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CRYSTAL METAPHOR – it has always been an important generic idea in design, either as a representation of a myth or as a metaphor reflecting the idea of perfectness, purity, and transformation derived from the ‘nature’ that is a source of inspiration either for imitation or driving the laws of order (Özen Eyüce 2016)
Abstract

This qualitative study takes a historical understanding of history education to explore the concept of interculturality for history teaching and learning in Australia. This research, set in Victoria, Australia, is contextualized by recent reforms to the history curriculum brought about by the introduction of the Australian Curriculum, which began with version 1.0 late in 2010 and has progressed to a national implementation model of the Foundation to Year 10, version 8.3, from 2018. The Australian Curriculum is intended to be used flexibly by schools and values teachers’ professional knowledge in reflecting local contexts and accounting for individual students’ family, cultural and community backgrounds. The Australian Curriculum includes intercultural understanding as one of seven general capabilities.

Interculturality, being when ‘two distinct cultures encounter each other’ and their unknown differences become familiar and known – or their content is exchanged and a space is created where meaning is translated and difference is negotiated (Rozbicki 2015, p.3) drives this research. Therefore, this thesis rests on the melding of two constructs: history education and interculturality. The Literature Review shows an indelible temporal link between history and interculturality; however, it also shows the foci are incongruent at the school level. The methodological framework has been constructed to provide a ‘way in’ to this problem for which there is very little guidance from scholarly research.

The framework of the study brings together core elements of historical consciousness, historical narration and interculturality. Data is collected through the methods of textual analysis and four focus group interviews comprising 5 to 6 practising history teachers interpreted through discourse analysis. Discourse analysis and its attested flexibility as method is used in conjunction with a refreshed position of ‘crystallisation’ to span ‘multiple points on the qualitative continuum’ and maximise the benefits of taking contrasting approaches to analysis and representation (Ellingson 2009, p. 11). This is achieved first by encountering the data through ‘multiple ways of knowing’, analogous to viewing an object through a crystal (Ellingson 2009, p. 11), and second, by blending
crystallisation with the more traditional qualitative form of discourse analysis to validate its contentions.

The study exposes a distinct unfamiliarity and uncertainty associated with interculturality by history teachers and a glaring absence of interculturality in the written and visual language of the history textbook. The study concludes that history education and interculturality operate in isolation from one another and that the field of curriculum and pedagogy provides a critical prism for their interaction. This study makes a further contribution to knowledge by pursuing the underused methodological approach of crystallisation for research into history education.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

This thesis examines how the concept of interculturality is conceptualised by history teachers in Victoria, Australia and interpreted in history textbooks. Sparked by significant curriculum reforms in 2013 which included the mandating of the general capability of Intercultural Understanding (ICU) that affected controversial changes to the secondary school History curriculum, the study focuses on the contemporary relationship between the concept of interculturality and history education to ask:

- How do history teachers conceptualise interculturality for history teaching and learning?
- How do prescribed history textbooks in Australia interpret the concept of interculturality?

In 2013 the Australian Curriculum and Assessment Authority (ACARA) introduced a national curriculum to Australia that brought about systemic and pedagogical changes, particularly for the discipline of history. At the secondary school level History, English, Maths and Science were the first key learning areas to implement the national curriculum. The new curriculum introduced a set of seven general capabilities, one of which was ICU. From the outset, the new History curriculum positioned Australia within a ‘world history’ and attended to students seeing themselves as citizens of the world, making them aware of global solidarity and responsibilities (Poulsen 2013). Further it was associated with ICU by the policy makers and consequently was central to the changes in structure and policy accorded in the Australian Curriculum (AC). For this history teacher, teaching in the state of Victoria, Australia, at this time, the logic positioning history teaching and learning and the concept of interculturality as an educational strategy and response to global responsibility warranted investigation.

Three years later and still under debate, the AC experienced strong opposition from the Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority (VCAA) and its position on the weight and organisation of the seven general capabilities. In 2016,
the VCAA launched the Victorian Curriculum (VC), citing the lack of weight afforded to the general capabilities of creative critical thinking, personal and social ethics and *intercultural understanding* as the reason for the split from the national curriculum body the ACARA. Consequently, in 2016 the VCAA introduced a revised version of the fledgling AC that gave even more weight to the concept of interculturality, introducing the ‘Intercultural Capability’ curriculum equipped with its own ‘Scope and Sequence’, set of ‘Content Descriptors’ and ‘Achievement Standard’ in line with all other key learning areas. The Intercultural Capability curriculum was immediately associated with the Humanities curriculum, as shown in Figure 1 below, and highly visible in the language of the History curriculum.

![Figure 1 Victorian Curriculum F-10 (VCAA 2016a)](image)

This thesis argues that how the concept of interculturality is translated from curriculum policy to the *enacted* curriculum and interpreted in history textbooks and conceptualised by teachers is under-researched, and is the substantive topic of this study. With the intention of both ACARA and the VCAA to assess intercultural understanding looming (in the state of Victoria by 2019), sound theoretical underpinning for ICU in history education is an urgent imperative and requires empirical research.
Background and significance

This study is situated within a context of a multiculturalist ideology in which cohesion and harmony are dominant but where teaching a nation’s history is colonial and value-laden. The mandating of ICU across public and Catholic schools in Australia, for this researcher, created conflict between the \textit{imagined} curriculum (the curriculum policy) and the \textit{enacted} curriculum that includes the key agencies of history textbooks and teachers’ pedagogical work.

Central to the study is how the concept of interculturality brings the social imperatives of globalisation and history education into closer contact and troubles school history as the support mechanism of national cohesion. The most prominent of a select few experts in an emerging field, and key theorist for this study, historian and educationalist Professor Emeritus Jörn Rüsen (introduced formally in Chapter 2), has posed interculturality as a challenge to Western historical thinking in education for some years now. Rüsen has argued that Western historical thinking is deeply rooted in ethnocentrism, motivating a growing propensity for interculturalism to be visible in history as a discipline and for history teaching and learning (Rüsen 2004c). In Australia, the concept of interculturality and its significance for history teaching and learning is slow to gain traction and theoretically weak, even though the historical climate in history curriculum in Australia over the past two decades (at least) has been under close scrutiny and debate.

Therefore, a significant contribution of this study is its theorising of interculturality for history teaching and learning by pressing boundaries within the ‘order of history’, to loosen the reins of modernism and find what characterises a ‘broken order of history’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 137). In doing so, the concept of interculturality can be valued for its capacity to invite the histories of others without the constrictions and constraints of binary historical interpretation. Although postmodernism creates a juxtaposition between the concept of universality of historical development and the ‘acceptance of a multitude of different histories or a multiperspectivity in historical thinking’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 142), this thesis follows Rüsen in furthering the diversity of historical perspectives to affirm the differences of cultures. Moreover, the principal value of historical
interpretation, as a strategy, can be universal in its methodical operation and at the same time able to ‘[legitimate] multiperspectivity and difference’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 142). In theorising interculturality for history teaching and learning at the school level, this thesis elaborates on cognitive structure that strengthens the ‘hermeneutical element of historical method’ and brings about a new theoretical approach to historical experience, synthesizing the temporal development of humankind and its unity on the one hand and the diversity and multitude of cultures on the other (p. 142).

The following extract from an interview with Jörn Rüsen in Brazil in 2013, the same year that the national History curriculum was introduced in Australia, gives credence to the warrant for this study by articulating the challenges posed by the concept of interculturality to history theory and therefore history educators. Rüsen’s comments are regarding historical interpretation and the impact of the density of intercultural communication for history theory:

A third challenge for theory of history is the growing density of intercultural communication. We do what we do in the context of a Western tradition – which is a tradition worthwhile to go on with. But it is a tradition in which “others” are different. It is a tradition besides other traditions. What we have to take much more into account while doing our work is the question “how do we come to terms with the fundamental difference between peoples, individuals, social units and whole cultures concerning their individuality and different identities? ... We have to widen the discourse on meta-history into a multi-dimensional intercultural discussion by bringing non-Western scholars and intellectuals into our game, and by listening to them. We have to integrate what they experience as Western, what they think about us, and what they think their own traditions are. (da Mata & de Araujo 2013)

Rüsen’s statement captures the phenomenon of interculturality and raises questions regarding history theory set only in a Western context, the influence of tradition on how we see difference for history teaching and learning, and the notion of identity of people, societies and whole cultures, and nations. This thesis has its role to play in not only addressing such questions but also in widening the discourse on metahistory to a ‘multi-dimensional intercultural discussion’ and finding a way into seeing and listening to fundamental difference within a cognitive structure.
On Australian shores

The History Wars in Australia are the backdrop to this thesis. Associate Professor Anna Clark, an Australian Research Council Future Fellow at the Australian Centre for Public History at the University of Technology Sydney, says: ‘teaching national history in schools generates significant public anxiety and political debate—as the various ‘history wars around the world reveal’ (Clark 2009, p. 745). As Lyn Yates and colleagues point out, prior to the development of the national framework for history and the AC, there was considerable variation in Australia as to what and how much history students were taught, the extent to which history was taught as a distinct school subject and what topics were emphasised (Yates et al. 2017, p. 95). Ironically, during the 1990s, prior to the introduction of the national curriculum, even though school history was in decline the public debate between politicians, academic historians and journalists regarding the teaching of history in Australia raged, and made clear the inevitability that a history curriculum will never be value-free (Guyver 2012; Martin 2012). Labelled the ‘History Wars’, this period of time was the catalyst for a new phase of history curriculum development in Australia driven by the conservative powers which drew a divisive line between the conservative root-and-branch approach to teaching history and the alternative narrative for history teaching to reflect a globalising nation.

The History Wars

The History Wars in Australia foreground a period that is a paradox of change and continuity in Australia’s approach to history education. At the time, the causes and chaos of the History Wars drew a large crowd and resulted in and informed the development of a national history curriculum. Some of the crowd, says Tony Taylor, an Australian academic who has written extensively on the History Wars and the development of history curriculum in Australia, deplored the prevalence of postmodern influence on educational philosophy emerging from the new history curriculum (Taylor 2010; Taylor & Collins 2012). Others strongly celebrated difference and diversity in place of the meta-narrative associated with the rise of Western civilisation (Taylor & Collins 2012). The concept of interculturality imagines a break in this dichotomy of historical interpretation as
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right or wrong; however, at the same time it risks being seen by the gatekeepers of modernity as a struggle for power.

Cohesion at breaking point

The Cronulla riots in New South Wales in 2005 brought the History Wars to a climax. This event is reported as Australia’s first significantly violent intercultural conflict and it occurred at a time when the omnipotent fear of the ‘other’ was becoming increasingly pervasive in Australian society. Post 9/11, anti-Muslim tensions and the political capitalisation of asylum seeker boat arrivals were creating complex racial tensions (Daley 2013). John Howard, the then Prime Minister of Australia, blamed those who taught history for the violent incidents. He saw the riots as a failure to instil a mutual respect for Australia, its history and its values (Guyver 2012). Howard supported a view of teaching history that resisted globalisation and proffered that a single narrative of triumph should construct the core of Australia’s lens to the past. For conservatives, the desecration of motifs such as the Australian flag and the ANZACs are synonymous with the Cronulla riots and imply that there is a causal link between intercultural conflict and disenfranchised heritage.

Retrospectively, the History Wars confirm two contentions relevant to this study. Firstly, that ‘history education sits at the most volatile point on the interface between politics and education’ (Cooper, Dilek & Nichol 2009, p. 4). Secondly, the teaching of history at the secondary school level in Australia was, and still is, highly politicised. At the time, the teaching of history in Australian schools was exposed for falling short of being able to deal with historical conflict accorded to a multicultural society.

Whilst the History Wars raged over whether to teach the colonisation of Australia as an ‘invasion’ or ‘settlement’, Australia continued in a direction whereby the national narrative became central to national identity itself. At the same time, suggests Yates, ‘nations around the world have been concerned with the role of the subject of history in the formation of national identity and social integration’ (Yates et al. 2017, p. 96). For example, in Clark’s words, ‘debates over Germany and Japan’s remembrance of World War II have offered such scholars as Ian Buruma significant comparative material for analysing how communities come to
terms with their histories’ (Clark 2006, p. 50). In relation to schooling, history and history curriculum development initiated profound discussions and debates in countries across the globe in the last quarter of the twentieth century and into the twenty-first century (Phillips 2003). In the co-authored piece ‘Four Histories, One Nation? History teaching, nationhood and a British identity’, Phillips, Goalen, McCully and Wood (2003) state that history is controversial because it is inextricably linked to notions of cultural transmission, heritage and national identity. This helps to explain why governments have sought influence over the history curriculum in schools (2003, p. 113) and it also explains Australia’s emphatic search for a historical approach in the classroom, which led to a collective, social and public memory which is inherently political (Clark 2006).

When the political tide in Australia turned in 2007 and the Rudd government provided the impetus for a national curriculum framework that was to become the AC, it was no coincidence that the discipline of History was named one of the four core subjects for reform. The context of ‘world history’ gave weight to notions of historical and intercultural sensitivity and the scrutinising of versions of the past as a cultural resource rather than what the nation holds as ‘familiar and dear to us’ (Macintyre 2009, p. 2). Arguably, the legacy of the History Wars was impetus for a new history curriculum that aimed to address an ‘over-nationalistic treatment of the home country’, which can often characterise history curricula (Guyver 2012, p. 5). However, the impetus for change was stalled through debate and politicisation of the History curriculum in Australia.

The legacy of the History Wars

More than twenty years on from the History Wars, the History curriculum in both the AC and the VC remains at the forefront of political influence. Whilst debates have ‘been embedded within wider ideological disputes’, they point to the primary concerns of the place of accounts of indigenous dispossession, colonial violence, stolen children and the ill treatment of our indigenous people (Yates et al. 2017, p. 42). On the other hand, some argue that these primary concerns have overshadowed the positive aspects of Australia’s history; for one, ‘its democratic traditions and struggles in two world wars’ (p. 42).
Debates of historical evidence, representation and historical method continue well into the twenty-first century and are always based on the craft of telling stories. There have been many scholarly works such as E.H Carr’s seminal work, ‘What is History?’ (1962), David Cannadine’s ‘What is History Now?’ (2002) and Munslow’s ‘Deconstructing History’ (2006), which debate the capacity for historical facts to exist ‘objectively and independently of historical interpretation’ (Yates et al. 2017, p. 42). Debates around historical representation, interpretation and their propensities background this study and highlight that it is ‘almost impossible to draw the boundaries round history: they are potentially endless’ and must move on (Becher 1989, p. 264). An intercultural perspective sees that it is not the intention to draw boundaries, but to characterise ‘external openness’ rather than ‘internal unity’, and incorporate the interdisciplinary nature of the Humanities that is ‘engaged with feminist and postcolonial challenges and critical questioning brought about through postmodernism and post-structuralism’ (Yates et al. 2017a, p. 41; Becher 1989). The concept of interculturality prompts the acquiescence in recognition of the limitations of a single narrative approach to advocate reciprocity and exchange of historical narratives, including stories from minority groups that lay claim to Australia’s heritage.

Arguably, the History Wars disrupted the historical linchpins of history and its ‘order’ in Australia. The political climate in Australia was ‘hot’ and reactionary, allowing culture and difference to enter the historical narrative. The stories that needed to be told as part of the nation’s historical consciousness and as a means of sustaining the multiculturalist ideology with which this introduction began were most formidable and created a catalyst for change. However, schooling, history and the development of history curricula are often slow to react.

**Rationale, research questions and design**

**Rationale**

In Australia, the rising interest in interculturality in schools was confirmed by the inclusion of the general capability of ICU across all learning areas of the AC for implementation in 2013. In 2016, the VC went further to identify the Intercultural Capability curriculum designed and supported by its own scope and sequence,
resources and structure afforded to other key learning areas (see Figure 2 p.9). Both curricula developments intensified Australia’s response to ‘social and political conditions’ caused by ‘global travel, migration and transnational mobility’, which has produced greater ethnic, cultural and linguistic diversity within nation-states (Halse 2017, p. 2). The mandate for ICU to be integrated across all subject areas of the AC and the VC’s introduction of the Intercultural Capability curriculum are significant steps toward curriculum intervention into the teaching of the ‘multiplicity and fluidity of cultures and cultural identities’ (Cloonan et al. 2017, p. 1).

In this study, interculturality as an interdisciplinary concept ‘holds epistemic value’ (Bardhan & Sobré-Denton 2015, p. 131) for the history curriculum and warrants research into its visibility because the teaching of the phenomena of historical time, its events and narratives holds fast to a traditional approach in Australian schools and is slow to react to the ‘capacious site of unfolding interactions’ emerging across lines of cultural difference (p. 134).

To shift the historical imaginary to meld with the intercultural imaginary in Australian secondary schools, school history and its curricula development requires sound theoretical underpinnings that push away from the ‘discrete positioning of cultures without any sense of their interconnected histories’ (Bardhan & Sobré-Denton 2015, p. 133; Shome & Hegde 2002, p. 261). Research in this respect must recognise the dichotomy between not only the national and the intercultural but also the traditional and the transformative.

Figure 2 Intercultural Capability curriculum from the Victorian curriculum (VCAA 2016b)
Research questions, design and methodology

This project is guided by a single overarching question:

What is the contemporary relationship between interculturality and secondary school history education?

And two sub questions which are:

- How do teachers conceptualise interculturality for history teaching and learning?
- How do prescribed history textbooks in Australia interpret the concept of interculturality?

This research is a qualitative study carried out in Victoria, Australia during 2016. The research design is inspired by Laurel Richardson (Richardson 1994) and the introduction of the concept of crystallisation to qualitative methodology. Richardson and her articulations of crystallisation for qualitative research provide the capacity for writers to break out of traditional generic constraints (Ellingson 2009; Richardson 2000; Richardson & St. Pierre 2005). Laura Ellingson developed Richardson’s concept into a more nuanced framework for qualitative research projects to combine multiple forms of analysis and multiple forms of representation. This study furthers crystallisation methodology in qualitative research through its exposition of subtle shades of meaning and expression that appear in the written, visual and spoken texts of history education.

The research design functions suitably for addressing the research questions because it shifts from the linear to the interpretive and conceptual, and gives the researcher scope to raise awareness about the concept of interculturality as a phenomenon in twenty-first century history teaching and learning (St. Pierre 2015; Stewart 2017). Crystallisation when applied in qualitative research involves an inherent openness and flexibility. It allows the study to evolve and the research design to be modified or melded when a new aspect of the relationship between the concept and the foci of the project arises (Ellingson 2009; MacLure 2003).

Crystallisation is understood as a complex journey of discovery which operates across many fields. The first step of crystallisation is the understanding of self
before going out to understand the surrounding world (Stewart 2017). Following Stewart, crystallisation centres on ‘understanding the research and researcher position to intimately view the process with an openness that allows discoveries to unfold that would otherwise be lost’ (p. 1). This study is a call for the ‘uptake of boundary spanning’ through crystallisation as a methodology (p. 1). Moreover, following other scholars (see Denzin & Lincoln 2011; Ellingson 2011), crystallisation ‘moves through and along the qualitative continuum in the quest for deeper and richer understanding to advance social construction’ (Stewart 2017, p. 1).

The wondering of crystallisation prepares the researcher for any opportunities that may arise during the methodological journey. Preliminary questions as part of the research preparation explored the project as it took shape. What did the participants of the focus groups teach about their world and about mine? How is power revealed or hidden in these data? How does my identity relate to the work? As the researcher, I learned about my data by wondering and then immersing myself in it over time and by continually returning to my research questions.

This study employs two methods for generating its data: textual analysis and focus groups. In keeping with Silverman (2013), in order to make the detailed textual analysis effective the body of data is limited to a single chronological timeline selected from a popular history textbook, the *Oxford Big Ideas History 9* (Carrodus et al. 2012; Carrodus & Smith 2016). This textbook remains a popular choice in Australian secondary schools and claims to have been written to align with the policies of the AC. It was republished in 2016 to accommodate the VC. It is also a text that I have worked with extensively in the classroom as a teacher of 7-10 history.

Classroom context and teacher practice, which is what I know, informed the choice to work with teacher focus groups. Focus groups as a method align with an interpretivist paradigm and underpin the choice of discourse analysis. The focus groups sought to establish insight into how the concept of interculturality is understood and conceptualised for the everyday history classroom within the parameters of the AC.
The combination of textual analysis and teacher focus groups to generate data ensures rigour in examining how the concept of interculturality and its associated term ICU as a national strategy in curriculum policy is being interpreted and understood in two core elements of the enacted curriculum and in light of policy expectation (Ball, Braun & Maguire 2012; Fairclough 1992).

A unique setting

The unique setting where I gathered data for the teacher focus groups was a college, which at the time stood iconically as the largest Catholic co-educational secondary college in the southern hemisphere. Comprising of three campuses, the spread and number of teachers who teach history across years 7-10 meant I could gather a random sample rather than a contrived selection. Further, the participants varied from early career teachers, to long-standing career teachers with ongoing positions, to teachers on contract. At the time of the focus groups the AC had been implemented. However, like most schools in Victoria at the time, the College was moving swiftly towards implementing the VC in 2017. Further, this setting was unique because the teaching fraternity and student body was predominantly Anglo-Saxon and arguably lacked multiculturality. Therefore, in the College, the national strategy for mandating interculturality was juxtaposed against a setting steeped in traditional boundaries in determining what counts for knowledge.

A unique moment in time

Green (2010) surmises, with regard to researching futures in education, that it is particularly important not to simply be acutely and critically aware of what constitutes the present moment, but also of where it traces, lingers and leaves its mark in how we think our way, now, into what might be. That is, the enterprise must be understood, right from the outset, as profoundly historical (p. 2).

The enterprise of this research is a unique moment in time in history education to inform future history curricula and pedagogy.

This research is situated in a profound, historical and unique moment in time for history education in Australia for these reasons:
• History curriculum in Australia at this time was heavily politicised, at the highest levels of government in Australia, demonstrating polarised views of what should be taught in history classrooms.

• After only two years the AC, and particularly the History curriculum, was challenged by the Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority and prominent politicians.

• History curriculum in Victoria was in flux at the time that the data was collected for this project. The researcher and the participants of the focus groups had feet in both camps: the AC and the VC. References are made to both curricula throughout the interviews. Therefore, a particularity of the data is that it is tracing what came before, what lingers in the present to inform the future of history education.

• During the course of this study the structure of the history curriculum changed significantly and impacted on this project. In the AC the historical knowledge regarding Australia’s early beginnings was placed in what is called a ‘Depth Study’, which carried the title of ‘Making a Nation’. In the VC this title was scrapped, and yet the actual ‘content descriptors’, which outline specific content knowledge, remain the same. This is a significant change that is extrapolated from the data.

• The data gathered from the textual analysis began in 2014 under the policy of the AC (v7.1). The textbook used for the analysis was rewritten to address the changes incurred through the implementation of the VC. Therefore, the sample for the textual analysis includes the text created for both the AC and the VC to show the whole story.

• The data collected for this project was carried out in Victoria, a state that has been doing unique things around ICU for some time and has contributed to both primary and secondary educators’ understanding of the national and global implications of the mandated implementation of ICU.

• As a researcher who has spent twenty-eight years as a practicing professional I see this project as having a transformative, personal and professional contribution to make to educational research.
Mapping the curriculum for the thesis

Central to this curriculum study is an understanding of the AC and the Victorian curriculum. This thesis is located in a study of curriculum and inspired and informed by curriculum research into:

- What counts for powerful knowledge in schooling in the twenty-first century (Green 2010; Young 2015)
- The ‘reframing of disciplinary organisation in the face of the knowledge explosion, new technologies, new global communications and relationships’ (Yates et al. 2017a, pp. 4-5)
- The intention and development of history curriculum and the role of history in schools and curriculum dilemmas
- What kind of world we are preparing students for (Baker 2013; Seixas & Peck 2004).

*What is the Australian Curriculum (AC)?*

The establishment of ACARA as a national authority, with a brief to develop a framework for a national curriculum, ‘is one of the most important developments in curriculum of recent times in Australia’ (Yates et al. 2017a, p. 78). This development, says Yates, represented ‘a major intervention both in process or governance terms and also in terms of the very visible public framing of the knowledge agenda for schools’ (p. 78).

In response to the politicisation of curriculum in general in Australia, a consultation process that involved numerous stakeholders the implementation of the AC was launched in 2013 in four key learning areas: English, Maths, Science and History. The consultation was initially guided by the ‘Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians’, an agreed statement of goals for schooling that was nationally agreed to by a Ministerial Council comprising of all federal Ministers of Education in Australia in December 2008. The trajectory for the implementation of all other key learning areas would occur over three years.

In conjunction with each key learning area the AC introduced three Cross-Curriculum Priorities:
• Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander histories and culture,
• Asia and Australia’s engagement with Asia,
• Sustainability.

In addition, it introduced the following seven mandated general capabilities:

• Literacy
• Numeracy
• ICT
• Critical and Creative Thinking
• Personal and Social Capability
• Intercultural Understanding
• Ethnicity

These specific curriculum capabilities and priorities, designed to operate alongside the domains of eight key learning areas, added a new holistic approach to disciplinary knowledge and students’ learning in Australia (Yates et al. 2017a). The new AC initially came under fire from conservatives, in particular for concerns about history and the impact discourses of ‘world history’ may have on the preferred ‘root-and-branch’ approach proffered earlier by the Howard government; however, ACARA maintained its new philosophical approach to curriculum and has since significantly changed the landscape of curriculum in Australia.

The AC in its true sense, however, was short-lived. Despite being implemented across States and Territories for Year 7-10 schooling, a significant split occurred late 2015 between the national body and the state of Victoria. Consequently, the latter launched its own 7-10 curriculum early in 2016.

This research began with its interests in the implementation and implication of the AC and its general capability of ICU. However, being situated in Victoria made it impossible not to follow significant curriculum developments such as the creation of the VC and the development of its history component and the Intercultural
Capability curriculum. Therefore, over a period of three years, this thesis followed the development of curriculum initiatives nationally and in the state of Victoria.

**What is the Victorian Curriculum (VC)?**

On the 12th of May 2016 Dr David Howes, then Chief Executive Officer of the Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority (VCAA), addressed an auditorium of Victorian teachers at the Melbourne Exhibition Centre on the topic of implementing the VC in 2017. Dr Howe’s key point was that the VC incorporates the AC but reflects Victorian priorities and standards. The title ‘Victorian Curriculum’, although it appeared predictable, identified ‘stability in curriculum’ as represented by the Victorian Certificate of Education, unchanged for twenty-three years. Consequently, the title ‘Victorian Curriculum’ was managed and engaged as a measure of that stability and a message for the future of curriculum in this state.

At the outset of the introduction of the framework, States and Territories of Australia were left to interpret and implement what was practical and pressing. In the state of Victoria, prior to 2016, the Foundation to Year 10 Curriculum was called AusVels and incorporated the Cross-Curriculum Priorities and the mandated seven General Capabilities (listed on the previous page) visible in the national curriculum. The history component in AusVels was organised using a curriculum model comprising of Historical Knowledge and Understanding, divided into specific ‘Depth Studies’ for each historical period, and Historical Skills. In 2016 the VCAA rewrote the AusVels and looked to implementing the VC in 2017. In 2016 the Intercultural Capability was (and remains in 2018) inextricably linked to the Humanities curriculum and therefore to history teaching and learning as shown in Figure 3 (over page). Further, unlike in the AC, this capability is targeted by the VCAA to be measured as part of schools’ assessment and reporting as early as 2019.

**History and the Intercultural Capability**

Associate Professor Tony Taylor’s national inquiry into school history at the beginning of the twenty-first century found that the teaching of history in Australian schools was ‘characterised by topic repetition and a lack of continuity
and coherence’ (Yates et al. 2017a, p. 43; Taylor 2000). In the decade to follow a national history summit was conducted by the Howard government and then a change of government in 2007 led to a National Curriculum Board, later to become ACARA. The history curriculum was developed and approved in 2010 and the process of implementation began. Then, under the Abbott government in 2013, a review of the AC led to history being absorbed into a broader humanities and social sciences subject in the primary years and attention turned to strengthening references to ‘Western’ influences in Australia’s history. More recently in 2017, former Prime Minister Tony Abbot confirmed this view and went on record saying that a Turnbull government’s plan to teach more Indigenous history in primary schools would be a ‘capitulation to the Left’ unless it was accompanied by lessons on British history and the rise of the West.¹ More intuitive perspectives prevailed in the face of staunch Western perspective and the concept of ‘World History’ broadened the framework of the AC through its general capability of ICU. For the first time in Australia, there was a change in the terms of reference for the national curriculum and therefore the discourse of school history.

In February 2016 at the outset of implementation of the VC, a preliminary stakeholder briefing was run by Sharon Foster, VC Manager for the VCAA. During Foster’s presentation a link between history curriculum and the intercultural capability was made in this way: ‘There are strong connections to the history and Intercultural Capability curriculums’². Further, Foster provided an introduction to the ‘Intercultural Capability’ in this power point slide:

² Presentation by Sharon Foster, VC Manager, at the Victorian Curriculum F-10 Stakeholder Briefing, Melbourne, 11-12 February 2016.
The above extract highlights from its inception in the Victorian Curriculum how the Intercultural Capability aligned with the Humanities in general and specifically with history. Specific words such as ‘difference’, ‘negotiate’, ‘challenge assumptions, stereotypes and prejudices’, ‘change attitudes and beliefs’, and ‘empathy, respect and conflict resolution’ – used here to explain the approach and essence of interculturality – act as a prelude to this thesis and its intention to show what an intercultural approach for history teaching and learning might look like.

**Disclosure of the insider researcher**

Drake says that ‘there are clear sets of difficulties that can be recognised in conducting research in one’s workplace in terms of the researcher’s status within the institution’ and this is a practical concern for the trustworthiness of the research (Drake 2010, p. 85). At the same time Drake’s article also suggests that researching within one's own workplace only happens on a small scale. However, as Greene points out, ‘the amount of insider research being conducted has increased in recent years; much of this research is happening within the field of education’ (Greene 2014, p. 1).
I can well see the concerns associated with being an ‘insider’ researcher; however, I can also see the weaknesses in these arguments. For example, Drake’s concerns outlined above are countered by the fact that it is becoming more and more frequent that people research within their own workplace, group or society (Greene 2014). This is practical for many reasons. One may be driven by pragmatism – ‘makes life easier’ syndrome – or, more likely, because there is high interest in finding out about phenomena that exist under our noses. Greene also touts the concern that ‘insider’ researchers may be confronted or challenged by methodological or ethical issues that may be deemed irrelevant to the ‘outsider’ researcher (p. 3). However, for this researcher, positionality in the thesis was the most glaring concern. Drake comments that putting oneself squarely in the frame of the research has over the last decades caused ethical issues for researchers (Drake 2010). Positionality, say Green and others, is determined by where one stands in relation to the other; this can shift throughout the process of conducting research. Positions are relative to the cultural values and norms of both the researcher and participants (Greene 2014; Merriam et al. 2001).

Thomson surmises the contention of others by pointing out that the binary language of insider-outsider has traversed many social science disciplines, including education. Outsiders have criticality by virtue of having ‘fresh eyes’ but can also miss important phenomena and thus seriously misinterpret local meanings and practices (Clifford & Marcus 2010; Geertz 1973a; Thomson & Gunter 2011). I take on board and respond to these well-researched notions regarding the dilemma of the ‘insider’ researcher.

For this study there are three salient points regarding my ‘insider’ identity. Firstly, it is never hidden. In fact, from the outset the reader is aware that I move in and out of my role as a teacher and researcher. Choosing which hat to wear at certain moments during the focus group interviews and when conducting textual analysis is part of the complexity of this thesis. How I see myself in the research at particular moments and writing about it is, as Hellawell (2006) encourages, a type of reflexivity. In addition to this, writing, reading and re-reading research diary notes is another avenue for reflexivity important to the credibility of qualitative study (Thomson & Gunter 2011). However, I do agree with Drake (2010) that opening up research diaries often works against the researcher because it acts as a
proof of the researcher’s ‘sins’, particularly if it is presented as further ‘self-revealing’ documentation (p. 87). I used the research diary, which operated as a set of field notes, on a regular basis throughout this study and this has been a valuable source. For example, I found that the notes/questions I asked myself after the focus groups made for interesting and critical reading, and although not presented as an appendix of faults, this approach worked as a mirror and increased the stability of my self-identity in this thesis (Drake 2010; Thomson & Gunter 2011).

Secondly, this project is heuristic by nature. It is not guaranteed to be perfect, but rather focuses on the learning and discovery that takes place along the way and at the moment in time. Therefore, I was careful to consider my sometimes ‘shifting position along the insider continuum’; I constantly developed my reflexivity and therefore a pathway to discovering new knowledge (Hellawell 2006, p. 483).

Thirdly, I felt and recognised the insider-outsider dichotomy to be particularly poignant when conducting the focus groups. At times I wondered if the discussion would have been different had an outsider been the facilitator, and if this was a disadvantage. Admittedly, sometimes I felt uncomfortable that my presence could be intimidating for participants or that they would respond with what they thought I might want to hear. However, ironically, I think the analysis of the data is all the stronger for these reasons. Here is an example explained by the notes written in my research diary late September 2016:

Group four was different to the others. Not just the atmosphere which was very relaxed and good humoured but because of the status of the participants. This was the only group in which the Head of the Department sat. The young man who held the position of Head of Humanities was a likeable character. I knew him well because I had worked with him over the past ten years. He was passionate and knowledgeable about history and history curriculum and keen to contribute to my research. He had asked if he could ‘sit in’ on some of the other groups. Now, an outsider may have seen this as an advantage, adding robust and depth of knowledge to the discussion. However, as an insider, I knew that his presence would change the demeanour of some of the participants because of his professional status, which was often interpreted as a position of power. The random selection of participants would suddenly be contaminated by an engineered choice of his presence.

Additionally, my shifting ‘positionality’ (Greene 2014) was caused by the complexity of the project and its data. There were times I felt like an outsider in
terms of theoretical knowledge and research knowledge. Upon reflection, in the end this was an advantage because I was not pinned to the intricacies of theory and pre-given knowledge. On the contrary, I was more open to the data in starting the analysis. As the key literatures for the project increasingly emerged, so did my understanding of what I saw in the data. I sensed the need to be disciplined enough not to anticipate or ‘read into’ the data to make it fit. I had to listen to the silences as such and watch for other signs of communication without imposing my own take on what I heard.

Ultimately each of the focus groups was a social situation and participants were seen as part of a social group who had come together randomly. As an insider I was a member of that specified social group and collective (of teachers and even coordinators) who held intimate knowledge of the school’s hierarchy. Before conducting the focus groups I wore my teacher’s hat and I identified strongly with the role of the history teacher and my colleagues. However, I found ease in shifting to the researcher position when each focus group began. Although the analyst is often ‘anchored in some or other discursive structure’, this is not to discredit the value of discourse analysis. The analyst cannot be a ‘fly on a wall’ but rather must accept the nature of the knowledge she wishes to produce (Jørgensen 2002).

To conclude, this last section acts as the declaration of an ‘insider’. I knew the terrain and its people from the start. I knew the history textbook through my own teaching practice. Whenever needed I have declared any concerns regarding my insider status and made links to any relevant literature. Methodologically, the decision to use crystallisation alleviated many of my apprehensions and concerns because it meant I would not analyse from a single perspective or through one lens, but rather through a set of diverse lenses that challenge the researcher in the places where data was gathered.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Chapter synopsis

In qualitative research the metaphor of the crystal has often been used as a way to frame the methodological congruence of the trustworthiness of the researcher’s account (Ellingson 2009; Richardson 2000; Richardson & St. Pierre 2005; Stewart 2017). This study follows these lines of inquiry. As the interaction between the image and text introduced in the preliminary section of this thesis infers, the crystal when it meets qualitative research assists the researcher, as crystals have many forms and can represent reflection, interpretation, representation, density and components that are difficult to see or grasp. This research rests on the melding together of two constructs: interculturality and history education. As this literature review will explain, it is rare for interculturality and history education to be discussed or analysed in the same literature; however, when interpreted within the research problem that this thesis sets out to understand, the underlying lattice of both constructs supports intersection in unequal measures and requires a review of the field, which is crystalline in nature.

This Literature Review is divided into three parts and is supported by the crystal as metaphor to make distinctions. Part 1 entitled ‘Distinctions’ draws on a body of literatures (triclinic3 in nature) to make three distinctions: interculturality, history, curriculum and pedagogy. Each distinction crystallises the philosophical and epistemological underpinnings of the thesis.

Part 2 is entitled ‘History as a nation’s mirror’ and draws on literatures concerned with the power of history textbooks and school history politics. A nation’s history is a desired reflection notoriously known for how it shapes identity through historical consciousness; a problematic necessity even in the most enlightened initiatives of intercultural exchange. Therefore, this section explains an underlying axis of the thesis: the notion of the power of representation in the discourses of history textbooks.

---

3 A reference to the triclinic nature of the crystal system united through an underpinning lattice – known as the Bravais lattice.
By outlining the role of interculturality in two distinct historical contexts, Part 3 interprets interculturality through a wider prism. Entitled ‘The distinction of the knotted cord’, this section takes a historical understanding of interculturality to show its capacity as a concept to be a disruptive tension in a nation’s history.

**Part 1: Distinctions**

A distinction is the act of seeing or pointing out a difference or diversity. For the teaching and learning of history to be intercultural we need a triumph of difference through a symbolic understanding of distinctions (Page 2007). I conceptualise ‘distinction’ through language and its interpretive diversity. By adopting the view that historical thinking needs to be intercultural, the review constitutes its argument through the intersection of three distinctions: interculturality, history and curriculum and pedagogy.

The first pane, Distinction 1, examines ‘culture’ and then ‘interculturality’. A vision of interculturality in history education is impeded by ‘good intentions’ at the broader level of intercultural education. According to Gorski, these ‘good intentions are not enough’ and the way that Western countries go about deploying intercultural education is part of the problem (Gorski 2008, p. 515). In Distinction 1, interculturality is defined for its complexity as a broader term, and then to advocate its role as an educational strategy for history education. I apply interculturality in this thesis as a whole in terms of an educational strategy that is theoretically underpinned by contemporary literatures that take into account the need to consider ‘historical, political and cultural contexts when formulating theories about the nature and significance of intercultural identities’ (Britto 2004, p. 3). Or to use another understanding,

> Intercultural education must embrace hope and the imagination, but in association with reason, understanding and knowledge. It is grounded in a capacity for critical pragmatism, an appreciation for an educational project based on a global concern for equity and justice and for the establishment of the basis of unfettered, rational communication between peoples (Bash 2014, p. 77)

The second pane, Distinction 2, joins a complex set of interrelated scholarly distinctions about the nature of history, the discipline of history and history education to establish context for this section and the premise that acumen in
history education ‘first and foremost necessitates an adequate explanation’ about history as a discipline because ‘epistemological and conceptual frameworks shape and colour’ a particular approach (Yilmaz 2008, p. 37). History teachers need to have a sufficient understanding of the impact of the global expectations for the general goals of history as a discipline, and how this intersects with history as a school subject to meet the challenges proposed by the concept of interculturality. The section then examines theoretical approaches to historical thinking as intercultural.

The third pane, Distinction 3, reflects the nature of historical content knowledge as value-laden; its subjectivity is driven by those in power and strongly marks a lack of research into interculturality as a concept to disrupt the world view of the powerful and dominant group. In this section history education and interculturality intersect at the point of curriculum and pedagogy with full consideration that what is included in a history curriculum should not be used as a means ‘of transmitting a privileged group’s cultural norms and values’ (Yilmaz 2008, p. 40).

Responses to these distinctions may be ‘defensive, adaptive or coexistential’ but whatever form they may take, this review of literatures positions interculturality as one of the most ‘dynamic forces driving historical change’ in history education (Rozbicki 2015, p. 1).

**Distinction 1 – Interculturality**

The multifarious nature of ‘culture’ in Australia regards all things inclusive and imposes pressure on all areas of education and specifically for history education. This section contributes to recognition of the complexities of culture in a globalised world, ‘which brings different traditions and civilizations into closer and closer contact’ emphasising the growing density and need for intercultural thinking’ (Rüsen 2004a, p. 119).

‘Culture’, according to Eagleton (2000) is one of the most complex words to define (Camase 2009; Eagleton 2000). Historically, Australia’s two hundred and thirty years since settlement add to the ‘philosophical and political dimensions’ of culture and highlight the ‘multiple facets of the term’ (Camase 2009).
Australia’s history challenges the essentialist theory that ‘encloses culture within the perimeter of nation-state borders: one language, one country, and one culture’; rather the multicultural brand of Australia advocates that culture is a more flexible, fluid changing process (p. 23). A more ‘hermeneutically oriented understanding of culture is both intellectually productive and usable within a variety of disciplines’, which is what makes it intercultural (Rozbicki 2015, p. 11). Further, it dispels a presumed antagonism between stability and fluidity (or functionalist and postmodernist) because ‘culture is not an outside, fixed system that guide people’s behaviour and can be reduced to abstract rules, but a dynamic phenomenon’ (p. 11).

Sewell (2005) makes the distinction between two aspects of culture. The first focuses on culture as a social category that can be separated from other aspects of human life. Culture in this sense, explains Nordgren and Johansson (2015), is always in the singular. Sewell’s second usage of culture refers to culture as a ‘concrete and bounded body of beliefs and practices’ that adheres to a society or subgroup (Sewell 2005, p. 39). In this second meaning culture is seen as different and distinct from other cultures. Nordgren recognises the criticism that may arise with this second meaning, which appears to turn cultures into overly strict and coherent entities, but this is not how its meaning is understood here. Like Nordgren and Johansson, I see Sewell’s second distinction of ‘culture’ to mean that ‘cultures can be coherent but also subject to dynamic changes’ (Nordgren & Johansson 2015, p. 6). ‘Cultures’ as ‘bounded worlds of beliefs and practices’ are also worlds filled with contradictions; they are integrated with other cultures in a loose way, where questions about identity and belonging are raised as part of understanding their differences (Sewell 2005).

From culture to intercultural

This study necessitates the complexity of culture that the literatures so far illustrate. In fact, the ‘culture’ must be fluid and never singular in order for interculturality to exist. When ‘two distinct cultures encounter each other’ and their unknown differences become familiar and known, or rather their content is exchanged, the concept of interculturality emerges and a space is created where meaning is translated and difference is negotiated (Rozbicki 2015).
Brown (2015) contemplates this emergence through the lens of anthropology. When looking at the historical events of revolution between the Spaniards and Pueblos of 1680, she says that the intercultural does not imply that two cultures consciously agree on what constitutes ‘culture’; it is not so black and white. According to Brown, the formative period of anthropology defined ‘culture’ as an ‘orderly and integrated, self-sustaining, whole or totality of shared meanings, beliefs and practices that are passed down from generation to generation’ (p. 99). However, this ‘culture concept’ in more recent times has been strongly criticised: anthropologists now argue that cultures are not, in fact, bounded wholes, especially in an increasingly globalised world, nor are they necessarily shared. It is now recognised that what ‘order’ or integrated set of beliefs and practices gets defined as representative of some group’s culture is a highly politicised process and is further defined as what is normative (Brown 2015, p. 99). On the other hand, says Rozbicki, just because ‘cultures are fluid and constantly change does not mean that they do not contain long-lasting, shared attributes’ and this is why an ‘historical dimension is just as indispensable as an anthropological one’ (Rozbicki 2015, p. 11).

Historically, interculturality has been a ‘tenuous’ balancing act which has emerged through peace but also through trauma of revolts and revolution (Brown 2015). Its existence is dependent on the ascription of content to culture and it is never about a singular culture.

The ‘notoriously tricky concept of culture can be blurred and changing and these are constituent factors of modern life’, and that should play a part in history education (Nordgren & Johansson 2015, p. 6). Further, the constituent factors of interculturality provide the means of viewing and negotiating cultural cohesion, allowing research and history education to ‘explore cultural encounters’ avoiding the essentialism of Sewell’s first definition (Nordgren & Johansson 2015, p. 6; Sewell 2005). Whichever way culture and representation of cultural difference are viewed, history gives voice to the stories of the dead and interculturality gives voice to the ‘other’. As Greg Dening of the Melbourne School of History once observed, both share an acute awareness that the strangers they write about exist independently of our knowing about them (Rozbicki 2015, p. 11; Dymond 2001).
Historically, countries like Britain and Australia have always been multicultural. If we use the taxonomy of linguistic, religious, social class and territorial indices of diversity, then Australia pre-colonisation was multicultural and is a descriptive term. It describes the factual existence of various cultures; however, it does not say anything about the relationship between or among these cultures (Hyundok 2006).

The prefix ‘inter’, according to Sarmento (2014), assumes that two or more cultures interact, whereas the prefix ‘multi’ does not. Instead it suggests the coexistence of various cultures, stratified and hierarchical. Through Hyundok Choe’s philosophical eyes, multicultural conjures the image of smaller, marginalised groups revolving around the dominant culture looking for contact and approval from this culture, yet not interacting with their neighbours. Within this image, ‘each community is mainly in conversation with the dominant cultural group, however, they are not necessarily in communication with one another, except as mediated by the dominate group’ (Lee 2007, p. 2; Hyundok 2006). The infographic presented in Figure 4 is my visualisation of Hyundok’s point.

![Figure 4 Infographic: Hyundok’s (2006) explanation of ‘multicultural’](image)

Under this arrangement, marginalised communities or countries cannot help setting their own interests at odds when competing for approval from the
dominant culture (Lee 2007). This scenario manifests as ethnocentrism, a perspective that Rozbicki (2015) suggests people naturally take historically. People do not misread ‘otherness’, says Rozbicki; ‘they often simply do not have the knowledge to read it properly’ (p. 12). Moreover, as Bourdieu pointed out, recognitions of the ‘other’ are to some degree misrecognitions because no one is able to fully see the other objectively outside of one’s own knowledge (Bourdieu 1980).

On the one hand in Australia, it can appear that we are still waiting for Rozbicki’s claim of a ‘new and vigorous emphasis on interculturality in public discourse’ (Rozbicki 2015, p. 18). On the other hand, in education, projects such as a recently conducted longitudinal study of Intercultural Understanding support the scholarly push for exacting how we understand interculturality and what it looks like in education in Australia (Halse 2015).

