

CULTURES OF SCHOOLING

Pedagogies for Cultural Difference
and Social Access

Mary Kalantzis, Bill Cope,
Greg Noble, Scott Poynting

ROUTLEDGE LIBRARY EDITIONS:
EDUCATION



ROUTLEDGE LIBRARY EDITIONS:
EDUCATION

CULTURES OF SCHOOLING

CULTURES OF SCHOOLING
Pedagogies for Cultural Difference and
Social Access

MARY KALANTZIS, BILL COPE, GREG NOBLE,
SCOTT POYNTING

Volume 183

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published in 1990

This edition first published in 2012

by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada

by Routledge

711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 1990 M. Kalantzis, B. Cope, G. Noble and S. Poynting

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 13: 978-0-415-61517-4 (Set)

eISBN 13: 978-0-203-81617-2 (Set)

ISBN 13: 978-0-415-50439-3 (Volume 183)

eISBN 13: 978-0-203-12833-6 (Volume 183)

Publisher's Note

The publisher has gone to great lengths to ensure the quality of this reprint but points out that some imperfections in the original copies may be apparent.

Disclaimer

The publisher has made every effort to trace copyright holders and would welcome correspondence from those they have been unable to trace.

Cultures of Schooling: Pedagogies for Cultural Difference and Social Access

Mary Kalantzis
Bill Cope
Greg Noble
Scott Poynting

Based on a report for the Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education, Canberra, commissioned as part of its contribution to the Education and Cultural and Linguistic Pluralism Project conducted by the Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris.



The Falmer Press

(A member of the Taylor & Francis Group)

London · New York · Philadelphia

UK	The Falmer Press, Rankine Road, Basingstoke, Hampshire, RG24 OPR
USA	The Falmer Press, Taylor and Francis Inc., 1900 Frost Road, Suite 101 Bristol, PA 19007

© M. Kalantzis, B. Cope,
G. Noble and S. Poynting 1990

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without permission in writing from the Publisher.

First published in 1990

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Cultures of schooling : pedagogies for cultural difference
and social access.

1. Australia. Multicultural education

I. Kalantzis, Mary

370.115

ISBN 1-85000-784-5

ISBN 1-85000-785-3 pbk

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Cultures of schooling: pedagogies for cultural difference
and social access/Mary Kalantzis ... [et al.].

p. cm.

'A draft report for the Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education, Canberra, commissioned as part of its contribution to the Education and Cultural and Linguistic Pluralism Project conducted by the Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris.'

'University of Wollongong, Australia, Centre for Multicultural Studies.'

'November 1989.'

Includes index.

ISBN 1-85000-784-5—ISBN 1-85000-785-3 (pbk.)

1. Education, Bilingual—Australia—Case studies.
2. Intercultural education—Australia—Case studies. I. Kalantzis, Mary. II. Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education. III. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Education and Cultural and Linguistic Pluralism Project. IV. University of Wollongong. Centre for Multicultural Studies.

LC3739.C85 1989

371.97'00994—dc20

90-43996

CIP

Jacket design by Caroline Archer

Typeset in 10.5/12 Caledonia
by Graphicraft Typesetters Ltd. Hong Kong.

Printed in Great Britain by Burgess Science Press,
Basingstoke

Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	vi
<i>Foreword</i>	vii
Joseph Lo Bianco	
<i>Chapter 1</i> Introduction	1
<i>Chapter 2</i> A Systems Perspective	15
<i>Chapter 3</i> A Mission of 'Empowerment': The Community Liaison Program at MacKillop Girls' High School	40
<i>Chapter 4</i> 'Australian is a Wide Word': The Bilingual 'ESSPRO' and Languages Other Than English Programs at Brunswick East High School	68
<i>Chapter 5</i> 'Different Paths We'll Tread': The Translators' and Interpreters' Course at Burwood Girls' High School	92
<i>Chapter 6</i> 'Two Steps Forward, One Step Back': The Bilingual and Languages Other Than English Programmes at Collingwood Education Centre	116
<i>Chapter 7</i> 'A Place in the World': The Language in Learning Program and the Intensive Language Unit at Cabramatta High School	148
<i>Chapter 8</i> 'Culture Cocktail': The English as a Second Language and Languages Other Than English Programmes at Footscray High School	181
<i>Chapter 9</i> Conclusions: Pedagogies for Cultural Difference and Social Access	215
<i>Bibliography</i>	251
<i>Index</i>	262

Acknowledgments

Special thanks to Joe Lo Bianco for his comments on an earlier draft report; the members of the Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education (AACLAME) steering committee who provided useful advice at the project design stage; the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) project organizers, particularly Allan Wagner and Jim Cummins who provided the critical impetus in the formulation of the case study protocol; and, perhaps most importantly, the educational administrators, principals, teachers, parents and students who so graciously allowed us to intrude in their lives. Needless to say, responsibility for the content of the report resides with the authors.

