Chapter 11
Australian Multicultural Education: Revisiting and Resuscitating

Georgina Tsolidis

Introduction

Australia considers itself as a successful multiethnic society. Since the significant demographic shifts that occurred after World War II, the social cohesion that is accounted for with great pride is often linked to the policy of multiculturalism. Increasingly, politicians are describing multiculturalism as a core Australian value (Sheehan, 2005; Silkstone, 2005). In this chapter, Australian multiculturalism will be considered in relation to imperatives triggered by an increasingly globalized world (Appadurai, 1996; Castells, 1996; Robertson, 1996). Can a social policy that some have described as assimilationist in intent (Castles et al., 1988; Jakubowicz, 1981) foster global citizenship? Can a policy designed to manage intranational cultural difference dovetail successfully with transnational belongings, which are arguably the hallmark of contemporary social existence? These issues will be considered with specific reference to education, which in Australia continues to be emphasized in debates about multiculturalism. Education has been called upon to enact shifting policy emphases related to values, citizenship, and social cohesion. In the context of current debates about the so-called culture wars, the place of multiculturalism within Australian schools takes on added significance, particularly given the nation's historic reliance on immigration for population growth.

In broad terms, the education of Australian school students is divided between government and nongovernment schools, with the latter comprising systemic Catholic schools, and what are known as independent schools. Within each of these sectors there is great variation. Within the nongovernment sector there are elite Catholic and independent schools as well as parochial Catholic schools, often underresourced. The independent sector also contains schools associated with less mainstream ethnoreligious communities. In Melbourne, for example, there are Islamic, Jewish, and Greek Orthodox schools that are full-time day schools. The nongovernment sector also includes schools associated with particular pedagogies including, for example, Steiner schools.

University of Ballarat, Australia

G. Wan (ed.), *The Education of Diverse Student Populations: A Global Perspective.*

© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2008

New imperatives related to cultural difference are coupled with a general shift to small government, including in relation to education. In this context, there has been a consolidation of marketization within the school sector, particularly with reference to secondary schools. It is at this level that competition for university entry is most intense and schools are judged as more or less equipped to facilitate the high scores requisite for university places. School reputation in this regard is responsive to the student population and perceptions about particular types of students and their academic proclivities, the curriculum offered, and the types of pedagogies utilized. In this way multiculturalism is implicated in such considerations, both in terms of the diversity of the student population and the curriculum and pedagogy offered (Tsolidis, 2006). A historical and policy context for these issues will be provided in the next sections of this chapter.

Australia: A Nation of Immigrants

In Australia, the terms "minority" and "majority" are commonly used to differentiate between the ethnic majority, seen as the "real" Australians, and the "new Australians." This notion of "Australianness" must be explored in the context of Aboriginal history. White occupation in Australia is just over 200 years old. The distinction between "real" and "nonreal" non-Aboriginal Australians needs to be considered in this context. The claim to legitimate "Australianness" by those with British ancestry is related to the colonization of Aboriginal Australia. Colonization established the British cultural hegemony that still characterizes mainstream Australian society, an important element of which is racism.

British colonialism was underpinned by social Darwinist understandings of race, which created a hierarchy of peoples and cultures based on an assumption of British superiority. The late-19th-century scientific obsession with classification extended to the exploration of national types. There was a belief that factors such as national prosperity and morality were a product of a national character; this notion was used to support the belief that the Anglo-Saxon race was superior. There was great interest in whether this superiority would degenerate or progress in the colonies. The Australian national type was understood as the best of British stock combined with an environment that allowed outdoor living and sport. The understanding was that the British type would thrive, particularly in Australia, because unlike other colonies, 98% of the population was British. However, this racial purity needed to be protected and immigration policy has historically been used to this end, specifically the notorious White Australia Policy. This policy was instituted in response to the Gold Rushes and the desire to control Chinese immigration. It remained active in various forms and in response to various groups of would-be immigrants until the 1970s.