One of the most important reasons why interculturality and its associated terms are so difficult to visualise for teachers is the lack of distinction between an overall descriptive term and an educational strategy. In the past, this has been a common failure of multicultural education, led by shifting ‘cultural texture’ and demographics imposed by trans-nationalism and immigration well into the twenty-first century; some might say contributing to its demise, but certainly to a decline in its popularity. The question, says Özturgut (2011),

*Is not whether a multicultural education should be adopted but it is rather what we understand from multicultural education and how we are going to initiate such a reform within an educational system when we cannot even define multicultural (p. 1, my italics).*

The ‘precarious hegemonic status quo’ of multicultural education has progressed this century to the extent that some refer to it in the past tense (Wright, Singh & Race 2012, p. 3). However, that is not to say that intercultural education has automatically progressed further. In fact, since 2006, the instigating body for guidelines on intercultural education UNESCO has not been forthcoming with anything further than this general distinction:

*The term multicultural describes the culturally diverse nature of human society. It not only refers to elements of ethnic or national culture, but also includes linguistic, religious and socio-economic diversity. Interculturality is a dynamic*
concept and refers to evolving relations between cultural groups. It has been defined as “the existence and equitable interaction of diverse cultures and the possibility of generating shared cultural expressions through dialogue and mutual respect”. Interculturality presupposes multiculturalism and results from ‘intercultural’ exchange and dialogue on the local, regional, national or international level (UNESCO 2006, p. 18).

According to Paul Carr (2012), the linguistic component in debating the definitions of multicultural and intercultural cannot be underestimated. Most of Carr’s work is in relation to Canada and its continuous progression in recognising their multicultural society and progressing intercultural education. His question of whether ‘language present[s] an impenetrable barrier to engaging with the “other”’, asked in 2012, was advanced in the wake of the release of progressive educational strategies produced by the Ministry for Education British Columbia in 2015, entitled ‘Aboriginal Worldviews and Perspectives in the Classroom’, and was evidenced in a comment made by one of the participants: ‘so much of worldview is carried in language’ (British Columbia 2015, p. 17). This is not unlike the situation in Australia’s education system, where the writing of interculturality, particularly for history education, furthers our understanding of indigenous worldviews.

**Interculturality – the ‘fractured significance’**

Within interculturalism, ‘culture’ is not treated in the same way as multiculturalism. In multiculturalism, Giuliana Prato states, ‘culture is treated as a “thing”, an object to be possessed and shared by strictly defined groups of people and which sets the group apart from other groups’ (Prato, Pardo & Prato 2009, p. 8). The impetus for the ‘lexical change from one prefix (multi) to another (inter)’ (Aman 2015, p. 153) some advocates of interculturality suggest, derives from the fact that multiculturalism tends to reify and preserve cultural identities, while interculturality acknowledges that cultures are endlessly evolving in a society, with the potential to be exchanged and modified (Aman 2015, p. 153; Gundara & Portera 2008). There is also an international sense that multiculturalism has become an ‘empty signifier, a conceptual void’, onto which ‘a range of groups projects their fears and hopes’ (Aman 2015, p. 153; Bhabha 1994). The retreat from multiculturalism can be ascribed to confusion about its purpose and its
rhetoric to help solve the troubles of European nations and most Western countries.

In the wake of World War Two, the causal relationship between globalisation and multiculturalism gained traction and population movement impacted heavily on Western European nations; under the auspices of multiculturalism, it moved people with diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds into ‘somebody else’s previously homogenous back yard’ (Aman 2015, p. 156). These sentiments regarding the failure of multiculturalism and the importance of interculturality were echoed earlier this century by the EU and UNESCO, two major bodies that emphasised an appreciation for diversity and the desire to facilitate dialogue (Aman 2015).

Consequently, interculturality began to be seen as an educational model that would offer guidance on how to act and live in a changing society and a multicultural, multiethnic, global and intercultural context (Lahdenperä 2004). However, the complexity of interculturality cannot be denied and a distinction between interculturality and interculturality must be made. In order to do this I follow contentions made by Aman and his inspiration from Derrida’s distinction – only graspable in writing – between his invented term différance and difference (Derrida 1978, 1998a).

Aman makes the distinction in this way. The term intercultural (no italics) indicates that different experiences, languages and identities under the name of culture already intersect with, and are contaminated by, one another, and are therefore already intercultural, before they are subjected to study under the auspices of interculturality (with italics), which as an educational topic denotes the contemporary set of theories connected to intercultural education that invoke notions of ‘plurality as a condition for its existence, elevated for its own sake, with the attendant risk of (re)writing cultural divides into being through its demand for alterity’ (Aman 2015, p. 5).

For the purposes of this study, I extrapolate this différance as interculturality (no italics) having its roots in ‘culture’ and bridging cultural specificities that are already interconnected through ‘language, different experiences and identities’ (Aman 2015, p. 5). When written without italics, interculturality encompasses
what we already know to be a ‘mosaic of cultures’ or the ‘history of all cultures, a history of cultural borrowing’ (Said 1994, p. 261) that sees the quest for national authenticity as absurd (Aman 2015; Khatibi & Dana 1993). Further, interculturality is a trait we all share before any commitment is made to it as a paradigm. In the writing of interculturality its ‘fractured signification’ is revealed (Aman 2015, p. 5).

Gorski writes that ‘good intentions are not enough’ in terms of how Western countries go about deploying intercultural education (Gorski 2008, p. 515). Further, Coulby argues that interculturality and intercultural education suffer from ‘theoretical weaknesses’ (Coulby 2006, p. 247). I suggest that in such cases these weaknesses arise from projects that address the intercultural rather than intercultural and stem from a lack of understanding of the distinct, fractured significance of the term being argued in this study.

Schools are well known for creating international food days and national costume days for the good cause of recognising and exchanging diversity and these initiatives are admirable and encouraged. They embody the far-reaching impact of interculturality on society, through globalisation and the movement of people. However, such approaches evidence that wherever interculturality is primarily used, it is employed distinctively from multiculturalism (the descriptive term for the factual co-existence of people of diverse cultures in a given space or as something to be possessed), and is often seen as a ‘cure’ or capacity for learning to live in an ethnically and culturally diverse society (Gundara 2000; Leeman 2003; Prato, Pardo & Prato 2009). However, as the article ‘Good Intentions Are Not Enough’ argues,

People who call themselves intercultural educators, most intercultural education practice supports, rather than challenges, dominant hegemony, prevailing social hierarchies, and inequitable distributions of power and privilege such are not intercultural (Gorski 2008, p. 515).

Many approaches to interculturality in education are devoid of an intercultural educational model or strategy.

Unlike Aman, I am not as strict in invoking Derrida’s theory that ‘an identity is never given, received or attained’, for Aman’s reasons for invoking différenc run
deep into the boughs of the act of writing self and other (quoted in Aman 2015, p. 5; Derrida 1998a). Nevertheless, the writing of **interculturality** as an educational model and strategy for transforming curriculum must be distinct from any terms that are underpinned by the postcolonial assertion that an encounter between two distinct cultures with fixed identities is sufficient in reflecting ‘nuances of history, power and domination’ (Fiedler 2007, p. 16; Salter & Maxwell 2018). **Interculturality** as an educational strategy, ‘begs theoretical preparedness’ (Rozbicki 2015, p. 5) and requires theoretical support and research in history education in order to protect the intercultural. The writing of interculturality can be traced historically and has significant bearing on this thesis and its discussion of perspectives. However, **interculturality** is less traceable and more topical in its bearing. From this stance, the intercultural must give heed to **intercultural** for fear of being written out of existence (Aman 2015).

None of this means that either intercultural or **intercultural** should create a dichotomy of right or wrong between interculturalism and multiculturalism, nor see the concept in its entirety as a saving grace for humankind. However, it does mean that new theoretical contributions, such as this study, must temporally situate interculturality as more than a ‘noble calling’ tied to the twentieth century (Aman 2015). I support Aman and others (Abdallah Pretceille 2006; Grant & Portera 2011; Gundara 2000) on the timelessness of interculturality, and see clearly the inherent risks in contextualizing interculturality within a linear trajectory, barring the ‘other’ from being a historical subject by splitting time into binaries (Aman 2015).

I subscribe to the notion that even though ‘other’ carries with it a discourse of ‘them’, its sheer presence generates cultural diversity and must be intercultural. As noted earlier in this section, Rozbicki makes the point that people do not misread ‘Otherness’. Misreading suggests that ‘people have the knowledge and understanding to “read” it in the first place’ and typically this is not the case (Rozbicki 2015, p. 12). Further, when Portera says ‘the only race on the Earth is the human race’, in so much as we have common origins and DNA, he highlights that it is history which has imposed development of difference. ‘Human existence is found on difference’, Portera says; historically, major problems for the human
race originate from these differences and an intercultural encounter is ultimately a relation of difference (Portera 2011, p. 15; Rozbicki 2015).

Assertions about *difference* within Western historical thinking encourage the concept of interculturality as a necessary presupposition to negotiating cultural difference in a ‘pragmatic and rhetorical context’ (Xie 2011, p. 14; Rüsen 2002). However, Aman (2015) suggests that the language of *interculturality* brings about an ‘inbuilt amnesia’ (p. 136) in that the modern nation emerges as an artefact of the mid-nineteenth century, one of the most sustained periods of mass immigration in the West (Bhabha 1994). The question that *interculturality* as an educational strategy sets out to answer has a long history in colonial settings: how will ‘we’ accommodate the ‘Other’ within ‘our’ borders? (Aman 2015, p. 136). I agree with Aman that the ‘newness of the answer’ to this question is a rhetorical strategy that disavows interculturality in the name of *interculturality* (p. 136). However, the historical traces of interculturality canvassed in this thesis suggest that one protects the other in order to give oxygen, rather than deny it, to ‘the narrative of overlapping and intertwined pasts’ (Bhabha 1994, p. 7), even despite the endurance of the myth of the nation as having been once upon a time homogenous and pure or at the very least, ‘white’ (Aman 2015).

*Interculturality and whiteness*

The final aspect of Distinction 1 has to do with whiteness and the growing body of literature that surrounds this field of inquiry used in many academic fields, including history, and is often applied to broader strands such as immigration history (Shiells 2010).

‘Whiteness’ studies is a discrete field of academic inquiry which since the latter stages of the twentieth century has had ‘important implications across a range of fields, including history’ (Shiells 2010). The author argues that ‘in Australia, historians across a range of fields have embraced whiteness studies’ (p. 790). Initially critiqued in the early twentieth century by scholars such as DuBois, whiteness was seen as an idea dreamt up by ‘whites’ who wanted to put it to use:

> Ever have men striven to conceive of their victims as different from the victors... It has been left, however, to Europe and to modern days to discover the eternal world-wide mark of meanness – color! (DuBois 1920, p. 42).
However, as Shiells (2010) points out, while DuBois’ work in particular remains foundational to the field, it is only since the late 1980s and 1990s that ‘whiteness studies’ has emerged within fields of academic inquiry.

I define whiteness in this study as a discourse borne out of the Australian colonial experience, which is different to the American field of whiteness closely related to Critical Race studies. However, it does draw on notions from cultural studies and scholars such as Ruth Frankenberg, who wrote about whiteness as an ‘unmarked marker’ or the ‘invisible norm’ that is a ‘terrain of structural advantage’ (Frankenberg 1993, pp. 236-7), and Australian historian Richard Dyer (1997), who writes that whiteness needs to be ‘made strange’ (p. 10). It is in relation to what is invisible that other cultures and identities are constructed and represented; often hidden in plain view, the discourse constructs an ‘historical contingency of whiteness and power structures that underpin a normative status’ (Shiells 2010, p. 791). It is not so much that there is a tone of subordination in the texts analysed in this study. Rather it is the acceptance of the ‘reproduction of dominance’ (p. 791) and ‘normativity rather than marginality and privilege rather than disadvantage’ (Frankenberg 1993, pp. 236-7) that is made significant in this study. Over time scholars have used whiteness as a means of displacing the normative status. I apply whiteness in both the textual analysis and analysis of the focus groups transcripts as a measure of disrupting categories of privilege and the reproduction of dominance.

**Distinction 2 – History and historical thinking**

The term history is unique in its interpretive generosity. Yilmaz (2007) says this is ‘because of the fact that it is both the subject and the object of its own discipline' (p. 177). The general goals for history, history the discipline and history the school subject, are part of the ‘complex relation between generic goals and subject-centred education’ (Nordgren 2017, p. 664; Young 2008).

The general goals for history are to explain what happened in the past and account for significant events, people and experiences. Then, ‘as one of the disciplines of the social sciences history represents accounts of multilayered and multifaceted human experiences across time and space’ (Yilmaz 2008, p. 38). This knowledge is translated to the school subject of history on a daily basis through the enacted
curriculum; however, unlike science, where for some time a ‘sophisticated understanding of the nature of science is deemed a major goal in science education’ (Yilmaz 2007, p. 176), the same emphasis on the importance of the nature of history as a ‘domain of knowledge is not consistently realised in history education’ (p. 177).

Making a distinction of history is to clarify, for the planning and delivering of history curriculum, what we know and have at present. History is a ‘necessary medium for articulating and actively approaching questions of identity’ and cultural conflict, so historical studies as a discipline cannot help but be involved (Rüsen 2002, p. 7). Therefore we have to address how that broader historical knowledge is produced and enacted and how this aligns with the ‘goal of providing to future generations’ the means of intercultural history (p. 7).

Global expectations for history

Much of the literatures canvassed showed that over the past two decades many countries have questioned how history is defined as a school subject in search of the intention and balance of history for a national curriculum; this includes Australia. In 2015 the Netherlands saw the start of broad discussion about the curriculum of the future. Likewise in South Africa in 2015, in response to calls made for history to be a compulsory subject and for the History curriculum to be strengthened, the Minister for Basic Education appointed a team to investigate and research matters into how history is defined as a school subject (Siebörger 2016). Similarly, in Australia discussions between policy makers, educational leaders, historians and teachers came to fruition in the definition of history as a school subject for the national curriculum. The current AC provides this as its rationale for the discipline of history:

History is a disciplined process of inquiry into the past that develops students’ curiosity and imagination. Awareness of history is an essential characteristic of any society, and historical knowledge is fundamental to understanding ourselves and others. History promotes the understanding of societies, events, movements and developments that have shaped humanity from earliest times. It helps students appreciate how the world and its people have changed, as well as the significant continuities that exist to the present day. History, as a discipline, has its own methods and procedures which make it different from other ways of understanding human experience. The study of history is based on evidence derived from remains of the past. It is interpretative by nature, promotes debate and encourages thinking about human values, including present and future
challenges. The process of historical inquiry develops transferable skills such as the ability to ask relevant questions; critically analyse and interpret sources; consider context; respect and explain different perspectives; develop and substantiate interpretations, and communicate effectively (ACARA 2010a)

The language of the rationale is a direct antecedent of the school subject and is not isolated from what is taught at the school level. In fact the statement ‘history, as a discipline, has its own methods and procedures which make it different from other ways of understanding human experience’ frames the historical inquiry of both the AC and VC. The shaping of historical consciousness and historical thinking, which can only be understood through the discipline of history, are at the core of this rationale. Lee suggests that

any theory of historical consciousness and its development in students should pay attention to students’ meta-historical understanding – of the discipline of History – as well as their conceptions of the past (Lee 2004, p. 1).

This demand on historical thinking is often subsumed in the daily pressures of the classroom, and the result is the simplifying of historical content and knowledge; one of the biggest reasons, says Wineburg and Wilson (1991), for disengagement of students in the history classroom.

One way of looking at the demands on historical thinking translated as history curricula is demonstrated in the following diagram by Barton (2015).

Figure 5 Competing Visions for History, Barton (2015)
Figure 5 illustrates perceived responsibilities of history where the macro and the micro intersect, being at the level of school history. Notions of nationalism, identity and diversity are part of the global vision of the discipline of history and are reflected in the historical content knowledge of school history curricula. I will use the notion of shaping historical consciousness to explain this further.

Shaping historical consciousness offers the prospect of linking the increasing interest shown by historians in what generally is called ‘memory’ and the focus of history education on students’ ‘pictures of the past’ (Lee 2004, p. 2). The academic discipline is closely related to everyday life. To paraphrase Lee, it develops theories, such as theories of historical consciousness and historical thinking, about how the world works, which can be explained as ‘leading views concerning experience’. These theories, in conjunction with appropriate methodological rules and practices, structure the characteristics of the discipline. This output from the discipline feeds back into everyday life and the wider interest of society which is how students learn about the past, fulfilling the function of orientation (Lee 2004).

In Figure 5 the expectation for history is to intersect the academic discipline with the key ideas of nation building and democracy, but also to look beyond the discipline; to be sufficiently inclusive of the ways in which the past will figure in the students’ views of the world. Hence, the diagram drills down to the layers of identity and values, diversity and the capacity to investigate and interpret what shapes students’ historical consciousness.

Figure 6 below, an interpretation of Jörn Rüsen’s (1994) disciplinary matrix by Alan Megill (1994), shows the intersection of the history discipline and the school subject of history as a conceptual space where the theories of the discipline inform everyday life just as much as everyday life informs the historical discipline. This model attends to the concern that if teachers lack an adequate understanding of these conceptual spaces and foundations about history, then the students’ meta-historical understanding is diminished.

4 Lee (2004) invokes the foundational work of Jörn Rüsen, introduced in more detail later in this chapter, as part of his overall understanding of historical consciousness within history education.
The distinctions made in this section present genuine challenges for how we are used to thinking about or perceiving history teaching and learning. It makes demands on the delivery of required content knowledge by history teachers to ‘critically [rethink] the foundations and habits of their own intellectual work’ in teaching (Rüsen 2002, p. 7) and produces a productive tension within the study.

**Why does historical thinking have to become more intercultural?**

There are many reasons why historical thinking needs to be intercultural; mainly, to paraphrase Rüsen, so all cultures can establish a narrative that is capable of exposing its specificities and differences. Another reason is to disrupt the power of Western dominance in historical thinking by differentiating between perspectives, or at least to identify what is specifically Western (Rüsen 2004c).

Historical thinking employs a range of terms that describe the intellectual and imaginative capacity of making sense of the past. It divides our own story of the past from the stories of the ‘other’, and in doing so creates identity through historical memory and historical consciousness. The premise underlying this section is that if history teachers become theoretically familiar with historical thinking as intercultural discourse, their students’ sense-making of the past expands beyond their own historical identity. Further, the historical relationship between past and present is celebrated for its temporal tensions, and a new
approach to historical content knowledge and its experience is more likely to
develop (Rüsen 2002).

Establishing historical thinking as intercultural relies on the continuous theorising
of the specificity of Western historical thinking, which as Rüsen points out, is not
easily tracked down in any clear cut manner (Rüsen 2002). The complex notions
of identity intrinsic to historical consciousness and therefore the constructions of
historical narration are all subject to the grounding of historical theories in
practical research. The interpretation and understanding of interculturality at the
school level is only hampered if there is little theoretical reconsideration.
Therefore, the intersection between the discipline of history and the school subject
cannot be ignored.

A vision for historical thinking to be intercultural at the school level requires
teachers to understand the ‘sharply contrasting perspectives’ of historical
knowledge – the idealist and the scientific views of history – and to realise that
history rests on a continuum between the two poles (Yilmaz 2008). An
intercultural historical thinking understands the nature of history through a holistic
lens rather than a ‘dualist approach’. For example, traditional narratives must be
part of students’ understanding of the historical content knowledge so the nation’s
story becomes the stories of the nation through a well-planned and theoretically
sound process.

Postmodern challenges

Theoretical approaches to teaching history continue to challenge history educators
because the general goals of history as a discipline swing (far and wide) between
theoretical perspectives. It seems everyone has something to say about how to
teach history. For example, the introductory chapter for this thesis describes
events in Australia that evoked the presentation of polarised views of history
education based on broad ideological approaches to teaching history: on the one
hand a positivist-realist approach to history, and on the other a postmodernist
approach, which was targeted in the political arena by Windschuttle (2002), who
deemed it an attack on the practice of conventional historiography.
When the History Wars arrived on Australian shores, advocates of postmodernism asserted history as a ‘textual subject full of grand narratives’ created by people who think they have an authority over historical knowledge and the past, which infuriated supporters of the Right (Yilmaz 2007, p. 182). Moreover, the grand narratives perpetuate the successes and victories of white middle class males and are simply based on Eurocentric and ethnocentric models of explanation of past events and its people. Such assertions have implications for the ‘world view’ of history that filters down to the levels of school history, and as a result invite further theorising.

The discourse of postmodernism engendered by Lyotard calls into question the totalizing narratives of modernism and raises questions as to how and from whose perspectives overarching narratives are constructed, and how they presuppose political views of the world (Giroux 1988; Yilmaz 2010). Postmodernism has implications for history teaching and learning because it emphasises the need for history teachers to stay acquainted with the discipline of history and its values, beliefs and assumptions, which are inherent in the development of historical knowledge (Yilmaz 2008). Postmodernism also emphasises that historical knowledge is not value-free, but interpretative and subject to change. It is also literary based, and the narrative, plot, structure and language shape the historian’s craft, and therefore how historical knowledge is constructed (Yilmaz 2010).

*Postmodernism and an introduction to Jörn Rüsen*

Jörn Rüsen, a contemporary theorist of history has been widely published in the fields of historical learning and has heavily influenced and informed the field. Over the past two decades he has written determinedly about why historical thinking has to become intercultural. Rüsen was born in 1938 in Duisburg, in Germany. He graduated in history, philosophy, literature and pedagogy at the University of Cologne, where he got his doctorate with a thesis on Johann Gustav Droysen, German historian of Alexander the Great, in 1966. His academic trajectory as a teacher includes the universities of Bochum, Bielefeld (where Reinhart Koselleck succeeded him in 1989) and Witten-Herdecke, where he remained until his retirement in 2007.
Over the past two decades Rüsen’s theories have provoked contemporary discussions regarding Western historical thinking as an intercultural debate because in his scholarly work, ‘interculturality assumes the egalitarian and humanistic recognition of cultural difference that exceeds the ethnocentric understanding which is guided by the courtesy of tolerance from the civilized to the uncivilized’ (Fronza 2017, p. 116; Rüsen 2004c). To reiterate, the premise that underlies this section is that historical thinking as intercultural discourse requires theoretical reconsideration for it to function as best practice at the school level.

Rüsen explains postmodernism as a critique of modernism, viewed as the ‘strong order of history’ (2005, pp. 137-41). Further, the postmodernist concept of history radically and totally negates the idea that there is anything like one single and comprising historical process of the development of humankind. Likewise, Zagorin (1999) says,

Postmodernism stands for the proposition that Western society in recent decades has undergone an epochal shift from the modern to a postmodern era said to be characterised by the final repudiation of the Enlightenment’s legacy of belief in reason and progress and by a pervasive incredulity toward all meta-narratives imputing a direction and meaning to history, in particular the notion that human history is a process of universal emancipation (Zagorin 1999, p. 1).

The precepts of postmodern thought and its approach to history can be characterised as the notion that ‘all old organizing frameworks that took for granted the privileging of various centres, such as Anglo-centric, ethnocentric, gender-centric, and logo-centric, should not be considered as legitimate and natural frameworks’ (Yilmaz 2007, p. 181; Jenkins 1997).

Shifting his view to another level, Rüsen creates a productive tension for this study, suggesting postmodernism as the opposite to modern historical studies and as the ‘broken order of history’ which creates critical questions about historical thinking and historical memory. To paraphrase Rüsen (2004c), historical memory partnered postmodernism and brought with it new plausibilities grounded in the fundamental and universal cultural function of memory as a means of identity building and orienting us in practical life.

Postmodernism affirms the historical imagination and tugs at the rootedness of historical cognition in practical life and our dependence on views and perspectives
that are solved through claims of truth and objectivity. However, that is not to say that the recall of history is unlimited subjectivism; to take this path, history is conceptualised as fiction. If history is seen as pure fiction it loses its cultural power and the norms and values of those it speaks for. Without doubt, historical thinking still requires methodical rationality that is how memory works, and cognition as an element of making sense of history cannot be neglected. Now to quote Rüsen, ‘there is no memory whatsoever without a claim for plausibility’ gained through experience and consent deep within the human mind (Rüsen 2005, p. 140).

**Debating difference through the postmodern lens**

The debate between the Universalist approach to history (popular in the eighteenth and nineteenth century) and how this becomes mediated with the ideology critique and the Particularist approach of postmodernity warns against the high price of complete relativism. The debate brings with it the understanding that within the diversity of historical perspectives, ‘a unity of history can only be brought about by universal values in the methodical operation of historical interpretation’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 142). Rüsen believes in a leading value system that affirms the difference in cultures and fundamentally legitimises multi-perspectivity and difference in historical thinking, where the cognitive structure is strengthened by the interpretive element of historical method (p. 143). Instinctively, this can bring about a new approach to the experience and synthesis of history in support of history educators.

Another school of thought that troubles the broad understanding of approaches to history emerged more recently in the early twenty-first century and created a somewhat theoretical gulf. In 2009, when Iggers gave air to Ankersmit’s (2001) criticism of both ‘modernism’ and ‘postmodernism’ as approaches to history, he called for a post-postmodernist theory of history. Generally, post-postmodernism is an angry response to this gap; it approaches history from the perspective of war and loses the core element of postmodernism, described by some as a deep tolerance for difference and ‘otherness’, to angry tribalism or localism. Like progress made toward post-postfeminism in the twenty-first century, it is a slippery slide into post-postmodernism. I agree with Iggers that back in 2009, as
an approach to history theory, this stance and how it might help as a lens to understanding the complexities and concerns being experienced in post twentieth-century historical thinking was not well explained by Ankersmit (Iggers 2009). Post-postmodernism intensifies the argument surrounding claims to truth, and to an extent it undoes postmodernism’s contribution to the discipline of history as giving voice to those who have been historically silenced or do not have a written history; the recognition of difference and the explanation of the past that is not definitive (Burke 2001; Yilmaz 2010).

David Carr’s realism – the view that ‘our story-telling must come to terms with the world as it is, not the way we wish it were’ (Carr 1995, p. 135) – reflects flaws in the postmodernist lens. ‘Making Sense’ cannot be separated from ‘being true’, says Carr (1986); but then, Iggers (2009) points out, this still leaves open the difficult epistemological and methodological questions of attaining solid historical knowledge. Hence, post modernism deviates from a single-threaded path of history and diverts to a wider lens that reveals stories that were once buried in obscurity. Therefore, as part of its theoretical lens this thesis is viewed through postmodernism, but not without caution. Post-postmodernism is looming, together with post-postfeminism and even neo-liberalism and its call for the return of the state, and I am not sure that appreciating the pragmatism of modernism and the wider spectrum of postmodernism, which rather could be interpreted as sitting on the fence, is a fruitful form of keeping up. However, as noted the introductory chapter, this thesis does not profess to be perfect or have all the answers to the complex epistemological questions raised in this discussion. Therefore, based on the literatures canvassed for this study, in the twenty-first century the flexibility of postmodernism is laudable in providing the opportunity for the voice of the ‘other’ to be heard divulging multi-faceted stories of history as they filter to the school subject. However, I reject any notion that tolerance is what drives the postmodern lens of historical thinking; this is too simplistic a reduction of historical thinking.

Under the auspices of the third millennium, in which ‘humanness remains an issue of the order of history’ (Rüsen, 2005, p. 142), history is an essential cultural factor and historical consciousness has an important cultural function in forming identity. The core concepts of rationality have their place in making sense of
history and its provision for historical thinking in the present; however, the
dangers of the notion of ‘mastering thinking’ attached to theories of modern
history cannot be ignored (da Mata & de Araujo 2013). Postmodernism widens
the discourse of the past so that metahistory refutes the model of historical time,
which views the past and its violence or human suffering as in fact the past, and
no longer pertinent to the present. My position is that the complexity of culture
and the realisation of its connection, threaded through time, assists in developing
the intention of this thesis toward a more comprehensive next step of theoretical
discussion about epistemological and methodological questions for the ‘new
time of history’ (Igers 2009, p. 128).

This crystal pane has made the distinction between the general goals for history,
the discipline of history and history the school subject. It then developed a view of
postmodernism as the most plausible theoretical space for interculturality to
intersect with the complex lattice of historical thinking for history teaching and
learning. Overall, Distinction 2 argues that postmodernism challenges the
tendency of modernism to cling to rationality and a strict dualist approach to
epistemological underpinnings of the discipline of history, to provide a framework
where history teachers can use the contribution of modernism, as traditional
accounts of history, to recognise the historically silenced. This is not to suggest a
‘free-for-all’ in the history classroom of unsubstantiated viewpoints based on
insensitivity and ignorance. The postmodernist approach does not disregard
historical concepts such as evidence, accurate use of primary and secondary
sources, historical empathy and others. It simply rejects modernity’s
marginalisation of difference and its ‘incredulity toward meta-narrative’ (Zagorin
1999, p. 5). In addition, the thesis of this section is a rejection of post-
postmodernism because it hinders teachers’ ability to function within a fluid
continuum.

Distinction 3 – Curriculum and pedagogy

This section makes the distinction that the field of curriculum and pedagogy is the
point where history education and interculturality will meet. This section argues
for the significance of critical thinking in history curriculum and pedagogy. It
draws on notions from the field of ‘new curriculum history’ to understand how
‘new analytics of power, alterity, otherness and the invisible’ (Baker 2013, p. 31) might be framed in history pedagogy, problematising a space where the two constructs, history education and interculturality, can interact. In keeping with the crystal as metaphor, this space, just like the Bravais lattice of the hexagonal crystal, is generated by ‘a set of discrete translations’5 regarding how curriculum translates to affect pedagogy and be seen as knowledge that counts.

*History and knowledge that counts*

Confirmation of the national history curriculum in Australia in 2010 caused heated debate within the national conversation, because history curriculum has always played a critical and controversial role in Australia’s knowledge building enterprise (Yates, Collins & O’Connor 2011). Too often, the standing of history in schools is given bad press and history educators appreciate the issues that are ‘not necessarily visible in the press articles or public discourse’, and as a core discipline in the AC and VC for implementation, the history curriculum is increasingly politicised in determining what school history should do in relation to content knowledge and ‘its relevance to the role of schools today’ (Yates, Collins & O’Connor 2011, p. 3).

Historical content knowledge is often treated as an external body of information, an objective knowledge that appears independent of human beings (Giroux 2011). Knowledge becomes impersonal under this type of pedagogical paradigm, and historical imagination is sacrificed to a positivist approach achieved through disciplinary knowledge and practice. Even after implementation of the AC and the VC, debates over the history curriculum and its teaching in Australia remain ‘particularly fierce and politically driven’ (Yates et al. 2017a, p. 96).

The role of curriculum in defining and characterising knowledge that counts is never straightforward. For history teaching and learning there has long been tension between historians and their craft and the professionalism of the history teacher regarding the discourse of content and pedagogy, and whose knowledge counts for what (Seixas 1999). In the 1980s, Lee Shulman (1987) worked back towards a balanced and whole conception of teachers’ knowledge; he employed

---

5 See Bravais lattice as part of the hexagonal crystal [https://www.revolvy.com/page/Bravais-lattice](https://www.revolvy.com/page/Bravais-lattice)
the terms ‘content’ and ‘pedagogy’ liberally, offering rich and nuanced definitions of each, and launching what subsequently became a major research field at their intersection – pedagogical content knowledge (Seixas 1999, p. 318). The distinction between what Seixas calls ‘inert’ knowledge in history and ‘pedagogy’ (meaning delivery), despite some decades of researchers’ and teachers’ individual and collective efforts to define and enact pedagogical content knowledge, still needs to be made. In short, literatures show that the concept of interculturality in the history curriculum stalls as ‘inert’ knowledge because ‘pedagogy’, as delivery, is engaged in an ‘uneasy negotiation’ with the theoretical underpinnings of the content (Seixas 1999, p. 319).

The field of ‘new curriculum history’ in the late 1990s, which stems from new waves of research and which can be described as a ‘healing between the split’ (Seixas 1999, p. 320) of what the earlier studies defined, gave oxygen to wider debates in the humanities and history teaching and learning. In doing so, the field generated a postmodernist space to move beyond whose knowledge counts for what, and engage with discourses and debates that genuinely ask what should be taught in history, and what should be emphasised, brought about through encounters with inclusion and exclusion. More recently, scholars like Michael Young (2013) have advocated a knowledge-based approach, which is about what students are entitled to learn. Young suggests there has been a crisis between what teachers feel curriculum should hand down to the next generation – past knowledge to ensure continuity:

On the one hand, as educators, we have the responsibility to hand on to the next generation the knowledge discovered by earlier generations. It is this element of continuity between generations which distinguishes us from animals; it is a way of saying that we are always part of history (Young 2013, p. 101).

On the other hand, there is ‘the passing on of knowledge to build knowledge and create something new’ (Young 2013, p. 101). The distinction of pedagogical content knowledge to reinvent itself or be reframed is a thorny tension for this study. In both the AC and the VC the concept of interculturality is emphasised and included as content for all students to be engaged with. For history teachers, having a command of the ‘substantive and syntactic’ components of history is not sufficient to enact interculturality as pedagogy (Yilmaz 2008). Only through
critical thinking for history pedagogy can means of emancipation from what has come before in history curricula and design be enacted. Critical thinking, says Baker (2013, p. 31), ‘enters all aspects of history curriculum and its pedagogies’ and although the ‘diversity and irreconcilability of more popular cultural conceptions of a past’ is troublesome, it can only be enacted through intellectual endeavours and critical pedagogy.

Navigating interculturality in curriculum and pedagogy as knowledge that counts

The concept of interculturality is an intellectual endeavour, or, as seen by Salter and Maxwell, a ‘site of intense intellectual work for teachers; those who are left to actually enact intercultural education in the classroom’ (Salter & Maxwell 2018, p. 15). This claim is further affirmed by its emphasis in the AC and VC, and it being targeted for assessment at the compulsory levels of schooling in Australia. Frankly, the concept of interculturality in curriculum policy in Australia is deemed knowledge that counts.

The placement of interculturality and its associated term ICU has already been outlined in the Chapter 1 of this thesis. As a reminder, its visual representation in curriculum policy and how it is placed in the structure in both the AC and VC is shown in Figures 7 and 8 below.

Figure 7 Learning Areas in the Australian curriculum (ACARA 2010b)
The prefix ‘inter’ invokes Marshall McLuhan’s 1962 prophecy of the ‘global village’: one world interconnected by an electronic nervous system or what we now know as the Internet. Education cannot escape this interconnection and nor should we want to, but the language created to accommodate people in that interconnected world has flourished in the third millennium and this has impacted on all facets of life, in particular education. As Portera (2011) reminds us, ‘humankind has always been characterised by the phenomenon of migration’ (p. 14), and because of this phenomenon, historically, the world has always been intercultural. However, one could be forgiven for not always seeing this in the reconstitution of History curriculum policy over time (Grant & Portera 2011, p. 14). Even though calls for education for global citizenship have led the way in the twenty-first century in recognising that the postcolonial assertion as an encounter between two distinct cultures with fixed identities is insufficient, pragmatically I am unconvinced that ‘notions of difference and the Other’ have been successfully addressed in the design of new history curriculum policy in Australia (Fiedler 2007; Salter & Maxwell 2018, p. 16).

In response to concerns that multiculturalism is ‘vulnerable to asserting essentialised, static notions of culture and cultural identities that shore-up the power and privilege of majority cultural groups’ (Cloonan 2017, p. 131), interculturality was a fundamental capability highlighted by UNESCO and entrusted to education systems, schools and teachers (UNESCO 2006). This was supported in recent times by the United Nations and international research projects that saw multicultural approaches to education (based on teachers’
understanding of ‘problems’ within classrooms and directed to students of immigrant origin) being a double-edged sword, where difference became a deficit rather than an advantage or part of success in education (Gundara & Portera 2008). This approach has led to the deepening of the racism of the dominant and majority populations who define ‘the others’ by their ‘ethnicity’ (Coulby 2006). By 2006, Coulby identified the rise of intercultural education as a condition of human history that is about the race between intercultural education and disaster (Coulby 2006).

Consequently, in more current times, scholars such as Cloonan stated that a key aim of intercultural education is to develop future generations with capabilities needed for sustained convivial, harmonious and cohesive relations in increasingly multicultural societies (Cloonan et al. 2017; Dervin, Gajardo & Lavanchy 2011; Kromidas 2011). Countries around the world have endeavoured to develop intercultural education as a means of fostering positive relations between different racial, ethnic and religious groups. In Australia this is afforded through curriculum policy for teaching and learning (Cloonan et al. 2017). As mentioned earlier in Distinction 1, there is international academic focus on intercultural education but there is not yet consensus as to what it should look like, or ‘how to best define and measure’ it as pedagogy (Denson et al. 2017, p. 231). Viewed within the field of curriculum and pedagogy the intercultural imaginary is eclectic in nature.

Interculturality and what it looks like for Australian education was discussed in Distinction 1 and is even more intriguing when perceived in terms of history curriculum and the intersection of curriculum and pedagogy. This is the case for many reasons, but most logically is again to do with the complexity of culture in Australia and epistemological questions fundamental to curriculum theory, such as what knowledge is of most worth, what schools should teach and how knowledge is selected (Deng 2015). With the 2016 Census results showing that Australians were born in close to 200 different countries, speak more than 300 languages at home, follow more than 100 religions and originate from more than 300 different ancestries, representation in curriculum and pedagogy of diverse histories carries a responsibility that is a minefield of misrepresentations. How do we know what to teach? Australia is not alone in these epistemological dilemmas.
Internationally we have lost sight of the educational value and significance of ‘powerful knowledge’ to equating school academic knowledge with ‘knowledge of the powerful’ which makes our task even more arduous (Deng 2015, p. 724; Young 2008). In this rich cultural diversity of multiculturalism, how can we understand how and where interculturality and history intersect in curriculum and pedagogy?

Theorising of interculturality within a sound and scaffolded framework grounded in curriculum and pedagogy is the only way forward, at least for history education. Unless the intersection of interculturality and history education at curriculum and pedagogy is supported by educational policy and curriculum development, then much of the work on intercultural education will continue to rely on ‘hunches’ and attempts to ‘do good’ rather than being based on and structured around ethnographic qualitative or quantitative evidence (Gundara & Portera 2008, p. 465).

This is not to say that in Australia we are not making progress. The past three years evidences intercultural education as pedagogy growing at an exciting rate in Australia, particularly in the state of Victoria, where researchers have done unique things around ICU.

The Australian Research Council Linkage Project ‘Doing Diversity’, conducted over a three year period from 2013 to the end of 2015, brought the concept of interculturality and its associated term ICU in primary and secondary schools in Australia into the light. However, as Moss (2017) found, writing from the project, the literature in this field,

Focuses mostly on classroom interventions or the attitudes of students and teachers … [and there] remains significant gaps in our understanding of contextual factors across all school levels that facilitate or impede the development of ICU. These gaps include research and action that pertains to school leadership (Moss, O’Mara & McCandless 2017, p. 956).

From this perspective, history curriculum and its development is one of these contextual factors because it lacks theoretical leadership at the institutional, national and state level of education in Australia.
This section has used three distinctions to explain the two constructs of interculturality and history education best placed to meet within the theories and practicalities of curriculum and pedagogy. Both constructs are bound by distinctions of what counts as knowledge and the epistemological dilemmas that haunt the global educational policy and curriculum development. There is nothing *apolitical* about these dilemmas, and the next section takes historical knowledge and how it is represented into the domain of history politics and notions of nationalism and subsequent impact on history education policy. The underlying criticality of the shaping of historical consciousness for this study is discussed in terms of the nation-state and the underlying power of historical knowledge, deeply rooted in history teaching and learning as a nation’s mirror.

**Part 2: History as a nation’s mirror**

Interculturality is part of a complex fabric of ‘symbolic hopefulness’ across nations and their governments to address emerging issues that transnational migration, the surge of globalisation and geopolitical reconfigurations have brought to our world post World War II (Cavanagh 2012). The concept of interculturality, together with theories of cosmopolitanism, citizenship education and multiculturalism, are all in combat against marginalisation, disenfranchisement, dominant groups and institutions (Gundara 2011). Further, the intercultural imaginary of a country is closely linked to its history politics and is translated to history curricula, which in most countries are designed on a narrow understanding of the nation (Gundara 2014). By all accounts, as an educational strategy for history teaching and learning, *interculturality* should not be in competition with nationhood or the modern nation-state, nor should it position teachers and their resources to disconnect from the nation-state (Harreveld 2012). However, in the past, education systems have failed to progress *interculturality* for a number of reasons. One cited reason is that frameworks for teachers have not been based on historical and contemporary diversity developed by understanding the discipline of history. As Rüsen says,

> Every nation and culture has to present itself vis-à-vis its cultural differences from others … history is the medium of articulating one’s own cultural identity in
respect to its difference from the identity of others; it is the voice of peculiarity in the dialogue between self and others (Rüsen 2007, p. 189).

The historical consciousness of the nation-state

The major question for historical thinking at the school level will very often be how it shapes the historical consciousness of the nation-state. Whilst I have used Rüsen above to emphasise the understanding that history is about cultural difference, the main elements of ethnocentrism – asymmetrical evaluation, teleological continuity and centralised perspective – impact strongly the shaping of a nation’s mirror (Rüsen 2004c, p. 118). Of course, ethnocentrism is not unique to Western civilisations; it is ‘deeply rooted in human historical consciousness and that works through all cultures and in all times’ (p. 118). Further, there is evidence under the legacy of the pressure of the History Wars, better known in the United States as the Culture Wars that the teleology of Western civilization began to fray toward the second decade of the twenty-first century. The historical consciousness of the nation-state relies heavily on the impact of identity in historical thinking. Ethnocentrism has long been the logic of this impact A sensible response to this is not a concept of ‘a plurality of ethnocentrisms’ (Rüsen 2008 p. 268), this approach simply negates any sense of interculturality and only promotes tolerance; which looks more like multiculturalism. Further, as Rozbicki points out, one should not lose sight that ‘one aspect of ethnocentricity that is often obscured is that it can be beneficial when it helps to preserve diverse cultural identities’ (Rozbicki 2015, p. 14).

The historical consciousness of the nation-state in the Australian context is always topical and often discouraging. Articles have been known to arise in the public arena to suggest our (Australian) universities are producing students of history educated in mendacity and indoctrinated in ‘anti-Western theory from the gurus of cultural studies, critical theory, radical feminism, neo-Marxism, post-structuralism, post-colonialism and postmodernism’ (Windschuttle 2017, p. 1). Not so. As this thesis argues, the recognition of the space between people that manifests as interculturality, and the diversity that postmodernism provokes, troubles all aspects of history content and pedagogy in the shaping of Western or otherwise historical consciousness. Further, ethnocentrism has its role in preserving cultural identity in history at all levels of education, and it is not a
fundamental tenet of interculturality to dispute this; however, the dominance and perpetuation of ‘master narratives’ conceived through unbalanced evaluations of ethnocentrism is. Such narratives become an unrecognised mechanism for history teachers if humankind cannot be seen as a ‘normative and empirical dimension of history’ (Rüsen 2008, p. 268). One way to look at this is through the walls and divisions of history and history politics.

Walls and divisions: History politics

Historically, the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 is a defining moment in history and marks a point of reference for many scholars and their research in history education; it is the point where a new direction for history as a school subject was high on the agenda for most European countries. That direction was not easily found in post-communist nations. As Shevyrev (2006) points out, ultra-liberalism had an initial period; however, control of history education has more often than not returned to state control and a nationalist agenda. In contemporary times, history curricula in most nations remains selectively developed within the context of the nation-state, and even though the forces of globalisation have somewhat weakened it, the crossing of borders through History education is not yet a key focus or strength (Sohyun 2009).

The fall of the Wall was the point in time when American political theorist Francis Fukuyama in 1992 claimed the ‘end of history’ (although he has often been misunderstood), meaning that ‘human history no longer involved a struggle between irreconcilable ideologies; that liberal democracy and economic liberalism were becoming globally triumphant; and that this trend was irreversible’ (Rizvi 2011, p. 226). However, cultural encounters of multicultural societies have outlined irreconcilable differences in another way. The notion of ‘civilizational divisions’ is central to a thesis put forward by Samuel Huntington (1996). At about the same time as Fukuyama wrote about the end of history, Huntington argued that a ‘clash of civilizations’, along a very different set of axes than those that defined the Cold War, was becoming a permanent feature of human existence; the fundamental source of conflict in post-Cold War years would no longer be primarily ideological, or even economic, but cultural (Rizvi 2011, p. 226). Rizvi notes that Huntington’s theory is objectionable to cultural theorists
generally, but it does point to the importance of culture in international formations (Rizvi 2011). In Hall’s view, history education constitutes parts of the border arena of culture, and culture is central to understanding struggles over meanings, identity and power (Hall 1997). According to van der Leeuw-Rood (2000), culture deploys power and the role of history education is inextricably linked to political perceptions and how it can promote and strengthen national identity. Rizvi suggests that Huntington’s ‘clash of civilisations’ remains popular and accepted in the Western world and reaffirms the construction of ideological and historical barriers in the name of the national identity. Rizvi maintains that not only is there now a renewed interest in building physical walls to address policy problems, but also that ‘over the past decade, we have witnessed the construction of walls that are stronger, taller and longer’ (Rizvi 2011, p. 226); there is also ample evidence of new ideological barriers along the dynamics of identity politics.

Whether the world is stronger or weaker in its dedication to nation building, national identity is crucial in the design of history policy, and earlier this century ‘sparked important conversations about the relationship between nation building and the teaching of history in schools’ (Stearns, Wineburg & Seixas 2000, p. 4). Later, Lévesque (2011) argued that history teaching needs to accept a nation-building role, and that the challenge is to create space for ‘dialogue and inclusion without undermining what is unifying’ (Nordgren 2017, p. 675). The marrying of nation-ness and interculturality as part of an educational strategy for history teaching and learning will always be problematic, particularly if we accept that history education of the twentieth century grew largely from within the context of the nation-state (Sohyun 2009). Further, mass education systems not only constitute a key marker of modern stateness, but also continue to perform a crucial function within the nation-building process (Sicurella 2008).