Foreword

Multicultural social policies in Australia have tended to gravitate between two opposing extremes, which in the past have seemed irreconcilable. On the one hand there has been a stress on the needs of minority communities to equip them with the linguistic skills and cultural knowledge so that their adjustment to the dominant societal values would be eased, and to bring about social justice, occupational mobility and educational equity for these minority groups. At the other extreme, multicultural policies have stressed the enrichment to the whole society through diversity and social pluralism. In education, multicultural policies have mirrored these emphases — occasionally stressing appropriate English language education, transitional bilingual programmes, bicultural aspects to curricula and facilitation of home-school relationships, thereby directly targeting immigrant and Aboriginal minorities and aiming to ensure educational equality for them. At other times, the stress has been on making available ‘community’ language programmes for all students, adding ‘multicultural perspectives’ across all curricula, and teaching history, Australian studies and social education generally from a pluralist perspective; in this way trying to construct a new version of Australian identity.

In recent years, a new emphasis has emerged which incorporates but transcends these two divergent tendencies. This new way of conceiving, ‘naming’ and talking about multicultural policies and their application to education reconciles the contradictory emphases of the past with a stress on the social and economic *functionalism* of cultural pluralism. In education, it is more common now to conceive of children’s cultural and linguistic diversity not as a *problem* to be eradicated, nor necessarily as a *right* to be guaranteed, but rather, as a *resource* to be cultivated — an intellectual, social and economic resource. An essential part of this new way of viewing cultural and linguistic pluralism has to do with the construction of a vigorous and new national identity — no longer dependent and derivative but, at the same time, locally and internationally oriented.

In this respect, Australia is part of what will increasingly be a world-wide phenomenon; driven by the universalization of labour migration, increased

Foreword

economic interdependence among nations, the emergence of large trading blocs, greatly expanded international student mobility and the unification of the globe in a network of sophisticated, instantaneous telecommunications. Traditionally labour-exporting nations such as Italy and Greece are now immigrant-receiving nations, hosting hundreds of thousands of foreign-born workers; 'guest' workers in Northern Europe have 'stayed on', and their 'home countries' are now either in the EEC or have applied to join, and the provisions for bringing about the single European Market by 1993 would mean the free movement of labour. Japan's labour force now increasingly includes Pakistanis, Bangladeshis, Filipinos; many societies which previously regarded pluralism as a 'North American' phenomenon are having to acknowledge the issue. Race relations, pluralism, teaching national languages to domestic minorities, and cultural and linguistic preparation for international communication are on the agenda of many societies, developed and developing alike. Such changes have influenced the way in which second language learning in schools is regarded. Whereas only fifteen years ago the learning of languages in Australia (in a world then presumed by some to speak only English) was only rarely regarded as instrumentally useful, now language learning is advocated mostly in this way.

The Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education (AACLAME) has sought to invest considerations of cultural pluralism in Australian education with a more modern, some would say a more 'hard-nosed', economically rationalist dimension, without neglecting either the rights and opportunities of minorities or the benefits of culture to the wider society, but bringing these together into a broader discourse. The traditional mainstays of multicultural education, *viz* cultural and linguistic maintenance for minority groups, and their equal access to the socially dominant language, knowledge and values, could be revitalized by placing them in an overarching internationalist context and seeing the pluralism of our population as a resource enhancing Australia's capacity to participate in the world.

The programme which funded many of the innovations examined in this book was terminated in 1986 federal budget. The case studies in this extremely valuable book are eloquent testimony to the fact that Australian teachers and schools have been given an enormously difficult job to do, and, with only 'stop-start' and inadequate support, they have done it very well indeed. Serious problems of increasing the achievement levels of students, and the range and depth of language programmes — *i.e.*, problems of planning to service a multilingual, multicultural population (and this increasingly within an international orientation) persist.

The book documents that the process of innovation is a long and arduous one and that the society's ever increasing expectations of schools are not matched by the appropriate support for them. Despite this, very many Australian schools have embraced the principles of cultural pluralism and fashioned them into viable and imaginative curricula.

I commend the authors for the dedicated and systematic way they have

Foreword

gone about their task, and assure them, and the schools which so generously gave of their time, that AACLAME is committed to addressing the issues they report to us — both to the OECD/CERI, of whose project on Education and Cultural and Linguistic Pluralism this research forms a part; and to the relevant Australian authorities.

Joseph Lo Bianco

Chair

Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education

Chapter 1

Introduction

Setting the Scene: Servicing Cultural and Linguistic Diversity in Australia

Australia is the site of a quite remarkable social experiment. In just over four decades since the post-war immigration programme began, the Australian population has more than doubled, from 7.5 million in 1947 to 16 million by the mid-1980s. Without immigration, given the birth rates of the native born, the Australian population would now be only about 11 million. This in itself is not remarkable. Mass migration has been one of the most important historical features of the era of global industrialization, from the country to the city, the developing to the developed world, from points of crisis to points of quieter affluence. But, in a half century when global mobility has been greater than ever before, Australia's immigration programme has been greater than that of any first world country relative to the size of the existing population, bar the peculiar historical phenomenon of the establishment of the state of Israel in British Mandated Palestine.¹

The diversity of Australia's post-war immigrant intake is also remarkable. Ostensibly, the first Minister for Immigration, Arthur Calwell, intended that mainly English-speaking immigrants come from the British Isles. This fitted with the official policy of assimilation, in which those people least likely to appear different in cultural and linguistic terms were to be encouraged as ideal immigrants and non-English speakers were to become 'normal', unaccented English-speaking Australians by the second generation. In fact, this prescription for cultural and linguistic homogeneity was immediately unworkable, even in the late 1940s, and the historical evidence shows that Calwell knew it despite much of the public rhetoric.² As insufficient British immigrants could be recruited, a large emphasis was placed on recruiting refugees from Northern and Central Europe. During the 1950s and 1960s, recruitment was increasingly from Southern Europe — again, very much determined by the availability of suitable immigrants. During the 1970s, with the 'economic miracle' in Europe, the net had to be spread still further, to include Middle