Despite a clear preference for a British population, non-British immigration to Australia has had a long history. This was most pronounced after World War II, when there was heavy reliance on immigration to increase the population. However, immigration policy was underpinned by a clear understanding of what constituted

"Australian" and the "Australian way of life". This was reflected in the government's explicit preference for British immigrants. When such immigrants failed to come in the desired numbers, despite incentives such as assisted passage schemes, the government set about consolidating a hierarchy of desirability. This coincided with familiarity, often established on the basis of physical features. For example, people from northern Europe were deemed more desirable because of their blonde hair, blue eyes, and fair complexions. Cultural traits also were important in determining the possibility of successful assimilation. As the government grew more desperate for immigrants, the source countries became more diverse. It was in this context that so many people from southern Europe entered Australia. They were simultaneously least desirable and imperative for the planned rapid industrialisation (Castles et al., 1988; de Lepervanche & Bottomley, 1988; Hage, 1998; Jakubowicz, 2002; Tsolidis, 2001).

Racism takes many forms as the context shifts with time and place. The emphasis on compatibility through sameness nonetheless continues. In Australia this has been traditionally framed through political discourse related to assimilation. Southern Europeans and so-called "Asians" have been considered incompatible because of a range of physical and cultural attributes. More recently, Muslim groups have been highlighted as not belonging; their dress and, therefore, appearance, as well as cultural practices associated with their religion, have been used to demark exclusion and natural nonbelonging (Browning & Jakubowicz, 2003; Hage, 2003; Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, 1991; Poynting, 2004; Victorian Committee to Advise the Attorney-General on Racial Vilification, 1992).

Managing Diversity

The success of managing the rapid demographic changes that occurred subsequent to World War II have been attributed to multicultural policy. This has been distinguished from the explicitly assimilationist policies that characterized the immediate postwar period. Nonetheless, debates have continued as to the nature of and rationale for such policy. Castles (1997) offers several models of multiculturalism and argues that the dominant model operating within Australia has been toward managing, rather than valuing, diversity. Such a view of multiculturalism is in contrast to radical or critical interpretations of it, which take into account structural inequalities that work against different minorities in various ways, most notably, those related to socio-economic factors. In the next section of the paper an overview of key elements of Australian multicultural policy will be provided.

The Schools Commission

In the 1970s the election of the first Labor Government after 25 years of Conservative rule led to a number of significant shifts in policy emphasis, which

were arguably aligned with the social movements that had characterised the 1960s and 1970s. Providing more opportunities and human rights for working-class people, women, indigenous peoples, and ethnic minorities became a priority, and this was reflected within education policy. There was a fervent belief that education could spearhead social reform; to this end the Schools Commission was formed to recommend on related priorities and accompanying funding strategies. It reported in 1973 through the Karmel Report, named after its chairman, Peter Karmel. The education of ethnic minorities was foreshadowed as an issue requiring special attention in this report and taken up in more detail in the first Schools Commission Triennieum Report (1975).

The right of ethnic minorities to maintain "dual cultural identity within a framework of Australian allegiance and to keep this possibility open for their children" (Schools Commission, 1975, p. 88) was the framing sentiment in the first Schools Commission Triennium Report. In the report was outlined the responsibility of schooling to assist with the maintenance of minority students' first language and culture. Also stressed was the need for English-language competence in order for all students to access the full range of opportunities within Australian society. In relation to the teaching of English as a second language (ESL), the Schools Commission emphasised the role specialist language teachers had in providing withdrawal classes for newly arrived non-English-speaking students and in assisting with the professional development of their colleagues so schools could provide a language-across-the-curriculum approach. Such an approach, it was argued, would benefit all students who had literacy problems including ethnic minority students born in Australia and Anglophone Australians. The Schools Commission also emphasised the responsibility schooling had to provide ethnic minority students with cultural reinforcement and to acquaint mainstream students with the multicultural nature of Australian society:

While these changes are particularly important to undergird the self-esteem of migrant children they also have application for all Australian children growing up in a society which could be greatly enriched through a wider sharing in the variety of cultural heritages now present in it (Schools Commission, 1975, p. 91).

In its first Triennium Report, the Schools Commission extended what had hitherto been known as "migrant education" beyond the teaching of English to non-English speakers. It highlighted the need for mother-tongue and cultural maintenance and recognized the important role these played in students' self-esteem and learning. It recognized the need for a two-way process that required the education of both majority and minority students. It also challenged the understandings that had dominated previous ESL programs. Rather than specialist staff withdrawing minority students into separate programs and separate rooms to learn English, there were references to bilingual programs, professional development programs for nonspecialist staff so they could take some responsibility for these students' acquisition of English, and the provision of resources so specialist and nonspecialist staff could work together on the development of language-appropriate curriculum. In these ways the education of ethnic minority students had the potential to become integrated into the mainstream life of a school, rather than remain peripheral.