The teaching and learning of history in any country is at the core of a nation’s official history, that is, the history that has become ‘part of the fund of knowledge or the ideology of a nation’ (Hobsbawm & Ranger 1992, p. 1). In the globalised setting today this fund of knowledge in the hands of national politics is averse to a ‘divergent reading of history’ (Sicurella 2008, p. 7) because there is still a sense that ‘the chance of multiple histories can only weaken and stifle a sense of identity’ (Smith 1986, p. 192). This premise comes out of twentieth century
education and conflicts with the structural forces that have long supported the concept of interculturality, such as the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights. However, aside from any other reason, the systematic and tight nature of perspectives that belongs to modernism is often more tangible for history teachers, as opposed to a postmodernist lens that is not ‘characterised by a single coherent framework’ and draws on multi-perspectivity (Yilmaz 2010, p. 780).

The assumption that the teaching and learning of history generally has moved on from ‘historical knowledge [that] appears as something fixed by authority rather than subject to investigation, debate and its own system of warrants’ (Seixas 2000, p. 23) is questionable and can only be proved through well founded empirical research. Even now, in the new Australian Victorian curricula – both framed by historical inquiry – the nature of national identity and its history politics interferes with how curriculum is enacted. Similarly, how an intercultural understanding can impact on history teaching and learning and count for the nation-state remains contentiously unfounded outside popular historical commentary.

In the past thirty years the world has witnessed increasing levels of interference in history education curriculum, not least in Australia under the Howard and subsequent governments (Taylor & Collins 2012). Even in what Taylor describes as a ‘customarily progressive Netherlands’, a fifty point essentialist ‘canon’ of Dutch historical events in the school curriculum was introduced in 2006 in response to a period of mass migration from Suriname and Morocco (Taylor & Collins 2012, p. 212). Similarly, Gundara makes reference to Britain’s ‘canon’ when they reported that the then ‘Minister of Education, Michael Gove announced that the history curriculum will be changed to reflect a more narrowly English history’ (Gundara 2014, p. 114). According to Ankersmit, politics has been the domain where modern historical writing and historical consciousness originated; hence there is a ‘truly indissoluble’ link between history and politics, and therefore ‘irreconcilable popular conceptions of the past’ (Ankersmit 2001, p. 227; Baker 2009).

History politics is inevitably woven into analyses of historiography and creates obstacles for intercultural comparisons. Rüsen makes the point that ‘most works on historiography are done within the framework of a national history’ (Rüsen
1996, p. 6), which either leads to a single narrative in non-Western countries or a dominance of Western historical thinking even in non-Western countries. Gundara provides a similar sentiment in arguing that ‘biologically derived versions of the nation of ‘blood and soil’ only tell a ‘narrow and singular version of the story of nation states’ (Gundara 2014, p. 115). Still, even further into the twenty-first century, the relevance of these comments is in the problem which lies with the distortion of historical narratives and what is understood as historical realities. People in society generally

think that their understanding of the history of their own and other societies corresponds to the reality of events. Yet the norm is that we generally have notions based on falsified histories (Gundara 2000, p. 135).

The shaping of historical consciousness is highly political, but not always understood in the content and pedagogy of historical thinking at the secondary school level. History politics is always about versions of history. What feeds the historical consciousness of people and countries is laden with political conflict; where the feed will have the most impact is often disguised as the historical content of history textbooks.

The history textbook as powerful knowledge

The history textbook is a time capsule for ‘prevailing attitudes that remain frozen in print to inform students of history for years to come’ (Frierdersdorf 2012). Despite the development of new media and educational technologies, history textbooks – one of the most trusted sources of historical knowledge – are a dominant translation of a nation’s history and of the history curriculum in schools (Abdou 2017; Repoussi & Guillon-Tutiaux 2010). Therefore, what are considered the challenges of the ‘first draft history’ by scholars – often the incomplete history or ‘outright false’ history that appears in textbooks (Yates & Grumet 2011, p. 233) – grace the pages of the textbooks prescribed for the Year 7-10 history students.

The major players in the Australian market for history textbooks provide an o-book/e-book version of the textbook that provide extra information about some
elements of the original text. For example, in the *Oxford Big Ideas History 9* (2012), for the Depth Study ‘Australia and Asia’ Chapter 4, the o-book provides access to ‘Asia and the world’ whereas the printed version focuses on ‘Making a Nation’. According to the publisher, 70% of schools teaching the Depth Study ‘Australia and Asia’ opt to teach ‘Making a nation’ (Oxford University Press spokesperson, 2016, personal communication).

History textbooks are a complex representation of past and present social and cultural construction and have everything to do with the complicated relationship between power and knowledge (Apple & Christian-Smith 1991; Repoussi & Guillou-Tutiaux 2010). Nordgren (2017) says that most History textbooks ‘display a distorted historical consciousness’ that marginalises most of the world and – to which I agree – it is not a solution just to add names of women or immigrants or other marginalised groups to offset this distortion, even though this is often an interpretation of interculturality (p. 676). The question for history textbooks is about what is it that we want to know. Powerful knowledge in history has to find a way to interpret, sequence and narrate what is selected from a critical distance (Nordgren 2017). This is not necessarily a matter of ideology. Often the content knowledge is heavily influenced by the constrictions of publishing.

The history textbook is part of the school culture, and even though the face of this culture is changing with technology it is still a major contributor to privileging textual information which is influenced by policy and economic prejudices. The history textbook is an ‘economic product with an enormous and often captive market’ (Repoussi & Guillou-Tutiaux 2010, p. 157). The history textbook (any textbook in schools for that matter) is shaped by markets that are not just about ideology. The economic consideration for textbook production is significant in understanding the visual image, and is part of what Rose calls the social and third modality of production (Rose 2001). In this sense the modality of production mobilises an economic determinism.

Concerns about ideology and the construction of historical narratives in nation-states are affected by the pragmatics of textbook publishing. Questions posed by this project regarding the visibility of cultures problematise school culture and its design to present subjects like history in a classroom, which privileges textual
information influenced by policy and economic prejudices. More often than not, despite ‘good intentions’ the publication agency of the history textbook overcomes any attention paid to the details of particular images thus affecting the overall ideological flavour of the historical content knowledge.

**What do history textbooks tell us?**

An intercultural approach to history teaching and learning means an understanding of the status quo of a nation’s mirror: how it sees itself and how it sees the ‘other’ in order to become part of the imagined community that Anderson describes as a cultural artefact (Anderson 2006).

This artefact is often located in the publication of history textbooks and the resistance or support the texts receive from the government and its people. History is a field ‘privileged’ with ideological use and textbooks as agents of practice hold a key position in transmitting national identity and values (Kremmydas 1998). For these reasons, many scholars have examined and re-examined the power of the humble history textbook. It is still the case, as Robert Kelley wrote in the twentieth century, that ‘those who write the history textbooks have a high responsibility and an exceptionally difficult intellectual task’ to complete (Kelley 1980, p. 296). The history textbook is still expected to be the place where the whole story is told, where the essentials are presented and interrelated (p. 296).

In addressing narrow nationalistic approaches to historical interpretations and geopolitical visions of the world, international history textbook revision became a politically acknowledged and scholarly activity after the shock of the First World War, performed under the umbrella of international organizations such as the League of Nations and, after the Second World War, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (Pingel 2008, p. 182). Today, modern nation-states are confronted with a common immeasurable task of managing historical consciousness and the cultural needs of a population of which a large percentage is born outside the home nation, and whose rivalries, imported pasts, mixed religious beliefs and other issues have been brought into it. According to Taylor, these scenarios seem to encourage a nationalistic and monoculturalist approach to history education, particularly amongst politicians and the media (Taylor & Collins 2012, p. 215).
History textbooks can and do enforce and reinforce homogeneity through advocating shared attitudes and constructing shared historical memories directed by the ideology of the dominant group. An example of history textbooks as a social construction, involving authors in a process of inclusion and exclusion of expectations of interested parties, is the content of the Year 6 history textbook in Greece and the intense political debate and tension it created over the construction and manipulation of popular memory (Apple 2004; Georgiadis & Apostolos 2009). The political use of history and its school textbooks with the propagandistic aim of justifying current policies is ‘an ancient practice and well documented by both historiographers and historians specialising in the field’ (Liñán 2010, p. 167; Hobsbawm & Ranger 1992; Zajda 2013). Inclusion and exclusion mechanisms deem what is legitimate curriculum knowledge and contribute to the process of developing the historical consciousness of a nation.

**Global perspectives of history textbooks, their narratives, and shaping national identity**

Australian scholar Joseph Zajda’s ‘The Politics of the New History School Textbooks in the Russian Federation’ (2007) evidences the nexus between the historical consciousness of a nation and interculturality in that the interpretation of social and political change, significant events, leadership and continuities is depicted in the new narratives in Russian school textbooks. Interculturality galvanises historical consciousness, internal values and the plurality of perspectives. However, it also discovers what Zajda refers to as moral vacuum, and it ‘can expose an absence of cohesion or a sense of belonging to the civic culture’, which Zajda found in the case of the Russian Federation and other countries (Zajda 2007, p. 304; Torney-Purta et al. 1999). Zajda’s close analysis of the new school history textbooks in Russia between 1992 and 2004 found that they had become a ‘major symbol for inculcating a new sense of national identity and patriotism’ (Zajda 2007, p. 304).

Politically correct historical narratives, according to Zajda are driven by ‘preferred images of the past, reminiscent of Anderson’s ‘imagined community’, patriotism and national identity (Zajda 2007, p. 293). New history textbooks in Russia (and the most popular ones according to Zajda’s research) intended to
encourage a critical consciousness for students accentuating pluralism, tolerance, patience and a romantic, quasi-humanistic perception of history. In the foreword of *Istoriia Otechestva 1939-1991* (‘History of the Fatherland 1939-1991’) the author advises students to consider the complex and contradictory past of the nation during its past decades (Zajda 2007).

In the same period, in Italy, history textbooks were called into question following years of debate (since the 1960s) between left and right influences and the role of history education in establishing national identity. Over the past three decades history textbooks in Italy have been scrutinised, attacked and interrogated from polar ends of politics for being the tool of the traditional means of teaching history, which was political and not social, or for presenting Italian history in a partisan way that ‘artificially feeds a generational clash which has lasted too many years and hinders the reconstruction of a national identity common to all Italians’ (Cajani 2001, p. 52).

*History Textbooks in Japan*

The case of Japanese history textbooks bolsters a dichotomy of nationalism versus interculturalism and the constructs of interculturality and history intersect through absence in curriculum and pedagogy.

Having celebrated the 72nd anniversary of their surrender at the end of WWII at the time of this study, Japan is a country for which, in the second decade of the twenty-first century, intercultural education remains relatively new (Shibata 2012). The discourse of school history textbooks and the versions of history are a constant challenge to the old regime of Japanese national identity. Japan’s nationalism is disrupted through recognition of silence distributed by historical content knowledge.

In some parts of Japan, as part of the Hokkaido Former Aborigines Protection Act, until 1922, Ainu children were not entitled to learn certain subjects, such as geography, history and science – subjects presumably too subversive for them to acquire (Refsing 1992; Shibata 2012). Even in current times, Japan maintains its colourful history when it comes to history textbook revision:
Struggles over the national narrative existed... before and even during World War II, when official narratives such as the Imperial Rescript on Education and other ‘fine militarist stories’ played a crucial role in Japanese identity formation (Woods Masalski 2001, p. 97; see also Hein & Selden 2000).

The Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform, headed by Nishio Kanji, caused serious controversy at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Known as ‘The Society’, its early leader Fujioka Nobukatsu set out to ‘correct history’ by emphasizing a ‘positive view’ of Japan’s past and by removing from textbooks any reference to matters associated with what he called ‘dark history’ (Woods Masalski 2001). The new textbook authorised by the Ministry of Education in 2001 presented Japan’s foundation myths as historical fact and characterised wars launched by Japan as wars to liberate Asia (Woods Masalski 2001). Intellectual and international outrage saw reactions from China and Korea, indignant about the omittance of atrocities, filter through to the Japan’s school districts; as a result, the new history textbook was rejected by every district and by what was seen as the ‘conscience of the Japanese people’ (Woods Masalski 2001). In 2017, the debate continues over history teaching and learning and the version of history regarding Japan during the Second World War depicted in history textbooks. The debate is further fuelled by controversy surrounding the national narrative that skips allegations regarding as many as 400,000 girls and women press-ganged into serving as prostitutes for the Japanese military during the war and the denial of the Nanjing massacre. Prime Minister Shinzo Abe’s decision to prod textbook publishers to depict Japan’s involvement in World War II in a more nationalistic light is defended on the basis of the importance of imbuing students with patriotism.

**History textbooks in Iraq**

Since the founding of the Iraqi state, a unified Arab nation is the acting subject of history in Iraqi textbooks. According to research conducted by Achim Rohde (Rohde 2013), since the US invasion of Iraq in 2003 emergency revisions of textbooks for Sunni and Shi’a bias were undertaken in order to rebuild the Iraqi public education system. Rohde conducted a close analysis of Sunni and Shi’a discourse in history textbooks after 2003. In the eighth grade history textbook of 2007 and a selection of other history textbooks from 2005, according to Rohde,
‘the Arab meta-narrative that structured curriculum since the inception of the Iraqi education system had remained unchanged’ (Rohde 2013, pp. 722-23).

Representation of both Sunni and Shi’a historical narratives remains a significant challenge, but in Rohde’s view it would constitute a ‘kind of multi-perspective approach to teaching Arab-Islamic history, by recognizing competing and partly conflicting readings of the shared history of Muslims on the Arab peninsula’ (Rohde 2013, p. 724). Rohde’s research into history textbooks takes further the inclusion and exclusion of legitimate knowledge. It gives further credence to the warrant for historical thinking to be intercultural through a distinctive transnational approach, and relational history that includes the history of conflicts and wars from multiple perspectives (Rohde 2013).

\textit{History textbooks in India}

In 1961, the young historian Romila Thapar was engaged by UNESCO to critique history textbooks in India (Bhattacharya 2009). Thapar’s critique is historically significant in the realisation of how poor the quality of history textbooks in India was and how effectively they promoted ‘communal and colonial stereotypes’ (Bhattacharya 2009). In her paper ‘The History Debate and School Textbooks in India: a Personal Memoir’ (2009), Thapar critically examines history textbooks in India and the struggle, over many years, to balance the imperialist singular history with the voice of marginalised groups. In her research it emerged that the ‘colonial view had been faulted on many grounds’; however, the nationalist interpretation by the mid-twentieth century was exposed as ‘ambivalent in relation to certain themes’ (Thapar 2009, p. 88). By the time Thapar was commissioned to rewrite textbooks for ancient Indian history she had been met with stiff resistance from traditional historians shackled to imperial auspices, and felt exhilarated over the proposition of creating history textbooks informed by an historiography that shifted away from a model based on the ‘Roman Empire that Britain was said to be emulating’ (p. 89). Thapar says:

\begin{quote}
The new textbooks tried to draw attention to other groups of supposedly lesser status that also contributed to history but this was a less popular aspect of the books. Possibly the idea was not emphasized with sufficient examples. For nationalist history the ancient past was used to construct identities as it invariably is in all nationalist history (Thapar 2009, p. 91)
\end{quote}
Thapar’s research shows that the nationalist history and its ancient past in India was used to ‘construct identities as it invariably is in all nationalist histories’ (p. 91), and this was sourced mainly from elite groups. The textbooks written by Thapar in the 1960s were unlike any that schools were used to and were informed by the interest in ‘economic questions relating to the economic and social evolution of Indian society’ (p. 92). Inevitably, says Thapar,

there was a turning to historians for information on the nature of traditional economies and social structures, and the histories of communities and castes. Historians were activated in new ways. There was less focus on political and dynastic history and more on social and economic history, and this in turn affected the discussion of causation (p. 92).

Whilst the politics of history textbooks unfolded at every level in India often in ‘silent and invisible ways’ (Bhattacharya 2009, p. 101), the new textbooks clashed with the symbolic value acquired through tradition and their writing by esteemed historians. The national textbooks, referred to as part of the National Council for Education Research and Training (NCERT) under which many sets were produced, saw a battle not unlike the History Wars in Australia at a similar time. The battle produced history textbooks in which teachers recognised historical content knowledge that was ‘reliable evidence and not fantasy, and that there was a logic to the way in which the narrative was set out’ (Thapar 2009, p. 94). As a result, the professionalisation of history textbooks evolved and so did their accountability to the public (Bhattacharya 2009, p. 101).

The intellectual wars carried over thirty years in India saw many arguments for historians, educators and public discourse. Chronology as a way of framing history became seen as problematic due to its reliance on religion to shape the essence of India’s past (p. 102). As Bhattacharya points out,

The new textbooks offered a radically different picture. They narrated the history of the pre-colonial past as a history of flux and change, development and dynamism: technology and economy, market and trade, agriculture and crafts all showed a linear process of growth. Colonial rule by contrast was a tragic time of decline and impoverishment, stagnation and backwardness, deindustrialization and agricultural involution (Bhattacharya 2009, p. 102)

The new textbooks set out to decolonise the past, and the history of modern India in the twentieth century was thus the story of the national movement.
The logic that positions this discussion of history textbooks is that interculturality, history and curriculum and pedagogy intersect at the national level. The role of *interculturality* as an educational strategy in the teaching and learning is to disrupt the exclusion of ‘content’ – stories, events, people and beliefs – and highlight the silences translated through the agency of ‘pedagogy’. Therefore, history textbooks are used in this study as an example of ‘inert’ knowledge under current practices of history teaching and learning in many countries.

Criticality is the ground on which we build students’ understanding of the world, and the histories that are often taken for granted in the discourse of textbooks must be unpacked in a variety of ways and methods. In other words, to historicise the past for students is to show how things are ‘constituted through historical processes’ (Bhattacharya 2009, p. 109). These processes must be viewed through a lens of empathy and understanding rather than a ‘basis of conceit’ (p. 109) in which we only see the truth of our own perceptions. Only through understanding the historical imagination of others and how they understand their lives ‘can we build the premises of dialogue between cultures, past and present’ (p. 109).

Integral to distinctions made across the literature review, this section reaffirms, for interculturality and history, the questions of ‘whose history, story and experience prevails in the school setting’ and ‘who speaks for whom’ (Giroux 1991, p. 507) in history teaching across the globe, and essentially under the discursive conditions of history teaching and learning in Australia.

**Part 3: The distinction of the knotted cord**

The role of interculturality in history is not new; it is long and complex, it can be identified in both peaceful and conflict relationships between cultures, and it does not judge a historical event or narrative to be wrong or right. Interculturality should not be perceived as a fuzzy feeling or ‘cottage industry’ that will assist the post-postmodern world in dealing with its angry response to angst and conflicts; rather, its capacity to expose disruptive tensions in a nation’s history – or what I identify in this section as *knotted cords* – is part of the intellectual deconstructive work necessary for interculturality to be integral to history education as an educational strategy. This section takes a historical understanding of
interculturality to demonstrate how the concept, as part of a nation’s mimetic devices (written and spoken discourses), develops through trauma and assimilation.

The exposition of a nation’s *knotted cords* is a distinction made counter to the discourse of history textbooks that reflect a master narrative of strength and victory. The two historical contexts used in this section – the Pueblo revolt of 1680 and the setting of Francophone Vietnam – reflect a distinction of interculturality in history that is absent in history education in Australia. The Pueblo Revolt of 1680 was one of the most successful indigenous revolts of the colonial period in all of Latin America.

The maguey fibre cord with four knots in it was passed as communication from pueblo to pueblo to alert communities that revolt in 1680 was imminent. The perception of it being passed between pueblos to inspire rebellion in the late seventeenth century is part of the history of New Mexico. After the 1680 revolt, the Spaniards and Pueblos lived together under the auspice of the rumour of the knotted cord. Years later, when another *knotted cord* was intercepted by Diego de Vargas, there was an eerie echo of the 1680 rebellion. Acting on rumour and alleged sightings of the knotted cord, the violence between the Spaniards and Pueblos continued for years. Metaphorically, the *knotted cord* started a culture without the conscious effort or will of any one group of people, and without any desire for shared meaning-making. The knotted cord, whether the Pueblos and Spaniards wanted it or not, linked them, through revolt and trauma, in ways that they had never experienced either with each other or with other groups of people. The revolt of 1680 created an intercultural ‘association between them of culture and place – that was neither agreed upon nor desired but existed nonetheless’ (Brown 2015, p. 86). ‘No knotted cords were ever circulated in Pueblo communities after 1701’, states Brown; however, it was a ‘mimetic device’ that summoned discourses about culture and trauma, conflict and suspicion as part of their history (p. 101).

Brown (2015) remarks that by using theoretical insights from anthropological studies of trauma and state terror and ethno-historical methodology, she uncovers a more complex portrait of the Spanish-Pueblo interculturality than is revealed in
current historiography. She writes about interculturality within the context of trauma where there was a projection of the ‘savage’ versus the ‘civilised’ which was used to justify all sorts of ‘behaviours, practices and beliefs’ (p. 94). In this period of history interculturality is well acquainted with fear built on stereotypes enforced through intergenerational myths and historical memory. After the 1692 reconquest of New Mexico the Spanish-Pueblo interculturality ‘created a shared set of beliefs and practices that when enacted perpetuated suspicion in both groups even when such fears were not rooted in any sort of reality’ (p. 91). The complex trauma and shared experience that emerged in colonial New Mexico shaped the Spanish-Pueblo interculturality. Brown calls this a ‘culture by default’ that appeared without the conscious effort or will of a group of people (p. 101).

Horrendous events, which are metaphoric *knotted cords*, leave indelible marks upon settler colonial states such as Australia. *Knotted cords* in history can be used to construct meaning in relationships of *difference* even if it manifests in suspicion and violence. However, as Brown (2015) points out, current historiography is often sanitised or less poignant in its descriptions of the complexities of interculturality and this is particularly true for school history. The invisibility of the *knotted cord* works for the power holders of any society who define what is *normal*, and contributes to a denial of interculturality.

The *knotted cord* extends the crystal metaphor to communicate another angle of interculturality and its disruptive persuasion. It symbolises a discourse that is neglected in school history and its Western historical thinking: an understanding that the world has ‘always been intercultural’ through both peace and conflict (Gundara 2000). The symbolic *knotted cord* gives voice to discourses made silent through the inclusion and exclusion of specific historical content knowledge as a means of legitimising a dominant discourse. Being cognizant of interculturality not always endured through peace is essential to establishing an international view of *interculturality* as an educational strategy for history educators.

The next section uses Karl Britto’s *Disorientation: France, Vietnam, and the Ambivalence of Interculturality* (2004) as an interpretive approach to demonstrate how, through the lens of the history of education, ambivalence of interculturality is deemed a tool of assimilation. Difference and diversity fall victim to a false
sense of achievement which highlights the complex dimensions of *interculturality* as an educational strategy reflected in this thesis.

*The Ambivalence of Interculturality – Karl Britto*

In contrast to Brown’s piece is Karl Britto’s book, entitled *Disorientation: France, Vietnam, and the Ambivalence of Interculturality* (2004). Published over ten years earlier, Britto’s theorising of interculturality is through a deep textual engagement with Vietnamese francophone literature. The author combines rigorous literary analysis with cultural and historical inquiry to imagine *interculturality* through analysis of particular historical literary texts about shifts in Franco-Vietnamese relations. Unlike Brown’s work, which shows the temporal characteristic of interculturality, Britto’s historical inquiry into its ambivalence is closely linked with education. Unsurprisingly, clear links can be made between Vietnam’s valorisation of Western culture in education and Australia’s (Britto 2004, p. 29). Britto’s theorising of the writing of interculturality informs many parts of this thesis but is particularly noticeable in the use of motifs in the textual analysis. However, as part of a review of key literatures, at this point, I have selected the notion of the *conquered student* from Britto’s *Disorientation* to further historical understanding of the intercultural imaginary.

*The Conquered Student*

In the second half of the nineteenth century, those who believed in the superiority of French culture believed in the ‘civilizing’ of colonised peoples and vehemently opposed respect for cultural difference. Colonial domination came through the power of assimilation and association with imperialist rhetoric (Britto 2004, pp. 13-4).

In the opening chapter, ‘The Conquered Student’, Britto describes a culture war that went on for decades and ‘affected the lives of generations of Vietnamese students’, some of whom wrote about their experience in literary novels (Britto 2004, p. 14).

The story of Jean Baptiste Luro’s dreams of a French empire in Indochina was dependent on the creation of cultural translators and intercultural subjects. He envisioned easy movement between Vietnamese and French culture, ‘their
intercultural position a crucial element in the structure of French dominance’ (Britto 2004, p. 18). Luro’s plan was manifested in pedagogy; however, it did not allow for the ‘spaces of tension and resistance inherent in intercultural identities forged out of colonial domination’ (p. 18). Notwithstanding these tensions, students were conquered through the use of French as the dominant language and cultural ambivalence. The colonial education system affirmed the cultural superiority of the French through powerful propaganda. Vietnamese francophone writers sought to preserve a sense of identity by engaging with the French on cultural terms; however, this often led to an undermining of what they aimed to protect. The ambivalence associated with this approach gave rise to texts that were often contradictory or conflicting. Britto tells that other texts were written without resistance to cultural domination where students longed for an ‘imagined France, an intellectual and cultural landscape mapped out in the colonial classroom’ (Britto 2004, p. 26). Further, course materials exposed flaws in Vietnamese ways of doing almost everything; although comments such as this one from Gail Paradise Kelly concedes that ‘perhaps this tendency to portray Vietnamese faults was unconscious’, it did undermine their own culture and ‘its ability to progress, improve or change on its own’ (Kelly 1975, p. 150).

The intercultural subjects created through systemic and calculated pedagogy over a century were often reflected in the literary representation of interculturality and not always in glowing terms. Historians and writers such as Britto see the ambivalence of interculturality, on this occasion embedded in the history of Indochina and France. The concept of interculturality goes beyond the boundaries of recent history; rather it denotes a well thought-out plans based on and motivated by the space between people. The ‘conquered student’ was a result of that plan and interculturality divided and confused the intellectual identity of the students of Vietnam. This resulted in a successful plight of assimilation.

Both Brown and Britto’s writing make a distinction of interculturality in historical contexts that are not necessarily positive. By evidencing interculturality in history as an unconscious union that comes about through conflict or even an educated approach to assimilation, a broader lattice is constructed through the crystalline structure of this literature review and therefore for the data analysis.
Closing the literature review

By adopting the view of historical thinking being constituted through distinctions – the intersection of interculturality, history and curriculum and pedagogy subject to a discourse of interpretive diversity – I have positioned this research through questions of interculturality for the teaching and learning of history in Australian schools. This review closes with the understanding that the methodological orientation of the study needs to be guided by an approach that recognises that language through discourse is central to understanding the issue. Therefore, discourse analysis is used in this thesis as both theory and method. As a theory it is used in a variety of academic disciplines to analyse nearly anything in terms of meaning (Gee 2014). Threadgold (2000) says the field of discourse is a ‘particularly contested terrain’, and as Gee suggests, there is no right way to do a discourse analysis (Gee 2014). The attested flexibility of discourse analysis is attractive to this researcher because declaring a prescriptive method conflicts with the postmodern and interpretive nature of the crystallised framework. Further, as both Graham (2011) and Gee (2014) point out, the reticence to declare a precise method is perhaps because there is no such thing as a concise description.
Chapter 3: Research methodology and methods

Chapter synopsis

Since my explanation of crystallisation methodology assumes an understanding of several elements and theories that are intertwined across the study, this chapter begins with an in depth explanation of crystallisation methodology before outlining the theories and elements that build the conceptual framework.

The chapter then explains the methods of data collection and analysis for the study. This includes an outline of the textual analysis and focus group methods, and discussion of my understanding and use of discourse analysis as the underpinning methodology for this study.

Crystallisation methodology

I understand methodology to mean the way I theorise and interpret the knowledge studied (Mackenzie & Knipe 2006), and methods to be the ‘tools’ I have used to do the research and generate the data (Thomson 2013). The choice of crystallisation as the basis for the study is based on an ontological position of seeing interpretive angles reflected in the melding of the two constructs: history education and interculturality. I envision the principle of crystallisation to have infinite possibilities for blending and moving among paradigms on a continuum, as a framework which adds litheness to the often stringent constraints of qualitative methodology (Ellingson 2009).

Being cognizant of the research questions begins with wondering in crystallisation and prepares the researcher for any opportunities that may arise during the methodological journey. There were preliminary considerations involved with wondering. Firstly, what I can learn about the data by being immersed in it and then what the written text and the participants of the focus groups can teach me about their worlds and about mine. Crystallisation provided a way to see how power is revealed or hidden in the data and how the identity of the researcher relates to the data (Ellingson 2009).
Crystallisation and history methodology

Crystallisation as a methodology was broadly introduced to qualitative researchers through the work of sociologist Laurel Richardson (Richardson 1994, 2000). Feminist theorists and methodologists, says Ellingson, took up the concept of crystallisation early on because of its capacity to disrupt conventional methodological practices and break disciplinary norms (Cook & Fonow 1990; Ellingson 2009). Predominantly, for this study, I follow the work of Laura Ellingson who developed Richardson’s original concept of crystallisation into a nuanced framework (Ellingson 2009, pp. 3-4). In her work, Ellingson recognises the capacity for scholars to use crystallisation to ‘embrace a wide range of methods, practices and perspectives’ to meet their needs and goals (p. 4). I chose crystallisation because it provides multiple forms of analysis and multiple forms of representation to researchers (Ellingson 2009, p. 4).

Crystallisation disrupts conventional methodological practices. For example, crystallisation as a methodology establishes validity and trustworthiness through ‘its central imaginary – the crystal, which combines symmetry and substance with an infinite variety of shapes and angles of approach’ (Richardson 2000, p. 934, my emphasis). On the other hand, a distinctly Western historical methodology produces elements of ethnocentrism for history teaching and learning which is ‘asymmetrical evaluation, teleological continuity and centralized perspective’ (Rüsen 2004c).

Yilmaz (2008) has argued that history methodology can treat historical knowledge as an end in itself when it should be a means of increasing students’ ability to understand complex human experiences across space and time (p. 45). The positivist position for explaining all things historical is about remembering facts, and therefore is disconnected from ‘the imagination of the historian; or the imagination of the history teacher’ (p. 38). In this study, the multiple ways of knowing historical facts are blended through the diversity of interculturality and the practical elements of curriculum and pedagogy which fit together within this flexible framework.
Multiple ways of knowing

‘Multiple ways of knowing’, says Ellingson, ‘are analogous to viewing an object through a crystal’ (2009, p. 11). Therefore, crystallisation requires engaging with at least two strategies of analysis. This is achieved in this study by these elements:

- drawing on the genre of literature and its use of motifs in constructing ‘themes and patterns to capture evocative moments in [the] texts’ (p. 934)
- employing historical interpretations of interculturality in history to create depth of understanding
- using the lens of Western historical thinking to analyse historical content knowledge and its purpose
- borrowing from various core elements of discourse analysis, for example, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and textual analysis, to examine the written and visual language of the text
- using a typology of stages of historical thinking for analysing data
- employing a narrative approach for revealing the rich data of spoken texts that emerges from the transcripts of the focus groups.

Crystallised texts and other genres

‘Crystallised texts include more than one genre of writing or representation’, says Ellingson (2009, p. 9). This principle of crystallisation suited the nature of the textual analysis as a method in this study because it draws on the literary genre and the use of motifs in discourse analysis to frame and interpret significant themes (Gee 2014). The decision to use motifs in the textual analysis reflects two things: a consideration of what Ellingson says is ‘including, interweaving and blending more than one way of expressing data’ (Ellingson 2009, p. 11), and a familiar element of literary deconstruction from my past experience as a high school literature teacher.

I remember the sheer pleasure of finding meaning in the motifs – repeated messages and patterns – that existed, hidden in plain view, amongst the words of authors. The origin of ‘motif’ is from French, dating back to 1840, and translates as a ‘motive’ and ‘dominant idea’; for example, the depraved and declining American dream of Scott Fitzgerald’s The Great Gatsby reflected in the eyes of
Doctor T. J. Eckleburg, a pair of fading, bespectacled eyes painted on an old advertising billboard over the valley of ashes. *The Great Gatsby* is one of the greatest literary historical novels of the twentieth century and has, over time, become an international source for the study of American social history; it is read as a record of American life at an actual time and place (Malvasi & Nelson 2004). Moreover, the historical novel

manifests the tensions between comparability and difference that makes it a productive site for cross cultural analysis; a place where the past reminds us of our ongoing attachment to history (Dalley 2014, p. 196).

In light of this diversity, I take the opportunity to utilise more than one genre of writing in the textual analysis and in presenting the findings of the focus groups. In the first part of the textual analysis, I draw on the literary genre to invoke the symbolic use of motifs. In the second part I use an essay format to report an *intercultural reading* of the data. Finally, I adopt a creative approach to construct a scenario and practical example of a new theory developed for this thesis.

*The interpretive paradigm in crystallisation methodology*

The research paradigm, makes ‘assumptions, concepts and propositions that orient thinking’ along the methodological journey (Bogdan & Biklin 1998, p. 22). The ‘role of the paradigm can be mysterious’ (Mackenzie & Knipe 2006, p. 194) and in qualitative research is often mapped through a continuum of ‘socially constructed dichotomies’ (Potter 1996, p. 6; Ellingson 2009). What appears suitable at one moment is eclipsed in another when the researcher is propositioned by multiple versions of intent, motivation and expectations for the research (Ellingson 2009; O’Leary 2004). Often qualitative studies for social and educational research are characterised by two paradigms: the positivist and the interpretive.

The concerns of this study could not be explained through a paradigm of positivism based on a ‘system of differences that have been cast in terms of binaries’ (Gergen 1994, p. 9). The shackles of positivism and its beliefs in ‘ahistorical, universal’ (Ellingson 2009, p. 4) truth can be dispensed with under the tenets of crystallisation. In fact, as Ellingson points out, the only position that crystallisation as methodology does not complement is positivism (p. 4). This
study embraces the flexible continuum of crystallisation by acknowledging that the positivist past of historical methodology does not endure the meld of history education and the concept of interculturality. The interpretive paradigm was chosen as compatible with crystallisation because of its capacity to reflect a more human experience of the stories told in the data, and to develop theory inductively through patterns of meaning along the way (Creswell 2003; Mackenzie & Knipe 2006).

Crystallisation ‘pushes the envelope’ (Ellingson 2009, p. 16), to keep researchers thinking and can potentially liberate the paradigm dichotomy through boundary spanning methods and methodologies in the quest for fulfilling and engaging research where very deep, thick descriptions are possible (Ellingson 2009; Geertz 1973b). Multiple ways of knowing, understanding and representing the data ‘[provide] more angles of vision’ (Ellingson 2009, p. 15) on the given foci.

This study necessitates seeing the field of methodology not as a dichotomy of right and wrong or art versus science. The constructs of history and interculturality do not oppose one another. They meld across a paradigm continuum that begins with the positivist - steeped in traditional narratives feeding historical consciousness - and travels toward the transformative and its forces of change through an interpretive paradigm.

Although sometimes criticised for its lack of capacity for making generalisations, because it often only takes into account small groups and samples that do not always apply to a whole population, interpretivism does allow for in-depth, detailed inquiry that considers a range of perspectives. Interpretive researchers must employ different ways of investigating people’s perceptions and attitudes, how these are shaped by cultural contexts, and how they inform people’s actions. This is one reason why interpretivism has, over time, shifted towards qualitative methods. We cannot understand why people do what they do, why particular institutions exist and operate in characteristic ways, without considering how people interpret and make sense of their world and the past (Mack 2010).

One of the strongest criticisms of interpretivism is that it neglects to acknowledge the political and ideological influences on knowledge and social reality; therefore, the researcher who seeks to accord change and emancipation from injustices in
society is not represented under this paradigm (Mack 2010). This was a crucial constraint of the interpretive framework, given that the study claims its role as a ‘triumph of difference’ through the distinctions made through language toward change. However, when interpretivism is associated with the philosophical position of idealism it can be used to group together a diverse range of approaches, including social constructivism, phenomenology and hermeneutics – as the ‘study of meaning and interpretation of historical texts’ (Mack 2010, p. 7) – and it appreciates that it is important for the researcher to appreciate differences between people (Collins 2010).

Further, the postmodern influence on interpretivism gives rise to employing multiple methods in order to reflect different aspects of the issue, including ideological influences (Saunders, Thornhill & Lewis 2012). Moreover, the study ‘recognises diversity as a real phenomenon’ and is informed by a central postmodern idea that difference is fundamental in society rather than superficial (Maxwell 2012, pp. 49, 50). Therefore, in seeking to understand how distinct values, attitudes and beliefs (ideology) are shaped within and shape the context of history education, its worldview is inextricably linked to a postmodern critical orientation.

**Developing the theoretical framework**

The theoretical framework for this study is informed by the strengths and weaknesses of the paradigm continuum brought to light through the principles of crystallisation. For example, the framework began with the broad notion of the discipline of history, which can sit comfortably within a positivist paradigm when it is viewed as a ‘science’. However, as distinctions of historical thinking and expectations for history evolved through the literature review, the weakness of this paradigm was its inflexibility to fulfil this thesis’ quest to be transformative.

Although I follow Yilmaz (2008) in seeing history more as art than science, deploying crystallisation as a methodology allows the researcher to have movement along the paradigm continuum to experience the advantages and disadvantage of approaches. I wanted to avoid too much emphasis on categorizing types of researcher or research, and acknowledge that this sometimes expects the researcher to think or act in accordance with the perception of the category, rather
than pursuing the essence of the research questions (Ellingson 2009, p. 7; Miller 2000). This is not a compromise of methodological principles, but rather a move beyond a ‘dualistic partitioning of qualitative methods’ (Ellingson 2009, p. 7) to blend paradigms, to support the blending of constructs in this study.

The nature of historical knowledge or data is always subject to the imagination of the historian – or the imagination of the history teacher, who, as demonstrated in the focus groups, operates from all measures of the paradigm continuum. Otherwise historical facts remain ‘disconnected’ (Yilmaz 2008, p. 38) and meaningless until brought together through a set of beliefs and values. As Seixas and Peck put it, ‘knowing a lot of historical facts is useless without knowing how they fit together and why they might be important’ (Seixas & Peck 2004, my emphasis). Therefore, even though my position for interpreting history remains closer to the art than the science, and not always with ‘a fixed viewpoint’ (Yilmaz 2008, p. 38), I was able to edge back and forth along the continuum to uphold a whole range of opportunities and approaches to sense making and representation (Ellingson 2009, p. 7). This benefited the development of the theoretical framework, which moved along the continuum toward the interpretive paradigm and recognised that all participants involved, including the researcher, bring their own unique interpretations of the world or construction of the situation to the research. However, I could not dismiss the sustaining position of positivism in history and its claims of truth and objectivity. I concur with Ellingson that most of us situate ourselves somewhere in the ‘vast middle ground’ (Ellingson 2009, p. 5) of a paradigm continuum, which, for this researcher, is about respecting the notion that researchers need to be open to the attitudes and values of the participants and suspend prior cultural assumptions (Mackenzie & Knipe 2006; Ruby Vine 2009).

Methodologically, crystallisation provides trustworthiness and value for the qualitative researcher if it is not misunderstood as a design of ‘do as you please’ (Ellingson 2009, p. 2; Stewart 2017). It in ‘no way stands in opposition or mutual exclusivity to triangulation, but it does reflect significantly different goals’ (Ellingson 2009, p. 22). Triangulation carries with it an all too positivist implication that, according to Guba and Lincoln (1989), there ‘exist unchanging phenomena so that triangulation can logically be a check’ (p. 240). Where triangulation ‘seeks a more definitive truth’, says Ellingson (2009, p. 22), which is
often rendered by positivist historians, ‘crystallisation problematizes the multiple truths it represents’ (p. 22), which is cognizant of the postmodern influences informing this study.

Crystallisation, in regard to planning and judgement, say Stewart, Gapp and Harwood (2017), ‘begins in the planning and emerges in data collection with the focus on building trustworthiness and credibility’ (p. 7). The trustworthiness of this study relies on judgements of relevance. For example, a discourse analysis is not based on all features of a transcript or written text; ‘not even all those that might in some conceivable context be meaningful’ (Gee 2014, p. 136). Judgements of relevance are ultimately theoretical judgements, based on the analyst’s ‘theories of how language, contexts and interactions work’ in the specific context being analysed (p. 136). I am constantly reminded that others will read the transcripts of the focus groups or interpret the written and visual texts presented in their own way and construe different interpretations which challenge my own conclusions. Therefore, the trustworthiness of the project relies on the ideas that are planned, generated and crystallised through the themes, patterns, motifs and words about what is made significant in the world created by the data.
Introducing the conceptual framework of the thesis

This section opens with a graphic image of the conceptual framework of the thesis, based on the interrelated blend of theories of historical consciousness, historical narration and interculturality brought together through discourse analysis. The postpositivist (interpretive) paradigm is represented in the image by the thin integral lines and intersecting dotted points. For the researcher, this is the lattice which holds together all histories and their discrete translations through discourse analysis as the perpendicular driver to circumvent obstacles. Further, the combination of philosophical positions in support of this conceptual framework, such as pragmatism and postmodernism, has proved extremely useful (Maxwell 2013, p. 43): not to create undue complexity, but ‘to benefit from an exchange of different perspectives’ (Ellingson 2009, p. 83) and establish a foundation for theoretical development in this field.
The conceptual framework draws on existing theories and typologies grounded in research into historical narration and historical consciousness of key theorist and scholar for this study Jörn Rüsen (see Appendix 5). Using existing theory and research to construct the conceptual framework provides a capacity to illuminate the data (Maxwell 2013, p. 49). On the other hand, the use of existing theories in constructing a conceptual framework for qualitative research can be risky in that these theories will not illuminate everything. Ellingson makes the same point about theory and its function in crystallisation: ‘multiple angles illuminate but they can also obscure’ (Ellingson 2009, p. 80). However, existing theories reveal their own strengths and weaknesses and when used in crystallisation can be celebrated as ‘additional facets of the crystal’ (Ellingson 2009, p. 87).

Not everything works all of the time within the conceptual framework, and this is the nature of qualitative research. What does not work, within the construction of this conceptual framework, simply reminds the researcher to be cognizant of the slippery nature of claiming knowledge. Hence, the beauty of adopting crystallisation as a methodology for this study is that it does not force giving up learning from systematic research methods and their work; it simply does not ‘perpetuate the remnants of positivist writing’ (Ellingson 2009, p. 15). For all of these reasons, to crystallise its findings, this study demands a conceptual framework that comes together through the crystal panes and angles to illuminate from the data disparate discourses of constructs and representations.

The next section discusses the key components of historical consciousness and historical narration before making a link between these key elements and interculturality.

**Historical consciousness**

In the twenty-first century, across the globe, historical consciousness has been informing school curricula. Historical consciousness is not a new invention, say Köbl and Konrad (2015). Rather, the notion dates back to empirical explorations of the Weimar era gaining attention in the West when John Lukacs first published *Historical Consciousness: Or, the Remembered Past* in 1968 (Köbl & Konrad 2015; Lukacs 1968). Since the middle of the twentieth century, historical consciousness has become one of the major concepts of history education and in
recent times has been framed in both the Australian and Victorian curricula through key concepts of including evidence, continuity and change, cause and effect, perspectives, empathy, significance and contestability (Ercikan & Seixas 2015). Historical consciousness cannot be separated from ‘historical understanding’, ‘historical thinking’ and ‘historical learning’. Today, methodological principles do more than distinguish between ‘understanding’ and ‘explanation’ in history, so, history is not seen as a perfect combination of these but more as a selective and perspective narration of the past (Borries 2009). We simply need more theories and methods to articulate and express the difference between ‘historical understanding’ and ‘historical misunderstanding’ – this based on research earlier this century regarding different prototypes of learning processes in teaching history (Borries 2009).

Central to historical consciousness is the connection between past, present and future. Jörn Rüsen describes history as a meaningful nexus between past, present and future, and historical consciousness as part of the translation and interpretation of past into present (Rüsen 2005, p. 25). Historical consciousness gathers the experiences of the past, is a necessary prerequisite for orienting ourselves in the present, and prefigures future perspectives. It is concerned with an understanding of the past that informs actions and attitudes of the present, which often includes shaping the dynamics of majority and minority groups that exist in a multicultural society (Rüsen 2005; Zanazanian 2012). In the academic world historical consciousness has pushed the boundaries about how we understand history, history memory and historical thinking. In Lee’s view, it is an idea that hints at an integrative theoretical perspective capable of subsuming two related trends, and perhaps one rather different tradition (Lee 2004). For history education, historical consciousness is about ‘looking beyond school for the ways in which the past figures in youngsters’ views of the world’ (Lee 2004, p. 2).

Jörn Rüsen has ‘become central in theorising historical consciousness’, says Abdou (2017). The German historian’s conceptualization of historical consciousness is a multifaceted one, within which narrating history and understanding historical narratives play essential roles (Kölbl & Konrad 2015). Current research into historical consciousness and history teaching and learning draws primarily from Rüsen’s work that examines how students understand
history as set between a temporal relationship between the past, present and future (Trostanenko 2008). For Rüsen, developing historical consciousness involves moving from considering the past in a traditional sense – meaning a simple acceptance of a historical interpretation – to the exemplary sense of being able to demonstrate single case rules and principles; to the critical sense of raising moral reasoning; and to the generic sense of being able to historicise or place into historical context an interpretation of an event (Rüsen 1989; Trostanenko 2008).

This direction is reflected in a typology of historical consciousness influenced by professional historiographical thinking inspired by diverse thinkers such as von Ranke, Droysen and Hayden White (Köbl & Konrad 2015). The typology of historical consciousness together with Rüsen’s typology of historical narration is used here to theoretically inform an understanding of the contemporary relationship between history education and interculturality.