Eastern countries, particularly Turkey and Lebanon, then South and Central America. From the mid-1970s an increasing number of Indo-Chinese came to Australia, many as refugees. This was nominally the result of an international humanitarian obligation and a by-product of Australia's involvement in the Vietnam War. In reality, considerable diplomatic pressure was brought to bear upon Australia by front-line South East Asian countries with a serious refugee problem, and the Australian government perceived a need to avert the possibility of a large-scale arrival of 'boat people' on the shores of Northern Australia.³

Thus, although the original official intention of Australia's post-war immigration programme had been cultural and linguistic homogeneity, the end result has been extraordinary diversity. As well as about 150 extant Aboriginal languages, there are now over 100 immigrant ethnic groups, speaking about 80 different languages. Over 25 per cent of the population in 1988 was of non-English speaking background (NESB).⁴ Of the two million Australians who reported in the 1986 Census that they spoke a language other than English at home, 20.6 per cent spoke Italian, 13.6 Greek, 6.7 per cent a Chinese language, 5.6 per cent German and 5.4 per cent Arabic; Spanish, the various Yugoslav languages, Polish, Dutch, Vietnamese, Maltese, French, Macedonian, Aboriginal languages, Turkish, Hungarian and Russian each scored between 1 and 5 per cent; and a very large proportion of 14.4 per cent were 'other' languages, each with less than 1 per cent representation per language.⁵

Numbers and diversity alone, however, do not justify the claim that this continent is the site of a remarkable social experiment. Immigrants have officially been encouraged to come and become citizens, not guestworkers. Unlike other countries whose immigrant recruitment was largely for labour force reasons, Australia's immigration involved population building and thus permanent settlement. Later this reality came to be forced upon countries with temporary guestworker programmes, despite their intentions. A succession of sophisticated settlement policies were orchestrated by the Australian federal government for two purposes: to reduce the social cost of return migration and to 'sell' mass immigration to the existing population — a population which in 1947 was 90 per cent Australian born, almost exclusively Anglophone, and harbouring a vigorous history of racism.

The history of these policies — from the assimilation policy of the 1940s to the 1960s, then integration, and, most recently, multiculturalism since the late 70s — is complex, subtle, and of immense historical importance. If one overarching assessment of these programmes can be made, it is that, on their own terms, they have been extremely successful. For immigrants, there has been a degree of upward social mobility, perhaps not always commensurate with their aspirations but at least as significant as that found in any other country at a similar stage of economic development.⁶ In broader social terms, one of the world's most homogeneous societies, culturally insular and racist, has been peacefully transformed into one of the most diverse. The extraordi-

nary sense of quiet on this continent belies an experience of world historical significance in the pace and extent of population change. The fact that change on this scale was effected in so few decades and the quiet maintained, history having been made almost behind the backs of its population, itself attests to the sophistication, creativity and adaptiveness of the succession of government policies dealing with cultural and linguistic diversity.⁷ Australia, in this respect, is an important place to look for lessons about social policy and practice relating to immigration and settlement.

This book documents this historical achievement on one social site only — schooling. Education, in fact, happens to be an extraordinarily significant site. It is compulsory. It is the place where the state, as nation builder and maker of national identity, can play its most deliberate, systematic and sustained socializing role. It is a place where the state can be creating the cultural conditions for peaceful social change rather than reactively patching up popular resistances to change. In fact, at each stage in the development of Australian policy, the state has always seen education this way: as one of the most important places where the real work of assimilation, or integration or multiculturalism — whatever the policy at the time happened to be — took place.

Perhaps ironically, recently vocal opponents of multicultural education cite the social mobility of immigrants as a reason to scrap specialist programmes. Immigrants do not seem to need, so these opponents argue, the special treatment and additional government expense. Ethnic minorities have their own particular sense of commitment, closely bound into the migration process itself, manifest in the ‘ethnic success ethic’ or ‘ethnic work ethic’. It is argued that these factors, extraneous to institutionalized education, mean that specialist servicing such as multicultural education is unnecessary. These critics, in other words, advocate a *laissez faire* approach to the interaction of processes of immigration/settlement and education.⁸

Critical to the story of mobility, however, has been the success of education systems in meeting the special needs of immigrant students, in part through precisely those special programmes which the new critics of multicultural education seek to abandon. Rather ironically, it is precisely the interventionary role taken by Australian governments, not just in education but in all areas of social policy, that has made the social changes wrought upon Australian society by mass immigration so peaceful, despite the cultural proclivities of the native born population in 1947, despite the extent of the changes, and despite the inherent structural difficulties of incorporating labour migrants in such a way that they do not form a permanently ghettoized underclass. Whatever their weaknesses, federal government policies of assimilation, followed by policies of integration and then of multiculturalism, were extremely active and effective processes of state intervention, almost always ahead of public opinion in their historical vision, and taking an educative stance even in relation to ‘educated’, seemingly professional and ‘expert’ service providers, such as state education authorities and teachers. Most importantly, these policies have never been static. Assimilation, for example, was a necessary story to tell a

population about to face mass labour immigration, but with a powerful, popular tradition of economically-based racism. But the architects of mass immigration knew right from the start that the immigration programme would inevitably bring with it cultural diversity which could not be erased by fiat of a policy of assimilation. Assimilation was therefore an extremely effective step in creating a culturally and linguistically diverse society, and its success was its own peaceful supersession by integration and multiculturalism.⁹ Similarly, today, multiculturalism is an unfinished historical process, visionary and historically active, yet ridden with limitations and inherent difficulties upon which its practitioners work creatively in their daily activity.

