I wanted to say, they wouldn’t let me speak” (p. 522). By controlling what students want to say, their subaltern status is maintained, and issues related to prejudice, discrimination, racism, disadvantage and inequality are covered over (van Dijk, 1993).

Many disenfranchised people remain silent about their experiences of racism but “internalise the negative perceptions” (hooks, 2008, p.374) that have been assigned to them. This is demonstrated, according to hooks, through self-hatred and fear of whites. Students in Gillborn’s (1990) study displayed these social phenomena when they came to understand that the best option was to remain silent so as to resist their fear of ridicule. Naomi, on the other hand, did not appear to show self-hatred and fear of whites, during her first year of schooling as she maintained her culturally affirmed practices. But her future, as Malin (1997) demonstrates, has already been mediated by racially based misunderstandings. These are derived from the teacher’s acceptance of negative stereotypes that have resulted in denial of Naomi’s identity and her promotion to Year 1 (ibid.).

The production of false knowledges about people from different cultures calls into question the role of the media. Said’s (1981) investigation of the role of media power in the racialisation of particular groups found the “dominance of racist and insulting caricatures” (p.69) on prime time television, for example, to be complicit in the maintenance of racialised
constructions of worthy and unworthy citizens. These stereotypes have made it impossible for many viewers to overlook racialised understandings of Others and their cultures (ibid.). Gillborn (1990) and Malin (1997) relate to racist discourses to the maintenance of inequality. The same themes of regulation, misrepresentation of identities, knowledges and practices, marginalisation of students and devaluation of the values, skills and attributes culturally and linguistically different students brought to learning were associated by Gillborn (1990) and Malin (1997) to the subsequent domination/subordination of explicitly different students and educational disenfranchisement. Non-acceptance of actions and interactions of students that did not conform to the norm adhered to by white students and white teachers lead to enactments of discipline and punishment regimes and, creation of categories of good and bad students.

In Youdell’s (2006) view, categories of “bad students and impossible learners” (p. 3) and “good students and ideal learners” (p.33) are created and maintained along cultural lines. Students, like Naomi, who are already socially marginalised, are likely to become educationally disenfranchised because of their exclusion and subsequent disengagement (ibid.). Youdell suggests that their alienation from education is evidenced in absenteeism and their early removal or withdrawal from schools.

She suggests that if teachers commit to including:
...disavowed and subjugated knowledges in the curriculum and deconstructing their subjugated status, the taken-for-grantedness of prevailing discourses might be called into question and discourses that have been excluded from schools and schooling might become recognisable and even shift the hegemony of prevailing discourse (p.183).

Aspirations such as these confront discourses and agendas that are grounded in the interest of the nation state in maintaining the façade of a homogenous White Australia (Luke, 1997a). To accomplish this feat difference must be eliminated or at the very least subordinated (Bauman, 1991).

**Eradication**

Bauman’s (1989, 1991) theorising of extermination offers one way of understanding the deployment of practices and processes of domination. Classification of the Others and labelling them as failures or unworthy, suggests, in Bauman’s (1991) view, that different others do not fit. Their segregation from the dominant culture is necessary, in Bauman’s (1989) terms, if an idealised artificial social order is to be maintained. The problem, according to Bauman is that “people tainted with ineradicable blight of their past or origin could not be fitted into such unblemished, healthy and shining world” (p. 93); one that a white English speaking teacher in Malin’s (1997) research could/would only share with white English speaking students.
Extermination must target, in Bauman’s (1989) estimation, the ‘un-kept’ and ‘uncultivated’. In maintaining the artificial world, those who do not fit “like all other weeds […] must be segregated, contained, prevented from spreading, removed, and kept outside the society boundaries” (p. 92) because “their nature could not be changed. They could not be improved or re-educated. They have to be eliminated for reasons of genetic or ideational heredity” (ibid.). Weeding out, in Bauman’s view, is not to be understood as a destructive activity. Rather it is creative in that it maintains control of the perfect artificial order through exclusion (ibid.)

Gillborn (1990) relates the separation objective to support programs that use withdrawal models to remove many culturally and linguistically different students from class based learning, that in turn, distances, them from native speakers. Sleeter and Montecinos (1998) have questioned the benefits of add-on supports as these reflect the view that existing curriculum is relevant and appropriate for all students and schooling is “basically sound and well structured” (p.113). The interests of the state in maintaining the dominance/subordination experience of schooling are, as Haile-Michael showed, powerful influences that ensure students’ social and academic failure (Kostogriz & Doecke, 2007).

Erroneous evaluations that cast people in trivial, demeaning and destructive ways cause those who are subjected to these expressions of power to take up these misrepresentations (Taylor, 1997). If inferiority is internalised there are likely consequences for communities when individuals and groups adopt a “destructive identity” (p.71). Mansouri
and Kamp (2007) have drawn associations between world events, political environments post 9/11, and vilification of Arab and Muslim students in Australia. They relate experiences of racism to exclusion and articulate disengagement and alienation from education to students’ rejection of national space (ibid.). Mansouri et al. (2009) have illustrated the connections between racism in schools perpetuated by teachers and students to exclusion and the loss of physical and psychological health. Mansouri and Trembath’s (2005) found that students retreated to a safe place because “it’s nicer to live in a suburb where you got the same people as you, it’s better” (p. 522). Their perceptions of the safety (or not) of national space raise questions about the welcome extended to Others by people of the nation (Hage, 1998). Nations can exhibit hospitality in welcome by shifting the perception that Australia is and should remain a monolingual mono-cultural place. One of the ways this can be facilitated is by paying greater attention to a nation’s language resources (Jones-Díaz, 2003).

1.1.5 **Shifting National Interests**

Touchon (2009) argues that “with globalisation, languages education should be one of the strategic goals of […] education” (p. 65) pointing out the “social, economic, intellectual and political advantages for nations if they incorporate languages into their repertoires for education” (ibid.). *The Australian Language and Literacy Policy (1991)* represented a shift in attitudes to languages when it provided education sectors and systems with a planning framework for languages education (Jones-Díaz, 2003). Historically, calls such as these have confronted national
discourses that address the maintenance of linguistic purity (COAG Working Party, 1994).

Since the Council of Australian Government’s endorsement of the 1994 recommendations there have been attempts to shift the nation’s interest away from maintaining the façade of Australia as a monolingual and mono-cultural nation state (COAG Working Group, 1994). The National Asian Languages/Studies Strategy for Australian Schools Report, *Asian Languages and Australia’s Economic Future* (1994), for example, recommended governments move to mandating the study of languages. The Council of Australian Governments (COAG) endorsed the report’s recommendations. However, inconsistent implementation in schools reflects COAG’s caution with respect to the capacity of schools to realise the programme’s objectives.

More recently, in addressing the importance of languages and cultures the *Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs* (MCEETYA), (2005) suggests that “Australia must build on its diverse linguistic and cultural environment which is a result of its Indigenous history, geography and migration” (p.6). The policy indicated that through engaging with languages and culture: “learners will view the world, not from a single perspective of their own first language and culture, but from the multiple perspectives” available to them (p.3).

This demonstration of recognition of the importance of languages does not include many heritage nor minority languages even though
“immigrant groups have sought support for the intergenerational maintenance of home languages” (MCEETYA, 2005). Exclusion of these languages shows the distance between the policy of inclusion of languages and conservation of privilege of the white English speaking subject (Luke, 1997a).

Australia is yet to enter into critical national conversations about whether Indigenous Australians and associated with that, the cultures and languages of Indigenous Australians, for example, should be recognised in the Constitution (Dodson, 2011). This is important because

Australian Indigenous Languages have a unique place in Australia’s heritage and in its cultural and educational life. For Indigenous learners, they are fundamental to strengthening identity and self-esteem. For non-Indigenous learners, they provide a focus for development of cultural understanding and reconciliation (MCEETYA, 2005, p. 7).

Even though many citizens of the nation demonstrate antipathy to languages education and retreat from recognising or using languages other than English (Lo Bianco, 1987) the importance of languages to learning has not been underestimated by advocates of bilingual education and multilingual in-class engagements (Kostogriz & Doecke, 2007). In the view of these educators, it is one place where difference, disadvantage and inequality can be addressed. The principle of access to languages education for all students in Australian schools has been established in all three declarations that address national goals for schooling/education in Australia (MCEETYA, 1989; 1999; 2008). Languages are included as one of the key learning areas in the
Australian Curriculum, which means all students will experience language learning (ACARA, 2011).

The emphasis placed on including Asian languages, currently Chinese and Indonesian, reflects the aims of the National Asian Languages and Studies in Schools Program (2011) which is to increase opportunities for students to engage with the “languages and cultures of Australia’s key regional neighbours, namely China, Indonesia, Japan and Korea” (p.1). Sentiments like the ones that have been expressed demonstrate a heightened interest in languages and culture today that are related to the nation’s social, economic and strategic interests in the Asia Pacific. Language education, as a political intervention in the interests of the state also offers a way of creating a culturally and linguistically responsive education and informed classroom practices. One of the problems has been that teaching languages routinely occurs in language classrooms that are isolated from curriculum and pedagogy that is enacted in mainstream classrooms language classrooms. Language classes provide an entry point for students to experience and observe languages and cultures but not for teaching and learning in multicultural classrooms more broadly. What is needed in new times is to bring a culturally and linguistically rich multicultural education into dialogue with existing pedagogy and curriculum.

1.1.6 Challenges to Economic and Cultural Ordering

Ladson-Billings (1995), responding to students’ experiences of learning in the US context, proposed a theoretical model for teaching and
learning that brought together student achievement/underachievement, teacher’ beliefs and challenges to inequality that represented an emerging culturally relevant pedagogy. Culturally responsive pedagogies since that time have been developed and have contributed a set of principles that can be used to address educational inequality (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Sleeter 1996, 2010; Doecke et al., 2007; Gutiérrez, 2008; Kostogriz, 2009; Paris, 2012). Central to this pedagogy are, in Sleeter’s (2010) estimation, “the teacher, his/her expectations of students, his/her ability to build on knowledge students bring and to engage them using what students know as a resource for teaching new academic knowledge” (pp. 116-17). Dialogical processes are the means through which this can be done, as learners (teachers, expert others, students and community) frame positive pedagogical relations together (ibid.).

One of the problems with the take up of culturally responsive practice in Australia has been the tension Carr and Kemmis (1986) suggest, exists between education and schooling that exposes aspects of social order and impede efforts to make pedagogies more responsive to the multicultural composition of Australian classrooms. In spite of these influences there are teachers and schools who approach their work from different orientations. Comber’s (1993) research, for instance, has shown teachers working from critical orientations that support students in questioning meanings, messages and interpretations found in texts and evaluating what differences in understandings mean. Bi-lingual schools and those with immersion programs give students in these
contexts a chance to see and experience existing and new languages being used to engage students (Jones, 2001).

Even though there have been some advances in responding culturally and linguistically to difference, the language learning needs of many learners of English (language) have been subsumed under the broader category of literacy (Hammond, 1999). Remedial literacy does not purport to work with variations in languages, knowledges and experiences but responds to deficits and deficiencies (ibid.). Through this process education concentrates on the constitution of subjects who Peters (2002) has described as technologized beings. Windle and Miller (2012) have argued, more recently for language and literacy informed pedagogies. This approach will better address the needs of students from Afghanistan, Iraq, Myanmar/Burma and Sudan who have had disrupted of non-existent schooling and mediate disadvantage (ibid.).

Irrespective of new initiatives, such as the coupling of language and literacy in a responsive pedagogy there is a perception that Australian students do not do as well as their international counterpart. Results of students in Programme of International Student Assessment (2006)

Thompson (2001) and Peters (2002, 2003) draw on The Question Concerning Technology (Heidegger, 1977) and Being and Time (Heidegger, 2005). Peters explores human relations with technology and Thompson and Peters, referring to Heidegger’s enframing concept show how a technologised understanding of being has been constituted. Thompson situates this within “dissolution of the historical understanding of what education is” (p. 245) and associates this with the transformation of beings into resources (p. 249). These, he suggests, are entities “lacking intrinsic meaning” (ibid.). Technical rationality takes over and represents, in Peters’ (2002) view, a loss of thinking. Teachers caught up in bureaucratic processes such as “the quantification of qualitative relations” (Thompson, 2001, p. 250) change. Their mode of being, according to Peters (2003) distorts “actions and aspirations” (p.2) and what is left for students is little more than “empty busy work” demanded by “business concerns” (Heidegger, 1976, p.15).
were used to promote the idea that systems of education had failed students. *National Goals for Young Australians* (MCEETYA, 2008) set out to address disparities in student performances.

By enshrining the problem of enduring inequality in education in the *National Goals for Young Australians* (MCEETYA, 2008) a space for negotiating shared and divergent understandings about learning and teaching was opened for debate. In line with beliefs held by the state about economic growth, prosperity and competitiveness and the perceived failure of students in the *Programme for International Student Assessment* (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), 2007), reform in education would take a narrow route that demonstrates a shift to neoliberalism.

Education, in Australia today, is grounded in a managerial and accountability agenda. Data gathered through testing regimes is accepted as credible measures of student achievement that can be used to show improvements (or not) in students learning and drive teaching practices (Thompson, 2012; Gillard\(^4\) in Ferrari, *The Australian*, 5 December, 2007). Accountability agendas like these rest on a strong belief that improving student outcomes through standardised curriculum is the only way to achieve this objective (Sleeter, 2010).

---

\(^4\) Hon. Julia Gillard Minister for Education in the Rudd Labor Government 2007-2010 and Prime Minister 2010-2013
The dilemma for teachers working in multicultural contexts in Australia is, in Miller’s (2011) view, about finding ways of “responding to diversity in meaningful ways and ‘performing’ in a system with normative benchmarks and constant demands for improvement” (p.460). The antithesis to this proposition is believing students will learn and finding ways to respond to difference and diversity meaningfully (Grant & Sleeter, 2007).

1.1.7 Responding to the Composition of Multicultural Classrooms

Migration and globalisation has had significant impacts on the composition of Australia’s population (Mansouri & Jenkins, 2010). For example, students from Afghanistan, Burma, Iraq and Sudan are enrolling in Australian schools in increasing numbers (Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), 2011). These students have very different needs to the increasing numbers of children of globally mobile Chinese, Japanese, and Korean arrivals who are enrolled in higher socio-economic status schools in Australia (Lamb & Teese, 2005). Together these populations have created “an education system which is […] complex” and one which Mansouri and Jenkins suggest requires “a unique educational approach” (p.95).

I am compelled to look for and interrogate approaches that teachers use in multicultural classrooms to see how their work is constituted and with what effects.
1.2 Research Aims and Rationale

1.2.1 Difference, Discourses, Teachers’ Work, and Educational Inequality

The challenge is to ascertain whether an approach to learning and teaching exists that does not discriminate and is capable of achieving equal treatment of difference in education (Meer & Momood, 2012) and if so, whether it is capable of ameliorating the disadvantage that exists today.

I do not propose to do this on my own because there are many teachers who have spoken of their dismay with regard to the current approaches to teaching and learning (Dufler, Rice & Polesel, 2013; Thompson, 2012). Teachers' voices cited in current research, and others like them, know about interests, influences and discourses in their work and the effects they have on the learning opportunities offered to students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Teachers who seek to enact practice that is suited to the realities of teaching in multicultural classrooms challenge exclusionary regimes that reflect beliefs that the being of culturally and linguistically different students should be refined (Momood, 1997) or eliminated (Bauman, 1991). Teachers who challenge exclusionary approaches to education are well placed to contribute to a broader discussion about working with cultural and linguistic difference.
My proposal is that I investigate the experiences and practices of teachers to see how their work has been constituted and with what effects.

1.2.2 Contribution of Research to Knowledge and Practice

This research will make four contributions to the existing body of knowledge that relates to this investigation of social relations in teachers’ work. The first of these is the focus of the inquiry. The selection of national interests as a pathway to uncovering the constitution of teachers’ work and its effects offers a fresh way of examining the impact of experiences and practices of teachers on culturally and linguistically different students and their teachers. Shifts in national interests across time enable engagements that potentially stretch from teachers’ enactments of teaching practice in and across local landscapes of practice to, national and global interests and social change more broadly. These relationships can be used to highlight the broader operation of social organisation of work than can be garnished from any single focus.

The theoretical-philosophical framework in theorising the experiences and practices of teachers clarifies the ontological, existential and semiotic aspects of teaching practice to show the challenges teachers face in being and becoming a teacher. The fact of existence, sociality and the political dimension of textual-mediation of teachers’ work are used to disclose the bearing of entities — people and texts — on individual lives (Schatzki, 2005).
A further contribution relates to the structuring of methodological framework. Ontology is presented as the research framework. Institutional Ethnography is used to unpack the relationship between a teacher’s representation of practice and their *Dasien* - an expression of their being (Heidegger, 2005). Critical Discourse Analysis is employed to develop the concept of textual mediation that is used in Institutional Ethnography but not sufficiently developed and augment the reading of texts.

From a pedagogical perspective the culturally and/or critical responsive practice that teachers demonstrate is not prescriptive. Their representations can be used to frame but not standardise a culturally responsive pedagogy suited to the multicultural composition of Australian classrooms. Each of the contributions teachers make is unique to and reflects each individual teacher’s experiences and practices.

### 1.3 Thesis Outline

#### 1.3.1 Clarifying Language

In the following chapters, I talk about the things students bring to learning and use to learn. These two aspects have been separated because I want to talk about the two differently. When I write of the former - things students bring to learning — I place emphasis on lived experiences like disadvantage that impose significant obstacles to learning; the latter involves advantageous commodities like cultural knowledge and practices that can be used to learn. I also use a number
of terms — responsiveness, perception, entities, institution, social relations, presence, and space and place. Each of these is important to the construction of meaning as I articulate both arguments and theoretical positions. The diversity of meanings that could be assigned to any one of these concepts warrants clarification.

I use the term *culturally and linguistically different students* when I refer to students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. These students, drawing on Luke (1997a), are routinely classified as ‘other’ because they do not meet the nation’s normalised homogenous standards. In that respect, the term cultural and linguistic difference signifies deficits including a lack of what it means to be a student in Australian classrooms. In this research, the term is not intended to position culturally and linguistically different students as less equipped to learn but to emphasise the importance of knowing difference with respect to what culturally and linguistically different students bring to learning and use to learn.

The term *responsiveness* is used in a number of ways. My interest is in responsiveness to the multicultural composition of classrooms that is demonstrated by engagements with students and the life experiences they bring to learning and the sociocultural resources used to learn. Responsiveness to multicultural classrooms that I search for rigorously is recognisable by relations with and between students and teachers engaging with the distinctive languages, cultures, experiences, opinions, views and ways of thinking and doing that any individual carries with
them. But I do not discount other responses, for example to institutional demands.

When I talk about perceptions teachers have with regard to their teaching practice I am thinking about what teachers intuitively have hold of — an understanding of the thing that they speak of. I am mindful, too, that perceptions, from an ontological perspective are nested in the structures of existence. As such they guide the researcher towards each person’s mode of existence. Perception, in this sense, can be understood as fluid and unstable as people see and catch hold of different meanings which can change according to awareness that influences what they see and understand (Heidegger, 2005).

The term entities, refers to people and equipment. Heidegger (2005) has warned us of the folly of naming things like tools because if we name them, we run the risk of accepting meanings that have already been assigned to them. It/they might show up as something that I glimpse and for which I have no word just the essence of an occurrence or presence. These remain undisclosed until I can name them. But at other times I can name these, understanding that I have taken on routine meanings that have already been assigned to them.

I use the term institution in a particular way when I talk about the role of discourse and texts in co-ordinating teachers’ work. Drawing on DeVault and McCoy (2001) institution does not “refer to a particular type of organisation” (p.752) like a club or school. What it refers to is “text-
mediated relations organized around specific ruling functions, such as education” (ibid.). Similarly social relations take on a particular meaning. These are the connections that exist among different texts that turn up in teachers’ practice (ibid.).

**Presence** in this work takes on multiple meanings. It refers to the condition of being present but presence does not assume immediacy because presences can be there-with intentionally or non-intentionally (Schatzki, 2005). These might be present in space and time but orchestrated from afar not just immediately present (ibid.). Munday (2009) adds to understandings of presence as “interpretation of something” (p.36) in the present. This entity is one for which I may have no name.

Drawing on the work of Doreen Massey (2008) distinction is made between place and space but the distinction is not straightforward. Place is understood here as “sets of social relations” (p.257). These are not bound in the way ‘enclosures’ might corral places because social relations that show themselves in local places are connected to networks in space. This relation suggests that these places are unstable and characterised by internal conflicts (ibid.). Any mixture of social relations in one place and space “may produce effects which would never have happened otherwise” (p.258) if place was bound.
1.3.2  Research Journey

This thesis began with an examination of my experiences and practices. I chose to pursue national interests so that I could show connections among and between interests and influences in teaching practice and their impact on teachers’ work and students’ experiences of learning to capture the conditions that contribute to exclusion. The journey’s end is a critical response to educational inequality.

Chapter 2 addresses two interrelated areas of interest. I begin by examining the presence and effects of nation building discourses on education in three different political eras. Using English language education as an example I show the effects of changing relations between education and teaching practice on students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. In the second section of Chapter 2, national and international literature relating to culturally responsive practice is used to present a set of principles underpinning culturally responsive pedagogies to disclose what this alternative can offer to teaching practice in multicultural classrooms.

In Chapter 3, I theorise the experiences and practices of teachers using concepts drawn from Ontology (being and becoming a teacher), Institutional Ethnography (sociality) and Critical Discourse Analysis (textual mediation) to develop a framework for analysis, interpretation and understanding. These different dimensions are used to frame the research methodology and guide approaches to analysis of experiences
and practices of teachers, understanding that a teacher is already situated in a world and in ways of being (Heidegger, 2005).

Responding to Spirkin’s (1983) separation of philosophical-theoretical framing of methodology from research method, Chapter 4 presents the research method. I begin by setting out the objectives of this inquiry and I give my reasons for talking with teachers. Following this, practical activities related to the generation and collection of data, are explained. Teacher profiles are presented and being a teacher is related to the contexts in which they teach and have taught. I show how the intellectual resources offered by Ontology, Institutional Ethnography and Critical Discourse Analysis will be used to inform three interrelated platforms for analysis and interpretation of data and show how these platforms address the inquiry interests. The ethical dimensions of this research as well as its limitations are interwoven into each subsection.

Part 2 consists of four chapters. Chapters 5-7 are organised according to Bowe, Ball and Gold’s (1992) categories of technical and professional approaches to teaching practice.

Chapter 5 presents a rigid work process that relies on the levelling of difference, narrowing of curriculum and segregation of low-performing students. In such contexts, teaching practices respond to the demands of texts including, for example, records of results obtained in tests and tasks performed in English. I reveal how processes designed to improve student outcomes and evaluate teacher effectiveness are tied to
discourses of performativity, cultural conservation, nationalism and conformity. The nation’s desire for improved regional and global relations and economic competitiveness is demonstrated through teaching practices that focus on the production of social and economic subjects. I relate teachers’ work to discursive domination to reveal the stretch and complexity of social organisation of classroom practices.

In Chapter 6, the focus shifts to teachers who claim their terrains of practice — the classroom. They show few, if any, replicable accountability texts and call on personal histories to inform their practices. Using notions of liberal and critical multiculturalism and, associated with that, theories of learning they show different processes, interests, discourses and relations as they demonstrate layered, multifaceted student-centred dialogical and experiential practices. But any challenges to prejudice and discrimination are silenced by holders of institutional power who use discourses emphasising performativity, conformity and cultural conservation to maintain English performance cultures.

By comparison, Chapter 7 reports on the work of teachers practising in schools where discourses, alternative to the neoliberal one, have been introduced. These teachers show an expanded vision of students and respond to some of the things students bring to learning and use to learn. Discourses of performativity and conformity are on stand-by and as teachers make learning events more accessible and enhance students’ participation their work is not free from destabilisation. There
are teachers who examine their own practice and places emerge where students and teachers interrogate their own beliefs and enter into transformative relations. But teachers do not routinely address disadvantage beyond participation in learning events or engage with inequality more broadly.

In Chapter 8, I use the experiences and practices of teachers as windows through which to observe their views on education and the relevance of multiculturalism in multicultural classrooms. From this vantage point I am able to show education as a complex, contested and contentious feature of social organisation and multiculturalism as largely irrelevant to the work of some teachers and understated by others. I found that where a work process model directed practice, education emerged as a social and economic imperative constituted in the national interest and designed to mould skilled economic and culturally conforming subjects. Multiculturalism was not considered relevant in a place where everyone was treated in the same way. Conversely, teachers oriented to improved participation communicated their view of education as an ethical undertaking. They drew on memories of past experiences and practices to inform their work. Liberal and critical multicultural discourses were present. Challenges to discriminatory practices were often ineffective and some teachers retreated from questioning discriminatory arrangements beyond the classroom. Within the milieu of performance rhetoric, Smith’s (1999) exceptionally aware teachers saw where they were standing and responded differently. They approached their work from different directions but revealed the
influence of different discourses – internationalisation, interculturalism and academic achievement.

A problem solving strategy is deployed in Chapter 9 to address these impediments to realising equality. Culturally responsive pedagogies and critical multiculturalism emerge as essential resources for addressing disadvantage and inequality. A critical response to inequality brings together the principles underpinning culturally responsive practice (theory) and teachers’ demonstrations of culturally responsive pedagogies (practice) with critical multicultural (agency). Teachers, as participants in professional learning will be invited to reflect on work processes and practices, identify places where they can include the experiences, practices, histories, knowledges and understandings that culturally and linguistically different students bring to learning and use to learn and settle participants in learning in inclusive multicultural classrooms.

In the final part I reflect on my research journey to show one way of realising a non-prescriptive culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy suited to Australian schools and suggest that the fact of a teacher’s existence is an issue for them in responding to the multicultural composition of their classrooms.
1.4 Generative Conclusion

I have suggested that national interests can be used to show different historical horizons of understanding of education that Gadamer (1997) suggests I will need to comprehend the constitution of teaching practice and its effects. In Chapter 2, I respond to this focus by reviewing 1) shifts in national interests and their relation to education (1972-2015) and 2) showing an alternative way of responding to culturally and linguistically different students.
Introduction

Catching hold of the various threads that have been used to stitch together the complex, contentious and sometimes colourful tapestry that depicts education in Australia is bound, in this investigation, by two significant events. In June 2014 Prime Minister Abbott (2013-15) announced the terms of reference for the Coalition Government’s Reform of Federation inquiry (Abbott, 2014). This investigation seeks to examine, among other things, the involvement of the State “in matters that have traditionally been the responsibility of the states and territories” (p.1) and to evaluate whether education can be understood as having “genuine national and strategic importance” (ibid.) that warrants Commonwealth involvement. Abbott’s questioning of the role of the State in education throws a spotlight on the changing nature of intergovernmental relations that changed substantially during the Whitlam Government’s (1972–75) drive for equality when Whitlam advanced a greater role for the State in education (Lingard, 2000). These two events provide the parameters for this review.

By examining education policy and its implementation in three different political eras situated between 1972 and 2015 I am going to show shifts in the presence and effects of nation building discourses on education policies and their implementation to reveal the variety of ways that
successive Australian governments have deployed education to attend to national interests since 1972. Shifts in policies of the State are considered in the context of education as it is articulated by governments in state and territory education jurisdictions. The first period considers the rise of economic rationalism in the Whitlam (1972–75) /Fraser (1975–83) years, and its consolidation during Labor’s reign under Hawke (1983–91) and Keating (1991–96). Shifts from economic rationalism to cultural conservation are explored in the context of Howard’s tenure (1996–2007). Rudd (2007–10) and Gillard’s (2010–13) Education Revolution provides the context for interrogating the most recent human capital building reform agenda that has been touted as a means for addressing student disadvantage and ameliorating educational inequality (Rudd & Gillard, 2008b).

By examining shifts in education from one historic epoch to another I link the State’s nation-building enterprises to education and the constitution of culturally and linguistically different students as subjects of the State. I demonstrate the formation of three subjectivities — deficient social and economic subjects, socially deviant and economically defective subjects and the more recent constitution of naïve/fleeceable subjects. These students are promised “high quality schooling that is free from discrimination” (MCEETYA, 2008, p.7) but with respect to learning are judged by the State and/or its agencies to be inadequate entities who, require management — monitoring, remediation, repair and systematic surveillance. Processes of reification demonstrate how differences are targeted and re-defined as social, cultural, economic and citizenship
deficits, defects, deficiencies and deviance. This matters because despite the disparate attempts by the State across different political eras to address inequality these efforts have excluded many students from meaningful learning and life time outcomes for these students are often bleak.

In the second section of this chapter I review different pedagogical contributions that are related to culturally responsive pedagogies and present six sets of principles that can be used to frame a culturally responsive pedagogy. It is advanced as a resource that can be used to help frame culturally responsive pedagogies suited to Australian schools.

As I present particular aspects of education and practice I enter into debates constituted through competing interests between, for example, Federal and state and territory governments and/or different literature sources. If I do this work I speak, drawing on Heidegger (2005), from the position of a teacher already situated in a world and in particular way/s of being.
Section 1

2.1 Economic Rationalism, and the Constitution of Economic Subjects in Industrial (1972–83) and Post Industrial Economies and (1983–96)

2.1.1 *Social Justice, the Economy, Teachers’ Work, and Exclusion/Inclusion*

Prior to Labor’s victory in the 1972 election, Whitlam (1972), in the *It’s Time* address to the nation, challenged voters to abandon a government attached to attitudes reminiscent of the 1950s. The event signalled a shift in discourse from cultural conservation that demanded ‘foreigners’ go “back ter [their] own bloody country” (O’Grady\(^5\), 1957, p.52) to discourses of hope and a chance to build a different kind of nation (Whitlam, 1972). And this, he argued, would be achieved through education; an education in which the State would have a greater stake (ibid.).

Whitlam faced low economic growth, substantial changes in the multicultural composition of classrooms and uncertainty about employment for school leavers (Lingard, 2000; Luke, 1997a). The government deployed a dual focus that involved the coupling of social justice interests expressed through equal opportunity with economic interests tied to employability (ibid.). It was used to create a framework for social mobility that relied on building human capital (Brennan & Reid, 2009). Education would be the site for the manufacture of subjects that, ________

\(^5\) *They’re a Weird Mob* is written by John O’Grady. The text presents the author as Nino Culotta the main character.
according to Luke (1997a), would become “productive economic resources” (p.6). Discourses of cultural conservation that, according to Luke had sustained the imaginary of the “homogenous generic subject of the imperialist nation state” during the post war years were neither silenced nor did they disappear (ibid. p.10). As the State operationalised its equal opportunity agenda English language education was positioned, according to Kostogriz & Doecke (2007), as a tool of assimilation.

To secure the entry of students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds into the social and economic life of the nation meant “cultural and linguistic differences [were] constructed as inferior and stigmatized” (Kostogriz & Doecke, 2007, p.2). Phillipson (2013) suggests that the monolingual fallacy is used to maintain the privilege assigned to English and strengthen the power of the dominant language over other languages. Syllabuses, like Oral English (Tate, 1971) set out the elements of language and the sequence in which they would be ‘delivered’. Students were expected to learn and correctly produce items inscribed in this curriculum (ibid.). Similarly Learning English in Australia (Australian Department of Education, 1974a) presented English incrementally often in isolation from other elements. Material resources — readers, workbooks and the Pronunciation Booklet were used to structure the role of language educators (1974b). Teachers were cautioned about changing the order in which elements would be presented as any disturbances to the sequencing was thought to make acquisition of the target language more difficult (ibid.).
This approach, according to Kostogriz and Doecke (2007) was intended to “eradicate linguistic pollution” (p.7). Practices of this kind position teachers as actors in the maintenance of linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 2013). It is aligned, in Freire’s (1990) opinion, with the impost of the choices of some on the activities of others. He has associated dominance such as this with the maintenance of oppression (ibid.). This appears in the English only assimilatory orientation and explains, in part, why there were no adjustments to classroom pedagogy and why existing curriculum arrangements were maintained (Allan & Hill, 1995).

English acquisition understood as enfranchisement became a “tool and an outcome of cultural-political integration as something that can both empower and disempower people” (Kostogriz & Doecke, 2007, p.3). On this basis, English language education addressed the lack of English and silenced what students knew, understood and could do by stripping them of their cultural and linguistic capital and funds of knowledge (Moll, 2009). Denial of the contributions of the students who use other languages and hybrid/creole Englis hes, resonate with Phillipson’s (2013) assertion, that fallacies about learning English conceal the value of languages (ibid.). Mansouri et al., (2009) have suggested that the losses experienced by students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds are considerable. These relate to losses of “a sense of belonging” (p.9) and “disintegration of a sense of self” (p.106).
Culturally and linguistically different students re-appeared as newly remediated and refined subjects (Momood, 1997). Stripped of wholesome cultural identities and existing cultural capital but armed with alien knowledge, skills, language, and values they were expected to blend into the social, economic and political fabric of an imaginary bordered mono-cultural/monolingual nation-state (Luke, 1997a). In this place their welcome was tempered, in Gunew’s (2004) view, according to how well they fit the image of being Australian.

The empowerment/disempowerment of the English enfranchising agenda (Kostogriz & Doecke, 2007) occurred during the seventies against the backdrop of innovations in language education appearing in state and territory documents. For example, the New South Wales (NSW) Curriculum for Primary Schools: Language (Department of Education NSW, 1974) and Victoria’s Language Curriculum Statement (Education Department Victoria, 1975) documents promoted, among other things, meaning-making from a child centred perspective. These texts appeared at the same time as Grassby (1973) promoted, with certain vigour, the rights of students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds to a relevant inclusive curriculum (ibid.). Students were able to tell their stories that, according to Cambourne and Turbill (2007) became important resources for learning. Integrated approaches to learning English emerged, in what could be described as developing forms of resource rich participatory environments (Gutiérrez, 2001).
Teachers, among others, were urged to re-consider the welcome extended to people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (Galbally, 1978). Breaching the cultural distance between different groups, through “tempering and modifying the simplistic attitudes of rejection or indifference”, offered new possibilities (Kristeva, 1991, p.104).

Shifts from structured language learning to student-centred practices show a change in theoretical propositions and pedagogical relations. Where the structural syllabuses focused on production the new documents can be more closely aligned with Piaget’s (1935) interest in the relationship between a child’s experiences and their learning and/or child-centred theories of learning that favour dialogical processes used to make meaning by associating what is known with the development of new knowledge (Vygotsky, 1986).

New forms of formative assessment like running records (Clay, 1993) were at odds with and did not displace traditional testing regimes (Luke, 1997a). The problem that students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds faced was being compared to students who met the homogeneous standard (ibid.). Their ‘lacks’ became deficits and subsequently the focus of teaching and learning (ibid.).

Debates about the value of culturally responsive pedagogies were silenced as attacks on whole language flourished (Gannon & Sawyer (2007). Questions about competencies that had been raised by Karmel
(Interim Committee of the Australian School's Commission, 1973) re-emerged. Youth unemployment became a problem and challenged, once again, education’s role in achieving national interests (Lingard, 2000). Goals 6 and 7 of the National Goals of Schooling, hereafter referred to as the Hobart Declaration (MCEETYA, 1989), responded by promoting skills that were judged by employers, particularly, as essential to employability.

2.1.2 Effectiveness and Efficiency, Teachers’ Work, Student Subjectivities and Exclusion/Inclusion


Education would address skills and competencies relevant to the national interests (MCEETYA, 1989). English language was constructed as a “basic skill [essential] in the modern world” (.p 7). Emphasis on
skills, reflect, in Kostogriz & Doecke’s (2007) view, a response “to the demands put on a new workforce by economic integration, the emergence of a transnational market and a single division of labour” (p.3). By prioritising literacy, numeracy, and technological skills that were transferable across employment sectors, the Hobart Declaration (MCEETYA, 1989) suggested, that students would have “maximum flexibility and adaptability in their future employment” (Goal 4) in post-industrial economies. Targets, like the one addressing appropriate levels of attainment of skills (Target 2.2) reflected the shift towards performance outputs (Lingard, 2000). This meant an increased focus on the “results of learning” (Luke, 2010, p.190) and contributed to recreation of the nations’ productive economic subjects to performing ones.

The economic priorities emphasised in the Hobart Declaration (MCEETYA, 1989) stood in opposition to emerging shifts in English language education. Halliday’s (1985) systemic functional linguistics provided the grounds for learners of English and their teachers to explore more rigorously their language and its use in context. Spoken and written texts were examined to reveal the relations between the selection and use of grammatical resources and their relevance to different social purposes (Derewianka, 1990). TESOL teachers (among others) talked with students about their language choices applicable to meaning-making in different social contexts (ibid.). At the same time, more critical approaches to learning such as critical literacy (Luke, 2000) entered teaching practice. Teachers, like those cited in Comber’s (1993)
research asked probing questions about texts and tried to disrupt students’ “uncritical acceptance” of the meanings and messages carried in “classroom and public texts” (p.75).

This different view of teachers’ work was challenged by education commentators who favoured initiation and socialisation approaches to the integration of culturally and linguistically different students into the host culture (Donnelly, 1995). In keeping with this view, Donnelly argued that students would be better served by learning western knowledge and Judeo-Christian values (ibid.). Under these conditions, schools, in Momood’s (1997) opinion, were positioned as agencies of refinement.

Building human capital through improving literacy and numeracy outcomes and technological skills permeated education since, as Kostogriz (2011) has noted, “literacy levels as a key indicator of economic productivity” (p.24) responds to the demands of post-industrial economies. New possibilities for culturally responsive engagements confronted competency discourses linking “educational deficiencies” to “proficiency targets” (Quality of Education in Australia: Review Committee, 1985, p.161). The ESL Scales (Australian Education Council (AEC), 1994), provided benchmarks that were used to assess English language competency (ibid.). Students’ performance would be evaluated, for instance, through showing proficiency in application of target repertoires (Outcome 5.3, p.14). The focus on English pronunciation with “native-like fluency” (ibid, p.125) demonstrates the
emphasis on skills that had been selected according to their usefulness for integration at school and/or work.

English focus, with remediation of perceived deficits in production reflects a view of English language education as a tool of assimilation (Kostogriz & Doecke, 2007). According to the Australian Education Council (1994) the language that culturally and linguistically different people would learn should reflect the language requirements of school and work. Equality ideals were realised by emphasising the rights of students to support in English acquisition and proficiency (Quality of Education in Australia: Review Committee, 1985, p.38). Distancing students from maintaining the sociocultural resources they could use to learn and positioning them in a process of instruction, evaluation, remediation and refinement contributed to their constitution as deficient economic and social subjects (Luke, 1997a).

The State’s interest in economic enfranchisement and upward social mobility for students who would otherwise be at risk was disrupted by the incoming conservative Coalition Government (Luke, 1997a). A citizenship thrust accompanied by free market ideologies — privatisation and competition — demonstrated changes to the way the State would view both education (Lingard, 2000) and people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (Singh, 2005). Social and economic discourses shifted, according to Luke (1997a), from those that had contributed to the constitution of many students as deficient economic subjects to new ones. National interests, in his estimation, shifted from
“ameliorative and redistributive discourses of the 1980s human capital model” (p.15) to “discourses of restoration and control and order” (ibid.). These, Luke maintains, rely on “judgement on the effected entities as not just lacking in skill but in need of moral order and discipline” (ibid.). Culturally and linguistically different students who had previously been judged as lacking in skills were transformed during this period (1996–2007) into subjects considered to be both socially deviant and economically defective (Luke, 1997a).

2.2 Reinstatement of Privilege, Social Cohesion, Global Competitiveness and Conforming Subjects

2.2.1 Re-instating White Anglo Privilege

Shifts in policy designed to maintain internal stability were intent on both normalising and demonising Others (Kostogriz & Doecke, 2007). The purpose behind these moves, in the view of the authors, was to maintain what was perceived to be “the cultural space of natives” (p.7). As Kostogriz and Doecke have pointed out, recovery and reinstatement of the white Anglo subject and maintenance of an ideal, imaginary, homogeneous, and socially cohesive nation-state was contingent on discrediting Others (ibid.).

Relations between the State and many culturally and linguistically different people and groups were repositioned through adjustments to multicultural policy (Commonwealth of Australia, 1999). Indeed “the freedom of all Australians to express and share their cultural values [became] dependent on their abiding by mutual civic obligations” (p.6).
This imperative of obligation was to be played out “within the context of a unifying commitment to Australia” (p.3). Howard⁶ (2006), in his tenth anniversary address, pointed out that “when you come to this country you become Australian”. In doing so, he reinforced the view that becoming Australian meant fitting the exclusionary white English speaking ideal citizen that is associated with dominance and exclusion (Hage, 1998).

Discourses of citizenship advanced during the Howard years (1996–2007) contributed to the “construction of normal and abnormal […] that is inextricably bound up with privileging the native self as opposed to the non-normative Other” (Kostogriz & Doecke, 2007, p.4). Debates driven by ‘new racism’ questioned the worthiness of some people to become part of a socially cohesive Australia (Luke, 1997a). Asian and Indigenous groups (ibid.) or anyone fitting the conflated Arab, Middle Eastern, Muslim category (Poynting & Noble, 2004) were subjected to heightened scrutiny. Questions were asked about the effects of Chinese immigration on national stability and social cohesion (Cottle & Bulger, 2008). Political posturing revealed prejudices when questions were raised about the suitability of Muslims for integration into the community (Howard in O’Brien & R. Kerbaj, The Australian, December 15, 2005, p.2).

⁶ Prime Minister of Australia (1996-2007)
Racialised constructions, broadcast through the media, present distorted images (Said, 1981). These have made it impossible for many viewers and listeners to overlook representations of Others and their cultures (ibid.). White flight from government schools to private ones intensified during debates about who is in and who is out (Ho, 2011). The materialisation of cultural conservation discourses in national space is confirmed when, according to Ho, you “hear one express concern about the local public school having ‘too many Asians’, or Lebanese, or Muslims, or Aborigines” (p.1).

Rhetoric invoking threat and fear has the effect, in Luke’s (1997a) view, of promulgating “reinvention of an (imaginary and unmarked) normalised subject as the homogeneous standard against which difference will be found lacking or deviant” (p.14). Economic subjects were no longer in need of linguistic reassignment and cultural refinement and reorientation (ibid.). What was pursued in these new times, drawing on Apple’s (1996) critique of social theories, was conservative restoration. This retreat to pre-1972s cultural and moral management was designed to facilitate eradication of the “unruliness of diversity and difference” (Luke, 1997a, p.10).

2.2.2 Education and the Constitution of Socially Deviant and Economically Defective Subjects

Citizenship agendas strengthened when moral development was represented in the National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty-First Century (MCEETYA, 1999) (hereafter referred to as the Adelaide
Declaration). Assumed national values were inscribed in *The National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools* (Department of Education, Science & Training (DEST), 2005a). This policy advances the view that education would be as much about “building character as it is about equipping students with specific skills” (p.5). In that respect, students will be schooled in ways that respond to and match predetermined skill sets and character. The *Values for Australia Schooling* (DEST, 2005b) poster is a resource used in schools that, from my perspective, is designed to address explicit features of character building. It presents nine values that emerged from consultation with school communities and responds to aspirations presented in the *Adelaide Declaration* (1999).

I remember my reaction to the image on the values poster. My recollection of that moment is presented in Reminiscence 2.

**Reminiscence 2**

> Viewed through my eyes — those of a white English speaking Australian born citizen, it does not represent Australians as it purports to do (see Figure 1 on the following page). It shows two men on a donkey. They both wear slouch hats. I know who they are but I wonder what others make of them. Difference is not represented and I question how, an image of white war weary warriors on a donkey represent the character of the nation’s people.

*Exclusionary images like this one are deployed to show who is in and who is out (Hage, 1998). They present and re-affirm the exclusionary post-war narrative of homogenous warriors — protectors of the nation.*
Students are shown a narrow image of who can be counted as a hero in Australian. Accompanying slogans like “Be aware of others and their cultures” (DEST, 2005b, 2005a, p.4) do not provide defences against intolerance and exclusion when they appear like warnings one would find on beaches where sharks’ lurk.

Figure 1: Values Poster for Australian Schools

Source: Department of Education, Science and Training (2005b)

Deficiencies in moral character and skill levels were advanced as the cause of underachievement and unemployment (Luke, 1997a). The Adelaide Declaration (1999) reinforced the need for building both cultural and economic capital. Goal 1 promotes personal excellence as the “basis for […] potential life roles as family, community and workforce
members”. Within that goal the desire to produce “active informed citizens with an understanding and appreciation of Australia’s system of government and civic life” (Goal 1.4) placed citizenship education within those boundaries on the schooling agenda. In responding to the National Multicultural Advisory Council’s Report, *Australian multiculturalism for a new century: Towards inclusiveness* (1999), Howard reinforced the unity ideal. In *A New Agenda for Multicultural Australia* (Commonwealth of Australia, 1999), Australian citizenship discourses displaced multicultural ideals of cultural recognition and rights in favour of obligations like “respect for and tolerance of others’ beliefs and practices” (pp.6–7). New citizenship discourses entered education and readied schools for the production of subjects whose “intellectual, physical, social, moral, spiritual, and aesthetic development” (MCEETYA, 1999, p.2) would fit the national imaginary.

Alongside the citizenship focus was employment-related skills. Goal 2 specified and prioritised the skills of numeracy and English literacy (MCEETYA, 1999). The *Commonwealth Literacy Policy* (DEETYA, 1998) shifted attention from English language education to literacy. Comber *et al.* (1998) point out that Labor’s prior “yoking of social justice and economic viability […] paved the way, in fact, for the Liberal Coalition Government to effectively re-read and reframe social justice as simply the provision of literacy standards” (p.26). The learning needs of many students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds were, according to Hammond (1999), “redefined and subsumed under the general heading of literacy needs” (p.129). The author argues that
students rarely had opportunities to utilise the different sociocultural resources that were available to them (ibid.). Remedial literacy focused on “developing literacy abilities in terms of what [students were] unable to do, that is their failures and deficiencies” (Hammond, 1999, p.126) an approach that contributes to the constitution of *deficient economic subjects* (Luke, 1997a). In previous historic epochs, multicultural discourses provided opportunities for teachers to mediate failure and deficiency discourses by promoting language rich learning experiences for culturally and linguistically different students.

Neoconservative opposition to multiculturalism flourished. The tolerance ideal was upheld, but cultural recognition was challenged by Howard’s promotion of a shared national identity grounded in core values (Commonwealth of Australia, 1999). The shift from multiculturalism to nationalism expunged the term ‘multiculturalism’ and effectively silenced responsiveness. These moves have been defended and promoted by Donnelly (2015). He is highly critical of multiculturalism, promotes knowledge of western civilisation and emphasises the importance of instilling Judeo-Christian heritage to the nation’s imagination (ibid.). In the US, Hirsh (2006) has argued strenuously for memorisation of core knowledge. This is the knowledge that Au and Apple (2009) associate with discourses of patriotism and nationalism. They also underpin Hirsh’s (2006) opposition to whole language approaches and critical literacy favouring, instead, standardised curriculum and homogenous learning environments.
Critical articulations of multiculturalism that offered different understanding of schools as sites of agency, political debate, ethics and transformation (Giroux, 1995; May, 1998) were silenced. One of the reasons that critical multiculturalism did not gain traction in western democracies is, as May and Sleeter (2010) suggest, that its theoretical focus, in the absence of illustrations of practical applications, could not displace the weaker demonstrations of multiculturalism including liberal multiculturalism (May & Sleeter, 2010) and interculturalism (Meer & Momood, 2012). Schools were able to accommodate annual celebrations on, for example, International Day without argument or debate, as leaders and teachers rarely questioned the substance and/or effects of cultural exhibitions as accurate representations of culture (Said, 1978). Celebration met the cultural recognition principle but did not prompt challenges to power relations carried in schools (May & Sleeter, 2010).

There was a concerted effort at this time to destabilise progressive reforms instituted by state and territory governments (Singh, 2005). Provisions for maintenance of Indigenous languages, in education, were reduced and/or removed entirely (Lo Bianco, 1987). Programs like the National Accelerated Literacy Program were “driven by accountability, effectiveness, and performativity discourses” (Kostogriz, 2011, p.30). At the same time, Singh (2005) has noted that “bilingual education, multi-faith religious studies, multicultural education, and studies of Asia and Africa” were suppressed and/or silenced (p.117).
By positioning education as an agency responsible for maintenance of internal stability, debates about how “education might work with difference” (Luke, 1997a, p.15) shifted to policies that would build a different kind of education (ibid.). In practical terms, drawing on Taylor (1997), evaluation of worthiness became a measure of acceptance that facilitated processes for “excluding strangers” who “misuse and contaminate language” (Kostogriz & Doecke, 2007, p.7) or do not match the nations’ desirable moral character (Luke, 1997a). Teachers, in Luke’s (2010) estimation, were potentially caught up in “the basics, vocational skills, order, authority, discipline, [and] canon” (p.15) which left them vulnerable and at risk of overlooking the multicultural composition of classrooms.

One way of understanding domination and subordination of culturally and linguistically different students and their teachers is advanced by Lukács (1920). He implies “class-conditioned unconsciousness” (p. 6) conceals one’s own conditions of existence. Teachers, like others, caught up in ruling class relations overlook the signs of dominance as they impose the interests and ways of living of the dominant class on the actions and interactions of people who are subordinate to holders of power (ibid.). Arguably, marginalisation of students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds and the likelihood of sustained social, cultural and economic disadvantage of disenfranchised groups potentially fuels disturbances to the internal stability that the State had aspired to.
Change was eminent when the 2007 general election brought a new Labor government into power (Rudd & Smith, 2007). Discourses that promoted restoration of white privilege and homogenisation of the population to maintain white privilege and achieve social cohesion confronted new ones (Luke, 1997a). In-coming Prime Minister Rudd (Rudd & Gillard, 2008a) reaffirmed his view, that the nation needed “to develop a rigorous national curriculum that helps Australian students and Australian schools compete internationally” (p.2). Discourses of performance within an equality framework signalled changes to how different features of social organisation including education would be positioned (ibid.).


2.3.1 Discourses of Failure, Social Justice, and Alienation

What marks this period (2007–13) from previous eras where human capital ideologies have framed education is the intensification of control of education by the State through ratification of the Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) Act, 2008 (Australian Government, 2008). This emanates, in part, from panic discourses circulating at this time about the failures of education (Lingard, 2000) and the need for a return to the basics of literacy and numeracy (Gillard, in Ferrari, (2007), The Australian 5 December). Crises such as these, in Comber et al.’s (1998) estimation, “are evidence more of governments and institutions grappling with major
social, economic and cultural change than of absolute declines in literacy per se” (p.19).

These failures, irrespective of whether they were real or not, were constructed using the performances of Australian students in relation to their international peers (Rudd & Smith, 2007). The Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians (MCEETYA, 2008) also highlighted failures to improve both “educational outcomes for many Indigenous Australians” (p.5) and failures to improve representation of “students from low socio-economic backgrounds” (ibid.) in higher achievement bands (when international comparisons are made). By raising questions relating to the relationship between educational inequality and new economic opportunities The Melbourne Declaration re-affirmed social justice ideals like equality that had been tempered during the Howard years (Brennan & Reid, 2009). It promoted economic expansion — global competitiveness and opportunities in Asia as national interests (MCEETYA, 2008). Social justice orientations characteristic of the Labor cause confronted the perceived failures of teachers, schools and systems of education. The “basics of literacy and numeracy” became the place from where social and educational inequality would be addressed (Gillard in Ferrari, (2007) The Australian, 5 December, p.2). In emphasising performance, measures of performance and the utility of performance information, the then Minister of Education advanced a teaching and testing accountability agenda

7 Hon. Julia Gillard, then, Minister for Education in the Rudd Government (2007-2010) and later Prime Minister of Australia (2010-2013)
Gillard’s stance on the importance of the basics of literacy and numeracy for ameliorating disadvantage is contested by educators who speak from oppositional positions. Donnelly (2012, *The Drum*, 18 June), speaking from the standpoint of an educator who favours the initiation and socialisation approach to difference questions the assumption that testing will “lead to higher standards, improved productivity, and a more competitive economy”. A belief about the usefulness of quantifiable performance indicators as credible measures of learning progress is also challenged by Luke (1997a). Irrespective of opposition from two different sides of education debates about the value of data, mechanisms for control instituted through the Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) Act (2008) established a new framework for education (Section 6 of the Act). It formalised development and implementation of a standardised *Australian Curriculum* and the *National Assessment Program — Literacy and Numeracy* (NAPLAN). National testing arrangements, the *MySchool* website and the *National Professional Standards for Teachers* (AITSL, 2011) operate as forms of surveillance. Policy statements like *The Melbourne Declaration* (MCEETYA, 2008) and its *Action Plan* (MCEETA, 2009), drawing on Luke (1997a), act as “narratives that

---

8 *MySchool* website is a publically accessible site that presents and reports on individual schools, shows demographic and performance data and enables comparisons between schools with similar community profiles.
describe and position human subjects as actors within chains of events and actions” (p.3). Partnership arrangements embedded in policy documents such as the National Plan for School Improvement and National Partnerships are a part of the chain that Luke suggests, link the interests of the State to implementation strategies employed by state and territory governments. The texts that they produce and disseminate represent components of a “discursive economy” that in Comber & Nixon’s (2009) estimation have “framed and regulated education” (p.336). Social organisation of education of this magnitude is able to change the ways teachers talk about their work. Comber and Nixon emphasise that “even in a project focusing on pedagogy” (ibid.), discussions about it are almost impossible to catch (ibid.).