**Historical narration**

There is a creative activity of the human mind working in the process of historical thinking. As a reminder from earlier in this thesis, narration is the way this activity is being performed, and *history* – or, more precisely, *a history* – is the product of this activity (Rüsen 2005). I have followed Rüsen’s complex explanations of historical narration throughout the course of this research. Although I concede from the outset there are elements of Rüsen’s theories on historical narration (and historical consciousness) that go well beyond the parameters of this thesis and its research questions; at the same time it is exactly the complexity that provides the dimensions and depth for this research.

At the crux of Rüsen’s extensive explanation and understanding of historical narration, to paraphrase, is that historical narration is a system of mental operations defining the field of historical consciousness. It overcomes uncertainty by seeing a meaningful pattern in the course of time, a pattern that responds to human hopes and intentions. Historical narration is a means of making sense of the experience of time. There is a sense of ambiguity about historical narration also. Is it fact or fiction? This is an ongoing argument, and Rüsen suggests we need the help of more theoretical arguments to differentiate between factual and fictional narratives. Historical narration is usually defined as dealing only with
facts and not with fictions. This differentiation is often problematic because the ‘all-important sense of a history lies beyond the distinction between fiction and fact’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 11). The peculiarities of a historical narrative are that it is tied to the medium of memory; it organises the internal unity of past, present and future by a concept of continuity and it serves to establish the identity of its authors and listeners (readers), dependent on whether the continuity is plausible or not. In doing so, historical narration makes the experience of the past become relevant for present life and influences the shaping of the future (Rüsen 2005, p. 11).

The link between historical consciousness, historical narration and interculturality

The link between historical consciousness and interculturality exists within the complexity of modern societies and the many different communities and minorities that coexist within our global populations (Laville 2006). When there is economic and ideological uncertainty in daily life people turn to the past, both individual and collective, in order to make sense of the present.

In that present, historical consciousness is integral to individuals’ identities, but also acts at the core of nations’ identities and how they wish to appear to the rest of the world. The complexity of what renders historical consciousness critical in modern Western society is the growing need for ‘contingency, otherness and difference’ that through history can be viewed and learned (Kölbl & Konrad 2015, p. 21). Moreover, a world turned global requires a modern historical consciousness, most importantly in respect to increased awareness of difference and otherness (p. 21). Grappling with this requires theoretical foundations that can appreciate how close teaching historical consciousness might be to teaching through an intercultural lens. If, as Rüsen says, ‘historical consciousness evokes the past as a mirror of experience’, then how we teach that past must propose more than the didactics of history being simply a technique of the usage of scientific knowledge (Rüsen 2005, p. 24). Paradigms of interpretation, societal history and the social sciences explicitly raise historiography and interpretation as a ‘matter for argument’, and shift toward perspectives that are part of an interconnection between events, people and cultures (p. 97). History education in
Germany reflects a revised concept of historical consciousness and is heavily informed by diversity studies. Barricelli and Sauer (2009) write:

An estimated third of all students in Germany today bear an intercultural background...What could history mean to highly heterogeneous student communities of different race, class and gender, what advantage could individuals and collectives of varying ethnic heritage, social origin or sexual orientation take of considering their own, their families’, the other’s past? (p. 70)

In the past two decades a substantial body of literature has focused on historical consciousness for history education that examines the complex connectedness of the past to present perceptions of an event (Lee & Ashby 2000; Stearns, Wineburg & Seixas 2000). Trofanenko explains that historical consciousness is not just about providing more time and more sources for students to engage with (Trofanenko 2008); rather, it is about students’ ability to move beyond the ‘branded’ history of a nation to recognising that how the past is represented is ‘often simplified through the construction of myths as opposed to a critical sensibility of this construction’ (Trofanenko 2008, p. 599). Most current scholarship examining how students come to understand the past accepts the reality of historical fact and knowledge. However, in my view, we can no longer hope to equip students with these facts and simply teach the past as one coherent story. Rather, the literature draws attention to facts as a vehicle to achieving an understanding about issues of inclusion and contested narratives. Developing historical consciousness, therefore, is ‘to encounter a tangle of tensions between the place of historical events in the past, present and future’ (Trofanenko, p. 597). Further, national narratives need to be located in pluralistic frameworks that promote national identities built on inclusiveness rather than dismissing other identities (p. 597).

The conceptual nexus between historical consciousness, historical narration and interculturality at the school level brings into focus the vehicle of historical content knowledge and the manner in which ‘narratives enter, are denied entry, or are modulated as they enter the historical consciousness’ (Taylor & Collins 2012, p. 210) and how these influence the present and the future. The development of historical consciousness in current times involves more than a single best narrative (Trofanenko 2008) to change the influence and strength of prior knowledge.
The consideration of prior knowledge

When students come to the history content of the Australian and Victorian curricula at secondary school level they are equipped with prior knowledge. Sears and others have made the point that ‘prior knowledge’ is significant to teaching and learning; learners bring a set of constructive structures to their learning that filter and shape new information in powerful ways and these must be engaged with for change to occur (Lave & Wenger 1991; Sears 2011; Windschitl 2002). Research by Barton and Levstik (2004) showed how pre-existing frameworks shape new knowledge. Their large body of work in the field demonstrated American students’ conception of the history of the United States is framed by the themes of freedom and progress. When exposed to historical sources that countered the idea that the nation’s history had digressed from these twin themes, the researchers found that the narratives that existed as prior knowledge were so powerful that students were led to distorting the historical evidence to fit their preconceptions (Barton & Levstik 2004, p. 170).

Historical consciousness is temporal and underlies collectively how we deal with the past, present and future. It is a narrative mode of thinking that is articulated through telling and understanding the past through historical narration (Kölbl & Konrad 2015, p. 20). Interculturality as an educational strategy, when part of the nexus and its development, involves a shift beyond a unitary grand narrative of the past and a re-conceptualisation of how history is taught. This requires theoretical support in bringing what appear as disparate constructs to work together in one conceptual framework.

Discourse analysis

The methodological orientation of this study recognises language as central to the research questions. Therefore, in this conceptual framework the theory and method of discourse analysis is the longest length of the Bravais lattice, which underpins all parts of this thesis (as shown in Figure 9 on page 78). This study takes seriously that discourses are used to shape historical consciousness through the power of prior knowledge and the perpetuation of master narratives. I am not just writing about the compelling intention we have in Australia, like other
countries, to ‘teach the best possible interpretation of the past to students’ (Seixas 2000, p. 21, my emphasis) or that in reality we are compelled to teach ‘one best picture’ (Shemilt 2000, p. 85). I am writing about the knotted cords of history that are hidden by a best version and carefully constructed discourses embedded in agency of history teaching and learning. Further, these discourses of conflict or absence are often misunderstood or kept unfamiliar even within the lattice, even though it seems the curriculum policy and its discourse have made steps toward bringing them into the light for the enacted history curriculum.

**Constructing the analytical lens**

The construction of the analytical lens for this study stems from the three conceptual elements of historical thinking, interculturality and discourse analysis. Jörn Rüsen’s theories of historical narration and historical consciousness (discussed earlier in this chapter) underpin the framework, using four types of meaning that can be derived from history and applied to the present (Rüsen & Duvenage 1993; Rüsen 2005, p. 253; Stearns, Wineburg & Seixas 2000). Although there have been previous attempts to make empirical use of this theory that have failed, other studies (see Stearns, Wineburg & Seixas 2000, p. 255) have made good with the logical levels of Rüsen’s theories. This study revives Rüsen’s ‘four types of historical meanings’, termed the ‘four stages of historical thinking’, and intertwines each with elements of discourse analysis that prepare the analytical lens for interpreting and experiencing the data (Lee 2004; Rüsen 2005; Stearns, Wineburg & Seixas 2000).

*Traditional stage*

The traditional stage regards histories as ‘indispensable elements of orientation within practical life and their total denial leads to a sense of massive disorientation’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 13), and therefore disconnection from a past. The traditional stage recognises the value of *tradition* but at the same time is cognizant that traditional narratives and their stories ‘tell about the origin and the genealogy of rulers, in order to legitimate their domination; [they are] stories of foundation’ that affirm a cultural pattern and self-understanding (p. 13). The traditional stage
expects prior knowledge and orients the present through a sense of permanence and eternity.

The traditional stage of historical thinking intertwines with discourse analysis through context, identities, intertextuality and complicity. These lines of inquiry follow Gee’s approach to discourse analysis and are used to explore texts as data steeped in tradition and communicated through written and visual and spoken language.

Exemplary stage

The exemplary stage of the conceptual framework represents the rules of the past that teach a timeless pattern of lessons demonstrated through historiography or what I call the ‘writing up of history’. The exemplary stage is where the historical consciousness deals with significance and identity. The construction of language interpreted at this stage deals in giving validity to certain rules and stories that tell a lot about the accomplishments of the past and importance. For example, Rüsen (2005) suggests that historical narratives in the exemplary stage are often preferred by female historians because they could tell about the capacities and efficiency of women of the past. In this way ‘many important women and their works of art, handicraft, science and religion and their learning in economics and politics were saved from oblivion’ (p. 13). However, through the circular, fluid appearance of the intersecting lines included in my conceptual framework, I suggest that at the school history level historical thinking and interpretation cannot idle at the exemplary stage. The concern is that where the general rules of conduct exist, and where identity begins to take shape, the ‘writing up of history’ is dominated about the achievements, virtues and vices and rules set by a dominant group; in history this is generally white males.

Discourse analysis works within this stage by examining the data through allusions that are brought to light in texts as mechanisms of power, dichotomies of right and wrong, vices and virtues or claims to truth. It is about identifying the voices that construct those underlying ‘rules and conduct’ found in the texts.
Critical stage

The critical stage scrutinises historical thinking, interpretation and perspectives from different angles. Rüsen derives his example from critical narration and its abundance in women’s history: ‘under critical narration sits the suffering of women under the long history of patriarchal domination’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 14). Further, critical narration is ‘based on people’s ability to say no to traditions, rules and principles which have been handed down to them’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 14). The critical stage problematises continuity and forms identity through denying the given patterns of self-understanding that emerge from the first two stages.

In relation to this study, the critical stage is the space where the two constructs of history education and interculturality will meet. This stage provides a platform for the enactment of curriculum and pedagogy because this is where judgements are made and where there can be a rejection of official versions of history in favour of traditional interpretations or otherwise (Stearns, Wineburg & Seixas 2000, p. 253).

Discourse analysis imposes judgment in the critical stage. Lines of inquiry – such as building significance, inclusion and exclusion of statements, questioning of the status quo and identifying the patterns and stability of figured worlds that are used to understand the world past and present – are part of these judgments (Gee 2014). Here, the data is encountered through more than one way of knowing. This postpositivist analytic method interrogates through signs, symbols and systems hidden and unhidden. Stories and their construction through language are not just accepted in the critical stage and signs and symbols are read for what they do not say.

The critical stage, being crystal-like, reflects externalities and refractions (Richardson 1994) and as a result creates difference in patterns and arrays disrupting singular values and interpretations that have long been fixed.

The goal of this study is to be transformative, and this is addressed through the pragmatism of the conceptual framework. Therefore the critical stage, just as in Rüsen’s theory, is ‘not the last word’ (2005, p. 14) for the building of the analytical lens.
Transformative stage

The final stage is transformative. Rüsen describes this in his theory as genetical because it describes ‘the pattern that finds the change’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 14). In women’s history, says Rüsen,

stories of this type of narrative overcome the alternative of affirmation or negation, of defining or refusing given traditions and principles of womanhood. They replace the abstract antithesis by stressing the element of dynamic structural change and use gender as a historical category (Rüsen 2005, p. 15).

I have use the word ‘transformative’ because of the nature of this project and the transformative stage gives direction to the temporal change of people, historical thinking and its progression. In this conceptual framework and analytical lens the transformative stage represents a force of change that can only occur as a reflection of the other three stages. It is the understanding that ‘time gains a sense of temporality’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 15) and that things must change at a sustainable rate.

A summary of the conceptual framework

The traditional layer of the conceptual framework sustains the cultural patterns in history that we are familiar with and orient us in daily life; for example, familiar stories of discovery, victors, and essential characters in a story. The exemplary layer provides the rules and allusions of the past; for example, the story of colonisation builds a set of rules for Western civilisation, the setting of groups and who belongs to these groups or categories, such as white settlers and what they have created. Within these categories is the power of language through contexts of familiarity, secure identities or complicit relationships of intertextual connections to present particular perspective. This is what we have always known in Western historical thinking, and its specificity as an approach to school history.

To give access to knowledge evidenced in the discourse of the History curriculum, concepts and key skills of historical empathy and the development of historical consciousness there has to be a theoretical understanding of two other layers: the critical and the transformative. The critical layer allows for judgement and rejection of what has been passed down through the safety and assuredness of
the two previous stages. The transformative enacts change. From the conceptual framework to the analytical lens, *interculturality* as an educational strategy, engages through language within the critical layer of the framework; however, the underpinning lattice of the crystal to intertwine and intersect makes clear that the critical cannot operate in isolation.

The effectiveness of the conceptual framework (see Figure 9 p.79) emerges first in the data analysis as the analytical lens used to support the analysis of the focus group transcripts and the textual analysis. Its development is then taken further in Chapter 6 crystallising a theory for the teaching of *intercultural* history in schools.

**Data collection and analysis**

In this study I have used the methods of focus group interviews and textual analysis to generate the data. The analysis is fundamentally supported by a postpositivist epistemology and interpretive approach, in keeping with the principles of crystallisation as a methodology. This structure enables the researcher to see different angles and subtleties in the data that might otherwise remain masked (Ellingson 2009, p. 11).

Firstly, this final section of the methodology chapter introduces the ‘chatter’ of the teachers through a detailed outline of each of the four focus groups. Secondly, it outlines the textual analysis and its examination of a timeline produced in the textbook *Oxford Big Ideas History 9* for both the AC (2012) and the VC (2016).

**Focus groups**

In asking what focus groups are, Jenny Kitzinger wrote: ‘[Focus group methodology] concentrates on the one feature which inevitably distinguishes focus groups from one-to-one interviews or questionnaires – namely the interaction between research participants’ (Kitzinger 1994, p. 103). More recently, Krueger (2015) said the purpose of conducting focus groups is to better understand how people think or feel about an issue or an idea. Further, participants are selected because they have certain characteristics in common that relate to the focus group, which creates a permissive environment where participants share perceptions and points of view with being pressured to vote or
reach consensus (Krueger 2015). Notwithstanding the school of thought that suggests the weakness of focus groups as a method for data collection is a hindrance to the researcher’s ability to gain in-depth knowledge of individual teachers’ opinions and experiences, other views suggest that focus groups actually mitigate or inhibit the authority of the researcher so that participants can take charge of the research space, leading to a richer and deeper understanding of the topic or issue. Further, focus groups can fill in the gaps of the ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions that are often a legacy of participant observation method (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis 2013; Morgan 2008).

The format of the focus groups was semi-structured. At the beginning of each session the researcher, as facilitator gave a brief outline of the aims of the study and the research questions. Within this format each focus group was conducted with quite a degree of flexibility to encourage and allow participants to develop their own ideas and responses. I was not only interested in how teachers understood ICU as a mandated element of the new curriculum, but also how they felt they were doing interculturality. I saw that the structure of the focus groups would allow for natural tensions to arise through the interaction that occurred between the participants. This level of interaction comes with participants feeling comfortable, respected and free to give their opinions. There is a certain amount of self-disclosure that occurs in the focus group environment; some participants find this easier than others, says Krueger (2015); self-disclosure requires trust and assurance that there is no judgement. Krueger also notes that participants are usually willing to disclose more about themselves and how they feel if they are with like people (on this occasion through occupation).

The teachers who took part in the focus groups are actors of curriculum. To what degree they critically mediate the history curriculum and its attendant ideology is a significant issue for this thesis. It is essential to acknowledge that as educational practitioners they are seen by this study not only as products of history but producers of history as well (Giroux 2011).

**Construct of the focus groups with teachers**

Four focus groups were conducted over a period of six months and ran anywhere between thirty-five and sixty minutes, but no longer than one hour, and comprised
of 5 or 6 participants. The researcher was granted permission to conduct focus groups in a Catholic college by the Catholic Education Office (see Appendix 1). Each participant filled out a Plain Language Statement (see Appendix 3) outlining the intention of the study and its parameters. Participants were given pseudonyms to protect their anonymity as required for ethical clearance. This research is considered low risk and was given ethics approval through Deakin Human Ethics Advisory Group (HEAG) on 4th February 2015 (see Ethics Approval, Appendix 2).

The focus groups were recorded by the researcher using Sonarca Sound Recording software on a laptop and on the researcher’s mobile phone as backup. The recording was then sent to a professional transcription service and returned to the researcher in typed format. The researcher supplied refreshments to show her sincere appreciation of the teachers giving up their time. This contributed to a relaxed environment for participants who, on each occasion, had already worked a full teaching day.

_The setting_

The demographic of the school where the focus groups were conducted was a large Catholic, co-educational secondary college which spanned three campuses and had approximately two-thousand students.

_The data sample_

The sample of participants was random and participants were not chosen for certain focus groups. Rather, the time and accessibility of a focus group chose the participants. In total twenty-four teachers in four focus groups participated in the study.

There are four tables in this section used to outline the attributes of the participants present at the focus group. An example of the structure of the tables appears in Figure 10 (over page). In each table participants have been given pseudonyms to protect their anonymity. The choice of titles for columns was decided by the researcher in relation to what emerged from the data and what would have bearing on the representation of the data. For example, initially I included ‘gender’ as a column. However, over time and as I delved more deeply
into the data, the idea of gender created its own set of problems: for example, my research questions and the conceptual framework constructed to answer those questions had no interest in the gender of the participants. Therefore, although the pseudonym names indicated gender it is not for any analytic parameter. On the other hand, I did feel, as I examined the data further, that the position held by a participant or their experience as a teacher did have a bearing on their conceptualisation of interculturality for history teaching and learning; therefore I have commented on these aspects throughout the data analysis where necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Teaching Experience &lt;5 years to 10 years</th>
<th>Teaching Experience &gt;10 years &lt; 20 years</th>
<th>Teaching Experience &gt;20 years</th>
<th>Status = Permanent/Contract</th>
<th>Position = class teacher/pastoral coordinator/Learning Area Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Jim</td>
<td>Over 30 years</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>House Coordinator across Year 7-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Chris</td>
<td>Over 30 years</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Class teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Anna</td>
<td>Over 30 years</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Class teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Megan</td>
<td>Over 30 years</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Class teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Caroline</td>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Class teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – Steven</td>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>Contract</td>
<td>Class teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10 Example of structure of table of attributes for focus groups

The next section provides a table of attributes for each focus group and a brief account of the group to reflect the tone of the discussions, dynamics of the groups and other aspects that have relevance to the researcher’s interpretations. To align with the interpretive paradigm of the study, each account is a descriptive annotation intended to prepare the reader for a more ‘human experience’ (Ellingson 2009) of the data encountered by the researcher.

**Focus Group 1**

The first group comprised of six participants. The texture of the focus group was contentious from the outset. The discussion was heavily influenced by the status
and experience of the participants. For example, two of the most experienced teachers in the group immediately made a connection between interculturality and the White Australia Policy as part of their understanding and interpretation. This conflicted with the views of a third, very experienced, participant. The lesser experienced participants waited patiently for an opening into the discussion but remained silent for most of it, and were only prepared to make a couple of contributions.

After working through this transcript and listening to the discussion many times I read and heard fragmentation in the construction of ideas, personal opinions and views. The experienced teachers, although most vocal, jumped around the topic, coming from many angles. They were animated and edgy, asserting authority on the topic through their own historical knowledge. It was also clear that this experience and knowledge intimidated the two less experienced teachers, who were more reluctant to contribute as the time passed.

The contentious nature of this focus group provoked by the concept of interculturality for history teaching and learning is presented in detail in Chapter 4, in the analysis of the focus groups.

**Focus Group 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Status = Permanent/Contract/CRT</th>
<th>Position = class teacher/pastoral coordinator/Learning Area Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Sally</td>
<td>&lt;5 years</td>
<td>&lt;5 years</td>
<td>12 month contract /renewed</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Class teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Rebecca</td>
<td>Between 10 and 15 years</td>
<td>Over 30 years</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Class teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Tina</td>
<td>&gt;10 years &lt;20 years</td>
<td>Over 30 years</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Class teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Heath</td>
<td>&lt;5 years</td>
<td>&gt;20 years</td>
<td>12 month contract renewed</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Class teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Roy</td>
<td>Over 30 years</td>
<td>CRT contract</td>
<td>Class teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12 Attributes of participants Focus Group 2

Upon a first listening of the transcripts the substantive topic of interculturality pushed many boundaries for some participants in this group, particularly
regarding their expectations for history. The discussion in this group evidenced the intersection of the history discipline and the school subject of history as a conceptual space, and these teachers drew on their understanding of the history discipline to inform their discussion.

As the table shows, Group 2 comprised of five participants with a mixture of experience. From the outset, Sally, although having only taught for less than five years, was confident and vocal about her conceptualisation of interculturality and began the discussion with this comment:

I think for me it often comes down to perspective and making sure when you’re teaching history that you are talking about the varying perspectives and how certain people may view certain events or situations, and making that clear to students as well (my emphasis).

Sally’s interconnection between interculturality and the word ‘perspective’ is made with conviction. Her use of the word ‘certain’ denotes what is significant to her and what alerts her to this significance – offering perspective to her students.

**Focus Group 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Jen</td>
<td>&gt;20 years</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Class teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Joanne</td>
<td>Between 15 and 20 years</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Class teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Emily</td>
<td>Between 15 and 20 years</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Class teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Amelia</td>
<td>Between 5 and 10 years</td>
<td>12 month contract renewed</td>
<td>Class teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Jessica</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Class teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – Student teacher</td>
<td>0 years</td>
<td>Student teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 13 Attributes of participants Focus Group 3**

If I had to give this group a title it would be ‘perspective, perspective, perspective’, based on the emphasis of the word ‘perspective’ to explain
interculturality. This is evidenced by comments like this one made by Emily: ‘I think I’ve just deliberately gone into my teaching and I think perspective, perspective, and perspective’. Focus Group 3 comprised of six female participants. Two male teachers were invited to the group, but on the day they were unable to make it. Out of the four focus groups, this was the most apprehensive to begin the discussion. At the time, it was difficult to know whether to prompt or simply wait for someone to open with a comment. I had not prompted any of the other groups beyond stating the research questions and the general intention of the study. The waiting created its own tension. From listening to the recording multiple times, this apprehension seemed due to a reluctance to actually articulate the word ‘interculturality’. There was a bit of nervous laughter around the difficulty of saying the word (which is lost in the written transcript). This reaction reflects one of the key findings of this study: the replacement of the word ‘interculturality’ with ‘perspective’ or ‘it’ and a resistance to articulate the word.

The tension that bubbled under the surface in this group was in direct contrast to Focus Group 1 and 2. In this group the less experienced teachers were forceful in their comments, whereas in the other groups, generally, they tended to stand back. The participants seemed to be empowered by recognising what shapes historical thinking or more poignantly, what is behind it. It was in this group that a poststructuralist view of historical interpretation was visible, and this had bearing on their conceptualisation of interculturality for their history teaching.

**Focus Group 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Status = Permanent/Contract/CRT</th>
<th>Position = class teacher/pastoral coordinator/Learning Area Coordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – Dan</td>
<td>Between 10 and 15 years</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Learning Area Leader/Humanities Coordinator for the College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Melanie</td>
<td>Between 10 and 15 years</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>House Coordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Joe</td>
<td>8-10 years</td>
<td>Contract 12 months</td>
<td>Class teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Lucy</td>
<td>Between 10 and 15 years</td>
<td>Job share/contract</td>
<td>Class teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 14 Attributes of participants Focus Group 4*
Focus Group 4 comprised of four participants. A fifth participant, a graduate teacher, had accepted an invitation to attend; however, she did not turn up to the session. The leader of the Humanities learning area was part of this group.

Although this group comprised of only four participants the discussion proved dynamic and reflected a different construction of meaning surrounding the topic. From this transcript I can recognise the fractured significance of interculturality explained in the literature review, in that the participants were more confident in articulating *interculturality* as an educational strategy and the consequent issues that this presented to them. For whatever reasons, this group of teachers engaged more in a discourse of curriculum and what counts as knowledge, and related their understanding of interculturality to current curriculum policy. Unlike the other three groups, there was no apparent tension between participants in the recordings and transcripts, but this did not make for a less poignant contribution. In fact, the opposite is the case. The teachers engaged with talk that set them apart from the other groups. They were less apprehensive about the term interculturality and, whether consciously or not, spoke to the capacity of *interculturality* as an educational strategy in history education. Whether this was because the leader of the Humanities learning area was present in this group I am not sure, but the tone of the discussion lent itself more to being attuned to the strengths and weaknesses of the new history curriculum in terms of its *intercultural* direction.

**Textual analysis**

Textual analysis in this study is defined as a key ‘part of discourse analysis’ (Fairclough 2003) that investigates how ‘entities of various sorts’, for example significant people in history, specific content knowledge or abstracts of historical thinking are differentiated, or how differences are underplayed or ‘collapsed by “texturing” relations of equivalence’ (Fairclough 1992, p. 193; 2003, p. 88). The textual analysis here examines the construction and placement of written and visual language to interpret the concept of interculturality.

This textual analysis operates as both descriptive and critical (Gee 2014). It is grounded in a deconstruction of overall linguistic structures (descriptive), but also elucidates the inclusion and exclusion of content (critical). In doing so, it invokes the conceptual framework of this study as a lens to unpack hidden, or not so
hidden, signifiers of dominant discourses through its ‘four stages of historical thinking’ and discourse analysis.

The analysis of the visual language is informed by the work of Gillian Rose (2001), whose work is in turn informed by Fairclough and Foucault and invests in investigating the constructions and placement of visual text. Together with other scholars such as Grace Karskens (1997), Sasha Grishin (2014) and Paul Carter (2010), the visual discourse of the timeline is interrogated on the grounds of selection and placement.

The data sample

The data sample is a timeline that appears in the textbook, *Oxford Big Ideas History 9* (Carrodus et al. 2012, p.160), shown on the next page at Figure 15. The sample represents the skill of chronology as history pedagogy; a key skill specified in both the AC and VC history curricula for middle years of schooling. The textbook, marketed as written for the AC, is positioned in this study as a prescribed text. The timeline appears on page 160 of the textbook and is the opening pedagogy for teaching Australia’s early beginnings for the AC elective entitled ‘Making a Nation’. This elective, according to the publisher, Oxford University Press, is taken up by 70% of schools who use this textbook (Oxford University Press spokesperson, 2016, personal communication).
Figure 15 Timeline, Oxford Big Ideas History 9 for Australian Curriculum 2012. Reproduced by permission of Oxford University Press Australia from 2017 © Oxford University Press, www.oup.com.au
The timeline as a data sample extends to its representation in the *Oxford Big Ideas History 9* (Carrodus & Smith 2016) textbook, shown in Figure 16 (over page), which was produced for the VC in 2016 as a result of Victoria’s split from the national curriculum. The Victorian version of the textbook espouses the same status as a prescribed text due to it being marketed as written for the VC. The Victorian version of the timeline was mostly unchanged; however, there are some simple changes in its discourse that benefit this study and its interests in what is made significant through the construction of written and visual language. It is part of this study’s methodology to follow the life of the data sample to ensure the representation of the whole story.

Indelibly impacted upon by space and the economic restrictions of publishing, it could be argued that the inclusion and exclusion of historical content is unlikely to be left to chance. Therefore, although they are not simply deemed as ideological or purposeful, there are choices made regarding the placement, inclusion and exclusion of content knowledge found in the sample data. Discourse analysis and the core elements of the conceptual framework interact in this textual analysis to determine the capacity and access ‘to perceive representation from different cultures’ in the sample, and offer insight into the space for intercultural discourse to disrupt dominant narratives (Abdou 2017, p. 11; Nordgren & Johansson 2015, pp. 11-2).
5.1 Australia (1750–1918): a timeline

Check your learning 5.1

Remember and understand
1. In what year was New South Wales first settled by the British?
2. When did the Australian gold rushes begin?
3. In what year was a law introduced to limit the working day to eight hours?

Apply and analyse
4. Use the timeline to calculate the year at which, when the British first settled Australia, the number of years between the founding of the Commonwealth of Australia through Federation.
Analysis of the timeline in the textbook written for the Victorian curriculum

It is part of this study’s aim to contribute new knowledge to history education and scholarship that concentrates on giving visibility to the people who lived Australia’s early beginnings. In the second part of the textual analysis, the study draws on the second principle of crystallisation to ‘utilize forms of analysis or ways of producing knowledge across multiple points of the qualitative continuum’ (Ellingson 2009, p. 11); that is, data can be made sense of through more than one way of knowing. To analyse the timeline in the textbook produced for the VC, pictured above in Figure 16, the textual analysis considers how the text might be read from outside the Western context. The analysis of the timeline is presented as an intercultural reading framed by questions about Western historiography.

Method of analysis – Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis contributes to the whole picture of the thesis. Its use throughout the study both theoretically and as method is driven by a healthy poststructuralist respect for uncertainty, and it acknowledges, as do Humes and Bryce (2003), the influence of key thinkers like Derrida (1978) in the ‘search for clarity and simplicity of meaning’ and the fact that there are always ‘other perspectives from which to interpret’ the data (Humes & Bryce 2003, p. 180). This reflects the kaleidoscopic nature of language and meaning. I trust in Halse’s view (2006) that ‘poststructural theory has been influential in unsettling the ontological certainty of the taken-for-granted foundations of humanism: the transparency of language; and the rational production of knowledge and truth’ (Halse 2006, p. 97; St. Pierre 2000).

Courses of discourse analysis

The course of a discourse analysis is often dependent on its epistemological framework. However, this is not always straightforward. The discourse analysis is about shuttling back and forth between the ‘little things’ and the bigger structures, big conversations and underlying situations of a text (Gee 2014; Kamler & Gee 2003). As noted in Barbara Kamler’s interview with James Paul Gee in 2003, the ‘little things’ are determined as words or stanzas; they can be written, pictured,
uttered or defined as ‘being (identity)’ or an insight into how we ‘do (action)’

Discourse analysis can also mobilise the big issues for the researcher, intervene in
the institutional, cultural and political problems and controversies in the world (p.
9). In his conversations with Kamler (2003), Gee emphasises the notion that no
‘one size fits all’ for discourse analysis. He gives the example of two large groups
that divide this varied field of analysis. First is the group who carry tools to
examine traces of the linguistic form and shape of the text, substantiated by
linguistic scholars, for instance Fairclough (1997) and his seminal work on the
functionality of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Then there is the group of
people who carry a tool box to interrogate the underlying big issues that have
shaped the language or caused it to be written or spoken in a certain way. Gee
asserts that these two groups do not always come together easily. However, this
does not mean that the tools need to be used in isolation. Therefore, in this study,
at times linguistic specificities are most valuable to cut through the text and
produce insight into the ‘nitty-gritty’ of what is significant or silent. On the other
hand, bigger issues glare at the researcher through situated meaning and figured
worlds, interpreted as created by written and visual language and conversations
(Gee 2014).

I chose to develop my interest in both approaches to interrogating agencies of
history education that construct classifications and qualify representations.
However, I do not suggest that I have used or shown an ‘expert’ understanding of
Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Therefore, I have called on scholars, notably
Fairclough, to assist with my own understanding of how the manipulation of
difference and diversity brings inclusion and exclusion, and thus marginalisation
(Fairclough 2003).

Why discourse analysis for this study?

Discourse-oriented research in education attends to the multiplicity of meanings
that are attached to, and divide, the people, spaces, concepts or objects that
comprise its foci, in this case the teachers and the textbook in relation to
interculturality (MacLure 2003). It is how the topic is talked about by the
teachers; the nuances, uncomfortable moments, tensions and gaps that give clues
to answering the research questions. Discourse analysis, in its many forms, has been used globally in other research relevant to this study to examine the discursive practices of nation building and identity, representation and orientation in history textbooks, power, identity and citizenship, and cross-cultural phenomena (Gill 2009a; Gill 2009b; von Münchow 2012; Zajda 2013). Such scholarly research shares the view of this study that discourse analysis has a disruptive or interruptive purpose (MacLure 2003).

*James Paul Gee and Discourse Analysis*

I mainly draw on James Paul Gee’s version of, or approach to, discourse analysis because it confirms the flexibility that can be utilised through its theory and methods. By breaking down ‘things’ built through language (such as significance, politics, practices, identities, connections and signs systems of knowledge) into what Gee calls ‘building tasks’, the data is unpacked from many different angles (Gee 2014, p. 31).

Methodologically, Gee’s version of discourse analysis is the ‘way in’ to the written, visual and spoken language. Crystallisation takes different shapes and forms (Ellingson 2009, p. 22). This extends to utilising what Gee calls ‘tools of inquiry’ (Gee 2014, p. 45) to examine Discourses (with a capital D – specific discourses), intertextuality and specific conversations. There are distinctions made between what Gee identifies as situated meanings and figured worlds (Gee 2014). That is, *situated meanings* deal with highly specific meanings that words and phrases take on, whilst *figured worlds* are often unconscious theories and stories or narratives that we use to understand and deal with the world (Gee 2014, p. 81). This approach to discourse analysis also provides the researcher with a lens through which to find out what is taken for granted in the foci.

Moving between Gee’s (2014) context and reflexivity ‘for understanding language in use’ and the ‘nature of discourse analysis’ the researcher, as listener, relies on ‘the context in which things are said to fill in meanings that are left unsaid’ (p. 119). This meant thinking about the small things, the backgrounds, what Gee describes as situated meanings and figured worlds of the participants. Further, the words, pitch of the voices and the nuances were filtered through the components of the conceptual framework (such as context, complicity,
intertextuality and significance) to establish the participants’ interpretation and understanding of interculturality for history teaching and learning. The conceptual framework prompted questions such as: where do the conversations and the construction of meaning through language exist within the four stages of the horizontal axis? Further: what ‘big Conversations’ are identified as underlying in the interpretation of the discourse? (Gee 2014, p. 46).

Concessions

The approach to discourse analysis in this study took much time to assemble. The method for analysis was an arduous process. It was clear from the start that my engagement with discourse analysis would not always follow a deep focus on linguistic structure; it does cross over into Critical Discourse Analysis when needed, but always under the expert guidance of other scholars, as remarked where appropriate (see Fairclough 2003; Rogers 2003; Wetherill, Taylor & Yates 2001).

Therefore, I concede that I have borrowed from many approaches to discourse analysis to ensure rigour and to prevent the pitfalls of limited scope. I have moved along the continuum of paradigms to gain a greater understanding of the positivism rejected by the project as a whole. I borrowed from visual methodologies and the work of Gillian Rose to analyse the visuals as discourse on the timeline (Rose 2001).

The discourse analysis I enact in this thesis is not a singular approach, which would not benefit any social constructivist or interpretive paradigm. A flexible and even an eclectic approach was more pragmatic in terms of what discourse analysis could achieve for this study, which is, to paraphrase Gee (2014), not just about achieving abstract and theoretical understandings. Through this approach to discourse analysis, the study attempts to find ways to deal with practical problems in the real world and to carry out research in a more fruitful manner (Gee 2014, p. 212) based on rich and enigmatic data.

Overall, my intention for this discourse analysis and thesis was to ‘span multiple points on the qualitative continuum in order to maximise the benefits of taking
contrasting approaches to analysis and representation’ (Ellingson 2009, p. 10), and simply to make sure that nothing was taken for granted (Gee 2014).

**Data analysis**

The approach to data analysis for this qualitative project is true of Maxwell’s (2013, p. 95) point that notes ‘data analysis is probably the most mysterious aspect of qualitative research’ for the novice researcher. As the thesis and its conceptual framework evolved, a more unstructured approach to data analysis took shape. My approach took into consideration that too much prior structuring can create ‘tunnel vision’ in making sense of the data and limit the flexibility that is needed to interpret emergent insights (Maxwell 2013, p. 80). Although Miles and Huberman (1994) remind that pre-structuring has its advantages, particularly in ensuring that a loosely defined design does not eventuate and cause a waste of time, the data analysis for this study was fuelled by the organic nature of crystallisation.

This approach to methodology impacted on my decision not to use technology to analyse the data. Initially, technology seemed like a good choice for organising the data, and so NVIVO was setup to begin analysis. However, the technological process did not suit the evolution of the thesis and how I felt comfortable with examining and analysing the data. Immersion in the data and process to build quality analysis precluded my use of technology because it was mechanical and took the intuitiveness out of the task (Stewart 2017).

After the focus group interviews with teachers were professionally transcribed the transcripts were listened to and read multiple times and initially a manual count of key words and manual colour coding system was set in place to illuminate relevant parts of the discussions. This manual analysis assisted me in identifying the big and little patterns, issues, constants and tensions that arose in the transcripts. Further, I was able to reflect on the concerns and issues raised in the review of literatures to inductively finding recurring patterns and topics. An example of a transcript is provided in Appendix 4 for the reader.

The transcripts from the focus groups and the textual analysis are tactile for this researcher. I wanted to get close to the data, cut out the middle person (being
technology) and look at how language presented the concept of interculturality in the shared knowledge and understanding delivered by teachers and in the textbook. I looked for the ‘little things’ that nuanced tensions for participants and readers, engaging notions of Derrida’s theory of deconstruction that unpicks textual crafting for universal and prescriptive tropes that can no longer escape scrutiny (Gee 2014). Halse points out that Derrida urges us to deconstruct and disassemble texts by putting them under erasure and exploring and critiquing their contradictions, silences, and the ways in which what appears to be real depends on what is privileged and/or excluded from the text (Halse 2006, p. 99).

Further, this way into the data analysis utilised the fifth principle of crystallisation, which ‘eschews positivist claims to objectivity and a singular, discoverable truth’ (Ellingson 2009, p. 13). Moreover, the data analysis shifts along the qualitative continuum to celebrate knowledge as ‘inevitably situated, partial, constructed, multiple and embodied’ (p. 13). My stance in seeing history more as an art than science allowed me to surrender any notion of an ‘all powerful stance’, and value knowledge further along the epistemological continuum (p. 13). Therefore, I kept an open mind when reading, viewing and listening to the texts. Following Gee (2014), I waited for the data to reveal itself in order to make deep sense of very real issues that run through the texts (p. 185).

**Closing the methodology**

Crystallisation maximises the benefits of contrasting and utilising different approaches to analyse and represent the data. Methodologically, crystallisation manifests in the ‘deep, thickly described and complexly rendered interpretations of meanings’ through language (Ellingson 2009, p. 10), central to the foci of interculturality for history teaching and learning and its enactment through curriculum and pedagogy. In the following chapters the methods of focus group interviews and the textual analysis come to life for the researcher and the reader to demonstrate how the data interact with the many facets of the methodology in answering the key research question: *What is the relationship between interculturality and secondary history education?*
Chapter 4: Analysis and discussion of the teacher focus groups

Chapter synopsis

The purpose of this chapter is to examine how interculturality is conceptualised in Year 7-10 history teaching based on four focus groups that involved twenty-four history teachers. The analysis manifests in ‘thickly described’ interpretations of meaning found in language (Ellingson 2009, p. 10), nested within a conceptual framework that is outlined in Figure 9 on page 79 of this thesis. The discussions are underpinned by a poststructural deconstruction of historical knowledge and narratives that challenge claims of truth and historical objectivity (Munslow 2006; Yilmaz 2007).

In conceptualising interculturality for their history teaching the teachers in these focus groups play a role that is clearly ‘not a mechanistic one’ (Giroux 2011, p. 24). They are sharply aware of the hidden assumptions that underlie the nature of the historical knowledge they impart and the pedagogies they implement: ‘I thought about doing a different angle...kids shut down about their own history because they feel like they’re being blamed’, says Jessica from Focus Group 3. The teachers’ conceptualisations reflect a construction of knowledge that encourages the ‘utility of history which is perspective’ (Hickman 1977) and a role in minimizing ‘the worst dimensions of the culture of positivism’ (Giroux 2011, p. 16). Therefore this chapter addresses the first sub-question of the thesis: How do Victorian teachers conceptualise interculturality in their history teaching?

In keeping with the principles of crystallisation some aspects of the data are presented in a narrative style that takes into account the ‘human’ experience of the participants and their socialisation. Using the core theoretical elements of the conceptual framework and discourse analysis, supported by Gee’s (2014) tools of inquiry, the analysis examines the teachers’ responses and their related discourses, called here ‘teachers’ talk’. Not all of the data can be commented on in this analysis and not all of the data revealed something to the researcher, but rather, the data is used to illuminate and be illuminated (Maxwell 2013) and show its
capacity for tensions that arise as a consequence of conceptualising interculturality.

Teachers’ talk

My reading of the literatures for this study indicates the necessity for distinctions to unravel the complexities of interculturality when melded with history teaching and learning. Further, my questions of these literatures and how they interact with the data are based on the manner in which historical thinking and knowledge are being forced to change in the postmodern world (Green 2010, p. 4). Distinctions and questions are implicated in curriculum and pedagogy and shaped by critical pedagogy in ‘theoretical and political practice’ (Giroux 2011, p. 6). The teachers’ talk ‘stirs the pot’ and the fundamental question of ‘what schools should be teaching’ (Green 2010, p. 4) in history, and problematises institutionalised normative truths of the dominant culture.

There is little guidance in contemporary literatures for conceptualising interculturality for history teaching and learning, except that, as a thematic approach in education, interculturality may cause schools to reconceptualise what has been done in the past (Coulby 2006). The discussion that follows seeks to find when weight is given to other cultures and histories, which is when ‘recognition is given to interculturality’ (Georgiadis & Apostolos 2009, p. 158). Conceptually the analysis avoids dichotomies of right and wrong (Ellingson 2009) so often associated with history and its claims of truth. Instead, it explores the teachers’ talk as enacted curriculum for all its fissures, underlying contradictions and conflicts.

History teachers do not operate in a vacuum. They are part of the curriculum in which they invest in historical thinking and its temporal orientation to ‘tie the past to the present in a manner which bestows on present actuality a future perspective’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 25). The teachers’ talk as enacted curriculum reveals how and when we feel bound or obligated by a metaphoric ‘ancient treaty’ shaped by discourse (p. 25). The past and present experiences of the teachers construct and attribute responsibility for values, attitudes and perspectives ‘mediated and synthesised’ in their conceptualisation of interculturality (p. 25).
The discussion locates and identifies teachers’ conceptualisation of interculturality through six distinct Discourses: unfamiliarity, whiteness, perspective, historical consciousness, other and change. Poststructuralism as deconstruction stimulates the discourse analysis and the analysis of language for its meanings, silences and underlying tensions, which undeniably overlap across the four transcripts. For example, the discourse of ‘other’ arises in all parts of the transcripts and carries with it different experiences and concerns of the participants. This is shown in the next section entitled, ‘The discourse of unfamiliarity’. In this section the unfamiliarity of interculturality experienced by the participant Jen overlaps with the discourse of ‘other’. Therefore, although ‘other’ is one of the six distinct Discourses identified and discussed for the specific purpose of interpreting the data, to separate it from the comments made by Jen would take away from the sensibility of the discussion.

**The discourse of unfamiliarity**

Some teachers are more confident using the word ‘interculturality’ than others. However, across the transcripts, there is unfamiliarity and uncertainty surrounding the articulation of the concept and the word. In the field of linguistics the pronoun ‘it’ is often related to the familiar (Allan 2013). However, that is not the case here; in fact, for much of the time interculturality is referred to as the unfamiliar ‘it’ or the unspoken, and is often replaced by the word ‘perspective’. So, despite the fact that governments, policy makers and researchers in Australia and indeed across the globe have proposed intercultural programmes to include ethnic minorities and transnational identities as policy and practice in education, the intention of this concept remains unclear and unfamiliar to most of the participants of this study (Halse 2015; Moss, O’Mara & McCandless 2017; Nordgren & Johansson 2015).

Nordgren says that ‘intercultural goals are often formulated as general knowledge or competences across the curriculum’ (Nordgren 2017, p. 663) and at the time of this study this appears to be the case in both the AC and VC, despite emphatic noises to raise the profile of the intercultural capability. This causes a genuine lack of understanding regarding the concept and contributes to the teachers’ lack of confidence in articulating interculturality. The teachers looked for ways to find
meaning in their uncertain use of the word ‘interculturality’. Consequently a
distinct Discourse of unfamiliarity emerges from the transcripts. The following
are three fragments taken from three different focus groups to capture the
distinction of unfamiliarity and uncertainty that emerges across the transcripts.

1. ‘I had never heard of it’, says Ray.
2. ‘I think you talk about it quite a bit when you’re doing your
different cultures like ancient Greece, you’ll talk about their
culture’, says Jen.
3. ‘I don’t think I even thought about it, it’s something that I didn’t
really even consider until I started to have a look at some of the
texts’, says Megan.

Ray

Conceptualising interculturality unsettles Ray’s seemingly positivist stance for
history teaching and learning. In his first statement, Ray replaces interculturality
with the pronoun ‘it’ and then follows up by asserting his credentials in his next
statement. ‘I’ve studied history, life history, never heard of it’, says Ray
determining his uncertainty as a problem. The tone of Ray’s talk indicates a sense
of distrust in interculturality and where it might lead the history fraternity and its
‘old organizing frameworks’ of modern historical studies (Jenkins 1997; Yilmaz
2007). Ray says: ‘I think true history has to be honest’, and then:

It has to give the facts and then people tend to have a political leaning or a point
of view, you’ve got to say – here’s the facts let’s interpret them. And see how
kids interpret them.

For Ray, interculturality interrupts traditional historical thinking and raises
rhetorical questions, as he says: ‘so [interculturality] has been suppressed, hasn’t
it’.

Jen

In Chapter 2 defining ‘culture’ is the departing point for the distinctions made
about interculturality. In the third focus group, statements made by Jen bring to
life the complexities of culture as shown in the literature review. Jen sees one culture as ‘distinct and different from another’ (Nordgren & Johansson 2015), reflecting the school of thought, referred to in the review of literatures, that turns ‘cultures into overly strict and coherent entities’ (p. 6), therefore limiting the unknown differences within cultures and making it difficult to recognise interculturality.