Despite the effective role of education, for example, in creating lasting social, cultural and linguistic change in Australia, there are still critical issues to be tackled. The positive social effects of education are distributed unevenly among ethnic groups. And even when educational attainments are statistically positive for any one ethnic group, generalization about the performance of students of particular ethnic groups ignores the fact that each group is itself deeply divided socioeconomically and by school performance. Even if one small stratum is making it through to higher education at a rate marginally more than average, the majority may still be having difficulties specific to their minority cultural and linguistic status in Australia in which their background plays a contributing part. Moreover, first generation immigrants enjoy substantially less social mobility through education than the second generation.¹⁰ And the cultural and linguistic content of curriculum is an issue that all Australian schools need to face all the time. These are just a few of the nagging questions that face those dealing with cultural and linguistic diversity in Australian education.

Thus this book is a critical documentation of an evolving social project. Australia might in some respects lead the world in the development of multicultural education policies and practices, yet this means more than ever that we must evaluate our ongoing failings, as lessons to be learnt before taking the next step. There are no lessons for direct export, which can be happily duplicated elsewhere. But there are experiences of partial success and a constructive approach to failure that might be very useful.

A Focus on Innovation

The research project 'Education and Cultural and Linguistic Pluralism: Innovative Schools' (ECALP), upon which this book is based, was devised by the Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (CERI) in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). A number of OECD member countries is involved in a parallel programme of research, employing a common methodology centred around a case-study protocol. The Australian component of the project was initiated and subsequently funded by the

Australian Advisory Council on Languages and Multicultural Education (AACLAME) which operates under the National Policy on Languages. The Australian fieldwork and reporting has been undertaken by the Centre for Multicultural Studies at the University of Wollongong, New South Wales.

The objectives of the overall project were expressed by CERI/OECD as follows:

The purpose of this project is to study innovation strategies which have resulted in particularly successful forms of education for the children of immigrants or ethnic minority groups. Through case studies of innovations in OECD member countries, approaches proven to be successful in a variety of settings will be identified and the common conditions under which the approaches have succeeded will be described and analysed.

The detailed analysis of the innovations is likely to be of interest to all those who are involved in multicultural education. It will draw attention to some effective and exemplary practices and also identify useful criteria for the formulation of new policies in this area. In assembling case studies from a number of countries, the project seeks to go beyond the narrow circumstances reflected in a particular educational system or country setting. In this way, the conditions under which innovations succeed may be revealed more clearly, even amplified.

A case study approach is especially well suited to the goals of the project, since inclusion in the sample is dictated by the uniqueness or creativity of the approach rather than on the number of such cases. The multi-site case study strategy adopted for the project is unique in that, while the case studies are guided by the overall objectives of the CERI project, the design allows for case studies of quite different types of innovations. As a result, the individual case studies will have in common those aspects necessary to permit comparisons across cases, but they will differ in striking ways according to the characteristics, settings and purposes of the innovation/approach under study.¹¹

For the Australian component of the project, case studies were conducted at Brunswick East High School, Collingwood Education Centre and Footscray High School (each part of the Victorian state education system); Burwood Girls' High School and Cabramatta High School (both part of the New South Wales state education system); and MacKillop Girls' High School (a Catholic systemic school, in the Sydney Archdiocese). These secondary schools were selected by AACLAME in consultation with the Victorian Ministry of Education, the New South Wales Department of Education and Catholic Education Office, Sydney. The criteria for selection were those specified in the ECALP project guidelines:

Cultures of Schooling

The schools that will be singled out as candidates for a case study will be chosen from among those providing examples of approaches which have been successful in improving the performance of minority children in the following educational situations:

- i) Cultural/linguistic incorporation;
- ii) Community participation;
- iii) Pedagogy;
- iv) Assessment;
- v) Use of new technologies in basic learning.

It will become clear as this book unfolds that 'innovation' in the Australian context turned out to be a somewhat different phenomenon to that evidently presupposed in the original project design. This does not imply that the focus on innovation was unfruitful or that there was no innovation to be found. On the contrary, the six Australian case-study sites were able to show off innovations in multicultural education of precisely the order of those anticipated by CERI/OECD. But, taking the liberty of 'reading into' the CERI/OECD guidelines, the rationales of seeking 'uniqueness or creativity' rather than representative national cases, and of attempting 'to go beyond the narrow circumstances reflected in a particular educational system or country setting', imply that perhaps isolated but replicable cases of excellence in multicultural education are thrown up at a grassroots level, in very specific micro-environments.