2.3.2 Materialisation of Discourses in Teachers’ Work

Recent Australian research (Dufler, Rice & Polesel, 2013; Thompson, 2013) suggests corporatisation of education has taken hold of practice. Thompson & Harbaugh (2013) have indicated that test training now takes up significant amounts of time in many classrooms. Instruction in demonstrating basic skills (training), performance measures (tests) and performance data (test results) reveals an intensification of human capital rationales (Luke, 2010). Instruction, caught up in the basics, according to Carter (2008), routinely involves decontextualized instruction. Furthermore, learning English through a decontextualized language focus exacerbates the disadvantage already experienced by students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (ibid.). In Luke’s (2010) opinion these practices, contribute to “large scale
reproduction of educational inequality” (p.169). There is an alternative to learning through a decontextualized language approach. Windle and Miller (2012) suggest that responsivity to cultural and linguistic difference should be situated in theories of learning. Teachers will need to activate each student’s prior knowledge, use modelling, scaffolding and deconstruction for making meaning and enlist first language support otherwise what students know and bring to learning will remain untapped (ibid.). In state and territory jurisdictions, approaches like this have been mediated by performance discourses in policy.

2.3.3 *English Language Education*

State and territory English language curriculum documents had offered, in other historical periods, different opportunities for teachers of English. During this period of reform (from 2008) English language documents, like other curricula were reviewed to bring them in line with the requirements of the new *Australian Curriculum* (ACARA Act, 2008). However, in keeping with the broader performance and accountability focus, the *EAL Developmental Continuum* P–10 has been introduced in Victoria as an addition to the existing curriculum for English language education (State of Victoria (Education & Training, 2012). It offers “evidence based indicators of progress” that teachers use to track student performance (ibid).

Other jurisdictions, for example, South Australia’s Department of Education and Child Development (DECD) has replaced its *ESL Scope and Sequence* document with the *Language and Literacy Levels across*
the Australian Curriculum: EALD Students to reflect the accountability focus (DECD, 2013). The organising elements, “text knowledge, grammar knowledge and word knowledge” (p.7) are sites of prescription where “each aspect is described through indicators of language and literacy development” (p.7–8). The role of the teacher is to 

...determine a student’s current literacy level and the gap between where the student is and where the student needs to be — the desired goal. The teacher is then able to identify specific language elements, pertinent to a given learning area topic, particularly assessment tasks within it (p.10).

Explicit in the language of the document is “the gap”. Drawing on May and Sleeter (2010), the gap approach is one of the problems associated with exclusion of students because deficit pedagogies are routinely deployed to fill the gap (ibid.). Students, in this case, are taught elements that have been judged to be useful to successful performances, particularly, in assessment tasks (DECD, 2013). The ability to retreat from filling the gap approach is limited by the strong links between assessment, moderated evidence and “funding for English Additional Language/Dialect (EALD) programs” (DECD, 2013, p.11). Whether English language teachers decide to retreat from gap filling processes is not a certainty. For as Derrida (1995) asserts “if I know what’s to be done [...] to do this to cause that, then there is no moment of decision, simply the application of a body of knowledge, or at the very least a rule or a norm” (p.37). English language education is positioned as a servant for ensuring successful performances in assessment tasks and emerges as a site of institutionalised inequality.
2.3.4 Generative Conclusion

Shifts in education and multicultural policies and their implementation in each of the periods under examination revealed changing social, cultural, economic and strategic national interests and their effects on teachers and the opportunities for learning offered to culturally and linguistically different students.

New discourses emerged during the Whitlam and Fraser years. A fledging multiculturalism took shape in the wake of Karmel’s (1973) observations of indifference to diversity, education for all was associated with the expansion of schooling and endorsement of liberal multiculturalism by the Fraser government drew social and economic interests of the nation into education. Pedagogies influenced by these discourses showed up in efforts to include culturally and linguistically different students in learning. The focus shifted to competencies that reflected worries about youth unemployment. Students were schooled to serve employment interests. Pedagogical relations shifted from inclusion of cultural experiences in learning to attainment of competencies.

Economic enfranchisement and liberal multicultural discourses permeated the Hawke and Keating government’s dual foci – economic prosperity and building a multicultural nation. Their focus on economic prosperity within an egalitarian framework enabled critical approaches to pedagogy but critical literacy was situated in opposition to competency agendas. English was positioned as an essential skill. Literacy and numeracy discourses associated preparation of students for work force participation with improved chances of social mobility for disadvantaged groups. Students schooled in this era served national interests through employment and aspiration for prosperity and in doing so was designed to relieve the state of financial burdens through social mobility.
The Howard government’s neo-conservatism emphasised individual market place freedom and a return to pre 1972 cultural conservation. Multiculturalism was silenced. Citizenship, built around core values promoted homogeneity in the population. People from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, who were already here, were expected to become Australian and the rights of some groups to stay and/or come here were challenged. White flight from government to private schools reflected worries carried in racialized discourses about explicitly different people. Moulding of students reflected in practices of remediation and refinement disclosed beliefs about deficiencies in skills and moral character.

Rudd/ Gillard/Rudd governments, determination to address the perceived failures of Australian students, embarked on a reform to education agenda. Standardisation of curriculum and the national testing regime show neoliberalism as a key discourse, driving education. Multicultural policies exist but the avalanche of policy and implementation discourses emanating from bureaucracies of the state have diminished possibilities for teachers who would like to enter into different pedagogical relations with students.

Shifts in approaches to education and multiculturalism across different historical eras mean that the experiences and practices of teachers also shift. Theorising the experiences and practices of teachers becomes a key objective as well as a recurrent theme that will run across all section in Chapter 3.

As I am certain that an alternative to the current approach to education exists. I examine, in Section 2 of this chapter culturally responsive practices to see if they offer an alternative to an education that reifies students and their teachers.
Section 2

Introduction

A body of literature already exists attesting to the significance of culturally responsive teaching and learning in addressing impediments to inclusion (Sleeter, 1995, 1996, 2010, 2011, 2012; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Gutiérrez, 2008; 2001; Paris, 2012). Its presence in Australian schools however is underwhelming but there have been calls for building cultural responsiveness in schools particularly in areas of social unrest (Burridge, Buchanan & Chodkiewicz, 2009). Adopting such an approach suggests engagement with critical approaches to pedagogy and multiculturalism.

One of the problems with recognition of the value of culturally responsive pedagogies has been that different approaches to education and multiculturalism have not engaged comprehensively and systematically with student exclusion and disadvantage by interrogating structural inequalities (May & Sleeter, 2010). Liberal multiculturalism, for example, promoted recognition and respect for difference but there was, in the view of May and Sleeter no "corresponding recognition of [...] power relations that underpin inequality and limit cultural interaction (p. 3). Celebratory expressions of imagined cultures that are often on display in Australian schools “essentialise and depoliticise culture” (ibid., p. 6). The replacement of liberal multiculturalism with citizenship and associated with that, the framing of citizens who adhere to core values and the Australian way of life as equal, diverts attention away from existing power relations (ibid.).
May and Sleeter (2010) suggest that critical approaches to pedagogy and multiculturalism can be used to address “longstanding racialized institutional policies and practices […] that consistently disadvantage minority students” (p. 3). Teachers wanting to engage students with the broader questions relating to recognition, identity, practices, experiences of existence and power and, oppression can do this by approaching analysis from multiple standpoints (ibid.). Dialogical processes through which students are given a voice begins, according to May and Sleeter, with the experiences of students themselves in the historical contexts in which they are and have been situated. Culturally responsive pedagogies partnered with critical analysis of structures of inequality can disclose and challenge institutional policies and practices that disadvantage and oppress.

Teacher educators in Australia have already made significant contributions to research and demonstrate histories of working in schools with students, teachers, families and leaders on issues related to pedagogy in multicultural classrooms (Kostogriz, 2009; Miller, 2011; Comber & Nixon, 2009; Comber & Kamler, 2007 and Nixon & Comber, 2006), encounters with culturally and linguistically different others (Kostogriz & Doecke, 2007) and professional ethics (Doecke et al., 2010). Within these domains educators have worked simultaneously with theory and practice in schools and subject specific contexts. Collaborations, such as these, suggest that there are educators, schools and teachers already open to working on matters relating to culturally responsive teachers’ work.
As such, it is a matter of scrutinising literature to ascertain whether a culturally responsive pedagogy offers an alternative to the current framework for education and whether it has a critical edge that makes it capable of ameliorating disadvantage.

2.4 A Cultural Responsive Pedagogy for Australian Classrooms

2.4.1 It's Time

Culturally responsive pedagogy rests on a fundamental belief that students will learn, if teaching and learning is embedded in recognition, acceptance and acknowledgement of who they are and the value of what they know and use to learn (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Grant & Sleeter, 2007). Such a monumental shift in thinking from indifference to recognition implies more than recognition: it asks, drawing on Kristeva (1991) “shall we be, intimately and subjectively, able to live with the others, to live as others, without ostracism but also without levelling?” (p.2). People can do this and be-with others equally, Kristeva suggests, but only when we recognise and accept “the foreigner […] within us” (p.1). It is care and hospitality, in her view, that enables one to recognise “the right of a stranger not to be treated as an enemy when he arrives in the land of another” (p.172). It also suggests, as Kostogriz and Doecke (2007) point out, challenging processes and practices designed to maintain cultural and linguistic purity and supremacy.

The journey is not a new one but fledgling endeavours have been effectively silenced in Australian classrooms by the pressures
surrounding performativity, conformity, imperialist and cultural conservation discourses. But educators committed to equality and inclusion, both in Australia and elsewhere, have safeguarded culturally responsive pedagogy. There is no better time than now to reinvigorate debates about culturally responsive pedagogy given that significant improvements in student outcomes have not been realised (Randall in Smith, 2015, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 5 August; COAG, 2013). Furthermore, re-engagement with responsive pedagogies is prompted by current national and global terror events, radicalisation of disenfranchised youth and home grown extremism (Evans, 2015, *The Times*, 9 August). Culturally responsive education is a place where issues related to student detachment from learning, alienation from education and disenfranchisement can be addressed.

### 2.4.2 Uncovering Key Principles

Drawing on Gutiérrez (2008) the difference between culturally responsive pedagogies and gap filling performance-based ones, for instance, lies in acceptance. This applies to classrooms where there are “multiple, layered and conflicting activity systems” (p.152). Within them a teacher’s role is one of “following threads […], interactions and engagements […] across multiple spaces, subject positions, points of mutual attention, harmony, conflict and disruption” (ibid.). Ultimately, acceptance of responsibility to the Other is the place where responsiveness flourishes (Kostogriz & Doecke, 2007; Gutiérrez, 2008). Learning imbued with recognition and affirmation can, according to May (1998), be transformative. It is here that the potential for “expanded
forms of learning and the development of new knowledge are heightened” (Gutiérrez, 2008, p.152).

With acceptance comes the challenge of knowing, a deep and intimate knowing grounded in ethical ideals (Corey, Corey & Callahan, 2011). A teacher, driven, for example, by a virtue ethic would ask, according to the authors, not only whether what they were doing was right but whether what they were doing was/is best for the student/s they were working with at that time. When teachers imagine possible futures, aspirational ethics — the “highest standard of thinking and conduct” (p.15) — defines practice. Aspirational practice resonates with what Doecke et al., (2010) refer to as “life affirming responsiveness to others, to social and cultural difference and to the multiplicity of abilities and needs of children in our schools” (p.4). Responsibility permeates this site of struggle when teachers question how to respond to “this particular student on this particular day” (ibid.). This struggle raises the crucial question — what will I do to ensure my students participate in meaningful learning?

The answer lies in knowing students. This means making arrangements in sites of learning, including in the communities of learners so knowledges and understandings can be shared (Sleeter, 2010). It is where multilingualism and multiculturalism, as Paris (2012) suggests, become central to learning as students work with existing resources at the same time as they develop and critique other ones (ibid.).
Accepting our responsibility to others and knowing what students and teachers bring to learning are two aspects of knowing. Another knowing relates to knowing what teachers and students are responsible for in each learning event (Sleeter, 2011). We can do this, Sleeter suggests, by knowing more than subject content knowledge. It means linking “everyday knowledge with learning academic subject matter” (p.16). Engagement in these conditions, means knowing experiences of disadvantage as well as how to think and work critically with knowledges, languages, understandings, literacies, and ways of being a learner (May & Sleeter, 2010). Sharing ideas, means having or being able to negotiate understandings. Through this process new and potentially complex bodies of knowledge are likely to be created (Sleeter, 2011).

Such a stance emphasises continuous dialogic engagements with and between students, teachers and community and institutions of learning and teachers and students coming to know “how to teach [and learn] based on different understandings of the situation” (Carr and Kemmis, 1986, p.180). Indeed Darling-Hammond & Snyder (2000) assert that:

...teaching in ways that are responsive to students requires that teachers be able to engage in systematic learning from teaching contexts as well as from more generalized theory about teaching and learning. Without an understanding of how culture, experience, readiness, and context influence how people grow, learn, and develop, it is difficult for teachers to make good judgements about how to deal with the specific events in the classroom. However, without an appreciation for the intense, interactive realities of classroom life, and for the multidimensional problems and possibilities posed by individual learners, it is difficult for the theoretically knowledgeable to apply what they know in practice.
It is both more difficult to develop such abilities and to evaluate them than it is to assume a single approach to teaching or a single right answer to teaching problems (p.525).

From the point of view of these authors, bringing together and applying knowledge of theories of teaching and learning within the context of the possibilities present in culturally diverse contexts is no easy matter. As Darling-Hammond & Snyder have suggested it is much easier to latch onto a single approach that appears to be, in an Aristotelian (1976) sense, correct, rather than grappling with the question of what might be right and possible. This choice prompts thinking about how teachers might respond to this dilemma. We can do this as Banks, Banks and McGee, (1989) suggest, by becoming culturally alert, recognising, accepting, collaborating and responding to others’ (no longer Others) interpretations and perspectives. At a practical level, realising possibilities begins, in Sleeter’s (2010) estimation, by “using what students know as a resource for teaching” (p.117) and helping learners teachers and expert others to negotiate connections between what is known culturally and new knowledge and maintaining the high expectations that teachers must communicate to learners (ibid.).

Culturally responsive pedagogy lies, not only with responding to the lived experiences of students, but also working with teachers whose lived experiences may not have readied them for changes in thinking about learning events that respond to who students are and what they really know. This means teachers and students working together but shifting from didactic teaching to learning situated in fluid, flexible and
dynamic learning environments where multiple interpretations, uses, and perceptions inhabit practice (Gutiérrez, 2008). These might be the same or similar amongst members of a group or, as Gutiérrez (n.da.) reminds us, they may be very different to what might be assumed because identity, like culture, is not fixed and is subject to change. The challenge is to understand what culturally responsive practice invites students and teachers to do.

2.4.3 **Challenge for Teachers**

An engagement with the key principles I have emphasised here — acceptance, knowing, agency, dialogical engagements, linking lived experiences with academic learning and creating fluid, flexible and dynamic learning environment invites consideration of each of these principles and responding to the challenges implicit in them. The answer to the question — How do educators work responsively with the students they teach? — is, as Gadamer (1997) suggests, an understanding of what I and others are looking for.

A teacher agent who is searching for freedom, transformation and/or emancipation for her students would not be silent. She would be on the move, intellectually and organisationally (Vygotsky, 1986). Such a person, in Darling-Hammond and Snyder’s (2000) view, would question relations in learning and probe how knowledges of students and theories of teaching and learning and language acquisition can be applied simultaneously, on a day to day basis. Investigation of different approaches becomes a part of such a teachers’ learning.
Experimentation with different features of dialogic engagements, for instance, disclose those that enable responsiveness to “this particular student on this particular day” (Doecke et al., 2010, p.4). On a day to day basis such a teacher would consider and act on arrangements that need to be made or changed (Gutiérrez, n.d.c).

These provocations represent challenges that teachers wanting to work responsively will confront. Young (2010) points out that, responsive sites of learning that welcome students equally, pose a threat because challenges to inequality involve confronting relations of power. Reticence to challenge dominance is related, in Schatzki’s (2005) view, to the potential fear teachers might have with regards to how their actions and interactions might be viewed. Teachers’ fear of failing to meet school targets is evidenced in their determination to instruct and test (Thompson & Harbaugh, 2013).

Culturally responsive pedagogy offers an alternative that “empowers learning in diverse student populations” (Sleeter, 2011, p.8). It offers assessment procedures that do not lack the complexity required of critical work and promotes expanding roles for culturally responsive practitioners as researchers and pioneers in developing alternative achievement criteria (ibid.).

2.4.4 **Framing an Alternative Approach**

Culturally responsive practice represents an alternative to the current neoliberal model that emphasises management of difference,
standardisation of curriculum and quantified performance. Drawing on the work of researchers interested in culturally responsive teaching it rests on:

Accepting

1. cultural diversity is the norm in Australian classrooms (Rizvi, 2011; Mansouri & Jenkins, 2005)

2. responsibility to the other (Kostogriz & Doecke, 2007)

Knowing

3. culturally responsive practice applies to all teachers in and across all landscapes of practice because it rests on what each teacher is able to find out about each student (Doecke et al., 2010)

4. students will learn (Sleeter, 1995; Ladson- Billings, 1995)

5. the lived experiences students bring to leaning and the cultural and linguistic resources they use to learn are the starting point for learning (Gutiérrez, 2008; Sleeter, 2012)

6. cultural difference is not something that can to be managed in an effort to overcome the presence of difference (Sleeter, 2011)

Engaging

7. ethically through the welcome extended to students and sustained in relationships (Kostogriz, 2009)

8. in multilingual and multicultural practices (Paris, 2012)

9. as a learner in sustained dialogical relations within and across community groups (Sleeter, 2010)
Linking Learning

10. through professional engagement with and between students, teachers, families, communities and teacher educators (Comber & Nixon, 2009)

11. appreciating that culturally responsive pedagogy accommodates all the domains dimensions of learning (Darling-Hammond & Snyder, 2000)

Building Environments

12. building resource rich participatory environments (Gutiérrez, 2001)

13. articulating high expectations and rigorous learning (Gutiérrez, 2008; Sleeter, 2010)

Agency

14. knowing that the site of transformation is the place where teachers, learners and communities stand together “recognising that the other brings more than I can comprehend (Kostogriz, 2007, p.16)

15. accepting the role of the agent in the struggle for understanding structures that produce and maintain inequality to reach a place of equality where Others are no longer Other (Sleeter, 2012b).

Even though educators working in this field suggest that socially just education will improve academic achievement for all students and better prepare students for being in the globalised world of the 21st century, commitment to it is not guaranteed (Derrida, 1995). One of the barriers to its adoption is the paucity of research that links culturally responsive practice to student achievement (Sleeter, 2011). This poses a problem for its adoption as it confronts panics about ‘the basics’ that are used to
create fear in the minds of the public (Lingard, 2000). These panics are flamed by demands for a return to basics whenever there are attempts to destabilise the domination/subordination status quo (ibid.).

Culturally responsive pedagogy offers one alternative to the current approach. It is inclusive of skills, so in that respect it does not exclude skills based learning from its repertoire. Indeed, Cheesman and De Pry (2010) have, taken an evidenced based instruction and measurement model of teaching literacy skills but they have not retreated from culturally responsive teaching. When De Pry and Cheesman (2010) re-define culturally responsive pedagogy, they suggest that recognition and responsiveness coupled with research based instruction and measurement should not be dismissed. Although their stance on academic achievement is yet to be evaluated and the depth of building on what is known to negotiate meanings and create new academic and intercultural learning opportunities is unclear, it is obvious that the authors’ intent is on promoting equality through a multifaceted approach.

Culturally responsive pedagogy emerges as an approach worth pursuing for its potential to change institutional arrangements and challenge the way relationships with others are entered into. This can be achieved by looking closely at teaching practice to see what practising teachers can offer to a newly articulated possibility for teaching practice in multicultural classrooms. A proposal such as this would challenge the privileging of the “cultural core” that Kostogriz, Doecke and Locke (2011)
argue claims the “monopoly in defining what counts as [...] good teaching” (p.3).

2.5 Generative Conclusion

In the conclusion to section 1 I disclosed what I believed to be a relationship between shifts in discourses underpinning education across time and place and the experiences and practices of teachers. Theorising the everyday experiences and practices emerged as a key objective of the research. As such the experiences and practices of teachers is the data on which this research rests. A theoretical framework viewed from ontological, existential and language and semiotic directions will enable me to view teachers’ work from different perspectives.

I have taken this approach, following Gadamer (1997), because coming to understand the experiences and practices of teachers means rejecting ‘naïve’ assumptions constituted between a text and the present and looking beyond the present to the past. From an hermeneutical orientation this means nesting this investigation in a philosophical-theoretical framework that can be used to disclose conditions that make interpretation and understanding of teachers’ work and its effects possible (Gadamer, 1997). Theorising the experiences and practices of teachers emerges as a key objective as well as a leitmotif running across all sections of Chapter 3.
3 PHILOSOPHICAL-THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR INVESTIGATING THE EVERYDAY EXPERIENCES AND PRACTICES OF TEACHERS

3.1 Theorising the Experiences and Practices of Teachers

In this chapter, I use being and becoming a teacher, sociality and the political dimension of textual mediation to theorise the everyday experiences and practices of teachers from three different perspectives — ontological, existential and language and semiotic. Ontological inquiry focuses on the centrality of the meaning of *being* and (becoming) a teacher, explored through a set of intellectual concepts provided by Heidegger (2005, 1976); Institutional Ethnography provides a theory of sociality as a foundational dimension of practice; Critical Discourse Analysis is used to theorise the political side of textual mediation of practice and augment the reading of texts. Following Gadamer (1997) the philosophical-theoretical research framework as methodology, “is less [about] methods we have at our disposal” (p.307) and more about the thinking behind this inquiry. It is employed to inform the research method but is separated it (Chapter 4) (Spirken, 1983)

3.1.1 The Possibilities Existence Offers

Theorising *being* and *becoming* a teacher through the lens of ontology offers a powerful way of coming to understand the relation between a
teacher’s expression of their being - their *Dasein*⁹ - and their experiences and practices. At the core of this examination are the structures of existence — *being* (existence) and *being-with-others* (co-existence) (Heidegger, 2005).

*Drawing on my own experience of working in multicultural classrooms in 1974–75 I can explain the significance of existence and co-existence to being and becoming a teacher. During this period of professional learning and concurrent practice I was schooled in and used a structural syllabus. The children with me were taught grammar in the sequence laid down in the documents. I rarely deviated from the script irrespective of whether the teaching point was relevant to their needs, or not. I could not make these evaluations because I did not see the conditions of their existence that they brought to learning nor the funds of knowledge and cultural capital they used to learn. Heidegger (2005) would suggest that these children and their experiences, knowledge and practices were concealed in the “averageness of [my] everyday existence” (p.240). My lack of sight shows my mode of being, at that time, as an everyday inauthentic human who Heidegger refers to as *Itself* (ibid.).

From a Heideggerian (2005) point of view there are only two possibilities for being. One of these is being *inauthentic*. They do not exhibit the same clarity of sight as people living an *authentic* existence are able to do (Smith, 1999). Heidegger’s (2005) *itself* — the *authentic* being — recognises possibilities and is distinguished from *Itself* — the *inauthentic* one’s — neglect of possibilities. It is possible for *inauthentic* beings to emerge from the sameness of everyday existence (Dreyfus & Wrathall,)

---

⁹ *Dasein* refers to the being a person possesses – the expression of their being (Heidegger, 2005).
2005). In fact, Gur-Ze’ve (2002) reinforces the view, that authenticity and inauthenticity can be ‘there’ simultaneously. Everyday impediments to awareness and insightfulness must be cleared away before everyday beings can be released from the obscurity and indifference of everydayness (Heidegger, 2005; Schatzki, 2005).

One of the impediments to achieving a more collaborative and emancipatory multiculturalism in Australia was the retreat of the people of the nation from their participation in reciprocal recognition. They did not see the possibilities for intercultural/cross-cultural relations. Critical multiculturalism’s emphasis on interrogation of structural impediments to achieving equality, for example, has the capacity to show the impact of liberal multiculturalism’s neglect of possibilities.

It is reasonable to argue, from a Heideggerian (2005) orientation that an individual teacher’s mode of existence is reflected in their practices. Authentic beings can be distinguished from inauthentic ones through their circumspect responses to entities - people, particularly students, in this case, and equipment.

When I taught students learning English in the early years of my practice I saw the syllabus, grammar sequence and the script I was to follow. I was conscious of the expectation that I would teach English to these students so they could participate in the mainstream curriculum. This is not the only way to be-with others (ibid.).
Some teachers, for example, will be-with students authentically and develop more sustained and ethical relationships by talking with them and their families and ‘dwelling’ in their communities so that they come to know who these children are. Differences in actions and interactions can be used to disclose a teacher’s mode of existence. The structures of existence being and being-with (Heidegger, 2005) provide a way of understanding being and becoming a teacher in relationship with others (Schatzki, 2005).

3.1.2 The Struggle of Existence in Being a Teacher

This inquiry recognises, drawing on Smith (2001) that many teachers are caught up in teaching practices “co-ordinated through the authorised texts of an institution” (p.187). As such, experiences and practices of teachers are not necessarily those of individuals but rather of people existing in one way, the everyday one where, in Heidegger’s (2005) view “everything that is primordial gets glossed over” (p.164). One of the ways this might happen is through the invasion of a teacher’s practice by texts carrying meanings and relations of power that have been embedded in them (Smith, 2001; Fairclough, 2005; Luke, 1997b; van Dijk, 1993). It is where social pressure exerted, for instance by the discourses of an institution, can overwhelm people (Comber & Nixon, 2009).

These assertions draw existence into any discussion of work in the world into which teachers have been thrown but one that they did not have a hand in creating (Dreyfus & Wrathall, 2005). Central to
understanding everyday experiences and practices of teachers is to understand the conditions they find themselves in. In these places they co-exist with other entities — people and equipment (Heidegger, 2005). Individual teachers, like any other person, will reveal themselves. They will show their being through comportment that either announces their possession of awareness and sight, or reveal themselves as everyday ones lacking these essentials.

Concepts underpinning existence — thrown-ness, concealment, relatedness, circumspection and comportment are important because they offer a way of working out the being that lies behind the things teachers say and do. The distinctions that exist between the two very different ways of being a teacher can be used to reveal the being a teacher possesses. Being authentically disposed means a teacher will, with awareness and sight, take-up entities to seek out and experiment with the possibilities that they offer. It means they will see students and the experiences they bring to learning and the knowledge, languages and ways of thinking and doing used to learn. This is not to suggest that those inauthentically disposed are not committed to their work or to the students they teach. It is, in Heidegger’s (2005) estimation, the essential and circumspect demeanor that they do not possess. This means that they are not aware of all of the possibilities people and equipment offer.

The struggle for teachers inauthentically disposed is in responding to things that trigger alertness to something that is intriguing or not quite right. It is from this place that teachers can push through the boundaries
of the everyday to respond to the fullness of meaning that entities possess (Heidegger, 1976).

3.1.3 Becoming Aware: Teaching and Circumspection

Circumspection is significant to becoming a teacher when observed through Heidegger’s (2005) existential phenomenology. People who can view entities from many different directions will see them in the fullness of their being and enter into different relations than those teachers living everyday existences who see them from one direction (ibid.). At the core of this conception is the notion that not everything is revealed to those living, an everyday existence. The problem is that: “that which remains hidden in an egregious sense, or which relapses and gets covered up again, or which shows itself only “in disguise”, is not just this entity or that, but rather the Being of entities” (Heidegger, 2005, p.59). It is the Being of entities that is yet to be brought out of concealment in many schools and classrooms.

The possibilities that itself recognises are the concealments that Itself does not see (Heidegger, 2005). One of the things that inauthentic beings miss is the distinctiveness of students and what they bring to learning and use to learn (ibid.). Their thingly character and all the different ways they can be perceived are available only to authentic beings because, in Heidegger’s opinion, accessibility to the full range of possibilities has been blocked by the constraints of everydayness. For this reason, things in classrooms may be perceived as “ready-to-hand” or “present-to-hand” (Heidegger, 2005, pp.98–104).
From an observer's vantage point, a spoken or written cultural text, for instance, might be ready for use. *Authentic* teachers are prompted to take notice (Heidegger, 2005). It is curiosity that draws them to it (ibid.). They do not, as Heidegger suggests, know everything that it can do because the “ready-to-hand” cannot show all the possibilities that it/they offer (p.101). Certain entities, like languages other than English, may only announce themselves. If there is no perceived need for them to be brought into use, they will withdraw. They remain *present-to-hand* but no more than that (ibid.). To see the possibilities provided by languages, for instance, a teacher must recognize that something *ready-to-hand* is useable and at the disposal of students and teachers. From the everyday mode of being, the possibilities that the *ready-to-hand* offer will be missed and entities like sociocultural resources withdraw. Students, who are robbed of their learning resources, are likely to withdraw (present-to-hand) too, because they have not been called upon to show themselves in the fullness of their being.

Heidegger (2005), in arguing that *Fürsorge* (care) enables some to catch sight of people and equipment in a different light, introduces the ethical dimension of teaching and learning. It shows care as one virtue ethic that can prompt awareness. Insightfulness can lead teachers back to the *a priori of existence* and to the moment of *becoming* (ibid.). It applies as well to those caught up in the *indifference* and averageness of everyday existence (Schatzki, 2005). Momentary glimpses of something like a spontaneous demonstration of culture can trigger a heightened awareness. High pitched trilling — *ululation* — used to
demonstrate joyfulness and celebration in some cultures is one example. Awareness can, as Dreyfus and Wrathall (2005) suggest, provide teachers with an incentive for pushing into the place of disclosure (Heidegger’s clearing) if they are keen to know what the student is so happy about. The risk is that the dominance/subordination objective of the nation’s everydayness will show this as a disturbance—a social order issue. Control and regulation is employed to pull everyday ones back to everydayness. Similarly, the avalanche of texts that, Smith (2001) asserts, co-ordinate teachers’ practice quickly covers over slivers of understanding. This can happen if a text, like a running record requires teachers to make an immediate physical response to it; that is to fill in student results on the form. With concealment, questions are left unsaid and the meanings that might be ascribed to things like languages and cultural practices are silenced (Heidegger, 2005). Darling-Hammond and Snyder (2000) make the point that latching on to something that appears to be logical removes the necessity for confronting the question of possibility because the multitude of possibilities is obscured from view by the logic attached to favoured alternatives (van Dijk, 1993).

3.1.4 **Becoming a Teacher**

The struggle, in Heidegger’s (1976) estimation, is “to let them learn” (p.15). This means making “everything we do answer to whatever essentials address themselves to us at a given time” (p.14). The essentials that are at issue here are the things students bring to learning— their advantages and educational disadvantage (May & Sleeter,
2010; Luke, 1997a) and those indispensable resources used to learn (Heidegger, 2005). The problem is that a teacher’s essential being, the primordial one is there “only so long […] as we for our part keep holding on to what holds us” (p. 5). The struggle for teachers is holding onto the essence of their ethical being — care, truth, fairness and responsibility and to the essentials of their professional learning that challenges them to respond to the distinctiveness of students in their care (AITSL, 2011).

For students, like Akira (p. 29) and Daniel Haile-Michael (first introduced on p. 30) (in Ryan, 2012, The Age, 14 May) the struggle is twofold. It is confronting indifference, as Daniel pointed out through ineffective and inadequate responses to the advantages and disadvantage they bring to learning. When there are concerted efforts to strip them of their indispensables, their identity and learning resources the struggle for them is holding onto their languages, cultural practices and knowledges - the essence of their being - as they learn new ones that contribute to becoming wholesome beings. Responding to students on authentic terms rather than on everyday ones presents a different proposition for being and becoming a teacher.

Thomson (2001) maintains that teachers must be open to the people and things that they encounter. This way of seeing guides dealings with people and equipment, that according to Heidegger (2005), are not subordinated to the “manifold assignments of the in-order-to” (p.98). An example of equipment that can be viewed as an object of the in-order-to, are national tests of literacy and numeracy because the tests are
designed to monitor improvement in student outcomes (ACARA, 2010). 

*Authentic* beings, drawing of Heidegger (2005) with all the possibilities in view, will see the *in-order-to* - tests, data and accountability procedures as distractions from the important work they would like to do whereas everyday ones, caught in the web of the *in-order-to*, do not see and therefore cannot assign the full range of meanings to these tests and student results.

Using Heidegger’s (1976) example of the cabinet maker as a model, a teacher would respond not just to students but “above all to the different kinds” (p. 14) of students and to “the *shapes slumbering within*” them (ibid.). This means taking account of their slumbering disadvantage and the indispensable essentials they use to learn such as ways of knowing, thinking, expressing and doing that are routinely silenced or ignored. Teachers recognising students “as they enter into” (ibid.) schools and classrooms knowing what to do “with all the hidden riches of [their] nature” (ibid.) and knowing their “relatedness to students is what maintains the whole craft” (ibid.). And knowing, “without that relatedness, the craft will never be anything but empty busy work, and any occupation with it will be determined exclusively by business concerns” (Heidegger, 1976, p.15).

In Heidegger’s (1976) view:

If the relation between the teacher and the taught is genuine, therefore, there is never a place in it for the authority of the know-it-all or the sway of the official. We must keep our eye fixed firmly on the true relation between teacher and taught. […] The hand reaches and extends, receives and welcomes — and
not just things: the hand extends itself, and receives its own welcome in the hand of the others” (pp.15–16).

Letting-learn, from the standpoint of a teacher searching for understanding, challenges, the power of institution and the State and has implications for professional learning. It raises questions of equality — relatedness and responsibility to students. Provocations like these illuminate becoming — becoming open to knowing the diversity of ways of thinking, experiencing, knowing, valuing, behaving, organising, and proceeding that are present in sites of learning. Perhaps these are not different to the emphases presented in the National Professional Standards for Teachers (AITSL, 2011). The difference is that Heidegger (1976) has urged teachers to question equipment like teaching standards, interrogate what they mean and expand the suite of meanings that can be assigned to them.

To do this, Heidegger (1976) maintains a teacher must remain “ahead of his apprentices” and let “nothing else be learned but learning” (p.15). This different view of learning is recognised by its distance from instruction and accountability’s discipline and by ‘true’ relations between teachers and students. These are revealed in the responses teachers make to their ontological environment “as they incline towards something that in turn inclines toward us” (ibid.). The ‘something’ is the presence that shows itself at any given time and that itself the authentic one sees. Learning can be advanced by taking up the challenge to see what people and equipment can do. This is the place where
transformation and the potential for emancipation is realised through teacher and student relatedness (ibid.).

Teachers with circumspection’s sight discover the distinctiveness of referential contexts — the classroom — and see “what the ready-to-hand [is] ready-to-hand for” (Heidegger, 2005, p.105). What is uncovered in use and experimentation is the Being of equipment — the variety of possibilities that are available — and with that the realisation that “equipment is not just there but is “maniputable [...] and at our disposal” (p.98). Teachers will discover different ways of using it. Equipment like language and cultural practices reveal their thingly character (ibid.). Experimentation with them reveals understandings of what they are, and what they can be used for. Similarly, when disadvantage is glimpsed it must be taken up, to be interrogated to see what it is, how it came to be there and what can be done with/about it.

In Heidegger’s (2005) estimation, readiness-to-hand cannot be arrived at directly. It is only by working with entities - people and equipment that they show themselves as something other than what they first appear to be. Through relatedness with others and manipulation of equipment unthought-of possibilities announce themselves to learners – teachers and students (ibid.). This approach to teaching practice is one that infers hands-on experiences, thinking, experimentation and dialogical processes in learning (Heidegger, 1976). The risk is that any in-order-to (to do this to achieve that) that has already been decided can take over.
This is significant since, according to Peters (2002) everything ‘out there’ is ordered and on standby “on call for further ordering” (p.17).

If challenges to the status quo are perceived as threats to social order then on-call discourses will reappear and assert themselves (ibid). This can happen if teachers endorse “naturally occurring phenomenon” (p.8) like translanguaging and promote strategies such as co-constructions and meaning-making through multilingual dialogical processes (Canagarajah, 2011). It is likely that the privileged English language discourse will be deployed to reassert English supremacy and cultural conservation that “drives out every other possibility” (Thomson, 2001, p.249) for exhibiting what sociocultural resources can do.

Being and becoming a teacher means pushing beyond the limits of everyday existence. One of the impediments to attaining and/or sustaining authentic existence is the bearing exerted by people and equipment on an individual life (Schatzki, 2005).

### 3.2 Sociality in and of an Individual Life

#### 3.2.1 A Question of Awareness

Associated with Dorothy Smith’s (2001) thesis on the local and trans-local co-ordination of work practices is a proposition that conveys her belief that “it is exceptional to have acquired an awareness […] to see the place I stand” (Smith, 1999, p.64). This judgement, applied to teachers’ standing in their community, school and classroom, suggests that they “do not [see] how society is putting [their] lives together” (p.65).
Blindness to the actual conditions of classroom practices reflects relations of power complicit in the social organisation of work (Smith, 2001).

To examine relations of power in education and teaching practice I take a Heideggerian (2005) view of sociality. It is one that Schatzki (2005) ties to co-existence - *being-with* - but, in doing so, emphasises that “an essential feature of an individual life is that others bear on it” (p.234). I demonstrate three different kinds of domination each of which relate to the exertion of power at different levels of social organisation — institution, school and classroom.

3.2.2 *Local and Trans-local Co-ordination of Everyday Experiences and Practices of Teachers*

Exercise of power in education shows itself is through the work of the institution (Smith, 2001). Institution does not refer to a school or any other type of organisation. It is understood to be “text-mediated relations organized around specific ruling functions” (DeVault & McCoy, 2001, p.752). Education is one such function. Close examination of institutionally orchestrated co-ordination of work reveals, according to Smith (2001), how our teaching world is co-ordinated through ruling relations but realised in our own activities. This bearing is carried, as Smith suggests, through institutional relations of power that permeate as many sites as possible because such infiltration is necessary if the intentions and existence of the institution are to be realised.
Domination of teachers’ working lives is achieved through the production and dissemination of texts that carry discourses representing and reinforcing particular versions of education and practice (Janks, 2010). Texts used to co-ordinate teachers’ work are produced at multiple levels of social organisation (Smith, 2001). It is through this relation that agencies (of the institution) such as the *Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority* (ACARA) and state and territory bodies that regulate teachers’ work come into being and, like the institution are able to exist (ibid.). Texts, emanating from these nodes enter as many sites as possible because the institution seeks to influence work in and across as many sites as possible (ibid.). Interpenetration of discourses carried through texts is said to have occurred when institutions, agencies of the State, professional organisations, school systems, principals, leadership teams, professional learning teams, year level groups of teachers and individual teachers all share co-ordinating texts.

The assertion is that professional discourses are all discursively linked (Smith, 2001). When meanings and methods delivered through discourses carried in texts, are embedded in practices they show that schools and teachers have entered into primary relationships with external influences. These relations can only be brought into view, according to Smith, by rigorous burrowing into the experiences and practices of teachers to find texts that are instrumental in co-ordinating teachers’ practice. A researcher’s role becomes one of making connections between texts, processes, interests, influences and
discourses to disclose the exercise of power on human and work place relations (Smith, 2001).

The bearing of the institution and its bureaucracies have the capacity to change the work practices of teachers by deploying texts that structure work processes (DeVault & McCoy, 2001). Awareness of the significance of their presence is missed as everyday participants settle meanings and methods in and across local sites of practice. These changes involve participants who are neither present nor known and, who will never know or understand the lived experiences of the students teachers are with (Smith, 1999). As such, the work teachers do, without awareness and the clarity of sight that Smith (ibid.) has referred to, is not their own. Rather it is prescribed elsewhere by people who bear on an individual teacher’s working life. Most of these people will never interact with individual teachers except through texts nor be in bodily co-existence with them (Schatzki, 2005).

3.2.3  The School - Textually Mediated Practice

Mediating texts are one of the powerful tools that leaders and teachers face in their local sites of practice (Smith, 2001). These enter schools and teaching practice irrespective of whether leaders and/or teachers are fully open to them. They exert insurmountable pressure on schools to comply with institutional demands. In Australia, reforms that institutionally generated texts speak to are routinely tied to the Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting (ACARA) Act of 2008 or to aspirations for improvements in student achievement (MCEETYA,
The plethora of texts — legislation, policies, reports and guidelines — carry the same knowledge, understandings and recommendations. These are easily taken up by school leaders and teachers because they are nested in equality agendas. The persuasive/coercive language used to construct privileged institutionally determined texts act to limit awareness (van Dijk, 1993). These strategies coerce school leaders and teachers in local landscapes of practice to respond in ways that can change their work practices and the learning experiences of the students they teach. School planning documents, minutes of meetings, memos and management and accountability texts such as school targets and running records are artefacts that demonstrate leaders’ and teachers’ responses to decisions made elsewhere. Publically accessible annual school reports, implementation plans and performance data are used to show the effectiveness of any school’s response to the intentions of the institution.

It cannot be assumed that school leaders and teachers relate to and respond in the same way to power inherent in discourses and texts disseminated through the institution.

Whole-hearted uptake of the interests of the institution calls a leader’s or teacher’s mode/s of existence into the question of text-mediated practice (Heidegger, 2005). Compliance is more likely if leaders are open to texts and when teachers are in place who will promote the interests expressed in texts (Fairclough, 2005). One way to enlist leader cooperation is through professional learning aligned with institutional
interests. Existing or newly emerging agencies align leadership courses with current change agendas (State of Victoria, 2010).

Sociality shows up in text-mediated relations when ways of being a leader match the practices and processes recommended by organising authorities (Smith, 2001). Attached to adoption and ultimate materialisation of texts in practice, are social agents (Smith, 2001). These are people who represent and work the interests of the institution (ibid.). One of the ways that they work these interests is through texturing (Fairclough, 2005). This is demonstrated when social agents tie local practice to sanctioned practice and silence the alternatives (Luke. 1997b). Using newly constituted arrangements such as professional learning teams, level/grade meetings (DEECD, 2009b) and school generated texts, social agents, link a school’s vision for teaching and learning to organising bureaucracies that standardise, regulate and act as surveillants of teachers’ work.

The scope of institutional power is realised when interchanges in and between local, trans-local and remote settings carry the same messages, thus co-ordinating, through texts, the interests of the institution. These are manifest in the reproduction of specified approaches to practice that are enacted by teachers but not necessarily decided by them (Smith, 1990). Schatzki (2005), through the better bearing concept, shows how others external to school are positioned as more knowledgeable than people on the ground. It is through acceptance of this rhetoric that teachers are distanced from their
professional learning. The end point of institutional domination is the realisation of text-mediated relations in local sites and the trans-local co-ordination of work practices (Smith, 2001). The responses many teachers make in multicultural settings are likely to be influenced by texts emanating from multiple nodal points rather than the multicultural compositions of their classrooms.

Text-mediated relations distance many teachers from their professional learnings (Smith, 2001). They are not faced with the dilemma of choice simply because they do what is expected of them (Derrida, 1995). The expectation is that they will respond to the guidelines, recommendations and procedures set out in policy and implementation texts. These not only flood systems, schools and classrooms but teachers respond by producing their own co-ordinating, regulating and accountability texts (Smith, 2001).

Teachers enter into new associations with the institution and its bureaucracies. Relations teachers have with both their prior professional learning and practice and with students are diminished. Everyday experiences and practice respond to what has already been decided and delivered to teachers by texts that are part of a complex web of social organisation of work (Smith, 2001). Teachers caught up in "[their] own activities as participants in discourse enter into and contribute to forces that stand over against us and overpower our lives" (Smith, 1999, p.228).
3.2.4 The Classroom - Textually Mediated Work Process

The appropriation of education and teaching practice by the power invested in texts means that teachers’ everyday experiences and practices are controlled and regulated. A powerful form of regulation is a text-mediated process (DeVault & McCoy, 2001). In schools where a work process model has been embedded, teachers’ work is directed by texts that structure the model. Even teachers who see the presence of co-ordination and standardisation (Smith, 1999) cannot escape all of the demands of the model. One of the texts likely to appear is an accountability one since an objective of the current reform process is for teachers to show evidence of improved student outcomes. These texts bear down on teachers’ working lives when they are used as evidence of student improvement, a school’s performance and by association, teacher effectiveness.

Sociality is revealed in textually-mediated practice when school leaders and teachers produce texts of their own to co-ordinate their response to bureaucratic demands (DEECD, 2009b, 2009c). These are used to show their progress towards targets that have been set by and for them. Teachers’ participating in Comber and Nixon’s (2009) research, for example, demonstrated exaggerated attention to bureaucratic demands. Changes such as these are reflected in ways teachers’ speak about their work (ibid.). They also show up in new ways of being a teacher as a data collector, analyst and manager (Peters, 2002). If these changes take hold, as Peter’s suggests, they will “distort[s] our actions and aspirations” (p.4). Teachers caught in a technologised mode of human
existence (ibid.) demonstrate relations with texts structuring a work process model that is exclusive of the broader needs and abilities of students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.

Smith (2001) argues that there will be teachers with awareness of where they are standing. They will see possibilities that people and equipment present and have sight of invisible controls that direct particular kinds of practice. Teachers acting as agents of reform have the potential to extend their work beyond the boundaries that have been set for them. However, their work is kept in check by the power of the institution that directs how everyday work will be (Smith, 2001). Agency, beyond that which has been defined by the institution, will be thwarted (ibid.). Anything leaders and teachers choose to do that falls outside of the demands of the work process is similarly bound (ibid.). The problem is the overwhelming dominance exerted by texts and the discourse they carry within them.

3.3 Politics of Textual Mediation of Practice

3.3.1 Exercise of Power

Critical Discourse Analysis is advanced as a way of understanding the political dimension of textually-mediated practice. Its interest, according to Wodak & Meyer (2009), is in “analysing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control manifest in language” (p.10). It provides a way to reveal the constitution and maintenance of “unequal relations of power” (p.8). The political side of textually-mediated practice is considered here from four
different directions. Three of these, following Luke (1997b), are concerned with representation (field), social relations between human subjects (tenor) and text (mode). The other draws on Van Dijk’s work (1993). He uses the notion of social cognition to relate dominance (macro-level) to talk and texts operating at the micro-level to demonstrate *mind management* in acceptance of meanings carried in discourses irrespective of their effects (ibid.).

3.3.2 **Representing Teachers’ Work**

Representing teaching practice, in Laclau and Mouffe’s (1985) estimation, is a discursive practice because articulations do not have a “plane of constitution prior to or outside, the dispersion of the articulated elements” (p.79) in the discursive field. Our own articulations draw on and reflect discursive formations. It is discourses and the “bodies of meaning” (Youdell, 2006, p.2) that are embedded in them that “frame social contexts” (ibid.). They direct how things will be understood, talked and written about and carried through.

Discourses are considered to constitute “diverse representations of social life” (Fairclough, 2005, p.77). Fairclough maintains that engagement with two ways of understanding discursive representation is essential for their respective attention to meaning and form. Following Fairclough (2005; 2003), discourse viewed from a meaning-making orientation, refers to “a category which designates the broadly semiotic elements of social life” (ibid) and, this focus is on shared and acceptable meanings. Discourse is also understood “as a category for designating
particular ways of representing particular aspects of social life” (ibid) and
is defined through “its relation to and difference from two other
categories, genre, and style” (ibid). Where, one discourse type specifies
an acceptable and largely unchallenged view with regards to education
and pedagogy the other intensifies its expression in ways that are
realised in changes to teachers’ actions and interactions, representations and ways of being a teacher (Fairclough, 2003).

Both discourse types are carefully constructed by holders of power
(Fairclough, 2005; Luke, 1997b; van Dilk, 1993). They decide on the
meanings that will be carried in discourse and how they will be
positioned as dominant, alternative, oppositional of marginal
(Fairclough, 2005). Discourses are thus, not only “designed to convey
particular meanings in particular ways” but also “to have particular
material effects” (Janks, 2010, p.61). These “effectively regulate and
control knowledge […] and practices” (ibid.). A framework for examining
the political dimensions of representation is set out in the following table.
It draws on social processes and practices to show what they achieve
and their effects on teachers and students.
### Table 1: Representation - Field

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Processes and Practices</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Effects on Teachers and Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>language and meanings are controlled</td>
<td>restrictions are placed on what can be said, thought about and enacted (Luke, 1997b)</td>
<td>Teachers, draw on repertoires of meaning available in discourses (Janks, 2010, p.65).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some possibilities are advanced and others excluded (Fairclough, 2005)</td>
<td>limits to production of meaning in the discursive field (Laclau &amp; Mouffe, 2001), assignment of privilege to favoured options and mitigation and/or silencing others (van Dijk, 1993)</td>
<td>Teachers’ talk changes as teachers “select from options available in the system — they have to make lexical, grammatical and sequencing choices in order to say what they want to say” (p.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promote the key message/s by repeating words and statements (Luke, 1997b)</td>
<td>words and statements “appear intertextually across texts” (Luke, 1997b, p.4)</td>
<td>teachers read the key meanings in multiple texts, emphasis is placed on improving student performance (Sleeter, 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspirations such as equality and social mobility are linked to discriminatory sentiments (van Dijk 1993)</td>
<td>dominance and discrimination are covered over</td>
<td>prejudicial and discriminatory actions go unchecked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holders of power network education with other features of social organisation (Fairclough, 2005)</td>
<td>further restrictions are placed on meanings available in the discursive field</td>
<td>language choices and, associated with them practices of the market place enter teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hierarchies of discourses are created (Fairclough, 2005)</td>
<td>one is dominant and it disseminates the views of power elites (van Dijk) others are positioned as oppositional, alternative and marginalised (Fairclough, 2005)</td>
<td>“we forget it is just a version of reality” (Janks, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lexical practices are used to regulate and control meanings and make them acceptable</td>
<td>nominalisation hides the everyday work of teachers, and metaphors gives legitimacy to schools (Smith, 2001), verb forms to are deployed to set up cause and effect (Janks, 2010)</td>
<td>teachers can be persuaded to do this to achieve that (Argyris, &amp; Schön, 1974)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Representation

Viewed from a dialectic-relational perspective (Wodak & Meyer, 2009) such as the approach Fairclough (2005, 2003) takes, language and semiosis are used to define a potential — “set of possibilities”
Discourses must make ideas, beliefs, values and understandings underpinning selected possibilities appear to the constituency as “neutral and quite acceptable” (van Dijk, 1993, p.255). In this historical epoch, the State’s interest in linking economic growth and global competitiveness to education meant changing the language and meanings used in discourses. New interests - improved student outcomes, school performances and teacher quality and/or effectiveness - were reinforced. Teachers’ articulations of their perceptions, imaginings and enactments are influenced by the meanings and language contained within the parameters of linguistic variability that are controlled by the representative element (discourse) of the orders of discourse (Fairclough, 2005).

Not only is language of texts controlled and regulated through the orders of discourse and its elements but the language teachers can use to talk about their work is similarly bound because it has been situated and naturalised in discourses. For this reason the potential exists for teachers to only talk about experiences and practices within the boundaries defined by (re)constructed professional discourses (Fairclough, 2005). When teachers talk they may communicate different ways of representing, for instance, performances of students who do not show improvement. References to ‘gaps’ in performances (Department of Education and Child Development (DECD), 2013) can be viewed as discriminatory when teaching practices are directed to filling gaps. Rather than seeing this narrow approach as discriminatory they can be tied to ideals like equality through emphasis on ameliorating
disadvantage through the provision of additional services for disadvantaged students (Luke, 1997b). In doing so, discrimination is hidden from view.