Jen says: ‘I think you talk about it quite a bit’. She associates interculturality with a broad notion of ‘doing different cultures’. What fails Jen here is a lack of distinction between culture and interculturality. She associates one culture with one history and compartmentalises historical thinking within ‘traditional historical identities’ (Rüsen 2004c). With all ‘good intentions’ (Gorski 2008, p. 15), Jen decides that interculturality means talking ‘about their culture’. She draws on artificial constructs of borders that act out nationhood – German/Greek – and separates sameness from difference. Based on Bhabha’s (1994) assertions, this sustains irrefutable pedagogy of the nation that imbues the identity of its population through cultural signifiers, where ‘their culture’ exists (Aman 2015, my emphasis).

Jen’s discourse of unfamiliarity reveals a paradox that hinders her conceptualisation of interculturality. There are those who belong to the culture through a shared history, whilst on the outside there are other histories. Those who belong inside the national space are authenticated through common values and language against those on the outside. In doing so, this collective authentication negates the internal cultural diversity of those in the nation. The discourse of interculturality struggles to survive in Jen’s conceptualisation because difference is not exchanged and reciprocal under the collective culture. Through the lens of the conceptual framework for this study, Jen’s conceptualisation is shaped by an exemplary discourse of the past, and whether consciously or not, she does not shift to a critical stage for historical thinking. This is evident when Jen identifies the Greeks and Germans as having collective identities. I detect here what Hughes-Warrington describes as when ‘pedagogy is both a poison and an antidote, a problem yet a solution’ (Hughes-Warrington 2013). For instance, Jen’s comments reflect a capacity through the construction of language to denationalise students by making them broad-minded and pursue
perspectives, but her articulation actually creates further divides, without reciprocity, through a strong notion of ‘other’. She says: ‘So you sort of blend it quite naturally’. The ‘other’ and their narratives are defined by the collective pronoun ‘they’ and nothing too definitive is made of historical events: ‘you’ll talk about why they did and what was going on at the time etcetera’. At this point, Jen’s voice trails off into further uncertainty and unfamiliarity, ending her comments in an unclear manner, ‘etcetera, to, with the interculture [sic]’.

Megan

Gee (2014) points out that the information within a single line of speech is most often too small to handle all that the speaker wants to say. This is evidenced when I consider the third fragment evidenced for the discourse of unfamiliarity. Megan was a teacher in Group 1 and this is the second comment she contributed to the discussion. I could tell she was nervous. Her voice was quiet and tentative. Her experience of over thirty years in history teaching denied her the confidence she needs to break into a tense discussion.

When she did break in, Megan conceptualised interculturality in terms of her own history teaching by re-contextualising her content knowledge. This reflects what Nordgren points out is commonplace in teaching practice and that ‘to advance intercultural learning a process of re-contextualizing intentions into skills and content knowledge is required’ (Nordgren 2017, p. 664).

Referring to interculturality, Megan says: ‘it’s something I didn’t really even consider until I started to have a look at some of the texts’. She re-contextualizes the content knowledge by diverting the attention of the group to the Oxford Big Ideas History 9 textbook. This is the text used by all of the teachers in the focus groups and is also the text sample for the textual analysis for this thesis. Megan shifts her focus to a specific image in the textbook, pictured in Figure 17 on page 114.

The image is interpreted by the researcher as what Gee calls a ‘sub-block’; a smaller part of information extracted rather than an entire unitary set of information (Gee 2014, p. 157). Megan shows the image to the other participants and is animated in her next comments regarding the image and what it represents:
Just even looking at that photo there, it’s just they’re all just ‘waspish’, they’re all sort of like, ‘elfy’ but there’s nothing, there’s no ‘other’ that’s presented in the making of our nation.

Figure 17 ‘Young Prospectors’ (Samuel Calvert 1828-1913)

When Megan conceptualises interculturality in this moment, the visual image, as a small part of information, constructs meaning for her. She makes a significant objection to how the children in the picture appear within her re-contextualisation, and remarks, ‘it’s just they’re all just “waspish”, they’re all sort of like, “elfy”. Let us consider these two words for a moment.

In another setting the word ‘elfy’ may be taken as part of a fairytale or as another word for ‘cute’ or ‘petite’. The word ‘waspish’ is more difficult to determine in meaning, but in another setting it may describe a ‘light’ or ‘floaty’ object, or even ‘petulant’. As Gee (2014) suggests, ‘situated meanings’ or ‘thinking devices’ (p. 91) that guide us to ask questions about particular words used in particular settings can operate at several different levels, and so the context of the ‘situated meaning’ is crucial for the validity of the interpretation. Keeping in mind that Megan is speaking in a context of uncertainty, she has been quietly contemplating the concept of interculturality and recognises that it is making a difference to the way she thinks. However, she is apprehensive about how to articulate her response to this thinking. Therefore, in this context Megan’s language takes on a situated meaning that cannot really be pinned down. In isolation her statement could mean a number of things but still there is something exceptional about her
comment that adds a productive tension to the discussion. When Megan continues, the discourse of unfamiliarity steps further into what Gee calls a ‘frame’ (2014, p. 85). That is, it widens the context to land on another concern embedded in and across the transcripts: the notion and treatment of ‘other’ for history teaching and learning. When Megan says strongly, ‘but there’s nothing, there’s no “other” that’s presented in the making of our nation’ the discourse is a clue to understanding what is absent in popular history texts. Her use of ‘but there’s nothing’ further exposes the absence of the ‘other’ as a concern raised by the concept of interculturality for Megan’s teaching of history. This brings the researcher back to the literatures of Green (2010) and Yates et al. (2017a) and the question of representation of knowledge and what it is worth – or, at least, what is included or excluded in its delivery, and therefore shapes our historical thinking (Seixas 2006). Megan’s discourse of unfamiliarity exposes the value-laden position of history made distinct in the literature review. It identifies, without being specific, a historical understanding of privilege given to a particular set of people – in this case, white, elfish, colonial children.

**The discourse of whiteness**

There are varied ways to interpret interculturality for history education. My reading of the literatures canvassed for this thesis raise questions about viewing the concept from other than a positive connotation so it is not perceived or interpreted as a cottage industry or approach to fixing the ailments of the post-postmodern world. In the transcripts of the focus groups, the metaphoric *knotted cord* appears in several different places and is couched in notions of conflict and in discourses of whiteness. Discourses of whiteness illuminate the unsettling aspects of teaching the nation’s history that emerge when the teachers conceptualise how a history is told.

*Whiteness*

‘The concept of whiteness itself’, says Hooley, ‘is often silent, unnamed and difficult to describe which is taken as an important characteristic of being dominant’ (Hooley 2009, p. 35). Further, in her seminal work on whiteness, Frankenberg (1993) describes the concept in terms of the ‘intersections of class,
race and culture where power, domination, language and identity collide’ (cited in Hooley 2009, p. 35). Such intersections are the starting point as a critique of the demarcation of ‘ideas, feelings, knowledge, social practices, cultural formations and systems of intelligibility that are identified with or attributed to white people’ identified in the transcripts. There is not a conscious attribution of white in the transcripts, rather there is a conflict between some participants’ figured worlds that brings whiteness into focus. As described in Chapter 2 of this study, whiteness is applied here as a ‘measure of disruption’ or racial category, rather than a measure of racism. Whiteness sits silently in the background of the discourse of the more experienced teachers when they conceptualise interculturality. I incorporate three specific responses (one each from Chris, Jim and Anna of Focus Group 1) into the following two sections, ‘A terrain of advantage’ and ‘Confronting whiteness’, to bring the discourse of whiteness into focus.

A terrain of advantage

With over thirty years experience in teaching history at the secondary school level, Jim opens the discussion for Group 1 with this statement:

Okay, I reckon, my idea of interculturality is if say I’m teaching gold rush and mining, I want the kids to get inside the head of a Chinese person that’s on the goldfield, who’s having their topknots cut off, you know, who’s being racially abused; and then perhaps a bit later on, family down the track who are making a living, okay, and then point to the that seventh generation Chinese in Australia who’ve got a greater claim to the country than perhaps your fifth generation ones, which is not right but – and then the same thing if you’re talking about the White Australia Policy, you could also come back to the Chinese having to walk from Adelaide across to Melbourne and compare that with the refugees. So there’s a real – it’s [interculturality] know the whole thing.

Jim’s conceptualisation of interculturality reveals two things reflected in the literature review for this study. First, he enters a terrain ‘of structural advantage’ (Frankenberg 1993, p. 236-237) based on the institutional ideology of Western societies to treat minorities whose cultures are not only ‘thought of as different, but definitely uncommon or strange’ (Rüsen 2002, p. 4). Jim relies on a structure of privileged position that wants to ‘get inside the head of’ the marginalised. Secondly, the relationship of whiteness to the ‘other’ and what Frankenberg calls ‘racial category’ is fundamentally asymmetrical, pointing the finger at particular
generations, past and present. This presents a lopsided or at the very least unbalanced view of claims to the country which illuminates racial categories identified through his own historical knowledge (Frankenberg 1997). The colloquial ‘getting inside the head of a Chinese person’ demands that critique is applied from outside any particular view of the world (Hooley 2009, p. 36); however, Jim’s view is qualified through a historical understanding of Western context only, based on the White Australia Policy as his marker. In doing so, he does not evidence any ‘cultural competence’ (p. 7) that aligns with an intercultural communication for history. So, although Jim is quick to give his conceptualisation of interculturality, his only demarcation of culture within history is a Discourse model, which has been made significant over time to argue or justify beliefs and attitudes: the White Australia Policy. This is not an isolated occurrence in the transcripts. The White Australia Policy is an anchor or part of a ‘terrain of structural advantage’ (Frankenberg 1993, p. 236-237) for another participant in this group, whose résumé is similar to Jim’s and whom I call Chris.

Chris joins the discussion on the back of Jim’s opening comments. He is concerned about viewing history through ‘rose-coloured glasses’ and muses on whether we are just teaching ‘a history of racism’. Similarly, in anchoring his comments Chris qualifies his concerns through the same point in time as Jim – ‘white Australia’:

On the other hand, I think you [are] bringing it back to the individual level of suffering, which I think is probably the right way to go, but I think it’s important that people don’t have rose coloured glasses when it comes to the reason why countries federated, there was a lot of – you know, I mean the first legislation was the White Australia Policy. So it’s trying to be as even as possible within the context of what we are.

Both Jim and Chris, whether consciously or not, evidence the ‘tendency of colonialists to study those they colonise from a position of cultural and intellectual superiority and accept that their classifications, labels and interpretations are correct’ (Hooley 2009, p. 36). This, Hooley says, ‘has been an extremely difficult

---

6 On 23 December 1901, the Immigration Restriction Act came into law. It had been among the first pieces of legislation introduced to the newly formed federal parliament. The legislation was specifically designed to limit non-British migration to Australia and allowed for the deportation of ‘undesirable’ people who had settled in any Australian colony prior to federation. It represented the formal establishment of the ‘White Australia Policy’ (National Museum Australia)
process to overcome as European expansion continues to occur throughout the modern era’ (p. 36) and, I surmise, in school history. In the discourse of whiteness constructed by these comments, ‘otherness’ is created, but in terms of interculturality it is difficult for ‘otherness’ to find its place. Such ways of historical understanding are marked clearly by the influence of a ‘figured world’, in this case a piece of legislation, which is talked about as the demarcation for a set of beliefs and feelings. This specificity of Western historical thinking places the Chinese, Indigenous people and any marginalised group in ‘an incredibly weakened position’ from which the cognisance of difference and diversity in history becomes arduous (Hooley 2009, p. 36). Despite all provisionality of these documented comments to conceptualise and/or explain interculturality, ‘the pressure of ideological self-determination in dealing with difference in historical thinking’ in this case is not lessened (Rüsen 2002, p. 9).

Confronting whiteness

In contrast, the next comments, set out below, are by the third participant in this group, whom I call Anna. Anna relieves some of this pressure and chances at an ‘unbiased perception of the common grounds and differences’ that are part of ‘the intercultural constellation of historical thinking’ (Rüsen 2002, p. 9). Anna’s conceptualisation of interculturality constructs language that reflects the notion that ‘sharp borderlines between the different traditions of historical culture can no longer be drawn’ (p. 9). In this deconstruction of Anna’s comments a tension is brought about by her capacity to view history teaching and learning through an intercultural lens, something not done in the previous examples. The construction of language in this excerpt challenges the typical story or ‘figured world’ (Gee 2014) that anchors the comments of both Jim and Chris, even though Anna’s attributes as a teacher, shown in the attributes table for Group 1, place her in a similar demographic of over thirty years of experience:

Can I just, sure in history we’re teaching about racism and the history of these things and how it changed, and what caused it and the other person’s point of view. But to me interculturality if you like is much more about the spaces between people and the fact that we still teach about Chinese as if they’re other. Or we still teach about Aboriginal people as if they are ‘other’. And I guess it’s my background from the territory going, ‘Well no they’re no, they’re right in front of me in my class every day, the Afghan/Thai child is sitting there.’ And so I come to it from a different point of view. Where I say, and I’ve spoken before
that there’s a very good history video about Indigenous history in Australian the things that happened to Indigenous people; it doesn’t say much about what the Aboriginal people did in response to any of the things that happened to them which I have a slight problem with, but there was a statement at the front about it’s really important that we understand our Indigenous neighbours, and that really disturbed me and I spoke to the students about it and I said, ‘I don’t know why these film makers think there’s not an Aboriginal kid in this classroom.’

When Anna says ‘so I come to it [interculturality] from a different point of view’ her use of the pronoun ‘it’ is with familiarity. Anna is one of the only teachers who is confident in her use of the word ‘interculturality. In contrast to Jime and Chris, Anna enters a terrain that suggests history teaching and learning, and schooling in general, ‘should be open-hearted and anticolonial, it should be collective and community minded respectful of local cultures’ (Hooley 2009, p. 37). Anna’s statement is symmetrical in its recognition that firstly there was ‘a response from Aboriginal people to what happened to them’ and secondly that the language used in the video (referred to in the quote above) disturbs her, ‘that we must understand our indigenous neighbors’ is a predictable trope that ignores the presence of *difference* in every classroom. Anna points out, in the language of the video, Aboriginal people are described as ‘our indigenous neighbors’, which marks the very practice of domination through language. Here is what Bhabha described some time ago, yet still relevantly, as the ‘incalculable colonized subject – half acquiescent, half oppositional, always untrustworthy’ which continues to produce ‘an unresolvable problem of cultural difference for the very address of colonial cultural authority’ (Bhabha 1994, p. 33).

Following Gee (2014, p. 113), when I ask, as the analyst, ‘What must I assume this person (consciously or unconsciously) believes in order to make deep sense of what she is saying?’ to understand Anna’s ‘figured world’, her capacity to stand outside a Western context and its unique historiography is glaring. For Anna, *difference* is not ambivalent and whiteness for historical interpretation is not her departing point for teaching history, as shown in her next comment:

Textbooks say that Aboriginal people were hunters and gatherers, and I think you would find indigenous people would dispute that and say, ‘No, we were – we are not hunters and gatherers and we weren’t. We burnt the land, we farmed the land, we made the perfect conditions for the kangaroos, we built fish dams, we did stuff.’ And so I think there is this thing that is still happening which is making it the study of ‘other’ instead of it just being the study of culture.
Through the lens of the conceptual framework and discourse analysis, the discourses of Jim, Chris and Anna are framed by very different figured worlds. Jim and Chris’s ‘figured worlds’ construct language through the discourse and impact of the White Australia Policy to make a value judgement based on structural advantage and a single story viewpoint. Conversely, Anna’s ‘figured world’ constructs language that confronts whiteness in considering her ‘own understanding of how class, race and culture intermingle in classrooms’ to define and direct what she does (Hooley 2009, p. 48). Therefore, her Discourse model, or the figured world that she draws on, prepares her to venture into ‘unknown territory’ where ‘epistemological whiteness is insufficient’ (p. 48) to make sense of history for teaching and learning. Therefore, the first two examples espouse beliefs and feelings anchored in white Australia and its impact made significant over time. On the other hand, Anna’s comments sit in judgment of this significance to affect actual practice (Gee 2014, p. 115).

The discourse of perspective and empathy

In her controversial approach to history, Elizabeth Ermath says point-of-view vocabulary invokes the terminology of perspective and is all important to Western historical thinking. This single-point perspective, Ermath says, can be found in almost any nineteenth century novel forming the substrate of historical explanation (Ermath 2011).

Perspective vocabulary emerges in the focus groups when the teachers’ conceptualise interculturality for the enacted curriculum and how they believe they are doing interculturality. A search for key words through manual counting across the transcripts of the four focus groups showed the word ‘perspective’ is most significant. It is the word used most consistently and in close proximity to the teachers’ understanding of the concept of interculturality during the four focus group interviews. The teachers’ talk renders perspective as inherently connected to interculturality. Consequently, when used by the teachers, the word ‘perspective’ mitigates the uncertainty of the concept of interculturality, making it less mysterious, to the extent that it often replaces it. For example, in her opening sentence Sally from Focus Group 2 says: ‘I think for me it often comes down to
perspective’. Rebecca from Focus Group 2 concurs with Sally and begins her first
contribution with, ‘Yeah, I think, something that occurs to me, when I went to a
workshop at the History Teachers’ Conference, and it was about the indigenous
perspective’. Further, Emily, from Focus Group 3 begins her contributions to the
discussion with the statement, ‘I probably teach interculturality by trying to
provide authentic perspectives’. So, why does the concept of interculturality
invoke ‘perspective’ so readily?

There is a distinct correlation made between the concept of interculturality and the
word ‘perspective’ by the teachers and this then leads to empathy. Further, this
connection demonstrates how the ‘inter’ in interculturality provokes a discourse of
‘negotiation and discussion’ (Salter & Maxwell 2018, p. 20; Fiedler 2007), at the
same time reflecting on how important perspective vocabulary is to Western
historical thinking.

The word ‘perspective’ appears as a natural default mode for interculturality in the
teachers’ talk. It is often interchangeable with interculturality; however, this is not
always obvious. The deployment of perspective in its many forms across the focus
groups exposes just how major an intellectual challenge interculturality is for
schools and their teachers. They are asked to engage with various epistemologies
of knowing cultures and their histories as a necessary precursor to enacting
interculturality (Salter & Maxwell 2018).

These comments from Emily in Focus Group 3 evidence the default mode
explained above and the intellectual endeavour to fit interculturality into everyday
teaching. I have underlined where Emily’s comments also evidence the point
made above regarding engaging with various epistemologies of knowing cultures
and their histories. Emily is curious about where the knowledge as history
educators actually derives from and how this knowledge is used to enact
interculturality:

So I teach perspective as a big idea in history and so for any period in time that
I’m looking at, for example I’m doing World War II. We’ve just done World War
II, kids – I talk about the perspective, identifying the perspectives that we’re
reading from, so who is it, who wrote the text that we’re reading from, who
would have actually produced this document or who was the writer of it. And by
asking those questions we then look for the story that we haven’t seen, So why
wouldn’t we have a young German woman who is Jewish, why wouldn’t we
There appears a natural progression in the ‘teachers’ talk’ from perspective vocabulary to empathy, which adds to the layers of the data. Therefore, I move on here to a description of this progression first by taking a look at the concept of perspective-taking and historical empathy, and then intercultural empathy, made relevant by key comments made by some teachers.

**Perspective-taking and historical empathy**

The concept of perspective-taking evolved from a term that was at a point ubiquitous in British history education: historical empathy (Seixas, Gibson & Ercikan 2015), and it is heavily present in the discourse of the history curriculum of both the AC and the VC. The term historical empathy often suggests an emotional involvement but it also involves knowledge of circumstances and an understanding of bias. Barton and Levstik (2004) define historical empathy as the ‘process of understanding people in the past by contextualizing their actions’. Moreover, historical empathy requires inquiry into the author and the production of texts; an idea of the time and place in which the event occurred, while also considering changing social practices and ideals over time (Simpson, Gowen & Murray 2011). In other words, it requires empathetic understanding, rather than just an emotional understanding, as historical concepts embedded in pedagogy must consider the adoption of a third person view where it is ‘not what they personally would do in the situation, but what the individual in question did in relation to their own circumstances’ (Simpson, Gowen & Murray 2011). This encourages a more balanced, equitable view of history, allowing for a greater depth of understanding and insight into the historical content being learned.

Following these lines of inquiry, the theorising of interculturality for history education necessitates consideration of how we describe intercultural empathy.

**Intercultural empathy**

It is widely acknowledged that in the field of language education the last two decades have crystallised the integral nature of the intercultural dimension
(Raquel Díaz 2016). Particularly in Australia, the work of scholars Liddicoat and Scarino (2013), and their instrumental role in the development of local interculturally-oriented language-in-education policies and the design and delivery of professional learning programmes for language teachers, has heightened this acknowledgment. This practice is identified by Caroline in Group 1 when she says:

> With languages we use interculturality and we tend to talk about that being the meeting place of the cultures and that into the idea of a dialogue between them and comparing the contrasts to understand those cultures.

In the field of language education, Broome (2017) associates empathy with foreign language learning and intercultural communication and uses the term intercultural empathy as understanding, which is not viewed as a product but rather an ongoing process occurring between communicators. Broome explains empathy and intercultural in this way:

> Empathy allows us to step outside the boundaries of our own awareness and imaginatively enter the world of another person. It makes possible meaningful human interaction, and it allows us to engage in tasks that require coordination and consensus. In intercultural situations, empathy is more complex and more difficult, but it is a key competency for effective intercultural communication. Intercultural empathy is created during interaction, emerging as we listen to one another respectfully and engage in a mutual process of exploring and learning together. Intercultural empathy requires shifting our focus away from our own outlooks and toward the experiences of the other, striving for a synthesis of perspectives ... (Broome 2017, p. 1)

Based on Broome’s explanation and guided by the scholarly field of language and its progressive and critical orientation for intercultural empathy, the analysis pursues lines of inquiry into the ‘tricky discourse’ of perspective-taking and empathy identified in the curriculum and reflected in the focus groups.

*Empathy in the curriculum*

The AC implemented at the time when these focus groups were conducted specifically identified empathy as part of the key historical concepts in the History curriculum:

> The content provides opportunities to develop historical understanding through key concepts, including evidence, continuity and change, cause and effect, perspectives, empathy, significance and contestability (ACARA 2010c).
However, the discourse of empathy that emerges from the transcripts is tricky because the concept of empathy is often very general and interchangeable with the concepts of interculturality and perspective. Interestingly, across the focus groups there are only two teachers who specifically use the word ‘empathy’ in relation to the concept of interculturality, and the word is used only four times; however, this does not detract from its significance and relevance.

Dan, from Group 4, immediately conflates interculturality and empathy in saying: ‘So it’s always been very important in History or at least in recent times in history education, the concept of empathy’. Immediately we see the ‘it’s’ is ambiguous and we face a problem with language and context. Which comes first in Dan’s mind, empathy or interculturality?

Dan’s comment continues in this way:

So I think the major push, particularly when we’re talking about interculturality that these different historical narratives, these different historical views, aren’t crowded out by one narrative and one view, which for a long time was dominantly a Western view, particularly in this country an Anglo-British view. So that’s very much a change, particularly through the Australian curriculum, and then particularly sort of Victorian curriculum, which has put even more emphasis in the lower senior levels on the Aboriginal narrative, and the Aboriginal views and culture. And like I said the importance of that skill of empathy.

From the outset Dan’s articulation is of interculturality as an educational strategy – the fractured significance of the concept (made clear in Chapter 2) – that shifts the dominant Western view of history. For Dan, empathy and interculturality are ‘like two mirrors facing each other reflecting images’ of what gives access to different historical narratives and historical views (Gee 2014, p. 120). Dan’s language reflects a context of curriculum that he sees has been changed through the historical skill of empathy. However, his references to the AC and VC reveal uncertainty about just how well empathy is understood in terms of interculturality as an educational strategy. Dan is confident that in the AC there has been ‘very much a change, particularly through the Australian curriculum’, and he is likely to mean that both empathy and interculturality are acknowledged. However, he is not as confident about the VC in saying, ‘and then particularly sort of (author emphasis) Victorian curriculum’. His choice of words reveals less knowledge and clear uncertainty by the use of the contradictive phrase, ‘particularly, sort of’. This
is understandable given that at the time of the focus groups the VC was yet to be implemented. However, it does raise an interesting point. Sometimes it is important to understand the speaker’s position in context as a tool to grasp the full meaning of what they say (Gee 2014). As head of Humanities, at this point in time Dan had had much more opportunity to engage with the fledgling VC than other teachers. His comments gesture toward a question about the clarity of the concept of interculturality in the VC history curriculum.

Dan ends his opening comment in this way:

So being able to look at different narratives different historical accounts, being able to scrutinise those, be critical, and as I said the importance of empathy, and putting these in a context in a particular historical time, that’s a very important move. And it’s very important if we’re talking about interculturality.

He considers empathy part of an ‘important move’ when conceptualising interculturality, but delving a little deeper into his terms of reference for empathy and interculturality I notice that he returns to the significance of different narratives and different historical accounts as part of a critical pedagogy associated context of historical content knowledge. When Dan says ‘in a context in a particular historical time’, he moves toward historical empathy as defined earlier in this section as much more than just seeing a person, idea or situation through the eyes of another, but rather a much deeper understanding of the circumstances and concepts surrounding the event and people in the past by contextualising their actions (Barton & Levstik 2004; Simpson, Gowen & Murray 2011). However, intercultural empathy eludes Dan’s cognisance. As seen above, Dan refers to Aboriginal narratives, views and culture when stating the importance of empathy. In this statement Dan says:

And like I said the importance of that skill of empathy, which we’re able to look at and we’re able to have the students conceptualise through document analysis, particularly through – it tends not to be written in the textbooks but the oral histories of these people.

Dan’s comments are somewhat fragmented in this comment and it is difficult to determine his actual meaning. Given that it is important to acknowledge that we cannot speak for the Indigenous people referred to by Dan, as they did not write anything down, I flag here the sensitivity of this comment and responses it may
incur. However, by drawing on Broome’s definition of intercultural empathy where understanding is ‘not viewed as a product’ (2017, p. 1), this statement suggests Dan’s understanding of empathy is still a type of product that can be found in the application of a document analysis rather than a synthesis of perspectives characterised more as diachronic.

The word ‘empathy’ is not picked up again until later in this focus group, but it provokes serious considerations for the two teachers involved. Lucy uses empathy when the discussion turns to how traditional stories or narratives are delivered. Just prior to this Melanie has commented on how the curriculum has changed and how she now teaches ‘rights and freedoms’. She laughs and says: ‘I’ve just sat there and gone, wow. This is really big stuff”. I interject here as the facilitator to clarify her concern about teaching the traditional method of history and the discussion unfolds like this:

**Me:** Do you mean the traditional stories, the traditional method of delivering the narrative?

**Melanie:** Yes. And also that sort of, being a bit of an apologist in a way too that I feel strongly as a human about the injustices that the indigenous communities have received over the generations. But I’m struggling with that on my own level, so sometimes I feel like maybe I just need, when I’m teaching it I’m really sort of being very critical of us as European, Anglo that kind of mentality. I don’t know whether I’m conveying that message in the right way. But yeah when it comes to teaching it with, in a way that’s as objective as possible, that I often have to stop anyway and just go hang on a minute, let’s get back to the evidence that we’ve got in front of us without, if that makes sense.

**Lucy:** Yeah, stopping yourself from casting the judgement. I have found that a little bit with things too, and what I end up having to do is go back into looking at the culture of the time, so instead of the other, looking at the different or the other, going back to okay so what was looking at, you know, the social structure, the education levels, the scientific opinions of the type, like re-evaluating that because sometimes that’s actually not explicitly talked about. I have felt, it’s just sort of assumed, like this is how the white people did things, but we need to explain why, because otherwise yeah you don’t have that, perhaps empathy even for that group.

The discourse exchanged between Lucy and Melanie, prompted by a question regarding traditional delivery of historical narratives, is multifaceted and probably belongs under several of the subheadings in this discourse analysis. However, I have put it here for its implications for ‘all things empathetic’ and the significance of perspective. There is a different course being travelled in this fragment of
dialogue. The teachers show a reflexive approach to historical understanding rather than viewing it as a product. Their statements are permeated with emotional ties attached to ‘casting judgements’ on groups of people. Melanie is very concerned, as the apologist, about the ‘the injustices that the indigenous communities have received over the generations’, but this is not historical empathy, rather, her ‘intercultural empathy’ takes shape. She is concerned about how such events cause her to view and criticise her own culture and describes it as a type of ‘mentality’ that she is wary of.

Lucy is even more precise in her understanding of empathy. She is able to interconnect historical empathy and intercultural empathy as an approach to how she conceptualises interculturality. She says: ‘I end up having to go back into looking at the culture of the time, so instead of the other, looking at the different or the other’. The word ‘instead’ makes significant a decision to appreciate difference through the lens of interculturality that is ‘egalitarian and humanistic recognition of cultural difference’ (Fronza 2017; Rüsen 2004c). In her contemplation, Lucy appreciates that there are things in these traditional narratives that go unsaid (‘actually not explicitly talked about’) that take away our ability to empathise with all groups – even white people. Melanie and Lucy, whether consciously or not, engage with a discourse of empathy that can be characterised as intercultural. In particular Lucy’s comments demonstrate the cognizant capability to expose the specificities and differences of culture in relation to the ‘other’ and in relation to ourselves.

‘Empathy’ is only used once more in the focus groups, but I keep in mind that it too is at times interchangeable with the word ‘perspective’ because of its complex attributes in bringing emotional and cognitive awareness to the fore. For example, Emily from Focus Group 3 is very keen on perspective vocabulary and perspective-taking (in her opening statement she uses the word ‘perspective’ ten times). However, sometimes her comments are more about empathy. In this example, Emily correlates interculturality with empathy through a humanist perspective. Therefore, although she does not use the word ‘empathy’, Emily establishes empathy through the principles of interculturality and interrelated notions of perspective-taking:
I think that point of talking to kids about making the human perspective real, like humanising the experience by using narrative. I just think you can’t go beyond using narrative; it’s just the best way to teach interculturality, because kids begin to understand what the perspective of that person was. Yeah, I think it’s really powerful.

Here, ‘teach interculturality’ can be interchanged with ‘teach empathy’ and Emily’s statement remains sensible; however, it discerns that interculturality is not actually her intended meaning. Emily uses ‘empathy’ once more later in the discussion. In this comment her sentiments and interchanging of interculturality as empathy and humanist perspective is simply rearranged:

So actually, empathising and having to get into the narrative is a good way of helping them understand the experience and the challenges of the period.

*Inclusion, exclusion and absence*

The discourse of perspective and empathy also led teachers to rally concerns related to the inclusion and exclusion of historical content knowledge, stories and their perspectives: ‘It’s that selection and inclusion, what are we choosing in our curriculum?’ says Melanie. The teachers’ consideration of what is included or excluded as historical content knowledge is another example of how the conceptualising of interculturality inevitably leads to identifying the metaphorical *knotted cords*. Here, I deconstruct an excerpt from Focus Group 4 as an example. The context of this excerpt is situated in a discussion of the textbook (the same textbook used for the textual analysis in Chapter 5) and how it has progressed:

**Dan**: Oh they’ve progressed, there’s still plenty of silencers. But they have progressed. Again the junior levels which I don’t think it’s surprising, I think it is easier to look at those sub-groups within the larger groups. There is such a clear focus on the experiences of women, and then children, and for example in ancient China or ancient Rome, I think it’s easier to do it at that level because it is so removed. Again when we get to 9 and 10 and we get into modern history, I think there are still major, major gaps there. We’re still pedalling a colonial narrative, to take that at the 9 curriculum. There has (as spoken) been moves within that colonial life, the different cultures within that, so certainly the experiences of women and children and the noble and not noble classes. Like this sort of thing we have moved towards that quicker, looking at those different views. But certainly the, just the Aboriginal narrative in the Year 9 text was virtually non-existent. It wasn’t anything new, it wasn’t anything that I wasn’t aware of from when I was learning at secondary school colonial history. So there’s a lot that needs to improve there. That being said there are some new textbooks emerging next year, although on sort of first glance they don’t look terribly different from what we’ve already had.
Joe: I think it’s really important when you look at the indigenous narratives as well, because when you get with the kids at Year 10 coming into the classroom, you do have to go back to what was happening in colonial Australia, in order for them to understand just – for them to understand why we have the, you know, National Day of Mourning, and why it was so significant. They need to understand all of the things that have happened up to that point. And when you get to teaching Year 10 History and you get up to that, you realise that they don’t know any of it. And so you’re therefore going back and re – you’re going over all of that, and you speed through some of the most important moments of our country’s history. Not proud moments; and there’s fires coming through. And you miss out on those. And to understand and to be able to emphasise properly, you’ve got to know and you’ve got take the time to go through it, and we don’t give it the time necessary.

Dan: For example an issue there, so if there’s a big emphasis on the massacres and frontier conflicts, so great that’s in there, we know that’s a problem. But that’s about it. And those interactions around the fringes of society at that time, they’re not really dealt with unless you go beyond I guess the common textbooks, which we do, but again time is limited and how far you go into that. At the moment with the texts and what’s available, there is equal emphasis on the experience of the slave trade as there is – there’s probably more to be honest, and there’s far more when you are dealing with children in the industrial revolution, than even with those common experiences with Aboriginal people living in early colonial Australia. So that’s the issue, because that’s not balanced, it seems a bit crazy.

Joe: It’s almost like that word is actually left out of the Australian understanding of our own history, the word ‘slave’. It’s absent completely.

Dan: Well they refer to the Kanakas in Queensland, rather than even just how the Aboriginal people are getting around those frontier settlements were treated.

Melanie: Or how they operated as an actual society, operating in exchange with white colonial society, there’s an absence there as well of a balanced view of those people. There’s that one view, I can say a victimised view, but there’s no mention of, would you agree with me there’s no mention of the operation of a functioning trading society.

The teachers’ talk in this excerpt is far reaching and, through the lens of the conceptual framework, the dialogue sits within the critical stage of historical thinking of the conceptual framework for this study, which gives historical thinking the capacity to shift along the continuum to access historical interpretation from different angles. Made significant in this exchange are the ‘fringes of society’ that contributed to Australia’s early beginnings. A pattern of absence of broader historical interpretation is foremost in the teachers’ talk. The recognition of some less well known historical content knowledge (for example the comment ‘the Kanakas in Queensland rather than just how the Aboriginal
people are getting around frontier settlements were treated’ made by Dan) suggests a sense of balance or reticence of the ‘centralized perspective’ that impacts ‘strongly the shaping of a nation’s mirror’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 118). Further, when Dan says ‘So that’s the issue, because that’s not balanced’ referring to the history of Aboriginal families as slaves of early Australian society and as part of the whole story, Joe responds with this statement: ‘It’s almost like that word is actually left out of the Australian understanding of our own history, the word “slave”. It’s absent completely’. Here, Dan and Joe, consciously or not, construct a discourse of perspective that questions those ‘taken-for-granted’ discourses that have framed the resources they use. Melanie follows this exchange with her own focus on the actual word ‘absence’ when she furthers the interrogation and sense of a *knotted cord* by saying: ‘or how they operated as an actual society, operating in exchange with white colonial society, there’s an absence there as well of a balanced view of those people’.

The conceptualising of interculturality in this excerpt highlights a different set of figured worlds which inform the deeper understanding of these teachers. Unlike the members of Group 1 highlighted earlier in this chapter, the figured worlds of these teachers are not in conflict, nor are they as value-laden. This could be because of their age and experience; they seem less burdened by what interculturality might bring to history education and are more willing to accept its disruptive element; but that is beyond the scope of this thesis. Poignant to this study, the members of Group 4 recognise what sits behind the familiar or normative selection of historical content knowledge at this level of schooling. *Interculturality* as an educational strategy depends on a preparedness to build a reimagined framework of historical knowledge, framed within resources that will lessen familiarity and the historical narratives that sustain silences. Statements like those set out below (chosen from the excerpt above) shine light on what the teachers can see and what they cannot see, reflecting what is significant and what is made significant, and therefore what is silent and falls below the ‘sense-creating procedures’ of historical consciousness (Rüsen 2004a, 2005):

‘There’s still plenty of silences’

‘We’re still pedalling a colonial narrative’
'There has (as spoken) been moves within that colonial life, the different cultures within that just the Aboriginal narrative in the Year 9 text was virtually non-existent'

'That being said there are some new textbooks emerging next year, although on sort of first glance they don’t look terribly different from what we’ve already had'

As mentioned at the beginning of this section, there are many interpretations of why and how the teachers use the word ‘perspective’ so often when conceptualising interculturality in terms of curriculum and for their teaching of history. Significant to these interpretations is the discourse of the curriculum informed by world trends. The key concepts in the AC for the Learning Area of History read as:

The content provides opportunities to develop historical understanding through key concepts, including evidence, continuity and change, cause and effect, perspectives, empathy, significance and contestability (ACARA 2010c).

However, not all of the key concepts are identified in the transcripts. There is something about interculturality that causes teachers to accord primary importance to perspective and empathy as pedagogical practice when conceptualising interculturality. The poststructural deconstruction of excerpts from various groups and their participants evidences Discourse models or ‘figured worlds’ which contribute to the discourse of perspective-taking and/or empathy. At times, teachers’ understanding of interculturality for their history teaching reflects perspective through the traditional and exemplary stages of historical thinking; at other times, perspective and empathy cause them to enter the critical stage of historical thinking to make judgements about historical content knowledge.

**The discourse of historical consciousness**

Historical consciousness, or historical thinking, as it is often referred, is defined in this project as a meaningful nexus between past, present and future (Rüsen 2005). It is widely seen as having several elements, including the organization of collective experiences of the past, such that they form a meaningful way to think about the present (Parkes 2014; Seixas 2006). In the current AC and VC,
historical consciousness is placed within the strand of ‘Historical Knowledge and Understanding’, assigning importance to the development of historical content knowledge that sits within a framework of inquiry and the interpretation of sources, evidence and opinion (Parkes 2014). In history education, historical consciousness is how we shape students’ ‘pictures of the past’ and how such pictures clothe their values, ‘traditions and timeless rules of conduct’ (Lee 2004; Rüsen 2005, p. 25). Historical consciousness is part of the translation and interpretation of past into present, and for some teachers in the focus groups there was an unconscious connection to the shaping of historical consciousness provoked by the concept of interculturality. I present an example here using the comments made by Jessica.

When Jessica joins the discussion late in Focus Group 3 her conceptualisation of interculturality is about the purpose of history and its responsibilities. This occurs when she engages in a discussion that arises after a comment made by Joanne about students’ attitudes toward Muslim children: ‘the interpretation that so many kids have of Muslim kids’. When Joanne continues with ‘I think we’re very mono-cultural in the way that kids can see. I mean, that has to come from home, it’s not coming from us, as teachers’, Jessica responds with a discourse of historical consciousness. She says: ‘history definitely has a job in trying to make sense of our more recent history’. The ‘job’ is about making sense of the past to inform more recent history and the present. Perhaps unconsciously, Jessica’s understanding of interculturality as an educational strategy is processed through the wider connection she makes between her students and the outside world. In the following statement she considers her students’ temporal experience and how this has shaped their ability to ‘orient themselves and their thinking’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 27):

And this generation have also been brought up in that [fear] as a norm. Like you’re talking about post 9/11 that would have been new to those kids that would have been their way to process it to work out the difference like of what their world was and what their world is.

At the core of Jessica’s comment is the increasing complexity of the development of historical consciousness generally, but significantly at the school level. For example, the post 9/11 world is part of an evolution of experience that is difficult
to digest (Rüsen 2005). Jessica considers this event in the context of her history classroom and describes a growth of complexity in historical significance and the experience of time that is divided by fear – ‘my own time’ and the ‘time of others’ (Rusen 2005, p. 35). Her language constructs recognition of her students’ historical identity, ‘what their world was, and what their world is’.

Rüsen points out, everyday observations demonstrate that the traditional and even exemplary stages of historical consciousness are widespread and frequently encountered; the critical and genetic stages (to use Rüsen’s terminology), in contrast, are far rarer. In this case, Jessica’s language represents a ‘figured world’ being revised for her and her students (Gee 2014, p. 124). She doubts that the curriculum can support the degree of education and historical knowledge required to accommodate the shift: ‘I don’t know how much our curriculum has really altered or changed in the last what, ten, 12, 15 years to cater for that’. Jessica’s comments construct a discourse that is curious about the progress schools are making toward the critical and transformative (to use the language of my conceptual framework) stages of historical thinking outlined in my conceptual framework. Research shows that the traditional form of historical thinking is easiest to learn, as is the exemplary form because, says Rüsen, there are lessons from the past that give certain rules and legitimacy of roles and functions. On the other hand, progression through the critical and transformative stages of historical thinking requires enormous amounts of effort by both teacher and student and this is what Jessica seems faced with (Rüsen 2005, p. 35).

The stages of historical thinking and the notion of progression is visible again in Chris’ discourse of historical consciousness, which is constructed through seeing history teaching fuelled predominantly by the traditional sense of historical thinking. In this example, Chris conceptualises interculturality within a historical understanding of society and how it has changed. This is different from above, where the discourse of historical consciousness is framed by ‘critical and genetic modes of historical thinking’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 35) that affect both teacher and student. Chris says:

I think that there is another level of interculturality that I think we should acknowledge the fact that the society has actually shifted, that 150 years ago this was a British colony with people born here, most were born overseas, one or two
generations, it was very British. Within that we have evolved into something, we’re still evolving to a new society, so when we’re judging our own history it’s not as if – it’s not fixed the way that the American Revolution fixed independence, from 1788 the Americans, sorry 1776 the Americans have got the Constitution, they’ve got independence, and they see themselves as a different entity.

We haven’t had that, we’ve evolved from a colony, five/six colonies into one big colony and then, you know, eventually we’re now, sort of, becoming a bit more independent, we’re still not sure we want to be part of the monarchy when the Queen dies, well not that – some people do, some people – this, there’s no classroom, there might be half of us that will say stick to the monarchy. So you’ve got issues about us judging Australian history in a way society’s a lot different, not only racially but also in the way we see ourselves, you know, I mean the British is out of the passport now and yet Menzies still had it in the 60s.

In this paragraph Chris’s ‘figured world’ re-emerges as his own ‘informal theory’ for how he articulates history and the judgements it makes (Gee 2014, p. 207). On this occasion Chris conceptualises interculturality as a means of understanding a shift in society; a way of seeing what has changed. Holding fast to a figured world that was the British colony – that ‘was very British’ – Chris constructs historical meaning through citing the traditional narrative of the American Revolution, making the notion of independence and the Constitution significant: ‘they’ve got independence, and they see themselves as a different entity’.

Whether consciously or not, Chris’s next statement out of all others creates division within the group through its use of inclusive language, in saying, what ‘we’ evolved from, what ‘we’ have become. When he says ‘We haven’t had that, we evolved from a colony, five/six colonies into one big colony’ there is a sense of deprivation of not being given the same chance as countries like America. The use of the collective commitment to a moral antenna, identified by the use of the collective pronoun ‘you’ve’ is utilised again by Chris when he says: ‘So you’ve got issues about us judging Australian history in a way society’s a lot different’ as he builds a case against the past Prime Minister of Australia, Bob Menzies, a significant historical figure in Australia’s patriarchal history, for having ‘the British’ in the passport up until the 1960s.

What of identity in Chris’s talk? He begins his statement by alerting the participants to his understanding of interculturality at ‘another level’. He attributes a particular identity to America – one of revolution and independence. In
comparison he speaks of uncertainty and division when considering the identity of Australia. Once again, Chris’s world is disrupted. In response, his multiple use of the inclusive ‘we’ in one unitary block of thought, whether intentional or not, aims to establish a relationship with not only the others in the room but a collective population of Australia’s past whether present or not (Gee 2014).

The discourse of historical consciousness is presented in two ways here and supported by the theoretical underpinnings of the conceptual framework. Firstly, Jo and Jessica’s exchange is grounded in the world of their students. Jessica thinks carefully about the ‘job’ of history and its responsibilities and is persistent in the notion that historical consciousness shapes her students’ understanding of the present and how they might view the future. On the other hand, Chris’ discourse of historical consciousness is grounded in the exemplary mode of historical thinking. That is, he is more concerned with patterns of historical significance that provide ‘timeless rules of social life and validity’, and argues through an ‘obligation of values and value-systems’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 29) made significant through well-known narratives. Further, the discourse of historical consciousness constructed by Jessica acknowledges ‘temporal change as a decisive argument for the validity of moral reasoning and values’ (p. 29).

Conceptualising interculturality for these two teachers evokes very different stages of historical thinking. In Jessica’s case the concept is determined as interculturality, interpreted as an educational strategy that impacts on how students’ orient themselves in the past, present and future. For Chris, the concept is interculturality which provokes an ‘affirmation of pre-given orders’ unrelated to history pedagogy and practice.

The correlation made here between how teachers conceptualise interculturality and historical consciousness has implications for history education. Some teachers will see interculturality as affecting the ‘ancient treaty’ of historical discourse that has shaped their thinking (Rüsen 2005, p. 25). On the other hand, other teachers will feel less obligated to that treaty in order to conceptualise interculturality as an educational strategy and find a place for it to exist as part of the ‘web of temporal change’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 25). Either way, it is impossible to see how discourses
orient our understanding of interculturality if there is no theoretical model for what underpins interculturality for history teaching and learning.

**The discourse of ‘other’**

The metaphoric *knotted cord* re-emerges in this section through a discourse of ‘other’. Where the textual analysis identifies ‘certain voices’ (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002) as a means of silencing the *knotted cords* of Australia’s early beginnings, the focus groups expose silence through a discourse of ‘other’. This is constructed in several ways and is shaped by historical thinking that recognises how the settler society clung to the ‘collective memory of the colonial past’ and how this is entwined to the present (Cavanagh 2012; Parkes & Sharp 2014, p. 159). Further, when the ‘other’ is exposed, teachers are more inclined to see interculturality as an educational strategy. For example, in this comment Anna sees interculturality as a way to understand the history of a culture without creating otherness: ‘And so I think there is this thing that is still happening which is making it the study of “other” instead of it just being the study of culture’.