In none of the six Australian case studies were innovations found that had been developed uniquely within that school. There were no school-based innovations in this sense. Yet innovations there were, in the sense of dramatic departures from traditional curriculum and school structures. These, however, have to be viewed as systemic, structural, historico-cultural events, in which the basis of educational innovation and change, and, in some cases, the reasons for the abandonment of certain of the innovations, are to be located outside the school itself. This is not to deny that the six cases surveyed here are amongst the best to be found in Australia, but to locate the origin and sustainability of the innovations outside each school — to those broad historical phenomena, alluded to above, that make Australia an interesting place.

Further, within each school it is often not the innovatory programme or practice alone which 'works' for the school, but the institutional framework in which it is set: that cluster of leadership, sense of community, and so on, that make a good school 'work' as a whole. Sometimes, in fact, there was nothing innovatory about the programme itself (such as teaching Turkish from traditional textbooks). It was simply having Turkish in the school, as part of a compulsory core programme in languages other than English, that was innovative. Turkish would never have featured in a more traditional curriculum structure, taught to Turkish-speaking background students.

Case-Study Methodology

The principal data sources for the six case studies were:

Education

Authorities: Policies and other documentary evidence
Extended key informant interviews

School Staff: Extended key informant interviews (principals, key teachers, school support staff)
Policies and programme documentation
Records: enrolment
Records: achievement
Classroom observation

Students: Selected extended interviews
Written questionnaires
Observation of classroom/playground interaction
Analysis of work produced

Parents: Selected extended interviews
Observation of parent-school interaction (such as meetings)

External: Community profile data
Community sources: local government/ethnic organizations (interviews and documentary evidence)

It is evident that there were three main means of collecting data: collecting documentary evidence, structured extended interviews and observation. The first step in analyzing each case-study situation was to examine closely all supporting documentation, particularly as it reflects systems/school/programme objectives, the sociological context of the school (such as enrolment details) and educational results. This was followed by structured oral interviews centred around the key case-study questions. The format of the interview schedule was both focused and open, allowing for responses and lines of conversation to go beyond the alternative answers presupposed in the interview format. Particular care was taken to seek out different perspectives on the multicultural education innovations, from the committed, to the uncommitted and the oppositional. Interviews ranged in length from forty-five minutes to two and a half hours and were tape-recorded with the interviewee's permission. In some cases, it was necessary to return to re-interview certain key informants when issues came up in subsequent fieldwork that required additional clarification from them. Finally, observations were made of classroom interaction, and various school meetings: staff meetings, parent-teacher evenings and school councils, for example. This involved recording observed interactions, based on semi-structured observation schedules, and was incidental to the main thrust of the interviewing and collection of documentary material.

Case-study methodology (unlike, for example, voluntary participation in an interview or laboratory work) involves the researcher peculiarly in observation of the subject's everyday world of experience. It is thus potentially much more an intrusion than other forms of research. This difficulty is compounded by the 'official' nature of this project. Accordingly, preliminary negotiations involved explaining the project in full and seeking permission from education authorities (insofar as they were not already aware of its objectives and methodology), principals, teachers, parents and students. A brief (two page) and clear description of the project was prepared, and continuous explanation provided orally as the need arose.

Given this intrusive nature of the research, the researchers' programme took second priority to the needs of individual subjects and school organization. This was the case both for time planning and the data collection itself. Interviewing, for example, had to be open-ended with no necessary assumption that the interviewee could or would want to cooperate or follow the logic of the questioning and data analysis. Data collection instruments were thus not presented as rigid or mandatory in form, but more as a structured programme of prompts in situations that had more of the feel of an extended conversation than a formal interview. The willingness of schools to give of their time and throw their activities open to public scrutiny, hiding no warts, was quite remarkable, and is reflected in the very full, complex and, at times, necessarily controversial picture that comes through in the case-study chapters.

The particular virtue of case-study methodology is that it actively seeks out the detailed dynamics of social process, rather than, as is the tendency in more traditional social research, collating results and inferring causal relationships. If in a given context, certain things demonstrably work or do not work for reasons that can be traced in the details of process, then generalizations can be drawn about the transferability of this experience to a similar context.

A veritable mountain of data was interrogated for its validity and reliability according to the following criteria, adapted from Yin¹²:

- i) **Construct Validity:** Does each case study focus on the operational issues it purports to reflect?
 - Multiple sources of evidence were used.
 - Agreed cause-effect relations were established both amongst the research team and in discussion with key informants.
 - Key informants were asked to review case study drafts.
- ii) **Internal Validity:** Within the case study, do purported cause-effect relations hold?
 - Alternative or rival explanations were sought.
 - Frequency of response, observation, and so on was checked.
 - Purported cause-effect was checked against time series.
 - Different types of evidence (such as oral/documentary) were cross-checked.

- All observations and interviews were attended by two researchers, and processes for the validation data discussed at the end of each interview/observation.
- iii) External Validity: Can findings be generalized from one case to another?
 - Case studies were compared with each other. Sometimes it was necessary to explain why generalization could or could not be made.
 - The innovation was examined to find out if it replicated other comparable experiences.
 - For the purposes of maximizing the validity of generalization across cases, all four researchers spent considerable stretches conducting fieldwork (in rotating pairs) in all six schools, and all contributed to the writing of this book.
- iv) Reliability: Would another researcher conduct the same study, using the same case-study protocol, and arrive at the same conclusions?
 - The project involved questioning from a variety of perspectives, both in terms of category of individual (e.g., parent) and having enough individuals in each category to verify observations or represent effectively the range of interpretations of the cause-effect relations stemming from the innovation.