Language and semiosis are complicit in defining, emphasising and reinforcing the importance and superiority of some representations and denouncing the failures of others (Fairclough, 2005). Importantly, essential understandings, drawing on Luke (1997b), are promoted by reiteration and re-statement. At the same time discourses that have not already been discredited or silenced are repositioned (Fairclough, 2003). They reappear as oppositional, alternative and marginalised in comparison to the dominant ruling one (ibid.). This means that dominant discourses are left relatively undisturbed in their work of influencing the production of “socially shared knowledge, attitudes and ideologies” (van Dijk, 1993, p.259). To restrict options even more, meanings drawn from different features of ruling functions can be linked.

One of the advantages of networking ruling functions such as education and market place is to restrict the scope of meanings able to enter discourses and limit understandings of practice even further (Luke, 1997b; Fairclough, 2005). Emphasis, more recently, has been assigned to the State’s interest in Australia’s place in the Asian century (Rudd & Smith, 2007). Discourses informed by Rudd and Smith’s opinions and beliefs are used to refocus the nation by reinforcing the potential that improved trading relations with Asia offer to Australia. Readers and listeners who are acting as social agents take up the positions
expressed by power elites and begin to prepare students now, for Australia’s place in the Asian century. They secure methods for improving student outcomes in institutional arrangements designed to meet national objectives (Smith, 2001, Fairclough, 2005 and Janks, 2010).

3.3.3 **Social Relations**

There are consequences related to discursive definition, production and dissemination of carefully selected meaning. If education and teachers’ work satisfy institutional interests the “discourse of power elites” can be said to have “exert[ed] power abuse” (van Dijk, 1993, p.252). Dominant discourses influence “knowledge, attitudes and ideologies” so that they are able to dominate listeners and readers (p.259). These, in van Dijk’s estimation, “sustain, legitimate, condone or ignore social inequality and injustice” and the “injustice and inequality that result from it” (ibid.).

Discourses, oppositional to the privileged one are available to be taken up. However, these confront political will settled in controlling and regulating discourses. Privileged foci enter education and everyday experiences and practices of teachers shift to address emerging interests. Teachers’ professional learning needs change and learning needs of students are redefined (Luke, 1997b). Through the work of discourses, new articulations for pedagogy appear alongside the sidelining or silencing of different ones. According to Luke (1997b) texts repeat and reiterate privilege meanings in multiple documents. These are made to appear acceptable through reinforcing ideals such as equal
treatment even though disenfranchised culturally and linguistically
different students, for example, are robbed of rich, relevant and robust
learning opportunities.

Behind this education stand holders of power who have exercised their
might by articulating learning to national interests. In doing so the
political side of textual-mediation, is disclosed (van Dijk, 1993). The
language that teachers use is bound by the limitations that have been
set in the discursive field. Those elements that have not been articulated
are silent and therefore are unavailable (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985). The
understandings teachers routinely realise are those promoted in
discourse. Similarly, the social relations teachers and students enter into
are defined by the subject positions that have been allocated to them by
discourse (Luke, 1997a). These relations, in Laclau and Mouffe’s (2001)
estimation, have, “a necessary character” (p.77). It is one that is
designed to connect representations to social relations between human
subjects.

A framework for examining social relations is set out in Table 2.
### Table 2: Social Relations between Human Subjects – Tenor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Processes and Practices</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Effects on Teachers and Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discourses stipulate subject positions (Luke, 1997b).</td>
<td>People enter into relations with others according to the subject positions that are allocated to them in discourse (Luke, 1997b)</td>
<td>Teachers approach their work in according to the subject positions assigned to them (Luke, 1997b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is achieved by setting up “a particular ordering of relationships among different ways of making meaning” (Fairclough, 2005, p.79).</td>
<td>Enactments of dominance and subordination show the maintenance of the power and privilege of elites and exertion of “power abuse” (van Dijk, 2010).</td>
<td>Those deemed to have ‘effective’ teacher and student status are rewarded (ibid.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers change ways of acting, and interacting (genre) and show different ways of being a teacher (style) (Fairclough, 2005).</td>
<td>Context is used to “confirm negative attitudes and ideologies” (van Dijk, 1993, p.263).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from the work of van Dijk, 1993; Laclau & Mouffe, 2001; Luke, 1997a; 1997b; Fairclough, 2003; 2005; Wodak & Reisigl, 2003; Janks, 2010
Social Relations between Human Subjects

Discourses are used to maintain the privilege of power elites (van Dijk, 1993) and define subject positions (Luke, 1997b). Positioning reflects the power and dominance/subordination relation that holders of power do not relinquish. The orders of discourse have a key role in defining and representing the object of discourse but the elements of the orders of discourse manage form through “the selections of certain […] possibilities” (Fairclough, 2003, p.1).

Two elements of the orders of discourse — genre and style — belong to the domain of professional practice in so much as they are articulated to doings. Different genres reflect “different ways of (inter)acting discoursally” (p.2). Different styles are demonstrated in bodily behaviour that reveals a way of being a particular professional identity (ibid.). The other element – discourse – is concerned with form. It makes available the set of words that teachers use to say what they need to say (Janks, 2010; Fairclough, 2005). Genre, discourse and style, not only select or eliminate potential possibilities but they show up in everyday experiences and practices of teachers as changes in ways of acting, representing and being a teacher (ibid.).

Current reforms to education include a strong focus on testing as a way of securing evidence to demonstrate improved student outcomes. Teachers who understand this relationship as empowering act and interact according to directions for improving student performances along the lines that have been discursively represented. Based on
assessments of performances students (and teachers) may be classified as successful skilled performers who escape the deficit classification. Those labelled as unable or deficit subjects are perhaps remediated but, irrespective of this intervention, the full range of their needs are not addressed (Luke, 1997a, 1997b; Janks, 2010). Those participants in learning deemed to have ‘effective’ teacher and student status are rewarded. Students (and teachers) who have been classified as unable or deficient are denied rich, relevant and robust learning as their deficits are addressed (Luke, 1997b). Enactments of power - dominance and subordination - shape categories of performers or non-performers through construction of successful worthy, not so successful and worthy and/or failing subjects (Youdell, 2006). Actions and interactions and ways of being a teacher reveal the different kinds of relations between teachers and students. Teachers may show themselves through genre and style as a leader, manager, data collector and analyst, negotiator, instructor and facilitator.

In Fairclough’s (2005) view actions and interactions, representations and ways of being a teacher differ according to status or position in an organisation. Social agents, for instance, strongly represent practices embedded in change agendas (Fairclough, 2005; Smith, 2001). Their role is to work the interests of the State by closing down other possibilities and show the embodiment of prescribed ways of acting and interacting, representing and being a teacher (Fairclough, 2005).
3.3.4 Discursive Reproduction of Dominance

Effects of discursive productions on the positioning of human subjects have been advanced but, in van Dijk’s (1993) opinion, it is impossible to relate “macro-level notions such as group dominance and inequality with micro-level notions such as text, talk, meaning and understanding without social cognitions” (p.257). His assertion is that the relation between discourse and dominance is far more complex. Social cognitions are, in van Dijk’s view, “the interface between the two” (ibid., p.279). He goes on to say that “discursive (re)production of dominance results from social cognitions of the powerful whereas the situated discourse structures result in social cognitions” (p.259). Mental operations — “interpreting, thinking, arguing, inference and learning […] together define what we understand” (p.257). Social cognitions “mediate between micro and macro-levels of society, between discourse and action, between the individual and the group” (ibid.).

A framework for examining the discursive reproduction of dominance is shown in the following table.
Table 3: Discursive Reproduction of Dominance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Processes and Practices</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Effects on Teachers and Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>This table is informed by the work of van Dijk (1993) except where other critical discourse analysts are cited.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mind Management

| Privileged and preferential access to discourse” (van Dijk, 1993, p.259) is available to power elites. | “Enactment, expression or legitimation of dominance” is embedded in the “various structures of text” (ibid.), e.g. control access to discourse. Freedom to participate in discourse is limited and who can speak and what they can say is regulated (ibid.). | Rights as speakers, writers, listeners are restricted by censorship and silencing. Segregation of opinions is arranged so that privileged voices and “preferred models” are “built by hearers and readers” (p.264). |
| Processes of understanding are managed by expressing and/or legitimising discourses of the power elites. | Privileged discourses “sustain, legitimate, condone or ignore social inequality and injustice” (p.252). | Power abuse — what is understood - is monitored by social cognitions. |
| Minds are managed by “persuasion and manipulation” (p.254). | The “functions, consequences and results of such structures” are realised in “the social minds of recipients” (p.259). | Aims interests and values of the power elites are materialised so that everyone the “even the disenfranchised are convinced” (p.255). |
| Enactments of dominance maintain privilege. | “It is much more difficult to read against texts we are comfortable with” Janks, 2010, p.72). | Other ideologies are positioned as inadequate and ineffective. Negative attributes are affirmed. Equal opportunity rhetoric is used to convince readers and listeners of fairness. |

Source: Adapted from van Dijk, 1993; Janks, 2010.
Discursive Reproduction of Dominance

Van Dijk (1993), through a socio-cognitive approach, shows the socio-psychological side of the exertion of power (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). The relation between dominance, in the production of discourse, is considered in relation to the bearing of privileged discourses on the minds of recipients. Power elites who have preferential and privileged access to discourse are able to contribute to the construction of discourses (van Dijk, 1993). Using the different structures of discourse they are able to advance their views and control the access others have to discourse as well as regulating their opportunities to be heard (ibid.). This provides a place where powerful and persuasive discourses can be constructed without interference from oppositional and alternative voices.

Ideologies can be manipulated to “reflect the basic aims, interests and values of the group” (van Dijk, 1993, p.258). They are constructed as neutral even though they are not (ibid.). This ensures acceptability and means that they are unlikely to be vigorously challenged. Privileged understandings that are threaded through discourses are reinforced through persuasive language and manipulation of meanings. These, in van Dijk’s (1993) estimation, become the understandings that even the disenfranchised agree with and adopt. The effects of acceptance of privileged discourses are twofold. People are distanced from their own opinions and beliefs and become active participants in building preferred models. As Janks (2010) has pointed out, resistance is ameliorated.
One reason for this is that mind management, in van Dijk’s (1993) view, hides the actualities of the conditions of practice from teachers. In this process the relation between power, discourse, dominance and social inequality is concealed (ibid.).

Discursive domination can be challenged because discourses can take into account imaginaries — “representations of how things might or could be” (Fairclough, 2005, p. 81). Indeed many teachers “imagine possible social practices and networks of social practices — possible articulations of activities, social subjects, social relations, instruments, objects, space, times, values” (ibid).

The voices of agents of reform who would speak of fairness, equality, inclusion, and social justice in education provide the conditions for challenging domination. If these agents retreat from discursive manipulations they may break through to others and enact transformative practices (Freire, 1990). But, mind management has the effect convincing others of the efficacy of privileged methods. Finding people who share different opinions is far more difficult. Fairclough, working from the dialogic-relational approach and van Dijk through a socio-cognition (see Wodak & Meyer, 2009) show how people are bound by what has been suggested and by understandings they have accepted as reasonable. Agency is contained and/or overpowered through semiotic control of possibilities. Understandings emanating from privileged and preferential discourses find their way into arrays of texts.
emanating, as Smith (2001) suggests from multiple levels of social organisation.

3.3.5 **Texts**

Texts, drawing on Janks (2010), are “the material form that discourses take” (p.78). They are a part of institutional and bureaucratic processes that are employed to ensure that the “dialectic of enactment, inculcation and materialisation is fully carried through” (Fairclough, 2003, p.6). Texts are “influential in determining processes and practices” in education (Luke, 1997b, p.2).

The same words, meaning and statements are reproduced at different levels of social organisation and circulated across target sites (Smith, 2001). Uptake of selected meanings and methods, by readers is influenced, by “linguistic (and other semiotic) choices made by a writer” (Janks, 2010, p.61). The plethora of texts such as policies, implementation strategies and services to schools contain the same constructions of desirable truths/realities (ibid.). These texts position readers in a particular way that is revealed through their relationships with texts. When members of a discourse community engage with coordinating texts, speak and write about their work or show their employee status they will “draw on the repertoires of meaning available in discourse” (ibid., p.65). A framework for addressing the constitution of texts and their work is presented in Table 4 following. It shows the relationships between social processes and practices, changes to practices and their effects on teachers and students.
Table 4: Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Processes and Practices</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Effects on Teachers and Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Texts – Mode</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Particular kinds of texts” are produced and these &quot;attempt to ‘do things’ in social institutions with predictable and ideational and material effects” (Luke, 1997b, p.6).</td>
<td>They show up in changes in actions, interactions and ways of being a teacher (Fairclough, 2005)</td>
<td>Teachers emerge as different kinds of for example a manager, data collector (Fairclough, 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Texts work to position their readers and the ideal reader, from the point of view of the writer (or speaker)” (Janks, 2010, p.61).</td>
<td>“Linguistic and other semiotic choices made by the writer are designed to produce the effects that position the reader” (Janks, 2010).</td>
<td>Texts “construct a reality” and these are taken-for-granted as truth (Janks, 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Knowledge and identity are constructed across a range of texts in […] the school” (Luke, 1997b, p.6)</td>
<td>Texts can “interpellate readers, situating and positioning them in identifiable relations of power and agency in relation to texts” (Luke, 1997b, p.7).</td>
<td>Teachers replicate lexical practices and make grammatical and sequencing choices to talk about their work (Luke, 1997b).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texts represent “experiences, events, or situations, as well as the opinions we have about them” (van Dijk. 1993, p.258).</td>
<td>Potentials such as engaging with the basics of literacy and numeracy are emphasised and reinforced (Fairclough, 2005).</td>
<td>“Deficit discourses of illiteracy” are deployed to address student deficits (Janks. 2010, p.69), They present a “taken-care-of attitude” (ibid.). These can &quot;combine with [for instance] a &quot;paternalistic racist discourse&quot; (ibid.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texts of schooling repeat, reiterate, emphasise words and construct statements.</td>
<td>These appear “intertextually across texts and comprise familiar patterns of disciplinary paradigmatic knowledge and practice (Luke, 1997b, p.3).</td>
<td>The “ideal reader […] is the one who buys into the text and its meanings” (Janks, 2010, p.61) “In reading texts that offend us, the discourse which structures our own beliefs and values give us the critical distance needed to read against them” (ibid., p.72).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Fairclough, 2005; 2003; Janks, 2010; Luke, 1997b; van Dijk. 1993
One problem for teachers is that discourses “represent a reality — often so taken-for-granted that we forget that it is just a version of reality” (ibid.). Its naturalisation in texts promotes, according to Janks, acceptability unless readers have a critical discourse they can use to read against texts (ibid.).

Janks (2010) argues that reading texts critically invites engagement with the linguistic and structural features of texts. Attention to the selection and use of words and their reiteration in phrases, statements and whole texts show mechanisms of control and are used to maintain lexical cohesion across texts (ibid., p.65). Textual macrostructures like sequential structuring of a process or scheme “operate as large scale grammars of actions” (Luke, 1997b, p.6). Activities constituting learning events, for example, are chained together, in Luke’s estimation, to present an acceptable logic. Where power elites wish to differentiate between dominant and subordinate participants a different voice is used (Janks, 2010). This enables speakers and writers to “construct active participants and allows for the deletion” (ibid., p.74) of passive ones. Tense changes are used to express “absolute certainty” and “timeless truths” compared to uncertainty expressed through modality (ibid.). Metaphors, for example, are employed in policy documents to represent institutional determinations in ways that hide intentions and these offer “legitimacy to schools” and to the work that teachers do (Smith, 2001, p.165). Pronouns, are worthy of interrogation because of the number of meanings that are carried in these words (Janks, 2010).
3.3.6  **Control and Regulation and their Effects**

Careful language selection and other semiotic practices are used to redefine or replace an existing potential with a new one. Underpinning, production and dissemination of discourses of (re)construction are mechanisms of control that regulate education and practice, order social relationships, change the way participants in discourse think and speak (Fairclough, 2005). They provide the conditions for compliance with things many people would ordinarily reject. Critical discourse theorists have pointed out numerous ways to achieve this goal. The “lexical, grammatical and sequencing choices” people make “to say what they want to say” (Janks, 2010, p.61) are restrained by options available to them. Changes such as these are, in Fairclough’s (2005) view, a part of “the process of social change”. The intention is to change understandings of education and other features of social organisation. The practices of teachers, in particular historic epochs, also change by construction and dissemination of new or different understandings of work. In this process privilege is maintained, the voices of the subaltern are regulated or silenced. Texts have a significant role in this process. The “ideal reader […] is the reader who buys into the text and its meanings” (Janks, 2010, p.61). People with a critical discourse of their own can read against privileged texts. They will always confront the dominant discourses that only the power elites are able to contribute to (van Dijk, 1993).
3.3.7 Theoretical Threads and their Application

I demonstrated how being and becoming a teacher, sociality and the political side of textual mediation can be used to better understand the ontological, existential and language/semiotic dimensions of a teacher’s work. From the theorisation of the experiences and practices of teachers I clarify, in Figure 2, how these aspects of inquiry can be applied to this research.

Figure 2: Structure of the Methodological Approach
Ontology is presented as the methodological framework. Drawing on Heidegger’s (2005) existential phenomenology — *being* and *time* — I approach teacher experience as something that is always already situated in a world and in ways of being (ibid.). As such, the experiences and practices of teachers are used in this research as windows through which to see how their work has been produced and with what effects.

I have chosen to use Institutional Ethnography as method because of its focus on the actualities of a teacher’s lived experiences. It will be employed to unpack each teacher’s expression of their being – *Dasein* - as a particular professional *being* in relation to institution (place) and the historical formation of institutional practices (time). Critical Discourse Analysis is used to develop the notion of textual mediation and augment the reading of texts. This approach is used to guide analysis and interpretation of data to show the things that enter and inhabit a teacher’s practice across time and in different places to disclose relationships between *social relations* in teachers’ work (macro) and what happens in the classroom (micro) to reveal their effects on culturally and linguistically different students and their teachers.

### 3.4 Generative Conclusion

*Existence (ontological), the work of the institution (existential) and language and semiosis (textual mediation) will be used to unpack the experiences and practices of teachers and explain teachers work and its effects.*
As such, this project becomes one of collaboration with practising teachers. Only then is it possible to ascertain how teachers’ work has been produced and with what effects and whether an alternative, to the current frameworks for education exists, and if so whether it is capable of ameliorating exclusion and inequality in education.

My plan is to invite practising teachers to contribute to this research by sharing their everyday experiences and practices with me.
4 RESEARCH METHOD

Introduction

This chapter has three sections. After briefly contextualising the inquiry, I begin, drawing on Spirken (1983), by explaining the practical activities involved with development of data collection instruments, recruitment of participants and collection of data. Teachers participating in this project are introduced and their teaching contexts presented to give consideration to what time and place offers to understanding experiences and practices of teachers. Following this, I present a multilevel framework for analysis of data. The research method is designed in this way so that I can view the data from ontological, institutional and language and semiotic directions. The ethical dimensions of this research as well as its limitations are interwoven into each subsection.

4.1 Generation of Data

4.1.1 Contextualising the Inquiry

My original intention was to recruit eight to ten teachers from primary and secondary schools in metropolitan Melbourne. I targeted schools in two regions - Moreland (North West Region) and Maribyrnong (South West Region) because of differences in the multicultural composition of their populations. I envisaged drawing two primary and two secondary school teachers from different schools in each of the regions. I contacted five primary schools and five secondary colleges by phone
and spoke to one primary school principal and two principals from the secondary sector. The school principals that I spoke to agreed, to circulate an advertisement and the Plain Language Statement to classroom teachers and faculty coordinators. In addition, I visited six primary schools. Two principals agreed to see me and one agreed to participate in my research.

Recruitment of participants corresponded with a period of prolonged industrial action in Victoria (Australian Education Union, 2013). Bans on the extras teachers were often asked to do was related by a two school principals, to the lack of response from teachers to the advertisement and Plain Language Statement. I amended the original research proposal and removed institutional involvement. The snowballing technique was employed to recruit potential participants (Longhurst, 2010). Data that could be collected shifted from participant observation, interviews and a focus group discussion to representations of teachers practices gleaned from focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews with and between teachers. Features of the revised research method are set out in Table 5.
**Table 5: Features of the Research Method**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>The objective, following DeVault and McCoy (2001), is to show how teacher’s work has been produced, demonstrate its effects and explain why it is like this.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>To do this work I need insider knowledge — the multiple horizons of understanding that relates to the experiences and practices of teaching working in multicultural classrooms. The narratives of practice of four primary and four secondary school teachers, drawn from government and non-government schools and colleges situated in metropolitan Melbourne, inform this inquiry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews are used to gather data — experiences and practices of teachers - that relate to the broader situation of teaching in multicultural classrooms. This data informs this inquiry. A feature of this method is that at each stage of institutional ethnographic analysis new data is produced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Investigation is situated in three levels of analysis – 1) knowing and representing practice, 2) social relations, and textual mediation and 3) being and becoming a teacher. Details of what will happen at each level of analysis are set out in Table 8 in section 4.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Outcome</td>
<td>Knowledge of what is “shaping the experience” (DeVault &amp; McCoy, 2001) of teaching in multicultural classrooms can be used to explain the challenges culturally and linguistically different students and their teachers face and frame a pedagogy better suited to Australian classrooms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A limitation of this research is that the outcomes are specific to each teacher’s location. Representations of teaching practices may reveal significant insights into practice and contribute to self-reflection. They offer opportunities for further investment in local practice and/or promote, following Smith (2001) an interest in or commitment to generative change. But they cannot be generalised across metropolitan learning landscapes unless the same or similar conditions and experiences and practices of teachers are found to exist in and across the different sites where teaching practice is enacted.

**4.1.2 Development of Data Collection Instruments**

I chose to use focus group discussions and semi-structured interviews as they offered a reliable way of collecting rich, varied, and informative...
data (Longhurst, 2010) and are compatible with institutional ethnographic inquiry (DeVault & McCoy, 2001). Both approaches provided each teacher with an opportunity to talk about their own situation and 1) relate their experiences and practices to institution (place) and historical formation of institutional practices (time) and 2) generate professional knowledge that potentially enters teachers’ lives and settles in their teaching practice (Smith, 1990).

While neither focus group discussions nor semi-structured interviews are meant to be question bound (Smith, 1988) I prepared some questions and associated prompts that I used during the focus group discussions and the semi-structured interviews. I viewed the schedules of questions and prompts as a tool that I called upon as opportunities arose to extend discussion or probe for elaboration or clarification.

**Focus Group Discussions**

Focus group discussion gave teachers an opportunity to talk with each other about teaching practice. Questions tapped into teachers’ perceptions of how students have experienced learning, what they have done and/or what they would have liked to do when students, for instance, become disengaged. Other questions responded to issues that had featured in media debates, such as, improving student outcomes, teacher effectiveness and school performance. One question explored mediation with prompts focussing on how teachers have responded to
different events, policies and people that have impacted on their practice. This theme was developed by inviting teachers to explore the characteristics of inclusive classrooms and to think about what was important, with regards to learning in multicultural classrooms. Teachers were also asked to consider how ethics informed their practice. In keeping with ideas about discursive mediation, I included a prompt that could be used to raise the issue of values with a view to seeing what teachers’ knew and thought about the core values that had been circulated in the *National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools* (DEST, 2005a). That is, to see if or how these had been incorporated in the schools in which they taught. Teachers were invited to engage with the ethical dimension of their work and disclose shifts (or not) between their experiences and practices and institutional changes to curriculum and pedagogy.

**Semi-structured Interviews**

Semi-structured interviews were employed to give teachers an opportunity to talk about their work in their local contexts. They also provided me with opportunities to follow up on issues that emerged in the focus group discussion that warranted further investigation.

Teachers, drawing on Smith’s (1990) Institutional Ethnography protocols, were invited, in the first instance, to talk freely about their practice in their own way. There were issues that I wanted to pursue. Broad topics and associated questions and prompts for investigation
operated at two levels. At the local level, I asked about: 1) the relation between teachers’ knowledge of the students and their expectations; 2) teachers’ experiences of working in multicultural classrooms and the kinds of opportunities they thought could help students’ participation in learning and promote inclusion; 3) the pedagogical conditions of their practice; 4) the contributions culturally and linguistically different students had made to teaching and learning and the life of the school more generally; and 5) school priorities and institutional arrangements. Teachers were also asked to think about whether professional learning provided opportunities for them to question their practices.

By comparison the trans-local dimension took into account themes that reached beyond the local landscapes of practice. I invited teachers to: 1) elaborate on strategies they found effective and the tactics they used if they wanted to approach learning from different directions; that is different to the authorised ones; 2) think about the relation between teaching practice and students’ opportunities to learn and life chances; 3) consider what they believed was/is important; 4) talk about shifts in their work over time and how these had impacted on how they wanted to practise and 5) comment on professional learning opportunities. Together, the use of key questions and more specific prompts were not designed to interrupt teachers’ talk but rather, to expand on issues under discussion.

In both forums, one prompt invited participants to talk about any other issues that they believed to be relevant or to raise any issues that were
particular and important to them. This emphasis has been reinforced because it responds to Smith’s (1999) commitment to giving teachers the opportunity to talk about their work in their own way.

4.1.3 Recruitment of Participants

Email was used to contact four key informants. All of them either shared an interest in teaching in schools situated in multicultural communities or worked in culturally and linguistically diverse settings. Three of the key informants had heard me speak about my research and had volunteered to participate in a snowballing process. Two of the three informants had been inducted into ethical research practices through their own research. I talked with the other teachers about my research at a morning tea celebration that marked the end of an interagency collaboration project. Two teachers volunteered to participate and I sought agreement from them to be recipients of an email inviting their participation in the snowballing strategy. I explained the ethical issues related to privacy, confidentiality and the voluntary nature of participation in research prior to emailing them.

The email introduced the researcher and the research proposal, and invited each key informant to participate in the research. They were also encouraged to pass a document set, an advertisement and Plain Language Statement to other teachers known to them and who they believed might be interested in participating in this research. The advertisement was used to emphasise the value of teachers’ contributions to conversations about teaching practice in multicultural
contexts. Potential participants confirmed their interest in the research, by emailing the researcher and prior to participation each teacher gave written consent for their participation in both or either of the activities and the use of their data in the study.

This method resulted in the recruitment of ten teachers who were (or had been) situated in schools across metropolitan Melbourne. This number matched my original target of between eight and ten. Each of the potential participants agreed to participate in the research and consented to the use of their data in this research. Of these only eight, all of whom are female, taught in the school sector. Four are primary teachers, three of whom work in the same school in different capacities and four are secondary teachers. Two practising teachers, one primary and the other from the secondary sector no longer worked in the school sector. They were not excluded from the study as they met the criteria for selection, as practising teachers and recent practice and memories were considered to be relevant to the research.

Data Collection

The collection of data was organised in two phases.

Phase 1 (October 2012 – December 2012)

Focus Group Discussion

I intended to conduct two sector specific focus group discussions. However, only 3 of the 5 primary participants were able to participate in
the focus group discussion. While 4 of the 5 secondary teachers agreed
to participate, circumstances particular to participants prevented their
participation. The fact that not all teachers had an opportunity to talk
with each other presented a particular limitation to this study. Without a
chance for all the teachers to talk together, building on what is already
known about teaching practice in multicultural classrooms across
diverse landscapes of practice was bound by what each teacher had to
say individually rather than in collaboration with other teachers. None-
the-less the conversations that participating teachers entered into with
each other were relevant to the context in which the three teachers
taught.

To accommodate all three primary participants, who worked in different
capacities, at Buckland Primary School\textsuperscript{10}, two focus group discussions
were held. One teacher participated in both discussions and was joined
by another teacher and myself. Together these discussions lasted
almost two hours. Although this arrangement was not ideal, with respect
to the original intention it was important, from an institutional
ethnographic view, to give these teachers the opportunity to talk about
their work together (Smith, 1990) rather than talking exclusively with the
researcher.

A local café was chosen by the participants as the site of these
discussions. These discussions were recorded. The cafe was quite

\textsuperscript{10} Pseudonyms are used to name schools.
noisy but convivial and the social mores usually associated with café culture were prominent. The conversations appeared to be like any others that people might participate in. But clearly because all three teachers worked at the same school what each teacher chose to say or not say was likely to be influenced, according to Schatzki (1996), by “how things stand and are going on” (p.54). Human phenomena, he suggests (ibid.), can enable and/or restrict what people choose to say or not say, in company. It would be fair to say that the arrangements, while not ideal, did not appear to detract from interaction. The knowledge and positions teacher’s communicated during these discussions, while valuable to teachers working at Buckland Primary School cannot reasonably be generalised to other schools as they are site specific.

In a focus group, the maintenance of privacy is important, and to that end participants were asked to maintain the confidentiality of other participants. This was emphasised as teachers’ participating in these discussions worked together.

**Phase 2 (December 2012 – March 2013)**

**Semi-structured Interview**

The interview format rested on two principles central to Institutional Ethnography. Drawing on Smith’s (1990) insider perspective, teachers were recognised as collaborators in the research. Mediation of perceived power relations was achieved by emphasising the voluntary nature of the research, reinforcing the value of insider knowledge
(Smith, 1988) and promoting the expert status of teachers with regard to knowledge, experiences and practices related to work in multicultural classrooms. This was supported, drawing on Smith’s emphasis on insider-ness, to privilege what teachers had to say about their work.

Nine of the ten teachers participated in an audio recorded semi-structured interview. Each interview lasted approximately sixty minutes. These were conducted in sites chosen by participants and included: cafes (3); family homes where I was already known (2); libraries (2); a work place office (1); and a non-government school where broader system approval was not required (1). There did not appear to be any differences in ambiance between locality and perceived comfort for participants.

To maintain the authenticity of these encounters I moved whenever possible, from question/answer formats, towards more authentic conversations. In keeping with Smith’s (1988) commitment to individual voices, I retreated, where I could from unnecessary disruptions to teachers’ talk. I used the prepared questions and/or prompts to facilitate discussion when moments of silence emerged or when I felt it necessary to clarify and/or elaborate on points of discussion. Participants were afforded every opportunity to tell their stories in their own way.

Teachers were reminded that they would be sent a copy of the interview and they were encouraged to add comments or delete aspects of the interview according to their discretion. Two teachers responded to this
opportunity. One teacher contributed a written text and attached two formal documents that spoke to the college’s vision for change. They substantiated the sorts of changes that the teacher had suggested were underway. These were forwarded but were not used as I did not have approval to use them and as similar information was available on the publically accessible My School website I did not seek the principal’s consent to use school documents. Another sought (and received from me) assurances that her anonymity would be maintained.

Participating teachers offered a substantial body of data to this research. The sources of the contributions each teacher made are set out in Table 6.

Table 6: Data Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Focus Group 1</th>
<th>Focus Group 2</th>
<th>Semi-structured Interview</th>
<th>Written Text</th>
<th>School Policy Texts</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F.G.1, F.G.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F.G.1, Text 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F.G.2, Text 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Text 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Text 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucinda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Text 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Text 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ava</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Text 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Text 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Text 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Research Participants

4.2.1 Introducing Participating Teachers

The study draws on the work of eight teachers currently working in government and non-government schools\(^\text{11}\) and colleges. Anna, one of the two teachers who no longer worked in the school sector questioned the presence of culturally and linguistically students in schools where she had taught. Another teacher, Kate, shared memories of her experiences from two decades ago but she did not have current or recent experience in schools. Their data have not been used in this thesis. Taking into account current\(^\text{12}\), concurrent and recent experiences and the memory work of participants, their narratives of practice relate to eleven settings in metropolitan Melbourne, one interstate and four international settings.

In Table 7, four primary school teachers are introduced and Table 8 is used to present four secondary school teachers. I set out the school, region and system in which they currently teach. Their teacher qualifications and current, concurrent, recent placements and past experiences are used to frame an image of their working life. The multicultural composition of current and concurrent sites of practice, drawn from the *MySchool* website, is provided. Pseudonyms are used

---

\(^{11}\) The term non-government has been chosen to protect the identity of Catholic and Independent schools in local government areas where there are relatively small numbers of each school type.

\(^{12}\) ‘Recent’ refers to practice after 2007 and corresponds with distribution of the new directions paper (Rudd & Smith, 2007) that connected investment in human capital to growth in productivity and prosperity. By comparison memory work refers to practice prior to 2007.
to protect the identities of teachers and schools. The multicultural proportion\textsuperscript{13} of each school’s population, as it is recorded on the My School website is expressed in bands — less than 20%; 20–29%; 30–39%; 40–49%; 50–59%; 60–69%; 70–79%; 80–89 and 90% and above rather than by using the exact percentage for the same reason.

\textbf{Table 7: Participating Teachers Working in Primary Schools}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Multicultural Composition of the School</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Teachers, Classes and Role</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Region of Melbourne and/or Country</th>
<th>Qualification and Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>70–79% (Average 2010–12)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>First year of School (P) to Year 3 Class</td>
<td>Site 1 Buckland Primary School</td>
<td>South East (SE)</td>
<td>Secondary; Team leader; Undertaking further study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First year of School (P) to Year 3 Class</td>
<td>Site 1 Buckland Primary School</td>
<td>South East (SE)</td>
<td>Secondary; Team leader; Undertaking further study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texts 1a &amp; 1b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First year of School (P) to Year 3 Class</td>
<td>Site 1 Buckland Primary School</td>
<td>South East (SE)</td>
<td>Secondary; Team leader; Undertaking further study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrent</td>
<td>80–89%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>P and Year 1 Research</td>
<td>Site 2 Gascoyne Primary School</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Research site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>70–79%</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Primary ESL</td>
<td>Site 1 Buckland Primary School</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>LOTE/ESL; Experienced; Undertaking further study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary ESL</td>
<td>Site 1 Buckland Primary School</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>LOTE/ESL; Experienced; Undertaking further study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texts 1a &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary ESL</td>
<td>Site 1 Buckland Primary School</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>LOTE/ESL; Experienced; Undertaking further study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent</td>
<td>40–49% (Average 2009–12)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Primary ESL</td>
<td>Site 3 Tambo Primary School</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Primary; Experienced; Undertaking further study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Site 4</td>
<td>Toronto Canada</td>
<td>Primary; Experienced; Undertaking further study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>70–79% (Average 2010–12)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Primary Class ESL</td>
<td>Site 1 Buckland Primary School</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Primary; Experienced; Undertaking further study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary Class ESL</td>
<td>Site 1 Buckland Primary School</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Primary; Experienced; Undertaking further study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{13} The multicultural composition of the school’s population is based on the participation of culturally and linguistically different students’ in national tests. As some of culturally and linguistically different students are exempt from sitting the tests and national testing is only conducted in years 3, 5, 7, and 9 these figures are, at best, an underestimation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Multicultural Composition of the School</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>Classes and Role</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Region and/or Country</th>
<th>Qualification and Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sophia</td>
<td>30–39% (Average 2009–12)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Years 7–12 Legal Studies Psychology</td>
<td>Site 8 Nicholson Secondary College</td>
<td>North East (NE)</td>
<td>Social Science; Lead teacher; Completed further study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucinda</td>
<td>50–59% (Average 2011–12)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Years 7–12 Legal Studies Psychology</td>
<td>Site 10 Jamieson Secondary College</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>English/ESL; Lead teacher; Studying Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layla</td>
<td>20–29%</td>
<td>NG</td>
<td>Years 7–12 ESL</td>
<td>Site 11 Campaspe Secondary College</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Secondary; English/ESL; Lead Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ava</td>
<td>50–59% (Average 2010–12)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>Years 7–12 English Humanities</td>
<td>Site 13 Culgoa Secondary College</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Teacher Librarian/English; Lead Teacher.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NG – Non-Government System

---

G – Designates a school that is a part of the government system

Table 8: Participating Teachers Working in Secondary Colleges
An issue that emerged during the configuration of the inquiry was removal of institutional involvement. As I was not able to participate in classroom observations of teacher's at work or speak with teachers, leadership teams and school principals I was limited in what I could see and discover. Institutional contexts of teacher's work were only partially communicated by each participant. School profiles posted on the My School website provided an institutional representation of each school. But I was also interested in how the school presented itself to the community it served. I visited one school because I was already known there but for the others I skirted the perimeters of each of the schools where teachers currently taught on two different occasions — either before school or at the end of the school day and during either mid-morning recess or lunch. My observations were recorded in my research notebook and I used these to present an image of the current work sites of participating teachers. These are presented later in the context of reporting as it relates to practice in local sites.

The more formal descriptions, detailed here, present schools in the context of the communities that they serve. These demographic characteristics were considered important because they give an impression of the wider social, cultural and economic context that can be considered in relation to current policies on improving student outcomes (MCEETYA, 2008). These target schools with Indigenous and refugee student populations and those serving low socio-economic status communities where there are concentrations of families from

4.2.2 **Teachers in Local Sites of Practice**

Participating teachers working in primary school classrooms (First year of schooling to Year 6) are located in schools in the Local Government Areas (LGAs) of Greater Dandenong and Whitehorse. Greater Dandenong has been characterised by consistent growth over the past two decades. In 2010–11, for example, 2,400 recently-arrived migrants settled in Greater Dandenong (State of Victoria, 2013a). This represents the highest number of new settlers in any Victorian municipality and has placed particular pressures on schools and the community (ibid.). According to the Victorian government “60 percent of residents were born overseas, with most coming from [...] Vietnam, India and Sri Lanka” and Vietnamese, Khmer, Cantonese, Punjabi and Greek are amongst the most commonly spoken languages other than English (ibid.). Most government primary schools located in Greater Dandenong, for the purposes of the Victorian Implementation Plan — Smarter Schools — National Partnerships Program (State of Victoria, 2010), have been classified as low socio-economic status schools.

Whitehorse, by comparison is significantly different from Greater Dandenong by virtue of the mix of cultures present and the socio-economic status of the community. The City of Whitehorse, situated some twenty or so kilometres from Greater Dandenong, is characterised by environmental amenity and the area houses the “largest technology
precinct in eastern Melbourne and is a hub for people involved in telecommunications, multimedia and information technology” (State of Victoria, 2013b). While almost 40 percent of the population were born overseas, dominant languages, other than English — Greek, Italian, Mandarin and Cantonese — reflect the area’s settlement history. Using median house prices in March 2013 as an indicator of the socio-economic status of the area, Whitehorse is much better placed economically than Greater Dandenong (ibid.).

Teachers working in the secondary sector are drawn from six different LGAs. Boroondara, while closer to the city than Whitehorse shares the area’s amenity and diversity. Mandarin is the most dominant language other than English but the area differs from the other LGAs by virtue of its high socio-economic status (State of Victoria, 2013c). Some thirty or so kilometres east, the City of Manningham exhibits features of both city and rural landscapes. While Chinese residents now form the largest group from non-English speaking backgrounds smaller clusters of people of Italian, Greek, and Lebanese descent live in the suburbs. Cantonese, Greek, Mandarin, Italian, and Arabic are the most commonly spoken languages (State of Victoria, 2013d).

When compared to Boroondara and Manningham the City of Moreland is quite different. While approximately forty percent of residents are born overseas, Moreland has not attracted significant Chinese populations with only 1.6% of the population speaking Mandarin. Dominant languages other than English — Italian, Arabic, Greece, and Turkish —
reflect Moreland’s settlement history (State of Victoria, 2013e). Even though the area’s strong manufacturing sector dominated economic activity in the past, its proximity to the city has meant that much of the area has been gentrified. Schools in the area are likely to include the children of first and second generation European and Arabic speaking migrants and Australia’s working class, as well as, Australian born offspring of upwardly mobile younger residents including the children of migrants coming from England and Ireland. Alongside these groups are unaccompanied refugee students and first and second generation children of migrants and refugees from current and past zones of war and civil unrest.

Melbourne stands in stark contrast to both Manningham and Moreland. Its proximity to the hub of economic, political and social activity means that the school attracts children of both residents and day users of the city (State of Victoria, 2013f). Approximately sixty percent of the population was born overseas but the most common languages spoken other than English, are Mandarin and Cantonese. Indonesian and Arabic rank behind Mandarin as the most used languages other than English (ibid.). Maribyrnong, situated alongside Melbourne is “Melbourne's smallest and most densely populated municipality” (State of Victoria, 2013g). Fifty percent of the population were born overseas. Most come from non-English speaking backgrounds (ibid.). Vietnamese is the most commonly spoken language other than English while Cantonese, Greek, Italian, and Mandarin rank behind Vietnamese as the most used languages other than English.
These community profiles act as a backdrop to better understand the relationship between practices of a teacher in a particular school and the community it serves. It also draws social class into discussions of disadvantage faced by particular groups of culturally and linguistically different students.

4.3 Developing a Plan

Teachers contributed a substantial body of data to this inquiry. The methods and approaches used in analysis of data respond to the methodological framework. It is designed to locate the actualities of a teacher’s practice, make connections between the things that reside in their work and show how existence is complicit in the moves a teacher makes. In this respect, analysis of data is cumulative in nature. Information gleaned from each level of analysis is used in Chapters 5-7 to respond to the first four of five research questions and inform a broader discussion of education and multiculturalism in Chapter 8.

I have “develop[ed] a plan” (Smith, 2001, p.154) that I used to investigate how the experiences and practices of teachers are constituted and their effects. My plan of action began with the problematic (Smith, 1990). This is a concept I employed to relate experiences and practices of teachers to teaching practice in multicultural classrooms (situation) and the learning opportunities offered to culturally and linguistically different students and, their inclusion in and/or exclusion from rich, relevant and robust learning
To explicate the problematic, I drew on DeVault’s and McCoy’s (2001, p.753) question:

How are the practices of teachers, working in multicultural classrooms, produced and with what effects?

To answer this question I devised a systematic approach that stretched across three levels of analysis and interpretation of data that responded to the language/semiotic, institutional and ontological aspects of this inquiry. Therefore different methods and/or theoretical propositions were used at each level of analysis to investigate the constitution of each teacher’s practice and its effects.

4.4 Analysis and Reflection

4.4.1 Accessing and Analysing Representations of Teachers’ Practices

At Level 1 — Knowing and Representing Teaching Practice I used strategies, practices and processes drawn from Critical Discourse Analysis, set out in Table 9 to: 1) identify standpoint; 2) locate experiences and practices of teachers who work and have worked in multicultural classrooms here and now and then and there; and 3) nominate a text for analysis that I employed to begin the institutional ethnographic aspect of this inquiry (Level 2).
Table 9: Level 1 — Accessing Experiences and Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ontological Markers Evidence of mode of existence</th>
<th>Critical Discourse Analysis Language and semiosis</th>
<th>Institutional Ethnography Research Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inauthentic existence</td>
<td>Strategies: e.g. representation, categorisation, intensification/mitigation</td>
<td>standpoint, experiences and practices, text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authentic existence</td>
<td>Social Processes: e.g. positioning, labelling, classification, justification, repetition, emphases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practices of Reproduction: legitimisation e.g. calls on authorities, objectification, myth creation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texts e.g. repetition, reiteration across different texts, semiotic choices, definition of available choices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


To facilitate analysis of teacher narratives to find this data, a key question (drawing on Research Question 1) and a set of contributing questions were used to frame analysis. Level 1 asks:

**Focus Question**

*What do a teacher’s perceptions, imaginings, articulations and representations of their enactments disclose?*

**Contributing Questions**

1. How is standpoint articulated?

2. What experiences and practices are represented by teachers?

3. Which text, object or service emerges as a starting point for inquiry (Smith, 1988)?
“Standpoint” “a particular point d’appu” (Smith, 1988, p. 171) was considered important to the discovery process because, in Smith’s (1988) estimation, it:

structures the representation of other relations from this perspective. It strives also to capture the coordinative interpenetration of different levels of social organization by the professional discourse (p.171).

To locate standpoint I looked for something that a teacher paid particular attention to. Places where teachers reiterated key messages to reinforce their points of view or used the language of persuasion and justification to emphasise their opinions and beliefs were identified (Janks, 2010). Appearances of new vocabularies (Smith, 1988) were recorded and they were used to identify shifts in beliefs and practices. Orders of discourse were scrutinised to see if there were shifts in language that could be applicable in different time periods (Fairclough, 2005) as well as revealing “a particular social ordering of relationships amongst different ways of making meaning” (Fairclough, 2005, p.79).

Application of strategies, practices and processes from Critical Discourse Analysis disclosed moves in practice across time and disclosed different subject positions that had been allocated to students and teachers (Janks, 2010). Practices such as mitigation and calls on authorities were employed to show justifications and/or disqualification of practices (Wodak & Reisigl, 2003). Emphatic matter-of-fact statements that appeared as taken-for-granted truths were noted as these indicated where a teacher stood in relation to their perceptions.
and enactments (Janks, 2010). I also looked-out for calls on ethics (Doecke, et al., 2010) or national values and/or economic advantages that teachers used to substantiate their views (Smith, 2001). Associated with these strategies were processes that I identified like those that connected perceived failures of students to their “subsequent treatment” (Wodak & Reisigl, 2003, p.379). To engage with the ontological thread of this inquiry I scrutinised the language teachers used to articulate standpoint to see if it showed an ontological understanding of the teacher about herself — “an expression of [her] Being” (Heidegger, 2005, p.33) as activist, bystander or one whose understandings of practice are institutionally bound.

Having identified standpoint I searched for the ‘actualities’ of each teacher’s work in the place standpoint created. That is, in the transition between teachers’ perceptions, imaginings and articulations and their representations of enactments. Instances where teachers showed their everyday classroom work was recorded and I identified tasks and activities that students had been invited to do. I also illuminated absences (Smith, 1988) – things that were missing. Phrases, sentences and extended texts were interrogated to see if teachers spoke of institutional/bureaucratic procedures and processes to the exclusion of learner-centred activities (Comber & Nixon, 2009).

As I had chosen to analyse the experiences and practices of teachers using a process provided by institutional ethnographers (Rankin & Campbell, 2009; Ross & Saunders, 2012) I located a text that I could
use to connect local actions to trans-local relations. To do this, I listened, following DeVault and McCoy (2001), for the presence of texts during conversations and I searched for these in the reading and re-reading phase. I scrutinised texts to find one that had “a relatively fixed and replicable character” (Ross & Saunders, 2012, p. 1657), is actioned locally by teachers but appears in multiple sites (ibid.) because, as Ross and Saunders suggested, these characteristics made them ideal for institutional ethnographic work (c.f. Smith, 2001). Where replicable texts were found in a teacher’s data the text I chose to initiate inquiry is one that showed a teacher’s entry into trans-local ruling relations (ibid). If texts were not named I identified, drawing on Smith (1988), material objects, for example, a test and services such as a differentiated groups to locate texts.

By framing the research, more broadly in Heidegger’s (2005) existential phenomenology I was already open to the probability that texts, other than replicable ones, and processes, other than institutional ones would be situated in the work of teachers authentically disposed. I adopted this position because Heidegger (1976) maintains that teachers working authentically reject “the authority of the know-it-all” [and] “the sway of the official” (p.15). From this ontological perspective I accepted that I may not find any replicable texts associated with institutional ruling relations. In these circumstances, the experiences and practices of teachers is the text that I chose to analyse.
I used texts to shift inquiry from teachers’ experiences and practices (local) to social relations, the social organisation of work, social change (trans-local) more broadly to disclose the relationships between a teacher’s actions/interactions and their modes of existence (Level 2).

4.5 Analysis, Generation of New Data and Making Connections

4.5.1 Cumulative Inquiry

I engaged at Level 2 with of three tiers of analysis. Tiers 1 and 2 responded to stages in the questioning technique demonstrated by Rankin and Campbell (2009) and were used to: 1) analyse a text to reveal processes; 2) interrogate processes to show associated interests, influences, pedagogical relations and discourses in the constitution of teachers’ work and their effects. In the third tier I questioned moments of discord between a teacher’s perceptions and enactments to illuminate contested beliefs and/or actions and interactions. Dissonances in these representations were employed to disclose if and/or how the fact of a teacher’s existence was an issue for seeing and responding to culturally and linguistically different students.

Inquiry at Level 2 asks:

Focus Question

What connections exist between texts and processes residing in teachers’ work, discourses, the principles which define them, the historic contexts in which they were created, social and economic interests and political processes, social change and a teacher’s mode/s of existence in teaching practice and student exclusion and subsequent disadvantage?
At Tier 1: *Initiating Inquiry*, I questioned, following Smith (2001), the initiating text to show the processes that underpinned each teacher’s practices. Inquiry asks:

1. What are the processes (new data) that contribute to creation of the experience?

2. With what authority do teachers speak?

Resources that are helpful in this stage of analysis are the processes constituting each teachers work. Examples of processes that may appear, drawing on the work of Rankin and Campbell (2009) are set out in Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ontological Markers Evidence of Mode of Being</th>
<th>Institutional Ethnography New Data Processes</th>
<th>Critical Discourse Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>comportment</td>
<td>institutional and other processes e.g. efficiency, elimination of diversity, categorisation, associating, prescription, co-ordination, standardisation</td>
<td>actions of texts words and phrases, whole texts used to describe the moves teachers make</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


I traced, following DeVault and McCoy’s (2001) observations of institutional ethnographic work, “the trajectory” (p, 753) of one text per participant — eight texts in all. I did this by questioning each text. Where analysis involved replicable texts I concentrated on what the texts did,
where they went and watched for interchanges between people (DeVault & McCoy, 2001) to identify processes. Prior institutional ethnographic work (Smith, 1988, 2001; Rankin & Campbell, 2009; Ross & Saunders, 2012) emphasised the importance of being alert to texts that were generated by practitioners within their experience. These moves were recorded on the analysis schedules (Appendices, 1-8). However, I did not discount what teachers said. Both doings and sayings were used to answer questions directed at texts to reveal ‘things’ associated with the experience being investigated. Three questions used to trace the trajectory of the eight texts are set out in Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Questions</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Who or what is implicated in text production?</td>
<td>Achievement of processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What do schools and/or teachers do with the information?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How is this information embedded in the practices of teachers?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Informed by Rankin & Campbell, 2010; Ross & Saunders, 2012

To answer the questions asked of each text I re-visited the data and recorded processes, for example, efficiency, transmission, classification, and learner-centeredness that each teacher showed and recorded these on the institutional ethnographic records (Appendices 1-8). I also noted how processes were used to influence and/or inform a teacher’s work and illuminated how a school used the processes to manage (or not) pedagogy. Teachers’ actual voices were used to answer the
questions or I drew on different pieces of information provided in the data and presented a composite answer.

The processes identified through questioning of texts procedure were used to set up a more substantial investigation of what lies beneath a teacher’s talk and actions as inquiry shifted from local insider knowledge to trans-local relations — from analysis of texts to analysis of processes that were revealed in the first stage of analysis.

My task at Tier 2 - *Interrogating Processes*, following DeVault and McCoy (2001), was to disclose wider interests that contributed to creating the experiences and practices that teachers had represented. I used institutional ethnographic questioning of processes to: 1) bring interests, influences, pedagogical and other relations and discourses into view; 2) make connections among them to show social relations; 3) reveal the scope and nature of the social organisation of work; 4) show the effects of textually-mediated work on human subjects and 5) disclose links between discourses and social change more broadly.

Resources that were helpful in this stage of analysis were the processes teachers showed. I used these to disclose interests, influences, pedagogical relations and discourses that I used later to bring social relations and social organisation into view. Examples of interests, influences, pedagogical relations and discourses are set out in Table 12.
Table 12: Textual Mediation and Social Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ontological Markers</th>
<th>Institutional Ethnography</th>
<th>Critical Discourse Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>circumspection e.g. advantages - students, their funds of knowledge, cultural capital; concealment e.g disadvantage – limits to opportunities for students</td>
<td>National Interests e.g. social e.g social cohesion economic e.g. employability strategic e.g. Asia Pacific relations Influences e.g. theories of learning, school leadership, ethics Discourses performativity, conformity, nationalism multiculturalism</td>
<td>Pedagogical Relations positioning of students and/or subjects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Questions used to make connections among and between processes, interests, influences, pedagogical relations, discourses, social relations and social organisation are set out in Table 13.

Table 13: Questioning Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>What interests, influences, pedagogical relations and/or discourses does [teacher] show when she represented [processes]?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>How are these related to wider interests and/or social change more broadly?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>What do different levels of social organisation show about the constitution of a teacher’s practice?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>What are the effects of textually-mediated work on human subjects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Achievement of discourses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I asked questions of the processes that teachers had disclosed to make complex associations. I concentrated, in the first instance, on national and other interests that, were disclosed. Connections were made
between interests, for example, treating every student in the same way and the liberal equality discourse.