There is a great deal at stake here not just for scholars of history and history education, but also for curriculum policy makers, because historical content knowledge articulated through the discourse of ‘other’ drives towards emancipation from – but not the eradication of – the colonial past. It also drives towards an understanding of settler colonialism as a structural continuum that has its own history and ‘does not stop’ (Wolfe 2006, p. 402; see also Cavanagh 2012, p. 16). This type of historical thinking for history teaching and learning reflects an intercultural approach. Further, the discourse of ‘other’ highlights the debate between the legitimacy of a history filled with ‘other’ as opposed to an undivided history. For example, where Cannadine acknowledges the enduring value in the work of scholars such as Geertz, in reinforcing academic insistence to ‘focus attention on the creation, perception, working, meaning and significance of what they varyingly describe as “difference” or “otherness”’ (Cannadine 2013, p. 6), he ultimately argues the expectation for history to be an *undivided past*, which does not focus so much on the binaries that create dichotomies of either side. Based on the transcripts, I do not see this as plausible nor fruitful at the level of school
history. The focus groups in some ways further the thesis that, as globalisation and technology bring different traditions and historical civilizations into closer and closer contact, there is a ‘growing density and need for intercultural thinking’ (Rüsen 2004a, p. 119) and therefore the celebration of difference and ‘other’. The transcripts evidence why educational systems are increasingly recognizing the fact that exposing students ‘only to their own kind, and their own history’ or what is described as an undivided past, does not encourage a deeper acceptance of cultural diversity (Rozbicki 2015, p. 3). I have chosen the next excerpt from Sally’s talk to endeavour to demonstrate a realization of this ‘big Conversation’:

I’m sure there are plenty of people who do try and cling to the more traditional narratives that they’d like to tell but I remember being down at a different campus of this particular school a few years ago, and even then they were learning about indigenous civil rights, and they were just confused because they said, “Well there’s no one indigenous here.” And they were very confused about whether or not there actually could have been some indigenous at their school, and I think in anything, if you see something like that you kind of feel like it’s your responsibility to actually go, alright, I have to make a real effort here to make them more aware (Gee 2014, p. 77).

In the above statement the knotted cord of indigenous civil rights in Australia are an example of how the past and present are entwined. Sally sees interculturality operating in her history classes as recognising the traditional narratives but at the same time acknowledging that deeper sense of cultural diversity that caused division in the past. She taps into interculturality as an educational strategy again through the shaping of historical consciousness and the responsibility this creates for history teachers.

The discourse of history pedagogy and change

The conceptualisation of interculturality for the teachers also prompted talk about change from several different angles but ultimately from the stance of what they know best: history pedagogy. Most teachers, when asked about the stories and narratives they use to explain Australia’s early beginnings, saw that approaches were beginning to change. Below are key statements that I have selected to highlight some of these views that the concept of interculturality provoked in the teachers’ talk.
In the following comments, Sally from Focus Group 2 sees interculturality as a catalyst for change. She takes up the notion of ‘awareness’ which was discussed earlier in this chapter and also arose in the key literatures, to consider how the view of people has changed. Sally uses the phrase ‘filter down’ as part of her conceptualisation, clarifying her understanding of *interculturality* as a strategy:

[The narrative of Australian settlement] always has a very positive spin to it in a lot of ways I find, but that is starting to change over recent years as well, people are definitely more aware and there is more of a push to be showing both sides of that period of time. But I think originally it was this very positive view of people coming to Australia and settling, and it was this great new adventure, and this new experience when in reality it was quite a devastating period of time for a huge portion of people, and I think it’s fantastic that now that is starting to change, and I know especially at a university level that’s starting to filter down and you have to learn about both sides of what happened there and I just hope it continues to filter down into mainstream education as well. But it’s definitely a change that needs to take place.

In the same group, Rebecca’s idea of change is also connected to her conceptualisation of interculturality. In her comment below, she relates a shift in historical consciousness and her understanding that interculturality will bring change if it is part of her students’ historical thinking:

I think a lot of it will change if all Australian’s and all Australian students start to perceive that that is part of their history as well, it’s not just the European side of it and the colonisation side of it, it’s actually as an Australian person.

Comments made by Dan from Focus Group 4 are poignant in showing how interculturality ‘creeps in’ to create change. Using an inclusive ‘we’ Dan invites the participants to be reminiscent of their experience of tales and stories that are familiar in Western schooling. He uses the example of the teaching of Aboriginal life as separate to the narrative of the conquerors: ‘they were separate and they were done at separate times’. However, Dan qualifies this further with a point of change that also sums up the theses in this chapter regarding *difference*. Dan’s discourse of change and history pedagogy recognises that the *difference* in the two narratives is not the problem; it is how and when they are presented. He says: ‘now we run those different samples of evidence and different narratives, we run them side by side’. Dan conceptualises the *doing* of interculturality as part of a discourse of change that is happening and altering history pedagogy and therefore is evidenced as an educational strategy:
It creeps in, it certainly creeps in. That’s been the big change. Once upon a time we may have even, and I remember at primary school, they were very separate, you would learn the conquerors tale of colonisation, but then you would learn about ancient Aboriginal life. They were separate and they were done at separate times, it was quite obviously different. And we don’t do that anymore – now we run those different samples of evidence and different narratives, we run them side by side.

Later in the discussion, Dan resolves that interculturality as an educational strategy that brings significant change, but he also admits that it is not being enacted in the curriculum is not being enacted as he might like. Dan’s comments make significant the complexity of interculturality for which he and his colleagues need guidance:

And saying that it is a significant change, it’s probably something that either at the school level or higher that we should be looking to do, as a basic understanding for anybody who is teaching those year levels of history. Even to fully understand the term of interculturality, or even say it, you still need the guidance to understand it.

Jessica from Focus Group 2 also articulates parts of her conceptualisation of interculturality through a discourse of change, the conversations held at home in the minds of her students, and how the imagined curriculum keeps up or not with these conversations. On these terms Jessica cites the difficulty of seeing the impact of interculturality because of the lag between what is happening in students’ conversations and what is written in the curriculum:

And likewise, they’re the conversations that they’ve had at home and I don’t know how much our curriculum has really altered or changed in the last what, 10, 12, 15 years to cater for that.

Simply put, some of the teachers’ language represents a ‘brink’ from which some teachers are willing to leap, whether consciously or not, from the exemplary to the critical stage of historical thinking. Conceptualisations of interculturality prompt a critique of historical blame and judgement: ‘students shut down because they think they’re to blame. Like, we’re to blame for the massacres and we’re all to blame for it’, says Jessica. Following Rüsen’s stages of historical consciousness, Jessica’s comments are about ‘the acceptance of different standpoints within a comprising perspective of common development’, as opposed to the continual ‘affirmation of pre-given orders by consent of what is a valid common life’.
(Rüsen 2005, p. 29). Overall, the discourse of change encourages questions about the rules and conduct legitimised through past experience in history pedagogy.

This concluding statement by Jessica is chosen to reflect the interconnectedness of the key theses of the discourse analysis: the complexity of culture for history education, the significance of perspective as key to interpreting interculturality, shades of whiteness that create discourses of judgement and blame in the reality of the history classroom, the impact of interculturality to affect change in the minds of teachers, and the gaps in how interculturality is understood to be an educational strategy and not simply a measure of racism:

Like kids shut down about their own history because they feel like they’re being blamed for the – and we are very one culture here, so a lot of them take on one side of the story rather than considering the other side because they don’t seem themselves aligned with that. So I said to them "You’re the generation who are going to change the world and you’re the generation who will probably change Australia Day and you’re the generation who understand that you aren’t to blame for this. You’re part of the generation who have said sorry, who are making amends, who are reconciling” and made out that they were, they were the heroes of the day and then went into our beginnings as a country and the devastation with white settlement has caused and try to look at it that way. Because I often find and I found that last semester when we taught it and when we’ve had these conversations before, students shut down because they think they’re to blame. Like, we’re to blame for the massacres and we’re all to blame for it. So I alleviated them of that guilt, talked them up and try to sort of align them with the good side and then got them to look at it. I don’t know how that went but I just thought I’d use a different approach (Underline author emphasis).

Closing the analysis of the focus groups

This discourse analysis of the four focus groups has identified six key discourses which answer the first sub-question: ‘How do teachers conceptualise interculturality for history teaching and learning?’ The analysis has endeavoured to capture the teachers’ talk and reflect the positioning of the teachers.

Listening to the recordings and reading the transcripts many times revealed that the poignancy of the teachers’ talk comes from polar positions, or as I have argued, what Gee calls situated meanings and figured worlds. The data that emerged through these discussions is rich and at times enigmatic because one cannot be certain of the intention for all statements and utterances and because the discourse analysis cannot not reveal everything (Gee 2014). These positions
accord teachers’ particular views of the world and sustain strong relationships between ontological stances and social and political influences to inform those views. Indeed, it was made very clear that although teachers were generally willing to engage with the concept of interculturality, some were resistant to what it might mean, or the impact it would have, or saw the need to justify underlying tensions through lenses of the past. Finally, this comment made by Emily ‘you see I don’t think in white’, reflects the poignancy of the central theme of ‘whiteness’ that governs both the focus groups and the textual analysis.
Chapter 5 – Analysis and discussion of the textual analysis

Chapter synopsis

This chapter generates data through a textual analysis of a timeline produced in the *Oxford Big Ideas History 9* textbook for the AC and VC between 2013 and 2017. Described by Fairclough (1995) as a key element of discourse analysis, the textual analysis utilises the same tools of inquiry and approaches as the analysis of the focus group transcripts, however the texture is very different.

As a reminder, when the new national curriculum was implemented in 2013 the general capability of ICU was aligned closely with the History curriculum and its subject specific goals of ‘world history’ for all Australian students: ‘Australian history is to be taught within a world history context’ (ACARA 2010d). This chapter follows lines of inquiry into this alignment and addresses the second sub-question of this thesis: *How do prescribed history textbooks in Australia interpret the concept of interculturality?*

From the outset, for me, the mandated inclusion of ICU created conflict between the imagined and the enacted curriculum (Salter & Maxwell 2018). This chapter engages with the gap between the discourse of the curriculum and its inclusion of ICU (positioned here as the *imagined* curriculum) and the written and visual language of the timeline (positioned here as the *enacted* curriculum) as a way into the research question.

The data is generated from the written and visual language of a timeline printed in the prescribed history textbook, *Oxford Big Ideas History 9*, first published in 2012 for the AC and then again in 2016 for the VC, and is presented in two parts:

1. The textual analysis of the timeline produced for the *Oxford Big Ideas History 9* textbook written and prescribed for the Australian curriculum.
2. An intercultural reading of the timeline produced for the *Oxford Big Ideas History 9* textbook written and prescribed for the Victorian curriculum.
The textual analysis overall examines the timeline using specific tools of inquiry informed by Gee (2014) and the principles of crystallisation to ensure rigour by subjecting the data through different forms and experiences (Ellingson 2009). In Part 1 of this chapter the textual analysis of the timeline that appears in the textbook produced for the AC, focuses on specific visual images and written text through the use of key motifs. In Part 2 that follows Part 1, the analysis of the timeline that appears in the textbook produced for the VC textbook takes the format of an essay entitled ‘An intercultural reading of the timeline’ and deconstructs the interpretation of interculturality through the discourse of Western historical thinking and its historiography. As Gough states, ‘an essay can serve a similar function to the experiment in empirical research – [as] a disciplined and methodic way of investigating a question, problem or issue’ (Gough 2004, p.157).

Part 1: Textual analysis of the ‘timeline’ for the Australian curriculum

Discourse of the curriculum

In a country where debates over history and its teaching ‘have been particularly fierce and politically driven’ (Yates et al. 2017a, p. 96), the History component of the Year 7-10 AC reflects, to a certain extent, a discourse of fundamental revision. The endeavours of conservatives, including former Prime Ministers John Howard and Tony Abbott, to reignite contentions of the History Wars – that Australian children needed more tuition regarding their colonial history and its foundations – begs the question have these wars been successfully resisted by history educators?

The literatures of the History Wars are a complex dichotomy of historical interpretation fuelled by strong pressure to return to a more traditional ‘root-and-branch’ approach to teaching Australia’s national story. The use of a timeline as history pedagogy presents chronological content knowledge as an objective, truthful and particular narrative. This does not mean that the inclusion of this timeline in this textbook supports the conservative political attitudes in Australia, however; as a pedagogy which gives students of all backgrounds access to key historical knowledge, the timeline can be interpreted as an expedition in historical consciousness by which certain events, people and their narratives ‘enter, are
denied entry or are modulated as they enter the collective memory at the school history level’ (Taylor & Collins 2012, p. 2). Further, there is an inference in this expedition through the construction of language that a positive narrative at this level of school history will inculcate loyalty from the nation’s young people.

Counter to this healthy cynicism is that the discourse of the new national History curriculum extends somewhat beyond traditional historical thinking framed by facts and memory. It reflects a historical vocabulary borne out of research into historical thinking and inquiry in schools championed by scholars such as Professors Peter Seixas, Sam Wineburg, and Jörn Rüsen. In education and specifically history education such scholars paved the way from the end of the nineteenth century to early twenty-first century for discourses in history curricula to evidence the building of historical consciousness, empathy, contested histories and perspectives that inform the present and the future rather than simply remember the past (Rüsen 2002; Sears 2011; Wineburg 2001).

Consequently, the discourse of the national History curriculum in Australia reflects historical thinking and historical concepts informed by Seixas and others. The changes in approach to the discourse of the curriculum reflect a change in approach for history teaching and learning and show strong support for inclusive education that forged ahead through the *Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians*, produced in 2008, and the ‘promotion of equity and excellence in education’ (Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs 2008).

All of these factors are demonstrated in the overview of the national History curriculum:

The content provides opportunities to develop historical understanding through key concepts, including evidence, continuity and change, cause and effect, perspectives, empathy, significance and contestability (ACARA 2010c, original bold).

*Year 9 History curriculum – AC*

The historical content knowledge prescribed in the AC History curriculum is taught through what are called ‘Depth Studies’. This textual analysis focuses on the Year 9 ‘Depth Study’ entitled ‘Australia and Asia’ and the elective ‘Making a
nation’. The national curriculum prescribes that students investigate ‘in depth’ the history of an Asian society or Australia in the period 1750-1918. I make these points regarding the latter choice which is the focus of this textual analysis:

- Oxford University Press is one of the largest distributors of history textbooks in Australia and according to this publisher, just over 70% of schools choose to teach the option of ‘Australia in the period 1750-1918’ and the elective ‘Making a nation’ as opposed to the history of an Asian society: ‘Figures are largely anecdotal, however, we believe that in any given year around 70% of schools teaching the Depth Study Australia and Asia opt to teach the Making a nation elective’ (Oxford University Press spokesperson, 2016, personal communication).

- The timeline is positioned as the opening pedagogy to this widely accessed chapter, therefore, is influential in shaping historical consciousness regarding Australia’s early beginnings for Year 9 students.

- In 2013, under the Liberal government led by then Prime Minister Tony Abbott, a review of the AC led to history being ‘subsumed under a broader humanities and social sciences subject in the primary years’ (known as HASS – Humanities and Social Sciences) and attention turned to strengthening references to ‘Western’ influences in Australia’s history: ‘Asked whether the national curriculum had become "politicised" under Labour, Mr Abbott said it was "mostly" to do with history’ (Lane & Maher 2013).

Figure 18 (over page) shows the specified content descriptors for the Year 9 elective ‘Making a nation’ in the national History curriculum. The content descriptors are specific curriculum that must be addressed and are supported by elaborations, cross-curriculum priorities and the general capabilities.
This analysis is concerned with the first two content descriptors shown in Figure 18:

- The extension of settlement, including the effects of contact (intended and unintended) between European settlers in Australia and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples
- Experiences of non-Europeans in Australia prior to the 1900s (such as the Japanese, Chinese, South Sea Islanders, Afghans).

In addition this analysis focuses on the related content descriptors for the General Capability of ICU. These are shown in Figures 19 and 20 below in their expanded format.

---

7 © Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) 2010 to present, unless otherwise indicated. This material was downloaded from the Australian Curriculum website (www.australiancurriculum.edu.au) (accessed 1/12/2017) and was not modified. The material is licensed under CC BY 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0). Version updates are tracked on the ‘Curriculum version history’ page (www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/Home/CurriculumHistory) of the Australian Curriculum website.
The discourse of the ICU content descriptors makes a strong move away from what has plagued History education in Australia for over three decades: ‘the struggle over collective memory of the colonial past and an object of concern for how this impacts students’ sense of national identity’ (Parkes & Sharp 2014, p. 159). Both ICU content descriptors align with the language of the overview of the national History curriculum outlined above. For example, phrases such as ‘empathising with others’ and ‘multiple perspectives’ evidence a shift beyond traditional historical content knowledge and narratives through notions of ‘cultural identity’.

The content descriptors raise the questions of the distinctions of culture and interculturality as a curriculum strategy design and interpretation problem. The terms of interculturality, as part of the imagined curriculum, use powerful language and are the ‘beginning of a struggle enacted in and through language’ (Gee 2014, p. 41) as to whether curriculum, textbook content knowledge, and teacher knowledge are to be privileged in regard to a shift in history teaching and learning.


**Discourse of the enacted curriculum**

The chronological timeline pictured below in Figure 21 (see enlarged version on page 99 of this thesis) is a familiar pedagogy used in Australian schools from the early primary years through middle to senior secondary levels, to address the historical concept and skill of chronology outlined by ACARA and VCAA as essential for the prescribed history education. The written and visual languages of this timeline, which construct the historical content knowledge for the historical narrative, are defined as discourses that shape students’ historical thinking. This timeline is positioned in the textbook as the opening pedagogy for addressing the elective ‘Making a nation’. The inclusion of particular historical content knowledge and therefore the exclusion of other historical content knowledge constructs meaning that is in direct opposition to the discourse of the curriculum shown above in Figures 19 and 20 which show the ICU descriptors expanded.

The timeline pictured at Figure 21 (over the page) denotes Australia’s early beginnings, 1770-1907, and, to reiterate, is furnished with an air of rationality to construct a past of validity and objectivity in terms of claims of truth (Rüsen 2005). In the transcripts of the focus groups one participant makes the comment: ‘and all the textbooks start at 1778’.

The data is experienced through what is made visible and significant on the timeline. What is not shown or is silent falls below the sense-creating procedures of historical consciousness (Rüsen 2005). This division of themes and discourses is shown in Figure 22 (over page) and refracts the crystalline structure of the iceberg metaphor (the most common crystalline metaphor). In line with Derrida’s (1998b) poststructural notion of deconstruction, deconstruction of the iceberg metaphor illuminates the properties of discourse analysis to include a ‘reflexive, reciprocal and cyclical process’ (Gee 2014, p. 148) between the intercultural imaginary of the curriculum and the uniqueness of Western historical thinking of the timeline. As a point of departure, the key themes derived from the crystalline metaphor support the researcher in identifying patterns and motifs which constitute discourses of historical narration. These motifs are related themes that ‘seem to go together’ to connect certain parts of the timeline and give it ‘overall coherence and texture’; as a ‘key tool of inquiry for discourse analysis’ the motifs find a way in to understanding written and visual language that, in the case of the timeline, constructs the ‘making of a nation’ (Gee 2014, p. 185). For this textual analysis, these mechanisms of significance are organised into three key motifs:

---

See enlarged version of timeline at Figure 15, Research Methodology (chapter 3 of this thesis).
whiteness, discourse of the settler society, and knowledge and power identified through the discourse of the *knotted cord*.

![Figure 22 Visualisation of the iceberg metaphor for this study](image)

**Motif 1: Whiteness**

The notion of whiteness was instrumental to the founding of the Australian nation and has been propagated in literature and art for centuries (Liewald 2012, p. 13)

The visual language of the timeline is characteristic of ‘saying, doing and being’ white (Gee 2014, p. 47). It contributes to the view that ‘despite improvements to their content over time, secondary school history textbooks still imply that Australians are white’ (Moore 2017, p. 1). As opposed to writing whiteness, the visuals deliver a *colour-blind* arrangement of historical content knowledge where whiteness denotes ‘a normative structure, a discourse of power, and a form of identity’ (Ware & Black 2002, p. 1).

Motif 1, ‘Whiteness’, is made apparent when all the people pictured on the page are white. This has clear implications for ‘any attempt to conceptualise and represent the position of any intercultural subject’ (Britto 2004, p. 131). Moore
(2017) reflects that the cross-curricular priorities in the current version of the AC, supported by the General capability of ICU, state that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students should be able to see themselves, their identities and their cultures (ACARA 2010f). However, in direct contrast to this intention only the contribution of white people is highlighted, signifying colonial rhetoric in the interest of nation building. Hence, there are no internal divisions in the narrative constructed on the timeline. It is a seamless unfolding of a colonial regime and its celebrated structures of conquering the new world through expeditions that attribute success through artistic symbolism of patriarchal strength, domestic bliss and ordered society.

Australia and its early beginnings are represented on the timeline as a cultural vacuum, suggesting that any culture that existed was peaceful or ‘bland’ and characterised by ‘average-looking white people’ (Moore 2017, p. 2). Further, the linear progress of the visual images reinforces tropes that tend to regard being white as identical with being human and rely on the embodiments of whiteness, traced through Christianity, and notions of race, enterprise and imperialism (Dyer 1997, p. 4).

Specifically, the discourse of the three paintings is striking in its construction of fundamental wordless statements of whiteness through measures of significance, exposed here to be *painting* whiteness.

*Painting Whiteness*

![Figure 23 A cottage in early Hobart 1803, Oxford Big Ideas History 9 textbook, p.160.](image-url)
Figure 23 is the first painting on the timeline and is described as an artist’s impression of Van Diemen’s Land first settlement at Risdon Cove on the Derwent River, plotted at 1803. The peaceful scene focuses on the colonial architecture and the archetype cottage complete with fireplace and chimney, provincial windows and door, safely gated by a picket fence against the rugged bushland of the new world. Outside the cottage a farmer feeds his imported animals whilst they bask in the sunshine, and neighbouring cottages dot the surrounding hills capturing a picture of colonial success.

Paintings like this one reflect Eurocentric representations prevalent in early nineteenth century art, to make the ‘other’ and their world intelligible to a European audience (Grishin 2014). The peaceful colonial cottage reflects what Karskens (2013) identifies as ‘space’; these were the imagined, planned and therefore unproblematic pictures of early white settlements. A counter interpretation is one of ‘place’ as occupied by the comings and goings of real people, invested with meaning that comes with people and their stories (Karskens 2013; Rose 2013). The architectural landscape depicted in this ‘space’ has the appearance of neatness and purpose associated with colonial discourse, and draws attention away from other groups’ contributions to society. The glaring absence of Karskens’ notion of ‘place’ silences the stories of the ‘other’ to compound the whiteness, and builds significance around the colonial structure of living and survival; a hierarchical enterprise in itself. The stature of colonial architecture, placed at the tip of the iceberg metaphor shown earlier in this chapter, creates a historical imagination of an ordered environment where people live peacefully and work hard.
The second painting, shown in Figure 24 above, is an artist’s impression of a crossing of the Blue Mountains an area which covers around 1436 square kilometres west of Sydney, Australia. The first attempt by Europeans to cross the Blue Mountains was made unsuccessfully by Captain Tench and Lieutenant William Dawes. In 1813 Blaxland, Wentworth and Lawson were successful. In his diary entries, Lawson describes the land as ‘poor and scrubby’, impinged by ‘deep Rocky gullys’ that made it ‘impossible to proceed’ with horses. The explorers cut a road five miles into the forest only to find a ‘ridge of mountains’ and no feed for the horses (Lawson 1813). The victorious glow captured in the painting ‘Crossing the Blue Mountains’ forgets the uncomfortableness of the trek. Even Lawson himself, writes in the pages of his journal, that the trek back to Blaxland’s tavern was much easier. He writes they ‘simply had to retrace the blazing trail of destruction left as their path’ (Lawson 1813).

Ancient pathways in the Blue Mountains were travelled long before the adventures of Lawson and his party. The geographic features and the intense flora and fauna of the region had been recorded by Aboriginal clans. When first contact was made between Aboriginal people and colonial Europeans, there were already clans of the Darug and Gundungurra people living in various locations across the Blue Mountains. Nevertheless, the effects colonialism has on thinking itself and historical understanding (which has been widely researched; see Bhabha 1990, Spivak 1988, and Said 2003) leads us to know that in these times the eyes of the
establishment and its power were everywhere, reinforcing the dualistic and Manichean thinking fostered by colonial discourse. In this painting the motif of whiteness is supported by the colonial dualism of coloniser versus colonised (Ochoa 1996), and a dichotomy of strength and weakness is made significant.

Figure 25 ‘Zealous Diggers at Bendigo’ by ST Gill, 1854, *Oxford Big Ideas History 9* textbook, p.161.

The third painting, ‘Zealous Diggers’ by S.T. Gill (1854), is placed on the timeline at 1851 denoting the Australian Gold Rush. By the time the Gold Rush officially started in Victoria in 1851, the Port Phillip Aboriginal Protectorate (1838-1850) had been disbanded. Aboriginal people had been dispossessed of their land by squatters and sheep, and they were now facing a second invasion – gold-seekers from across the globe. When, by the mid-1850s, it became clear that gold was literally strewn across Victoria, the rush to the diggings by a mass of humanity began (Cahir 2012).

Cultural hegemony lingers behind the choice of the painting ‘Zealous Diggers at Bendigo’ for this space, and its placement and whiteness in the construction of cultural identity is ‘disproportionately reaffirmed’ (Moore 2015, p. 2). This painting as visual language contributes to a discourse that constructs the rhetoric of nation building, mentioned earlier in this chapter, and success that runs at the expense of any other successful heterogeneous economic endeavour. In this visual representation, the historical narrative of early Australia is a culture of Christian
family values, with the husband, wife, female child and new baby. The man stands as a tower of strength above the female who nurses the babe in her arms. The historical narrative shared is about the reward for settlement and conquering of the wilderness through the norms and values of the dominant class.

There is no other ethnicity in the painting ‘Zealous Diggers’ (or any of the paintings), and the scene hints at ‘a colonial civilizing mission’ (Rogers 2011, p. 74). This is not a criticism of S.T. Gill, who had his own problems being accepted by the colonial establishment during his lifetime. In fact, it is only posthumously that his artwork has been appreciated. It is a criticism of the choice and placement of the visual because in the context of this period people from all different backgrounds sojourned from one field to another in Victoria, their only goal being where the gold was reported to be found. Counter to the narrative of the timeline, the Victorian goldfields were horrendously disordered for colonists, immigrants and indigenous people alike. Further, and as Cahir (2012) points out, evidence of this historical content knowledge is not difficult to find and can be readily found in art of the gold rushes in Australia: ‘the physical presence of Indigenous people on the goldfields has been noted by both writers and artists of the period’ (Cahir 2012, p. 6).

The distinction of this painting on the timeline, to exclude all others, structures an explicit discourse that carries an implicit message of whiteness. Where this painting gives privilege and relevance to the colonists, it constructs meaning and significance around an imagined social milieu that gives no access to interculturality as an educational strategy for history pedagogy, because of the absence of difference. Yet, a simple search of S.T. Gill’s work reveals this well-known pictorial diarist drew and painted other impressions of the social milieu that surrounded him on the streets of the goldfields in Victoria; some of which make clear that cultural tensions disrupted anything serene, and that difference was part of the social fabric of the goldfields. Grishin (2014) suggests that S.T. Gill’s work was often very different from the composed, sanitised order illustrated in ‘Zealous Diggers’.

The watercolours produced by S.T. Gill during this period focus on everyday activities and depict all levels of society when both rich and poor, migrants,
Indigenous people, Vandemonians and convicts flooded onto the gold fields and worked side by side in search of gold. Many of his paintings are intimate scenes of a particular event or activity, and often highlight the differences between those who succeeded and those who failed, such as in the paintings ‘The Unlucky Digger That Never Returned’, whose bleached bones lay in the bush never to return to his family, and the ‘Invalid Digger’, whose only faithful companion is his dog. However, in stark contrast, ‘Zealous Diggers’ only celebrates white success and harmony.

The selection of this S.T. Gill painting gives no access to the language of the content descriptor outlined at the beginning of this section: ‘The extension of settlement, including the effects of contact (intended and unintended) between European settlers in Australia and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples’ (ACARA 2010e). Further, there is no access to the discourse of the ICU content descriptors: ‘interacting and empathising with others’ and ‘consider and develop multiple perspectives’ (shown in Figure 20), highlighting a gap between the discourse of the curriculum and the discourse of the enacted curriculum and how interculturality as an educational strategy is being understood and interpreted.

It must be accepted that not all decisions made for history textbooks are ideological, and according to the spokesperson for Oxford University Press, ‘if any ideological decisions are made they are made by government, not publishers’ (Oxford University Press spokesperson, 2016, personal communication), or authors for that matter. Even so, my thesis is that in its endeavours to uphold what is referred to by the same spokesperson as ‘curriculum fidelity’, the gap between the historical thinking and interpretation of the discourse of the curriculum, and the historical thinking and interpretation presented in the discourse of the enacted curriculum grows wider. Consequently, this gap impedes the melding of interculturality and history education at the intersection of curriculum and pedagogy.

Enactment of the intercultural imaginary through art would distribute or make visible historical content knowledge that makes wordless statements about other contributors – not to replace, but to exchange, therefore disrupting the ‘revolving around the dominant culture’ of marginalised groups that Hyundok (2006)
describes (see Chapter 2). Moreover, there would be communication and interaction between the pasts of different cultures, therefore disrupting ‘reproduced dominance’ (Shiells 2010, p. 791). I offer the following historical understanding of Australia’s early beginnings and alternative artwork as an example of such distribution and enactment.

*The Chinese Makassar Trepang industry and Aboriginal intercultural trade*

During the same period of the paintings on the timeline, in other parts of the country not denoted on the timeline, Australia’s first modern trade industry and intercultural economy (known as the Makassar Trepang industry) was in full swing. The trade was conducted between Indonesian fishermen, Indigenous people and European explorers. Joining the list of cultures were Chinese people. The Chinese purchase of the fish is considered by historians to have contributed to the first modern economic industry in Australia; yet the operation of the Makassar industry is not mentioned in the timeline.

The Chinese pioneers are briefly mentioned in later parts of the chapter of the textbook as too are the Makassar, however this seems a throwaway. The viable economy created through intercultural exchange, which evidences peaceful relationships and positive bonds between three of the world’s ancient cultures (Indigenous, Chinese and Indonesian), must be made visible in history pedagogy such as this timeline in order for whiteness to be ‘made strange’ (Dyer 1997, p. 10).

Matthew Flinders and Robert Brown met with trepangers out of Arnhem Land and wrote about the interactions between the different cultures and the impact this had on culture and societies (Macknight 2011). One example is how Makassar words were absorbed into Aboriginal language, and art and ideas about food were exchanged. Not surprisingly, the Trepang industry thrived throughout the nineteenth century in Australia and only ceased in July 1906, after Federation, when Australia’s fledgling parliament introduced new taxes.

The absence of these intercultural factors in the discourse constructed by the paintings ‘Risdon Cove’, ‘Crossing the Blue Mountains’ and ‘Zealous Diggers’
on the timeline erases this important intercultural phase in Australia’s history from the Australia historical consciousness. Therefore, such motifs, their themes and patterns of understanding and reciprocity can only appear visible below historical consciousness on the crystalline structure of the iceberg metaphor, losing their significance to the past.

Figure 26 below shows the painting ‘The Source of Life’ by artist Zhou Xiaoping, known for his work on the cross-cultural influences of Chinese and Indigenous art. The painting was of central significance at the Melbourne exhibition ‘Trepang: China and the story of the Makassar-Aboriginal Trade’ (2010). This painting disrupts the normative status of whiteness in presenting ‘white’ as other, or at least in disrupting conceptions of self through otherness (Arber 2013). Further, in this painting Indigenous people are not presented in a negative way or as victims, as so often is the case in history textbooks in Australia. The implicit message from the painting is how the Trepang industry thrived through intercultural trade, and how the history of Australia’s early beginnings is connected to ‘other’ and not celebrated through terms of white expedition.

Figure 26 ‘The Source of Life’, Zhou Xiaoping (2010)

**Motif 2: Discourse of the settler society**

Motif 2 is concerned with themes and patterns of the settler society constructed by the discourse of the timeline. Since the ‘surge of globalisation and geopolitical
reconfigurations the specificities of settler colonialism emerged as requiring a different interpretive paradigm’ (Cavanagh 2012, p. 16). Consequently, the growth of the global Indigenous movement after the 1970s and the discourses this inspired created a ‘new historical imagination with regard to the subjugation and marginalization of indigenous communities’ (p. 16). Despite shifts in curriculum policy to espouse a discourse of ‘world history’ the timeline as history pedagogy holds its place firmly in our history education system to hide the complex knots of Australia’s early beginnings behind a discourse of the settler society.

This section examines specific aspects of the written language on the timeline for dominant discourses that claim a right to ‘signify from the periphery of authorised power’ that is integral to the settler society (Bhabha 1994, p. 2). It uses the conceptual framework as a lens to explain the construction of traditional and exemplary historical thinking that protects the genealogy of the rulers and legitimises the perpetuation of the stories told.

*What’s in a title?*

The timeline opens with the title ‘Big picture’, which appears in bold letters above the subtitle: ‘Making a nation’. ‘Big picture’ suggests a visual experience from the outset. The nature of the phrase is colloquial in Australia and is an intertextual reference to the vernacular phrase ‘look at the big picture’, a familiar and relatable term for teachers and students. It is an informal presumption that relevant, comprehensive and reliable content is at the students’ fingertips.

The subtitle ‘Making a nation’, transferred directly from the Year 9 History curriculum of the AC, is a colonial classifier and shifts the focus from a social interaction between the text and the reader to a value-laden position creating a political context; claims like the one made in the title, says Gee, ‘do not just come out of nowhere’ (Gee 1999, p. 87). This is an explicit statement of ‘terra nullius’ – an unoccupied continent that needed to be ‘made’, i.e. transformed and constructed into a social, political and economic entity. ‘Making a nation’ grounds tradition for the reader, framing a narrative that ‘is engraved in the archives of memory’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 11).
Methodologically, there is a relationship between these words and what is reflected in the literatures regarding the building of the nation through history textbooks and what counts as knowledge. Moreover, the language of the title takes on a more specific meaning in the context of its actual us. This is what Gee calls the ‘situated meaning’, which according to him is really where discourse analysis has its ‘biggest bite’ (Gee 2014, p. 91).

As explained in other parts of this thesis, a situated meaning is a ‘thinking device’ that guides the analyst to ask certain sorts of questions about the key words, to learn as much as possible about the context the language is used in and how the words construct certain meaning/s. The situated meaning created by this subtitle raises many questions in relation to the building of a social phenomenon called ‘the nation’.

By the time Australia became a nation in 1901, one hundred and twenty-five years had passed since history had been ‘wrenched from the hands of balladeers and chroniclers and entrusted to the philosophers, who placed firm footings of rational inquiry under all forms of knowledge’ (Appleby, Hunt & Jacob 1994, p. 91). In their chapter ‘History Makes a Nation’, Appleby, Hunt and Jacob deem nations in the nineteenth century a modern concept on the European landscape, where men and women came together under political union. Generally, as reflected in the literatures examined for this thesis, the link between school history and its dedication to the nation is an obvious one, and what counts as knowledge on this timeline is directly connected to this school of thought. In the literature review the idea of the nation’s mirror was explored, and the chapter showed a global trend to deliver national discourse through middle school history textbooks as the key agency of government history curricula.

Keeping in mind that the subtitle of the timeline is the name of the elective in the Year 9 History curriculum AC – which as mentioned above is a most popular choice for teaching in Victorian schools – it could be argued that the subtitle is simply an efficient connection to the curriculum. This analysis is not an interrogation of that decision, rather an endeavour to understand the power that the subtitle carries in print and how it is read.
The identity of the nation is made significant through this title and its ‘situated meaning’, a complicit ingenuity that deploys a strategy of colonial tradition. The subtitle is grounded in traditional historical thinking and is one of those ‘indispensable elements’ of orientation described by Rüsen (2005, p. 13). I acknowledge that it is argued earlier in this thesis that the valuing of tradition is theoretically sound. However, at the same time, it is also theoretically crucial for history teachers to recognise that stories and their discourses that sit within the paradigm of tradition tell about the ‘genealogy of rulers in order to legitimate their dominance’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 13).

The analysis now shifts to using these theoretical anomalies to underpin the analysis of the chunk of text on the timeline that I call the ‘Overview’, which is based on the story of a collective set of subjects. Hence, the next section examines how the text begins with the traditional and then moves to the exemplary stage of historical thinking, consequently providing little or no access to any notion of difference. The discussion opens with a vignette taken from a 1950s history textbook, and draws similarities between its introduction and the Overview of the contemporary textbook that is the data sample for this textual analysis.

*Analysis of the Overview – Oxford Big Ideas History 9, 2012*

The object of this little book is to tell the wonderful story of our own country. Fewer than one hundred and fifty years ago no white man lived in our land. In so short a space of time by the pluck, hard work, and energy of our grandmothers and grandfathers, and of our mothers and fathers, a splendid heritage has been handed down to us (Meston 1950)

This vignette is taken from the introduction to an Oxford University Press history textbook used in Australia throughout the 1960s entitled *A Junior History of Australia* (Meston 1950). In context, at this time, Australia was governed by the Immigration Act of 1901, better known as the White Australia Policy, which barred people of non-European descent immigrating to Australia. I preface this section with the introduction to the Oxford University Press history textbook used in Australia from the 1950’s because its use of language is not dissimilar to the discourse of the Overview, shown in Figure 27 on page 162, which appears above the timeline printed in the contemporary textbook, by the same publisher forty
The story of Australia’s progress from convict dumping ground to democratic nation is a dramatic and exciting one. The six colonies were all settled separately from England. They shared many common characteristics – culture, language, diet, political systems and religion. They also had a similar lack of recognition for the rights of the original inhabitants of the country.

During the second half of the nineteenth century, the colonists became increasingly aware of what they shared. The idea of nationhood began to grow. In the last decade of the century, a series of conventions and gatherings led to the development of the Australian Federal Constitution. On 1 January 1901, the first Australian Parliament was opened at the Exhibition Building in Melbourne.

Figure 27 Overview from Oxford Big Ideas History 9, 2012, p.160.

The construction of language in this paragraph identifies with traditional to exemplary stages of historical thinking. To begin, the language constructs a discourse that affirms a pre-given culture and a pattern of belonging which orients the reader to make sense of the past and find their way to the present or in other words, from ‘convict dumping ground to democratic nation’. For the most this traditional narrative constitutes present systems. It constructs continuity, permanence of origins and identity through a story that tells the ‘genealogy of the rulers’ and legitimises their domination (Rüsen 2004a). Under this construction of language, the ‘other’ is left to orbit around the security of those integrated by language to belong to the ‘nation’ (Hyundok 2006; Lee 2007).

In the second paragraph, the historical narrative reflects the exemplary stage of historical thinking as shown in the conceptual framework, proffering stories of accomplishments to concretise the rules and principles of a single case (Rüsen 2005). Although words like ‘colonists’, ‘settled’, ‘shared’ and ‘common characteristics’ are seemingly benign, they create a sense of familiarity and are given relevance based on preference at the expense of loaded words like ‘invasion’, which are desirably omitted from the Overview. Therefore the
Overview gives little relief from a commitment to a master narrative that has extended since the first colonial period in Australia’s history.

Deconstructed, the discourse of the Overview is constructed through contradictions of early Australia. On the one hand, it is negative in its imagery of the ‘convict dumping ground’, which Karskens suggests has been a shame for Australia that led to ‘elision and silences’ over the early colonial period up until the 1970s (Karskens 2013, p. 2). On the other hand, the imagery is juxtaposed with the positive connotations ascribed to the ‘democratic nation’. The familiarity of this discourse utilises what Gee (1999) labels a largely ‘taken-for-granted’ theory or a Discourse model, also known as a ‘figured world’; in other words, language that is in our first thoughts or taken-for-granted assumptions about what is ‘typical’ or ‘normal’ (Gee 2014; Karskens 2013). For example, the ‘convict dumping ground’ draws on a preconditioned discourse of slavery, torture, tyranny and depravity that has come to dominate the popular imagination of convict Australia (Karskens 2013). However, such discourses do not exist in isolation (Halse 2017) in history textbooks – such as ‘democratic nation’, a simplification of the world represented which leaves out many complexities regarding the terms of that democracy. Further, just as in any text, the preconceived idea of democracy takes on different meanings depending on the context within which it is read or spoken. In this case, the word ‘democracy’ represents a world that is taken for granted (Gee 2014), bringing a certain historical gaze to how we see the world described in the Overview.

We can look to the field of settler colonialism and settler societies to draw attention to the complexities and implications of what is kept unseen by the Discourse model of the Overview (Cavanagh 2012; Karskens 2013; Veracini 2008; Wolfe 2006). Let us take three differing arguments between scholars that demonstrate the depth of complexity behind words and phrases such as ‘convict dumping ground’ to ‘democratic nation’ that denote the discourse of the settler society. For example, Veracini (2008) emphasises settler colonialism’s need to disavow violence, and Wolfe (2006) argues settler colonialism’s inherent logic of elimination. The Discourse model of the Overview could affirm either of these arguments, but works more on taking for granted a historical imaginary that is acceptable to most readers. In contrast, Karskens (2013) focuses on settler
evolution, and takes a different approach to the historical interpretation of the ‘convict dumping ground’ by starting from an intercultural understanding of the conditions of the penal colony of NSW. In fact, says Karskens,

Convicts were a diverse lot, around 160,000 men, women and children, arriving in waves over eighty years between 1788 and 1868. Among them were people from all the regions of the British Isles, all speaking different dialects and accents, Jews and African-Americans, black West Indians, and later Aborigines, Maori and Khoisan (Karskens 2013, p. 4)

Therefore, the Discourse model of ‘convict dumping ground’ to ‘democratic nation’, which as a traditional narrative lacks complexity, constructs the fantasy of the settler society that emanates from the ‘colony-to-nation teleology that imperial historiography [such as this timeline] so effectively established’ (Cavanagh 2012, p. 29). On the other hand, in the interests of master narratives and a nation’s mirror, the conjecture associated with the Discourse model ‘convict dumping ground’ to ‘democratic nation’ provides continuity of what is a temporal and pre-given culture, which disavows violence or its elimination.

Within the ‘taken-for-granted’ Discourse model, the simplifications and lack of complexities involve readers in exclusions that are not always obvious, and which they are often not aware of (Gee 1999). For example, the ‘democratic nation’ framed in the first paragraph is based on the sharing of common characteristics, such as culture, language, diet, political systems and religion, by a unified group; but which one? There is a distinctive social language going on here that alludes to the reader being privy to the identity of this group. The intertextual property attached to these characteristics that demarcates their meaning comes from the recurring narratives of Australia’s school history experienced over time (Fairclough 1992; Gee 2014). Further, the collective pronoun ‘they’ assumes that we all know who belongs to this group. Words from the Overview like ‘colonies’ and ‘settled’ marginalise people who did not fit into the image of the white settler and the settler society. Therefore, the narrative erases the intercultural composition of the people who came from not only one, but all the regions of the British Isles during the period 1788 to 1868, and spoke different dialects with a variety of accents, including the diverse groups mentioned above and identified by Karskens (2013).
Using the conceptual framework as a lens, initially the language of the Overview operates within the realms of a traditional narrative furnishing both concreteness (widely recognised people and events) and temporality, a compelling form of narrative structure, both of which are powerful in constructing identity and specific social representations (Liu & Hilton 2005). Then, the language shifts to the exemplary narrative, which are stories that present models of virtue and vices. They allude to historical occurrences and the notion that history is the teacher of life. Stories of this type expand across time and save accomplishments from oblivion (Rüsen 2005). Through this lens the narrative in the second paragraph of the Overview validates the rules and principles of a single case: the success of the colonists. For example, in the first sentence of the paragraph, ‘they’ has been identified as colonists and the phrase ‘what they shared’ alludes to specific accomplishments of the second half of the nineteenth century. The discourse has shifted to more than just a combination of words that determine influence through form and function and the traditional narrative. Now the language is integrated with action and beliefs. The colonists are valued by being given responsibility for ‘nationhood’ and its growth. The group are part of a socially recognizable whiteness sustained through language. At this point, the reader is moved on from the taken-for-granted and pre-given assumption of knowledge, to engage with ‘what’ – that is, how the colonists gathered conventionally, and what outcome this led to (Gee 1999, 2014). Status is handed to the ‘colonists’ first through what ‘they shared’ and then by being associated with and integral to the establishment of proper nouns such as ‘Australian Federal Constitution’, ‘Australian Parliament’ and the ‘Exhibition Building in Melbourne’, all of which are an utterance of white settlement and power.

The discourse of the settler society in Motif 2 constructs specific identities based on taken-for-granted images and Discourse models, which are complicit in distributing simplified historical narratives through contextual and intertextual patterns. This is a well-oiled allusion to the ‘best story’ in history textbooks, which Seixas suggests history educators are often compelled to recognise and deliver (Seixas 2000, p. 20).
I conclude Motif 2 following Gee’s guidance to pose questions when delving into the ‘situated meaning’, ‘figured world’ or Discourse model of the text. I do this because the language of the Overview is in such direct opposition to how one might imagine the writing of interculturality as an educational strategy into the timeline; as an intricate, interrelated memory or story where phrases, symbols and words are examined and re-examined, placed in different contexts and ‘made to signify in astonishing – sometimes bewildering – ways’ (Britto 2004, p. 135). Therefore, trustworthiness can come from interpreting the text through another dimension (Ellingson 2009), such as one of these questions that Gee asks:

> What ‘situated meaning’ or ‘figured world’ for a word or phrase is it reasonable to attribute to those who are reading the text, from the point of view of other Discourses than the one in which the words were written? (Gee 2014, p. 91)

These other Discourses might be ‘ones that bring different values, norms, perspectives and assumptions to the situation’ (p. 91). For example, what sort of ‘situated meaning’ might a student who has escaped a country of conflict, or who has been bullied because of his or her own history, or is Indigenous, give to the Overview if he or she chose to interpret the text from the point of view of their own Discourse and not the settler society discourse of the textbook? I would argue that the discourse of the Overview relies too heavily on the ‘prior knowledge’ of students – a tricky notion in education discussed in Chapter 3 of this thesis – used to counter situated meanings and figured worlds. That is, the discourse of the Overview reaffirms that it takes a great deal to change the influence and strength of prior knowledge (Lave & Wenger 1991; Sears 2011; Trofánenko 2008; Windschitl 2002). Building on Gee’s question, my own question draws from another of the key literatures presented for this study, Koole and Thije’s ‘The Reconstruction of intercultural discourse’ (2001), in asking: what methodological consideration is given to ‘common ground’ through the construction of language that can be attributed to those who are reading the text?