With these emphases, data reduction has occurred throughout the data collection process, focusing on salient information in three stages. Critical evaluation has been the main basis for data reduction, from the very beginning of data collection.

Method	Observations	Interviews	Documents
Analysis			
<i>Stage one:</i> Observe and establish hypotheses			
<i>Stage two:</i> Inquire further and validate hypotheses			
<i>Stage three:</i> Seek to explain data, construct narrative of report, identify gaps in data etc.			

Anticipatory data reduction had already begun before fieldwork in the formulation of the case-study propositions themselves. During stage one, the testing of hypotheses involved a dialogue between the field and the researcher which focused clearly on the salient element of the innovation and its impact. In stage two, conclusion drawing and verification began: as well as transcribing and collating the raw data, draft narratives attempting to describe patterns and irregularities were written. During stage three, this process continued, developing explanations of cause-effect relationships. A draft of the empirical narrative of the report and tentative generalization on its immediate results was ready soon after the completion of fieldwork to allow the researchers to verify ambiguous points, fill in data gaps and so on. Key informants were then asked to read and verify this narrative.

The Case-Study Propositions

The general framework of investigation for the ECALP project was spelt out by CERI/OECD as follows:

All the OECD countries share the view that the school should prepare all pupils for active participation in the life of the society and that all children should have equal chances of success. This broad view raises a number of questions about such matters as the avoidance of under-achievement and wastage of human resources; the improvement of the performance of all pupils; and the positive exploitation of diverse cultural and linguistic heritages (for example, through two-way bilingual education programmes).

The work proposed here is intended to throw light on two aspects: on the one hand, what is happening in those schools that are implementing multicultural education programmes (which is the purpose of the case studies) and, on the other, what happens at the policy-making level once it is decided to allow schools greater latitude so that they are able to adapt the general aims of multicultural education policies, curricula, teaching materials, and structures of support and assistance to suit local conditions.¹³

Within this overall framework, five key case-study propositions — hypotheses to be tested in each of the six schools by the study of innovations tackling the challenge of cultural and linguistic pluralism — were formulated for the Australian research. They are broadly based on the CERI/ECALP Guidelines, but include particular pedagogical and institutional perspectives that have emerged in the Australian context.

First, schools can *incorporate* 'minority' (adopting the OECD/CERI terminological equivalence with non-majority, immigrant) students in a variety of ways, each of which might portend greater success at school. They can

incorporate in the sense of bringing 'minority' students into the mainstream and providing paths to academic success (the 'ethnic disadvantage' model of specialist teaching). This may well incorporate 'minority' students successfully yet also assimilate them culturally (intentionally or unintentionally), by subsuming their 'minority' culture to the demands of the dominant culture. They can also incorporate in the sense of actively respecting and allowing the difference of 'minority' students (the cultural pluralist model). This may well succeed at the affective level (esteem, etc.), and through this, perhaps, have a bearing on student access to the mainstream. Incorporation might also take place in both of the above senses: structural equity in the context of cultural diversity. The main thrust of this proposition is that cognizance of cultural context is a necessary prerequisite to both structural incorporation (removing barriers to access to mainstream industrial society/culture) and cultural incorporation (allowing openness to cultural diversity and facing the demands of intercultural communication in the school and the community).

Second, schools can use a variety of techniques to increase the 'minority' *community participation* in education. These can range from processes which democratize decision making, to making minority parents and communities feel part of the social atmosphere of the school. Yet there are tensions between the rhetoric of participation as an ideal and, in particular circumstances, problems including: a community's capacity to participate; a potential conflict between community views on the way schools should work and the positions of authority of the school personnel; the time and material resources required to support community participation; a possible threat to teacher professionalism and control of their work; and the fact that the culturally specific liberal ideal of grassroots community participation might well be at odds with many immigrant cultural expectations. Effective school management and community participation, in other words, involves interaction in which parents and the broader community play a significant role in school life, whilst, at the same time, teacher professionalism is maintained and a mutually educative dialogue is established between school and community about the role and function of schooling in advanced industrial society.

Third, schools use a variety of *pedagogies* according to their educational philosophy; the preferred teaching styles and perceived learning styles of their students, the method that appears most effective, systems and syllabus requirements, or parental demands. Successful pedagogy reflects both the living hand of cultural tradition (cueing into culturally specific learning styles) and the particular social, linguistic and cognitive requirements of the future in a rapidly changing industrial society. This is an historically unique demand to be put upon education as a public institution and is pivotal in the articulation of private and public rites of passage or socialization. Pedagogy for 'minority' students will be most effective when it is clear about the core social linguistic and cognitive requirements of the dominant society, yet sensitive to the differential pedagogical techniques necessary to achieve that end. While addressing this core, successful multicultural education will be open to community

cultural diversity in its curriculum content and social/behavioural objectives. Pedagogical strategy is thus an essential issue in this twofold endeavour: initiation to the core linguistic, cognitive and employment requirements of late industrial society, yet sensitivity to the local, the culturally specific and the particular.