Features of relations, for example, indifference to students, efficiency, urgency to manage and control learning and/or ethics such as patience were brought into view to show, for example, text-mediated (or other) relations and their effects including, for instance, subordination and/ or domination or emancipation of teachers and students. I related shifts in discourses to periods of social change and showed what the discourses achieved (Appendices 1-8). I used the achievement/s of discourses to reveal how each teacher’s practice has been produced and disclose the effects of a teacher’s work on human subjects (DeVault & McCoy, 2001).

Textual Mediation

As I had not been able to observe, first hand, the organization of teachers’ work I wanted to demonstrate, more fully the reach of social organization. I employed the literacy and numeracy focus associated with the current reform of education agenda and features of that agenda to 1) locate the same of similar features in teacher’s work; 2) show the nature and extent of textual mediation; 3) illuminate relations of power circulating in multicultural classrooms. The resources that I used are set out in Table 14.
Table 14: Textual Mediation, Relations of Power and Teachers’ Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ontological Markers</th>
<th>Institutional Ethnography</th>
<th>Critical Discourse Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>circumspection e.g. advantages - students, their funds of knowledge, cultural capital; concealment e.g disadvantage – limits to opportunities for students</td>
<td>systems for managing literacy and numeracy education e.g. testing, measurement/assessment and evaluation of student progress, intervention arrangements</td>
<td>coercive devices acceptability discourses, expressions of power, accountability measures, evidence of inculcation, enactment and/or materialisation of discourses in teachers’ representations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Searching for systems and features involved scrutiny of formal texts published and circulated by participating teachers, schools, the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (Victoria), State of Victoria policies, partnership arrangements between the State of Victoria and the Federal Government, agencies of the State and profession, the Federal Government’s policies on education, platforms articulated by political parties and transition documents that link the organisation of education in Australia to international influences. Intermediations are important too, such as those of the media that remind and reinforce the basics of, for example, literacy and numeracy.

Connections I made among these different levels of social organisation showed textual-mediation as a process of concealment; a way of limiting sight that had the effect of maintaining everyday responses to the multicultural composition of classrooms and limiting resistance and agency. Concealment, the ontological dimension of textually-mediated practice, was revealed by looking at textual mediation of practice.
through van Dijk’s (1993) lens of mind management. This concept was employed to demonstrate one way that the experiences and practices that students and teachers bring to learning and the knowledges used to teach and learn is covered over.

These propositions – concealment, mind management and limits to teacher awareness and sight confirmed that the fact of a teacher’s existence became an issue for teaching and learning and drew the ontological dimension of teaching practice into this inquiry.

**Questioning Existence**

My task at Tier 3 – *Questioning Existence*, following Heidegger (2005), was to show how different discourses conceal and/or promote possibilities. I chose moments of discord as the subject of analysis because these were places where teachers revealed discord between what they perceived should be done and what they were doing. I used institutional ethnographic questioning of moments of contention to: 1) show how teachers responded to discord in their practice; 2) reveal the *Dasein/s* they expressed and 3) disclose what their responses meant for *being* and *becoming* a teacher. Analysis of discord in a teacher’s work represented a shift from institutional interests to ontological influences. Questions that I used at this level of interrogation are set out in Table 15.
To identify moments of contention I looked in the data for shifts between a teacher’s standpoint and representations of actions/interactions and illuminated the text that showed changes in their position and the reason for the shift. I identified the motivation for their shift and used this justification to make associations between, for example, subordination of students and ethics.

4.6 Being and Becoming a Teacher

4.6.1 Making Sense of Experiences and Practices

At Level 3 I explored the ontological dimension to being and becoming responsive teacher. This approach, informed by Heidegger’s letting-learn (1976), required a keen alertness to the presence of a number of assertions that Heidegger has made with respect to learning. These are set out in Table 16.
Table 16: Making Sense of Practice and Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Concepts</th>
<th>Assertions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>existence</td>
<td>Authentic ‘<em>Itself</em>’ recognises possibilities and is distinguished from inauthentic <em>Itself</em>’s neglect of possibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concealment</td>
<td>Covering over of the being of entities obscures the complexity of what exists in any school, classroom and learning event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circumspection</td>
<td>Circumspection is a way of seeing. Those living an authentic existence see possibilities that are hidden from <em>Itself</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ready-to-hand and present-to-hand</td>
<td>It is necessary to take up and work with the ready-to-hand to reveal what can be done with it. Otherwise it withdraws, remains present but its usefulness is concealed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agency</td>
<td>Actions of authentic individuals are not those of subject agents. They see possibilities beyond the potential emphasised in discourses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transformation and emancipation</td>
<td>Transformation and emancipation rests on being open to entities and responding to ‘essentials’, those things that are indispensable to a student’s learning and authentic existence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letting-learn</td>
<td>This means responding not to students but to different kinds of students, otherwise education is nothing more than ‘busy work’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


I used these concepts and associated assertions to find possibilities for practice that do not neglect what culturally and linguistically different students bring to learning. These were used to 1) locate and illuminate features of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogies and 2) show how the fact of a teacher’s existence is an issue for them in responding to the multicultural composition of their classrooms. Level 3 Tier 1 asks:

**Focus Question**

What do the kinds of responses teachers make to the multicultural composition of their classrooms suggest about the relationship between their knowledge of the possibilities for learning and teaching available to them and the inclusion and/or exclusion of culturally and linguistically different students in and/or from rich, relevant and robust learning?
Contributing Questions

1. What do the meanings that teachers assign to students and the things they bring to learning and use to learn disclose about their mode of existence?

2. What do a teacher’s actions and interactions reveal about their awareness of the scope of learning/teaching possibilities available to them?

To find this information I concentrated on opportunities that were offered to students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Drawing on Schatzki’s (2005) take on sociality I interrogated the bearing each teacher represented as they responded to the multicultural composition of their classrooms. I searched for the qualities, attributes, and potentials that teachers used to define/refer to people and equipment. Taking up a Heideggerian (1976) orientation I searched for relatedness rather than concentrating on the power of the institution.

This meant that I “ke[pt my] eye fixed firmly on the true relation between teacher and taught” and sought out “the hand [that] reache[d] and extend[ed], receive[d] and welcome[d]” (pp. 15-16). I looked too for “the hand that extend[ed] itself, and receive[sd] its own welcome in the hand of the others” (ibid) to capture site of transformation and/or emancipation for teachers and students (ibid.).

Following this, I looked for triggers - people, events and other presences such as influences, interests and discourses - that could be used to show why there had been changes in a teacher’s awareness of possibilities.
The fullness of all of the connections and associations can be brought into view by representing teachers' work. The two different ways I used to represent teachers' work are presented in the following section.

4.6.2 Representing Teachers' Work

Two different methods for representing teachers' work — mapping and composite analytical descriptions are routinely used by institutional ethnographers to represent complex webs of association. These representations are offered as they provide a place where the constitution of a teacher’s work and its’ effects can be shown visually and through texts.

The maps presented in this thesis drew on the experiences and practices of all the teachers whose work showed similar features of social organisation when they were set out side by side (Rankin & Campbell, 2009). These can be complex representations. Instead of presenting the complex webs I initially constructed I have chosen instead, to map different levels of teachers’ work separately understanding, that in practice, they overlay and intertwine with each other. I made this move because the original maps proved to be difficult to follow. Following institutional ethnographic protocols (Smith, 2001; DeVault & McCoy, 2001; Rankin & Campbell, 2009) I have included subjects, the initiating text, showed how it is actioned, pointed out interchanges that show who or what it is related to, identified newly generated texts and demonstrated their relation to the local and trans-local co-ordination of practice. Connections, if they exist, between the
social organisation of teachers’ work and social change, are illuminated (Fairclough, 2005).

Composite analytical descriptions are different. I use my own voice to describe teachers’ work and analyse what they say and do, within the description, to show how their work has been produced and with what effects.

4.7 Analysis and Recording Strategies

Records of institutional ethnographic analysis (Appendices, 1-8) are a part of the analytic process itself. The results of this analysis have been used to show processes, interests, influences, pedagogical relations, discourses, social relations, social change and each teacher’s Dasein to disclose what they have achieved with regards to the inclusion in and/or exclusion of culturally and linguistically different students from rich, relevant and robust learning.

A series of slides showing the experiences and practices of teachers are presented in Chapters 5-7. These texts offer windows through which to view the features and effects of texts, processes, interests, influences, pedagogical and other relations, discourses and modes of existence on teachers and the culturally and linguistically different students they teach.
4.8 Generative Conclusion

By using semiotic, institutional and ontological analysis of the experiences and practices of teachers I have found texts, processes, interests, influences, pedagogical and other relations, discourses and modes of existence to be complicit in the constitution of each teacher’s work. In the following chapters 5-7 I show and explain how the work of teachers who participated in this inquiry has been produced, with what effects and disclose why it is like this.
PART 2

Reflection and Reporting

Part 2 consists of four chapters. Chapters 5-7 are organised according to Bowe, Ball and Gold’s (1992) categories of technical and professional approaches to teaching practice. Each chapter responds to the first four of the five research questions.

1. How do teachers, perceive, imagine, articulate and enact teaching practice?

2. What do social relations that reside in a teacher’s practice reveal about their work?

3. In what ways is teaching practice responsive to the multicultural composition of their classrooms?

4. What potential for agency exists for teachers’ intent on changing practice in their local landscapes of practice and/or beyond?

In Chapter 5 I present one example of technical education represented by two teachers. Both teachers showed a text structured work process that is articulated to national social and economic interests. Where a text-structured work process existed prejudicial judgements were concealed as teachers positioned students as deficient subjects and discriminatory actions distanced these students from robust learning.

Chapter 6 represents the work of three teachers. All three teachers articulated their experiences and practices to personal and/or professional histories. The processes, influences, interests, pedagogical relations and discourses that managed their learning process revealed
culturally responsive practice in action. However, their agency was constrained by discourses emphasising performativity, conformity and cultural conservation.

In Chapter 7 I introduce three teachers who revealed an expanded vision of students and their expertise, abilities, attributes and needs. These teachers showed the transformative nature of culturally responsive experiences but, with one exception, they did not address disadvantage beyond participation in learning events or engage with inequality more broadly.

Chapter 8 engages with the final research question. I use experiences and practices of teachers as windows through which to see the views teachers hold with regard to education and multiculturalism and ask:

5. What do the constitutive elements of the experiences and practices of teachers reveal about their views on education and the positioning of multiculturalism in education and pedagogy?
Introduction

In this chapter, I introduce two teachers who demonstrated a technical response to the multicultural composition of the classrooms in which they currently teach or have taught. The processes, interests, influences, pedagogical relations and discourses that they disclosed are presented. Following this presentation I exhibit a set of annotated diagrams that show the experiences and practices of both teachers and accompanying composite analytical descriptions that represents the text-structured work process model, that Eve (Appendix 1), particularly, and Sophia (Appendix 5) described. Individual processes that constitute the work process model that teachers represented are described and interrogated to illuminate how work processes and practices are set up (macro) and critique how these operate and with what effects (micro).

By isolating the achievements of these different processes, interests, influences, pedagogical relations and discourses I am able to respond to the research questions to 1) reveal teachers’ perceptions and enactments of their work; 2) disclose social relations in each teacher’s practice; 3) show the effects of their responsiveness to multicultural classrooms 4) emphasise the work of subject agents in securing the work process and 5) illuminate the impact of modes of existence on the work of these teachers.
5.1 Introducing Two Teachers and their Teaching Contexts

Eve teaches students in their first year of school (Prep) and is team leader for the early years at Buckland Primary School. Sophia, on the other hand, teaches humanities and is a leading teacher at Nicholson Secondary College. Eve and Sophia work in schools serving very different communities. Buckland Primary School, by virtue of its socio-economic disadvantage and that of the community it serves, stands in stark contrast to Nicholson Secondary College.

As I skirt the perimeter of Buckland Primary School I can smell and taste the acrid fumes circulating around me and feel the hot putrid air rising from the blackened tar covered thoroughfares. Sounds of dry earth cracking are not audible. But I taste the dust from mounds of uncovered dirt picked up by the wind as it floats about the neatly uniformed children. Scampering feet kick up dust but any sounds I might hear from the schoolyard are muted by the repetitive thud of bouncing tyres speeding past.

Nicholson Secondary College, on the other hand, is nested in heritage parklands.

Scent of eucalyptus floats about amongst foreign whispers and raucous laughter. The piercing screech of parrots fighting amongst themselves, compete with the banging of basketballs. Shouts and slaps of victory are audible amongst the sounds of traffic swishing along an adjacent street. I can hear and I’m sure others can too, the chorus of multilingual noises rising from the soccer field a few metres away.
Irrespective of differences in education sector, geographic location and the socio-economic status of each community, these teachers share common goals. They are both driven by a desire to produce students with particular attributes. Both teachers have represented their practice in the same way evidenced in the presence of the same processes, interests, influences, pedagogical relations and discourses underpinning representations of their practice. The findings of the institutional ethnographic analysis are presented in Table 17.

Table 17: Eve and Sophia’s Representation of Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Pedagogical Relations</th>
<th>Discourses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>efficiency, surveillance, standardisation local/trans-local coordination,</td>
<td>production of English speaking skilled subjects</td>
<td>Culturally and linguistically different students:</td>
<td>performativity, conformity, liberal equality,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrowing of curriculum, skill only testing gap filling, differentiation</td>
<td>behaviourism,</td>
<td>classified,</td>
<td>employability, linguistic imperialism,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of students, levelling of difference, creation of hierarchies of students,</td>
<td>Eve – virtue ethic (care) and</td>
<td>positioned as deficit subjects,</td>
<td>assimilation, subordination/domination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exclusion of low-performing students e.g. add on programs, remediation,</td>
<td>Sophia- deontological (responsibility, obligation) ethics</td>
<td>subjected to subordination and/or elimination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refinement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>agents of the state,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome: Text structured work process model for instruction

Mode/s of Existence

Inauthenticity is revealed in the responses teachers’ make to the multicultural composition of their classrooms that show concealment of students.

Eve: Ethic of care prompts awareness but emergence from everyday existence is not sustained.

Sophia: Ethic of responsibility prompts awareness. Emergence from everyday existence is not sustained beyond mediation of the English only rule.
Features that are complicit in the organisation of work and their effects are illuminated in Figures 3-6. These slides act as windows through which to see how Eve’s and Sophia’s work has been constituted and its’ effects.

**Reading Data**

In Figure 3, I present Eve’s experiences and practices and show the practices, processes, interests, influences and discourses that were revealed through the institutional ethnographic analysis (Appendix 1). These are used to show how and why Eve has organised her work in a particular way and the effects. I disclose how her work is linked to extra-local relations through the *National Assessment Program – Literacy and Numeracy*. Discourses permeating Eve’s work are revealed in Figure 4. Effects of the work process model on culturally and linguistically different student’s experiences of schooling are illuminated in Figures 3 and 4.

Sophia’s experiences are presented in Figure 5. Her articulations show how hierarchies of students are created and reveals differences in the services provided to students in high socioeconomic communities compared to students who live in poorer ones. In Figure 6, processes that organise Sophia’s work are linked to discourses. The way in which students are positioned, is revealed when Sophia reveals how the identities of low-performing students are concealed.
I've never gone to nursery grade. I have no connection with those sort of teaching [...] from year twelve I was dropped down to prep level for teaching (F.G. 1, p.3).

We look at the term planner - the guideline for us. NAPLAN is basically our feeder. The Annual Implementation Plan will give us [...] expected school targets. Based on that, we plan we will decide (p. 4). We clarify what's expected on the week's plan (ibid.). So if it's a narrative, how long do we need to work on that? Because [...] if it's Grade 2 then I'm preparing the Grade 2s for a NAPLAN or preparing them for future. Although story writing doesn't play a very important role, [...] the structure matters (p. 4). We look at the spreadsheet. It will say clearly whether the child has achieved the skill of not. (p. 11).

That's one more opportunity for the teachers to discuss whether they're on the right track. If [students] haven't got it, they come under that C comes [to me] - I would actually be talking about the topic that they hadn't got it (p. 8).

We've got [...] differentiated groups. Although initially I was all for it, I was very much against it because I'm actually dividing the groups. That you're not good at something (p. 7). What I've noticed here is that if they've lost that confidence or belief in themselves [...] they believe the only way [...] I can get the attention of the teacher is do the atrocious thing. So you need my attention" (p. 13).

NAPLAN results and the Annual Implementation Plan connect practice to institutional relations of power.
I started doing a bit of research – which school has got the highest – in this area. The success rate is not proved just one off, but it’s been proved every year. [Now] we start with cued articulation first thing in the morning (Eve F.G. 1, p. 5-6).

My Mum used to say […] if nuns taught me […] I would learn good English. These parents […] expect[ed] an Australian to teach better than me (F. G., 1, p.4).

“I’ve gone for English communication” (Eve - F.G.1, p.3). Yes, Yes” Eve answered to my question – Are concepts always taught in English (Eve - F.G.2, p. 3)?

Remember that kid in Joanne’s classroom, Zahria! She came in and she couldn’t speak a word of English. She always spoke Arabic. So I had to use my Charbel to kind of – what is she saying Charbel? Charbel will translate that in English. So he used to be very proud. Every time he translates he gets 20 house points for doing that job for us (F.G. 2, p. 9).

**Figure 4: Eve’s Practices**

**Performativity**
Eve adopted and introduced a key strategy for improving student outcomes used in the highest performing school in the area.

**English privilege**
Repetition of “Yes, Yes”, to a question directed to another teacher shows the importance of English to this teacher that has the effect of subordinating other languages.

**Linguistic Imperialism/ Colonialism**
Eve’s childhood experiences of learning English are caught up in the debate surrounding value assigned to English used by ‘native’ speakers as opposed to non-native speakers.

**Effects: Domination, Subordination and control**
Rewards are given for Arabic – English translation work. Arabic for learning is excluded even though multicultural teaching assistants work in the school.
As a young person you wouldn’t understand Anglo kids and they wouldn’t understand you. I found myself in a situation. Our group of migrants all came out here to work, collect money and go back. We sold everything and went back. I was the “Aussie kid” in a mainstream Greek class. I had that experience […] and that’s why (Text 5, p.2).

We’d always get those kids […] the Asians and between the Asians and the Africans there were the Middle Eastern. You’d have to try and develop an understanding of who they were, where they came from – especially with the African girls, and they’d have some horrific stories. I suppose they’re in a safer place, and that’s good. You’d think, “Gee, I’m asking you to do some hooey”? Like this would be so meaningless.

But their language was very poor and so you have to really try and work out ways to be able to deliver the content. But then you’re thinking, “I just need to get you to develop your language skills so that you can get out there and get a job,” because at this point in time it’s about survival.

When I arrived here at [Site 2] I thought, “Where are all the African kids?” It’s quite different.” Here it’s a different clientele so it’s a different job you need to do (Text 5,
What we're better at now is being able to test for literacy levels. It's called on-demand testing. Kids sit and do a test. At the end it spits out where they are [on the spectrum] and being able to hone in and move them forward. It can be challenging in the subjects I teach […] because it's very concept-driven and vocab is really important. We don't encourage them to speak in mainstream classes we say “NO – it's English only”. I'll let them speak their own language […] I don't have a problem with that because it's about them understanding the concept (Text 5, p. 4).

We have learning area meetings and then we have teaching learning teams. We made them faculty based. We did this because we link them to our performance review process and […] our focus is on differentiation (p. 15). This year we've [leadership team] asked them [teachers] to think about a low performing student and assess […] whatever they are differentiating – has helped that particular student to move forward (p. 5). We've got a very small percentage of kids […] withdrawn from class for literacy support. I wish I had that document [list of students] we just did it this morning. They have explicit one-on-one teaching building their vocab and literacy skills. You'd want to know, of those, how many are…… (ibid.).
5.2 Constitution of Teaching Practice in and Across Two Diverse Landscapes of Practice

5.2.1 Representing Work Processes

Analysis of Eve’s (pp. 406-09) and Sophia’s (pp. 423-27) experiences and practices showed the processes, influences, interests and discourses that co-ordinate their work and that of other teachers in the schools where these teachers worked. In Figure 7, I set out the efficient text structured work process model that Eve, particularly, and Sophia described and relate this model to their mode of existence. I reveal, in Figure 8, the role of the text - record of text scores - in building the instruction, testing, assessment and remediation processes to disclose how students are classified and positioned in different pedagogical relations. Figure 9 shows the term planner. It is used to reveal the relations between classroom practices, trans-local co-ordination, national interests, social organisation and global influences.

The constitution of the work process model, the complicity of texts in structuring teachers’ practices and their effects and the role of the institution (the State) in controlling and regulating teachers’ work is brought into view.
Teachers are already situated in the world. They bring beliefs about difference to their conversations.

Teachers attend Level/Faculty Meetings

Teachers make decisions about what to teach based on two texts:
1. Term Planner
2. Spreadsheet of text scores

The week’s plan is determined according to the information contained in the Term Planner and the Spreadsheet of scores.

The weeks plan is formulated.

Teachers take the work plan to the classroom and it is used to structure their practice

Practice is standardised across the level/group. Difference is levelled and everyone is treated in the same way.
5.2.2 **Composite Analytical Description of Text-Structured Work Process Model**

Using my voice, following DeVault and McCoy (2001), I explain and critique how this approach to teaching and learning works.

> Teachers already situated in a world and in ways of being bring attitudes, beliefs, experiences, knowledge, values and understandings to the meetings that they attend each week. At level meetings, teachers decide what to teach. They read a syllabus text that sets out skills and concepts and the sequence in which they will be taught and look at quantified data on the spreadsheet or spectrum. This knowledge comes from two documents. One of these is the record of results in the national tests for literacy and/or numeracy. School targets set out in a school’s Annual Implementation Plans are the other source of information.

> During their conversations teachers decide on a particular skill or skills to be taught. The week’s plan is generated by teachers and they carry the decisions about what to teach into their classrooms. Standardisation of practice across classes and year groups is the outcome of this deliberation. Management of the instruction process is essential because all students in year or subject groupings are tested using the same common assessment tasks that are generated by schools and bureaucracies external to it (e.g. Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority; Australian Council of Education Research). Many of these do not require any work on the part of the teacher. Students do these tests on-line and a computer generates a new set of data. The results of tests and tasks are used to establish measures of improvement.

> Back in their classrooms each teacher instructs and tests. There is no room for disturbances. Instruction is always in English.
Spreadsheet of test scores informs the work plan which is then used as the co-ordinating text.

Teachers instruct students in how to structure a narrative.

Some students repeat the cycle. Others begin new learning.

Students are tested for competency in reproducing the “skill.”

- Teacher produced test
- On-demand test (VCAA)
- PAT Test (ACER)

At Professional Learning Team meetings – teachers evaluate student results and their own effectiveness.

Teachers group students according to performance and make lists that show who will be in A, B or C.

Teachers can enter the Smarter Schools National Partnership Program for building leadership capacity.
Teachers prepare a text that represents a transparent accountability system — spreadsheet or spectrum — capable of showing student progress. It is used to show each student’s achievement, measured against predetermined indicators. This text operates as a form of surveillance. Students are shown how, for example, to construct a narrative. Tests are used to validate students’ competency in the target skill. Team meetings are the place where teachers check student performance against indicators and evaluate their own effectiveness. These meetings serve accountability functions. Using quantified data, students are grouped according to degrees of forward movement measured by counting progress from one indicator of performance to another, for example, from A1.1 to A1.3 (State of Victoria, 2012b).

Teachers produce lists of students. Those students who do not show adequate improvement are grouped together and separated from rich and robust learning that might occur in places where ‘successful’ students learn. Instead, low-performing students targeted for differentiated in class support and/or short term interventions re-enter and repeat the same instruction, test and evaluation cycle or receive explicit one-on-one or small group tuition directed to teaching phonics in the primary school and vocabulary and literacy skills in the secondary college.

Leading teachers are keen to ensure school targets are met. They are able to take advantage of leadership courses offered through National Partnerships — Building Leadership Capacity initiative (State of Victoria, 2010). Others can conduct their own research in high-performing schools. To ensure compliance with activities designed to produce data that shows improved student performance, evidence of forward movement, is linked to annual and other reviews of teacher effectiveness. There is no room for complications or deviation because texts are used to structure these models of efficiency.
Figure 9: Trans-local Relations and the Term Planner

Term planner has NAPLAN results and school targets

Targets are set out in Annual Implementation Plan (AIP) – endorsed by the leadership team; school council; and the Victorian Government.

The AIP forms part of the National Plan for School Improvement 2012-15

The Education Reform Agenda 2008 (ongoing)

ACARA Act 2008

Teachers attend Level/Faculty Meetings

Teachers prepare students to do NAPLAN (National Assessment Plan – Literacy and Numeracy)

Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority is responsible for developing and monitoring NAPLAN

Melbourne Declaration (2008) reports on failures of some students when comparisons are made between their results and those of international competitors.
Extra-local connections established through NAPLAN and Annual Performance Reviews link teachers’ work to test results. Leading teachers secure the model by controlling the co-ordinating mechanisms that are designed to produce confident skilled and knowledgeable English speaking conforming subjects. Their work is responsive to policies emanating from the Australian Government, bureaucracies of the State and international agencies that assess student performances through tests. Leaders, who collect, record, manage and respond to skills generated data appear as technologised subjects. According to Smith (2001) and Fairclough (2005) they work in the interests of the State.

The exercise of power is revealed through levelling of difference, narrowing of curriculum, classification of students, and technologisation of teaching and learning that are part of an efficient process for production of human subjects. These processes reveal a business like efficiency and a perception of their effectiveness. There are consequences for everyone when teachers are distanced from their professional learnings and culturally and linguistically different students from their life experiences and sociocultural resources.

5.2.3 Levelling of Difference

Successful implementation of the work process model relies on the levelling of difference because everyone is treated in the same way. There is no accommodation in the model for difference, complications and disturbances. The approach that these teachers have enacted can be related to their perceptions and/or imaginings of teaching practice.

Eve and Sophia have confirmed that English is the medium for instruction and testing in these multicultural contexts. Their perception is that learning and assessment is best conducted in English. Eve follows the skills set inscribed in the term planner. Using the instruct, test and
evaluate process students are grouped based on their performances. Zahria, for example is provided with very few opportunities show her learnings as she cannot use English. Charbel, a student in his first year of school, translates for her when she is sent to his classroom. Empowerment is represented through material rewards, offered to Charbel that affirm his identity. But the teacher’s attention is diverted away from Zahria and a discipline and punishment regime emerges when language use is corralled, in a way that confines its employment to activities that meet institutional interests. Underpinning the levelling of difference, demonstrated through the elimination of Arabic, are discourses that Eve and Sophia have brought to teaching and learning.

Teachers, drawing on Heidegger’s (2005) existential phenomenology, already situated in a world and in ways of being, bring knowledge about the nation’s beliefs about English privilege to learning. Its reproduction in Eve’s classrooms reflect colonial heritage of Australia and India, the constitution of nations (Kristeva, 1991) and the strength of cultural conservation, colonialism and linguistic imperialism discourses that maintain cultural dominance and subordination of difference (Phillipson, 2013).

Eve makes no accommodations for other languages. Her stance on English privilege is informed by her experiences. She (F.G., 1) recalls her mother’s advice on the importance of maximising one’s life chances by learning good English. As a young child she experienced subtraction of Hindi in her transition to English the dominant language of political
elites in India. Her adoption of the English only approach is caught up in her understandings of the power of English. This message is held in place by colonial and imperialist discourses. It is reproduced by rewarding Charbel’s English and silencing Zahria’s Arabic.

Questions are not asked about the privilege assigned to English. It adheres to the English Additional Language (EAL) Development Continuum’s (State of Victoria, 2012) direction, that students need to understand that they are to communicate with their teachers and peers in English (Indicator A1.1). English also supports the efficiency and effectiveness emphases embedded in the work process model as it eliminates the unruliness of difference (Luke, 1997a). Furthermore, it responds to the empowerment ideal in that it eases culturally and linguistically different students into living and learning in an English speaking nation state (Kostogriz & Doecke, 2007). Responsiveness to the multicultural composition of classrooms is informed by English privilege that relies on the elimination of cultural practices other than those of the dominant culture.

Practitioners caught up in processes of levelling and standardisation lose sight of students and “their knowledge, which includes their ways of thinking and learning” (Munro, n.d., p.2). Teaching practice is not viewed through a lens of lived experiences that Gutiérrez (n.dc) advocates for. As Bell and Roberts (2010) suggest, the emphasis on conformity and measureable progress (performativity) silences features of existence like race, ethnicity and culture. This approach responds to the perception
that learning will be more effective if languages other than English and ways of thinking, learning and being are silenced.

Cultural and linguistic responsiveness is absent because knowing and using English is perceived to be empowering and emancipatory in the sense that students like Zahria will have a language that supports their social and economic integration into this English speaking nation (Luke, 1997a). The problem is that it is difficult to ascertain whether any performance, judged to be inadequate represents a skill ‘deficit’ or a translation difficulty. Confusions like these can be more easily negotiated in flexible learning events but not in tests (Vygotsky, 1986).

When students are classified as in need of remediation, grouped with others who have been similarly positioned, the process of exclusion is set in motion. This, I suggest, drawing on Youdell (2006), is “not intended to be racist” (p.19). However, when the right to participate equally in learning using the sociocultural students have at hand is denied, it is “racist in […] effect” (ibid.). This stance is mediated somewhat by Sophia (Text 5) who has knowledge of what can be done. She asserts, with respect to her recent site of practice, that “you’re always having to, you know, build your understanding of cultural things that can affect the way you teach” (p.1). Her connection between cultural things and the way you teach can be tied to her own experiences of learning in culturally dominant classrooms in Australia and Greece.
Sophia’s integration of culture with the way you teach shows the impact of her prior experiences. However, a glimpse, albeit a weak one, of liberal multicultural discourses is in sight. These certainly circulated in the time that is synchronous with Sophia’s prior practice. This knowledge is demonstrated by her decision to ‘allow’ students to use other languages if they are trying to understand concepts. Sophia’s mediation of the English Only rule shows a horizon of understanding born of past experiences (Gadamer, 1997). More substantial uses of languages and cultural practices are displaced because cultural conservation discourses privilege English and as a consequence “we don’t encourage them to speak [using LOTE] — in mainstream classes we say, "No — it's English only" (Text 5, p.4).

Cultural and linguistic responsiveness to the multicultural composition of classrooms is absent because difference must be levelled to maintain the efficiency and effectiveness (performativity) of the text-structured model. Discourses of cultural conservation; conformity, colonisation, linguistic imperialism and performativity control and regulate the ways these teachers respond to culturally and linguistically different students. Maintenance of an idealised world Bauman (1991) has consequences for students who are subjected to remediation and refinement necessary for their integration into this imagined place.

Emphasis on English and ways of thinking and doing promoted by the dominant culture ignores the other right to practice culturally. In multicultural classrooms this, according to Paris (2012), means
recruiting the languages and practices a student already employs to learn new languages and knowledges. The privilege assigned to English means that decisions are made based on evaluations of student progress that have been expressed in English. Students who have shown improvement proceed with new learning. These students are classified using the “A” tag and are positioned as successful learners. Those who do not show improvement at Buckland Primary School, for example, are classified and grouped and labelled “C”. Remediation in English targets the things they cannot demonstrate in English and instruction is repeated until “they have those lights on” (F.G. 2, p.8).

Gap filling processes, using services such as small group instruction, appear as enactments of responsiveness to disadvantage. In May & Sleeter’s (2010) view, they hide “unequal relations of power” (p.10) and maintain disadvantage. Students are subordinated to processes and the things they need and use to learn are denied. The problem is that under these conditions, practices that discriminate and punish culturally and linguistically different students are not recognised as punitive.

The English only emphasis and the sidelining of Arabic, one of the things that both Charbel and Zahria could use to learn shows the exercise of power in the privileging of English (van Dijk, 1993). Zahria is caught in a process of dislocation as she goes back and forth from one classroom to another. Her exclusion is illuminated by the fact that her learning attributes have been denied and little or no learning will be achieved until she is competent in using English to learn.
An assumption that culturally and linguistically different students should abandon their existing sociocultural resources, to learn English reflects the influence of the fallacy that other languages will interfere with acquisition of English (Phillipson, 2013). This demonstrates the power of discourses of cultural conservation, conformity and imperialism that dominate and subordinate culturally and linguistically different students and their teachers.

The elimination of difference is necessary to maintain the efficiency of the work process model used for instruction. Once the idealised world has been constituted through the elimination of difference a standardised curriculum appears as one where everyone can be treated in the same way. A consequence of levelling difference is that cultural and linguistic assets are concealed. The risk for students is that ready-to-hand will withdraw (Heidegger, 2005). Standardising and narrowing of curriculum may go unnoticed once difference has been levelled or eliminated.

**5.2.4 Standardisation and Narrowing the Curriculum**

Processes of standardisation and narrowing of curriculum do not happen in isolation from other processes, interests and influences. As Figure 8 showed, decisions about what to teach and how long to spend on a particular skill, are made during level meetings and reflect teachers’ evaluations of student progress. This is determined according to test scores and school targets. On one occasion, Eve and Year 1 teachers decided to instruct students in how to structure a narrative. Addressing
narrative structure rather than rich and robust engagements with narratives reflects a perception that success in narrative writing rests on knowing and demonstrating the structural components in the right order. The performativity discourse emerges in the efficiency of standardisation and narrowing of curriculum. Eve and other teachers are able to focus on particular skills as they prepare students in Grade 2 “for a NAPLAN” [national test of literacy] or “preparing them for the future” (F.G., 2).

Eve’s attention to results in NAPLAN and the future show relations between teachers’ work, Australian Curriculum, Reporting and Assessment Authority that monitors NAPLAN and future national interests. Concentrating on structuring a narrative makes instruction, testing, assessment and remediation easier to organise and more efficient. It dispenses with the unruliness of difference (Luke, 1997a) and represents an efficient way for students to demonstrate acquisition of the target skill.

The direct reference to “preparing them [Grade 2s] for future” (F.G. 2, p.4) suggests that improved student outcomes are connected to life chances, linking social mobility, employability, and Australia’s economic growth, prosperity and competitiveness to education and practice (Luke, 1997a). Connections between targeted instruction, skill acquisition and future social and economic mobility can be understood as applications of liberal equality ideals (Smith, 1988). However, more than this, it reveals the employability thrust that Luke (1997a) suggests is tied to the nation’s aspiration for full employment that will reduce the burden of
welfare carried by the nation. Responsiveness to the multicultural composition of the classroom, in these conditions, is bound by national/global social and economic interests.

In this situation, responsiveness is directed to texts – the term planner (skills), national and other tests (performance) and imagined futures for these students (social and economic mobility). Emphases, such as these, reflect the performativity discourse carried in policy, implementation and evaluation texts that address improving student outcomes. It responds to an imagined productive future for culturally and linguistically different students who will realise social and economic mobility. The consequences for many culturally and linguistically different students are that they cannot show what they already know and are able to do.

If teachers, instead, had been invited to discuss narrative writing they may have spoken about how students’ stories could be used as an entry point for teaching writing (Cambourne and Turbill, 2007). Young writer’s, following Aston (1988), would, through bilingual or multilingual dialogical processes deconstruct texts to discover how narratives are put together in different cultures. The narrative structure approach discloses cultural conservation overtones as it pre-supposes that narrative structure is something that should be standardised across cultures using the dominant culture’s frame rather than experiencing and sharing narratives from different cultures.
Important features of writing like ideas, literary descriptions within narratives, the structuring of ancient Indigenous narratives, ‘sweeping’ metaphors found in many Chinese narratives and vocabulary choices are subsumed. These are some of the things that are routinely demonstrated in iconic narratives and other stories drawn from diverse cultures. These conversations have been closed down by placing boundaries around what can be spoken about (Luke, 1997b).

Multicultural and multilingual learning events are absent and there are no places for bilingual learning. One reason for this is that the work process approach is constructed by texts where alternatives have already been eliminated (Janks, 2010). Indicator A1.1 shows that the state of Victoria has dispensed with other languages in opposition to its own policies set out in the Vision for Languages Education (State of Victoria, 2011) through its demand for English only communication between teachers and students and students and their peers. This allows teachers working through a rigid sequence of actions to focus on the skills to be taught, performed, and measured in English across year levels.

Decisions made at level and team meetings are not questioned as these respond to guidelines for conduct and regularity of teacher meetings found in the Victorian Literacy and Numeracy Secretariat’s (DEECD, 2010b), Literacy and numeracy 6–18 month strategy: P-10 improvement schedule for school leaders. Teachers, van Dijk (1993) would argue,
are unaware of their enactments of dominance as they classify and label students in their quest to demonstrate improved student outcomes.

5.2.5 **Classification of Students and Differentiated Practices**

In attempting to realise improved student outcomes, leading teachers’ co-ordinate services designed to provide support for students who have been identified by their inability to show the desired forward movement. The perception is that targeted programs can ameliorate student disadvantage with minimal disruptions to existing institutional arrangements.

At Nicholson Secondary College two kinds of support — differentiated classroom practice and short term intervention — respond to students’ needs that have been determined, primarily, through on-demand testing (Text 5). These two ‘phases’ of intervention, set out in *The Key Characteristics of Effective Literacy Teaching [P-6 and 7-10]: Differentiating support for all students* (DEECD, 2009b), link effective teaching to differentiated services and respond to performativity’s demand for evidence of improvement. Sophia (Text 5) and Eve (F.G., 2) confirm, each schools adoption of this recommendation.

At Buckland Primary School “differentiated groups” (F.G., 2, p.7) have been organised according to the successes and failure of students in tests and common assessment tasks (ibid.). It is realised through in-class and across grade hierarchical streaming. The “particular activity” for “the C group” at Buckland Primary School is “working on cued
articulation” (F.G.1., p.1). In the across grade groupings, low performing students repeat, as the diagrams (p.195-9) showed, instruction in the skill “that they hadn’t got” (p.8).

Gillborn (1990) has suggested that the separation agenda is an act of domination. It distances teachers and students from the more nuanced differentiated classroom practice recommended in the formal coordinating text (DEECD, 2009b). The implementation text encourages teachers, drawing on research (e.g. Luke & Freebody, 1999), to move beyond fragmented bits of knowledge to address meaning-making, the function of texts and importantly raises questions about their neutrality (DEECD, 2009b). Implementation in both of these sites is at odds with these meaning-making and critical aspects of differentiated practice.

Furthermore, Breen & Candlin (2008) have demonstrated how differentiated practice can be applied in culturally and linguistically diverse settings to teach language and learning. The authors suggest a range of media including written, audio and visual texts, provide the best opportunity for meaning-making in learning. Multilingual and multicultural texts, as examples of complementary media offer teachers and students working in multicultural classrooms additional cultural and linguistic dimensions that can be applied to learning. A range of media, individual pathways, different participation structures and a mix of learning strategies offer a more meaningful arrangement for differentiated practice in multicultural classrooms (ibid.).
Impoverished applications such as in class and across grade hierarchical streaming can be understood as responsive to an equality aspiration in that gaps in basic skill acquisition are attended to. Deficit pedagogies, such as gap filling, link practice to wider discourses of production and performance and maintain inequality. Luke (1997a) has connected these discourses to beliefs about the failures of students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds to learn. In doing so, Luke has revealed national interests — the need for economically productive and/or performing subjects rather than ones that are cast as burdens on the nations’ welfare system (ibid.). The problem is that many culturally and linguistically different students have not had a chance to participate equally in relevant, rich and robust teaching and learning.

Sophia, in articulating her belief that it is “important to build their skills and knowledge and build their personalities” (Text 5, p.15) confirms the production of human subjects aspect in the text structured work process. To show the strong focus on the production of subjects with particular attributes I present Eve’s and Sophia’s perceptions related to building skills and personalities.

In Figure 10, I show the aspirations teachers’ have for different groups of students and relate socioeconomic contexts to the exclusion of particular culturally and linguistically different students.
My principal she just said I need these kids to be confident (Eve F.G. 1, p. 3).

We want them, when they all graduate, to be young confident people who have knowledge and skills that will allow them to step in any direction that they choose (Text 5, p.12). It's important to build their skills and knowledge and build their personalities in terms of how to cope with authority and things like that; they would be important things over there [previous school] because of who they were (p.15). Here it's a different clientele so it's a different job that you need to do. If we can play a role in getting them to leave school as confident young people then, you know, they're going to be good contributors to society and do that flow-on effect (Sophia ibid.).

At Rubicon, they were good-hearted kids. They had this honesty. The kids were honest and straight. Here, “No it wasn't me. I don't know what you're talking about” (Sophia p. 14).

Figure 10: Production of the Human Subject

Desirable Attributes
The use of “just” suggests that Eve perceives that the most important thing she has to do is produce confident students.

Conformity
Moulding personalities is “important” in eradicating behaviours that are perceived to be ones that upset social order.

Citizenship
Students who show acceptable attributes are prepared for productive citizenship.

Elimination
This image of the ideal citizen is the one that culturally and linguistically different students are measured against.

Exclusion
Culturally and linguistically different students do not receive/deserve the same choices.

Denial
Positive attributes that culturally and linguistically different students demonstrate are not valued.
The issue of the future that Eve raised to validate preparing Year 1 students for NAPLAN can be related to future contributions that skilled subjects will make to Australia’s economic growth and prosperity. Eve remembers the principal’s request — “I need these kids to be confident” (F.G. 1, p.3). The perception that is projected by both teachers is that schools are charged with producing subjects who will be good citizens and contribute to society. This aspiration resonates with Goal 2 of the *Melbourne Declaration* (MCEETYA, 2008) that emphasises the production of “successful learners, confident and creative individuals, and active and informed citizens” (p.8).

The productive enterprise that Sophia (Text 5) describes constitutes a sight of exclusion. When she draws a comparison between students who attend Rubicon Secondary College and those who are enrolled at Nicholson Secondary she shows class based discrimination in the production of human subjects. The difference is that the former is located in a highly diverse and disadvantaged community whereas Nicholson Secondary College serves an affluent and advantaged community. Responsiveness to the multicultural composition of classroom in one school reflects the privilege associated with high socio-economic status compared to disadvantages associated with low socio-economic status in another (Lukács, 2003).
Sophia makes the point that “it depends on what we consider — it’s what’s important and what’s relevant [...] to the setting. Here it’s a different clientele so it’s a different job that you need to do (Text 5, p.11). The implication is that students will be treated differently. The future that Sophia imagines for culturally and linguistically disadvantaged students at Rubicon Secondary College is quite different to the one she has for the ‘clientele’ she now teaches.

Teachers working at Rubicon, as she suggests, concentrate on building skills in English because “I just need to get you to develop your language skills so that you can get out there and get a job” (p.1). This discloses her aspiration for preparing culturally and linguistically different students for work but their education does not prepare them for all the different kinds of jobs that are available to school leavers who have had access to robust teaching and learning. The other is building personalities “in terms of how to cope with authority and things like that” (p.15). However, she makes the point that social and economically disadvantaged culturally and linguistically different students who are to be moulded are already “honest and straight” (ibid.) compared to the less forthcoming subjects in her current more advantaged site. These students, as Sophia has suggested, always claim "No, it wasn't me. I don't know what you're talking about" (ibid.).

It is the not so honest but potentially good contributors that will be transformed in ways that will benefit the nation socially and
economically. Their short-comings are frustrating but they are moulded to be the valued “good contributor to society” who will “do that flow-on effect” (Text 5, p.11). In this process the good-heartedness, honesty and straightforwardness of the culturally and linguistically different students who attended Rubicon Secondary College are overlooked as significant positive attributes. This group is remediated and refined to fit the image of an English speaking citizen who will contribute in some way to the nation’s productivity. The problem is that they do not receive the same learning opportunities. Remediation is directed to English acquisition. Refinement addresses behaviours that are judged to be interferences to social cohesion and social order.

Findings of research undertaken by Gillborn (1990) and Mansouri and Trembath (2005) suggest that these kinds of evaluations can be attributed to the way members of the dominant culture maintain domination and subordinate and silence difference. There is no sense that the integrity (or lack of integrity) of the potentially good contributor is addressed in the same way.

Education in the national interest maintains disadvantage when students’ attributes are perceived of in different ways. The aspirations that the most disadvantaged culturally and linguistically different students hold are subordinated to production of someone’s image of the ideal citizen. It is against these representations that culturally and linguistically others are measured (Green & Cormack, 2008) and fail to meet the imagined homogenous ideal standard (Luke, 1997a).
Responsive to difference in these circumstances is mediated by perceptions of the ideal student.

5.2.7  **Responsiveness to National Interests and Effects**

The work process model, driven by discourses of performativity, cultural conservation, conformity, imperialism and social class privilege provides a way of responding to the nation’s interest in economic growth and social cohesion. It also maintains domination and subordination through social differentiation based on class, ethnicity and race. Through processes designed to achieve these ends teachers and students are transformed. Leading teachers, as Fairclough (2005) has predicted, show changes in what they do (genre), what they say (discourse) and how they are (style) as they coordinate, articulate and manage textually-mediated practices in the interests of the State. In doing so, one way of understanding academic progress and achievement is disclosed, and with it a view of teachers as technologised resources (Peters, 2002).

The *Dasein* that many culturally and linguistically different students might express is concealed by their marking as deficient or even deviant subjects (Luke, 1997a). Evaluations made about them reflect perceptions of difference as something that can be managed and defeated (Sleeter, 2011). This can happen because of the perceptions of difference teachers bring to the classroom that are informed through systems of domination and exclusion (Gillborn, 1990; Kristeva, 1991, Youdell, 2006). Teachers who jump in, drawing on Schatzki (2005), to take over learning events show indifference to the ways students work
with the sociocultural resources gleaned from within the knowledges and practices of cultures they bring with them to learning. In doing so, teachers disclose an image of their work views through the lens of inauthenticity. They do not match what students know and are able to do with an evolving pedagogy (Sleeter, 2011).

Being and becoming an aware teacher is not a straightforward proposition. Dreyfus and Wrathall (2005) have suggested that we are all thrown into a world that we did not create. Systems of domination, drawing, on hooks (2008), show up in the world of teaching. Eve, for example, entered a world where she was asked her to teach students in their first year of school. She indicated that she had “no connections with those sorts of teachings with those skills” (F.G. 2, p.3). Based on that perception a decision to ground pedagogy in English communication makes perfect sense (ibid.).

Eve comes face-to-face with a reform of education agenda driven by a desire to improve student outcomes through intensive attention to the basics of literacy and numeracy (Gillard in Ferrari, 2008, The Australian). To bring this focus into being discourses were reconstructed to privilege this position (Fairclough, 2005). From 2008 texts carrying policy and implementation advice and ‘how to’ guidelines flooded schools. Fairclough (2005) has suggested that whether these take hold or not depends on two things. One of these is the openness of schools to discursive mediation (ibid.). The other is the presence of social agents who will manage the inculcation, enactment and materialisation of
particular meanings in school policy, implementation plans and practice guidelines that show how improved student performances can be realised (ibid.).

As team leader for the early years at Buckland Primary School Eve, takes up this responsibility, arguably, because she did not know what else to do. Her prior experiences and practices as a Year 12 teacher, had not prepared her for work in the early years of school. Her mother’s advice with regards to learning good English is possibly on her mind (F.G. 1). It is likely that she has seen *The EAL Development Continuum* (State of Victoria,, 2012b) and read indicator (A.1.2) that recommends young culturally and linguistically different learners should “begin to understand that communication with teachers and peers needs to be conducted in English” (p.2).

Eve sees what needs to be done and meets her leadership obligations by contributing to building, maintaining and managing a work process that is structured using texts. Many of these she has produced to help the school co-ordinate its plan for improved student outcomes that is responsive to the national agenda for school improvement. Texts direct the management, control and regulation of teaching and learning that is standardised and normalised within the parameters of the work process.

Eve appears to have approached her role from one direction, the authorised one, rather than from every direction, as Heidegger (1976) suggests. Other possibilities are missed and their potential in showing
what students can do is denied. Arguably her initial perception – “I have no connections with those sort of teaching with those skills. So I’ve gone for English communication” (F.G. 1, p.3) – has been complicit in how she sees the challenge of teaching in a multicultural classroom in these times.

Viewed through the lens of *inauthenticity* she sees students with proficiency in languages other than English but not in English and the skills based reform agenda. In Schatzki’s (2001b) view, it would make sense to address skills including those associated with learning English. One of the things Eve misses is the value of the sociocultural resources students use to learn. These are concealed by discourses promoting competency in English, systems of domination such as colonialism and linguistic imperialism emerge as influences in the ways people conceive of their work in particular times and places. Eve’s *Dasein* as a particular professional being is constituted in relation to experiences of colonisation of India by the British, imperialist discourses of privilege (institution) and the historical formation of institutional practices (time).

Preventing the withdrawal of sociocultural resources presents a challenge when their relevance is overlooked because it relies on educators to see what they can be used for. From a managerial position, demonstrations of what students can do that fall outside the work process are not rewarded in the same way. Eve mentioned previously, that Charbel received “20 house points” every time he did translation work for Eve (F.G. 2, p.9) but neither Charbel nor Zahria received ticks
on the spreadsheet that represent formal recognition of what they can do.

Without successful challenges to these contradictory conditions, schools and classroom emerge as norm governed places (Schatzki, 2005), everyday places where everyday practices are played out. A teacher who reveals *Itself* — Heidegger’s everyday one — will work in ways that result in students being subjected to conditions associated with a regulated and controlled norm governed standardised practice (Luke, 2010). In this place, discrimination and inequality exist and are maintained because the questions that can be asked and interrogated are left unsaid (Heidegger, 2005). The selective meanings that have been embedded in texts and assigned to people, equipment and relationships remain intact (ibid.).

Responsiveness in these sites is not to students but to powerful discourses of performativity, employability, conformity, nationalism, imperialism, cultural conservation, citizenship and privilege of the dominant classes. These deflect attention away from knowing culturally and linguistically different students. The work that teachers do reflects the “interpenetration by relations of discourse of more than one order” (Smith, 1988, p.160) and shows the exercise of institutional power in education and its practice.
5.2.8 *Social Organisation of Teachers’ Work*

In the technical response that Eve, particularly, and Sophia demonstrated, literacy skills were positioned, to different degrees, as the content of instruction. Teachers at Buckland Primary School followed instruct, test, measurement of forward movement and evaluation sequence and used faulty adaptions of differentiated approaches to address inadequate English dominated performances by students. Similar arrangements applied at Nicholson Secondary College although, Sophia (Text 5) noted that differentiated classroom practices, informed by Tomlinson’s work, were to be applied to subject curricula rather than to the grouping of students.

Literacy, managing systems for testing, measurement and evaluation of progress and, making arrangements for intervention emerged as the main features of the work Eve and Sophia did. I have used these foci as tools of analysis as I undertook a comprehensive search of different document types to see if I could determine how teachers have been coerced to do this work (van Dijk, 1993).

Figures 11-15 present persuasive/coercive devices designed to hook the broader constituency, education systems, schools and teachers into the interests of the State. The exercise of power is disclosed in the layering of control and regulatory processes that operate in and through multiple levels of social organisation. Their materialisation in schools and classrooms reveal the role of texts in the mediation of education and teachers’ work in and across diverse landscapes of practice.
Discourses of failure and the nation’s economic wellbeing provide the openness necessary for the interpenetration of measurement and accountability discourses (Fairclough, 2005).

A perception that Australian students are not performing as well as others makes changes more acceptable.

“Demands of our increasingly sophisticated economy and a more complex and rapidly changing society require us to address […] poor performances and, indeed, improve educational outcomes for all (Department of Education and Training (Victoria), 2003, p.1). The Department recommended schools “set targets” (p.7) and “measure performance” (, p. 1).

Rudd & Smith (2007) on behalf of the Labor Opposition claimed “Current policy settings are not enough” (p.4), “Australia’s education ranking overall is below competitor countries” (p.17) “one in ten students also suffer a serious level of educational disadvantage” (p. 21)

“…increased testing and more rigorous examinations, adopting a back-to-basics approach to curriculum, holding schools accountable […] is now mainstream in terms of the debate” (Donnelly, 2008)

Rudd and Smith, Labor power elites (van Dijk, 1993) used changes to Australia’s ranking in the OECD’s (2006) Program for International Student Assessment to emphasise the need to raise standards and connected calls for changes to current education system

Donnelly’s assessment of media debates during the run up to the 2007 election suggests that education and students outcomes were a political issue.
“Australia needs a fresh focus on the basics of literacy and numeracy to ensure our kids get the best start in life” (Education Minister Gillard in Ferrari, *The Australian*, 2007, December 5, p.1)

“We’ve also got to lift our achievement […] because it’s one of the best predictors of long term economic capacity” (Labor Prime Minister Rudd, *Press Conference*, January 30, 2008a).