This report represented a significant shift away from compensatory models of teaching and learning. It had been common for immigrant students to be withdrawn from classes and isolated in peripheral locations, including those not intended for teaching. These were makeshift arrangements in schools where it had been assumed all students were native speakers of English. It was not uncommon for students with English language difficulties to be deemed to have learning difficulties and placed in the care of what were known as remedial English teachers. In this context, allowing students into the mainstream classroom, where they received some additional support to develop English language skills more naturally, was welcome. This approach allowed immersion into an English language environment, gave students access to learning in other curriculum areas, and encouraged all teachers to develop awareness and strategies that brought language awareness into their teaching, regardless of the subject taught.

The Galbally Report

In 1977 the Australian Commonwealth Government appointed a committee to review services available to ethnic minority communities. The committee, which had Frank Galbally as its chairman, produced the report *Review of Post Arrival Programs and Services to Migrants*, which is more commonly referred to as the Galbally Report (1978). This was an extensive review of both government and nongovernment services including education, health, and law, whereby their appropriateness for ethnic minority communities was assessed. In relation to education, the establishment of the Multicultural Education Program to allocate $5 million specifically to assist with the development of multicultural curriculum was recommended. The rights of ethnic minorities to maintain their cultural identity and the need for all students to acquire knowledge of Australia's multicultural character was advocated. The allocation of $5 million was intended to stimulate a range of initiatives including the teaching of community languages and cultures, bilingual approaches, multicultural perspectives programs, related teacher professional development, relevant materials development, parent and community involvement, and research.

The review committee responsible for the Galbally Report drafted its recommendations under broad guiding principles that stressed concepts of equal opportunity and access, cultural maintenance and tolerance, the need for specialist services and programs as an interim measure towards the issues being taken up by existing programs, and the importance of self-help towards self-reliance. Within it was embedded an understanding of multiculturalism that equated pluralism with democracy and social cohesion. It was argued that "[p]rovided that ethnic identity is not stressed at the expense of society at large, but is interwoven into the fabric of our nationhood by the process of multicultural interaction, then the community as a whole will benefit substantially and its democratic nature will be reinforced" (Committee of Review of Post Arrival Programs and Services for Migrants, 1978,

p. 104). Within this framework, respect for cultural difference was expected to guarantee social cohesion by fostering in ethnic minorities a sense of security.

It was recommended that a committee of educators with relevant expertise draw up guidelines for the allocation of the $5 million and that policies and programs in related areas be coordinated through formal structures established at the Commonwealth level (Committee of Review of Post Arrival Programs and Services for Migrants, 1978). In accordance with this recommendation, two committees were established: the Committee on Multicultural Education and the Commonwealth Education Portfolio Group. The Committee on Multicultural Education was convened by McNamara and reported to the Schools Commission with its advice on the allocation of the $5 million. In its report, *Education for a Multicultural Society*, published in 1979, the committee defined some key terms. It stated a preference for the phrase "education for a multicultural society" because it indicated a "philosophy which permeates the total work of the school" (Committee on Multicultural Education, 1979, p. 10) rather than a strand of education that was implicit in the term "multicultural education." Similarly, the committee stressed that education for a multicultural society was intended for the whole community, not just for schools with large percentages of ethnic minority students. Three areas of work were identified as particularly significant: (1) relationships between schools and homes and students and teachers; (2) the curriculum, particularly multicultural perspectives and language teaching and learning; and (3) support mechanisms including training, research, and communication of information (Committee on Multicultural Education, 1979, p. 11). *Education for a Multicultural Society* included a series of recommendations on how schools should approach multiculturalism. The relationship between the home and the school was emphasized within these.