Fourth, *assessment* performs a dual function in schooling: promotion from one level or class to another and final school credentialling; and diagnosis of learning needs. Assessment is frequently accused of being a process of ranking which reconstructs differential performance and achievement as reflecting inferior or superior ability. For example, low ranking in the 'majority' language early in a student's school life can affect later educational participation, self-esteem, and so on. However, 'soft' forms of assessment are often weak in their capacity for comparability, in failing to report accurately on results as they lead to the final school credential for entrance to higher education, in being often unclear and ambiguous, and involving, as they frequently do, a devaluing of the assessment process to the point where it loses much of its meaning. Notwithstanding the critique of the effect and reliability of standardized testing and IQ tests on 'minority' students, assessment is crucial. Teachers need assessment tools of broad comparability for diagnostic purposes. Parent participation requires a clear and accurate assessment and reporting procedure. Students need accurate feedback on their work. Education systems need comparable results for final school credentialling and to determine entrance into post-secondary education. Assessment, therefore, needs to be designed to be sensitive to cultural differences, not foreclosing possibilities in the fashion of standardized tests or IQ tests, yet reporting to teachers, parents, students and systems in ways which are accurate and ensure comparability.

Fifth, the use of *new technologies in basic learning* can involve learning in traditional ways (but more efficiently whilst incidentally gaining familiarity with new tools), or new ways of learning, packaging knowledge or presenting curriculum which would not otherwise be presented. In other words, new technologies in basic learning can mean both more efficient ways of teaching the 'basics' using traditional pedagogy and new ways of knowing in which, for example, memory and note-taking are less important than an ability to access information storage, use spelling programs or draft and edit on a keyboard.

The Style of Reporting

These propositions are tested in the six chapters (three to eight) which report directly on each of the case studies. The style of reporting in these chapters is not analytical in the sense of interpreting the data directly and systematically in relation to the hypotheses, and vice versa. Rather, these chapters each describe a part of the life of the institution largely 'from the horse's mouth', reporting what people say, with little or no analytical commentary other than

the participants' own reading of the situation. This is appropriate because they say it all, anyway, albeit in various voices framed by various discourses. No perspective on the problem of education for cultural and linguistic pluralism seems to escape the critical gaze of these education professionals, parents and students. Direct engagement with the cases-study propositions, and interpretation of the whole spread of data, occurs in the concluding ninth chapter.

The book itself needs to be prefaced with a very strong statement in praise of teachers and school. It is, after all, an area of life and work which enjoys relatively low social prestige, for the length of training of its professionals, for the intensity of its working conditions, and for the high expectations that are placed upon it by communities and governments as a social cure-all. Despite this, the case studies stand, more than anything, as a testimony to teacher professionalism and commitment beyond the call of duty, social reward and remuneration. This professionalism and commitment is probably evident more in teachers' awareness of critical lessons to be learnt from the difficulties and limitations of their practice, than in their school success stories. The critical professional appraisals, in other words, are more revealing than reports of unequivocal success or statements of noble intention.

Notes

- 1 CASTLES, S., COPE, B., KALANTZIS, M. and MORRISSEY, M., *Mistaken Identity: Multiculturalism and the Demise of Nationalism in Australia*, Pluto Press, Sydney, pp. 24–25; AUSTRALIAN BUREAU OF STATISTICS, *Australian Yearbook 1988*, Canberra, 1988.
- 2 KIERNAN, C., *Calwell: A Personal and Political Biography*, Thomas Nelson, Melbourne, 1978, pp. 117–121; KUNZ, E.F., *Displaced Persons: Calwell's New Australians*, Australian National University Press, 1988, pp. 11–20.
- 3 VIVIANI, N., *The Long Journey: Vietnamese Migration and Settlement in Australia*, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1984, p. 114.
- 4 DEPARTMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS, *Don't Settle for Less — Report of the Committee for Stage 1 of the Review of Migrant and Multicultural Programs and Services*, (Jupp Report), Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, 1986, p. 42.
- 5 AUSTRALIAN BUREAU OF STATISTICS, *Australian Profile — Census 86*, 1988.
- 6 WOOD, D. and HUGO, G., *Distribution and Age Structure of the Australian Born with Overseas Born Parents*, DIEA, Canberra, 1984, pp. 254–257; KALANTZIS, M. and COPE, B., 'Why We Need Multicultural Education: A Review of the "Ethnic Disadvantage" Debate', *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 1988, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 39–57.
- 7 The terms 'homogeneous', 'peaceful' and 'quiet' refer to the European experience in Australia only. The indigenous Aboriginal peoples suffered grievously at the hands of the British, who, from their perspective, invaded their land. The waves of new settlers remained blind to the original dispossession and unwittingly did nothing to alleviate the injustice. This work concerned as it is with immigrants does not address the issue of the indigenous peoples of Australia. The discussion