An answer to either question will ‘always be tentative’ (Gee 2014). Framed here as part of the discourse analysis and its intention to bring an intercultural expectation to history education and the enacted History curriculum, a tentative
answer is found by ‘looking at how the past led up to these words theoretically and historically’ for the discipline of history, and appealing to a wide and ‘diverse array of linguistic and contextual factors’ for school history curriculum and pedagogy (Gee 2014, p. 92).

**Motif 3: Discourse of the knotted cord**

The distinction of the *knotted cord* made in Chapter 2 of this thesis demonstrates the capacity of the concept of interculturality to expose disruptive tensions in a nation’s history. Further, the literature review identified *knotted cords* as part of the intellectual deconstructive work that needs to be done for the concept of interculturality to be sustained in history education as an educational strategy. Motif 3 is underpinned by the distinction of the *knotted cord* and examines the timeline to realise that the *knotted cords* are hidden behind the discourse of the settler society and its whiteness. Therefore, as shown in the iceberg metaphor at the beginning of this chapter, the *knotted cords* develop silently beneath the constructed language sit silently in the depths of the collective historical consciousness.

Motif 3 focuses on the notion in educational research that engages in a struggle to reveal and undermine what is ‘most invisible and most insidious in prevailing practices’ through intertextuality and the power of sequence (Ball 1995, p. 267). Motif 3 examines the timeline for its silences from different angles to reflect the complex lattice of the crystalline structure underpinning my methodology.

*The power of sequence*

The landing of Captain Cook at Botany Bay is a claim of truth regarding the ‘discovery’ of Australia that has caused much dissension in this country. The timeline as history pedagogy begins with 1770 and the landing of Captain Cook at Botany Bay, and ends with 1907 at the ‘Harvester Judgement’. The years 1770 to 1778 underpin a big Conversation reflected in the focus groups by statements such as ‘all the textbooks begin at 1778’, to privilege a story of discovery that, again, relies on the strength of prior knowledge as powerful instrument in shaping the historical consciousness of students (Barton & Levstik 2004). However, the dates cannot just stand alone in creating a relationship between knowledge and power.
The significance of 1770 is carried by the meanings of the other key dates denoted on the timeline associated with the settler society and whiteness: gold, education and work. Out of fourteen plotted moments on the timeline, exactly half are in regard to settlement. This may be inevitable in a timeline that is about Australia’s early beginnings; however, there is a silence of *knotting cords* unfolding in this structure.

On the timeline, the colonies of New South Wales, Queensland, Western Australia, Victoria and Van Diemen’s Land are denoted as part of the historical narrative, their significance made by an assumption of common achievement linked to the Henry Parkes Tenterfield Address (1889) and Federation (1901) at the finite end of the timeline. The sequence of text and image to construct historical content knowledge marks the absence of the Northern Territory, which not unlike other parts of Australia was settled by Indigenous people thousands of years before, but its unruly nature as a territory goes unremarked. This exclusion from the sequence of linear progress suggests that certain knowledge is valuable because of its contribution to Federation.

The image of the Christian family and their toils of labour in ‘Zealous Diggers’, mentioned earlier in this chapter, is placed in close proximity to the political cartoon of the banner that celebrates the anniversary of the eight-hour day of 1856, and gives weight to the intention of the timeline to climax at the Harvester Judgement of 1907. The importance of these events is not disputed here, but the sequence and placement contributes to a pattern of a reoccurring voice of colonial concepts of money (gold) and work (conditions) over all other statements. Remembering that there is something in the narrative construction called history which cannot be invented, says Rüsen (2005), and has to be recognised as pre-given, there is still a legitimate question about the order of systemization here. This is a systemization of traditional historical thinking and narrative which, based on the conceptual framework of the study, functions around complicity and intertextuality.

The core concepts of settlement, money, work and education as a piece of unitary knowledge serve to establish plausible continuity. The key dates on the timeline are complicit in resisting less well-known dates or achievements. Interculturality
on these terms is not interpreted on the timeline because it cannot exist in this linear narrative structure where knowledge ‘gains a sense of eternity’; or, in other words, this is the way things have always been. It is understood in terms of history theory that all ‘human life are necessarily organized by traditions’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 13) to stabilise identity; however, I argue, the timeline is ‘stuck’ in the traditional phase of historical narration and historical thinking, to the detriment of melding interculturality and history education at the intersection of curriculum and pedagogy.

Intertextuality

‘Intertextuality’ is a key tool of inquiry in discourse analysis. Images depend on the meanings and interpretations carried by the other images and text on the timeline (Rose 2001). Intertextuality here is related to the sequence of the visuals in relation to one another, and the key dates on the timeline construct a plot that is used as a methodical process of explaining a representation of the early beginnings of Australia. I use intertextuality as a tool, in conjunction with notions of historical interpretation and representation, to examine the placement of texts and their prioritization of knowledge and power as an approach to discourse analysis (Foucault 1980; Gee 2014; Rose 2001). That is, each visual and each key date is ‘fixed as a moment’ through its relation to one another, establishing a sense of totality and unitary knowledge (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002). The intertextual relationship of the written text and the visual images also relates to Foucauldian notions giving significance to statements, and demonstrates that knowledge and power are imbricated one in the other, not only because all knowledge is discursive and all discourse is saturated with power, but because the most powerful discourses, in terms of the productiveness of their social effects, depend on assumptions and claims that their knowledge is true (cited in Rose 2001, p. 138).

Therefore, knowledge and power fit together on the timeline through the capacity of intertextual sequence and the arrangement of ‘certain voices’ to silence the knotted cords (Jørgensen & Phillips 2002). The placement of the only example of frontier violence on the timeline is used in this next section as an example.
The knotted cord of frontier violence

The Myall Creek Massacre, which involved the killing of up to 30 unarmed indigenous people, is the only knotted cord included on the timeline, but is overshadowed by a large and prominent statue figure of Colonel William Light, founder of Adelaide, which as part of the sequence applauds the ‘beautiful layout’ of the city and the success of this ‘founding father’. Just below, plotted on the timeline at 1838, without emphasis, is the Myall Creek Massacre in NSW.

The Myall Creek Massacre was one of many bloody events in Australia’s history and the gravity of this event is not to be denied:

In 1838 white settlers murdered 28 Aboriginal men, women and children near Myall Creek Station. The massacre is a harrowing reminder of Australia’s colonial violence and one of the rare cases where killers were tried and hanged. (Korff 2017, p. 1)

This was one of the few occasions that white men were brought to justice in Australia’s early years of colonisation for crimes against Indigenous people; however, its inclusion as a singular entry is a contradiction that continues a story of dominance. That is, there is no counter entry to show the internecine conflict of the frontier wars in Australia’s history, or the strength of Tasmanian Indigenous people in conflicts such as the Black War (1821-1834).

The Black War is a knotted cord in Australia’s history. The statistics of the Black War are held by some historians on a par with the First and Second World Wars:

The death rate among the colonists was half that of Australians in the first world war, much higher than the death rate in the Second World War and the casualties affected almost every family in Tasmania. The death rate among the Tasmanian Aborigines was even greater. Of the 1000 Aborigines in the war zone he estimates that more than 600 were killed by the colonists (Ryan 2014)

This war was a clash between the two most culturally and technologically dissimilar humans to have ever come into contact yet it is absent on the timeline. Although a bloodied scourge in Australia’s history, if included this event would place the timeline more in the critical stage of historical thinking.

The strength of Tasmanian Indigenous people against the colonists in this war – although it decimated their numbers and ended in retreat to an island in Bass Strait
under a conspicuous exchange ‘for a fiduciary duty of care’ between the governor and Aboriginal chief Mannalargenna – is a knotted cord that does not deny historical intercultural war and politics. Such events disrupt the Discourse models of the settler society and its white tropes of a peaceful and ordered past, which on the timeline is held firmly together through the intertextual relationship between the written text and visuals and how they build significance and irrelevance.

The inclusion of the Myall Creek massacre privileges the notion of the defenceless ‘aborigine’ rather than the impact indigenous ingenuity and knowledge of the land and warfare had on the early settler society. The placement of a one-sided massacre on the timeline is powerful in resisting any access to the critical stage of historical thinking to affect change.

Curriculum and contradictions

Whether intended or not, on many levels the written and visual language of this timeline as the enacted curriculum do not fulfil the intention of the content descriptor to ‘consider and develop multiple perspectives’ or ‘include the effects of contact and represents an institutionally supported settler society’ outlined in Figure 23 below (ACARA 2010e). The contradiction lies in the fact that the timeline employs the ‘organizing grammar of race’ a trait of settler colonialism (Wolfe 2006, p. 387). On the one hand, the language of the curriculum encourages interaction and empathy with others. On the other hand, in practice, the timeline as pedagogy encodes a discourse of race by excluding anything other than ‘white’ residence in the discovery and development of land. A stark example that emphasises this is the inclusion of Colonel William Light. I argue that the choice of the statue, even the name ‘Light’, reproduces an unequal relationship through which Western historiography in school history coerces the reader. The statue reinforces settler colonialism’s intention to disavow ‘Aboriginality’ at the grass roots of symbolic representation, the school history text book, and make invisible or even eliminate the contributions of other cultures and societies (Wolfe 2006, p. 389).
Contradictions to the curriculum are also made through identifying what Abdou (2017) calls narrative templates. Narrative templates impact on students’ historical consciousness and begin in the child’s formative years (Abdou 2017, p. 6). As a narrative template, the timeline constructs an intertextual sequence of images and specific written text as historical content knowledge that transports the reader to only matters of jubilation attributed to the conquests of colonisation. In a nutshell: Blaxland stands jubilant on a rock ledge of the Blue Mountains throwing his hat to the wind like a salute to his and his countrymen’s achievements; Colonel William Light stands tall directing the public discourse of South Australia, described as ‘the surveyor responsible for the beautiful layout of Adelaide’ – a jubilant case. The background of the ‘Zealous Diggers’ painting is light and positive, indicative of the joys of hard work and the jubilation of Christian Judaist narratives; the political cartoon ‘8 Hour Jubilee’ (Figure 29 below) speaks for itself in praise of the accomplishment of the workers who belong to the nation. I will stay with this cartoon and its curious inclusion on the timeline for a further moment to glean another example of what Foucault (1972) emphasised as statements that enter the discourse of the timeline above all others.
Figure 29 Banner to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the achievement of the eight-hour working day, Oxford Big Ideas History 9 textbook, p.161.

The political cartoon is larger than any other image on the timeline and denotes and celebrates the 50th anniversary of the eight-hour day in 1856 by the workers. This banner, which celebrates an achievement in Australia’s history of ‘work’, a historical event in Australia’s history was produced in the early years of the twentieth century. There is no denying that the eight-hour work day ‘was the first of a long, hard-fought series of victories that led to Australia having one of the most progressive labour environments in the world by the early twentieth century’, and the cartoon is an example of a series of banners produced in recognition of such battles won on behalf of the workers in the mid- to late nineteenth century. The banner contains ‘a number of wishes for conventional kinds of success’ (Rose 2001, p. 126); liberty and female representation, the coming together of all classes, the colonial victory of the exploited white workers, the affluence of the working society and the celebration of work at the core of the federated nation. As historical content knowledge imparted, the banner is about the West as a place which is ‘associated with a homogenous history and as a continuous sequence of time’ (Al-Azmeh 2002, p. 58). Here are the colonists who signify ‘nationhood’ in the Overview discussed earlier in this chapter. Strong emphasis is placed on both men and women in the banner representing various walks of life and classes from the ‘white’ element of the settler society. In the boat

http://www.nma.gov.au/online_features/defining_moments/featured/eight-hour_day
these characters are distinctive of a category of ‘the collective subjects’, with which I began this textual analysis.

Part 2 – An intercultural reading of the ‘timeline’ produced for the Victorian curriculum

When the VC was launched in 2016, the timeline of the *Oxford Big Ideas History 9* was rewritten to align with the curriculum. Therefore, the timeline was reproduced in the new version of the textbook. In contrast to the previous version analysed in Part 1, the timeline, now called ‘Australia (1750 – 1918): a timeline’ pictured in Figure 30 below (see page 101 of this thesis for enlarged version), begins earlier at 1750, and ends later to include the start of World War 1 in 1914. Similar to the previous version, the timeline, printed across an A3 page, is more spacious due to two significant changes: the omission of the subtitle ‘Making a nation’ and the two paragraphs which I called the Overview. The logic that positions these changes is considered and discussed in this second part of the textual analysis.

Figure 30 Timeline, *Oxford Big Ideas History 9*, Victorian Curriculum 2016, p.94-95.
**Why an intercultural reading?**

I have already made clear that the principles of how I have deployed crystallisation as a methodological device to support this study and the need for these data to be experienced in different ways and from different angles (Ellingson 2009). Therefore, this part of the textual analysis engages with the data through the uniqueness of Western historiography as a means of exploring how interculturality is interpreted on the timeline as history pedagogy at the secondary school level. This intercultural reading of the timeline is informed by the Derridean distinction – only graspable in writing – made in Chapter 2 between interculturality and *interculturality*, and is framed by the uniqueness of Western historical thinking and its historiography to examine how *difference* is represented or reasoned from a particular angle of historical thinking. In doing so, I recognise that interculturality as a perspective, like any other theory, demands ‘assimilation to its own point of view’ (Aman 2015, p. 4); however, in the writing of *interculturality*, to function as an educational strategy the concept as perspective is little used as a theoretical measure of historical thinking.

**The timeline as historiography**

In this section, the timeline is defined as historiography and therefore as a ‘specific form of manifesting historical consciousness’, characterised by its ‘presentation of the past in the form of a chronological order of events which are presented as factual, that is with special quality of experience’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 119). The challenge for Western historiography is the capacity to look beyond what we do in a Western context.

This raises an epistemological struggle that has conceptual and methodological implications for the humanities. The researcher has to imagine the timeline being read in another culture, and acknowledge that the text was created within a culture that has pre-given knowledge and exists in the context of its authors. This pre-given knowledge of what historiography is functions as a norm and a hidden parameter and is about *non-awareness*. If the reading of the text is underpinned by such ‘non-awareness’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 110) of the historiography, then the use of ‘a single case for historical thinking has an unreflected status’ (p. 110) and what is real or valid can only be found in one’s own pre-given paradigm, from which
other modes of historiography get their meaning and significance. In other words, an intercultural reading of the timeline needs projections of alternatives into other cultures in order to criticise the dominant culture’s point of view. It should offer a set of points of view which render difference visible (p. 112). Otherwise, we fall deeper into romantic notions of the past or irrationality. As Al-Azmeh describes it, ‘there are layers of culture in all societies, and Westerners are as irrational in the conception of history as any others’ (Al-Azmeh 2002, p. 64).

An Intercultural Reading of the timeline: The gaze of Western historiography

It will be a great day when all our children know the story of our indigenous history, as well as they know the story of Captain Cook and white settlement in Australia. (Sinclair 2015, p. 1)

Nothing would contribute more to pursuing an intercultural history at the secondary school level than a deliberate focus on Australian people rather than territory, and ‘interactions rather than bodies of power’ (Atkinson 2017, p. 13). Unlike New Zealand, the experience of Australia’s early beginnings is not a story of two ‘long-distance immigrants’ (Atkinson 2017, p.13). Cultural relationships in the early nineteenth century between, for example, First Nation people and Europeans, or Chinese and Indonesians and First Nation people, were ‘neither random nor universal’ (Fitzpatrick 2017, p. 1) but selective and strategic (Irish 2017). However, the stark maps of linear time found on this version of the timeline are striking, and sustain an established discourse that becomes the norm in its construction of a dominant and accepted narrative.

The gaze of Western historiography does not roam far from the traditional historical narratives on this timeline produced for the VC textbook. The familiar landscape is committed to driving identity based on the notion of linear progress and development, something that Peter Burke discusses as ‘so important’ to Western historical thinking (Burke 2002). Further, comparison as a tool of historiography ‘has its roots in the age-old attempt to bring order into the diversity of phenomena’ (Müller 2002, p. 33) and is based on ethnocentrism, where traditional societies have an intact identity and unified concept of the world. By the exclusion of any less familiar or new narratives on the timeline, a comparison to the ‘other’ is silently accomplished, preventing an inter-relationship of cultures
and their histories that could enable people to celebrate difference and diversity. Further, reasoning only comes from one angle of historical thinking on the timeline. There is no cultural power of recognition and acknowledgement; rather its characteristics are embedded in that cultural logic, already mentioned, of deep-rooted ethnocentrism (Rüsen 2005).

Following Ken Barger’s definition that ‘ethnic’ refers to cultural heritage and ‘centrism’ refers to the central starting point – so ‘ethnocentrism’ basically refers to judging other groups from our own cultural point of view – I concur with his comment, ‘it is impossible not to be ethnocentric’ (Barger 2018, p. 2). This is recognised too by Rozbicki in his comments that ‘all people, including scholars, have and always will continue to harbour prejudgements rooted in their own experiences’ (Rozbicki 2015, p. 14). The problem is our limited understanding of ethnocentrism to give license to distort what is ‘meaningful and functional to other peoples through our own tinted glasses’ (Barger 2018, p. 3). Further, it is the deeper underlying issues of ethnocentrism that give cause for concern in terms of history pedagogy and prevent deviation from accepted and normative standards.

Through an intercultural lens, the timeline is an example of how ethnocentrism appears because ‘we don’t understand that we don’t understand’ the assumptions made about ‘other’, and echoes of Gorski’s article ‘Good intentions are not enough’ reverberate (Barger 2018; Gorski 2008). For example, the ethnocentric concept of historical identity on the timeline is identified by its ‘unspoken’ distinction ‘between civilization and barbarism’ (Rüsen 2004c, p. 119). This tendency is powerful in teaching history to perpetuate its Western themes and, if viewed from outside the Western context, is an expected linear progress of a society built on the powerful and the privileged, the ‘normal rather than the deviant’, where the ‘others’ are forgotten (Galtung 2005, p. 87).

Moving outward from ethnocentrism, an intercultural reading recognises borders that separate sameness from difference, which are sustained in an:

Irrefutable pedagogy of that nation that imbues the identity of its population with cultural signifiers such as shared history, common language and collective values, with the objective of authenticating the inside as a national space against the outside (Aman 2015, p. 150; Bhabha 1994).
Notably, this position also emerges from the analysis of the focus groups and is ever present in the timeline (Bhattacharya 2009)\textsuperscript{10}. Pedagogy becomes both a poison and an antidote when it creates cultural signifiers, but at the same time negates any internal diversity (Aman 2015; Hughes 2009). In other words, the timeline unifies a national narrative because it assumes a shared understanding of familiar cultural signifiers, for example key people (Captain James Cook), key dates (1770), key events (the major colonial settlements), and key places of recognition (the Victorian goldfields); however, it negates internal diversity because of its choice to construct meaning through an apex of vertical dimension in social formulation (Galtung 2005). That is, white men rather than Indigenous, Chinese or any other men, women or marginal group, as the achievers and the cause for civilisation through white settlement are privileged, the attribution of education to white settlement, and the civilised notion of work represented through the eight-hour day give little or no individual agency to any other achievements. Again, this argument is not to advocate a dichotomy of right and wrong, because the inclusion of all of the above points is valuable. However, through an intercultural lens, there is little access for \textit{interculturality} as an educational strategy to be enacted, even though it is heavily emphasised in the VC. On the contrary, the timeline fills the difference between the unified concepts of nation and ‘others’, with positive and negative values enacting what Rüsen (2004c) remarks is a ‘mutual devaluation of intercultural relationships’ (p. 120). So, although there are changes to the timeline, an intercultural reading highlights a formidable resistance to the \textit{critical and transformative} stages of historical thinking remains.

\textit{Interpreting changes}

The most notable change from the first version to the second version of the timeline is the omission of what I called the Overview and the subtitle, ‘Making a nation’. The Overview was discussed in light of a more critical discourse analysis; for example, the use of pronouns as collective agency such as ‘they’ determined identity through group membership, and although it attracts both positive and negative values there is only the visibility of only one homogenous group. There

\textsuperscript{10} See discussion on page 111 of this thesis and comments made by Jen from Group 3.
is a rhythm at work in the first version of the timeline and its use of the pronouns and their verbs (‘they shared’ and ‘they also had’) to create a particular visibility. I use two key questions to explore the changes made to the second version of the timeline under the auspice of linguistic mechanisms: So what if the politics of pronouns is removed? How does this shift the interpretation of interculturality on the timeline?

Whether a conscious decision or not, the omission of the Overview and its power of familiarity represented in the subtitle ‘Making a nation’ from the second version of the timeline, to some extent, relieves the writing of privilege accorded to the settler society and its whiteness from the timeline. As history pedagogy and the distribution of historical content knowledge the change is evidence that specialised knowledge is not always fixed but in constant development and open to critique (Young 2013). However, this is perhaps a little too optimistic. Even though the collective agency of pronouns is removed from this version, unless the complexities of interculturality are harnessed through an awareness of the diachronic construction of the specificity of Western historical thinking and theoretically underpinned for school history, then history pedagogy will struggle to be transformative and sustained as an educational strategy. According to Rüsen (2005), the most important parameter of diachronic comparison is the direction of change. I suggest that the second version of the timeline lacks such direction in asking: Does the removal of a paragraph ‘loaded with Western supremacy’ based on the historical discourse of pronouns develop tendencies of change? (Rüsen 2005, p. 122).

I revisit Gee’s notion of ‘situated meanings’ as a thinking device to address this question. The pronoun ‘they’ referred directly to the colonists and created a ‘situated meaning’ that allows the researcher to ask questions about the Discourse model constructed. It is reasonable for the reader to attribute progress and achievement to ‘they’, and to suggest that there is no other Discourse uttered or written (Gee 2014, p. 91). So, with the Overview gone, one would think that the ‘situated meaning’, which in this case disprivileges the various cultures that contributed to Australia’s development, may expand. Instead, in this version of the timeline, the set of dimensions to describe Australia’s early beginnings are reduced. The politics of pronouns may have been removed and with it any rich
epistemological discourse ‘reduced to a meagre trickle’ (Galtung 2005, p. 87); but the logic for removing the paragraph, ‘loaded with Western supremacy’, or any theoretical underpinning are not apparent. The Overview is not replaced with any contemplation of otherness or how it is defined or engaged with in Australia’s history. Presented as ‘specialised knowledge’, the timeline bears a responsibility as the enacted curriculum for which it is prescribed, and therefore a responsibility to recognise what Young says is the ‘learner’s entitlement to knowledge’ (Young 2013, p. 101), which involves more than one singular culture (Aman 2015).

Viewed through the uniqueness of the Western context this specific angle of historical thinking has ‘immense duration and long-term power’ (Rüsen 2002, p. 9) in which the construction language has temporal depth to present a distinct notion of time.

**Western specificity of time**

Time belongs to everyone, and as Galtung points out, ‘history has to move fast in the West’ (Galtung 2005, p. 95). Linearity is a basic theme in Western historiography and its thinking that breeds a sense of irreversibility. The notion or theme of time in Western historical thinking is also linked to justice, and has ‘traditionally been dominated by the idea of the past as absent or distant’ (Bevernage 2008, p. 149) and with that irreversible. To quote Bevernage further:

> History’s ability to contribute to the quest for justice, as a result [of historians who plead against history in favour of an ethics aimed at the present] often seems very restricted or even non-existent (p. 149).

This timeline depends on the notion of linear time where the recognition of past injustice (official or informal) will never mean the same as the recognition of present injustice (Bevernage 2008, cited in Cavanagh 2012). The introduction of interculturality within school historiography can potentially alter this relationship between history and justice through the notion of time.

Within the structure of linear progress, the timeline captures a drama from beginning to end, unfolding it as it was enacted between 1750 and 1914 and creating an absence of *in-between* (Aman 2015; Galtung 2005). Under this intention of familiar and identifiable points, an approach to linear progress that
abides within the parameters of the *traditional* narrative excludes access to any other concept of time, such as that of Indigenous people who:

> Do not perceive time as an exclusively linear category (i.e. past-present-future). [The indigenous perspective] place[s] events in a ‘circular’ pattern of time according to which an individual is in the centre of ‘time-circles’ and events are placed in time according to their relative importance for the individual and his or her respective community (Janca & Bullen 2003, p. 40).

Again, it is not the campaign of this thesis to ‘throw out’ the notion of linear progress; of course it exists in other non-Western contexts. However, as the only representation of time and its actors on the timeline, ‘absence supplies its own underlying meaning’ (Aman 2015, p. 158). The structure of the timeline as a Discourse model understood through linear progress and its development speaks most loudly through its exclusion from presence (Derrida 1998a). At the very least, *interculturality* as an educational strategy suggests inclusion or shared space between ‘global Westerners and local others’\(^\text{11}\) when using the timeline as a pedagogical tool (Aman 2015).

To conclude, the plot that structures historical narratives in history education today is still how (European) nation-states formed and developed, even though postmodern thought has challenged the notion of a *history* and replaced it with the idea of many narratives (Nordgren & Johansson 2015). Evidently, this timeline reproduced for the VC clings to what Iggers (2002) described as a nineteenth-century historiography, dedicated to a formidable construction of the nation-state through a grand narrative that over time ‘endowed the Western world with identity and set it sharply apart from other cultures’ (p. 102). The writing of *interculturality* as an educational strategy into history pedagogies like the timeline is cognizant of the discourses of historical narration as a measure of historical thinking; in other words, it is a theoretical intersection to bring time and its historical identities and contexts into the present for history students. As a way forward, breaking free from simplistic chronology only informed by the Western context and its unique historiography may need to be an *ethical* mandate from which to construct and teach *intercultural* history in schools.

\(^{11}\) I have borrowed this phrase from Aman because of its succinctness and suitability in describing the space in between.
The written and visual language of both timelines as the enacted curriculum constructs discourses of the settler society and whiteness which are averse to the discourse of the curriculum and therefore lack interpretation and understanding of the concept of interculturality and therefore intercultural as an educational strategy. It could be argued that history teachers will ‘fill in this gap’ to ensure a diversity of discourse when denoting Australia’s early beginnings, and this was tested in the analysis of the transcripts from my focus groups discussed in Chapter 4. However, the textual analysis finds that the timelines do not reflect the goals or interests of the mandated implementation of the general capability of ICU for both the AC and VC (Nordgren 2017, p. 664). As a prescribed text for both curricula, the timeline as history pedagogy signals traditional epistemological boundaries for history education; furthermore, the selection of historical content knowledge, in both written and visual language, falls short of the ‘the intersection between history as a subject and intercultural education’ (Nordgren 2017, p. 664).

Teachers may decide to present a single story as the best history we have available, perhaps because, as Parkes notes elsewhere, this is the way they encounter history from historians (Parkes 2009; Seixas 1999). Seixas captured the world of history pedagogy ten years earlier to demonstrate how the ‘name and date’ pedagogy reflected in the use of this timeline manifests a conservative political approach to controlling public memory, and limits the development of more sophisticated forms of historical consciousness (Parkes 2009). I agree with Parkes here and conclude that this textual analysis and its lens of discourse analysis evidences little chance for the ascription of historical content knowledge that looks beyond the single story.
Chapter 6: Conclusions

Chapter synopsis

The intercultural process emerges in its full beauty as a vital dynamic of human history when scholarship takes a long-term perspective (Rozbicki 2015, p. 4).

The opening quotation reflects two key premises of this thesis. Firstly, the concept of interculturality has always been part of human history, and as an educational strategy in history education it requires a long-term perspective. Secondly, the study shows that at the secondary school history level, textbooks and teachers are often constrained by conventionalised historical thinking and a lack of theoretical underpinning to enact the concept of interculturality as integral to history pedagogy.

This chapter sets out the key findings of the data generated through the focus groups and textual analysis and makes its detailed conclusions with respect to the overarching question of the study: What is the contemporary relationship between interculturality and secondary school history education?

The study reveals that the contemporary relationship between the concept of interculturality and history education requires a sound theoretical underpinning that scaffolds interculturality as an educational strategy for history education. Further, the study reflects a permeating theme that interculturality does not come naturally to people generally (Rozbicki 2015), but even less naturally to the enacted History curriculum. Therefore, I draw a strong conclusion that to successfully chart the characteristics of interculturality for history teaching and learning there needs to be a ‘sound interpretive scaffolding’ (Rozbicki 2015, p. 5) that reveals the complex nature of this phenomenon and what it looks like for history teaching and learning.

This concluding chapter has three sections: the specific findings, the interpretive findings and the conceptual findings. The first section provides an overview of the specific findings of the study and discussion. Then, the interpretive findings are presented as a constructed practical scenario using a fictional Year 9 history teacher to explicate the inductive nature of this study to create a new theory. The
third section demonstrates how this study and its theses complement and contribute to the body of knowledge originally canvassed from the fields of intercultural education, history education and curriculum and pedagogy. This conceptual conclusion then makes recommendations for further research.

**Specific findings of the study**

The presentation of these specific findings is foreshadowed by the changes in the world since the beginning of the twenty-first century that have forced a fierce debate in regard to what should be taught in history at the secondary school level in Australia. This debate resulted in the creation of a History curriculum, at both the national and state level (and specifically in the state of Victoria for this study), which reflects a commitment to teaching a ‘world history’ and therefore, inevitably, its intercultural complexities. The study provides evidence of a limited understanding of the concept of interculturality by teachers for their teaching of history and an absence of interculturality on the timeline featured in the most commonly used text book in Victorian secondary schools.

**List of specific findings of the focus groups with teachers**

*Key findings*

- Overall, although the concept of interculturality was unfamiliar to teachers, however most see the concept in a positive way.
- There is a willingness by the teachers to interpret the concept of interculturality as part of the enacted curriculum.
- Teachers are generally aware of a shift in the curriculum to approach the teaching of historical content knowledge from different angles.
- The concept of interculturality encourages a greater use of perspective and empathy in the teachers’ consideration of history teaching and learning.
- Teachers engage readily in the discussion because they see the concept of interculturality will inevitably impact on their teaching of history.
- For some teachers the concept of interculturality offered a way to ‘other’ in history teaching.
• The concept of interculturality sparked teachers’ awareness of the critical and transformative stages of historical thinking.

• The focus groups supported the notion that the melding of interculturality and history education intersects at curriculum and pedagogy.

**Key Challenges**

• Teachers are apprehensive and reluctant to articulate the word ‘interculturality’.

• Teachers replace the word ‘interculturality’ with the word ‘perspective’ overall and generally show a limited understanding of the complexity of the concept for history teaching and learning.

• The concept of interculturality for teachers reflects a misunderstanding or lack of understanding of ethnocentrism.

• Some teachers feel obligated to ‘ancient treaties’ anchored in positivist views that have shaped history teaching in Australia.

• Overall, teachers work in the traditional and exemplary stages of historical thinking for the delivery of historical content knowledge (see above for the counter point to this under key findings).

• There is currently no professional development or guidance for teachers’ theoretical understanding of what the concept of interculturality means in terms of history teaching and learning.

• The general capability of ICU is not consciously addressed at this point in history classrooms.

**Specific findings drawn from the textual analysis of historical timeline**

• The timeline reveals the absence of interculturality which results in:
  - The prevalence of ‘whiteness’ in historical content knowledge
  - A lack of representation of marginalised voices and therefore a significant creation of ‘other’.
  - Inclusion and exclusion of specific historical content knowledge which continues the perpetuation of a dominant discourse.
• The timeline reflects a discourse of settler society that suggests order and success and therefore perpetuates a conservative, Christian-Judaist trope of Australia’s early beginnings.

• *Difference* is absent on the timeline. As a result, the notion of *diversity* is made absent by the narrative of colonial acquisition of success.

• The timeline does not reflect the general capability of ICU mandated in the AC and the VC.

• The timeline affords the power of Western specificity and its historiography as its primary function.

• The notion of linear progress does not give access to the concept of interculturality for history teaching and learning.

• The timeline as a history pedagogy in this instance hinders the melding of the constructs of interculturality and history education to intersect at curriculum and pedagogy.

• The timeline does not enact the critical or transformative stages of historical thinking.

**Discussion of the specific findings**

Key literatures support this study’s position that it is essential for teachers to ‘be’ and ‘become’ intercultural. There are intellectual demands associated with this position because of the nature and complexity of the fractured significance of interculturality for history teaching and learning. At present, the History curriculum in both the AC and VC mandate the inclusion, monitoring, and (quite soon) assessment of ICU; however, the specific findings of this study show that in this case implemented curriculum policy lacks consideration for a theoretical framing to mobilise interculturality as part of the enacted curriculum. To reiterate, unless the complexities of interculturality are harnessed through an awareness of the diachronic construction of the specificity of Western historical thinking (which cannot be tracked down in any clear cut manner; Rüsen 2005), history pedagogy cannot be transformative. Unless there is new theory to inform history teaching and learning for the *enacted* curriculum in history classrooms and textbooks, the elements of cultural essentialism cannot be disrupted: as one
participant of the focus groups asked, ‘How daring can we be with interculturality in our own classroom? That’s a big question.’

This question taken from the transcript of Focus Group 4 defends the finding that teachers are prepared to take on the concept of interculturality as a mandate of the AC and VC. However, the data provide evidence that for most teachers conceptualising interculturality for their history teaching is an unfamiliar and disruptive tension in their intellectual work. The teachers determined interculturality as demanding an emphasis on multiple perspectives and empathy in their teaching, however there is little professional guidance to assist progress in this endeavour:

Even to fully understand the term of interculturality, or even say it, you still need the guidance to understand it. And to also then once you do have an idea of a definition of it, then to see how it is actually affecting your classroom, because if affects it on all of those levels of the planning for what we’ve got to do throughout the year to ensure that not only we’re including it in the course, but we’re also doing everything else that we need to do.

Dan’s comment reflects the impact teachers feel the concept of interculturality will have on their history teaching. Further, the direction in Victoria to assess ICU is not unnoticed by teachers and this is creating some angst:

And it can be assessed, and then how do you assess it, I mean do you assess somebody’s ability to understand through a different perspective, so to be able to tell you that the different perspective in one source for instance, or to see how it might have been, how it might have been viewed by the different perspectives of the time, of the period, things like that. So I would love to have some more PD on the idea.

Notwithstanding the tensions and unfamiliarity revealed in the transcripts related to how individuals understand and interpret interculturality, the specific findings point out that overall the teachers are willing to engage with the highly complex process of recognising interculturality as an educational strategy, to be systemic in the discipline of history and its teaching.

The data provide evidence that teachers’ conceptualisation of interculturality elicited a general interpretation and understanding that revolves around perspective, empathy and inclusion. The data also demonstrate that most teachers
are not confident in their use of the word ‘interculturality’, but realise the challenges and impact of interculturality for the teaching of history.

By contrast, the findings of the textual analysis are less optimistic. There is an obvious ‘lag’ between the teachers’ capacity to conceptualise interculturality and the interpretation of the concept in the written and visual language of the timeline data. This is due to a dominant narrative driven by the discourse of Western historiography and specificities of traditional historical thinking which drive both versions of the timeline, even though they were produced four years apart. This raises the question of the domain of the textbook genre, which includes the authors who script and the publishers who endorse particular worldviews.

The next section is called ‘interpretive findings’ to reflect the inductive nature of the study to create new theory. In this section the key findings of both the focus groups and the textual analysis are brought together through the presentation of a new theory for teaching intercultural history as an educational strategy. The theoretical model presented is intended as a new theory that mobilises a methodological means in history education to bring the concept of interculturality into the work of teachers and history textbooks, enabling them to be cognizant of a complex and political culture of recognition (Rüsen 2004c).

**Interpretive findings**

This section is a creative and interpretive representation of the key findings of the study. It is a constructed scenario that gives insight into the findings of this study and its overarching narrative. The data from both analyses has been embedded in the scenario to illustrate and address the real theoretical struggle hindering the capacity for history education to incorporate interculturality as an educational strategy in a meaningful way. My approach to this section is about the researcher adapting to the context of educational research within which she works, but also the complex environment of curriculum and pedagogy and the key actors this involves – the teachers.

The constructed scenario is a practice example of where the constructs of interculturality and history education intersect with curriculum and pedagogy. In
doing so, it introduces Lucinda, a fictional teacher with fifteen years’ experience teaching middle school history, working with a planning team in preparation for Year 9 history. Firstly, the scenario shows the challenges facing teachers and texts regarding the interpretation and understanding of interculturality that emerged from the data, and secondly introduces and explains a new theory for addressing these challenges.

*A constructed scenario*

Lucinda is a fictional Year 9 history teacher. Together with her Year 9 planning team Lucinda is using the AC and the option to teach the popular elective ‘Making a nation’ and the key content descriptor expanded here:

![Figure 31 ‘Making a nation’ content descriptor and ICU descriptor expanded (ACARA 2010e)](image)

At Lucinda’s school, the Year 9 history teachers and their students use the *Oxford Big Idea History 9* textbook written for the AC. Based on decisions made by the team, Lucinda aims to begin her teaching of the elective ‘Making a nation’ through the use of the chronological ‘timeline’ in the textbook (see page 98 of this thesis); however, she is grappling with how to approach the historical content knowledge shared on the timeline and enact the general capability of ICU. The ICU symbol is highlighted as imperative to this specific content descriptor, so there is an understanding that there needs to be a less restricted framework that ‘bypasses conditional binaries’ of dualisms set by the specificities of Western historical thinking (Human & Cilliers 2013). However, there is little guidance to assist Lucinda with how the concept of interculturality and the associated general capability of ICU should be incorporated or interpreted for this specific
For history teachers, like Lucinda, the theoretical weakness behind the implementation of ICU for history teaching and learning is real. Based on this study’s analyses, the interpretation of the concept of interculturality is limited and the term on the whole unfamiliar to teachers. Further, the interpretation and understanding of interculturality for history teaching and learning is not supported by any professional development or grounded in any literatures in the field of intercultural education.

The key problem as revealed in this study is a lack of theoretical understanding that interculturality as an educational strategy for history teaching and learning cannot exist in isolation. It is important for history teachers to have an understanding of where interculturality as a concept can exist in history theory before it can be enacted as part of history pedagogy.

The theory set out in Figure 32 below endeavours to assist history teachers like Lucinda and her planning team in two ways: the blending of the constructs of interculturality and history education to address the mandated general capability of ICU, and the delivery of specific historical content knowledge and development of students’ historical thinking to be intercultural.
My new theory, shown in the diagram above, developed from the conceptual framework of this study illustrates the theoretical underpinning to support interculturality as an educational strategy for history teaching and learning. This theoretical model comprises elements of Rüsen’s (2004a) typologies of historical narration and historical consciousness, and builds on the interrelated nature of historical thinking and discourses examined in this study. The theoretical model is part of this thesis’ aim to apply the knowledge acquired through the literatures and the data to affect history pedagogy in theory and practice.
**Applying the theory for teaching intercultural history in practice: new knowledge**

Initially, in the crystal pane labelled *Critical*, Lucinda can see that the concept of interculturality is enacted in the critical stage of historical thinking, where the sharing and negotiation of historical content knowledge includes judgement and resistance to patterns of rules and virtues passed down in the *Exemplary* pane. This critical space grounds the historical content knowledge of the curriculum within a critical narrative, which for Lucinda and her colleagues identifies a place for multiple perspectives to legitimately challenge the silences created in the *exemplary* stage of the model. This is the space where stories of the past are judged by the experience of time.

When Lucinda considers her own secondary school experience of the same historical content knowledge included on the timeline in the textbook, which begins at 1770, she comments, ‘so my history experience was the Captain Cook story and the idea of heroes and conquerors, and the noble savage and that sort of aspect’. On the other hand, as a practitioner she is reminded that the curriculum requires her to look beyond the stereotypes and be equipped to refute stories that have been handed down over time as a matter of cultural understanding and identity.

The theoretical model demonstrates that the *critical* stage of historical thinking cannot operate in isolation. The nature of history orients the teacher and the students in time and gives them a compass for the present. The thinner lines and intersecting dot points on the model represent how the stages are interconnected and how each has its role to play in enacting *interculturality* as an educational strategy.

Therefore, in the bottom left hand pane of the crystal, labelled the *Traditional* stage, Lucinda can acknowledge and identify the presence of tradition as a means of people finding their way through history; for example, the familiarity of 1770 used on the timeline to denote Australia’s beginnings of making a nation. Noted by colour and symbol, the value of the traditional stage cannot be denied and must be seen as a stage that walks students through a historical memory that has contributed to the construction of identity. However, at the same time it is and
must be recognised for its resistance to alterity. When Lucinda recalls a conversation with one of her colleagues and a comment made about traditional narratives (‘this narrative or this story, is the easy experience of these groups of people’) she understands that the traditional stage constructs permanence where ‘time gains a sense of eternity’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 12). These stories as historical content knowledge have and will always remain essential to historical thinking and the development of historical consciousness. At the same time, they must be theoretically understood for their monuments and legitimation of rulers and their dominance.

The interconnecting thin lines further indicate to the history teacher the essential awareness that the concept of interculturality can be enacted when there is recognition of the traditional stage and its stories.

The pane labelled *Exemplary* stage of the model establishes history as the teacher of life, and sets out the rules and principles constituted within its historical narratives. This stage gives Lucinda and her colleagues’ insight into ‘virtues and vices’ set as examination of the past. There is more room to move in this stage because it goes beyond the *traditional* one, and ‘time gains the sense of spatial extension’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 12). For example, the traditional narrative on the timeline being used by the Year 9 teachers is located in Captain Cook’s landing at Botany Bay in 1770, and the plotting of the settlement of each colony in Australia. This knowledge is made significant because it is associated with a discourse that tells a story passed down about the origin of the genealogy of rulers and their conquests. In the *exemplary* stage, the teachers are given access to how the timeline constructs the rules of conduct that are associated with these stories, and their students can begin to ask *whose* story is made exemplary. For example, in the case of this specific timeline, the story of the settlers is made exemplary and the stories from any other contributors are absent. Therefore, the *exemplary* stage brings the notion of listening to the voices that we cannot hear on the timeline into the focus of the history teacher.

In this theoretical model *interculturality* is mobilised by a further stage, without which the negation of a story or pattern in history in the *critical* stage is just replaced by another (Rüsen 2004a). The *critical* stage cannot affect change in
history pedagogy alone. This happens in the transformative stage, where the concept of interculturality becomes part of the enacted curriculum and then develops as an integral part of an educational strategy.

The pane labelled Transformative stage is where change becomes a decisive argument. It is this element of the theoretical model that requires the history teacher and students to adjust accordingly to what is revealed through the critical stage. In this stage, they must recognise the capacity for stories to change and give direction to the ‘temporal change of humans’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 15) and therefore the world. For example, if what has been found and established through the other three dimensions of the model is enacted in the transformative phase, the historical experience becomes more dialectic rather than finite, or a ‘dead end’. Hence, the ICU content descriptor that began the planning exercise for Lucinda and her colleagues, such as ‘explore and compare cultural knowledge’, can be enacted when critical understanding of the traditional and exemplary stories has taken place. Then, with theoretical underpinning, what is made visible on the timeline or what is hidden in plain view through the construction of the written and visual language begins to give access to difference and diversity within time.

Each of the stages of the theoretical model defines a particular condition of historical thinking for the history teacher. However, awareness that all are connected is essential; none can exist without the other in order for ‘human life to find its way in the course of time’ (Rüsen 2005, p. 25) and to be intercultural.

Finally, the interconnected panes of the crystal follow a sense of time that is other than the linear progress of time in Western historiography, and this alerts Lucinda and her colleagues to anticipate a different presentation of historical content knowledge. The timeline presented as history pedagogy in the textbook supports the expectation of linear progress and its development as a basic theme of the irreversibility of finite time; there is a beginning, an identifiable point of origin where the process of progress can be said to have started, and a definite point of arrival where the timeline ends (Galtung 2005). Conversely, the lattice of the crystal makes visible the layers of time.

The crystal image shifts the expectation of linearity to allow the history teacher to at least consider and be more aware of the anticipation of time incorporated in the
concept of ‘chronology’ represented in the curriculum. Interculturality can only exist beyond the constraints of the Western determination of time.

By underpinning her delivery and teaching of the historical content knowledge outlined in the curriculum and the timeline using this theoretical model, Lucinda can access stories, historical patterns and themes that may have been previously invisible or simply not considered. For example, the violent encounters exchanged between European settlers and Indigenous people, known as the Frontier Wars, are saved from oblivion if taught with support and awareness of the critical stage of the model. These knotted cords in Australia’s history can be brought into the equation of historical thinking if students are made aware of the dominant and traditional stories passed down as exemplary and as a result accepted as normative. This depth of understanding suggests that interculturality should not always be perceived as positive under historical conditions; rather, the fact that it is seen, whether positive or negative, is part of transforming the dominant story.

Understandably, the transformative stage makes Lucinda and her colleagues a little nervous: ‘I think we are sometimes nervous to speak about things, a bit, and that is a problem. I do feel sometimes nervous about speaking about indigenous issues for example’. This apprehension is fuelled further when interculturality is addressed in isolation because feelings and beliefs are being disrupted by a force of change that is not theoretically underpinned. However, under the reciprocal dimensions of this model, the transformative stage is part of a dynamic progression of change. Investigating culture and cultural identity does not threaten a loss of identity, but rather advocates the gaining of diverse identities and their stories. Consciously or not, the transformative stage brings Lucinda to allude to historical consciousness from within a postmodern orientation to history when she says: ‘history definitely has a job in trying to make sense of our more recent history’.
By working through the phases of the theoretical model history teachers are able to ground their understanding and conceptualising of interculturality within the interrelated stages of historical thinking. The model insists that for interculturality as an educational strategy to exist and be sustained within the teaching and learning of history at the secondary school level, it must be transformative. Interculturality is a concept that when enacted will disrupt traditional narratives built on epochs of victors and their conquests. However, it cannot be effective without these traditions. Likewise, if the critical stage is simply used to critique stories from the past, then the long-standing rules and principles that structure the historical memory and historical consciousness are not interrogated, and the silences remain. The model invokes the ‘inter’ in interculturality as key to it being an educational strategy, and an integral contribution to teachers’ intellectual work (Salter & Maxwell 2018). When pedagogical tools like the timeline are deemed and prescribed as best practice, then in order for historical thinking to become intercultural it must be underpinned by theory for the sake of society being intercultural.