This needs to be considered in the context of prevailing discourses of the time. Commonly, the education of so-called migrant students was considered with reference to "culture clash". The school represented the mainstream way of operating and the family, the ways of the parents' homeland, often assumed to be backward-looking and thus potentially inhibiting the students' academic and social achievement. Flowing from psychologistic frameworks and the assumption that the desired end point was assimilation, emphasis was placed on reconciling students with the dominant culture as a way of eliminating the contradictions assumed to exist between the cultures of their home and school. Within this framework, the committee offered a range of strategies to assist schools communicate with ethnic minority homes. While this was a different path to the same end point (assimilation), it did represent a new orientation by advocating communication between homes and schools. Funding was provided to schools so that newsletters and reports could be translated. Interpreters were employed so that teachers could communicate with parents. Perhaps most significantly, people from relevant communities were employed to work as liaison officers or Ethnic Teacher Aides, integrating families, their communities, and cultures into the mainstream running of schools. Ethnic Teacher Aides often ran informal groups at the school for non-English-speaking parents. These were ethnospecific and became important conduits for bringing parental expectations into schools. Most often, mother-tongue maintenance was a

priority supported by these groups. Through these groups, minority parents became visible in schools and in many cases this became a means of breaking down stereotypes about such parents and their communities.

Established almost at the same time as the Committee on Multicultural Education, the Commonwealth Education Portfolio Group represented the first stage in implementing the Galbally Report recommendation to establish formal structures dealing with multiculturalism at the commonwealth level. Their intention was to set down the major issues as they saw them and in this way act as a stimulus for further discussion towards the creation of a commonwealth policy on multicultural education. In their discussion paper entitled *Education in a Multicultural Australia*, published in 1979, the group aimed to clarify the term "multicultural education" because they believed no consensus existed around the concept, but instead were concerned that it "may divide the community by highlighting existing differences rather than foster understanding, tolerance and social cohesion" (Commonwealth Education Portfolio Group, 1979, p. 1). In line with the Galbally Report, the Portfolio Group stressed cohesion through diversity. It identified several elements within Australian society that protected this cohesion. These were national institutions such as parliament and the legal system; English as the lingua franca; and shared values, primarily those of democracy and egalitarianism.

Multiculturalism has remained an amorphous concept. Government reports, until as late as 1987, still had as a stated aim the need to define multiculturalism and its implications for educational practice (Committee on Multicultural Education, 1979; Commonwealth Education Portfolio Group, 1979). Despite the attempts of a number of committees and reviews, established during both Liberal and Labor Governments, this situation continued – so much so that in 1983, the newly elected Hawke Labor Government, through its Minister for Education and Youth Affairs Susan Ryan, appointed the first national advisory body for multicultural education. One of its tasks was to provide a rationale for policy in multicultural education. This rationale was provided in 1987 (NACCME, 1987) but was never developed into policy.

Understanding Shifts in Emphasis

Despite the stated aim of early government policy to assimilate immigrants, by the 1970s it became evident that some immigrant communities were becoming earmarked by their low incomes, poor housing, lack of English-language skills, and limited career opportunities. Furthermore, inadequate and inappropriate services, including within education, were re-creating similar circumstances for the children of immigrants. There was increasing concern about "ethnic ghettos" forming in cities such as Melbourne and Sydney, were immigrants were concentrated. Teachers, particularly through their professional associations, were one group seeking government recognition that their work with ethnic minority students needed additional support.

The notion of culture clash was very influential in shaping debate about the children of postwar immigrants, the so-called second generation. Through this framework, the emphasis was placed on immigrant groups, particularly those deemed least compatible with the Australian lifestyle and values. Their children, it was argued, faced the burden of having to reconcile their family values with those of mainstream society. The need to assist them with this became the priority. Thus the aim was to explore mechanisms that could minimize the effects of culture clash on ethnic minority students. The dichotomy between "Australian" and ethnic minority students was consolidated and the emphasis placed on models seeking to compensate minorities for their "un-Australianness." Within this framework education was constructed as pivotal.

The changing political environment, however, was evolving to include larger ethnic minority representation within peak bodies. This contributed to the evolution of an alternative multicultural policy orientation, which sought to challenge the mainstream conceptions of "Australianness" and extend this to include nondeficit images of minority cultures (MACMME, 1984; NACCME, 1987). This was evident in the way language education was being considered. Biculturalism and bilingualism became important elements in such explorations and there was an important shift in emphasis between the teaching of ESL and bilingual approaches to the acquisition of English. The significance of bilingualism was extended to anglophone monolinguals through the teaching of community languages more broadly.