“The overwhelming challenge we face, is to build a modern Australia, capable of meeting the challenges of the new century” (Rudd, in Rudd & Gillard, 2008b).
“develop an action plan for [...] improving literacy and numeracy outcomes” (DEECD, 2010b, p. 2), focus “energy on literacy and numeracy improvement (p. 3), devise a strategy for “whole school approach to literacy and numeracy” and develop “linguistic competence” in English and “knowledge about [English] language” (p. 14).

“professional learning offered by the Bastow Institute of Educational Leadership” is available to leaders in National Partnership schools (State of Victoria 2010, p. 24)

“Action plans will outline the strategies and initiatives that Australian governments will undertake, in collaboration with all school sectors” to “improve educational outcomes for Indigenous youth and disadvantaged young Australians, especially those from low socioeconomic backgrounds (MCEETYA, 2009, p. 18).

Australian school education needs to make significant improvement (p. (MCEETYA, 2008, p. 5). The curriculum will include a strong focus on literacy and numeracy skills (p. 13).
Schools are advised to set up “transparent and rigorous systems by which schools and performance can be evaluated” (ibid.)” (DEECD, 2010a, p.7)

Schools develop “transparent and rigorous systems […] by which schools and performance can be evaluated” DEECD 2010b p.2)

“school wide assessment and analysis schedule to inform whole-school approach to high quality literacy and numeracy learning and teaching” (DEECD, 2010b, p. 2) and “use student learning data to inform planning and instruction” (ibid.).

Coaches “support teachers and leadership teams to develop schedules”, “gather qualitative and quantitative data over time (DEECD 2010a, p. 7) and “assist with interpretation of whole-school assessment data and identification of subsequent targets” (p. 9)

The Performance and Development Guide (DEECD, 2012) advisors teachers to implement “the most effective teaching and learning strategies in their classrooms […] striving for consistent, high quality classroom teaching that will deliver improvements in student learning” (p. 2).
“differentiated classroom teaching for all students” is recommended and “additional short term intervention” should be provided “for students not achieving the expected level in literacy in order to accelerate their learning” (DEECD 2009b, p. 1).

Coaches “assist teachers to differentiate their classroom practice” (DEECD 2010a, p. 7) using the “different approaches for target groups” (DEECD 2010b, p. 12)

Schools “provide targeted support to disadvantaged students” to ensure “young people are meeting basic literacy and numeracy standards” (MCEETYA, 2009, p. 16).

At Nicholson Secondary College and Buckland Primary Schools both approaches have been introduced.

Eve and Sophia evaluate student performance and created lists of students targeted for remediation.

The role of coaches is specified and repeated in advice to schools documents.

Nicholson Secondary College’s product or process differentiated classroom practice is personalised for individual students.
5.3 Politics of Textual Mediation

5.3.1 Managing Minds

Multiple interrelated levels of organisation influence the work that Eve and Sophia do. These emanate from global and national interests, policies of the State, implementation strategies that states and territory jurisdictions deploy, the work of education systems, the school and its internal institutional arrangements and teachers who have been persuaded to do this work. These levels of social organisation are interspersed with sub-levels of intermediation such as media and political party affiliations that are used to reinforce the interests and intentions of institution and ordering authorities.

Opening the Landscape to Discursive Domination

Teachers like Eve and Sophia and school leaders in Victorian government schools were already cognisant of the view that “poor levels of literacy and other skills” were a concern (Department of Education & Training (Victoria), 2003, p.1). Teachers were introduced to the notions of setting “targets” and “measuring performance” in a bid to improve student outcomes (ibid.). The focus on the failure of education systems to produce competitive students intensified, when results of Australian students’ in the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) became the subject of public and political debates. The problem was that “Finland, Korea, Chinese Taipei and Hong Kong-China, outperformed all other countries/economies in PISA 2006” (OECD, 2007, p.5).
Education commentator, Kevin Donnelly (2008), in his assessment of media debates during 2007 concluded that testing, the basics, and more rigorous accountability reflected mainstream views. These, he suggested, were “being advocated by ALP (Australian Labor Party) state and federal governments” (p.8). In 2007, an election year, the quality of student outcomes, school performance and teacher effectiveness became a political issue and addressing education outcomes was positioned more broadly as a national priority.

**Acceptability**

When Federal opposition power elites Rudd & Smith (2007) advocated, on behalf of the Labor Party, for changes to current policy settings, they advanced the view that current system settings were inadequate for economies in the era of globalisation. They linked proposed reforms in education to national prosperity and the disadvantages Australian students face when in competition with students from other countries. The nation’s capacity to meet millennium goals – economic growth and global economic competitiveness were questioned (ibid.). These uncertainties were used to constitute a new discourse for education (Luke, 1997a). Promotion of a perception that Australian students were not performing as well as others made changes more acceptable when governments signalled their intention to address the problem that they had represented (Janks, 2010).
Discourse Production

In the wake of Rudd’s election win in 2007, Gillard (Rudd & Gillard, 2008b) the new Minister for Education, promoted changes to education. Using a liberal equality discourse she linked the acquisition of the basics of literacy and numeracy to life chances to persuade the constituency of the efficacy of the approach (van Dijk, 1993). Prime Minister Rudd (in Rudd & Gillard, 2008a) reinforced this direction by connecting national prosperity to changes to education that targeted underachievement. He made the challenge of overcoming disadvantage a collective one by using “we” to help convince the nation’s people of the economic benefits for everyone if Australia’s education system is changed (van Dijk, 1993).

Subject positions that have been allocated to the people reveal the interplay of dominance and subordination (Luke, 1997b; van Dijk, 1993).

Institutionalisation of Power

The Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training, and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA, 2008), set about building on and re-defining Goals for Young Australians. The council, taking up a liberal equality orientation, reinforced the need for a “strong focus on literacy and numeracy” (p.13) to improve student outcomes and “reduce effects of […] sources of disadvantage” (ibid.). To that end the Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) Act (2008) established ACARA. It was charged with fulfilling two key policy agendas — the development and implementation of the Australian Curriculum and a National Assessment Program — Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN). These new mechanisms for control and
regulation of education were instituted through Section 6-Functions of the ACARA Act (Australian Government, 2008). The national testing regime, understood, as an instrument for monitoring student learning, teacher effectiveness and school performance is an expression of scepticism with regard to the capacity of education systems to improve student outcomes (van Dilk, 1993). To legitimise measures for control and regulation discourses were articulated particularly, to “Indigenous youth and disadvantaged young Australians, especially those from low socio-economic backgrounds” (ibid.) that includes significant numbers of students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Teachers like Eve and Sophia and their colleagues, were advised to “use information about student progress to inform their teaching” (MCEEYTA, 2009, p.14). This is exactly what they did.

Power Arrangements

MCEETYA’s (2008) emphasis on the production of a curriculum with a “strong focus of literacy and numeracy skills” (p.5) set the benchmark for education systems in state and territory jurisdictions. Partnerships between the Federal Government and state and territory governments are mechanisms that hook systems of educations and schools in these jurisdictions into the plans of the State. This is achieved by setting up the ordering of relationships between different stakeholders (Fairclough, 2005).

School leaders were needed to bring these changes to fruition. One arm of the Victorian Implementation Plan - Building Leadership Capacity
(State of Victoria, 2010) concentrated on school leadership. Leaders and teachers in National Partnership schools were able to participate, as Sophia did, in “professional learning offered by the Bastow Institute of Educational Leadership” (p.24).

**Accountability Measures**

The Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD) Victoria formalised an implementation strategy. This is specified in the *Literacy and numeracy 6–18 month strategy: P-10 improvement schedule for school leaders* (DEECD, 2010b). It sets out a “cohesive and comprehensive approach, to school improvement” (p.3). By setting out sequences of actions like the timing and frequency of level and team meetings and specifying when things like formal observations or on-line evaluations should be completed, decision making capacity is tightened. Many of these recommendations are repeated in different documents, as Luke (1997b) suggests, to reinforce their acceptance.

Eve has ensured that teachers working in the early years at Buckland Primary School support the sequence of steps carried through *Key Characteristics of Effective Literacy Teaching P-6* (DEECD, 2009b). Its presence is evidenced in indicators of progress on the spreadsheet that represents a formal accountability text. In Eve’s school, a coach “supports teachers and leadership teams to develop assessment schedules” (DEECD, 2010a, p.7) “gather qualitative and quantitative data over time” (ibid.), “assist teachers to differentiate their classroom
practice” (p.8) and help “with the interpretation of whole-school assessment data and the identification of subsequent targets” (p.9). Eve and Sophia presented their assessment schedules — the spreadsheet and spectrum. These are evidence of transparent accountability systems. They fall short on compliance with recommendations because they do not show qualitative data. A retreat from using qualitative data is associated with the time taken to organise and evaluate work samples compared to tests, particularly, computer generated tests that teachers do not have to create or correct.

At Nicholson Secondary College the accountability framework, based on improvement in student outcomes, has also been positioned within the parameters of each teacher’s annual performance review. This mechanism connects student outcomes to teacher effectiveness. The *Performance and Development Guide* (DEECD, 2012) is used to formalise measurement of teacher effectiveness that reflects the requirements of the *Victorian Government Schools Agreement* (State of Victoria, 2008). Schools that are a part of the government system are advised to “develop processes that recognise and affirm high performance [and] address underperformance” (p.2). Nicholson Secondary College has responded to this recommendation. Teachers who fail to deliver “high quality classroom teaching that will deliver improvements in student learning” (DEECD, 2012, p.2) risk admonishments that may impact on promotion and material rewards.
Inculcation, Enactment and Materialisation

The State of Victoria (DEECD, 2009b) connected effective teaching practice to “two phases of teaching” (p.1). One of these emphasised “differentiated classroom teaching for all students” (ibid.). The other focussed on “additional short-term intervention for students not achieving the expected level in literacy in order to accelerate their learning” (ibid.). Eve and Sophia have demonstrated differentiated applications. Eve prepared lists of students in accordance with test results. The school introduced across grade streaming and Eve brought cued articulation, from the highest achieving school in the area to accelerate learning for low-performing students in the Early Years Program. At Nicholson Secondary College Sophia, formalised the list of students targeted for short term intervention.

Co-ordination

Buckland Primary School and Nicholson Secondary College have replicated the structure and sequences specified in the Literacy and numeracy 6–18 month strategy: P-10 improvement schedule for school leaders (DEECD, 2010b). Both sites have linked teaching practice to student outcomes and strategically to data analysis that has been realised in targeted school plans. This suggests a strong perception, shared by these teachers, that there is only one way to improve student outcomes (Sleeter, 2011). This is achieved through multiple levels of persuasion that van Dijk (1993) ties to the maintenance of privilege and dominance that manages understandings and ignores inequality.
5.4 Generative Conclusion

The cumulative nature of the methods used for analysis of data allowed me to move from text to processes and discourses to disclose interests, influences and pedagogical relations. I related the absence of positive pedagogical relations to each teacher’s inauthentic mode of existence and connected their commitment to instituting a text structured work process model in the schools where they work to discourses and the influences and interests embedded in them. The relationship between their work now, and their own childhood experiences disclosed the impact of their personal histories of exclusion and discourses of performativity, colonialism, migration and imperialism, that van Dijk (1997) claims, manages peoples’ minds. By following the methods for data analysis set out in Chapter 4 I have disclosed how each teacher’s work has been constituted and with what effects.

It cannot be claimed that these teachers live one way or the other. There were instances where curiosity triggered awareness (Heidegger, 2005). Eve’s call-up of the ethic of care to placate the child who she believed, realised, he was not good at something shows awareness and suggests that authenticity and inauthenticity are at work simultaneously (Gur-Ze’ve, 2002). Sophia’s inauthenticity is shaken when she recalls her own experience of being different and relaxes the English Only rule and ‘lets them learn’ using their first language to make meaning.

These teachers want students to succeed at school and in life more broadly but the fact of their existence is a problem for them. For awareness to be sustained impediments to vision must be illuminated and cleared away before everyday beings can be released from obscurity of everydayness (Heidegger, 2005). This discussion is further developed in Chapters 8 and 9.
6 TEACHERS CLAIMING THEIR TERRAINS OF PRACTICE

Introduction

In this chapter, I introduce Grace, Jennifer and Helen and show the contexts in which these teachers work, present the processes, interests, influences, pedagogical relations and discourses that they disclosed and exhibit a set of annotated diagrams that show the experiences and practices of both teachers. I use their experiences and practices to demonstrate how their multifaceted and layered learner-centred approaches have been produced and with what effects. Following this, I show their modes of being and disclose limits to their agency to reveal the clutter of everydayness that these teachers face in being and becoming culturally responsive teachers. A composite analytical description of their practice is presented. It is used to represent one way of conceptualising and resourcing culturally responsive practice. In the final part, I offer on behalf of these teachers the contributions they have made to a culturally responsive pedagogy suited to Australian classrooms.
6.1 Experiences and Practices of Primary School Teachers

6.1.1 Teachers in Local Sites of Practice

Grace, a Year 1/2 classroom teacher at Acheron Primary School and Helen and Jennifer, English language educators at Buckland Primary School demonstrate pedagogies that are culturally and linguistically responsive to the multicultural composition of their classrooms. They enact learner centred approaches that position students as active participants in learning events and one where interactions with and between students and teachers are central to learning. However, it cannot be claimed that their practice is free from disturbances that are attributable to texts that structure the work processes in the schools where they teach.

Acheron Primary School where Grace works is very different to Buckland Primary School (p.198) where Helen and Jennifer are situated.

The boundaries of Acheron Primary School are shared with impressive suburban homes mostly representative of the Art Deco period. These are interspersed with a smattering of high-end market new builds. Red satin, gold encrusted banners — symbols of Chinese new-year celebrations — flutter in doorways.

14 Helen and Jennifer worked at the same school as Eve (Chapter 5).
This representation of culture is the only one visible with the exception of the Australian flag in the schoolyard. Sporting facilities sweep across the streetscape and the jubilant sounds of play echo from a tightly cloistered space tucked behind the equipment. One little boy stamps about in knee-deep leaves caught by the boundary fence. I am alerted to his presence by the sound of dry leaves crunching. I pause and catch the musty wafts of mulch in the damp air rising from the shade garden where he plays.

6.1.2 **Findings of Institutional Ethnographic Analysis**

Irrespective of differences in geographic location and the socio-economic status of each school and the community it serves Grace, Jennifer and Helen represented a learner-centred approach revealed through the processes, interests, influences, pedagogical relations and discourses that each teacher showed. Findings of the institutional ethnographic analyses (Appendices 2, 3 and 4) are presented in Table 18.
Table 18: Grace, Jennifer and Helen’s Representation of Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Interests and Influences</th>
<th>Pedagogical Relations</th>
<th>Discourses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>observation, change, resistance, dialogical, devise multiple participation structures, calls on experiences, integration e.g. theories of learning, layering of language and subject learning, differentiating tasks, associates learning one language with learning another one, allows for variations of opinions, collaboration</td>
<td><strong>Interests</strong> learner-centred pedagogies <strong>Influences</strong> personal and professional histories, theories of learning, ethics <strong>Culturally and linguistically different students:</strong> positioned at the centre of learning, positive pedagogical relations by connecting lived experiences, cultural knowledges and practices and academic learning <strong>Teachers</strong> silencing, marginalisation</td>
<td>liberal multiculturalism, glimpses of critical multiculturalism, social justice, performativity, domination e.g. teacher marginalisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome:** Multifaceted, flexible and layered approach to learner-centred practice

**Mode/s of Existence**

**Helen** demonstrated her authenticity through comportment. She uses her awareness of what students bring and use to learn to enact her teaching syllabus. When Helen sees domination she voices her opposition but confronts opposition from the ‘They’ who do not see the impact (classification and categorisation) of iffy guesses on students.

**Jennifer** reveals authenticity when she brings the enfranchisement/disenfranchisement binary into view by 1) illuminating the impact of routine testing on newly arrived refugee students and 2) showing how to respond to cultural practices. However, Jennifer is silent on the testing regime. This shows authenticity and inauthenticity existing together.

**Grace**’s struggle between applying her knowledges of culturally and linguistically responsive practice and institutional relations show “authentic and inauthentic life” existing simultaneously (Gur-Ze-ve, 2002, p. 69).

For Jennifer and Grace inauthenticity is revealed in concealment of opportunities to speak.
Irrespective of these very different contexts, teachers articulate the same single message. They all show that learners and what they bring to learning and use to learn is central to their practice. I demonstrate the three main ways — dialogical, tactical and topic based practice — that these teachers employ to respond to the multicultural compositions of their classrooms. I do this by bringing forward their experiences and practices and reveal the processes in their work that were identified through the questioning of text analysis (Appendices 2, 3 and 4).

The first slide (Figure 16) shows the experiences that inform Grace’s work and some of their effects that relate to the strategies and processes Grace uses to include culturally and linguistically different students in learning. This theme is developed in Figure 17. Processes are unpacked to demonstrate the culturally and linguistically responsive nature of her work. I connect relatedness to teaching practice and relate her work to her expression of being. Grace’s Daseins are revealed through the learning opportunities offered to culturally and linguistically different students and her caution with regard to speaking about learner-centred pedagogies in multicultural classrooms and systems of domination and subordination.
Many of us [late seventies] faced the same issues of teaching children from war-torn backgrounds and creating a learning environment that applied to them (Text 4, p.1). So a lot more hands-on - a lot more interactive activities but also teacher-based activities. Introducing topics which were common to them - starting with the central focus of what the child knew about in their own language so that they could associate something common, within a different linguistic structure, of course (ibid.). It opens up their minds to learning from one another, rather than being a student that sits down and just does their exercise and marks it off (p. 9).

I remember going to some Vietnamese students’ homes as a means of breaking down the isolation of the parents and the school (p.3).

Our programme […] is just catering for very good English speakers. We’ve got a lot of Chinese kids in the school. They don’t see it the same way. Their understandings are different (p. 6). You’ve got to realise that […] and that sparking moment will be when the child or children will come to you and say, “Oh, but I thought… (p. 11).

Responsibility
Various approaches for tapping into what the child already knows creates the applicable/relevant learning environment, responds to the equal opportunity agenda and reflects social justice interests.

Associating
By using “central” Grace sets up a learning process based on association between one fund of knowledges and languages and a new one.

Articulation of “sparking moment” to disclose understanding shows the importance Grace places on making meaning through dialogic engagements.

Dialogical processes are compared to completion of exercises that can be “marked off” to show the difference between efficiency agendas and more time intensive engagements.

These multicultural initiatives focus on primary relationships rather than on the levelling of difference as a pathway to social cohesion.

This multicultural education accepts variations in understandings, knowledges and values.
It's up to the class teacher to deal with children from a background where it is culturally Chinese or maybe French.

It's much more of a social system - talking with each other, waiting for variation, allowing different opinion, broader thinking, which builds relationships or works towards building better relationships [...] it takes time, this sort of thing (Text 4, p. 9)

Introduce the topic, family, home, possibly pets, and animals (p. 1) - talk about it in as many different ways as applicable to the conversation you’re having with children. Hear what they're saying. So there's a great sharing of ideas there with children (p. 11)

It takes time - it takes repeated teaching in different ways. I think it takes stimuli, too: pictures, conversation, movement, tactile - those sorts of important things for children (p. 2). I think it's when they draw on something maybe that they've experienced in their own culture, that maybe they can correlate with and they connect but with the input of the teacher and with the one-to-one assistance or group assistance (ibid.)

**Figure 17: Grace’s Practices**

**Relatedness**
- The relation between “talking”, waiting”, “allowing”, and “broadening” procedures for making meaning and “building better relations” shows the essence of Heidegger’s (1976) “letting learn”.

**Learner centeredness**
- Students are situated at the centre of learning.

**Layering**
- A layering of cultural knowledges about a topic common to students

**Support**
- Different participation structures and inclusive support realise the “sparking moments” (Slide 7) that shows the realisation of understanding.

**Associating**
- Students are supported to make connections between the known and new learning.
6.1.3  **Dialogical Learner-Centred Responsive Practice**

Grace understands her classroom as a place that accommodates and maintains dialogical relations. She explained how she positions each student in an ‘applicable’ dialogical environment where students’ and the teacher experience learning together. Emphasis is given to interactions — talking, listening and sharing of ideas. These conversations are conducted using different languages and situated in topics common to students and ones they have experience of. She reinforces the inseparability of these foci, by starting with the knowledge students bring to learning. How have her enactments come to be constituted in this way?

Complex pedagogical processes are advanced when Grace suggests that knowledge expressed in one language can be used to learn the same knowledge in another. Associating different linguistic contributions in this way can be understood as scaffolding meaning making that reveals aspects of Vygotsky’s work (1986). In this context, languages are used to support children to collocate in the new language the ideas and opinions they understand and want to share (Lewis, 2008). Within this approach the focus is on using one language to learn new knowledge in another and extends to learning from one another. For Grace it means accepting variations in language/s, understandings, and knowledge to reach new knowledge. This approach represents robust academic learning.
Layering of language learning with variations in opinions, views and knowledge immerses students in dialogical processes. Students are positioned as knowledgeable and successful learners through their contributions. The dialogical aspect of this work contributes to shaping strong positive identities (Luke, 1997b). Strong emphasis on dialogic engagements in the third space (Kostogriz and Doecke, 2007; Gutiérrez, 2008) links Grace’s practice to social justice in so much as it is here that students and teacher meet face to face and learn from one another. Capturing the influences informing Grace’s work relied on searching for Gadamer’s (1997) horizons of understanding.

In commenting on her multifaceted approach Grace recalls past experiences of practice. She remembers that during the years she spent at Condamine Primary School (late seventies) teachers were challenged to create learning environments where newly arrived students from Vietnam could learn. Arrangements for building school community relations were advanced when she was able to visit her students and their families. These activities, as she describes them, show the presence of a relational discourse that is quite different to the accountability discourses that guide practice in her current school.

Grace’s presentation of this service of building community, home and school relations is used here to show connections between her past experiences and current practices. Explicit arrangements that were employed to develop relations between community, home and school reflect early liberal multiculturalism initiatives. These were used to break
down isolation experienced by newly arrived refugees. The *Galbally Report Review* (1978), apart from emphasising the right of “every person […] to maintain his or her culture without prejudice or disadvantage” (p.1) also “promoted intercultural understanding” (p.6). Intercultural discourses permeate her articulations. The responses Grace demonstrated to the multicultural composition of the Year 1 classrooms shows interculturalism in a dialogic pedagogy.

For Grace, teaching and learning in multicultural classrooms means watching, noticing, acting and interacting because how students “view a topic or […] a situation is going to be quite different, based on their experiences” and “it makes a difference” (p.2). To do this work Grace offers a number of participation structures that show the presence of intercultural and multicultural discourses — sharing ideas, using pictures, hands-on activities and making cultural, intercultural and linguistic connections through teacher input and group work. The participatory nature of this open environment demonstrates Grace’s retreat from prejudicial arrangements such as elimination of languages and cultures.

Instead, Grace fosters equality in relations among and between students and teacher. Learning, situated in co-operative dialogical relations allows students a voice. These perspectives are a part of Grace’s personal history. Horizons that I glimpse in her practice are different moments of her professional learning and practice (Gadamer, 1997).
This is not the only way that teachers can include culturally and linguistically different students in rich, relevant and robust learning.

Jennifer, by comparison, favours an action oriented opportunistic approach rather than a dialogical one. One of the forms this approach takes is to question, modify or change authorised programs. In Figure 18, the relation between Jennifer’s standpoint – changing and modifying practices that she estimated will not work - is evidenced in her efforts to make learning and teaching events inclusive and relevant to the students she was teaching. The processes Jennifer showed are annotated in Figure 18.
I have worked in multicultural schools four or five in the last twelve years. I just absolutely loved the multicultural aspect of Australia (Text 3, pp. 1-2).

What I've learned is never, ever, ever assume anything, even the simplest of things. I see it in their faces. I see it in the work that they're doing. They get lost; completely lost […] and I say “let’s modify it, let’s change it” (ibid.). Another thing […] is, knowing children – talking, respecting the children when they are talking, and listening to them and registering it, then using it in the classroom (FG 2, p.8). We have done lots of projects on countries because they are experts on their home country and they can educate people (p.13). I had to scaffold them a lot – that had to follow little prompts, I’d bring in books – we don’t have a library in the school. I showed them, made a slideshow about India and I showed it so they had a model.

I remember one of the kids had henna on his hands today. I said “oh you had Eid”? He just smiled and said “yes Miss”. With my upper level kids there were three or four Muslim kids. I use that into their writing. Then we published it in the school newsletter for the community (F. G. 2, p.8)
6.1.4  **Tactical Learner-Centred Practice**

Jennifer is interested in teaching and learning that is relevant to her situation in a school with a very high proportion of culturally and linguistically different students. Her perception is that practices that have been authorised must be evaluated and may need to be changed, modified or replaced because they do not match students’ needs or readiness to learn.

She demonstrates this when she sees henna on the hands of a student. Jennifer’s response to her noticing shows a relationship between students, the things they bring to learning, the sociocultural resources they use to learn and academic learnings. Jennifer’s comportment and circumspect practices reveal the presence of Heidegger’s (2005) *itself* who recognises the potential that *entities* in different situations offer to learning. In a Derridean (1995) sense, she took the leap of faith, abandoned the pre-determined plan, and recruited a group of expert Muslim students to report on the practice of painting hands. Rather than taking over someone else’s learning event in ways that take control away from the learner Jennifer steps back, somewhat, to share the conduct of this event with the holders of knowledge (Schatzki, 2005).

Calling on student resources and cross age arrangements (Years 4–6), students’ needs and expertise are recognised as the means through which they will get things done. She maintains elsewhere that she scaffolds a lot (p.13). Any scaffolds that are put in place in this learning event must respond to what the teacher already knows about these
students. And the teacher would need to know, in advance, the places that their learning will take them (Heidegger, 1976) if Jennifer is to “let them learn” (ibid.). Responsiveness to the multicultural composition of English second/additional language classrooms in which Jennifer teaches reflects the influences of learner-centred theories of learning and markers of authenticity – comportment and circumspection. These guide the conduct of this learning event.

By linking cultural knowledge with school-based learning students engaged with academic learning (Sleeter, 2010). Through this process Jennifer shows a multicultural dimension in her work through promotion of student participation in learning using their sociocultural resources. This approach emerges as a powerful way to affirm cultural identities (Luke, 1997a). Agency emerged as Jennifer gave students a forum to demonstrate, publicly, what they could do. Through this process a ‘product’ — a report on the festival of Eid al-Adha — was generated and published through the school’s newsletter. By working with what students bring to learning and use to learn Jennifer makes connections between cultural knowledges and practices, new knowledge and academic learning (Sleeter, 2011).

The significance of Jennifer’s response is she could have responded in any number of ways. In an indifferent mode of existence she could have walked by and done nothing (Schatzki, 2005). An alternative response would be to recognise only henna on a child’s hands and not its significance and enter into conversations about the painting practice.
Discussions like these often take place in schools but the risks associated with staff and classroom discussions about cultural practices involve accepting, representing and reproducing “simplistic” views of culture (Sleeter, 2011). Jennifer rejected these options because, from authenticity, she glimpsed the significance of the possibilities that a cultural presence offered.

Realising the learning possibility that henna presented she manipulated it and turned possibility it into an opportunity (de Certeau, 1984). By linking a cultural practice to learning, students were open to new academic learning (Sleeter, 2011). Access to the learning event was through existing knowledge that a group of Muslim students knew and understood. There was no talking about ‘it’ but rather pooling knowledges and understandings and using these to demonstrate academic learning. The outcome for students was greater ownership of the learning event and their participation in it.

This image is one that sits comfortably with the hospitality that Kostogriz (2009) and Gutiérrez (2008) claim is essential to learning in multicultural classrooms. Jennifer’s welcoming response to this equipment — henna — reveals herself as Heidegger’s authentic itself who realises possibilities and who drawing on Smith (1999) “sees with clarity where [she] is standing” (p.65). Her interest in “henna on his hands” (Text 3) was not deflected by managerial and accountability texts nor by the bearing of others on her teaching life. Authenticity enabled her to see, in full relief, the place she was standing and the people she stood there-
with. This is not exactly what Heidegger (1976) means when he talks about “letting learn”. It is a more sustained commitment to responsiveness rather than an opportunistic one. However, by sharing carriage of the learning event with students who have prior knowledge of it, Jennifer has indeed let them learn.

There were disturbances to her responsiveness – chafing moments – (Rankin & Campbell, 2009). She did not fully pass carriage of the event to the experts, as Heidegger (2005) suggests, she should have done. Her reference to “needing something about Eid” (F.G 2, p.10) suggests that she perhaps looked elsewhere for knowledge about the festival even though experts were ready-to-hand (Heidegger, 2005). The lack of clarity with respect to needing something about Eid when there were expert Muslim students in the room shows how texts such as Professional Standards for Teachers and School Leaders (AITSL, 2011) that emphasise teacher responsibilities about knowing and being prepared bear on individual lives covering over the very thing one is searching for that is already there and ready for use.

None-the-less, the potential for agency is disclosed by Jennifer’s engagement with culturally informed academic learning even though everydayness and authenticity are working simultaneously (Gur-Ze’ve, 2002). Jennifer’s outreach to the community, though publication of the boys’ report in the school newsletter, raises questions related to the importance of community and wider relations in informing culturally relevant and responsive work.
In emphasising the importance of crafting texts worthy of publication, Jennifer challenges the school’s narrow approach to working with different text types. Writing a report would no doubt appear as an indicator of achievement on the spreadsheet that Eve introduced us to (Chapter 5). But institutional recognition of this work is denied because the spreadsheet only records results of across grade common assessment tasks and/or tests. Jennifer has a critical understanding of the situation. She has supported culturally and linguistically different students to reveal themselves as skilled and knowledgeable participants. Jennifer’s outreach to families and community and emphasis on a public demonstration of academic achievement gives students an opportunity to be recognised more broadly for their achievements. Jennifer has uncovered and displayed for the school and the community it serves a tactical learner-centred approach that is different to the behavioural orientation that is valued by the school. The agency of an individual teacher working authentically, is demonstrated when Jennifer responded to students and the sociocultural resources they used to learn (Heidegger, 2005).

A problem for Jennifer is that in the school where she teaches, she confronts people who do not share the same way of seeing the multicultural composition of this world. Jennifer is alone! Her perception is that there is no support for a teacher who challenges institutional arrangements. A further step Jennifer could take is to connect with people who share these ideals (Benjamin, 1997; Sartre, 1965).
Helen, by comparison, demonstrates a holistic teaching framework with a strong whole language focus. In Figure 19, Helen relates her enactments to a traumatic childhood experience of schooling. She explains why she does a lot of different things. In doing so, she associates (Figure 20) her learner-centred practice to her local and global professional and personal histories.
I remember learning about maths. I had problems with fractions. The teacher didn’t - no diagram, no nothing (speaker's emphasis). So I went home and I explained it to my dad. He got an orange. He was trying to teach me what a half is, what a quarter is. It went on and on. So I was really happy. I went back to school. I had to show them quarters. So I drew the orange and I drew the lines and got in trouble for it. Why? Because that’s not the way it was taught in class. And she tore the piece of paper and threw it in the bin (F.G. 1, p.12).

I suppose that’s why I do a lot of things. I try to include – that’s why […] I don’t stick with one way of teaching because everyone's diverse. So I try to focus on the child and see what clicks (Text 2, p. 17). How would I want the teacher to teach me? So I change all the time. We cannot […] say this is the method I’m going to have and that’s what I’m going to do because it won’t work. I’ve just seen these kids excel (p. 11).

I made sure I knew what she was good at. I rewarded her (p. 10). She had a big smile and her eyes were all shining and she was happy with herself (p. 10). They [students] know a lot. They might not be able to say it [in English], but they know a lot (p. 10). It is very important for those students to use [their] language in school (F.G. 1, p.1).

Figure 19: Helen’s Experiences

I remember learning about maths. I had problems with fractions. The teacher didn’t - no diagram, no nothing (speaker's emphasis). So I went home and I explained it to my dad. He got an orange. He was trying to teach me what a half is, what a quarter is. It went on and on. So I was really happy. I went back to school. I had to show them quarters. So I drew the orange and I drew the lines and got in trouble for it. Why? Because that’s not the way it was taught in class. And she tore the piece of paper and threw it in the bin (F.G. 1, p.12).

I suppose that's why I do a lot of things. I try to include – that's why [...] I don't stick with one way of teaching because everyone's diverse. So I try to focus on the child and see what clicks (Text 2, p. 17). How would I want the teacher to teach me? So I change all the time. We cannot [...] say this is the method I'm going to have and that's what I'm going to do because it won't work. I've just seen these kids excel (p. 11).

I made sure I knew what she was good at. I rewarded her (p. 10). She had a big smile and her eyes were all shining and she was happy with herself (p. 10). They [students] know a lot. They might not be able to say it [in English], but they know a lot (p. 10). It is very important for those students to use [their] language in school (F.G. 1, p.1).
I worked with a teacher [at Tambo Primary] and being a LOTE trained teacher with ESL [...] – they have the holistic approach. We immersed the kids with language. We did a lot of wall stories. We did a lot of cloze activities. We made books with the children. But that was all language (F. G. 1, p. 2). That's the way I teach my ESL.

I went to Toronto. Did a lot of joint teaching and we shared our resources (p. 1). TESOL was everywhere. I saw the signs TESOL, TESOL, everywhere TESOL (Text 3, p. 2). So I've taken that. That's what they were focusing on at Toorak College in the 80's (Text 2, p. 3)

I had a picture storybook about frogs [and] an information book. They gave us [...] important information. I put specific information on [...] a whiteboard [...] you had to get into groups and discuss it. I got it from the kids by asking them explicit questions. I engaged them by asking and stopping and pausing and so on. I also had flash cards [...] The flash cards actually had the stages. So every so often, we'd show the flash cards and they had to read and so on. They had to draw about the stages of the frog and write about the lifecycle of the frog (p. 8).

I make sure I roam around the classroom, as I'm reading I might stop and ask them to rethink something or re-arrange a sentence for me. I pair them up and they can help one another. I can sit with them and actually scribe sentences or scribe the story with them (p. 4).
6.1.5  **Topic Based Learner-Centred Practice**

Helen immerses students in language rich resourced learning events that provide various participation structures. Her approaches respond to her perception that students “know a lot even though they may not be able to communicate it in English” (F.G. 1, p. 10). She presents an image of practice that is grounded in meticulous planning. Reading signs is important because she believes they signify readiness (or not) for learning that may not be able to be communicated if English is the only language used. It is a matter of watching and waiting to see what clicks. When readiness to learn is confirmed, she enacts her planned but flexible learner-centred language rich practice believing “those kids [will] excel” (Text 2, p.10).

Helen relates her commitment to contextualised language-rich learning events to her experience of using the holistic approach and whole language pedagogies at Tambo Primary School (eighties). It offers Helen an alternative to the work process model that operates at Buckland Primary School. Such approaches featured strongly in many Australian primary schools throughout the eighties and nineties. Harking back to the 1980s, a time that is synchronous with Helen’s initial teacher education and early practice, provides some insights into her current practices.

Documents like *Victoria’s Language Curriculum Statement* (Education Department of Victoria, 1975) emerge as an influence. This statement,
informed by the works of Clay, Holdaway, and Frank Smith (ibid.) is a text that Helen, as a beginning teacher, would have had experience with. Although it retains aspects of earlier behaviourist approaches it has a distinct whole language and process focus. It presents a view of learning and of language and literacy that is different to the skill focused behavioural one present in the school where she now teaches.

Helen revealed another experience and an associated text — TESOL — that has informed her practice. In Toronto, TESOL, Helen suggests, was everywhere. “I saw the sign TESOL, TESOL, everywhere TESOL” (Text 2, p.3) where repetition of the key indicator “TESOL” exposes the significance of this text. It points to an alternative communicative discourse that is revealed through her emphasis on language, working collaboratively, resource sharing and joint teaching that was common practice, in Helen’s estimation, between ESL and classroom teachers in Canada.

This expression of TESOL education is closely aligned with the whole language movement in Canada during the eighties and early nineties. It can also be connected to the work of Donald Graves, Frank Smith, Jerry Harste, and Carolyn Burke and to their presence in Australia during the 1980s (Cambourne & Turbill, 2007). These have been reflected in Helen’s strong reinforcement of immersion, meaning making and language-centred focus. Responsiveness to the multicultural composition of classrooms emerges in Helen’s commitment to child-centred language rich teaching and learning.
Helen displayed these characteristic when she presented a topic-based syllabus. It was used to 1) provide content (the life cycle of frogs); 2) scaffold writing a report and 3) teach English language. In doing so, she revealed a structure that she uses for gathering information, negotiating understandings, synthesising and recording information before students generate their own texts. Helen suggested that this process will work irrespective of what the topic might be as long as it is one that students have experience of and can contribute to.

Her approach exhibits features of task-based learning (Nunan & Lamb, 2008) as it invites students to use language/s to make meaning, solve a problem, or as Helen showed, explain things they have discovered. Comprehensible input is derived “from the kids by asking them certain explicit questions” (p.8). This orientation can be associated with Krashen’s (1981) theses on second language acquisition and more broadly to Sleeter’s (2010) emphasis on inclusion through dialogue with and between students and teachers and with texts.

Through these processes, Helen (Text 2) disclosed, a language rich text structured learning event that set up positive pedagogical relations. She emphasised her use of different kinds of texts — students’ spoken, written and pictorial texts, information texts, story books and sets of cards — that are, in this lesson, used to scaffold learning. With the support of information drawn from these resources students “get into groups and discuss [the topic] amongst themselves” (p.7). This structure
gives students a chance to “talk with their peers when they’re not understanding” (p.3) and Helen an opportunity to “roam around the classroom” (p.4). She “might stop and ask them to rethink something” (ibid.), use the cards she has produced or record information on the whiteboard. Her approaches can be explained by drawing on her personal and professional histories.

Helen’s experiences and influences of initial teacher education and early professional experiences quarantine her practice from the emphasis on phonics and skill acquisition in the school where she works (Eve: F.Gs 1 & 2). She does not discount their relevance but makes the point that “I [teach phonics] but only within a context” (ibid.). Her view of English language education in this regard accords with Carter’s (2008) contention that students learn best when languages are learnt in language rich contexts. The overwhelming attention to phonics, according to Carter, “signals an increasing emphasis on the basics in so far as what is ‘basic’ often involves a decontextualized language focus” (p.97).

The multifaceted and layered learning events Helen demonstrated draw on whole language, constructivist theory and TESOL orientations like task-based approaches that Canagarajah (2006) suggests emerged during the nineties. A strong social justice discourse emerges too, particularly when Helen emphasises that she tries “to include” and doesn’t “stick with one way of teaching because everyone is diverse”
(Text 2). This sentiment illuminates the principle of inclusion that permeates her work. It is one born of a childhood experience.

Helen (Text 2) recounts her own childhood experience of prejudice and discrimination when she was trying to learn about fractions. Her father helped her with this by showing her half an orange and the four quarters. What is certain is that Helen’s father saw what “the ready-to-hand [orange] was ready-to-hand for” (Heidegger, 2005, p.105). In recounting this story, Helen positions her understanding father’s approach to teaching and learning in opposition to the inhospitality of the classroom teacher who, as Helen explains, tore up her work and threw it in the bin because she showed a different way of showing halves and quarters compared to the one that had been taught. Helen’s choice of language “no diagram no nothing” (F.G. 1, p.12), that she used to create her narrative and the tone Helen employed to emphasise her dissatisfaction shows the anger she felt and still feels at the enactment of dominance she was subjected to so many years ago (van Dijk, 1993). These experiences have had a lasting effect and permeate Helen’s work.

Today Helen is always already poised to ask the question: if I do this, what will happen? It triggers Helen’s alertness to students and reflection in practice (Schön, 1983). This indelible memory is the text that Helen draws on and, as she points out, is the reason that she does not “stick” with any particular method but watches to see what “clicks”. Her story of class and ethnically-based discrimination as a young child demonstrates
the disadvantage she experienced as a learner. This, I suggest can be linked to her on-going efforts to include everyone and everything in learning.

Drawing on Gadamer (1997), Helen’s practice demonstrates the “fusion of horizons” — childhood experiences of domination and migration from Greece to Australia and later from Australia to Canada drawing languages and cultures into her repertoire. Professional learning in LOTE in the eighties, teaching at Tambo and later in Toronto and recent TESOL professional learning show up in Helen’s culturally and linguistically responsive practices to explain her practices in “larger and truer proportions” (p.305).

Helen’s experiences show that “the horizon of the present cannot be formed without the past” and “understanding is always the fusion of these horizons supposedly existing by themselves” (Gadamer, 1996, p.306). The simultaneous replacement of one horizon with another (ibid.) has made capturing the influences in Helen’s authentic practice a searching process. What I can see now in Helen’s work are the multitude of processes – agency, noticing, integration, layering, associating – but more than that are theories of learning, descriptions of language, approaches to languages learning, notions of liberal and critical multiculturalism and a social justice orientation that settles on inclusion.
The wider relation between Helen’s experiences and practices is revealed through her comportment as she demonstrates being-with others authentically (Heidegger, 2005). This disposition partly explains why Helen (and Jennifer and Grace) experiment with those knowledges and practices that are there and ready to use. Their watching and waiting tactics (de Certeau, 1984) give them a predilection for changing events and experimenting in practice while almost always alert to what is happening about them. This might be done by provoking further thought as Helen does when she “roams” about or when she engages with students using her own first language. It is exemplified by Jennifer when she responds to henna on a student’s hands and by Grace as she moves engagements through multiple knowledges, understandings, opinions and expressions.

Grace, Jennifer and Helen have revealed the things they do. They have disclosed how their practices have been produced and shown the tactics (de Certeau, 1984) they use to avoid institutional arrangements as they devise ways to respond to the multicultural composition of their classrooms. The building blocks of their culturally responsive practice are now presented.

6.2 Teachers’ Culturally Responsive Practice

6.2.1 Building Blocks

The building blocks of their pedagogical work shows the basis on which each teacher constructs her everyday learner centred pedagogies. These are set out in Table 19.
Table 19: Building Blocks of Teachers’ Responsive Practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Interactions</th>
<th>Material Resources</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Language and Semiosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>facilitates integrates layers positions people as associates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discussion, tasks, interactive activities, promotes questioning, calls on theories of learning mono and multilingual exchanges with and between students and teacher concepts, views, experiences, ideas, knowledges, languages, collocations, topic information knowledgeable, excited, thinking, experienced, understanding, different but equal e.g. native speakers and non-native between cultural knowledges and practices, new knowledge, and academic learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>task-based approaches, questioning, scribing with them, mini-lessons, pairs and groups, recycling, in the moment - timely intervention dialogue, clusters of words, comprehensible input, provocations, mono and multilingual exchanges with and between students and teacher syllabus, cultural knowledge, languages, topic information, texts, teacher made texts lesson plans and units of work knowledgeable, and holders of aspirations and memories, experiences, makes assumptions eg. students will learn and excel signs and signals, cultural knowledges and practices, new knowledge, and academic learning and languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>modifies and changes planned learning events, scaffolds, models, leaps of faith, mono and multilingual exchanges with and between students and teacher and uses her own first language calls on critical multiculturalism henna, Report on Eid al-Adha, text types with academic learning and outreach to the community Newsletter experts, knowledgeable, experienced, different but equal e.g. expert other non-expert other cultural knowledges and practices, new knowledge, and academic learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helen and Grace particularly have made explicit references that show the influences of their personal histories and professional experiences. Links can be made between teaching practice, theories of learning,
liberal and critical multicultural discourses, approaches to language learning and their experiences and practices here and now and then and there. These influences can be used to explain why these teachers enact integrated, multi-faceted and layered learner-centred dialogical and experiential approaches. Teachers have demonstrated dynamic shifts in actions and interactions while at the same time maintaining coherence between the elements of practice.

Actions of facilitation, negotiation and collaboration nested in dialogical and/or learner-centred processes are used to build knowledge and understandings. In the material world of the classroom teachers and students share the things they use to learn. Ethics of care, respect, responsiveness and trust permeate learning events. Connections are established between cultural knowledges and practices and new knowledge and academic learning.

Helen, Grace and Jennifer have histories that have quarantined their work from some of the arrangements that organise practice in the schools where they teach. For things to change in local landscapes of practice, teacher activists would need to take the next step, that of challenging things like denial of rights and prejudice and discrimination but so far only tentative steps have been made.

The relationship between the fact of their existence and their experiences and practices influences what these teachers can show and
do. Figures 21-23 reveal the different ways these teachers have been marginalised and silenced in the schools where they teach.
Grace

It has to be core subject - literacy and numeracy. It is indoctrinated into you through all sorts of ways that you don’t realise (Text 4, p. 4). It may be people that have been tagged to be literacy coordinators or maths coordinators. It comes through agendas from a leadership meeting; it's filtered down to a level meeting and then that's filtered down to the grade meeting, and then that's filtered down to how it's implemented in the classroom. There's no time for professional discussion and I wouldn't [speak] anyway, simply because your opinions not wanted (Text 4, p.10-11).

When Grace demonstrates different ways of including culturally and linguistically different students in learning she shows an approach that is oppositional to one that focuses on literacy skills. She retreats from talking about her pedagogy beyond her classroom because she believes her opinion is not wanted. From her subaltern position she does not speak. Exertion of power executed through processes of indoctrination, have silenced her.
Jennifer At the moment as I read it, it’s NAPLAN, NAPLAN, NAPLAN! You’ve got to get the numbers up, you’ve got to have the data right, you’ve got to have this many kids working about this level. Some things cannot be changed because pedagogy is driven, by “NAPLAN, NAPLAN, NAPLAN (Text 3, p. 4)! It happens in May every year, so they start drilling the kids now from October, November (p.11).

I’ll tell you exactly what happens. Grade 6s were doing PAT English reading test today. The teacher said “oh, they need to do the test”. I looked at the first article. It was so difficult. It was – the topics, the concepts were dense. The vocabulary was dense. The sentence structures were so dense. I just thought to myself you are setting these children to fail. There is no way on earth these children are going to feel good about themselves. They know. They’ve opened the booklet they know I cannot do it (F. G., 2, p.14).

**Figure 22: Jennifer’s Responses to Conditions of Practice**

*Emphasis on NAPLAN, repetition of “you’ve got to” and the impossibility for change shows Jennifer’s powerlessness and anger at pedagogical practices and institutional arrangements that are prejudicial and discriminatory.*

*Technologisation* Jennifer tells us “exactly what happens” and using “no way on earth” shows the deleterious effects of standardised practices. But “I just thought [about this] to myself.*
Helen
I’d like to talk about moderating their writing. It really doesn’t make sense. I see that different teachers have got different opinions. We’ve gone to some PDs and still we have different opinions. We’re iffy! They say it’s always going to be like that [...]. I wasn’t very happy with that [...]. If I’ve given that child an A2.3 and, let’s say, it shouldn’t be an A2.3. It’s frustrating. Because you want to give them the correct stages, right? Let’s say I’m an A2.3. The next teacher says oh no, he’s not A2.3, he’s an A2.1 Now that’s a big difference. But they say it’s always going to be like this (Text 2, p. 13).

Agency
Conflict between wanting to do the right thing and processes that result in "iffy" decisions, accompanied by declarations of frustration, cause Helen to challenge to institutional arrangements that are prejudicial and discriminatory. The protests fall on deaf ears.

Figure 23: Helen’s Responses to Conditions of Practice
6.3 Limits to Agency and Activism in New Times

6.3.1 Silencing the Voices of Agents of Reform

Grace, Jennifer and Helen show their awareness of the multicultural composition of their classroom, recognise the need for constructing relevant learning environments and look at learning opportunities from multiple directions. Their actions and interactions suggest that each teacher approaches their work by looking at the situation through the lens of an authentic existence.

I have already demonstrated that Grace’s classroom work has not been overly affected by institutional arrangements. On this basis, Grace (Appendix 7) presents as one teacher who should have something to say about culturally responsive practice. She explains her silence on this subject when she sets out a process for the indoctrination of teaching staff. Grace maintains that the government’s mantra is “indoctrinated into you through all sorts of ways that you don’t really realise. But it’s there because that drives learning in Australia” (Text 4, p.8). Her assertion is compatible with the existing body of work that Smith (2001; 1999; 1990; 1988) has contributed to the academy. According to Grace the process of indoctrination is aided by “people that have been tagged to be literacy coordinators or maths coordinators” (ibid.). These people act as social agents who can be deployed within and beyond the target site in the ways described by both Smith (2001) and Fairclough (2005) and demonstrated by Eve and Sophia (Chapter 5).
Social agents disseminate selected messages deployed from different levels of organisation. Grace, in elaborating on how this process works, details a hierarchical organisation for securing domination — leadership, level meetings and grade meetings that set out how priorities are to be implemented in the classroom. The structure that Grace describes shows one of the ways agency is silenced. But the filtering down process that Grace has referred to has not changed her class based work. At Acheron Primary School an institutional arrangement is in place that means responsibility for teaching students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds rests wholly with their class teacher. This arrangement is a lottery of sorts, but it has offered Grace, a qualified TESOL teacher, an option. Her existing inclination to work responsively through dialogical processes and hand-on learning is revealed in her inclusive pedagogy which makes her classroom a site of agency in the school where she works.

Grace has also been presented with a different role, that of activist. This is one she has declined. The indoctrination process, she asserts, does not allow for professional discussion. Staff meetings that might canvas teachers' opinions have been re-named as professional development and these, deal only, according to Grace, with the management of the literacy and numeracy based work processes. Another way the status quo is maintained is by marginalising a teacher and silencing things they might choose to say. Grace had come to understand that “sometimes your opinion's not wanted” and, for that reason, she “wouldn't [speak] anyway” (ibid.). The mask of silence hides her classroom based agency.
Jennifer, too, is caught up in the politics of marginalisation and exclusion (Appendix 6). She asserts that there is nothing happening in the school that is not associated with NAPLAN. The tenor of her articulation of ‘NAPLAN’ and her repetition of the term demonstrates a relation between her discontent and the limits to learning she observes in the testing and accountability focus of the current reform agenda. Her use of ‘nothing’ in the exclamation — “there is nothing else” — suggests that other ways of demonstrating academic achievement have been eliminated. In describing the conditions of practice, Jennifer sketches an impoverished view of education “we don’t have a library” and “it [NAPLAN] happens in May every year, so they start drilling the kids now from October, November” (p.5).

In the rush to produce data that shows improved student performance Jennifer and Helen show how teachers are caught up in discriminatory practices. On one occasion Jennifer observed and was snared into participating in the practice of testing Afghani and Sudanese students in reading using a PAT (Progressive Achievement Test) that she knew they could not do. She recognised this act of dominance (van Dijk, 1993) as discriminatory, saw the effect of positioning students as failing deficit subjects and aligned herself with Freire’s (1990) contention that this kind of schooling maintains inequality. The deleterious effects of domination have been confirmed by recent Australian research into the impacts of NAPLAN on pedagogy and student and teacher wellbeing (Thompson, 2010; Miller, 2011; Dufler, Rice & Polesel, 2013). Jennifer thought about the testing procedure and act of domination but maintained a silence on
the matter. By comparison, Helen chose to speak out and challenge acts of domination.

On one occasion, Helen quite bravely challenged the validity of the quantified results recorded on the spread sheet. She announced her authenticity when she voiced her concerns about the disparity in scores that had been assigned to the same writing samples, by different teachers. The argument was whether it was right to accept assessments where there was “a big difference” (Text 2, p.13) between teachers assessments. Helen’s challenge was unsuccessful because school leaders and course facilitators normalised these variations and made them acceptable (Janks, 2010). Acceptance of these differences, by leaders, means that whatever is recorded on the spreadsheet is contested. Activism against prejudice and discrimination were silenced by holders of institutional power. Arguably, their vision has been clouded or obscured by texts and discourses emphasising the importance of collecting quantified data and creating transparent accountability schedules (DEECD, 2010b). The struggle Helen confronts is opposition from the “Itself” who does not see the impact of “iffy” guesses on students’ opportunities to learn (Heidegger, 2005).