Conceptual findings: contribution to new knowledge

When I embarked on this project I was a history teacher, not an educational researcher. I had to emancipate myself from the school teacher identity and undertake an intrepid journey into qualitative research. I began with a broad question about interculturality when it was first implemented as part of the new national History curriculum in 2012 in Australia, because I had no theoretical understanding of how to interpret or understand its impact and implications for history teaching and learning. There was no crystal ball to give insight into the weight that would be given to the general capability of ICU by 2016 with the launching of the Victorian curriculum; however, the evolution of its specific emphasis and recognition over a period of three years only added to the warrant for my research.
Without doubt, at the coal face of teaching history at the secondary school level, theory and history can often be perceived as mutually exclusive entities, particularly if historical content knowledge is situated in ‘traditional discourses of history’ (Villaverde, Helyar & Kincheloe 2006, p. 2). However, my wondering about the concept of interculturality led to an understanding that however history is understood, the melding of interculturality and history education demands research into the articulation of the theoretical underpinnings that inform the discourse, interpretation and writing of history (Villaverde, Helyar & Kincheloe 2006, p. 2).

I wondered about the language used in history textbooks and by teachers to deliver historical content knowledge, and about a perceived blind acceptance of a dominant narrative and its actors. Eventually my wondering was defined as the initial steps of crystallisation methodology and this opened the door to a flexible research design that could account for the distance between traditional modes of history teaching and the imposing breadth of the field of intercultural education as a means of answering the research questions.

*A methodological contribution to knowledge*

‘Without denying the existence of different interpretations and understandings of interculturality’ (Coulby 2006, p. 5) a common problem for *interculturality* as an educational strategy in history education in Australia is that it suffers from ‘theoretical weakness’ (Aman 2015). The body of doctrine which this study follows show that it is essential for history teachers to be intercultural; ‘a necessity of today for the sake of tomorrow’ (Aman 2015, p. 7). This body of doctrine is furthered by this study because it is cognisant of the nature and complexity of the concept of interculturality, as well as the intellectual demands required of the *imagined* curriculum set by the policy makers and of the *enacted* curriculum delivered by textbooks and teachers before *interculturality* can fundamentally exist and be sustained as history pedagogy at the secondary school level in Australia.

In using the arguably little-utilised approach of crystallisation coupled with discourse analysis as a methodology, the complexities of the concept of interculturality and its fractured significance of *interculturality* as an educational
strategy are examined through an interpretive and diverse paradigm. The crystal metaphor and its lattice of intersecting points enabled the researcher to examine how the agencies of secondary history education in Australia understand and interpret the concept of interculturality to further interculturality as an educational strategy.

In the course of answering my research questions and the close analysis of the foci, I have contributed new knowledge in the form of furthering crystallisation methodology to include discourse analysis for educational research, and more specifically research into history education.

‘No formula for crystallised design exists, instead’, says Ellingson, ‘opportunities and constraints abound and researchers should expect an organic evolution of their projects’ (Ellingson 2009, p. 73). Careful planning before entering the fields for this project led me to embrace opportunities as they arose; one of which was addressing the gap between interculturality and history education as a theoretical weakness. This weakness clearly emerged from the data.

The construction of meaning through language has remained central to the core of this theoretical weakness and therefore the research questions. At this point in time the methodological approach encountered in this study is not readily apparent in other educational research or literatures canvassed. The flexibility of discourse analysis, and there not being one way of doing discourse analysis, functions effectively with crystallisation to examine the data and show how language makes significance and builds relevance and relationships between particular situations, words and visual images. Building on this methodological relationship, this study takes a fresh approach to contribute new knowledge to making distinctions regarding where interculturality, history education and curriculum and pedagogy intersect.

Finally, my contribution to knowledge is a unique conceptual framework that brings together two constructs through stages of historical thinking and discourse analysis. As a result the study furthers crystallisation as a methodology by developing new ways for the writer/researcher to tell the tale. The crystal metaphor and its lattice constantly reinforces the depth of understanding that intertwines the elements of the conceptual framework and its translation into
curriculum and pedagogy. The methodological interaction between text and image in this study is inductive and is carried from beginning to end, to rest with a theory that melds the constructs of interculturality and history education in an intelligible and accessible way for theorists and teachers.

**Recommendations for further research**

The ‘teachers’ talk’ shows clearly that history teachers do not operate in a vacuum. The focus groups give insight into the fact that history teachers are proponents of letting history inform the present and are willing to adjust their teaching accordingly. However, there is such unfamiliarity with the concept of interculturality they find it difficult to understand how the concept can be *enacted* as history pedagogy.

The textual analysis highlights the grip that *traditional* narratives have on the written and visual language of prescribed texts. The timeline, for both the AC and the VC, heeds little progress toward a *critical* stage of historical thinking since those written in the twentieth century and the glorification of linear progress, whiteness and exclusion of content knowledge. None of these extrapolations from the data mean creating a dichotomy of what is right or wrong for history teaching and learning; what they do mean is that new theoretical contributions like this project must temporally situate *interculturality* as an educational strategy rather than just a noble calling.

Theory is essential for sustaining interculturality in history education. The analysis of the data shows that, by far, the construction of meaning through specific discourses, inclusion and exclusion of what is deemed as historical content knowledge are all barriers to the rise of *interculturality* as an educational strategy in history education. However, unless the curriculum policy makers, the writers and the teachers have a sound theoretical framework for how interculturality (the concept) is part of human history and is a conceptual space of historical thinking, then the constraints of traditional histories and their discourses will continue.
At this point in time there is, to my knowledge, no other project in history education that focuses specifically on the interpretation and understanding of the concept of interculturality for Year 7-10 history education when mandated within a prescribed curriculum. This study has evidenced valuable studies both globally and in Australia which have dedicated research into the field of intercultural education. However, there is no empirical evidence of how the concept of interculturality is specifically understood and interpreted within the discipline of history at the secondary school level to inform the planning and development of history pedagogy. Therefore, it is imperative there be further research into the specific nature of interculturality for history teaching and learning.

Upon reflection, this thesis has been about distinctions that need to be made in order for history education in Australia to develop and celebrate difference through the understanding of the concept of interculturality and then the enactment of interculturality as an educational strategy. The History curriculum policy in Australia gives credence to some change in discourse by mandating ICU for compulsory secondary schooling. However, it falls short in explaining two things: how the concept of interculturality as an educational strategy is to be interpreted and understood in history textbooks and by teachers, and how specific knowledge and understanding of the concept of interculturality can be woven into history at the subject specific level. Hence, there must be further research into the intersection of history education, interculturality curriculum and pedagogy in order to meld the constructs of history and interculturality in practice. In reality, this is the only place for my research and theoretical model to be brought to life.

The recommendations for further research made here are based on a belief that History as a school subject is critical as a discipline, because it can change how people interact with, empathise and accept difference as opposed to peddling sameness. Further, it is often alone in an array of school subjects as a domain that can demonstrate the identity of distinct cultures etched out of temporal change.

Following on from these insights and final comments there are many avenues for further educational research that could build on this study:

- Further local data of teachers’ response to the impact of ICU in the VC
• Further research into the representation of a dominant narrative in history textbooks in Australia
• This field of research would benefit from a longitudinal study that measures the impact of interculturality on history teaching, through to example planning of units and their delivery.
• A comparative study of history textbooks globally for the impact of interculturality
• An analysis of history curriculum policy based on Western historical thinking and non-Western to understand the coherence of the West and its distinctiveness
• Research generated through the field of curriculum and pedagogy to further examine and expose the intersection between the constructs of school history and interculturality.

From the outset and to the very end I have found crystallisation an enterprising and complex methodology, made all the more interesting and useful when matched with discourse analysis. In closing, I present a final use of this methodology to illuminate the data from a different angle, poetry, and therefore the contemporary relationship between interculturality and history education:

_I can better understand you if I know where you come from_

_Through stories and positivist claims of truth that keep you strong_

_I understand tradition orients and gives ground under our feet_

_But it is laden with cultural patterns etched from the contexts of which you speak_

_Identities formed through exemplary rules of conduct, virtue and vice_

_Shape historical consciousness as the teacher of life_

_There is significance in your language; what you write and what you say_

_Evidenced by patterns of complicity that ensure dominance does not sway_

_But I disrupt significance and what your discourse cares to make seen_

_I have my own analysis and judgement of what you intend people may glean_

_Your politics constructs tension so enactment is where I begin_

_To see refractions and reflections through the angles of a crystal lens_
I cannot do without you or where you have come from
I cannot operate in isolation if I too want to stay strong
Our paths, say teachers, must cross at every chance
Through distinctions and intersections within a pedagogical dance
For you there will always be paintings, statues and words in time,
To evidence conquests, conquerors and settlers sublime
For me, continued silences and absence hidden in plain view
To enact a force of change and transformation; a story told anew

So, I offer you this crystal; post-positivist in its stance
Held together by a lattice within which all stories are enhanced
As a thesis for your future as unfamiliar as I might be,
For you are history and I am interculturality
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3. A Working with Children (WWC) check – or registration with the Victorian Institute of Teaching (VIT) – is necessary for all researchers visiting schools. Appropriate documentation must be shown to the principal before starting the research in the school.

4. No student is to participate in the research study unless s/he is willing to do so and informed consent is given in writing by a parent/guardian.

5. Any substantial modifications to the research proposal, or additional research involving use of the data collected, will require a further research approval submission to this Office.

6. Data relating to individuals or the school are to remain confidential.
7. Since participating schools have an interest in research findings, you should consider ways in which the results of the study could be made available for the benefit of the school community.

8. At the conclusion of the study, a copy or summary of the research findings should be forwarded to Catholic Education Melbourne. It would be appreciated if you could submit your report in an electronic format using the email address provided below.

I wish you well with your research study. If you have any queries concerning this matter, please contact Ms Shani Prendergast at apr@ceomelb.catholic.edu.au.
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Mr Jim Miles

DIRECTOR ENTERPRISE SERVICES
APPENDIX 2: Ethics Approval

Human Ethics Advisory Group

Faculty of Arts and Education
Geelong Waurn Ponds Campus
Postal: Locked Bag 20000,
Geelong 3220, Victoria, Australia
Telephone: 03 5227 2368
Facsimile: 03 5227 2260
Email: kyliek@deakin.edu.au

Memorandum

To: Prof Christine Halse School of Education
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Interculturality, History Education and Agents of Practice

Please quote this project number in all future communications

The application for this project has been considered by the Faculty HEAG under the terms of Deakin University’s Human Research Ethics Committee (DUHREC). Approval has been given for Mrs Kerri Garrard, under the supervision of Prof Christine Halse, School of Education, to undertake this project from 4/02/2015 to 4/02/2019.
The approval given by the Faculty HEAG is given only for the project and for the period as stated in the approval. It is your responsibility to contact the Faculty HEAG immediately should any of the following occur:

- Serious or unexpected adverse effects on the participants
- Any proposed changes in the protocol, including extensions of time.
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APPENDIX 3: Plain Language Statement and Consent Form

PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT AND CONSENT FORM

TO: Participant

Plain Language Statement

Date: 3rd March, 2015
Full Project Title: ‘Interculturality, History Education and Agents of Practice’
Principal Researcher: Associate Professor Julianne Moss
Student Researcher: Kerri Garrard

Dear Colleague,

You are receiving this invitation because you have been identified by your Principal and Faculty leader as a teacher who would be keen to voluntarily participate in a research project entitled ‘History Education and Intercultural Understanding in secondary schools’ being conducted by Kerri Garrard for a PhD at Deakin University in the Centre for Research in Educational Futures and Innovation (CREFI).

Purpose of the Research

The purpose of the research is to find out how teachers conceptualise interculturality when teaching history at Year 7-10 in Victorian secondary schools. The project asks how interculturality exists in the delivery of historical narratives.

What will be involved?

- Attending a one off Focus Group comprising of yourself and three other teachers from your school.
- The group will meet for one 1 hour session.
• The Focus Group will discuss broad areas of interest such as: what does intercultural understanding mean in terms of history teaching. And, how relevant is intercultural understanding to your history teaching?

How do you benefit?

• You will have the opportunity to discuss an important issue relating to the History component of the new Australian curriculum.
• You will contribute expert knowledge to an identified gap in research into Australian history education.

Giving Consent

• Please bring your consent form (attached) to your Focus Group.
• Attending the Focus Group is voluntary; participants are free to withdraw at any point by notifying the researcher using the ‘Withdrawal from Consent’ form. (Copy attached). Data contributed by the participant withdrawing will not be included in project data.

Privacy

• No identifiable personal details will be made in this project.

Notification and Publication of Research Findings

• The research will be published as a PhD thesis and as a potential journal article.

Complaints
If you have any complaints about any aspect of the project, the way it is being conducted or any questions about your rights as a research participant, then you may contact:

The Manager, Ethics and Biosafety, Deakin University, 221 Burwood Highway, Burwood Victoria 3125, Telephone: 9251 7129, research-ethics@deakin.edu.au

Please quote project number HAE-15-003.
CONSENT FORM

Date: 3rd March, 2015

Full Project Title: ‘Interculturality, History Education and Agents of Practice’

Reference Number: HAE-15-003

I have read and I understand the attached Plain Language Statement.

I freely agree to participate in this project according to the conditions in the Plain Language Statement.

I have been given a copy of the Plain Language Statement and Consent Form to keep.

The researcher has agreed not to reveal my identity and personal details, including where information about this project is published, or presented in any public form.

Specific consent:

I give consent to being involved in a focus group discussion regarding the project entitled “History Education and Interculturality in secondary schools”.

Participant’s Name (printed)

............................................................... 

Signature ....................................................... Date

........................................
APPENDIX 4: Example of Transcript (Focus Group 3)

This copy of the transcript for Focus Group 3 is provided as an example of the transcripts used for discourse analysis of the focus groups with teachers. Not everything in the transcripts can be used in the analysis so there is always content and aspects not taken up by the researcher. The inclusion of this transcript is intended to provide the reader with a sense of how the focus groups unfolded as an engagement with real teachers and their concerns, issues and challenges. It also gives the reader an indication of the researcher’s approach to the focus groups as semi-structured interviews. The teachers are identified as the ‘Participant’, however, have been given pseudonyms in the actual presentation of the data in Chapter 4 of this thesis.

Facilitator: So today is about asking you in an informal discussion how you see interculturality or the intercultural capability in your history classes seven to ten, what you know about it. It’s not a test by any means, if you’re unsure about the word or – it’s really to see, well in my question is how do teachers conceptualise interculturality in teaching history? So just what you think about it, what you know about it, is it being done, are you unsure etcetera, etcetera. The other part of my thesis is about historical narratives so when we teach any type of narrative, the story of anything in our seven to ten classes where do we see the intercultural element in those narratives. So they’re really the two questions that I ask. The other question I ask is about the textbooks that we use. So I’ll be comparing what is said in the transcripts, what teachers are thinking about interculturality and then what is in the textbooks and doing a textual analysis on that. So really it’s just an informal discussion on what you think about it and if you think it’s – how is being enacted, whatever thoughts you have got on interculturality in seven to ten history teaching. So even if you want to talk about what it means to you or whatever you think to start with. It’ll just flow once you get going.

Participant 1: I think you talk about it quite a bit when you’re doing your different cultures like ancient Greece, you’ll talk about their culture. If you’re doing the Germans in World War II you talk about what the German culture is. So
you sort of blend it in quite naturally and with the narratives particularly you’ll talk about why they did that and what was going on at the time etcetera to with the interculture.

**Participant 2:** Yeah I think I probably tend to draw a lot of comparisons between say our culture and what is going on in the particular area that we’re looking at. Be it Rome, be it China, Japan, whatever it might be, so I probably do that so the kids maybe can draw a better understanding of it in some sort of way.

**Participant 1:** Yes, you’re right we do a lot of comparisons don’t we between, even today’s society compared to ancient society. What girls and boys wore and then in some subjects we’ll even compare different cultures as well as Australian culture. We’ll compare Greece with Egypt and with Australia as well. So we do, do a bit of that.

**Participant 3:** I probably teach interculturality by try to provide authentic perspectives. So I teach perspective as a big idea in history and so for any period in time that I’m looking at, for example I’m doing World War II. We’ve just done World War II, kids – I talk about the perspective, identifying the perspectives that we’re reading from, so who is it, who wrote the text that we’re reading from, who would have actually produced this document or who was the writer of it. And by asking those questions we then look for the story that we haven’t seen. So why wouldn’t we have a young German women who is Jewish, why wouldn’t we have, or which one would we have, so we talk about can you think of one, Anne Frank classically come up. But looking at the voices that we can’t hear, the perspectives that we’re not being presented with often is a way of teaching interculturality. Kids who choose when in our research projects in year ten for example, who chose different topics such as for example the emperor in Japan I told them not use – try to find authentic Japanese texts as well as other texts. So looking for the Japanese perspective about that, and there are different perspectives about that particular person from even a Japanese perspective there are different perspectives. So asking them when they’re researching about those particular people to go into that culture themselves so classically I’d say go to the google of the country often and then use the translate functions to help them do that. Which isn’t good but often within the sites in Japan they’ll have to translate. The same
for Germany, I got them to go to Germany, google and to go into German, for example German, there’s a lot of different sites in Germany you can go into and you’ll get an English translation. And that I think is really useful way of getting them to understand different perspectives. In Aboriginal history I’d have to say I definitely use historical narratives. So I try to present them with a couple of different for example creation stories from a couple of different stories first of all, of how oral history and the discussion about which perspectives in history would have traditionally used more of an oral tradition rather than necessarily a written tradition. So that’s probably one way and then we look at a couple of different stories and try and keep the voice an indigenous voice. So that we’re listening to indigenous voices, so I’m thinking we use the drovers boy, we use some indigenous creation stories, we use the records from the bringing them, we use creative spirits which is a website that’s an indigenous website. So I just try to stay focussed on presenting the students with and going back to is that the perspective that we’re listening to now and judging this particular period in time a authentic one. So not someone else’s version, yeah.

**Participant 4:** I used a really good DVD for comparing Japanese and Australian experiences I Kokoda. The Beyond Kokoda DVD because it interviews both Australian veterans and Japanese veterans. And so that way it wasn’t so much a lesson which they often fall into with that Australia “we fought and us”, and it becomes actually well this Australian soldier said this and this is how he remembered the war and you can explain any kind of antagonistic feelings they have towards Japanese. Because that’s where they were in that time, they were in the heat of the battle. But, then by also showing them the Japanese perspective and how they were feeling at the time and also understanding that they were under order and the things they had to do and their own grief afterwards also made them more human to the students. Which is really good for them to get out of that us versus them mentality in the lesson.

**Facilitator:** Did you find that they responded well to that?

**Participant 4:** They did because there was a big focus as well on dealing with trauma after the war. So once the war was over what did all of these soldiers do to move on and so it made it really human for them.
Participant 3: I think I used this – there’s a website that may have those, is it interviews from different (trails off). I don’t know if it was in – no I used it on the bombing of Darwin and there was Japanese, the Japanese commander was interviewed as well as the yeah, it was on the anniversary or whatever of the bombing of Darwin and we did a bit on – and it had the Japanese pilots, with commanders that were interviewed [too post]. And that was a similar thing.

Facilitator: That sounds interesting.

Participant 3: And I think exactly the same, the kids actually responded very well too and I think that point of talking to kids about making the human perspective real, like humanising the experience by using narrative. I just think you can’t go beyond using narrative, it’s just the best way to teach interculturality, because kids begin to understand what the perspective of that person was. Yeah, I think it’s really powerful, personally.

Participant 1: I suppose even your secondary sources too, you look at who the author is or who the artist is and if you look at their background, you can see why they’ve done what they’ve done. You can discuss whether it’s accurate or why it’s been composed as it has.

Participant 3: And even with like, think in junior, like in year sevens and stuff when I’ve done, probably when we did Rome, we must have done Rome in history once and I got – or Greek history I can’t remember. They had to find a Greek myth that they connected, so just getting them to connect with a narrative from that period in time, not that necessarily they knew who the author was essentially but it was a narrative of that culture at that time. And so they made a choice to connect with one and then they got up and I had a, like a little orators outfit and they’d stand up there and do their little *00:09:41 for that lesson. Yeah, that must have been a few years ago but I think yeah, they enjoyed that, they liked connecting with a different narrative. I suppose it’s not exactly or the, you know, in the day in life, even the medieval times when we ask them to connect essentially with a role in that period in time where they have to research and think about it. So actually empathising and having to get into the narrative, is a good way of helping them understand the experience and the challenges of the period, I think sometimes too.
Participant 2: And I think so many things in adolescents’ lives are not real, because there is so much media in their face, so I think they absorb that really well. You know those true, supposed true life experiences that people have actually been through and I really believe that they actually connect with that very well.

Facilitator: So do you think some of the things that you are doing are not often consciously, well you’re not often consciously thinking that this is intercultural?

Participant 1: Yes absolutely.

Facilitator: But when you reflect on it you realise that you’re bring in, as you say that other voice

Participant 3: Yeah I’m probably pretty – I’d have to say after doing like most post grad in the teaching Asian studies, I think it did, even though I did my undergraduate actually in Asian studies, in Asian history and that kind of thing. I probably never had that presented to me about voice and how having an authentic voice can present an authentic picture of a certain experience. And I can remember thinking going through the library here and looking at every book and looking for books that were from someone from Indonesia that had the experience and we just didn’t have them. I was thinking, gosh I use this all the time, I don’t – it’s not bad but I need to find something better too. So I think and the internet has just been amazing for that, because you don’t need to have a text book, you can actually seek out that information in those places increasingly. But there are a whole lot of undiscovered narrative that we don’t hear, because of that. But I think I’ve just deliberately gone into my teaching and I think perspective, perspective, perspective. Who’s, what can we hear, who are hearing, who are we not hearing. And I think by saying who are we not hearing that our ability to teach interculturality it just happens, once you ask the question of who are we not hearing, then it allows you to hear them sort of.

Facilitator: So do have any examples of or would be quite clear to you of the silences of stories that you’re not hearing still in some of the units that you teach?

Participant 5: I find that I struggle sometimes with rights and freedoms to get them working with enough female indigenous, or not only that like, working in a
topic called rights and freedoms I’d like to hear more of a female voice in it regardless of whether it was indigenous or not. I know we focus on indigenous history, but it would be such a great time as well to look at that women’s movement. And I don’t think we really have a space for it in our curriculum.

Facilitator: In the curriculum yeah. Because I don’t know that I know of in the curriculum anything that’s highlighted from that perspective.

Participant 5: I don’t think it is, no.

Participant 3: There is, I think well in the old Australia curriculum I haven’t looked specifically you know across the board spectrum of content that we could do in the Victorian curriculum. But there was a unit I think in the post modernism kind of part, that you could take an element of feminism I think in the movements of the sixties. But we didn’t make that critical choice I suppose.

Participant: Well we don’t really have the time either.

Participant: The time yeah, in only having 20 weeks that doesn’t, 20 weeks with 10 cycles basically, of eight periods, it’s not really. It’s 80 periods it’s not really.

Facilitator: So it’s an interesting point that you just bought up though because intercultural doesn’t always mean, a different nation or you know, so the female cultural aspect stands, you know, could stand quite heavily as a silence. Do you think that, that’s -

Participant 5: And I think that they actually recognise that in my student interest as well. I find that boys engage better with history then the girls and that could be a reason as well. That they don’t always see it a big female -

Facilitator: Well there’s a lot of male input in history.

Participant 5: Oh absolutely.

Participant 3: I reckon those video games have a lot to do with that, like not video games but computer games, a lot of them have, kids are often you know kind of they’re interested, because a lot of the pseudo historical narratives that happen around gaming. There’s a lot of pseudo historical narrative so the kids are kind of interested in that and I think that’s quite engage for boys sometimes. They
kind of want to know whether it’s correct or whether it happened, or whereas girls just don’t have that, I have noticed they don’t seem to have that same kind of, I don’t know, that edge to their inquiry. It’s different.

Participant 2: They make good connections with emotional stories.

Participant 3: Yeah that’s what about to say, it’s a different connection that I find. When I’ve used song, sometimes I sing too, which is pretty stupid, but I liked it last year, I sung a bit in history. But singing, because I was talking about how you know the Irish, like I was talking about different types and I was talking about black slavery and how different the narrative was often sung. Because that’s how oral tradition was transferred and so I kind of used a song that had been brought down in my own family, because my grandmother couldn’t read and write. This is the song that this country, now this would not be unusual in many cultures to have song that you know could. So I think if there was interculturality if there’s segments that we’re missing. I reckon we’re really missing out the African perspective, I often feel that we have kids that are going to be in our cohort that we don’t even attempt to make sense of their culture. Because probably and a lot of people can’t make sense and we don’t have necessarily a lot of accurately well documented authentic voice. But there’s so much stuff coming out of Africa that you could totally get on top of that as things go on. And there’s a lot of educated people in Africa that have a lot to say. But I think it kind of would be a nice thing to feed back to, not just to our students who might be African but also for us to understand as educators about the rich history outside that kind of Asia and European sect.

Participant 5: Yeah, Africa’s always overlooked though, even in media. I mean, you’d have students that think Africa is a country not -

Participant 2: Rather than a continent.

Participant 1: We do a bit on slavery which I know is not quite the same, but we -

Participant 3: It’s kind of more American though really rather than African.

Participant 1: It is centred on that African <over talk> *00:16:56.
Participant 1: I don’t know.

Participant: <Over talk> *00:16:58.

Participant 3: Oh we do, do the slavery roots in year nine. We do, do the slavery roots, but it’s the slavery roots I suppose.

Participant 2: And also modern humans like, knowing where they came from, with year sevens we do that as well.

Participant: The out of Africa theory.

Participant: Yeah, so we look at that a bit.

Participant 3: It would be good to look at colonial in Africa. And the effects of it which foils them.

Facilitator: But that is another interesting point, because intercultural or the intercultural element is often used in conflict countries in history to try and create some sort of peace between different tribes, groups, etcetera and Africa is one of the nations that had had to change its way in how it actually teaches history. So it’s an interesting point that from your perspective teaching here we’re not feeding back that intercultural element at all. Yet it’s such a big thing that can be used in conflict, sorry close conflict situations.

Participant 3: Well even to understand to just make meaning of the conflict. If you’re a kid who’s been, you know, you came out here 12 years ago when you were five from the Sudan and you don’t know. You know, your parents were affected by post traumatic stress and they don’t talk about it and now you’re part of this group and you kind of, how do you make sense of your own narrative. You’ve made sense of it, what someone else tells you, or what. Your teachers don’t know about your narrative like, how do you actually find out about why your parents really left what was it that surrounded your culture that made you become, or get to that position. And I know that’s not necessarily a problem in our school, but we’ve got a couple of – I now at least we’ve got a family coming in that are Kenyan refugees next year. So I think for different reasons I think it will happen more often. We will have kids who maybe and it’s not just from there, it
could be from any country really couldn’t it like, but it’s just yeah, Sri Lanka or anywhere.

Participant: Oh, any.

**Participant 2:** I was going to say that, I mean probably more with my Catholic action hat but we talk a lot about social justice issues and the interpretation that so many kids have of Muslim kids. You know, they just have no understanding and this is in our backyard and we have so many debates and conversations about what is politically correct, what isn’t and that’s literally, that’s inter... (breaks away from saying the word here) exactly what we’re talking about. But in our own backyards.

**Facilitator:** Yeah, we don’t have to go that far.

**Participant 2:** No and I mean, that’s nowhere in the history book.

**Participant:** In RE, I do it a lot better in RE than I do in history in truth.

**Participant 1:** Because year ten RE covers it quite well.

**Participant 3:** Yeah and let’s say even year nine RE, I’ve tried to do a song from around – so I do different our father songs or different songs that we do here. I show them a different one from Kenya, or I find them from Zimbabwe or I try to take them from West Africa, or from the Philippines or use one from South America and I try and do one from each country. And just be a similar prayer and they love it, because I said "Now look, would we much prefer to have our liturgies like, you know, the one that was in the Philippines or the one that was in Sri Lanka". I just do that off you tube, that’s kind of really pretty basic, but that’s a different way of just presenting, for me it’s a way of presenting a unified faith really to kids that this is a shared thing that’s celebrated around the world. But they kind of find that really interesting.

**Facilitator:** And often that historical element has to come into RE anyway, so they can complement one another. Just on what you were saying about the, you know, in our own backyard, do you get the sense that there’s not a lot of interculturality in our community, coming into the classroom.
Participant 2: No, I think we’re very monocultural in the way that kids can see. I mean, that has to come from home, it’s not coming from us, as teachers.

Participant 4: It’s also increasing I find.

Participant 2: Oh absolutely.

Participant 4: I think even from last year to this year it’s increasing.

Participant 2: And I think that’s a big concern and I don’t know whether there is a place for that in the history curriculum but I think kids are very narrow minded in the way they discuss those.

Participant 3: I wouldn’t have, in my own experience I wouldn’t have said it’s increasing. I can remember when I’d be correcting year eight essays and when you’re down here we have the Taliban bombers in every second narrative post the 9/11. I don’t feel like I have that anymore.

Participant: You don’t feel like –

Participant: In that stage.

Participant 4: I think that we’ve got a post kind of Sydney siege though.

Participant 3: Really?

Participant 4: Yeah, even in media and rises of fascist kind of, it doesn’t have to be fascist a kind of a right wing kind of thing. But there is a rise of that fear of something they don’t really understand.

Participant 5: And this generation have also been brought up in that as a norm. Like you’re talking about post 9/11, that would have be new to those kids that would have been there way to process it to work out the difference like of what their world was and what their world is. Whereas -

Participant 3: These children have grown up with it.

Participant 3: Our kids now that is who, part of their outlook.

Participant 5: That’s what they are, part of their make-up. That’s their understanding.
Participant 5: And likewise, they’re the conversations that they’ve had at home and I don’t know how much our curriculum has really altered or changed in the last what, ten, 12, 15 years to cater for that. It’s a new like,-

Participant 2: And the world has changed so much in that time.

Participant: And history definitely has a job in trying to make some very sense of our more recent history I think.

Facilitator: And the emphasis placed on intercultural in the history curriculum is definitely there but there seems to be that sort of gap from what you’re saying that do we actually know where to place these social issues within that curriculum element. Like, is it token, is it, or does it depend what you’ve been informed by. That can make a difference too.

Participant 3: I think it’s directly what you’re informed by and I think you can’t right, you know, right, get a politically correct thing. I think all you can do is teach a critical perspective. All you can do is say well have we got a – do we know a Muslim person, have we got some children here that could, you know, have you said is there a mosque here, where is our nearest mosque? Well our nearest mosque is your XYZ and oh you’ve been there and there’s some kids there that go it would be good to interview them wouldn’t you, or to find out what does their website say, why don’t we look that up. I think just that seems to be for me, I think, the only way you can kind of critically teach these and break down these barriers, it’s not by kind of any massive policy change but rather just to be critical digesters of narratives like, really, that’s what you think or who’s narrative is that? Which persons? Where does that – I think by exposing kids to the broad range of narratives and critically always asking them who’s perspective is included and who’s isn’t included.

Facilitator: What about the historical narrative of our early beginnings, do you see that that has shifted to a degree? Do you see that there’s an intercultural element there?

Participant 5: I most recently just had a conversation with kids and I thought about doing a different angle before introducing our ‘white shame’. Like kids shut down about their own history because they feel like they’re being blamed for the –
and we are very one culture here, so a lot of them take on one side of the story rather than considering the other side because they don’t seem themselves aligned with that. So I said to them "You’re the generation who are going to change the world and you’re the generation who will probably change Australia Day and you’re the generation who understand that you aren’t to blame for this. You’re part of the generation who have said sorry, who are making amends, who are reconciling" and made out that they were, they were the heroes of the day and then went into our beginnings as a country and the devastation with white settlement has caused and try to look at it that way. Because I often find and I found that last semester when we taught it and when we’ve had these conversations before, students shut down because they think they’re to blame. Like, we’re to blame for the massacres and we’re all to blame for it. So I alleviated them of that guilt, talked them up and try to sort of align them with the good side and then got them to look at it. I don’t know how that went but I just thought I’d approach a different approach.

**Facilitator:** It’s a different approach.

**Participant 4:** It’s again they relate to that, I’m the white Australian.

**Participant:** Yeah they do, that’s all they see.

**Participant 4:** Like with here yeah, I’m Australia against Japan, I’m the white Australian.

**Participant 5:** And they go I’m white Australian so I don’t want to listen to you about what you’re saying and I don’t want to listen to the voices of indigenous people and what was cause, what harm was caused because I’m responsible for that, I’m part of that. And I just wanted to just say it there like, you are not responsible, it’s not you. You’re part of the change, you’re going to be part of the generation that already, I s said "I’m already part of the generation, I’m older than you and I’m already part of that and you’re going to be even more so". It’s not always necessarily true.

**Participant:** <over talk> *00:26:58.

**Participant:** It’s a good point to try and put them as a starting point.
**Participant:** Yeah, and maybe separate them from it. Because sometimes you have to put them in history and make them a part of it and sometimes you have to remove them I think as well so that they can listen to the stories and have that empathy.

**Participant 3:** I said to mine that, I started off with saying that we were doing a real perspective but that it’s not about a difference. Like, it’s just remember that there are a number of Aboriginal kids who have named themselves as students of Aboriginal descent and by the way, there’s probably a whole lot more that have Aboriginal descent in them that will not have named themselves because of lots of reasons that we might find out. And so, I never want you to talk about this type of history if you’re going to say something that you wouldn’t want someone who’s of Aboriginal descent to hear. Because you wouldn’t know who’s here. Just like you shouldn’t really say anything about what’s happened to Germany unless you’ve got an informed opinion and if you’re happy to say that with someone else there. So that’s how kind of we did it where you just wouldn’t, we just don’t know and so if you had – we talked about that you just wouldn’t know if people were of Aboriginal descent or not because we do have people of Aboriginal descent here at school. If we’re talking about their history we’ve got to be respectful of that. I talked about my own conflict, I said "I feel like I want to make a reconciliation but my house is on land and I’ve bought that house and that house was owned by someone else and someone else and I’ve got a mortgage on that and do I feel like I can just give that back? I don’t, should I give it back?" So I kind of just start with those questions, I don’t feel like it, maybe, I don’t know, I want you to think about that. I don’t think that’s the answer, I don’t think necessarily there’s a bunch of Aboriginal people there waiting for my land either. I don’t think that’s the answer because I just sort of start with that kind of perspective, yeah so. Which is kind of challenging but I think they need to know that they’ve got to be respectful of any like, thoughtful of different people that may be there that are not speaking up or not making the.

**Participant 1:** And I suppose with more the modern history getting back to that, like someone that is from Sudan. In year nine, we do their family trees and if they’re from a different country which is very rare at this school so you don’t get a lot of that history but every now and again you’ll get someone that has a really
interesting like Croatians or and, you know they’ll talk about their story. So you do a little bit of history from that point of view but if you haven’t got anyone in your class it doesn’t happen.

**Participant 3:** Yeah, do that in RE actually. Do that in RE in a lot doing your tree you find, it kind of takes off on two generations. But once that happens it can be quite interesting to hear what kids have done and *00:30:05.

**Facilitator:** So you’re sort of saying that if we’re not, you know, if the face is in front of us -

**Participant 1:** It’s not getting covered or not in my history classes I don’t think it’s definitely not being covered. All the conflict or, unless it comes up, no, it doesn’t really come up that often unless you’re doing a comparison. If you’re teaching something particular and you might compare it to something modern day but apart from that -

**Participant 2:** It’s a distraction and it might make the kids not understand what you’re doing either like, you know, it’s only you don’t want to teach it just to teach it for teaching, you know what I mean? Sake, you -

**Participant 1:** For the sake of it.

**Participant 2:** For the sake of it. You want to be teaching in context, meaningfully in context. So you kind of just want to as you say they do it like, you know, you were saying when you put them in a position but you want to be addressing interculturality whilst you’re purposely teaching a context for whatever reason be it change and continuity or technology or whatever you.

**Facilitator:** Which might come back to the fact that there isn’t often that set place in the curriculum and we have to really think carefully about it, yeah. Okay, well anybody else got any other comments or..?

**Participant 5:** So we were just saying before does anyone ever find that they can’t really click in with the students until they’ve made a connection about with another country? Like, and my example is I find that if I play up the connection between American civil rights movement and Australia’s civil rights movement and compare the cultures and what was happening and that I get a better response
because they are more interested in other culture than their own. So that idea of like, other cultures to them I find is far more intriguing and more willing to engage. That’s just been the experience for that one unit but you guys have taught a lot more than I have.

Participant 2: I also think there’s a lot of stereotyping that obviously our history’s so short in terms of white history. So I think the kids obviously will identify with countries that have 2000 year old history so I think that has an impact as well. They sort of think oh, you know, and we’re just really new.

Participant: Even America’s history isn’t that much larger than Australian’s that it’s just a big cultural thing.

Participant: I just say ours is 62, 000 years old.

Participant 2: Well, that’s <over talk> *00:32:47, I’m talking white.

Participant 3: And that’s how I start.

Participant 3: Yeah but I don’t talk in white and yeah, I don’t talk in white critically for that reason. I think that they need to know that this piece of land, you know, we have oral history in art and we have a whole lot of historical artefacts to talk about the history of this land or are we talking about the history of who we like yeah, so I think strong narratives I think are so important.

Facilitator: But in the new curriculum there does seem to be a bit – it’s a bit more concrete about the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander factors which has really only come about in the last 12 months. Like that was a definite shift from Australian to Victorian curriculum. So sometimes it doesn’t sound as fascinating even if we are saying that for 65, 000 years because they’re really had sort of one way of looking at that over primary school to when we get them in seven to ten.

Participant 5: And all the textbooks start at 1778.

Facilitator: At 1778 yeah.

Participant 5: And then they might go oh by the way this is what they saw when they arrived in Aboriginal culture and set this up. But back to 1778 and beyond, like that’s yeah.
Participant 5: Well, but then that’s a problem with our texts.

Participant 3: Yeah, I don’t use the textbooks.

Participant 5: There does need to be that shift in approach because you’ve got that mindset but if we’re teaching it the way, you know.

Participant 3: Well I did postgraduate study so I suppose it was an interest of what an interest like, but that’s something -

Participant 5: But you have to make a proper decision as a history teacher.

Participant 3: If that’s about to say I’ve made a decision and I don’t think if I hadn’t done that little bit of study, I was saying to [Kerrie]*00:34:31. I think if I hadn’t done it and I did a mandarin and Asian, actually I did actually quite a, I would have said a pretty kind of intercultural undergraduate degree before I did my teaching degree but if I hadn’t done that thing about voice I don’t think I would have ever have come to my teaching like that. I think that was -

Facilitator: And then you’re put in a school.

Participant 3: Yeah and if I just -

Facilitator: And you really are and it – (lost in translation here)

Participant 3: Yeah I think it was -

Facilitator: It tends to exacerbate that one particular perspective.

Participant 3: And resource is a massive thing like, that’s what I would say. I think it’s very difficult to teach interculturality when people just need really good resources to know when half the books have been chucked out of the library at the moment like they have been. People are reliant on a textbook that they’ve got and the internet. And so that really requires a bit of work around -

Participant 3: In that area.

Participant 5: In that area.

Facilitator: So going on just back to text and that if we stick to that, the narratives in our texts around that early beginnings, just how do you see the
representation of the indigenous narrative? So you said and then often there’s this little bit that – so how do you see in a sense the actors of that narrative being how they presented in our narratives that is supposedly the curriculum?

Participant 2: Can I just go back a step from that Kerrie? So for instance, the indigenous topic, I think on the program is meant to be I think it was two to four weeks for the year sevens. Now Rome and China are eight to ten weeks, well not ten weeks, probably eight weeks each. So that probably says a lot already.

Facilitator: There’s a silence there that we haven’t picked up in policy.

Participant 2: Yeah, so that in itself I think it’s a good point to make.

Participant 1: Although is that because I’ve always thought that in primary school it’s done quite a lot, the indigenous and then -

Participant 4: Yeah, the kids always tell us that they’ve done -

Participant 1: They’ve done a lot and they’ve never done China or they haven’t done Rome so.

Participant 3: It depends also Nat and [Ollie] have spent like, Nat – I think it depends on kind of this hodgepodge because the curriculum has changed so much -

Participant 4: Where they come through.

Participant 3: That where they come through and when the changes happened -

Facilitator: And the expertise.

Participant 3: Yeah, the expertise of the teacher, you know, what kind of was the flavour of the day, like I know my child in primary school did India to the cows come home last year. But, that was doing Rudyard Kipling’s version of India which I kind of was doing my head in.

Facilitator: As guidance of written policy regardless of whether they’ve done a lot or not, there is that statement even if it is a statement of time being dedicate.
Participant 3: I reckon in, from thinking about our freedom and rights that we’ve
done in year ten, even a lot of the stuff that you get is a lot about men’s like, a lot
of, it’s all about the male, a lot of the male narrative. And I get that probably the
male narrative was the more respected narrative of the time. But the reality is
there was still another one and we’re trying to provide a different range.

Participant Yeah it’s hard. (Talking over between participants)

Participant 4: In the resources that we had, I showed the documentary Blood
Brothers and that says the Charles Perkins was the first Aboriginal to complete a
university degree and I had a look and I looked it up and he’s not. A woman was,
but is it Margaret Williams-Weir and I tried to look her up and I couldn’t find
anything on her on the internet.

Participant 3: And that’s my point. Is that there just isn’t, the more you critically
look and I found the same and I’ve just gone through stuff trying to check on
creative spirits, oh let me have a look. And just can’t, end in a few dead ends.

Facilitator: But that narrative can only shift with curriculum policy allowing that
framework to come into our classrooms, so that’s another really interesting point.

Participant: I must say like, just I haven’t taught it a lot, or seen a lot of
resources but you know when I look for something for the stolen generation it’s
always a lot of voices of the children. But are there many voices of mum’s, of the
mothers?

Participant: No.

Participant 5: I mean you hear them and you can find them but it’s not the voice,
and why isn’t it the voice? Like, why is it about, you know, -

Participant 4: Is it because it isn’t recorded?

Facilitator: So it would be an oral history.

Participant 3: It was an oral history, it comes back to an oral history and I
suppose it was done in 1997, so kids were stolen, like kids were removed for a
long time, so 1997 they were probably maybe 50, 60 years old then. So I suppose
it was how many were willing at that stage in the 90s to come forward.
Participant 2: And maybe still alive.

Participant 3: Yeah maybe still alive, because 60 too, you know, look at the statistics around 60 year old people whose children were removed from them, it’s probably not that great. So yeah, maybe it’s just.

Participant 5: But that leads into why there’s problem and a real lack of voices from that time for women, because they just weren’t valued so it’s one thing to say, we need more voices, but it’s another to say they don’t exist.

Facilitator: So is that where the intercultural factor lies?

Participant 5: And that’s why I think our texts are very male dominated and why they’re all so white centred, but then, oh but yes we’re being very empathetic and record what happened, but it’s <over talk> *00:40:23.

Participant 5: And they have a women’s section.

Participant 3: Yeah and maybe if we were teaching in Carlton or if I was teaching out at *00:40:29 in P to 12 and I had a half Afghani class, they’re not white. Here they are reading about, and they’re kind of like. I often wonder how it kind of seems to people who have just arrived here sometimes, you know, where we kind of oh, this is kind of the white perspective. They probably think this is a bit weird, sometimes I think, it might seem a bit weird, yeah.

Facilitator: Okay, so we’re pretty much done, that’s great.
APPENDIX 5: Jorn Rusen – Typologies of Historical Narration and Historical Consciousness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1.1 TYPOLOGY OF HISTORICAL NARRATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Memory of</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exemplary narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical narrative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Jörn Rüsen, 2004
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of time</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Critical</th>
<th>Genetic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>repetition of an obligatory form of life</td>
<td>representing general rules of conduct or value systems</td>
<td>problematizing actual forms of life and value systems</td>
<td>change of alien forms of life into proper ones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterns of historical significance</td>
<td>permanence of an obligatory life form in temporal change</td>
<td>timeless rules of social life, timeless validity of values</td>
<td>break of patterns of historical significance by denying their validity</td>
<td>developments in which forms of life change in order to maintain their permanence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation of external life</td>
<td>affirmation of pregiven life forms by consent about a valid common life</td>
<td>relating peculiar situations to regularities of what had happened and should happen</td>
<td>delimitation of one's own standpoint against pregiven obligations</td>
<td>acceptance of different standpoints within a comprising perspective of common development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation of internal life</td>
<td>internalization of pregiven life forms by limitation—role taking</td>
<td>relating self-concepts to general rules and principles—role legitimation by generalization</td>
<td>self-reliance by refutation of obligations from outside—role making</td>
<td>change and transformation of selfconcepts as necessary conditions of permanence and self-reliance—balance of roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation to moral values</td>
<td>morality is pre-givenness of obligatory orders; moral validity as unquestionable stability by tradition</td>
<td>morality is the generality of obligation in values and value-systems</td>
<td>breaking the moral power of values by denying their validity</td>
<td>temporalization of morality-chances of further development become a condition of morality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation to moral reasoning</td>
<td>the reason of values is their effective pre-givenness enabling consent in moral questions</td>
<td>arguing by generalization, referring to regularities and principles</td>
<td>establishing value-criticism and ideology-critique as important strategies of moral discourses</td>
<td>temporal change becomes a decisive argument for the validity of moral values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Jörn Rüsen, 2004