Internationalization

It would be reasonable to describe the 1970s and 1980s as a peak period in multicultural education. Funding provided by the national government initiated extensive work in various states, notably Victoria, where innovative policy, curriculum, and professional development initiatives were undertaken. However, such initiatives by and large assumed cultural diversity as bounded by nation and premised on the perspectives and priorities of those groups associated with postwar migration. Increasingly this became limiting. Debates were situating Australia in relation to the Asia-Pacific region and increased interest in languages from this region was shifting the emphasis from those associated with ethnic minority communities to so-called trade languages, including Japanese and Indonesian. Coupled with this shift was the growing emphasis on international education, including within secondary schooling. The growing number of students from the Asian region studying in Australian schools and universities, the move towards the teaching of languages and cultures from this region within Australian schools, and increased economic relations and changes in migration patterns increased the relevance of international education. Internationalising the curriculum, much like multicultural education, has been interpreted in multiple ways. It can be understood as a response to globalization, whereby teaching to cultural difference transcends national borders and becomes responsive to ongoing flows rather than migration and settlement. In this way, it can be associated with wider social justice agendas, including those related

to postcolonialism (Vasta & Castles, 1996). In other cases international education is teaching and learning about specific countries in our region, a type of cultural exchange program that facilitates understanding and economic relations. This approach is associated with Australian students learning about Asia as well as approaches taken to international students studying in Australia.

The amorphous nature of multiculturalism continues to characterize discussions related to cultural diversity. In essence these discussions are about the nature of Australianness and how it is envisaged, its critical elements, and how these can be preserved given current imperatives related to globalization. Of increasing significance is the so-called war on terror and how this constructs an enemy inside as well as outside national boundaries. In the context of such debates, the absence of any explicit policy related to multicultural education is particularly noteworthy. Similarly, the priority given to values and citizenship education and a reinvigorated exploration of the teaching of Australian history by a conservative government have been interpreted as a move to consolidate an understanding of Australianness in conventional and narrow terms. In 2003 the Australian Commonwealth Government released a 3-year policy aimed at updating the 1999 strategic directions for the implementation of multiculturalism (Commonwealth of Australia, 2003). In this document, multiculturalism is situated firmly within the context of conflict, including the bombing of the World Trade Center in New York and the bombings in Bali, where many Australians lost their lives. The 2003 policy stresses the importance of nation building in times of conflict and links this firmly to social cohesion. Multicultural policy is understood as imperative to shaping this social cohesion through the promulgation of shared values. Following from this policy, the Department of Education, Science and Training released *The National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools* (Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training, 2005). Attached to this proposal was a total of $29.7 million to be spent over 4 years supporting schools and communities with the teaching of values. Nine core values are advocated in this document, the last entitled "Understanding, Tolerance and Inclusion." This is explained with reference to awareness of others and their cultures and the respect of diversity in the context of a democratic society (Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training, 2005, p. 4). Not surprisingly such policy has elicited public debate about the nature of Australian values and the processes through which these are determined. This debate needs to be considered in the context of government initiatives related to citizenship tests for would-be immigrants, more aggressive border protection, and interventions within education that foster nationalism, including a Prime Ministerial summit on the teaching of Australian history.

Challenges for the Future

Australia still relies heavily on immigration for population growth, and while the source countries and reasons for immigration have altered over time, immigrant communities still are concentrated within major cities, particularly Melbourne and

Sydney. Within these cities there is stratification linked to ethnicity. In Sydney, for example, there are suburbs with high concentrations of Middle Eastern families. This community, despite long-term Australian settlement, has a strong association with unemployment, low-income employment, and weak educational achievement. Riots in the suburbs of Sydney in 2006, which involved youth from these communities and those who identified as “real” Australians, have brought to the fore the divisive potential of narrow understandings of Australianness that promulgate “them” and “us” notions of citizenship. Similar events in other countries highlight the interdependency of global and local discourses including those that are anti-Islam and anti-Arab. These events have increased awareness of the need to consider why particular communities experience alienation, the possible impact of this alienation, and the role of schooling in its management.

Refugee settlement remains a critical challenge, particularly with regard to schooling. Students from such communities remain concentrated in specific suburbs and professional development and support for teachers is a priority. In many instances such students have experienced trauma as a result of war, escape, living in camps (sometimes for long periods), and immigration to a country where they are constituted as members of a visible minority. The management of the needs of such students can be intensive and multifaceted.