- of multiculturalism and the forging of community in Australia cannot go forward however, without an integration of their concerns.
- 8 BIRRELL, R. and SEITZ, A., 'The Ethnic Problem in Education: The Emergence and Definition of an Issue'. Paper presented at AIMA Conference, Melbourne, 1986; BULLIVANT, B., *Getting a Fair Go; Studies of Occupational Socialisation and Perceptions of Discrimination*, Australian Government Publishing Service, Canberra, 1986; KALANTZIS, M. and COPE, B., 'Why We Need Multicultural Education: A Review of the "Ethnic Disadvantage" Debate', *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 1988, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 39-57.
 - 9 JAKUBOWICZ, A., MORRISSEY, M. and PALSER, J., *Ethnicity, Class and Social Policy in Australia*, Report No. 46, Social Welfare Research Centre, University of New South Wales, 1984, p. 27, 40.
 - 10 HUGO, S., *Australia's Changing Population: Trend and Implications*, Melbourne, Oxford University Press, 1986; HORVATH, B.M. 'An Investigation of Class Placements in New South Wales Schools', Mimeo, NSW Ethnic Affairs Commission/Sydney University, 1986; CASTLES, S., LEWIS, MORRISSEY, M. and BLACK, J., Patterns of Disadvantage Among the Overseas Born and Their Children, Centre for Multicultural Studies, Wollongong University, 1986; AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS, *Reducing the Risk; Unemployed Migrant Youth and Labour and Market Programs* AIMA, Melbourne, 1985.
 - 11 ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT: CENTRE FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND INNOVATION, Project No. 6., *Education and Cultural and Linguistic Pluralism (ECALP): Innovative Schools*, Protocol, OECD, Paris, 1989.
 - 12 YIN, R.K., *Case Study Research: Design & Methods*, 1984, Sage, p. 30.
 - 13 ORGANIZATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT: CENTRE FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND INNOVATION, Project No. 6., *Education and Cultural and Linguistic Pluralism (ECALP): Innovative Schools*, Protocol, OECD, Paris, 1989.

Chapter 2

A Systems Perspective

A Brief History of Responses to Cultural and Linguistic Diversity in Australian Education Since 1947

It is a complex history that links Australian federal immigration and settlement policy to the life of schools. At first glance, it would seem that these two realms are, institutionally at least, far removed. Under the division of powers in the Australian Constitution, immigration is a federal matter and education a state matter. Yet, the connections between the two have been very close. The immigration power has given the federal government a licence to generate programmes which meet the special needs of immigrant children. The most important constitutional turning point in this regard was the passage of the federal Immigration (Education) Act of 1971. And, in the past two decades particularly, tied grants (in the distribution of federal income taxes to the states) have given the federal government an additional lever with which to influence directly state education policy and programmes.

In fact, it is possible to argue that adjustments to the cultural and linguistic policies of the federal government have been translated into education policy and practice more quickly and more effectively than they have impacted upon other realms of life more institutionally autonomous of government, including much of high culture (such as academic interpretations of Australian history and identity) and public opinion.¹ In other words, education has been an important opinion leader, a critical element in actively reshaping Australian culture and identity. It has been a central part of the project of winning over people's hearts and minds, be it to assimilation, or integration, or multiculturalism.

The brief historical sketch that follows, therefore, concentrates on federal politics as the heart of any explanation of the origins of multicultural education in Australia. The chapters of this book that document the six case-study schools are the empirical proof of the pudding — that the political debate about immigration, settlement and cultural diversity actually came to something, indeed, often wrought significant changes, in schools.

From the beginning of the post-war immigration programme, Australian education systems were unable to turn a totally blind eye to the presence of non-English speaking immigrant children. Special classes were set up outside school time to teach 'Elementary English and Civics'. But the main idea in the quite frequent departmental exhortations to teachers was that the 'New Australian' or 'foreign-speaking' child would fit in quickly and with a minimum of assistance. This was the advice of the New South Wales Department of Education in 1951:

The fact that the New Australian child is eager to master the language and, indeed is forced to do so if he wishes to take his place amongst Australian children, makes the teacher's task much easier. It has been found that children with little or no command of English appreciate being given an 'adjustment period' of a fortnight or so during which they can observe their new class and 'get the feel' of the new conditions without being unduly worried by formal classwork. The adjustment process is helped by seating the migrant beside a sympathetic Australian child.²

It soon became obvious, however, that assimilation was not this simple. Even by the mid-1950s a New South Wales school inspector was lamenting 'the social problems of integration of Australian and Migrant Peoples'. The word describing the 'absorption' process had changed by then, as had even some of the niceties of how it was to be done, but not the fundamental historical, cultural and linguistic intent.

The Australian way of living has for its base a magnificent [English] tradition. On this base we have grafted the material and economic fruits of our adjustment to a markedly different environment . . . , [and a] preoccupation with material purposes and prospects has undoubtedly been responsible for our amazing material and scientific development.

. . . [T]he planners decided that 'social and cultural absorption' of migrant peoples was essential if Australia was to gain, in the limited time left, the national strength required in population and development for her protection. Fear of unabsorbed alien minorities, based on war-time experiences in other lands made 'assimilation' a fundamental issue in our mass immigration policy. But Australians have yet to realize the real meaning of assimilation in terms of mutual attitudes, appreciations, and activities. The first step to a better understanding of the problems is to substitute the term integration for assimilation, and to realize that differences cannot be 'rubbed off' merely by daily contact with Australians! Indeed, the merging together of peoples is a time process which has, as its outcome, the merging together of migrants and the local population in such a way