Indiscriminate grouping of students according to contested results in tests and tasks represent “moments of educational exclusion” (Youdell, 2006, p.3) when categories of “bad student” and/or “impossible learner” (ibid.) are created. Students classified in this way are subjected to experiences that do not engage with either students or the breadths of
their advantages and disadvantages (Heidegger, 1976). Engagement is directed towards people who through management and accountability texts demand evidence of improved outcomes. In this instance, responsibility is to the school’s essential equipment, the work process, and to the State’s accountability processes. The things that the almost eighty percent of students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds in the class and school did not have, was an opportunity to show what they could do with the things they use to learn.

Reaching beyond norm-governed existence to see more clearly where one is standing is possible but it rests on the acquisition of heightened awareness. Standing in the way of acquiring the acute sight associated with circumspect teaching practice are people and texts carrying discourses that control and regulate what can be validated, spoken about and enacted. Through these processes professional knowledge is hidden and the being of students concealed. The impoverished meanings assigned to people and equipment, are not interrogated (Heidegger, 2005).

Catching sight of “the ready-to-hand” and discovering what the ready-to-hand-for” can be ready for (Heidegger, 2005, p.105) is only possible when “our essential being” the primordial one (ibid.) has not been covered over. The thing that will lead us to see everything, in Heidegger’s (1976) estimation, is relatedness. Teachers showed relatedness in their classroom action and interactions. Teachers can search for relatedness beyond the school too. Community engagement,
(Jennifer and Grace), international experiences (Helen) and discourses of inclusion such as multiculturalism have the capacity to prompt clarity of sight. Only then can limits to vision be eliminated. Under these conditions challenges to prejudicial arrangements cannot be deflected and teachers are enabled to challenge discriminatory practices.

6.3.2 Setting Limits to Agency

The possibilities for agency of the kind Christine Sleeter (1996) linked to multicultural education have diminished. Grace, Jennifer and Helen have been marginalised and/or silenced by institutional arrangements that operate within schools and more broadly. During the Howard years (1996–2007), for example, the ideal of cultural recognition and rights to maintain and practise culturally was challenged. The Howard government’s promotion of universalism built around a shared national identity grounded in core values and constitution of an Australian way of life made unrealistic demands on Others to comply with the unknown entity of being Australian. Expunging of the term ‘multiculturalism’ effectively silenced cultural responsiveness.

However, the voices of “parents and other concerned community people, as well as educators” who can “organize to pressure schools to serve their interests and those of their children” (Sleeter, 1996, p.242) have not been totally silenced in Australia. Connections have been made between the focus of the current reform agenda and disappointing trends that show, for example, little or no improvements to post school
employment or further study options for students from low socioeconomic backgrounds (COAG, 2013).

Even though much is written about culturally responsive pedagogies in Australia and elsewhere and teacher educators’ work tirelessly with school communities, teachers like Grace, Helen and Jennifer who use more culturally responsive pedagogies often do so, on their own.

Most recently education reforms and the texts that prescribe how these reforms will be implemented have shifted teachers’ interests away from questioning the disadvantages experienced by students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. One reason for this is that the narrow work process limits professional collaboration on issues other than authorised institutional ones and this arrangement places limits on agency. The work process model and its text-mediated process driven practice, regulates and controls teachers’ work “such that even in a project focusing on pedagogy, conversation about pedagogy becomes elusive” (Comber & Nixon, 2009, p.336).

This possibility for agency exists for Helen and Jennifer and perhaps Grace because together they have produced images of culturally responsive pedagogy. It represents an alternative to the current work process and is suited to the Australian context. There are obstacles to talking about and demonstrating culturally responsive practices in some schools. Implementation, more generally, beyond individual classrooms
is unlikely at this stage. These circumstances are addressed in Chapter 9.

The following composite analytical description demonstrates the first stage: that of conceptualising a flexible culturally responsive pedagogy that has been represented by practising teachers.

6.4 Teachers’ Contributions to Pedagogy Responsive to the Multicultural Composition of Australian Classrooms

6.4.1 A Composite Analytical Description of Culturally Responsive Practice

Teachers believe that culturally and linguistically different students are knowledgeable and will excel. Grace, Jennifer and Helen show their authentic mode of existence when they listen, observe, register and respond to students. These teachers, facilitate learning, integrate language, knowledge and skills, include different opinions and interpretations, draw associations between different knowledges, position students as experts, provoke thinking through explicit questioning, and add further participation structures.

Their actions and interactions reveal their primary interest in inclusion and associated with that, learning and academic achievement. Approaching teaching practice from this learner-centred standpoint reflects the complex layering of memories drawn from experiences of teaching and learning and, practices across time and place. These are different for everyone and are not restricted to being a teacher. This is important because all people are subject to the experiences and practice of others.
Different horizons of understanding (Gadamer, 1997) operate like a movie watched in fast forward motion where one image is superseded by another. This process shows how teachers’ evaluate the situation in-now-time and change what is happening moment by moment by drawing on memories to inform topic based, hands-on dialogical experiential co-operative learning. Using notions of liberal and critical multiculturalism and, associated with that, theories of learning, they demonstrate layered, multifaceted student-centred dialogical and hands-on practices.

Discourses of responsivity and relatedness reflect personal experiences and historic and/or more recent observations of migration to Australia. The challenges associated with teaching and learning in schools that maintain an English performance culture are addressed within individual classrooms by creating rich, relevant and robust learning environments.

Challenges to prejudice and discrimination are mounted from time-to-time but these are silenced by holders of institutional power who use discourses emphasising performativity, accountability, conformity, citizenship and/or cultural conservation to maintain English performance cultures in schools where culturally and linguistically different students go to learn.

Reticence on the questions surrounding disadvantage suggests that teachers do not see the relation between learning opportunities and addressing the structuring of life-long inequality. This shows the struggle of existence that teachers face in being and becoming a teacher.

6.4.2 Illuminating the Omissions

While each of the teachers who have contributed to the constitution of a culturally responsive pedagogy by showing different ways of working responsively to the multicultural conditions of their classrooms, these demonstrations remain the provenance of individual teachers. A number
of significant resources are missing from the landscapes of practice where Helen, Grace, and Jennifer work. Contemporary resources that support cultural and linguistic responsiveness exist, but these have not been articulated by Helen, Jennifer, or Grace.

Notably the liberal multiculturalism ideals that were disclosed had their genesis in decades past when this now marginalised discourse had a greater presence. There are limits to what this discourse can do because it lacks the critical aspects needed for interrogating disadvantage and inequality and bringing about changes to power relations that structure inequality (May & Sleeter, 2010). Critical multiculturalism was glimpsed when Helen challenged iffy decisions but the broader disadvantages students brought to learning were not afforded the same priority.

Losses that have been incurred relate to elimination of the freedom of teachers to speak about teaching practice (Luke, 1997b). This is exacerbated by the absence of knowledge about contemporary discourses of inclusion that can stand against the one that appears to be fair because everyone in treated in the same way. Irrespective of these conditions teachers have offered a set of principles that can be used to support pedagogy that is culturally and linguistically responsive to the multicultural composition of their classrooms.
6.4.3  *Principles and Practices*

The significant contribution that these teachers have made is to demonstrate 1) relatedness among and between teacher and students; 2) expectations with regard to an academic focus; 3) constructive resistance to authorised practices that are judged to be irrelevant; 4) moment-by-moment decision making in, on and prior to practice; 5) layering of English language education and topic/content learning; 6) associating cultural knowledge with learning new knowledge using linguistically different language structures; 7) provision of different participation structures and 8) experimentation using multiple languages that approximates more recent articulations of translanguaging.

Together these principles and ideals created resource rich, student-centred dialogical and experiential environments that enabled opportunities for mono and multilingual learning events. The meanings that teachers assigned to languages and cultural practices showed that these were valued and were different to the ones present in the schools where they teach.

I am mindful though that, apart from Jennifer’s explicit demonstration of culturally responsive practice in action and Helen’s procedural arrangements for topic/task based inquiry, some of the articulations moved between descriptions of what could or should be done and actions. Details of what happened, for example, in some multilingual dialogical events, remain unclear.
6.5 Generative Conclusion

The complex pedagogical arrangements that that teachers represented are related to their awareness and reflect multiple horizons of understanding. Grace, Jennifer and Helen project a language rich, relevant, robust and inclusive curriculum and demonstrate culturally responsive pedagogies. A significant problem for these teachers is that they do not have either the resources or the freedom to speak about, demonstrate or develop culturally responsive pedagogies beyond their classrooms or show the multilingual, multifaceted and layered work they do.

The challenge is to illuminate and or create places that are open to collaboration among and between communities, parents, students and teachers. Grace, Helen and Jennifer are able to make valuable contributions to these conversations, about responding to the multicultural composition of classrooms. This is a discussion that is yet to take place and shows authenticity and inauthenticity existing together.
7 DISCOURSES, NEW POSSIBILITIES AND TRANSFORMATION

Introduction

In this Chapter, I introduce Ava, Layla and Lucinda in the contexts in which each teacher works, present the processes, interests, influences, pedagogical relations and discourses that they disclosed, exhibit a set of annotated diagrams that show the experiences and practices of teachers. I connect teachers’ practices to experiences of living and learning in a rapidly changing world and relate teacher’s practice to comportment to reveal the impact of existence on their being and becoming a teacher. In the final part I present a composite analytical description of this work to show the relationship between modes of existence, interests and influences in teachers’ work and the shift in opportunities that are available to students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds and their teachers. The contributions these teachers have made to a culturally responsive pedagogy are presented.

7.1 Teaching Practice, Responsive to the Multicultural Compositions of Classrooms

7.1.1 Introducing Colleges, Teachers and their Practice

Ava, Layla and Lucinda who teach students in Years 7-12 work in secondary colleges located in the Eastern and Western regions of metropolitan Melbourne. Ava teaches English and humanities at Culgoa Secondary College, in the north eastern sector in a college that is a part
of the government system. Layla and Lucinda are both leading teachers. Layla works at Campaspe Secondary College, in the south west. It is part of the non-government sector. Lucinda teaches in the north-west at Jamieson Secondary College, a government school. Both are English subject and English language educators.

Ava, Layla and Lucinda know about the multicultural composition of community, school and classroom. Ava’s understanding of context is revealed through her statement:

The EAL (English Additional Language) program [is] huge and we’ve got over 40% Chinese now and there are over 40 nationalities represented at the school. An Anglo Saxon in a classroom is pretty rare. There’s a lot of Malaysian Chinese, a few Vietnamese, an increasing number of Middle Eastern people. The area is actually heavily Greek and Italian (Text 8, p.4).

I can represent the image the school presents to the community it serves.

A pulsing beat is all that I can hear as wind gusts catch the banners that introduce Culgoa Secondary College to the community it serves. As I pass along one boundary the sounds of male voices fill the air. The clanging of the metal gate and the slamming of car doors announce the exit of a group of students. On their return I catch a whiff, of condiments that I’m not familiar with. Ah, I hear it — ana jā i — I now know they are hungry but more than that I know something about who they are and, perhaps, what they bring to learning and use to learn. One of these is the exuberance that they show that reminds me of the students I once taught. As I think about the past I silently watch their playful goings on.
Travelling south I catch sight of the City of Melbourne’s skyline. Campaspe Secondary College, like a small number of nearby schools has a distinctiveness about it that cannot be described for risk of its identification.

Layla (Text 7), rather than naming different nationalities as Ava did, moves beyond backgrounds of students to explain the significance of diversity and difference to teaching and learning when you teach ESL students. The value of completely different backgrounds, different experiences and different opinions that students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds bring to learning are emphasised as Layla positions students as teachers of cultural understanding as well as learners of a new language and academic knowledge (Text 7).

Further north, Jamieson Secondary College presents its diversity proudly.

Student traffic, in and out, shouts out diversity, trust, responsibility, and freedom. The chatter of many voices reveals a vibrant community. The smell of polish wafts about in the warm air and shiny wood panelling presents a backdrop to quiet conversations. But outside the crack of hockey sticks and the repetitive bangs of basketballs against the back board draw me to the game. Young men, most likely of Somalian descent tower over their Aussie mates. And they hold the ball high as some friendly taunting is going on. Further down a ping pong competition is underway. And in an adjacent room, young men and women are warming food. Tantalising aromas fill the air joining the many voices there.
When Lucinda (Text 6) describes her school as “extremely diverse” her use of “extremely” gives the impression that she has an expanded vision of the school community that stretches beyond first generation language learners and/or eligibility for English Additional Language (EAL) support. In view are students with:

really significant issues [...] people that are from linguistically diverse backgrounds but they don’t qualify for English additional language support [...] then there are, other students — students who have been here for longer but they don’t speak English at home and they just sort of haven’t progressed (Text 6, p.3).

All three teachers know, articulate, and understand the multicultural conditions of their classrooms. They recognise the talents students show and disclose their interest in creating pathways for student participation. The difference is that each teacher deploys a different approach — hands-on, dialogical and skills based personalised learning to facilitate student access, inclusion and participation in learning. In Figure 24 I show their shared goals
Irrespective of differences in approach Ava, Layla and Lucinda disclosed the same processes, interests, influences, pedagogical relations and discourse in their work. Features of their practice are presented in Table 20.
Table 20: Features of Ava’s, Layla’s and Lucinda’s Approach to Teaching to Difference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Processes</th>
<th>Interests</th>
<th>Pedagogical Relations</th>
<th>Discourses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>differentiating curriculum,</td>
<td><strong>Interests</strong></td>
<td><strong>Culturally and linguistically different students:</strong></td>
<td>liberal multiculturalism,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>layering language and academic learning,</td>
<td>academic excellence, learner-centred pedagogies e.g. individualisation,</td>
<td>positioned at the centre of learning,</td>
<td>critical multiculturalism,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical analysis,</td>
<td>global citizenship</td>
<td>positive pedagogical relations informed through learner-centred approaches and face-face negotiations</td>
<td>interculturalism,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collaborative work with staff in different faculties,</td>
<td><strong>Influences</strong></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>internationalisation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td>agents of reform</td>
<td>equal opportunity,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>innovation e.g. Jamieson SC’s expanded EAL program;</td>
<td></td>
<td>academic achievement,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campaspe SC’s bilingual approaches and programs,</td>
<td></td>
<td>parity of participation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Culgoa SC internationalisation of curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td>social justice,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Teacher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>performativity,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fusion of personal and professional histories, globalisation, ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Asia Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Outcome:</strong> Multifaceted, flexible, language rich dialogical and/or layered approach to learner-centred practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mode/s of Existence**

**Ava’s** struggle, from authenticity is showing how learner-centred responsive teaching practice will achieve improved academic learning outcomes that students, teachers, parents and community are keen to see.

**Layla’s** response to expressions of racism shows authenticity but when Layla declares that students must use English to report on their work this teacher reveals absence of all the possibilities. Everydayness emerges in the English only ideal carried in an historic cultural conservation discourse.

**Lucinda** shows her authentic self when she picks up equipment (Bahasa Indonesian) and experiments with what can be done with it.
In the following section (7.2), I demonstrate how hands-on, dialogical and skills based individualised practice have been constituted. I use features of each teacher’s work to respond to the research questions to: 1) reveal teachers’ perceptions and enactments of their work; 2) show social relations in teaching practice; 3) consider the effects of their responsiveness to multicultural classrooms and 4) disclose the effects of newly introduced discourses on schools, teachers, teachers’ work and the opportunities offered to students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.

7.2 Experiences and Practices of Secondary School Teachers

7.2.1 Exploring Ava’s Hands-on Approach to Practice and Students’ Experiences of Learning

Ava built an inspirational image of her work. Her stories and photographs acted as invitations for me to enter her world of teaching. The “huge package” of her experiences is presented in Figure 25. As you will see (Figure 26) Ava does not stand still. This teacher is on the move, not only in the classroom and school but also locally, nationally and globally
After spending six months teaching on outback cattle stations in Queensland, we went to England. I spent my term holding the door closed to keep the kids in (Text 8, p. 1). We drove through Russia in 1984, in the days of Communism and that was really hard. We went back to Poland [...] in 2003. I just stood there and I cried because there was just so much food for these people at long last (p. 19).

I think it's the travelling and this trip [...] that trip that really changed my life. I went to China. I had a whole classroom of kids singing an Australian song and they were dancing to it and doing all of the actions. They had walls with nothing on them. The kids were alive and excited to be there. I said to the teacher, “Have you got any scissors?” “No, we don’t have scissors,” because parents would say that that's not a worthwhile activity. They'd have to be doing their work they’d have to be learning, learning to get to that point where you went to the exam.

Then this course [post graduate studies] it's just enriched – so it's been a huge package. Everything’s just fallen into place at the right time for me (p. 10).

Figure 25: Ava’s Experiences

Sharpening
Vivid images of disadvantage and structural inequality have sharpened Ava’s sensitivity to the challenges culturally and linguistically different students’ experience.

Fusion of Horizons
Experiences here and now and then and there are a part of Ava’s being and becoming a teacher.

Integration
The comparison between teaching practices here and now and then and there raises questions related to pedagogies suited to students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.

The “huge package” Ava refers to represents her personal and professional histories.
It's not quite what I'm supposed to be doing. They were supposed to brainstorm the role of a [...] particular person and then become that person and I'm thinking, well, they really don't know what they're doing – so making it more hands-on (Text 8, p. 6).

They went out and made the interview time and conducted the interview. Now, they have to write a diary being that person, using the information that they've got (ibid.). [I]f you did that in all of the EAL classes [...] everybody would be seeing everything from everybody's perspective not just a white Anglo-Saxon [...] stuck in a rut type way (p. 7).

[Another time] I then brought them into their groups. We had to read the short story. [Now] one's doing dialogue, another one is doing metaphor - she came out and she said “What do you reckon I could do?” I said, “Oh, there's a great metaphor in there,” and she said, “Oh, there's lots of them, Miss.” I said, “Mm, I reckon you could handle this. Could you teach the class metaphor?” So she's going to teach the class metaphor and another one is doing punctuation (p. 12).

One time I said, “Righto, I'm not going to teach you these skills.” I broke them up into different groups. They had to research each section and they had to present it to the class (p.16).

We're supposed to do on-demand testing as well but I don’t really use it a lot (p.13). PAT Tests – they're looked at in terms of value added. Have the kids improved?

**Figure 26: Ava’s Practices**

**Agency - Courage**
Ava dispenses with authorised practices and replaces these with scaffolded ones.

**Evaluation**
Ava’s socially just, inclusive practice confronts performativity, evidenced in testing and accountability regimes.

**Pedagogical Relations**
Ava favours changing participation structures and positioning students as active participants in learning to achieve the equal opportunity and academic achievement she is looking for.

**Ethics**
She trusts that students will learn if they have the freedom to choose what they will do to show learning.
Ava has prioritised a hands-on approach to practice. Her first action is to evaluate whether the activities set out in the syllabus are relevant to students in her mainstream class. Her perception of teaching practice is captured in her exclamation “Righto, I’m not going to teach you these skills (Text 8, p.15)”! Imaginings of how teachers can meet student and institutional needs are revealed when Ava presented students with a more robust, research focussed rigorous alternative syllabus to the skills based one. Acts of agency like this one are not isolated incidents.

Ava routinely replaces prescribed activities or converts them to hands-on experiences even though “it’s not quite what [she is] supposed to be doing” (Text 8, p.6). On one occasion (Appendix 11) Ava decided to replace a brainstorming activity with an interview process. Her enactment was initiated in this way so students could gather the information they would need to successfully complete a prescribed and predetermined writing task. To facilitate the interview process questions were constructed to prepare students for conducting an interview. These were open ended prompts as Ava wanted students to explain, explore, identify and comment on their discoveries. Students invited a person to participate in an interview, negotiated an interview time, conducted the interview and used the information that they had found to “write a diary of five days being that person” (Text 8, p.7). Analysis of Ava’s experiences and practices revealed complex associations in her work.
Ava’s articulation of the teaching and learning process shows a relationship between her work and the e5 Instructional Model (DEECD, 2009a). Its presence is disclosed when Ava refers to “explore” and “explain” which are two of the reference points (engage, explore, explain, elaborate and evaluate) that frame the model. Ava approximates another reference point, “elaborate”, when she suggested students would ‘comment on’ the results of their investigation. The presence of this co-ordinating text is confirmed and with it a relation between Ava’s work and contemporaneous support offered by the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (DEECD) in Victoria. This model for developing depth in both knowledge and understanding to inform new academic learning shows the strong academic focus in this learner-centred approach. Ava does not disclose governmentality’s regulation and control, characteristic of the performativity discourse. This, I suggest, has been tempered by Ava’s awareness of other possibilities.

The possibilities for responsiveness to the multicultural composition of the class are revealed in her actions - replacing the brainstorming activity with actual experiences and scaffolding the place between what students know and can do and what they will be asked to do. Transformation of the task made it more accessible, comprehensible and achievable. It gives students the equal opportunity that Ava is aiming for. The interview schedule, school diary, record of appointment
time and place, notes and questions provided students with resources they could use to structure the writing task.

In approaching a writing task in this way Ava has shown that she has sight of those resources that are, in Heideggerian (2005) terms, ready to be used (ready-at-hand). People like the laboratory assistant who engaged with one student about her/his work, were redefined when they were positioned as experts in their field. Recruitment of expert others resonates with Sleeter’s (2011) suggestion that people with expertise should be called upon to enhance teaching and learning experiences.

Furthermore, responding to her emphasis on the role of experts, Ava also uses activities that place students in expert other roles. This strategy responds to Ava’s perception that students know and are able to take advantage of opportunities to learn. In one activity, Ava differentiated the activities students could do. Her reasons for adopting this approach, as Ava demonstrated, was to let students find what they were good at and enable them to select/negotiate the aspect of learning that they wanted to research and present. Experts, who emerged, from this activity, were able to “teach dialogue [...] metaphor and punctuation to the class” (ibid.). In doing so, Ava connects her approach to something she “picked up from one of the readings from one of the books” (Text 8, p.11).
Ava’s reference to “one of the readings” articulates her work to professional learning in TESOL that she completed in 2010. By inviting students, as experts, to participate in the teaching/learning cycle they were able, drawing on Breen and Candlin (2008), to choose “the activities they attempt” (p.15). In pursuing activities they elect to do, students are able to demonstrate “the way they use their abilities” (ibid.). This approach highlights differences between a communicative differentiated approach to classroom practices and deficit based differentiation. The latter has the effect of hiding the talents culturally and linguistically different students can offer to learning but leaves in place the things they cannot show (Smith, 2001). Rather than search for deficits to be taught, Ava looked for the things students could do. The virtue ethic of trust emerged from this teacher’s repertoire. Its’ application enabled culturally and linguistically different students to reveal themselves as knowledgeable and able (Luke, 1997b). Ava suppressed the deficit discourse by calling on a communicative one that privileges students’ voices and active participation.

Ava, acting as an agent of change, has demonstrated a layered hands-on process and demonstrated how it can be enacted. Students have been positioned as active and equal participants in learning events. Material scaffolding and dialogical engagements with and between students, teacher and expert others bring into view Vygotsky’s work and that of Bruner and Rogoff whose theories of learning are featured on the
DEECD website. Influences like these are more prominent in Ava’s practice than test results. Ava’s act of distancing herself from on-demand testing is revealed in her words “I’ve only ever found that it verifies what I already know” (Text 8, p.13).

Processes of resistance, indeed rebellion (Appendix 11), and the goal of equal opportunity have the effect of positioning students in positive pedagogical relations. Ava’s interest was making sure that students would perform well. This shows that the constitution of skilled subjects is still in sight. Performativity is revealed through practices related to using information from the interview to prepare students for a forthcoming assessment task. However, the journey students take represents a more comprehensive and multifaceted approach to discovering and using information than brainstorming does as the latter does not guarantee equal participation. However, the route that Ava encouraged students to take meant positioning them as active participants. Her retreat from creating standardised learning environments (Luke, 1997a) is connected by Ava, to her personal history.

The multiple horizons of experiences and practices, constituted through time and in place, are important in understanding Ava’s focus on achieving equal opportunity through access and participation. Her social justice orientation is related to significant influences in her life. Ava’s considerable personal and professional experiences have brought her

face to face with different portraits of disadvantage and structural inequality. Time spent teaching in outback Queensland and on the outskirts of London sharpened Ava's appreciation of the impacts of disadvantage on students, particularly, culturally and linguistically different students opportunities to learn. In describing (Text 8) the London school as “very working class” Ava (p.1) recounted her To Sir With Love moment when a whole term was “spent […] holding the door closed so to keep the kids in” (p.1). Ava travelled through Russia and Poland in the mid-eighties and returned to Poland in 2003. When observing that the food queues had gone Ava response was to cry because people finally had food to eat (p.19).

These indelible memories of disadvantage and inequality are no doubt reflected in Ava’s aspiration for equality and can be used to explain the importance of personal and professional histories to being (and becoming) a particular professional being in relation to time and place. Bringing together contemporary professional learning and practice with a personal history, Ava has proposed an alternative way of improving student outcomes that does not marginalise students and exclude them from experiencing rich and rigorous learning.

Beginning from similar propositions to those suggested by Ava, Layla (Text 7) is interested in positioning students at the centre of learning. The difference is that equal opportunity aspirations are settled in learning that is essentially dialogical in nature. Layla’s experiences and practices are presented in Figures 27 and 28. Like Ava, Layla connects
some of her current practices to experiences in international settings. I show, in Figure 28, how students are challenged to extend their thinking and demonstrate, drawing on Layla’s representation of her practice, one way of approaching discussions of disadvantage, structural inequality and racism.
I've had a bit of experience overseas with students in Dubai and also in Brunei. Those experiences have informed what I do here (Text, 7, p. 1). In Brunei it was a lot more grammar based. In Dubai we used Scott Foresman (USA) [...] it was more grammar in context (ibid.).

I've been able to say “We're writing about this - it's in the past so - What's the best way we could actually write this” (p. 4)? That sort of in-context came through a lot clearer in Dubai and I've been using that (ibid.).

We've been doing [the film] Paradise Road in Year 12 I'll make a little bit of a montage - who's involved, what's going on and then we might work out the vocabulary we might need even a few phrases and sentence prompts as well (Text 7, p. 3). Sometimes they don't see the connection between “I've got really good ideas” now “how to put it in formal essay” (ibid.).

[International Baccalaureate] made me reconsider how I teach ESL […] language B (LB) is the same as French B or Spanish B […] it's a lot more targeted to the language of the subject as opposed to VCE which is the text of the subject” (p.5).
I'll sit in a conversation and I'll listen. I might provoke a question. It might be, they've come up with something, I might acknowledge it's a really good thought “Can you take that a little bit further for me” or “how does that mesh with something someone else said (Text 7, p. 3).

I want them to question. “What are my ideas about this? Where have they come from? What has made me respond that way (p. 5)? [Trying] to get them to open up or at least saying - this is a view I have and I acknowledge I've got it but, there are other views and other things and in different societies we do things differently. So it's perhaps giving them a broad sense of who they are and, where they are. (pp. 6-7).

They [significant issues] do come up quite a bit. Sometimes it [racism] comes up when students feel they've been a victim of racism. The other side of that there's also racism that they might have towards others. We were talking the other day in year 12, about conflict and, one of the students was saying there were a lot of Shanghai immigrants, people from the villages who are coming to Shanghai and the Shanghaies don't like that because “how dare they come here using our resources”? So they're like “well I am racist, I might be racist towards my own people”. So sometimes issues come out that weren’t intended.

Layla is interested in developing depth by inviting students to make connections between their thinking and that of others.

Production of the questioning global citizen is reflected in the notion the people do things differently. It resonates with IB’s (n.d.) emphasis that people with different opinions can also be right.

Questions are used to develop depth, interrogate beliefs and opinions, and expand knowledges and understandings.

Dialogical processes are employed to prompt thinking about causes of inequality to show some of the ways racism is deployed.

Students are invited to think about evaluations we make about the activities of others.
7.2.2 Exploring Dialogical Engagements and Students’ Experiences of Learning

Layla demonstrates the dialogical nature of her practice by creating opportunities for developing knowledge and understandings through engagement. A key component of her work is the integration of subject ideas and language content. This involves putting in place particular pedagogical relations where students are expected to work with each other. Layla revealed her role of facilitator by “sit[ting] in a conversation” listening and “provoke[ing] a question here or there” (Text 7, p. 7). Her perception of work in multicultural classroom is revealed in her commitment to engagement, participation, integration, layering of subject content with learning English and intercultural co-operation. Layla represents this approach in a Year 12 class comprising “2 Koreans and 1 Indonesian student in a group of 10 but predominately it’s Chinese” (p.1).

Students in this class had been studying [the film] Paradise Road. The layered approach that Layla presents shows her interest in the relation between good ideas and both informal and formal expression of these. It might be, as Layla suggested, that “they’ve come up with something, and I might acknowledge it’s a really good thought” (Text 7, p.7). However, the privilege that has been assigned to dialogue means students are challenged to “take that [idea] a little bit further” and “often it’s Chinese that gets spoken” (p.1). Here, the importance of a student’s

---

16 Paradise Road (Beresford, 1997) tells the story of a group of women who leave Singapore during World War 2 only to be captured and imprisoned in a Japanese prisoner of war camp.
first language is recognised. Its use is in accord with the view that maturity in the first language enables “transfer to the new language the system of meanings he already possess in his own” (Vygotsky, 1986, p.195). This practice of using the structures of one language to learn another show that theoretical propositions associated with meaning-making and language acquisition are strongly represented in this work.

These influences emerge too, in Layla’s interest in the “dialogical character of learning” (Vygotsky, 1986, p.xxxiv). Her use of “leading questions” and “other forms of help” (p.187), following Vygotsky, are used to support new learning. By inviting students to relate their perspectives to “something someone else said” (Text 7, p.7) means that they are encouraged to use language, knowledge and cultural/intercultural understandings to negotiate meanings. Contributions that students bring to learning show the teacher’s commitment to making connections among and between different perspectives. She reinforces aspirations for intellectual depth by inviting students to take their ideas and/or observations further as she scaffolds the development of wider ‘world’ views that she suggested were very important in her work.

At another time, Layla’s emphasis of “different experiences, different opinions” (Text, 7, p.9) and wider thinking opened the classroom to discussions of issues that are often judged to be too difficult to address (Mansouri et al, 2009). When students raised the question of racism in the context of their experiences of racially based bullying she invited the
class to examine racism more broadly. In a more situated discussion, students were able to explore some of the ways people are caught up in racist judgements about others. This is the most explicit demonstration of education as a site for critical analysis in this project. It disclosed a way for teachers to assist students to develop critical understanding of different lived experiences.

The question prompts that Layla used to promote critical analysis — What are my ideas about this? Where did they come from? How do I respond? — along with her attention to thinking, reflecting, and open mindedness articulates Layla’s approach quite strongly to the International Baccalaureate (IB). Key values — equality, intercultural understanding and respect — permeated practice as Layla strove to develop both academic learning and people “who understand that other people, with their differences, can also be right” (International Baccalaureate, n.d.). International Baccalaureate offers an approach to education that is oriented towards developing “intellectual, personal, emotional and social skills” relevant to “living, learning and working in a rapidly globalizing world” (ibid.). The focus on “intercultural understanding and respect” has permeated activities designed to constitute “internationally minded people” who will contribute to peaceful co-existence (International Baccalaureate, 2013). However, the approaches that Layla (Text 7) has demonstrated tend towards balancing the productive element of this education with ethical engagements so that Layla’s participation objective is met.
Looking more broadly at Layla’s practice, using Gutiérrez’s (2001) scaffolding perspective, it is clear that Layla has built an intellectually challenging environment, acknowledged good ideas, “encourage[d] elaboration, clarification, and exemplification of student’s responses” (p.24) and she “carefully crafts questions” (ibid.). Gutiérrez’s critique confirms, through the emphasis on the notion of “reciprocal dependence” between teacher and taught, the pre-eminence of Heidegger’s (1976) and Vygotsky’s (1986) influences in Layla’s work.

It becomes culturally responsive when students are given a voice. It can be Chinese, English or other languages because “they’ve done Japanese or the Koreans have done Chinese, some of the Chinese have done Japanese […] and we have Spanish in the IB” (p.10). However, the English language focus maintained for reporting and presenting shows inconsistency in how languages as a resource are used.

The value assigned to English for reporting is justified on the grounds that “everyone can listen” (p.1). Circumspection (sight of and responsiveness to possibilities) is absent at this moment. Layla has not been prompted to investigate how Japanese, Korean, Chinese, Spanish and English might work together in reporting and presenting. Layla’s response is likely to have been prompted by her monolingual status and the English only discourse that is a part of the nation’s domination and cultural conservation history (Lo Bianco, 1987).
It becomes clear that one of the problems teachers face is how to take advantage of the multiple languages in their classrooms. This means understanding the relationship between first language proficiency and learning a new language and using the “systems of meaning” that students already have to support academic achievement (Vygotsky, 1986, p.195). Issues related to the association between learning and languages raises the question of whether learning additional language/s is an attribute that teachers and students could share. The relation between learning and languages is explored in section 7.3 through engagement with shifts Lucinda (Text 6) made in the use of languages.

Lucinda already knows that culturally and linguistically different students are often very sophisticated. They have, in her estimation, a level of maturity and a “huge amount of life experiences” (Text 6, p.3). They understand what they have to do and Lucinda told me that they need English so that they can express what they already know. Her experiences of working with these culturally and linguistically different students are presented in Figure 29.
A lot of them come to Jamieson with a huge amount of life experience. They've got this level of maturity that often isn't in the mainstream students often [they] are very sophisticated. They just want the tools to express what they understand […] it's the language that they're struggling with. So kind of being able to tap into that and then just give them the language that they need to express stuff (Text 6, p. 3).

Obviously skill level is hugely diverse. And that's a real challenge for EAL teachers, especially in terms of assessment for the progression points and that sort of stuff. The biggest challenge for […] me is differentiating the curriculum enough so that all students are effectively getting access to it (p. 1).

It's […] gets quite complex. I'll put it on the board as if it's a menu. They're all doing different things. I'll say, “Okay, this is kind of where you're up to”. You start doing this.” I use a lot of the materials that I've designed specifically for the EAL students, so things like text type scaffolds and sentence starters and that kind of real building the field stuff (p. 2).
7.2.3 Skill-based Personalised Learning

In talking about the scope and nature of the needs of learners from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds Lucinda advances her reasons for adopting a “skills focus”. Lucinda knows that “they want the tools to express what they understand and [...] it’s the language that they’re struggling with” (Text 6, p.3).

The challenge Lucinda (Text 6) reported facing was being able to differentiate the curriculum so that all students were effectively getting access to it. Personalised learning using differentiated classroom practices is presented as one way that can promote student participation, target learning needs, realise equal opportunity and achieve high academic standards.

To achieve the goal of individualised practice Lucinda has set up a vast array of access and participation structures. Important amongst these is the invitation extended to students to contextualise each lesson by reflecting on and explaining the previous one prior to engagement with. skill acquisition using differentiated classroom activities. Lucinda emphasises the importance of identifying and responding to individual student’s needs and providing resources for students to scaffold learning. Text type scaffolds and sentence starters are provided by Lucinda to help students build the field of language necessary for learning.
Lucinda attaches her English (subject) practice to language and literacy learning because, as she suggested, “it’s the language that they’re struggling with” (p.3). This approach can be aligned with more recent research into how culturally responsive practice and strategies for literacy learning come together. In Cheesman & De Pry’s (2010) view, this coupling offers explicit skills instruction as a partner in culturally responsive literacy education. Although the authors’ stance on academic achievement is yet to be evaluated and the depth of building on what is known to negotiate meanings and create new academic achievement is unclear, it is obvious that the authors’ intent is on promoting equality through a multifaceted approach.

Lucinda (Text 6) describes an approach to practice that matches her commitment to equal opportunity by making curriculum accessible and enhancing participation in English (subject), while at the same time integrating English language and literacy education. A number of influences and interests inhabit this site of differentiated practice. Aspiration for inclusion is indicated by the key word ‘access’, while skills, differentiated individual learning plans, building the field and systematic support all point to a learner-centred approach that is individualised for each learner. A commitment to personalised learning reflects the national policy objectives “that aims to fulfil the diverse capabilities of each young Australian” (MCEETYA, 2008, p.7). A strong presence of the Literacy and Numeracy 6–18 Month Strategy, (DEECD, 2010b) is revealed. In keeping with the language and intent of the strategy teaching and learning has been “adapted to the individual needs of...
students” (p.2) and “purposeful teaching builds on student knowledge and matches the learning needs […] of each student” (p.3).

Importantly, “activities and programs to implement and support improved student learning outcomes” (p.1) have been implemented within the flexible curriculum approach. This means, in Lucinda’s case, that there are no add-on programs that position students at the periphery of learning. The ways in which these intentions have been put into place suggest a more nuanced reading of the implementation documents and their recommendations than disclosed previously (Chapters 5 and 6). While these documents have attested to Lucinda’s engagement with curriculum and syllabus implementation strategies recommended by the Department of Education and Early Childhood Development (Victoria), the support offered to students also shows recruitment of theoretical underpinnings. These can be aligned with Vygotsky’s (1986) Zone of Proximal Development in so far as Lucinda’s (Text 6) actions, interactions and material resources are intended to support individual students who are engaged in building knowledge, skills and understandings.

Lucinda’s detailed approach to individualisation set out in Figure 30 shows the kind of relatedness that Heideggerian (2005) situated in a partnership – teacher/guide and apprentice. Lucinda’s response to disadvantage and student reluctance to participate shows aspects of relatedness that Heidegger maintains, is essential to being a teacher (1976).
There’s one student […] he sort of didn’t work for the first two lessons. His body language was just really defiant. Eventually I sort of said, “You haven’t got any books today.” He goes, “No!” Have you got a copy of the book? Have you had a chance to read it yet?” And he said: “No, no, I haven’t.” I said; “Okay” and I gave him a really simple task and he goes, “Oh, no, no”.

He finally said, “Oh, I want to work now.” I said, “Okay, well we’re doing this.” He said, “Yes. No, I don’t want to do that.” And I said, “Do you mind telling me why?” And he said, “Because I don’t really like reading and answering questions and stuff. (p. 11). I said, “Are there any books that you’ve read through your time at Jamieson that you’ve enjoyed?” And he laughed and he said, “No”.

I kind of went, “All right”. I gave him a really small section of the book; I gave him some Post It notes and I gave him a list of the key events and where to find them. I said, “How about you just start by finding these key events on the page, underlining them and Post It noting it.” He did it and that was good…. I got him to write it out, and he did that. He gives me his work so I can give him feedback outside the class and he corrects it. And look, it’s going pretty well with him (ibid.).
How Lucinda works professionally, within a personalised approach, is reflected in her interactions with one student. Ziad shows that he has not had access to English curriculum or an opportunity to fully participate in English prior to this lesson. Lucinda’s efforts in building authentic relations with this student illuminates the benefits for students and teachers when they work co-operatively with one another. Importantly, drawing on Vygotsky (1986), the student is not “left on his own” (p.xxxiv).

Respectful interactions serve the reasoning objective and offer an entry point for this teacher to discover why Zaid “didn’t work for the first two lessons” (Text 7, p.11). Lucinda reports on a certain body language projected by Ziad. Read as defiance, Lucinda was cautious as she probed for knowledge about this student only to discover, among other things, that Ziad had never read a book in all the years that he had been in school. After he agrees to do some work, Lucinda picks up a book, her list of events taken from the text, some post-it notes, pencil and a separate piece of paper to see what guide and apprentice could do together. His job was to find events detailed in Lucinda’s list, make notations in the text and post-it note them too. Lucinda invited him to write out what he had found. They talk about his work, further, outside of class. In Lucinda’s estimation, “it’s going pretty well” (p.11).

Responsiveness to Zaid’s disadvantage is built around respectful relations (Lucinda’s invitation to participate), evaluating his willingness to work, showing an entry point for participation and providing the tools that
he could use to learn. Assessing when humour is appropriate and knowing when and how to intervene were important if the student’s engagement was to be realised. Building access and participation through non-confrontational respectful negotiations showed the virtue ethics of patience and trust that frame and support Lucinda’s responsiveness to the experiences, needs and attributes this student brought to learning. This representation of culturally responsive practice responds to Doecke et al.’s (2010) question “how to respond to this particular student on this particular day” (p. 4)?

Responsiveness to broader issues related to enduring disadvantage, discrimination and structural inequality were not pursued beyond intervention, by Lucinda, in the learning event. It appears that this dimension — the disadvantages brought to learning - have, in Heideggerian (2005) terms, withdrawn. They have been concealed, in the past, by institutional arrangements that are shown to have been complicit in exacerbating this student’s existing disadvantage (Fraser, 1996). In this lesson, Lucinda addresses his detachment from learning but the broader issue of structural inequality is not addressed.

Community involvement in education, also a feature of individualisation, is one place where teacher activists (among others) can learn more about the communities schools serve (Sleeter, 2011). Dwelling in communities is one way of discovering the value of knowledges and sociocultural resources, and discloses the conditions of disadvantage to
reveal what it means to be a teacher in multicultural communities. This aspect is pursued more rigorously in Chapter 9.

The approach Lucinda employs, which features aspects of culturally responsive practice through its attention to individualisation, academic achievement and respectful relations, has been able to produce results. Where many schools worry about results in the national tests, Lucinda (Text 6) maintains that “our school doesn’t kind of notice NAPLAN all that much, to be honest. We don’t ever — I mean in [...] the curriculum committee meetings, we never talk about it” (p.14). This is not to say that tests are not important at Jamieson Secondary College. Lucinda and her colleagues are interested in improving results. This is revealed in her comments about student results in the final end of school tests that qualify students for the Victorian Certificate of Education. Lucinda confirms:

The EAL students killed it. The class average was 32 or something study score. Four students got above 40 [out of 50] — they just did so well. It was amazing, and it was my first Senior Year 12 EAL class so I was just like, “Yes!” and — so that was really cool. And then the next year it was similar. They did very very well” (p.13).

The exuberance communicated through words like “amazing” and “cool” and the phrase “killed it” suggest that excellent results are very important. Lucinda has demonstrated how skill acquisition structured through differentiated learning that is personalised for each student responds to this aspiration. This is important because, as Sleeter (2011) argues, there is an urgent need to establish and affirm connections
between culturally responsive practice and academic achievement. In this context, Lucinda has demonstrated one way of improving student performance. It retains a systematic skills focus but also shows the importance of the languages and learning relationship. Her engagement with disadvantage in the classroom is evident but discourses that are able to illuminate the broader issues of inequality are missing (see Chapter 9).

Teachers, through their practices have revealed the influences of alternative discourses driving innovation in each of the schools where Ava, Layla and Lucinda teach. Discourses of inclusion, academic achievement and internationalisation are important in explaining why management and accountability discourses have not had the same effects as they did, for example, at Nicholson Secondary College. In the following section (7.3), I look at the ways in which discourses of inclusion, innovation and internationalisation circulating at Jamieson Secondary College have been able to create different experiences and practices for teachers to show how more comprehensive opportunities for learning have been realised. Lucinda’s experiences of working in a school undertaking its own reform agenda is presented in Figure 31. In this slide, I show how alternative discourses have been used to change the culture of a school and open up new opportunities for teaching and learning.
The school used to try very hard to sell itself as an academic high school. I think they were almost trying to almost exclude those students. But now, it's bring them in, lift them up (Text 6, p. 14). The EAL program's grown at our school. We've got a lot more EAL teachers. EAL classes run at the same time as English classes, with less students, so a maximum of 16 (p. 2). We're trying to implement more of a skills focus across all year levels (p. 3).

[Now] we teach Mandarin there. There's a Year 11 class, which is our first senior class in Chinese, finally and it's looking like there will be another one next year. There's a real buzz about learning another language and sharing language. So we're going to start being a real VCE Chinese high school, which is really exciting (p, 5). We run classes for Year 6 students, like an after-school kind of thing, which is for our feeder schools (p. 5). I started a language exchange program [...] with the EAL students with Mandarin as a first language, with our local Australian-born students who are learning Mandarin. [...]It's a nice vibe (p. 11).

Figure 31: Changing Cultures

The change process is situated in a comparison between then and there and here and now.

Investment in responding to difference is reflected in employment policy, arrangements for EAL students and shifts in pedagogy.

Mandarin has moved from the isolation of the LOTE classroom to other school programs and to the community.

Use of “buzz” and “nice vibe” suggests promotion of languages has changed the way people think about learning another language.
7.3 Broadening Opportunities for Teaching and Learning

7.3.1 Languages and Cultures as a Site of Transformation

Lucinda drew a comparison between Jamieson Secondary College here and now and there and then. Through this evaluation she disclosed shifts in representation of the college from an ‘academic’ focus and exclusion to acceptance of cultural and linguistic diversity and inclusion to show how changing “the culture of the school” (p. 13) has benefitted culturally and linguistically different students.

The college’s new principal (2009) expanded arrangements for both English additional language education (EAL) and languages other than English education. Institutional arrangements for supporting learners of English as an additional language changed from ad hoc interventions for students judged to be most at risk, to an EAL stream in every year. In the new arrangement, EAL learners are enrolled in EAL streams irrespective of their academic achievement or English competency because of Lucinda’s strongly held view that a critical relationship exists between language learning and academic achievement. Lucinda (Text 6) expressed this perception through her assertion “they want the tools to express what they understand and generally speaking, for the makeup of our classes, it’s the language that they’re struggling with” (p.3). In Lucinda’s view, this means “getting the balance right” (ibid.)
between the explicit teaching of language skills for expression of ideas and arguments and rigorous attention to subject content.

Arranging for an EAL stream in every year is designed to make sure all students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds receive support. This expanded program has, in Lucinda’s estimation, had an effect — “everyone’s really curious about each other” (p.13) and this has raised the interest of staff. Lucinda mentioned almost incidentally her involvement in Professional Learning Team meetings. These are different to the meetings Eve (Chapter 5) and Grace described (Chapter 6). In these sites, the meetings were used to evaluate student improvement and teacher effectiveness whereas Lucinda worked with teachers from science and mathematics faculties to demonstrate how they could make the language used in the classroom, assessment tasks and worksheets simpler and more accessible for students.

The other expansion that the principal embarked on was raising the status of languages other than English. Mandarin was introduced (2009) to sit alongside the more traditional and well established Italian programme that was available to students. Investment has been such that Lucinda has noticed that “there’s a real buzz about learning another language and sharing language” (Text 6, p.11). There is a Mandarin class in almost every year now and as Lucinda has noted, next year (2014) will be the first Year 12 Mandarin class. In addition there are after-school classes for Year 6 students from feeder primary schools. Lucinda started “a language exchange program […] mainly with the EAL
students with Mandarin as a first language, with our local Australian-born students who are learning Mandarin” (p.11). More recently a Special School Grant for Language: Mandarin (MySchool website, 2012) has helped maintain momentum.

These initiatives reflect an Asia focus compatible with the *National Statement for Languages Education in Australian Schools* and *National Plan for Languages Education in Australian Schools 2005–08* (MCEETYA 2005). Inclusion of students from Jamieson in the *Victorian Young Leaders to China Program* (DEECD, 2015) suggests that Asia Literacy as a co-ordinating discourse has strengthened the college’s initiative with regard to changing institutional arrangements and reform of curriculum innovation (Asia Education Foundation, 2011).

Given the “buzz about learning another language” (Text 6, p.11) and inquiry from other teachers about their use of English language it would appear that changes have been inculcated, enacted and materialised in practices (Fairclough, 2005). Changes to arrangements at Jamieson Secondary College show how alternative discourses open landscapes of practice and the people in them to different and or deeper understandings of responsiveness to the multicultural composition of classrooms.

Like all innovations there can be unexpected consequences. One of these is presented in Figure 32. In this slide I show how the inculcation of alternative discourses of internationalisation and Asia Literacy have
promoted the status of languages and opened up new possibilities for both students and teacher. Drawing on Althusser (1969) theorisation of contradiction it is important to ask: Where has and does language sit in Lucinda’s consciousness? Lucinda appears to be a beneficiary of displacement of the power of exclusionary discourses that have concealed the possibilities that languages offer (Althusser, 1969). The following slide reveals Lucinda’s consciousness of new possibilities that have contributed to teacher transformation and opened up new relations between teacher and students.
I felt a bit sort of fraudulent or just didn’t feel quite right not having a [second] language of my own (Text 6, p.16). I was marking the roll and I noticed a student with an Indonesian name. I’d just got back from Indonesia, so I thought ‘Ah!’ and I just started chatting to him in Indonesian. And the whole class just went dead silent.

Then a Lebanese girl said: “Miss that was really unexpected.” All the Chinese kids were like, “Miss, you should learn Chinese!” and they were so excited by the fact I was learning a language and they were too, and it started a real dialogue (ibid).

What’s crept into my practice just since I’ve started learning Indonesian is this real reflection on how we learn in terms of languages (p. 12).

Lucinda’s Dasein changed as she experienced real dialogue and understood how we learn if different languages are in play.

Reflection

Lucinda reveals her discomfort (antagonism) as she reflects on what it means to be and become a teacher in multicultural schools and classrooms?

‘Real’ Dialogue

“Real dialogue” represents a response to “the surplus […] that Others bring to dialogue with me” (Kostogriz, 2001) to show the significance of relatedness to learning.
In the milieu of language education expansion at Jamieson Secondary College Lucinda made a decision (2010) that has impacted significantly on her being (and becoming) a teacher with all the essentials needed for teaching in a school serving a multicultural community. Her journey in this respect exposes her moment of truth and understanding that reflects consciousness of the different ways of understanding languages in learning. As Lucinda explains, she enrolled in a course to learn Bahasa Indonesian. On return from an in-country experience Lucinda reports noticing an Indonesian name on the roll. Schatzki (2005) understands this noticing as a moment of decision. Lucinda, in a moment of recognition, chose to start chatting with a student she had not met before.

Lucinda (Text 6) describes classroom silence as “dead”. In doing so, the exceptionality of this situation is emphasised. In positioning language learning positively through “I like” and when “I just started chatting to him” (p.12), the potential of a language rich environment for learning is established. The significance of a commitment to relationally based practice is revealed through her use of “real” in describing the dialogue she aspires to. Reflecting on her experiences of learning another language Lucinda came to understand “how we learn in terms of languages” (Text 6, p.12).

This is one of the essential understandings that teachers in multicultural classrooms must have. In these engagements, Lucinda meets face to
face with the learners she is learning-with. Learning Bahasa Indonesian is not about appropriation of something others have. It is more to do with Lucinda’s experience of being a learner and creating the conditions for authentic dialogue (Sleeter 2010).

Lucinda’s curiosity was roused by the “buzz about languages. Experimentation with this equipment showed the emergence of authenticity when Lucinda saw that languages were not what she assumed them to be. This was demonstrated when immediately after her conversation with the student who spoke Bahasa Indonesian she became involved in engagements with students who use Arabic and Chinese. As Lucinda comments, “they were so excited by the fact I was learning a language and they were too, and it started a real dialogue” (Text 7, p.12). Freedom from the dominance of cultural privilege and linguistic imperialism is the site of Lucinda’s transformation in ways of being a teacher (van Dijk, 1993). This theme is developed further in Chapters 8.

7.4 Contributions of Teachers to Culturally Responsive Pedagogies

7.4.1 Composite Analytical Description

Ava, Layla and Lucinda have made significant contributions to building a pedagogy that is culturally and linguistically responsive to the multicultural composition of classrooms.
There is no rigid prescriptive approach to teacher’s culturally responsive practice. Experiences and practices of teachers gleaned from their work across time and in different places have been situated in teachers’ culturally responsive pedagogies. The fusion of multiple horizons of understanding informs the work that Ava, Layla and Lucinda demonstrate. Authentically oriented teachers offer culturally and linguistically different students various opportunities for participating effectively in robust teaching and learning events.

Students are invited to participate in hands-on, dialogical and individualised processes and practices to enhance their learning by making it more accessible. Resistance to strict adherence to authorised practices, establishment of learner-centred processes, layering of multiple theoretical propositions, integration of subject content and English language education and positive pedagogical relations are some of the features of practice that create pathways for participation and promote academic achievement.

Alternative discourses — Asia Literacy, internationalisation and interculturalism have opened landscapes of practice to new ideas and initiated changes to institutional arrangements. Hospitable language rich environments appear as places where real dialogue among and between students and teachers can take place. These classrooms emerge as places where disadvantage, discrimination and inequality can be addressed. Teachers show a heightened awareness of where they stand but one of the things that can disturb this place is the privilege assigned to English. Teachers who position themselves as learners of a language emerge as one amongst other language learners. The struggle in being and becoming a teacher is seeing clearly the place where real dialogue is created.