Since World War II, refugee settlement in Australia has included communities from the Balkans, Lebanon, Vietnam, Latin America, and, most recently, from the Horn of Africa. Students from such communities can have little experience of formal schooling and often are illiterate in any language. Extended periods of war and residency in refugee camps can have serious implications for their future schooling. This can include direct experience of extreme violence and torture, rape, poverty, and emotional and social dislocation. Their life experience includes much, which should not be assumed for young people their age. Furthermore, they and their communities are targets for racism and public debates about immigration policy. This has been the case historically in Australia, including with the first “refos” who arrived from the Balkans after World War II. However, subsequent groups of refugees have experienced exacerbated difficulties because of being Asian, Black, or non-Christian. Such factors are assumed to make assimilation more difficult and therefore to threaten social cohesion. There have been various examples of public debate about the number of refugees, their visibility within the community, and the possible outcomes of such factors on the Australian way of life. A notorious example of this occurred in relation to the Vietnamese community in the 1980s, which resuscitated debates about the White Australia Policy (Hage, 1998; Tsolidis, 2001). More recently such debates are occurring in relation to African refugees.

Commonly refugee students are inducted into mainstream schooling after periods of time in Language Centres. These centres specialise in the teaching of English as a second language and are intended to transition students into nearby schools where they will continue to receive such tuition as well as participate in all other aspects of school life. There are various levels of success with such programs, which are unlikely to provide solutions to the range of obstacles such students face,

particularly in Australia, where Blackness is still relatively unusual and refugee students remain clustered in some areas, commonly those where poverty dominates.

Students whose parents and grandparents immigrated to Australia still have specific needs, which can be overlooked because of length of settlement. Sometimes referred to as second- or third-generation immigrants, such students highlight experiences of schooling that they claim illustrate racism. This is more obvious for particular groups including those described as "Asian" and those from Muslim communities. Nonetheless, students from other groups also make similar comments.

Australia includes international education as one of its major income earners. While most students in this category attend universities, there is increasing enrolment at secondary schools. There is evidence that such students feel alienated in the Australian context. Changes in systems of funding mean that many institutions, particularly within the Higher Education sector, need to attract full-fee-paying students, most of whom are overseas students. The imperative to increase funding can mean that services provided to these students remain inadequate. Furthermore, the experience of studying in Australia may not offer the anticipated outcome of learning about anglophone culture through lived experience, as many international students remain relatively isolated or in situations in which they rely on each other for support and company.

A major challenge for Australian schooling remains creating programs that speak to global citizenship and are suitable for all students. In the context of globalization there are strong imperatives for all students to develop transcultural experience and expertise. Arguably there is considerable room for improvement with regard to this priority, particularly in relation to mainstream curriculum. While particular cohorts of students may have such expertise and experience through family circumstances, its value within formal schooling structures and its broader application remain minimal.

Cultural Fluidity as a Way Forward

While global citizenship may sound like a cliché (and in some ways it is), once we connect it to the real lives of individuals its impact resonates. As educators we have an obligation to remain relevant and prepare young people for futures that will be lived in an ever-shrinking world. Many young people already are living globalized lives through recreational, work- or study-related travel, cultural pursuits- and technological facility. These shifts assume the cultural fluidity that some have argued is the hallmark of successful citizens of the future. Bauman (1997), for example, states

> Well-sewn durable identity is no more an asset; increasingly and ever-more evidently, it becomes a liability. *The hub of postmodern life strategy is not making identity stand – but the avoidance of being fixed* (p. 89, original emphasis).

Yet teaching to cultural fluidity needs to be considered in the context of the paradoxes presented by new political imperatives. In Australia, as elsewhere, fear is being promulgated by references to a "clash of civilizations" (Huntington, 1993). Young people most often are left to their own resources to make sense of the contradictions implicit in the modern condition. On the one hand, they live identities that plug into global cultures of consumerism and popular culture and they network globally; on the other hand, they enact discourses of (non)belonging. Most particularly, adolescence is a time when identity issues are at the forefront. In schools, young people are left to reconcile identities associated with the subcultures of their peers, the identities the adult world (school, family, work) presumes for them, and the identities they see themselves adopting in the future. Identification is responsive to factors such as gender, class, and ethnicity. It also is responsive to time and place. These are complicated relationships, and while schools are critically placed with regard to them, identity issues rarely come to the fore in formal ways (Tsolidis, 2006).