7.4.2  **Building a Culturally Responsive Pedagogy**

Ava, Layla and Lucinda have shared 1) detailed examples that show multicultural, multifaceted and to different extents multilingual student-centred dialogical experiences and practices that layer knowledge, skills
and understandings with language education and 2) practical applications of existing culturally responsive principles - evaluations of relevance, equalisation of relations of power, relatedness in sustaining dialogical engagement and places were disclosed that had the potential for teacher and student transformation and emancipation.

**Practical Considerations**

Their questioning of the *relevance* of prescribed learning events probed whether they were achievable (Ava). Teachers evaluated these events using multiple reference points — students’ resources, knowledge of theories of learning, approaches to the use of languages in learning and notions drawn from liberal multiculturalism, and to a lesser extent critical multiculturalism. Teachers already situated in a world in ways of being were aware of sociocultural resources but missed their significance for learning. None-the-less, learning events were changed, replaced or scaffolded to make them accessible (Lucinda; Layla; Ava).

Teachers established classroom dynamics and instituted processes to promote meaning-making and move learners beyond immediate understanding (Layla). Decisions were made with regard to who would be the expert others (Ava). Changes such as this meant **shifting relations of power** and organising the roles students and teachers would have (Ava; Layla; Lucinda). Arrangements were made so that student ‘experts’ could show their abilities including places for students and teachers to show themselves as knowledgeable and skilled (Lucinda; Layla; Ava). A significant shift was their retreat from
didacticism and transmission of knowledge. Demonstrations of engagement relied on creating the conditions for sustaining dialogic processes. Within that process a dual focus addressed knowledges and ideas and their expression (Layla). Self-reflection and subsequent actions promoted teacher transformation (Lucinda).

One challenge for teachers related to the languages that would be used (Layla; Ava). The privilege assigned to English was not addressed but Lucinda, by revealing her multilingual self to students, disclosed a place where her learner status enabled students and teachers to rethink teaching and learning in multicultural classrooms. Opportunities emerged that opened pathways for transformation and disclosed possibilities for emancipation. These were not taken up but as Lucinda demonstrated they await illumination that is the precursor to awareness and insightfulness which are essential features of living and working authenticity (Heidegger, 2005).

7.5 Generative Conclusion

Ava, Layla and Lucinda have offered detailed examples that show, to different degrees, multicultural, multifaceted and multilingual student-centred dialogical experiences and practices that layer knowledge, skills and understandings with language education. These contributions can be used to scaffold a non-prescriptive culturally responsive pedagogy.

If teaching practice is to be transformed and students and teacher emancipation realised, broader issues of disadvantage brought to learning, cannot be left unattended. This means targeting arrangements that discriminate and relating these to the structuring of inequality. This is the subject of Chapter 9.
8 EDUCATION AND MULTICULTURALISM

Introduction

In this chapter I use the different approaches to teaching and learning that teachers revealed to make associations between their experiences and practices and the views each teacher holds with regard to education and the role of multiculturalism in education. Connections are established between teachers’ work and national and other interests and influences, to reveal the power of discourses in framing, mediating and/or challenging authorised approaches to education. I disclose how multicultural principles can be used breach the divide between technical and professional responses to the multicultural composition of classrooms and repose nation education so that it can meet equality aspirations and address national interests and global challenges.

As such this chapter responds to the final research question:

What do social relations in teachers’ work reveal about their views on education and multiculturalism?

8.1 Instrumental Education

8.1.1 Eve’s Views on Education and Multiculturalism

Eve, already situated in a world and in ways of being disclosed an instrumental view of education that represents a technical response to the multicultural conditions of classrooms. Her perception of education and multiculturalism was revealed when she connected processes for improving student outcomes to the achievement of human capital
production. She adheres to Argyris and Schön’s (1994) action /desired outcome proposition: if I level difference, narrow and standardise curriculum and refine and remediate students I will produce confident, skilled subjects who would be (or become) good speakers of English and productive citizens. Processes deployed to refine, level, and/or eliminate difference shows an absence of both liberal multicultural principles of reciprocal recognition, respect and acceptance and, interculturalism’s focus on developing intercultural understanding. Questioning of the elimination difference is missing and the absence of critical reflection suggests that neither liberal and critical multiculturalism nor interculturalism play any role in the constitution of teachers’ work in technical enactments like the one that has been represented.

The productive approach to education represented by Eve and Sophia can be connected to neoliberal ideology. It positions students and teachers as human capital (Harvey, 2005). Economic and political theories, such as these, rest on the belief “that human well-being can be best advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework” (p.2). Eve demonstrated elements of institutional frameworks when she 1) managed the narrowing and standardisation of curriculum; 2) controlled professional conversations of teachers; 3) corralled the places where languages other than English could be used; 4) silenced foreign-ness by limiting the use of Arabic to institutional purposes and 5) separated students to ameliorate the unruliness of difference (Luke, 1997a). These demonstrations of efficiency rest on the elimination of difference and
situate Eve’s work in the national interest in improving social and economic outcomes.

Teaching practice responds to the national interest through the production of skilled citizens. However, the strong interest in the maintenance of monolingualism is not in the broader national interest (Council of Australian Government’s Working Group, 1994). It emanates from and is maintained by imperialist and cultural conservation discourses that assign value to English and the nation’s Anglo heritage. It serves the efficiency and effectiveness processes, that Harvey (2005) has associated with neoliberalism. Discourses of performativity, employability, conformity, imperialism and cultural conservation reflect the national interest in improved workforce capability, social cohesion and the nation’s stance on the maintenance of English dominance and subordination of difference. These discourses have been inculcated, enacted and materialised in the work some teachers do.

8.1.2 Sophia’s Views on Education and Multiculturalism

Sophia, like Eve, presents an instrumental view of technical education. Her emphasis on the measurement of forward movement of students along the spectrum of skill and concept indicators is associated with the production of subjects with a broad suite of skills and desirable attributes. Sophia (Text 5) described exactly who this future citizen should be. He/she will be English speaking, confident, co-operative, knowledgeable and skilled. These attributes are ones that, she believes will ‘allow’ a student to progress in any direction that they choose.
People with these attributes will operate in the national interest by contributing to economic growth, global competitiveness and social cohesion. From an economic rationalist orientation this education is directed to building human capital necessary for living and working in an increasingly mobile, competitive and globalised world.

However, practices that are directed to current national interests alone cannot effectively respond to demands for improved economic competitiveness and national security in a world where new alliances and strategic positioning are important to the nation’s future (Rudd & Smith, 2007). However, at a national level, productive and/or performing economic and co-operative social subjects will, as Sophia suggests, contribute to economic prosperity and social cohesion.

What happens if you are not classified as confident, skilled and knowledgeable? Sophia answers this question when she refers to advice she has given in the past to culturally and linguistically different students attending a school serving a highly diverse, low socioeconomic community. Students at Rubicon Secondary College, as Sophia suggested, had to develop their language skills so that they could get a job. The focus of their preparation for work was restricted to learning English. Existing curriculum was not changed even though Sophia knew it would be received by culturally and linguistically different students as “meaningless hooey” (Text 5, p.15). This site of marginalisation and exclusion discloses their subordination as jobs that are available to
these culturally and linguistically different students are not the ones that the confident, conforming, knowledgeable and skilled English speaking students are prepared for.

8.1.3 Instrumentally-motivated Education and its Effects

Education, viewed through the lens of instrumentally-motivated teachers, is a process that focuses on the production of confident academically-able, English speaking citizens who will contribute to the nation. To them, instrumental education is a nation building exercise. The nation’s interests in economic growth, prosperity and global competitiveness responds to changing labour demands in the economically competitive era of globalisation (Kostogriz, 2011). Accompanying this is the drive for social cohesion that reflects that nation’s attachment to cultural conservation (Kristeva, 1991).

Schools that respond to diversity using instrumental education sense that an enfranchising agenda is present through adoption of the equal treatment principle (Luke, 1997b). An unintended outcome is that it draws “attention away from people as individuals and […] from power relations amongst groups” (May & Sleeter, 2010, p.5). In this particular productive enterprise, resources that are faulty are removed. In some cases, the resources can be fixed - remediated and/or refined. Looking at this from a student’s perspective it sets them up to fail. As Haile-Michael,(introduced on p. 29) (in Ryan, 2012, The Age, 14 May) asserts, this approach is a precursor to detachment from learning, alienation from education and life time exclusion from opportunities for social,
economic and political participation. Exclusions such as these maintain social and economic disadvantage and contribute to intergenerational inequality (May & Sleeter, 2010; Fraser, 1996).

There is no perceived need to pursue multicultural ideals because treating everyone in the same way appears reasonable and fair (Janks, 2010). Acceptance of the ‘sameness’ proposition is managed, in van Dijk’s (1993) estimation, by connecting it to the principle of equality. The problem is that rights and recognition ideals have already been subordinated through discursive manipulation (ibid.). This occurred in Australia when the Howard government (1996–2007) replaced recognition and rights emphases in policy with core values and the notion of a shared national identity (Commonwealth of Australia, 1999). Relegation of multiculturalism to a marginal position, in relation to, nationalism, cultural conservation and conformity discourses means that it has effectively been silenced (Fairclough, 2005).

The outcome of moulding and shaping of culturally and linguistically different students is the elimination of their sociocultural resources that would serve the national well. Instead, privileged clientele are schooled to be confident and “good contributors to society” (p.11). They may fulfil the State’s desire for a socially cohesive and economically prosperous society. As yet, they do not all have the multilingual capabilities needed for broader regional and global engagements. Competing discourses – employability and conformity - complicate the processes associated with production of desirable subjects. Remediation and refinement supports
the creation of homogenous entities (Luke, 1997a) even though the State, today, wants Asia literate subjects who can engage effectively on matters related to economic and security, particularly, in the Asia Pacific region. Neither the State nor students are well served through instrumental education.

Many culturally and linguistically different students have transnational identities (Basch, Glick Schiller and Blanc, 1994) and already hold the sociocultural resources – languages and intercultural experience - that the nation is interested in. What the State, systems of education, schools and many teachers miss is the ready-to-hand of these abilities and attributes and what they can be used for (Heidegger, 2005). Taken-for-granted productive practices emerge as prejudicial and discriminatory if culturally and linguistically different students are not able to relate to and maintain the cultural and linguistic essentials of their being (Heidegger, 2005). Stripping of identity goes unnoticed or is dismissed in the production of subjects who demonstrate favoured attributes. In this process, the nation’s competitive edge is impaired as education fails to advance the production of bilingual, multilingual and interculturally aware labour suited to broader global interests.

8.1.4 Education in the National Interest

This productive enterprise in education reflects the coupling of national interests with education that is a part of the nation’s history (Green & Cormack, 2008). Attention to student deficits, characteristic of this historic period, is a part of building, what Green and Cormack (2008)
have referred to, as the nation’s capacity to meet challenges particularly with regard to the economy. In the past, books used to teach reading, for example, carried discourses of imperialism and nationalism (ibid). Their role was to disseminate expressions of the ideal future citizen and assign value to particular attributes (ibid.). In this historical epoch the strong English focus cannot be separated from linguistic and cultural imperialism evidenced in images of national identity like the one depicted on the values poster (p.80). It is against practices and images like these that culturally and linguistically others are measured (Green and Cormack, 2008). Narratives of nation that dominate and exclude (Kristeva, 1991) are used to homogenise identities and strengthen core national values. Schools are one of the places where Australian cultural events such as ANZAC and Australia Day are used to secure, what Green & Cormack (2008) refer to “national formations” (p.258).

Instrumental education cannot meet current national interests because narratives of nation and constructions of national identity are exclusive (Hage, 1998). Both liberal and critical multiculturalism have the capacity to mediate restrictive pedagogical relations by 1) articulating and demonstrating the value of cultural and linguistic resources to learning and to the nation and 2) providing a critical lens through which teachers can use to reflect on their responses to the multicultural conditions of their classrooms. In the State’s haste to eradicate difference, they have also thwarted any chance of building a ‘truly’ multicultural society where people can respond authentically to cultural and linguistic difference locally, nationally and globally. One problem is that multiculturalisms
have not as yet prompted the nation’s curiosity and another is that people of the nation have not, in a Heideggerian (2005) sense, picked up cultural and linguistic assets others bring to dialogue with them to see what can be done. This is not to say that teachers consciously decide on this course of action.

Peters (2003) has suggested that leaders and teachers entangled in instrumental education are transformed into resources capable of managing and maintaining the efficient production of economic and social subjects. Teachers concentrate, as Comber and Nixon (2009) have pointed out, on bureaucratic processes. Professional knowledge, practice and engagement is bound by teacher, school and institutionally-generated, management and accountability texts. From an economic and social perspective the relentless focus on instruction in English, measurement of progress in English, assessment of achievement, deployment of deficit pedagogies, remediation in English and refinement of identities are all a part of building the country’s capacity to meet social and economic challenges but they are yet to address global conditions, particularly migration, multilingualism or strategic interests. None-the-less education is transformed into a technical enterprise driven by discourses of surveillance, performativity, employability, conformity, cultural conservation, imperialism and accountability. These change what education is and who people in education will become (Schatzki, 2005).
In Argyris and Schön’s (1974) estimation, learning, truth and care, the ideals they name as traditional functions of education, are abandoned. Eve demonstrated this process when she called on care to placate the child who, she believed, knew he was not good at something. She did not sustain her opposition to discriminatory acts because of her submersion, in what Schön (1983) refers to, as technical rationalism.

According to Peters (2003) the teacher’s role, in these conditions, is adjusted to one that favours the deskilling characteristic of technical rationality and in which data guide what is to be done. Through professionalization teachers, in Peter’s view, become alienated from shared goals and the need to produce “instrumentally useful results” (p.251) takes over. This does not suggest a conscious abandonment of learning, truth or care by teachers; rather abandonment speaks of the ways in which practice has been grounded in predictable and accountable behaviours: that is “what I ought to do if I wish to achieve certain results” (Argyris & Schön, 1974, p.6).

In this place, quality, in Thomson’s (2001) view, is accounted for through quantification of work samples and is driven by a desire on the part of some teachers to produce useful results (Argyris & Schön, 1974). This education robs teachers of their professionalism and students of rich and robust experiences of learning. Instrumental education does not represent the breadth of vision for education projected in this historical period (MCEETYA, 2005).
Critical discourses that can be used as a lens through which to see and question what is happening are absent. There is no perceived need for such interrogation because this education is framed in a way that suggests disparities in results among different groups can be overcome using the instruction, testing and intervention sequence. Instrumental educators perceive that the technical approach to learning and teaching will solve the problem of student disadvantage and ameliorate educational inequality. Practice, as a consequence, is allowed to proceed in ordered and predetermined ways. This means that disadvantage and inequality will be created and/or maintained (Luke, 1997b). Fragmentation of identity is ignored even though physical and psychological effects associated with alienation (Mansouri et al., 2009) are likely to be played out in schools, communities and nation as unruly behaviour or through more extreme acts of terror. The reification of culturally and linguistically different students has robbed the nation of the citizens it needs today to meet social, economic and security interests.

There are alternatives to this education. Teachers who participated in this project demonstrated professional approaches to education that engage with difference – the things students bring to learning (disadvantage an structural inequality) and use to learn (cultural practices).
8.2 Professional Education

8.2.1 Layla’s Intercultural Education

Layla (Text 7) advanced the view that the “completely different backgrounds, different experiences and different opinions” (p.9) that culturally and linguistically different students bring to learning, positions them as learners and teachers of intercultural understandings. This view of education was disclosed when she questioned and provoked deeper and broader thinking and encouraged students to relate their understandings to those of other students as they formed complex and comprehensive bodies of knowledge that they could use to interpret diverse situations.

She does not retreat from, what Mansouri et al., (2009) refer to, as difficult situations. When students raised their own experiences of school based racism and recounted recent incidents of cultural dominance and subordination in Shanghai, Layla, through a more situated discussion invited students to consider why particular views are held by some, with regard to disenfranchised rural workers entering Shanghai. Students were encouraged to interrogate these views so that they could consider the place they and others were are speaking from. Through this process Layla steps from reflective practice towards transformative education by affirming the students desire to speak and engaging with authentic, meaningful and relevant actions (May, 1999).

Processes and practices in Layla’s work reflect and respond to Learner Profiles situated in the International Baccalaureate (2013). Layla
showed some of these particular profiles when she prompted students to:

- expand and develop knowledge (Inquirer)
- engage with issues that have local significance (Knowledgeable)
- use more than one language (Communicator)
- evaluate a range of points of view (Open minded) (ibid.)

These are designed to support the development of students who will be “inquiring, knowledgeable and caring young people who help to create a better and more peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect” (International Baccalaureate, no date, p.1). In that respect, this curriculum is clearly interested in the production of global citizens who will become “responsible members of local, national and global communities” (ibid.).

Layla demonstrated how these foci advanced the scope for teachers to develop intercultural perspectives in learning and teaching. She did not demonstrate the critical element necessary for responding effectively to student exclusion when school based racism was reported. This could have been approached using the Thinkers Profile that emphasise “critical and creative thinking skills to analyse and take responsible action on complex problems” (ibid.). The critical aspect of inquiry that promotes a shift from analysis to action was missing from this almost transformative education. Critical multiculturalism can be used in
situations such as these to analyse, critique and act on complex problems but, drawing on Meer & Modood’s (1997) interculturalism does not have either the equal treatment perspective of liberal multiculturalism or the agency dimension of critical multiculturalism for acting on issues related to racism and inequality more broadly. Liberal and critical multiculturalism and interculturalism can be used to develop cultural and linguistic responsiveness to difference. In the following section (8.2.2), relations are disclosed between multicultural principles in learning events and student inclusion.

8.2.2 Jennifer’s Multicultural Education

Jennifer is obliged to follow the mainstream skills-focused syllabus that Eve introduced us to in Chapter 5. Her observation of henna on a student’s hands raised other possibilities for her (de Certeau, 1984). She picked up the cultural practice of decorating hands with henna that was presented to her and ready-to-use (Heidegger, 2005). Muslim students were offered an opportunity to show themselves as knowledgeable and capable of reporting authentically on the cultural practice. The pedagogy Jennifer displayed was culturally responsive and demonstrated a critical understanding of teaching and learning in multicultural classrooms.

Jennifer’s view of education and multiculturalism is disclosed when she privileged student-centred cooperative learning, shifted from using standardised curriculum and rigid text bound practice to employ activities designed to respond to diversity and maximise inclusion (May,
1998). Multiculturalism is not named but the multicultural presence is revealed through acknowledgement of students’ cultural and linguistic practices and acceptance of their rights to use their cultural resources (Australian Government Office of Multicultural Affairs, 1989). This is not the only multicultural influence in this work. Drawing on Giroux’s emancipatory multiculturalism (1994), Jennifer:

- shows positive pedagogical relations constituted among and between teacher, students community and curriculum
- provides a space where cultural and linguistically different students can speak to each other and to the school and community about the use of cultural knowledges in learning
- challenges conformity by exposing limited understandings of citizenship
- promotes identity formation without shaping and moulding.

By publishing the report on the Festival of Eid Jennifer participates with students in setting up conditions that Parekh (2006) refers to as “proper terms of relationships between different communities” (p.13). In this case, the relationship Jennifer addresses is between the image of a homogenised school community and the culturally and linguistically diverse community it serves.

Critical evaluation in her repertoire of practices is illuminated when she ignores the school’s narrow concept of writing. Rather than teach a
structure for writing a report in isolation from context, the students and teacher produce a crafted report suitable for publication in the school’s newsletter. Instead of creating generic, deficit or homogenous subjects, these students are positioned as successful and knowledgeable culturally and linguistically different learners.

This process is transformative in so much as the teacher affirmed student voices and engaged with authentic, meaningful and relevant actions (May, 1999). The demonstration challenges the school’s dismissal of multiculturalism in a community that welcomes significant numbers of newly arrived migrants and refugees annually (State of Victoria, 2013a) and where at least eighty percent of the school population come from culturally and linguistically different backgrounds. Importantly, it contributes to academic achievement and social cohesion, which Williams (1989) maintains, is more readily achieved by opening the possibilities for learning rather than by narrowing them.

The potential for transformation is revealed through Jennifer’s agency and demonstration of a multiculturalism that is capable of providing the basis for change (Sleeter, 1996). This means advancing multicultural education beyond a single teacher’s opportunism by coupling Jennifer’s cultural responsive practices and principles with ideals underpinning liberal and critical multiculturalism to show one way teacher agents in local sites can question exclusionary approaches and, drawing on Sartre (1965) reach out to other activists.
Helen is one such activist who represents authentic, meaningful and relevant actions/interactions and questions and challenges unfair practices.

8.2.3 Helen’s Socially Just Education

Helen presents complex arrangements for responding to students from culturally and linguistically different backgrounds that are oppositional to the strong literacy skills focus in the school where she teaches. She retreats from and in fact disparages the explicit skills emphasis when she comments on the importance of context in the teaching of phonics. She calls on memories of past experiences and practices to frame a language rich and academically robust inclusive education.

The culturally and linguistically responsive work Helen has represented is informed by a belief that culturally and linguistically different students know more than they can express in English. As such, much of Helen’s work is based on trust. There was no mention of improving student outcomes. Helen spoke of opportunities where students can excel. Helen is interested in approaches that produce students who learn and are happy with themselves. The view of education that Helen represented does not discard or subordinate deals of recognition, patience, respect and trust associated with liberal multiculturalism and the ethical dimension of education.

A strong connection emerges between her work today and policies, philosophies, methods and approaches that Helen has articulated,
through her actions, to 1) the whole language movement that was influential during the eighties in Australia and 2) immersion principles that she has associated with LOTE professional learnings. She mentions her initial teacher education (in the eighties) and the language rich holistic approach that she experienced at Tambo Primary School. Some thirty or so years later Helen points out that this is “the way I teach my ESL” (F.G.1, p.2). The significant contribution of her Toronto experience to TESOL is revealed in her emphatic statement “I’ve taken that” (Text 3, p.2). This means, drawing on Cambourne and Turbill (2007), that teaching and learning theories and philosophies are more influential in her work than social, economic and political theories driving technical education.

However, the influence of parity of participation (Fraser, 1996) partnered with high expectation and academic achievement is reflected in her socially just equal opportunity agenda. She shows this approach through the mix of methods and participation structures that Gutiérrez (2001) advances as a way of promoting achievement. It is possible that a connection exists between equal opportunity discourses of the Hawke and Keating era and her focus on participation. However, Helen’s work can be connected, more effectively, to her childhood experiences of prejudice and discrimination in a classroom where there was only one acceptable way to demonstrate what she knew and could do. This is evidenced in her watching “to see what clicks” (Text 2, p.17) strategy and her challenges to discriminatory practices like those associated with ‘iffy’ assessments that were discussed previously.
Interestingly, it can be claimed that national interests are better served through Helen’s socially just, ethical, multicultural and inclusive education than through efficiency processes associated with neoliberalism. Helen did not articulate this intention explicitly. However, culturally and linguistically different students learn in an environment that provides for and addresses rigorous learning and multilingual and multicultural respectful relations. As such, it meets both academic achievement and intercultural understanding aspects of current national interests that are situated in the Australian Curriculum (ACARA, 2012). Helen’s use of languages responds to students’ abilities but also meets the nation’s interest in building bi and multilingual capabilities and intercultural understanding.

Helen’s actions suggest that she reads her own work through a fairness lens. The view of education that she reveals is socially just. It incorporates multicultural ideals like reciprocal recognition, hospitality and responsiveness to difference and disadvantage. Integration of these ideals in Helen’s work exceeds offerings from Australia’s relic liberal multiculturalism, as a public policy, for promoting social cohesion (Gunew, 2004). The challenges Helen mounted against institutional arrangements that categorized students shows aspects of critical multiculturalism in her work. Helen did not mention multiculturalism but multicultural discourses are related to her experiences and practices at different times and across different place. Time and place emerge as significant influences and these influences are shared by Grace.
8.2.4 Grace’s Ethical Education

Grace uses dialogical processes to accommodate difference by allowing for variation in ideas and opinions. She uses these variations to unpack different cultural knowledges of a topic and their expression. Grace makes the point that “this sort of thing takes time” (Text 4, p.9). Virtue ethics are strongly present. Patience, wisdom, integrity, respect, equality, justice, fairness, care, dignity, empathy underpin her work as she helps students associate what they know in one cultural and linguistic context with the same or similar knowledge in another. Embedded in these processes is the reciprocal recognition principle of listening to and learning from one another.

Learning, from her perspective, is best positioned in events and environments that are ‘relevant’ to students. Grace related these key features of her work to the challenges teachers faced in the seventies. She disclosed connections between the learning and teaching approaches she uses today and early articulations of Australia’s multiculturalism. Grassby, in his 1973 address A Multicultural Society for the Future, challenged schools to “provide a curriculum that is culturally and linguistically relevant” (p.8). In the same presentation he also reported on the progress of “mother tongue projects” (p.9) that would be trialled, in a Melbourne school. At the same time he reinforced the importance of “practical forms of social interactions” (ibid.) designed to alleviate isolation. Grace engaged in these activities in the seventies and their legacy is present in her current practices – relevant environments, bi and multilingualism and dialogical processes that...
underpin Grace’s perception of the classroom as a social system. The relational rather than celebratory multiculturalism she has invested in is captured in her assertion that learning in multicultural classroom relies on members of the social system “opening their minds to learning from one another” (Text 4, p.9). The way in which Grace has positioned her work meets national social order and economic growth interests without resorting to the reification of students and their teachers.

However, Grace’s retreat from speaking out about indoctrination of staff and prejudicial and discriminatory acts suggests that the ethic of courage has not been called on as yet. Ava, on the other hand has the freedom to speak and act in ways that are not always in accordance with institutional arrangements.

8.2.5 Ava’s Participatory Education

Ava’s work is an expression of her local, national and global experiences of teaching in culturally and linguistically diverse contexts and her observations of acute inequality. A strong commitment equal participation means that Ava views authorised practices through the equal participation lens. Change are made to institutional arrangements and demonstrated through recognition of worth of culturally and linguistically different students. This is in accord with Fraser’s (1996) proposal for assessing “the justice of institutional arrangements” and “the patterns of interpretation and evaluation” (p.40) that she suggests destabilise/disavow possibilities for equal treatment.
This explains why Ava retreats from institutional arrangements like on-demand testing and dispenses with across year authorised learning events if they do not match what she knows about her students. By projecting an equal recognition of worth view Ava demonstrates innovation in syllabus and shows ways of situating students in positive pedagogical relations. The difference between Ava’s articulation of learning and improved performance and the technical orientation is that opportunities to learn are enriched and extended beyond a single focus and involve learners working in and through multiple participation structures.

Ava’s work engages with early liberal multiculturalism’s equality of opportunity and critical multiculturalism’s agency principle. In doing so, Ava’s work touches on but does not address disadvantage and structural inequality beyond changing classroom practices and resisting the school’s institutional arrangements. In that respect, improving student outcomes, driven performativity discourses, are strongly present.

8.2.6 Horizons of Understanding

Rich and robust expressions of professional education imbued with interculturalism, liberal, emancipatory and critical multiculturalism, social justice principles and ethics have not been at the expense of students’ knowledges and understandings or teachers’ professional learning. Accounting for practice that is fair, equal and just has meant making connections between current practices and personal histories —
particularly memories of prior personal and professional experiences. Green and Cormack (2008) suggest, with respect to ‘innovation’ in New English (1906), that borrowings from different educational discourses informed the new approach. A similar claim can be made with regards to the mix of discourses these teachers have shown to be present in professional education.

The representations of teachers participating in this research reveal the presence of discourses speaking to equality, fairness, academic achievement, ethics, recognition, participation, relatedness, interculturalism, multiculturalism and social justice to show a broader and more dynamic view of education and multiculturalism than is currently present in education policies and implementation approaches and texts.

National interests are well served through approaches to education that have been mediated, to different degrees through multiculturalism. Rather than being driven by national interests these teachers’ privilege respectful relations, academic excellence and parity of participation and in doing so reveal interculturalism, multiculturalisms, and ethics that are compatible with learner-centred education theories and philosophies. Instead of producing conforming subjects, these teachers showed that they were interested in opening students learning so that they could see things from different perspectives. They did not mention improving student outcomes but rather spoke of opportunities for students to 1) excel (Helen); 2) reveal themselves as knowledgeable and able
(Jennifer); 3) see things from everyone’s perspectives (Ava); 4) opening their minds to learning from one another (Grace) and 5) contribute to the linguistic resources available for use in the classroom (Helen, Grace).

Coupling of interculturalism with multiculturalism advances and strengthens the national interest. Interculturalism offers a place for dialogue that exceeds liberal multiculturalism’s co-existence focus (Meer and Modood, 2012). Missing from this learner-centred ethical intercultural/multicultural education are substantial responses to disadvantage and inequality beyond learning events. A shift from isolated demonstrations of cultural responsivity to broader conversations about practices and critique is required to uncover critical understandings of disadvantage, inequality and learning.

Critical multiculturalism can be used to illuminate and address prejudice, discrimination and disadvantage and “challenge inequality” (May & Sleeter, 2010). Such resources will be considered in Chapter 9 for their capacity to advance teachers’ expressions of education and multiculturalism to more transformative ones (ibid.).

8.3 Towards Transformative Education

8.3.1 Stepping Stones Towards Lucinda’s Transformative Education

An outcome of curriculum innovation at Jamieson Secondary College was that possibilities that existed previously became visible. Lucinda suddenly saw herself as ill prepared for working in a multicultural school and community. In describing her practice as “fraudulent” (Text 6) in
relation to the multicultural composition of classrooms Lucinda learnt Bahasa Indonesian. The reaction of the class to a conversation between teacher and students learners – dead silence – followed by exuberance was not only due to the fact that Lucinda could speak Bahasa Indonesian but that she was a learner too. When she extended her hand and received in return the hands of others (Heidegger, 1976) she stood face to face “recognising that the Other” (Kostogriz and Doecke, 2007, p.16) brings me “more than I can fully comprehend” (ibid.). In this place there is no need to appropriate what others have but rather to respond to “the surplus of seeing that the Other brings to a dialogue with me” (ibid).

Achieving culturally responsive practices requires a shift in recognition. Not only is recognition of the Other required but also recognition of ourselves as Other through coming to know “the foreigner within us” (Kristeva, 1991, p.1). In this place there is no exclusion because there is no Other. Lucinda’s shift in recognition reveals a dwelling place where people equal in dialogue and negotiation with one another come to understand.

Underpinning this demonstration is Asia Literacy that was used to facilitate the expansion of curriculum. The school repositioned itself in terms of teaching languages — English, Italian and Mandarin. Lucinda’s revelation that the innovations created a “buzz” about learning languages shows that Asia Literacy is related to shifts in Lucinda’s mode of existence. Asia Literacy discourses, drawing on Heidegger (2005),
prompted Lucinda’s curiosity and raised her awareness of possibilities. Within the milieu of excitement about languages and learning from one another, Lucinda was presented with a different image of education and multiculturalism. It is not about learning the languages of others but rather finding ways to enter into meaningful dialogical engagements with and amongst the different people we co-exist with. Languages are the place where Lucinda reflected on and changed her view of what it means to be and become a teacher in this globalised and mobile world. Lucinda’s expression of Dasein as a particular professional being reflects her experiences in relation to institution (place) and the historical formation of institutional practices (in a new time).

8.3.2 Discourses and Teaching Practice

The specifics that set this work apart cannot be accurately described. Lucinda has expressed her experiences quite clearly but they are loaded with multiple energies. One of the reasons for this is the presence of different discourses. Lucinda knew and responded to demands for academic achievement (performativity) and showed positive relations with a disenfranchised culturally and linguistically different student (relatedness). Her new language focus reflects, in part, changes to institutional relations aimed at providing students with skills to learn how to relate to and communicate with people across cultures (interculturalism and Asia Literacy).

The nation’s interest in engagements in Asia on economic and geopolitical matters places Asia Literacy in the national interest. Benefits for
Australia depend on how Australia enters into these engagements. According to the Asia Education Foundation (2011) “Asia literacy, provides our young people with a competitive edge in today’s world and contributes to our national advantage” (p.1). This means schools are charged with producing Asia literate subjects who can advance Australia’s place in the Asia Pacific region. Asia Literacy is in the national interest but from Lucinda’s standpoint it prompted her curiosity and awareness and provided a place from which she could see exactly where she was standing (Smith, 2001). With the heightened awareness that circumspection brings she saw new possibilities. Through her response to her self-reflections she showed her authentic self and an expanded vision of the community she served that reflect the influence of alternative discourses that are a part of the schools reform process.

8.4 Conclusion: Contributions and Concealments

8.4.1 Education and Multiculturalism

Although significant resources have been directed towards ameliorating inequality in education the Council of Australian Governments’ Reform (COAG) Findings (2013) suggest the improvements that were anticipated through the current reform agendas have not been realised. This evaluation of student progress from 2008 to 12 showed “little improvement in the proportion of students, achieving the minimum standards” nationally (p.8). Indigenous students and those from low socio-economic backgrounds that include substantial numbers of culturally and linguistically different students remain at risk.
Disappointing outcomes have been confirmed more recently by Russell (in Smith, *Sydney Morning Herald*, 5 August 2015), who, on behalf of ACARA, acknowledged that anticipated outcomes had not been met. The findings suggest that the current skills instruction, testing and gap filling interventions has done little to ameliorate disadvantage.

One problem is that discourses of performativity, conformity, cultural conservation, and the *nation’s* attachments to domination and subordination processes conceal the discriminatory nature of the technical approach to the production of economic performing English speaking and socially conforming citizens. In this process, students’ experiences that they bring to learning and the knowledge, understandings and practices they can use to learn are concealed.

A group of teachers who demonstrated approaches imbued with intercultural, multicultural, socially just and ethical principles and ideals understand their obligations to respond to students and what they bring to learning and use to learn. However, their challenges to discriminatory practices were deflected and their agency was (with one exception) contained to their classrooms where they were safe from institutional surveillance.

Key policy documents that reinforce the importance of languages and culture (MCEETYA, 2005) are overlooked and wider issues related to lived experiences, disadvantage and educational inequality are concealed. The principles teachers demonstrated did not carry the
breadths of transformative and emancipatory ideals that can be used to
link challenges to disadvantage and inequality to changes to education
and pedagogy that critical multicultural offers.

8.4.2 Redefining Education

Thomson (2001) has suggested that the problem is that education has
been so obscured [that it] is now in danger of being forgotten” (p.245).
This happens when metaphysics determines what education is in
different historical ontological epochs (ibid.).

The former Minister of Education Peter Garrett (2012) asked questions
of an education that is grounded in teaching to ‘the test’. Educators and
parents have raised concerns about the impact of this approach on
students and teacher wellbeing (Dufler, Rice & Polesel, 2013). The
majority of teachers in this study reject, where they can, practices that
exclude culturally and linguistically different students. Van Dijk (1993)
points out that we are all subject to exertion of power. But what is the
power that conceals who we are and what we do? Heidegger (1977),
some forty or so years ago, communicated his grave concerns with
\textit{technicity} - the essence of modern technology in education.

Thomson (2001), drawing on Nietzsche’s onto-theology, makes the
claim that an incursion into education, like the instrumental one causes
us “to transform all beings, ourselves included, into mere resources”
(p.249). In this historic epoch, quality in learning is accounted for
through quantification of, for example, work samples (ibid.). Professional
knowledge is replaced by professionalisation as teachers are schooled in how to collect, use and interpret data. Technical practices conceal students as their needs are replaced by those that data suggest should be attended to.

Ontological perspectives on education that a number of teachers have disclosed challenge technologisation. Indeed, ontological freedom in Thomson’s (2001) view is revealed through “an attentive and responsive way of dwelling in one’s environment” (p.256). Teachers in this project have shown, to different degrees, attentive and culturally responsive practices prompted by experiences and practices across time and in different places. Aspirations for culturally responsive practice confront, as we have seen, an education constituted in, ‘pos-ure’ (Ge-Sull), the “essence of technicity” (Heidegger, 1966). In this place, teachers and school leaders who accept, for instance, discrimination in the quest for data have shown how we are “posed, enjoined and challenged by a power that becomes manifest in the essence of technicity” (p.8) — a power over which we have no control.

Teachers have shown that they have not been consumed by the essence of technicity. The valuable contributions of teachers in this study cannot be dismissed as they show some of the ways this power has been mediated without thwarting either academic achievement and national interests.
8.5 Generative Conclusion

Principles and ideals, particularly, respectful dialogical reciprocal relations were demonstrated in the professional approach compared to their absence in technical/instrumental education. One of the reasons for this was the interest of teachers in integrating languages and cultural knowledges in robust learning compared to the neglect of these in the technical response. National interests were well served through the professional approach.

Irrespective of whether teachers approached their work from technical or professional directions there were instances where the abilities and attributes culturally and linguistically different students brought to learning and used to learn were denied.

Prejudicial and discriminatory processes and practices were not always recognised. Gaps appeared to exist in teachers’ professional knowledge and limits to understanding exist with regards to teaching in schools where culturally and linguistically different students are enrolled. Some teachers were either unaware of or uncertain about what to do about disadvantages students bring to learning and the sociocultural resources they use to learn. This suggests that teachers have turned away from the essence of their primordial self (Heidegger, 2005). The challenge teachers’ face is holding on to the essence of their authenticity when they are caught in everyday existence.

An alternative articulation of metaphysics can change what education is. Discourses that speak of cultural and linguistic responsivity emerged as important in changing actions and interactions. The significant contributions teachers and teacher educators have made to a relationally informed culturally responsive practice presents an alternative (Heidegger, 2005). However impediments to culturally responsive pedagogies must be cleared away before teachers can respond authentically to culturally and linguistically different students.
9 A CRITICAL RESPONSE TO INEQUALITY

Introduction

In this Chapter, I 1) outline four features of teaching practice that act as barriers to inclusion; 2) present the problems that must be interrogated; 3) approach each problem using a logic governed process; 4) consider the advantages for students and/or teachers if the problems could be ameliorated or eliminated; 5) advance and promote criteria that can be used to evaluate whether or not changes can be counted as effective and 6) illuminate the resources that are needed to support a change agenda. In doing so, I demonstrate one way of settling culturally responsive teachers in multicultural classrooms.

Accompanying this is a response to a key question as to whether an alternative to the current framework exists and, if so, whether it is capable of ameliorating disadvantage.

In the final part I explore my research journey as I consider the usefulness of the theoretical framework, consider the contributions and limitations of the methodology and discuss areas for future research.

9.1 Concealments in Teachers’ Work

9.1.1 Prejudicial and Discriminatory Acts

Eve showed the effects of testing and classification of students based on test results, when she associated labelling and classification with atrocious behaviour. She called on the ethic of care and gave voice to
the methods she used to placate the student who, she believed knew”
that he was “not good at something” (F.G 2, p.4). She did not sustain
her objections to categorisation or move to change institutional
arrangements. Low-performing students were confined to the ‘needy’
group. Apart from Eve’s sighting of discrimination, teachers practising
through the work process did not see categorisation of students as
deficit subjects and skills based remediation as prejudicial and
discriminatory. Remediation and refinement were not recognised as acts
of discipline.

9.1.2 **Challenges to Prejudice and Discrimination**

Helen recognised the prejudicial and discriminatory nature of arbitrary
assessments of students’ work. She objected to the assignment of
contested values on records of achievement. Her challenges to these
practices were dismissed, by leaders who gave normative explanations
for their acceptance of ‘iffy’ results. These show that prejudice and
discrimination, were overwhelmingly accepted and are normalised in
institutions.

Helen did not show knowledge of the breadth of contemporary
resources that she could use to support her arguments. This suggests
that Helen was unaware of existing policy documents that call for
qualitative as well as quantified evidence. Helen did not have a critical
lens or associated discourses to effectively challenge prejudice,
discrimination and racism.
9.1.3 Denial of Sociocultural Resources

Opportunities for culturally and linguistically different students to use the resources they had at hand were not universally adopted. Jennifer’s demonstration of responsiveness to cultural practices was opportunistic rather than routine. All of the teachers in this study were cognisant of the unwritten “No, it’s, English only” rule (Text 5). Only one teacher upheld this rule. Several teachers demonstrated a relaxed stance on enforcement and “let them” use other languages (Text 3, 5, 7, 8) but it was always within set limits. Culturally and linguistically different students did not have the same rights as English speaking students to use the sociocultural resources they used to learn. There was no indication that teachers found the exclusion of other languages and cultural practices unacceptable in places where culturally and linguistically students go to learn.

9.1.4 Retreat from Addressing Disadvantage and Inequality

Ava and Lucinda knew of students’ life experiences (pp.268-270) but neither teacher ventured into broader debates about disadvantage and inequality. When a disenfranchised student revealed his experiences of social inequality to Lucinda its significance was not interrogated beyond the learning event. This challenge is one that most teachers in this study are yet to take up. Experiences of disadvantage that students brought to learning and issues related to structural inequality, more broadly, were routinely ignored or overlooked.
Discriminatory practices and processes like these emanate, in May & Sleeter’s (2010) view, from “longstanding racialized institutional policies and practices that consistently disadvantage minority students” (p.3). Discourses that are used to maintain cultural domination reflect the strong influence of the monolingual and mono-cultural emphases that the nation strenuously maintains. These are demonstrated in classrooms when attempts are made to eradicate, stigmatise and/or silence languages and cultures (Phillipson, 2013). The problem is that processes and practices designed to maintain privilege hides the being of students and conceals the value of the things students use to learn.

A solution to exclusion lies in revealing these impediments to culturally and linguistically responsive practice and inviting teachers, schools and communities to participate in broader conversations about learning in multicultural classrooms. Only then can an alternative to the current framework be advanced as one that is capable of addressing disadvantage and ameliorating inequality.

Four problems that must be addressed are now presented.

1. Practices like labelling students as deficient and subsequent processes that separate, remediate and refine and deny students their right to rich and robust learning were not routinely recognised as prejudicial and discriminatory.

2. Challenges to discriminatory practices were ineffective because teachers were unaware of critical responses to disadvantage and injustice. When they tried to challenge unfair practices they faced the power of existing discourses. In the absence of their knowledge
of oppositional or alternate ones, they were unable to mount successful challenges.

3. Experience of disadvantage that students brought to learning and issues related to inequality, more broadly, were rarely interrogated.

4. Processes and practices designed to maintain privilege concealed the value of the things students used to learn.

9.2 Limits to Vision

9.2.1 Discipline and Punish

The problem that is addressed here is the limits to vision that some teachers disclosed with regards to processes and practices that discriminate. Eve, for example, expressed her opposition to grouping students based on test results. She called on the ethic of care to placate the child who she believed, realised, that he was not good at something. The problem is that the ethic of care response the teacher applied to this situation was designed to help the child feel better. Eve did not advocate for changes to discriminatory institutional arrangements that excluded affected children from the breadths of learning. This shows how prejudice, discrimination and dehumanisation associated with closing the gap activities can be covered over. Limits to vision like this enable a discipline and punish culture to flourish. It is sustained by discourses of performativity that reinforce the importance of improved outcomes and conformity and cultural conservation ones that place limits around how students can speak and act.
The discipline that I refer to here is ‘training’ that students are subjected to through remediation and refinement. It responds to failures of students to participate satisfactorily in normative performances that many students are not ready for. Classification, categorisation and labelling students as ones with deficits, deficiencies and/or deviances contribute to their alienation and dehumanisation. Test scores and other quantified tasks, used to inform instruction show the exercise of power when these are used to separate, remediate and refine.

Prejudicial and discriminatory practices associated with discipline and punishment cultures were not routinely challenged. A process for addressing the problem of non-recognition of prejudicial and discriminatory processes and practices is set out in Table 21. The problem to be addressed is identified, the benefits for students are set out and anticipated outcomes presented. Questioning of the problem discloses the resources that are needed to bring about change.
Table 21: Discipline and Punish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Benefits for Students</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcomes</th>
<th>Essential Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What would happen if the effects of prejudicial and discriminatory processes and practices could be brought out of concealment?</td>
<td>Classification of students as deficit and deviant subjects would be removed.</td>
<td>Immediate Changes to the structure and sequencing of learning events,</td>
<td>A critical discourse that 1) shows prejudice and discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students no longer classified as deficit or deviant would be recognised as able and successful learners.</td>
<td>Less representation in school discipline systems,</td>
<td>2) makes connections between the closing the gap approach and discourses promoting economic competitiveness and cultural conservation to show effects on pedagogical relations and learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching practice directed to strengths means students can show what they can do.</td>
<td>School leadership opportunities,</td>
<td>3) a pedagogical response that responds to disadvantage in a different way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved learning outcomes and expanded options in and beyond school education</td>
<td>Long Term Improved participation in and beyond school based education And disenfranchisement mediated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two assets, a critical discourse and pedagogical response are advanced as a way of responding to the discipline and punish culture by 1) giving participants in learning a voice and 2) encouraging teachers to research and examine different ways of responding to culturally and linguistically different students. It is important because such a response engages with relations of power complicit in placing limits on social, economic, education and political participation (Fraser, 1996; May & Sleeter, 2010).
9.2.2 **Teachers’ Discourses**

The second problem that emerged was the absence of a discourse that teachers could use for responding effectively to prejudice, discrimination and racism. Helen (Text 2) questioned the usefulness of ‘iffy’ values assigned to assessment tasks that were used to place students in hierarchically organised groups. The fairness lens that Helen cast over the “iffy” decisions shows the refutable value of quantification. She challenged the validity of results but the iffy decisions remained as leaders said it would “always be like this” (p.14). She could not effectively voice her opposition even though resources are available that support inclusive pedagogical practices and emphasise qualitative assessments. The task of the problem solving strategy is to identify the tools that are available and that can be used to help teachers move from their own analyses of practices to successful challenges. One approach to identifying essential resources is shown in Table 22.

**Table 22: Teachers’ Discourses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Benefits for Teachers and Students</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcomes</th>
<th>Essential Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What would happen if teachers (among others) had a <strong>powerful language</strong> for talking about, challenging and changing the conditions of their practice?</td>
<td>Teachers would be able to challenge unjust practices effectively. Teaching practice would be articulated to student’s strengths. Teachers would have a broader text base on which to develop their practices.</td>
<td>changes to assessment procedures, alignment of learning and assessment, move from didactic to responsive co-operative learning, happy and successful students</td>
<td><strong>Action Research and Critical discourses</strong> provide teachers with knowledge to use in staff meetings and classrooms that teachers can use to view processes and practices including their own.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Action research associated with problem solving is one way of engaging teachers with breadths of literature that support inquiry.

9.2.3 Using Students' Sociocultural Resources

While the majority of teachers showed notions of multiculturalism and associated with them, theories of learning and demonstrated layered, multifaceted student-centred dialogical processes in their practice, these demonstrations were rarely free from destabilising influences. Coherent pedagogies were in use but most of these were articulated to professional histories spanning three and four decades or more.

A review of the Victorian Department of Education and Early Childhood Development’s professional learning site revealed the department’s strong commitment to advancing professional learning and curriculum development initiatives using student-centred theoretical propositions for supporting teaching and learning. Apart from Ava’s (Text 8) call-up (and adaption) of the e5 Instruction Model (DEECD, 2009a), Lucinda’s adoption of personalised learning (MCEETYA, 2008) and Layla’s dialogical approach (International Baccalaureate, n.d.) silence on literature attesting to the value of alternative methods was overwhelming. If this body of knowledge could be illuminated and reinforced teachers would have coherent framework for responding

culturally and linguistically to the multicultural composition of their classrooms. One approach to solving the problem of non-recognition of the value of cultural and linguistic resources is set out in Table 23.

Table 23: Using Students’ Sociocultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Benefits for Students</th>
<th>Anticipated Outcomes</th>
<th>Essential Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What would happen if — the value of sociocultural resources could be revealed?</td>
<td>Students use the sociocultural resources to connect to new learning,</td>
<td>Participating in learning shows their strengths and students emerge as experts.</td>
<td>Existing policy and implementation resources are needed that show the relation between theories of learning and culturally responsive pedagogy. Professional learning opportunities link teacher education and on-going professional learning in/with communities to classroom practice. Local sites are promoted where teachers demonstrate culturally responsive pedagogy in practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They participate using the things they use to learn.</td>
<td>Students use their resources to learn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogical processes and scaffolding support meaning-making and learning.</td>
<td>Variations among the experiences, opinions and beliefs are accepted and people retreat from homogenous representations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A student centred learning culture is situated in a rich and robust hospitable environment,</td>
<td>Teachers shift from talking about bureaucratic processes to discussions and demonstrations of pedagogy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students have a voice,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life experiences are understood and responded to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Central to solving the problem of sightlessness with regard to students and the resources they use to learn, is deploying a culturally responsive pedagogy. It would, as teachers in this inquiry have shown, give equal voice to students and teachers. One of the problems associated with
advancing culturally responsive pedagogy is the limited understanding teachers have with regard to their responsibility for responding to the breadth of experiences culturally and linguistically different students bring to learning. With this information in hand a teacher can raise and debate school and classroom practices and wider relations.

9.2.4 Responsibility to Students and Experiences Brought to Learning

Lucinda faced a defiant and disenfranchised student. She showed that she could respond to his detachment and literacy needs by changing participation structures. Responsibility for the student's learning is demonstrated but disadvantage and broader issues related to inequality were not addressed. The significance of disadvantage has, in Heidegger’s estimation, most likely been forgotten. This is why questions were not asked about relations between the efficacy of practice, defiance and disadvantage. Table 24 is used to question teachers’ responsibility to students and the disadvantage many bring to learning. I ask: What are the benefits for students if this barrier could be eliminated? What will be achieved? What is needed to dismantle the way teachers think about social, economic, educational and political disadvantage?
Critical multiculturalism offers a powerful discourse that can be used to examine, analyse and respond to relations of power. It gives “priority to structural analysis of unequal power relationships, analysing the role of institutionalized inequalities, including but not necessarily limited to racism” (May & Sleeter, 2010, p.10). A critical multicultural lens cast over the disenfranchised students' circumstances (Figure 24) would disclose a history of denial of this young man’s circumstances. Analysis
using critical multiculturalism can be employed to show “how unequal power relations, lived out in daily interactions, contribute towards its production” (May and Sleeter, 2010, p.10).

Some teachers in Australia have been introduced to:

dialogic processes in which the teacher, acting as a partner with students, helps them to examine the world critically and politically, using a problem-posing process that begins with their own experiences and historical location (May & Sleeter, 2010, p.9).

It offers a starting point for critical analysis and supports questioning the sociocultural, economic and political contexts of learning. By addressing disadvantage and inequality in and through education students and teachers learn to be critical analysts. Critical multiculturalism and culturally responsive pedagogies together offer a way of tackling the creation and maintenance of structural inequalities that must be addressed if educational inequality is to be ameliorated.

9.3 A Proposal

Teachers participating in this research used different lenses through which to create, view and evaluate the learning events they planned and participated in. Efficiency, performance, ethics, culture, knowledge, language, multiculturalism, cognition, organisation, fairness and social justice were some of the perspectives that teachers employed to read their teaching practice. But they did not routinely appear in combination with each other — there was no critical edge so things were missed.
The solution lies in showing the problems in full relief. With awareness and sight questions that are not asked and meanings that are not assigned to the being of entities can be brought out of concealment (Heidegger, 2005). This means showing the impediments to learning associated with each of the problems and responding to them.

This research can, by bringing together theoretical propositions and principles underpinning cultural responsive practice set out in Chapter 2 (theory) and the building blocks of teachers culturally responsive pedagogies of participating teachers (practice) with critical multiculturalism (agency), demonstrate a way teachers can respond to the multicultural conditions of their classrooms. As such, a critical response to inequality is approached from these three perspectives.

9.4 A Critical Response to Inequality

9.4.1 Professional Learning Approach

I have taken, what I will call, a professional learning approach because the most significant challenge in responding to the impediments to inclusion, is creating and maintaining a space where people have the freedom to talk about what it means to be a learner, expert other and teacher in multicultural classrooms. The professional learning approach presented here targets whole school communities because it is not possible for a school to talk about its work, as responsive to the communities it serves, without equal representation. Such a strategy must stretch across time and place because schools cannot be the only location where such conversations can take place. It is in dialogical and
analytic processes, developed across time and in different places that an alternative to the current framework will emerge. Only then can teachers settle responsively in multicultural classrooms.

Teachers, for their part, would be invited to examine their own learning events using critical templates to show how their practices respond to the multicultural composition of their classrooms. Teachers will be encouraged to reflect on the places where their work can be enriched. Each of the analytical tools that I have used to construct this template have been categorised according to their relation to knowledge, practice and engagement, the three pillars used to organise the National Professional Standards for Teachers (AITSL, 2011). Table 25 sets out theoretical contributions from culturally responsive pedagogies (blue), practical applications (green) and critical multicultural principles (red) that can be used by teachers to reflect on individual learning events. These are not exclusive of other contributions. Teachers would not, necessarily, apply all of the indicators at the same time. Schools, participating in ongoing collaborative learning could select how they would stage this critical learning and choose the perspectives they want to concentrate on at different stages of analysis and inquiry.
Table 25: Critical Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culturally responsive teachers know</strong></td>
<td><strong>Culturally responsive teachers</strong></td>
<td><strong>Culturally responsive teachers engage</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“culture and identity […] as multilayered, fluid, complex and encompassing multiple social categories, and at the same time being continually reconstructed through participation in social situations” (May &amp; Sleeter, 2010, p. 10).</td>
<td>assign value to languages and cultural practices; position students as knowledgeable and promote their expert status</td>
<td>in real dialogue in multicultural communities involves reciprocal relations – learning a language is one to show relatedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the lived experiences people bring to learning and the cultural and linguistic resources they use to learn (Gutiérrez, Sleeter, 2012)</td>
<td>enter into professional engagement with and between students, teachers, families, communities and teacher educators (Comber &amp; Nixon, 2009).</td>
<td>with cultural diversity knowing it is the norm in Australian classrooms (Rizvi, 2011); with students’ experiences of disadvantage and in their communities to understand wider expressions of inequality (May &amp; Sleeter, 2012).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Practices</th>
<th>Engagement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>practice is informed by what each teacher is able to find out about each student (Doecke et al, 2010).</td>
<td>accept responsibility for creating relevant learning for culturally and linguistically different students (see Grassby, 1974)</td>
<td>ethically through the welcome extended to students and sustained in ethical relationships (Kostogriz &amp; Doecke, 2007; Kostogriz, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>equality expressed through face to face engagements (in the</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>in and sustain existing multilingual and multicultural practices at the same time</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
third space) is the site of transformation (Kostogriz, 2007; Gutiérrez, 2008) variations as students learn other ones (Paris, 2012).

and use all the domains dimensions of learning (Darling-Hammond & Snyder 2000). build resource rich participatory environments (Gutiérrez, 2001);
integrate English language education with topic/content;

learning how to teach in multicultural classrooms requires a unique approach (Mansouri & Jenkins, 2010) “should not set the limits of ethnicity and culture, nor act to undermine the legitimacy of other, equally valid forms of identity”(May & Sleeter, 2012, p. 10)

accept the role of agent in the struggle for understanding structures that produce and maintain inequality to reach a place of equality where Others are no longer other (Sleeter, 2012b, 1995). challenge injustice; “structural analysis of unequal relations of power” (ibid.) in critical analysis and “approach analysis of oppression from multiple standpoints” our own and others (ibid.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Multiculturalism</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers Culturally Responsive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principles Underpinning Culturally Responsive Practice</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application of the resources set out in the template is designed to show up features of practice that exemplify inclusion and illuminate those aspects worthy of reflection, investigation, action research and change. Using these resources as tools for examining learning events teachers, are invited to participate in a broader conversation about pedagogy in
schools where they are employed. Through this process teachers are able to collaboratively construct a critical pedagogical response to disadvantage and inequalities they uncover in the places where they teach.

Applying the template to Jennifer’s enactment that used henna on the student’s hands as an entry point for learning it is possible to illuminate quite quickly the principles underpinning Jennifer’s pedagogy, aspects worthy of examination and places where teachers can reflect on what else might be done.

9.4.2 Analytical Description of a Learning Event

There is no sense that Jennifer will dismiss henna on her young student’s hands. It is clear that she did not put limits on expressions of “culture, gender, ethnicity and identity” (May & Sleeter, 2010, p.11). Cultural presences are not trivialised but Jennifer affirms the child’s cultural identity and uses the cultural presence as a starting point for learning (Sleeter, 2011). Hospitality is demonstrated and Jennifer gives students a voice (Kostogriz, 2007). The representation shows that Jennifer understands that culturally and linguistically different students bring her “more than [she] can fully comprehend” (p.16).

Chafing: While she discloses her non-expert learner status she does not relinquish full control of the knowledge aspect of the learning event. Trust in expert students to build and use cultural knowledge effectively, is missing (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Sleeter, 1995).
The task for students is to write a report. Cultural knowledges, rigorous learning and high expectations are in play. Acceptance of the role of agent in the struggle for inclusion is demonstrated through engagement with the community. The benefits of this outreach show relatedness that brings with it the potential for analysis with wider expressions of inequality (May & Sleeter, 2012).

Chafing: Institutional processes that create and maintain inequality are not addressed (Sleeter, 2010; 1996). She knows that the report the students produced is not valued in the same way as the ticks on the spreadsheet. Her marginalisation in the school is apparent in her comment “I just thought to myself” that the school was setting students up to fail when she saw the PAT Tests students were made to do.

Unequal relations of power emerge between cultures — the English performing culture and community cultures. Jennifer’s decision to publish was one way that she could communicate to the school and community the value of the work culturally and linguistically different students do. In this respect the report represents a challenge to injustice. She does not retreat from questioning prejudicial and discriminatory practices but the next step that of articulating challenges has not been taken.

Broadening the Experience: ‘Dwelling’ in the community is one way that Jennifer can come to better understand different ways of living, thinking, knowing and doing so that she can move from opportunistic responses to more sustained culturally and linguistically responsive approaches to disadvantage and inequality.

Structural analyses of institutional processes that create and maintain inequality were not addressed. The “institutionalisation of unequal relations of power” (May & Sleeter, 2010, p.10) is able to show the impact of these “daily interactions” on the being and becoming of the students who live with and in them. By moving from individual
experiences of powerlessness to confronting wider structural impediments to justice and equality, learning becomes one of educating students and teachers for understanding that includes “the struggle against oppression that others of us face” (ibid.). Adoption of culturally responsive practice and critical multiculturalism is not without challenges.

9.4.3 Adoption of Critical Culturally Responsive Pedagogies

Critical multiculturalism rests on a number of principles that teachers may well find challenging. Indeed, May and Sleeter (2010) acknowledge that teachers are likely to “struggle with critical multiculturalism” (p.10). One of the reasons for this is that teachers do not easily connect the robust and rigorous work they already do with “analysis of oppression” (ibid.) Lucinda and Eve, for example, were presented with typical expressions of disadvantage - defiant students who did atrocious things. Seeing experiences such as these as a starting point for the analysis of oppression is difficult because as Gillborn (1990) points out “institutional racism can operate through the normal workings of the system” (p.9). Rules, regulations, procedures and practices “can have the effect of discriminating against members of an ethnic group” (ibid.). In making this assertion Gillborn shows that existing rules, regulations, procedures and practices must be subjected to systematic interrogation.

9.5 Conclusion

This research asked if an alternative to the current framework exists and, if so, whether it is capable of ameliorating disadvantage.
Participating teachers have demonstrated a non-prescriptive culturally and linguistically responsive alternative to the current one. Its learner focus and dialogical nature gives voice to all students. Importantly, it is situated in coherent theories of learning that are orientated to each child’s strengths rather than to perceived weaknesses. In that respect, it neither excludes nor discriminates. The skills focus that the current approach favours is not neglected. It is clear that this pedagogy is compatible with the pedagogical positions disclosed by education bureaucracies. It will also engage with national interests better, by addressing educational inequality and promoting stronger respectful relations with people here and in the Asia Pacific than can be achieved through intercultural understanding. Can it ameliorate inequality?

Culturally responsive pedagogies give students an equal voice and their participation in robust learning events ensures that they have meaningful opportunities to learn. It is capable of addressing impediments to learning in local landscapes of practice and accommodates the nation’s interest in ameliorating disadvantage and inequality, improving student performance and broadening linguistic capabilities. This more critical approach is designed to give students, teachers and communities in partnership with each other a voice that can be used in their roles as agents of change.

A significant outcome of this research is a non-prescriptive culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy suited to Australian schools. This disclosure has been realised through the theoretical framework that
enabled engagement with ontological, existential and language and semiotic dimensions of teacher’s work. I have been able to show how the fact of a teacher’s existence is an issue for them in responding to the multicultural composition of their classrooms, the bearing (or not) of people and institutions on teachers’ working lives and illuminate the way discourses can conceal and or prompt attention to the conditions present in multicultural classrooms.

I was limited in what I could see as I did not observe teachers in their classrooms nor was I able to talk with teachers, team leaders and school principals. This presents a limitation to this project. For example, Eve’s representation of her practice revealed a rigid norm governed standardised practice that was driven by management and accountability texts. This teacher showed the neoliberal discourse when she articulated management and accountability agendas as she set up processes and procedures for measurement of student performance. However, there were instances, drawing on Noddings (2010), when Eve revealed care of students, and concern for student wellbeing. In doing so, ethical responses emerged as important. Spending time in a teacher’s classroom would have provided significant opportunities to see and questions how management and accountability agendas can be mediated by virtue of the presence of ethics.

Even though teachers provided comprehensive representations of practice I have noted (Chapter 6) that in some instances descriptions
lacked details so it was not possible to imagine how, for example, cross and multilingual engagements actually worked.

Observations and questions such as these prompt future engagement. Lucinda, for example showed how the Asia Literacy discourse and internationalisation prompted excitement and curiosity amongst students and teachers. In a moment of recognition, Lucinda related her shift from everydayness to authenticity to “the buzz about languages”. I would be interested to know more about conditions that prompt curiosity and awareness that enable teachers to see the conditions of their practice in a new light. Associated with that, I have presented a professional learning strategy that uses theory, practice and agency as lenses through which teachers can view their work. I believe the strategy is capable of drawing out concealments. Application of the critical lenses I have constructed provide a resource that I can contribute professional learning and teachers can use to view their work. These are the directions that my future research will take.
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APPENDICIES

APPENDIX 1: ANALYSIS OF EVE’S RESEARCH DATA

I’ve never gone to nursery grade. I have no connections with those sort of teachings. From Year 12 I was dropped down to Prep level for teaching (F.G. 2, p. 3). My principal she just said I need these kids to be confident. My Mum used to say […] if nuns taught me […] I would learn good English. These parents […] expect[ed] an Australian to teach better than me (F. G., 1, p.4). So I’ve gone for English communication (ibid.). Remember that kid Zahria. She couldn’t speak a word of English. She always spoke Arabic. […] Charbel will translate in English. Every time he translates he gets 20 house points (F.G. 2, p.9).

Level meetings — we clarify what’s expected on the week’s plan (FG 2, p.3). We look at the term planner - the guideline for us and [Year 1 teachers] decide if we’re going to stick — or do we need to extend [time]. Say trying to get a particular skill of the kids (ibid.). So if it’s a narrative, how long do we need to work on that? Because […] if it’s Grade 2 then I’m preparing the Grade 2s for a NAPLAN or preparing them for future. Although story writing doesn’t play a very important role, […] the structure matters (p.4). NAPLAN is basically our feeder and […] we look at the spreadsheet. The indicators are put in and we have the kids’ names, by group. It will say clearly whether the child has achieved the skill of not. I look at the levels — what are the needs of the kids
[Professional Learning Teams] decide these are the areas we need to focus on. At a school level the Annual Implementation Plan will give us [...] expected school targets. Based on that, we plan we will decide (p.4). We have something called differentiated groups (p.7). It’s come out of the assessments. [...] We group them accordingly (ibid) - although initially I was all for it, I was very much against it because I’m actually dividing the groups - that you’re not good at something (F.G. 2, p.4). So basically, particular skill three different ways in three different sessions I do it during the whole class focus. Still, if they haven’t got it, they come under that group of ABC and C comes [but] I would actually be talking about the topic that they hadn’t got it (p.8). What I’ve noticed here is that if they’ve lost that confidence or belief in themselves [...] they believe the only way [...] I can get the attention of the teacher is do the atrocious thing (p.13). I started doing a bit of research — which school has got the highest — in this area. The success rate is not proved just one off, but it’s been proved every year... targeting cued articulation (F.G. 1, p.5-6)?

Eve named a suite of texts. These are marked in red. The text chosen for analysis is the term planner. It links classroom practices to trans-local co-ordination through connections to NAPLAN and the Annual Implementation Plan.

Only Eve and Sophia identified texts with the features that Ross and Saunders (2012) suggest are most useful for institutional ethnographic
work. The experiences and practices of other teachers is the text selected for analysis.

**Questioning Term Planner, Processes and Chafing Moments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Term Planner</th>
<th>Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Who or what is implicated in its production?</td>
<td>1) NAPLAN test results, 2) Annual Implementation Plan set targets</td>
<td>accountability school generates the spreadsheet,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What do schools and/or teachers do with the information?</td>
<td>1) teachers generate the <strong>week’s plan</strong> that sets out skills to be taught and how long they will spend, 2) instruct and test in English to prepare students for NAPLAN and the future, 3) check whether (i) &quot;that child’s achieved or not&quot; and (ii) &quot;if they are on the right track&quot;, 4) Eve goes to the highest achieving school in the area to see how cued articulation works and implements it in her school, 5) group students according to results in common assessment tasks and tests 6) create <strong>lists of students of low-performing students</strong> 7)</td>
<td>standardise practice surveillance trans-local co-ordination establishing trans-local relations differentiation (naming) classification categorisation refinement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How is this information embedded in practices of teachers?</td>
<td>Professional Team Meetings e.g. Years P-3), Level Meetings (Year 1) Decisions:- e.g. teach narrative structure e.g. reward English “Charbel gets 20 house points” every time he translates</td>
<td>co-ordination narrowing of curriculum, levelling difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do the processes</td>
<td>production of a text structured work process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Interests and Discourses</td>
<td>Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What interests discourses and/or relations emerge are shown when</td>
<td>efficiency (efficiency and effectiveness)</td>
<td>text-mediated relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) curriculum is narrowed</td>
<td>treating everyone in the same way (liberal equality)</td>
<td>subject agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) practice is standardised</td>
<td>improved student outcomes (performativity)</td>
<td>subordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Eve goes to the highest performing school</td>
<td>national economic interests (performativity)</td>
<td>text-mediated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) students are prepared for NAPLAN and the future</td>
<td>citizenship (conformity)</td>
<td>domination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) difference is levelled</td>
<td>refinement (liberal equality)</td>
<td>inclusion exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) the Principal told Eve that she wanted confident students</td>
<td>good English (cultural conservation)</td>
<td>domination subordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Eve privileges English</td>
<td></td>
<td>imperialism colonisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How are discourses related to social change?</td>
<td>production of skilled human capital (employability)</td>
<td>economic relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“preparing them for the future”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do discourses achieve?</td>
<td>system for production of economic subjects for post-industrial economies, conflict between discourses of performativity and cultural conservation and national interests</td>
<td>exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questioning Existence - Chafing Moments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>What do chafing moments reveal?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eve's concern about labelling and classification - “you’re not good at something”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>care triggers emergence from everyday existence recognition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>How does a teacher respond to disclosures?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;initially I was all for it, I was very much against it&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>struggle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td><strong>What does this mean for being and becoming a teacher?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethic of care prompts awareness but emergence from everyday existence is not sustained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>concealment of students elimination of diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>How is Dasein expressed?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inauthentically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I remember […] I had problems with fractions. The teacher - no diagram, no nothing! I explained it to my dad. He got an orange. He was trying to teach me what a half is, what a quarter is. I was really happy. So I went back to school. I had to show them quarters. So I drew the orange and I drew the lines and got in trouble for it. And she tore the piece of paper and threw it in the bin (p.12). How would I want the teacher to teach me? So I change all the time. You have to change. We cannot […] say this is the method I’m going to have and that’s what I’m going to do because it won’t work. I’ve just seen those kids excel (p.10-11). I had a girl who wouldn’t do anything. I made sure I knew what she was good at. I rewarded her. She had a big smile and her eyes were all shining and she was happy with herself (p.10).

The outer east area […] focuses a lot on phonics, to help [new arrivals or ESL students] with their reading and spelling and pronunciation. I do, but only within a context (p.5). They [students] know a lot. They might not be able to say it [in English], but they know a lot (p.10). It is very important for those students to use [their] language in school (F.G. 1, p.1). I try to focus on the child and see what clicks (p.17). I was very lucky because I worked with […] a LOTE trained teacher with ESL […] — they have the holistic approach. We immersed the kids with language. We did a lot of wall stories. We made books with the children.
That was all language (Text 2, p.3). It’s not having just the child in the centre. So we’re all together (p.3). That’s the way I teach my ESL. I went to Toronto (p.1). TESOL was everywhere. I saw the signs TESOL, TESOL, everywhere. We worked collaboratively. Did a lot of joint teaching and we shared our resources (ibid.). So I’ve taken that. That’s what they were focussing on at Toorak College in the 80s (p.3).

I had a picture storybook about frogs [and] an information book. They […] gave us […] important information. I got it [information] from the kids by asking them certain explicit questions. I engaged them by asking those questions and stopping and pausing and so on. I put specific information on […] a whiteboard […] you had to get into groups and discuss it. They had to draw about the stages of the frog and write. I also had flash cards […]. The flash cards actually had the stages (p.8). But I make sure that I roam around the classroom. I’m reading their work, I might stop and ask them to rethink something or rearrange a sentence for me. Or if […] a child is stuck and needs a bit more help I might sit next to him or if there’s an early finisher, I might pair them together. They can help one another (p.4).

I’d like to talk about moderating their writing. It really doesn’t make sense. I see that different teachers have got different opinions. We’ve gone to some PDs and still we have different opinions. We’re iffy! They say it’s always going to be like that […]. I wasn’t very happy with that.
Let's say I'm an A2.3. The next teacher says oh no, he’s not A2.3, he’s an A2.1. Now that’s a big difference (p.13).

**Questioning, Experiences and Practices, Processes and Chafing Moments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Experiences and Practices</th>
<th>Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Who or what is implicated in its production?</td>
<td>1) experience of discrimination, 2) beliefs about knowledges and languages children bring to learning, 3) professional learning and practice across time and place</td>
<td>fusion of multiple horizons of understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What do schools and/or what do teachers do with this information?</td>
<td>I'm in my own little room (p.5). &quot;I watch to see what clicks&quot; (ibid).</td>
<td>marginalisation of ESL teacher, separation of ESL from mainstream curriculum, enacts learner-centred practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How is this information (Q. 1) embedded in experiences and practices of teachers?</td>
<td>1) changes in methods 2) uses topics to teach language and learning 3) immerses students in language rich resourced learning events that provide various participation structures</td>
<td>calls on own experiences layering, integration associating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
<th>What do the processes achieve?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>multifaceted and layered approach (language and learning) to child centred practice, Helen’s agency is contained by institutional arrangements — withdrawal and isolation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questioning Processes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Interests and Discourses</th>
<th>Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. What interests discourses and relations emerge when</td>
<td>students who are happy with themselves (building positive identities) academic achievement (equality)</td>
<td>responsiveness positive pedagogical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) students are placed at the centre of learning 2) language and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning</strong></td>
<td>are integrated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3) Different theories and approaches</strong></td>
<td>are layered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4) Helen includes languages and cultural knowledges?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>education (equality)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>participation (inclusion; social justice; multiculturalism)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>relations responsiveness to disadvantage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>trust that students know more than they can express it in English</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>inclusive - value assigned to sociocultural resources and students positioned as knowledgeable,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. How are discourses related to social change?</strong></td>
<td>memories migration as it relates to her own childhood experiences and those of the students she currently teaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What do discourses achieve?</strong></td>
<td>holistic education grounded in ethics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>holistic education grounded in ethics</strong></td>
<td>inclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questioning Chafing Moments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. What do chafing moments reveal?</strong></td>
<td>“It [moderating their writing] really doesn’t make sense”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>debate about validity of quantified data</strong></td>
<td>resistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. How does a teacher respond to disclosures?</strong></td>
<td>Helen questions unfair practices - “They say it’s always going to be like that”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>social justice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. What does this mean for being and becoming a teacher?</strong></td>
<td>The struggle Helen confronts is opposition from the “They” who do not see the impact of “iffy” guesses i.e. everyday existence (Heidegger, 2005)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How is Dasein expressed?</strong></td>
<td>authentically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OUTCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have worked in multicultural schools all along in the last 12 years, four or five schools. I saw one where I thought […] they were doing a wonderful job. [Parents] I think they felt very comfortable. They would approach, you know, the teachers or the aids very comfortably knowing that somebody is there to talk their language (Text 3, p.2). What I've learned is never, ever, ever assume anything, even the simplest of things (p.9). I see it in their faces. I see it in the work that they're doing. They get lost; … completely lost […] and I say “let's modify it, let's change it” (ibid.). Another thing […] is, knowing children — talking, respecting the children when they are talking, and listening to them and registering it, then using it in the classroom (FG 2, p.8).

I remember one of the kids had henna on his hands today. I said “oh you had Eid”? He just smiled and said “yes Miss”. With my upper level kids there were three or four Muslim kids. I use that into their writing. I’m not a Muslim so I’ll need something about Eid. They were all together. Then we published it in the school newsletter for the community (F. G. 2, p.8)

I have worked in multicultural schools – four or five- in the last twelve years. I just absolutely loved the multicultural aspect of Australia (Text 3, p.1-2). We have done lots of projects on countries because then [students] are the experts and they can educate other people. I had to
scaffold them a lot because they had not done projects before, so it was very structured. I showed them - made a slideshow and I showed it, so they had a model and they made the posters (p.13).

I’ll tell you exactly what happens. Grade 6s were doing PAT English reading test today. The teacher said “oh, they need to do the test”. I looked at the first article. It was so difficult. It was — the topics, the concepts were dense. The vocabulary was dense. The sentence structures were so dense. I just thought to myself you are setting these children to fail. There is no way on earth these children are going to feel good about themselves. They know. They’ve opened the booklet they know I cannot do it (F. G., 2, p.14).
# Questioning Jennifer’s Experiences and Practice, Processes and Chafing Moments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Experiences and Practices</th>
<th>Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Who or what is implicated in its production?</td>
<td>1) teacher activist</td>
<td>resistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) observations of students’ despair, “I say let’s modify it, let’s change it”.</td>
<td>evaluation and change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) beliefs about students as (i) experts and (ii) the relevance of cultural practices to learning</td>
<td>inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What do schools and/or teachers do with this information?</td>
<td>Jennifer has no time allocated to her for planning with class teachers.</td>
<td>marginalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How is this information embedded in experiences and practices of teachers?</td>
<td>talking, listening, observing, registering, adapting established approaches to suit the situation, using what students say or show to promote learning,</td>
<td>responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>positive pedagogical relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTCOME</td>
<td>What do the processes achieve?</td>
<td>multifaceted approach (cultural knowledge and academic learning) to student-centred practice but Jennifer’s agency is bounded by marginalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Interests and Discourses</td>
<td>Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What interests discourses and/or relations emerge when Jennifer 1) talks with, listens and observes 2) notices henna on his hands, 3) positions students as knowledgeable 4) publishes students work in the school newsletter 5) makes learning accessible</td>
<td>knowing students (relatedness) uses students' lived experiences to connect cultural knowledge to academic learning recognition (liberal multiculturalism) outreach to community (critical multiculturalism) equality (parity of participation – social justice)</td>
<td>responsive cultural responsiveness, inclusion inclusion teacher/student collaboration, dialogical,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How are discourses related to social change?</td>
<td>migration, humanitarian intake, acute demonstrations of disadvantage in the school and community</td>
<td>responsiveness to disadvantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do discourses achieve?</td>
<td>opportunities to show how students can use lived experiences to connect cultural knowledge to academic learning</td>
<td>inclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questioning Chafing Moments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. What do chafing moments reveal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How does a teacher respond to disclosures?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What does this mean for being and becoming a teacher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is Dasein expressed?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4: ANALYSIS OF GRACE’S RESEARCH DATA

You don't just become a teacher - it's like a building up. I'd have to say the teacher training that I undertook (Text 4, p.16). It would have to be diversity at schools that I've taught in, and the people that I've come across (p.17). Many of us at that time [late seventies] faced with the same issues of teaching children from refugee, war-torn backgrounds and creating a learning environment that applied to them (p.1).

So a lot more hands-on, a lot more interactive activities, but also teacher-based activities that […] focused on language and what the structure of language was about, and thinking about ways to make language come alive for students (p.1). Introducing topics which were common to them; for example, family, home, possibly pets and animals - starting with the central focus of what the child knew about in their own language so that they could draw or associate something common, within a different linguistic structure, of course (ibid.).

When you've got children that come to school with a different cultural frameset, they see things differently (p.11). Our programme […] is just catering for very good English speakers. We've got a lot of Chinese kids in the school (p.6). They don't see it the same way. Their understandings are different (ibid.). How they view a topic or […] a situation is going to be quite different, based on their experiences. Their
knowledge and the way they think through their language, it makes a difference (p.2).

It's much more of a social system - talking with each other, waiting for variation, allowing different opinion, broader thinking, which builds relationships or works towards building better relationships [...] it takes time, this sort of thing (p.9) — to talk through or introduce the topic, talk about it in as many different ways as applicable to the conversation you're having with children and to hear what they're saying. So there's a great sharing of ideas there with children (p.11). It takes time in synthesising (p.5) — it takes repeated teaching in different ways. I think it takes stimuli, too: pictures, conversation, movement, tactile - those sorts of important things for children (p.2). I think it's when they draw on something maybe that they've seen experienced in their own culture, that maybe they can correlate with and they connect but with the input of the teacher and with the one-to-one assistance or group assistance (ibid.). You've got to realise that [...] there's not just one meaning for one word, and that we can interpret it in other ways - and that sparking moment will be when the child or children will come to you and say, "Oh, but I thought... (p.11).

Literacy and numeracy - we follow what the government are doing and it's couched and transformed into the personality of the school. It is indoctrinated into you through all sorts of ways that you don't really realise (p.8). There's no time for professional discussion - sometimes your opinion's not wanted (p.11).
### Questioning Experiences and Practices, Processes and Chafing Moments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Experiences and Practices</th>
<th>Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Who or what is implicated in narrative production?</td>
<td>professional learning and history of practice in culturally diverse schools, particularly solutions to issues faced in the late 1970s,</td>
<td>fusing horizons of understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What do schools and/or teachers do with this information?</td>
<td>“There’s no time for professional discussion - sometimes your opinion’s not wanted”.</td>
<td>marginalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How is this information embedded in experiences and practices of teachers?</td>
<td>1) hands-on interactive experiences, 2) teacher-based activities, 3) using topics common to students, 4) “talking with each other, waiting for variation, allowing different opinions, broader thinking”, 5) “learning from one another”.</td>
<td>student centred organisation of multiple participation structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| OUTCOME | What do the processes achieve? | student centred culturally responsive practice | containment of responsive practices to a single (isolated) classroom |
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### Questioning Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Interests and Discourses</th>
<th>Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. What interests, discourses and/or relations emerge when Grace demonstrates 1) student-centred organisation 2) integrates theories of learnings and approaches to English language 3) learning allows for variations and different opinions</td>
<td>creating relevant learning environments using different participation structures (equality; inclusion) education (academic achievement) inclusion (multiculturalism)</td>
<td>positive pedagogical “that sparking moment when the child or children will come to you and say, “Oh, but I thought…” dialogical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How are discourses related to social change? Australia’s migration and humanitarian program e.g. intake of refugees during the 1970s and more recent migration of upwardly mobile Chinese immigrants.</td>
<td>a dialogical alternative for responding to the multicultural composition of classrooms</td>
<td>responsiveness to disadvantage and difference inclusion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Questioning Chafing Moments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Interests and Discourses</th>
<th>Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. What do chafing moments reveal? reluctance “I wouldn't [seek out like minded teachers] anyway, simply because sometimes your opinion's not wanted” (p.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>domination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How does a teacher respond to disclosures? Agency with regards to classroom practice but subordination outside of her classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td>subordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What does this mean for being and becoming a teacher? Struggle between authenticity (her knowledge from experiences across time and place) and inauthenticity (what is expected).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is Dasein expressed? authentically aware of the need to create learning environments that are relevant/responsive to the multicultural conditions of her classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td>authenticity and inauthenticity work independently and simultaneously</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 5: ANALYSIS SOPHIA’S RESEARCH DATA

We want them, when they all graduate, to be young confident people who have knowledge and skills that will allow them to step in any direction that they choose (Text 5, p.12). It’s important to build their skills and knowledge and build their personalities in terms of how to cope with authority and things like that; they would be important things over there [previous school] because of who they were (p.15). I just need to get you to develop your language skills so that you can get out there and get a job (p.1). Here it’s a different clientele so it’s a different job that you need to do. If we can play a role in getting them to leave school as confident young people then, you know, they’re going to be good contributors to society and do that flow-on effect. One thing that I really appreciated at Rubicon - the kids were honest and straight. Here, ”No, it wasn’t me. I don’t know what you’re talking about.” It’s quite frustrating (p.11).

What we’re better at now is being able to test for literacy levels. It’s VCAA [Victorian Curriculum & Assessment Authority] - it’s called on-demand testing. Kids sit and do a test. At the end it spits out where they are […] on the spectrum and being able to hone in and help build and move them forward. It can be challenging in the subjects I teach […] because vocab is really important. We don’t encourage them to speak [in languages other than English] in mainstream classes we say “NO —
it’s English only”. I’ll let them speak their own language. […] I don’t have a problem with that because it’s about them understanding the concept. I think then everything else will fall into place (p.4).

We have learning area meetings, they are faculty based, and then we have teaching learning teams. The reason we did this is because we link them to our performance review process and […] our focus is on differentiation (p.15). This year we’ve [leadership team] asked them [teachers] to think about a low performing student and assess […] whatever it is that they are differentiating — has helped that particular student to move forward (p.5). We’ve got a very small percentage of kids […] withdrawn from class for literacy support. I wish I had that document [list of students] we just did it this morning. They have explicit one-on-one teaching building their vocab and literacy skills (p.5). You’d want to know, of those, how many are…… (ibid.).

**Texts**
The record of forward movement links “building skills and personalities” to extra-local relations through the futures orientation.
### Questioning Text, Processes and Chafing Moments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Measurement of Forward Movement</th>
<th>Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Who or what is implicated in its production?</td>
<td>1) belief — building skills and personalities, 2) school policy on collecting data, 3) teachers who administer the tests and collect and record data,</td>
<td>dispositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What do schools and/or teachers do with the information?</td>
<td>build skills and personalities: 1) faculty groups organise syllabus, 2) set up testing policies, 3) produce the <em>spectrum</em> for recording results, 4) teachers measure progress, 5) produce <em>list of students</em>, 6) offer add-on support to low performing students, 7) school ties differentiated classroom practices to Annual Performance Review</td>
<td>co-ordination, surveillance, classification, differentiation, gap filling, management and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How is this information embedded in experiences and practices of teachers?</td>
<td>1) Teacher instruct and/or teach according to where students are on the spectrum, 2) Sophia lets students use languages within set limits but reiterates the unwritten rule – English ONLY, 2) Kids sit and do a test. At the end, it spits out the evaluation, 3) teachers see where students are […] on the <em>spectrum</em>, 4) calculate the degree of forward movement, 5) Teachers organise differentiated ‘something’ for low performing students and 6) “We linked them [learning area meetings and teaching learning teams] to our <em>performance review process</em> and […] our focus is on differentiation”.</td>
<td>responsiveness to text, levelling of difference, efficiency, evaluation, surveillance, adjustment to syllabus or short term intervention, accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What do the processes achieve?</td>
<td>production of an efficient text structured work process</td>
<td>subordination of culturally and linguistically different students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Interests and Discourses</td>
<td>Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What interests discourses and/or relations emerge when Sophia shows and/or demonstrates</td>
<td>productive economic and socially acceptable subjects (citizenship)</td>
<td>domination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) building skills and personalities</td>
<td>improved student outcomes (performativity)</td>
<td>subordination of the breadths of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) measurement of forward movement</td>
<td>focus on skills (efficiency)</td>
<td>silencing, elimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) creates the list of low performing students</td>
<td>Sophia compiled the list of low-performing students before our interview but did not know if any students were from culturally and linguistically different</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) restricts the use of cultural capital and funds of knowledge,</td>
<td>efficiency (levelling of difference)</td>
<td>transformation of teachers and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) different expectations for different groups of students</td>
<td>sets up binary - entitled/not entitled to stay at school (exclusion)</td>
<td>domination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How are discourses related to social change?</td>
<td>“good contributors to society”, students who “do that flow-on effect” (p.11)</td>
<td>production of human capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australia’s 1)economic competitiveness</td>
<td>globalisation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2)social cohesion in times of global uncertainty e.g. terrorist acts;</td>
<td>production of human capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do the discourses show/achieve?</td>
<td>framework for moulding future social and economic subjects</td>
<td>domination and exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questioning Chafing Moments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>What do chafing moments reveal?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“in mainstream classes we say “NO — it’s English only”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sophia establishes conditions for use of other languages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>How does a teacher respond to disclosures?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I’ll let them speak their own language […] because it’s about them understanding the concept”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>deontological ethics: obligation/responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td><strong>What does this mean for being and becoming a teacher?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethic of responsibility prompts awareness but emergence from everyday existence is not sustained beyond the condition where the English only rule can be broken.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How is <em>Dasein</em> expressed?</th>
<th><strong>Expression of Being</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inauthentic expression of being</td>
<td>concealment/elimination of diversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 6: ANALYSIS OF LUCINDA’S RESEARCH DATA

The culture of the school’s changing and everyone’s really curious about each other (Text 6, p.13). The school used to try very hard to sell itself as an academic high school. I think they were almost trying to almost exclude those students. But now it’s bring them in, lift them up (p.14). The EAL program’s grown at our school. It’s structured by year level. We’ve got a lot more EAL teachers. EAL classes run at the same time as English classes, with less students, so a maximum of 16 (p.2).

Our school’s really starting to group itself as a Chinese sort of — because we teach Mandarin there” (p.5). There’s a real buzz about learning another language and sharing language. We run classes for Year 6 students, like an after-school kind of thing, which is for our feeder schools (p.5). I started a language exchange program […] with the EAL students with Mandarin as a first language, with our local Australian-born students who are learning Mandarin. […] They chat and help each other with their different homework and stuff. It’s a nice vibe (p.11).

There are some really significant literacy issues in my mainstream class. They [students from linguistically diverse backgrounds] just want the tools to express what they understand and generally speaking […] it’s the language that they’re struggling with. They conceptually, often are very sophisticated. A lot of them come to Jamieson with a huge amount of life experience […] they’ve got this level of maturity that often isn’t in
the mainstream students. So kind of being able to tap into that and then just give them the language that they need to express stuff (p.3).

The biggest challenge for [...] me is differentiating the curriculum enough so that all students are effectively getting access to it (p.1). I’ll put it on the board as if it’s a menu. I’ll ask them to tell me what we’ve learned last time and that’ll just be a discussion between them. It’s [...] gets quite complex. They’re all doing different things. I’ll say, “Okay, this is kind of where you’re up to”. You start doing this.” I use a lot of the materials that I’ve designed specifically for the EAL students, so things like text type scaffolds and sentence starters and that kind of real building the field stuff (p.2).

We’ve got professional learning teams that meet once a week. I met up with a science teacher and a maths teacher and we just went through some science and maths assessment tasks and worksheets and I just pointed out the language and how unnecessarily complex it was and gave them strategies for making it simpler (p.15).

The EAL students killed it. The class average was 32 or something study score. Four students got above 40 [out of 50] — they just did so well. It was amazing, and it was my first Senior Year 12 EAL class so I was just like, “Yes!” and — so that was really cool. And then the next year it was similar (p.13).
I’ve got three very, very naughty Lebanese boys in my Year 11 class. I’ve taught there for six years and I’ve never had these kids and, you know, their brothers are all in jail and they’ve all been suspended about a zillion… They’re really tough and I saw their names on the roll and I’ve got two [family name], one [family name] and two [family name] and I sort of went, “Oh, my God!” I thought I would be scared of them but I’m not. I’ve really enjoyed teaching them. You can’t ever pull the authority card on them ever. You just can’t. Or they’ll win (Text 6, p. 10).

There’s one student […] he sort of didn’t work for the first two lessons. His body language was just really defiant. Eventually I sort of said, “You haven’t got any books today.” He goes, “No!” And I said, I’ll give you pen and paper. Have you got a copy of the book? Have you had a chance to read it yet?” And he said: “No, no, I haven’t.” I said; “Okay” and I gave him a really simple task and he goes, “Oh, no, no”. He finally said, “Oh, I want to work now.” I said, “Okay, well we’re doing this.” He said, “Yes. No, I don’t want to do that.” And I said, “Do you mind telling me why?” And he said, “Because I don’t really like reading and answering questions and stuff (p.11).

I said, “Are there any books that you’ve read through your time at Jamieson that you’ve enjoyed?” And he laughed and he said, “No”. […] I kind of went, “All right”, I gave him a really small section of the book; I gave him some Post It notes and I gave him a list of the key events and where to find them. I said, “How about you just start by finding these key events on the page, underlining them and Post It noting it.” He did it and
that was good…. I got him to write it out, and he did that. He gives me his work so I can give him feedback outside the class and he corrects it. And look, it’s going pretty well with him (ibid.).

I decided because I had been teaching EAL for so long and I felt a bit sort of fraudulent or just didn’t feel quite right not having a [second] language of my own (p.16). What’s crept into my practice just since I’ve started learning Indonesian is this real reflection on how we learn in terms of languages (p.12). I was marking the roll and I noticed a student with an Indonesian name. I’d just got back from Indonesia, so I thought ‘Ah!’ and then I just started chatting to him in Indonesian. And the whole class just went dead silent. Then a Lebanese girl, […] said: “Miss that was really unexpected.” All the Chinese kids were like, “Miss, you should learn Chinese!” and they were so excited by the fact I was learning a language and they were too, and it started a real dialogue (ibid).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Experiences and Practices</th>
<th>Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1.** Who or what is implicated in text production? | Principal, ESL Co-ordinator, teacher of Mandarin in changing institutional relations  
1) ESL — “students with significant issues”, lack of support, little or no progress,  
2). “we’re going to start being a real VCE Chinese high school, which is really exciting” (p.5) | change  
evaluation of existing institutional arrangements  
reinvigoration |
| **2.** What do schools and/or teachers do with this information? | Lucinda:  
1) re-organises institutional arrangements for EAL and introduces skills based personalised learning in the EAL stream  
2) works with other staff from other faculties on the language used in assessment task  
School:  
3) expands the LOTE program | innovation  
differentiating curriculum  
connections between language and academic performance  
associates students with expertise in Mandarin with students learning Mandarin |
| **3.** How is this information embedded in experiences and practices of teachers? | 1) establishes EAL pathway from Year 7 to 12,  
2) focus on language and learning  
3) sets up English/Mandarin exchange program | re-structuring  
iintegration  
co-ordination across languages |
| **OUTCOME** What do the processes achieve? | 1) response to disadvantage by providing support for all culturally and linguistically different students  
2) heightened awareness of languages - Mandarin expands curriculum opportunities for students, | structures for inclusion |
### Questioning Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Interests and Discourses</th>
<th>Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. What interests discourses and/or relations emerge when Lucinda shows or demonstrates</td>
<td>a way to address “really significant literacy issues” (social justice)</td>
<td>access and participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) innovation - layered individualised learning</td>
<td>academic achievement (performativity)</td>
<td>dialogical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) skills based learning</td>
<td>equal access to curriculum (parity of participation)</td>
<td>individualisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) differentiating the curriculum enough</td>
<td>collaboration between knowers and learners (hospitality; Asia Literacy)</td>
<td>“everybody is interested in one another”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) the Mandarin/English in-school exchange program</td>
<td></td>
<td>reciprocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How are discourses related to social change?</td>
<td>“Our school's really starting to group itself as a Chinese sort of — because we teach Mandarin there”</td>
<td>Asia literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do the discourses show/achieve?</td>
<td>Re-positioning of the school in the national interest</td>
<td>intercultural relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>internationalisation of curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia focus and successful students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questioning Chafing Moments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>What do chafing moments reveal?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) The possibilities offered by the story the boys told about the raw pistachio nuts were missed. “I gave them time to explain it to me, I ate a couple and then we put them away and then we got on with it” (Text 6, p.10).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Feeling like a fraud, and feeling that her work was fraudulent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>How does a teacher respond to disclosures?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) reveals disquiet about teaching some students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) enrols in a course and learns Bahasa Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>What does this mean for being and becoming a teacher?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Something pulled Lucinda back from awareness to everydayness when she dismissed the story of the pistachio nuts. This is possibly related to human phenomena:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) urgency in improving student outcomes e.g. “it stresses me out. They're all doing different things; and/or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) disquiet about teaching these boys. She says “I've never had these kids and, you know, their brothers are all in jail and they've all been suspended about a zillion…” (p.10).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How is Dasein expressed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>authentically <strong>Circumspection</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lucinda picks up what she can see</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) text, her list of events, post it notes, pencil, a separate piece of paper to see what can be done with them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) enrols in a university course to learn Indonesian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Phenomena like fear or anxiety appear to be implicated in her struggle in being and becoming a teacher.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inauthentically <strong>Concealment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lucinda responds to disadvantage but restricted to learning events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shifts from domination to face-to-face relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students’ narratives are subordinated to the syllabus;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
They [culturally and linguistically different students] come with a whole completely different background, different experiences different opinions. They’re just teaching […] that’s what you feel like you’ve […] in a class, diverse as they can be (Text 7, p.9).

I’ve had a bit of experience overseas with students in Dubai and also in Brunei. Those experiences have informed what I do here (p.1). In Dubai we used Scott Foresman (USA) […] it was a lot more grammar in context (ibid.). I’ve been able to say “We’re writing about this - it’s in the past so what’s the best way we could actually write this” (p.4)? That sort of in-context came through a lot clearer in Dubai and I’ve been using that (ibid.).

We’ve been doing [the film] Paradise Road in Year 12 I’ll make a little bit of a montage and go through and actually identify what’s happening in this scene - who’s involved, what’s going on and then we might work out the vocabulary we might need even a few phrases and sentence prompts as well. Sometimes they don’t realise that they can translate what they thought into essay - they don’t see the connection between “I’ve got really good ideas” now “how to put it in formal essay” (p.3). I’ll sit in a conversation and I’ll listen and I might provoke a question here or

---

18 Paradise Road (Beresford, 1997) tells the story of a group of women who leave Singapore during World War 2 only to be captured and imprisoned in a Japanese prisoner of war camp.
there. It might be, well they’ve come up with something, I might acknowledge it’s a really good thought “Can you take that a little bit further for me” or “how does that mesh with something someone else said”. I might throw out a question (p.7).

[International Baccalaureate] made me reconsider how I teach ESL [...] language B (LB) is the same as French B or Spanish B [...] it’s a lot more targeted to the language of the subject as opposed to VCE which is the text of the subject” (p.5)

We’re doing a unit at the moment on charity. I want them to look outside of themselves but also question. “What are my ideas about this? Where have they come from? What has made me respond that way? Actually giving them some kind of stimulus and try to get them to open up around their own little views or at least saying - this is a view I have and I acknowledge I’ve got it but, there are other views and other things and in different societies we do things differently. So it’s perhaps giving them a broad sense of who they are and, where they are. (pp.6-7).

They [issues related to race] do come up quite a bit. Sometimes it comes up when students feel they’ve been a victim of racism. The other side of that there’s also racism that they might have towards others. So, we were talking the other day in year 12, about conflict and, one of the students was saying there were a lot of Shanghai immigrants, people from the villages who are coming to Shanghai and the Shanghaies don’t like that because “how dare they come here using our resources”? So
they’re like “well I am racist, I might be racist towards my own people” (p.6).

They’ve done Japanese or the Koreans have done Chinese, some of the Chinese have done Japanese. We have Spanish in the IB so we’ve got Spanish, Japanese, Chinese (p.10). It’s kind of like a rule … you can use Chinese to perhaps clarify or work through an idea but, if you’re having a discussion about the topic then I want them to use English (p.1).

**Questioning Layla’s Experiences and Practices, Processes and Chafing Moments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Experiences and Practices</th>
<th>Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Who or what is implicated in its production?</td>
<td>1) International Baccalaureate, 2) Dubai experience using Scott Foresman (USA) syllabi, 3) They’re just teaching [...] that’s what you feel like you’ve [...] in a class, diverse as they can be</td>
<td>fusion of experiences, syllabus integration subject English with learning English beliefs recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What do schools and/or teachers do with the information?</td>
<td>“I think staff who teach ESL tend to get pigeon-holed [...] even though my method is in English and literature, the idea that they could give me an English literature year 11 or 12 senior class-it’s “she’s an ESL teacher”(p.13).</td>
<td>marginalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How is this information embedded in experiences and practices of teachers?</td>
<td>1) invites students to look beyond their own views and acknowledge other views, 2) integrates subject (ideas) and language content i.e. grammar in context to approach the study of a text (film) 3) inviting students to take things further or associate their ideas with those expressed by others</td>
<td>critical analysis layering associating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do the processes achieve?</td>
<td>A multifaceted, layered and critical approach to teaching and learning but one that is contained to her classes.</td>
<td>dynamic process for creating and maintaining dialogical relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interests and Discourses</strong></td>
<td><strong>Relations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What interests discourses and/or relations emerge as Layla shows and/or demonstrates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) integration of learning English through subject English</td>
<td>significance of language to improving academic performance (performativity)</td>
<td>dialogical relations to develop and expand thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) prompts associations between ideas of different speakers</td>
<td>wider/deeper thinking (world view)</td>
<td>inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) questions opinions</td>
<td>developing and expanding thinking (develops and expands thinking)</td>
<td>world view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) uses question prompts to promote wider thinking</td>
<td>critical analysis (intercultural understanding, aspects of critical discourses)</td>
<td>intercultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How are discourses related to social change?</td>
<td>production of culturally aware students who acknowledge and/or understand others ways of being in the world</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do the discourses achieve?</td>
<td>one way for education to respond to challenges facing humanity in a &quot;rapidly globalising world&quot;</td>
<td>production of a global citizen with particular attributes – community, service, agency, critical analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questioning Chafing Moments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What do chafing moments reveal?</td>
<td>common languages shared by students cannot be fully utilised because of monolingual teacher status</td>
<td>English privilege, conformity, subordination of shared languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How does a teacher respond to disclosures?</td>
<td>I want them to use English […] so it’s better that everyone can listen to it (p.1).</td>
<td>domination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What does this mean for being and becoming a teacher?</td>
<td>Pulling back from awareness to everydayness by an historic cultural conservation discourse. The issue of languages as an attribute teachers could share with students is raised.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is <em>Dasein</em> expressed?</td>
<td>authentically and inauthentically</td>
<td>inclusive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 8: ANALYSIS OF AVA’S RESEARCH DATA

We [Ava and her family] spent six months teaching on outback cattle stations. We went to England. In the first term, [I] spent my term holding the door closed to keep the kids in. You know To Sir with Love? (p.1). We drove through Russia in 1984, in the days of Communism and that was really hard. We went back to Poland […] in 2003. I just stood there and I cried because there was just so much food for these people at long last (p.19). I think it’s the travelling and I think also it’s — this trip, that photo album there. I think it was that trip that really changed my life (p.9).

I went to China. I had a whole classroom of kids singing an Australian song and they were dancing to it and doing all of the actions. They had walls with nothing on them. The kids were alive and excited to be there. I said to the teacher, “Have you got any scissors?” “No, we don’t have scissors,” because parents would say that that’s not a worthwhile activity. They’d have to be doing their work they’d have to be learning, learning, learning (p.9). Then, of course, this course [post graduate studies] has come along and it’s just enriched — so it’s been a huge package. Everything’s just fallen into place at the right time for me (p.10).

An Anglo Saxon in a classroom is pretty rare. It’s not quite what I’m supposed to be doing because they were supposed to brainstorm the role of the teacher or […] particular person and then be— making it
more hands on (p.6). Unless you go and interview that person, you can’t. We came up with open-ended questions beforehand so they had to explain, explore, identify, [and] comment upon, all of those (p.7). Then they went out and made the interview time and conducted the interview. Now, they have to write a diary of five days being that person, using the information that they’ve got (ibid.). [I]f you did that in all of the EAL classes […] everybody would be seeing everything from everybody’s perspective not just a white Anglo-Saxon teacher, my generation, stuck in a rut type way (p.7). It’s policy in the school now, especially for the ones who have done the EAL program, that if a student is having difficulties conducting the research in English, that they can actually go in and do the research in their own language as long as they give the feedback in English (p.17).

I […] brought them into their groups […] their friends will support them. So they read the story and one of the students had to summarise the story. Another student had to identify the characteristics and find supporting evidence to support that and another one had to use the story for a grammar activity. Another one is doing metaphor because a lot of the story had metaphor and it just fell into place because […] she came out and she said, “What do you reckon I could do?” I said, “Oh, there’s a great metaphor in there,” and she said, “Oh, there’s lots of them, Miss.” I said, “Mm, I reckon you could handle this. Could you teach the class metaphor?” So she’s going to teach the class metaphor and another one is doing punctuation (p.12).
We do NAPLAN and we look at the statistics but that’s all. They insist upon us doing PAT Tests at the beginning of the year and the end of the year. We do them in English and Maths and they’re actually looked at in terms of value-added, have the children improved? We’re supposed to do on-demand testing as well but I don’t really use it a lot because I’ve only ever found that it verifies what I already know (p.13).

**Questioning Ava’s Experiences and Practices, Processes and Chafing Moments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Experiences and Practices</th>
<th>Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Who or what is implicated in its production?</td>
<td>“it’s the travelling” — Queensland, England, Russia, Poland “and I think also it’s — this trip [to China], I think it was that trip that really changed my life”. “This course [post graduate studies] has come along and it’s just enriched — so it’s been a huge package”.</td>
<td>fusion of horizons (Gadamer, 1997)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What do teachers and/or schools do with the information?</td>
<td>“I’ve actually got the Alpha Program — a group of high-achieving students — a heavy weighting of Chinese (p.15). I said, “Righto, I’m not going to teach you these skills.” I broke them up into different groups. They had to research each section and they had to present it to the class (p.16).”</td>
<td>recognition and acceptance of Ava’s work, rebellion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How is this information embedded in experiences and practices of teachers?</td>
<td>focus on “learning, learning, learning” from (China experience) to address disadvantage using different participation structures e.g. 1) “It’s not quite what I’m supposed to be doing” 2) students choose what to do and how they will demonstrate their learning</td>
<td>resistance to authorised learning and change, change to hands-on participatory learning, communicative differentiated practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do the processes achieve?</td>
<td>constitution of a multifaceted, integrated, layered and collaborative approach that is recognised, as effective, by the school</td>
<td>teacher and student inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Interests and Discourses</td>
<td>Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What interests discourses and/or relations does Ava show when she demonstrates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) resistance to authorised practice</td>
<td>access and participation (agency; aspects of critical literacy)</td>
<td>responsive pedagogical relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) ways to make learning events accessible</td>
<td>academic achievement (performativity)</td>
<td>collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) positions students as experts</td>
<td>showing students as knowledgeable and able (performativity; multiculturalism)</td>
<td>seeing things from different perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How are discourses related to social change?</td>
<td>Related to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) global changes across time and place where Ava saw acute demonstrations of disadvantage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Australia’s current interest in the Asia century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do the discourses show/achieve?</td>
<td>coupling of Ava’s strong social justice interests with the nation’s interest in Australia in the Asia century to produce a pedagogy responsive to the multicultural composition of her classes</td>
<td>responsive pedagogical relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questioning Chafing Moments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>What do chafing moments reveal?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasis on the use of quantified performance data to show value-adding is similar to Sophia’s (Text 5) forward movement evaluating students according to value-added concept</td>
<td>accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><strong>How does a teacher respond to disclosures?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dismisses on-demand testing</td>
<td>agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td><strong>What does this mean for being and becoming a teacher?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Struggle between authenticity (her knowledge from experiences across time and place) and what is expected. Ava resists using on-demand tests. She reveals her understanding of the PAT testing policy by saying “They insist upon us doing PAT Tests at the beginning of the year and the end of the year” (p.13). She does not reveal any evidence of explicit challenges to this testing regime. The struggle in being and becoming a teacher is showing that responsive teaching practice will achieve academic learning that students, teachers, parents and community are keen to see.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>How is Dasein expressed?</strong></td>
<td>authentically</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>