What might curriculum and pedagogy for fluid cultural futures look like? A curriculum and pedagogy premised on a static sense of self remains by comparison relatively straightforward. The idea of national rather than global citizenship invokes a history and a geography to teach. A seemingly natural consequence of this history and geography will be a designated set of languages, a version of high culture, and perhaps a range of sports to be played, et cetera. And even if oppositional perspectives are introduced, these coexist or are contested within a tightly bounded framework. Additionally there will be a seemingly unproblematic vision of appropriate pedagogy linked to particular cultures. This is evidenced, for example, by the common assumption that Western pedagogies are student centered and value exploratory and self-actualizing learning. By comparison pedagogies in the East are understood to be based on rote learning, discipline, and deference to hierarchically situated authority. In this way, what is taught, the means of teaching it, and consequential systems of authority and assessment flow from a culture that is presumed to be self-contained and homogeneous. Increasingly this model is problematic because the understanding of culture on which it is premised is itself problematic. Instead education needs to be compatible with globalization and the fluidity of culture that it implies. An essential component of such an education is the relationship between sameness and difference and the need to construct a pedagogy that assists students to understand, manipulate, and construct culture as fluid, including with regard to their own cultural identities.

In the context of globalization and related understandings of culture, the emphasis shifts from intercultural to transcultural pedagogy. Intercultural education assumes communication between distinct and bounded cultures. Instead we need to recognize that cultural boundaries are both fixed and fluid, reconfiguring themselves in response to various shifts in emphasis over time and space. In this context, we are teaching all students how to be cosmopolitan and the experiences they bring with them to the classroom will impact greatly on their future success with cultural fluidity. If we understand our classroom as situated in global space rather than bordered by the parochial, this view of cosmopolitanism inverts traditional conceptions

of ethnic disadvantage. The students who, because of hegemonic power relations, are located at the cultural margins are likely to be the students with experience in what are referred to as "border cultures" (Anzaldua, 1987). Border cultures are those that sit closest to the interface between sameness and difference. It is here that there is the most familiarity with understanding and negotiating "them-" and "us"-ness. This transcultural expertise is commonly silenced. A reinvigorated multicultural education needs to sustain and extend this expertise to all students.

Multicultural Pedagogies for Globalized Times

Teaching and learning needs to be premised on the understanding that there is an ongoing and productive tension between sameness and difference. Rather than construct pedagogies that aim at either sameness or difference, we should be teaching to the relationship between these by focusing upon what is shared as a means of making difference familiar to all students. An example of this strategy is curriculum that has at its foundation a theme that is crosscultural and explores such a theme in relation to specific cultures or periods of history. This illustrates practices that are at once common and interpreted variously.

Often we assume that students wish to learn about another culture because they do not value their own culture as highly. Wanting to learn something new does not mean that what is already known is not valued. Transcultural facility assumes knowing more – more about less familiar cultures, more about what is familiar between cultures, and more about how to move between cultural differences in productive ways. In this sense it is about adding rather than replacing. This is an extremely valuable component of international education, which is emblematic of globalization. Furthermore, as students experience increasingly distinct cultures, the more challenging is their curriculum and the more thought has to go into how appropriate pedagogies are constituted.

In order to successfully teach, we need to respect what it is that students bring with them to the classroom, both as learners and as members of particular cultures. In a globalized world it is more likely and appropriate that a classroom will be culturally heterogenous. Attempting to silence or assimilate difference is denying all students transcultural experience. Utilizing existing cultural difference in order to teach about cultural difference is good teaching and learning because it makes the most of what students bring with them to the classroom and provides a lived lesson of allowing students to engage with cultural diversity. This method can be extended beyond the classroom to the community more generally. And through the use of technologies, opportunities for transcultural teaching and learning can be expanded to other students and places in ways that reflect globalization.

We cannot assume that culture is linked solely to ethnicity, although ethnicity is a key underpinning for culture. Place of residency and migration history will bring to the same ethnicity a varied range of meanings. The notion of diaspora has become integral to globalization. This inextricable linking together of various

cultures (Brah, 1996; Morely & Chen, 1996) is lived in many countries. This is particularly the case with diasporic culture, which is lived transnationally. For example, what it means to be Chinese will vary in Singapore, Taiwan, Malaysia, Hong Kong, the People's Republic of China, the USA, or Australia. We cannot assume that there is something essential about being Chinese. The meanings attributable to "Chinese" will shift in response to factors such as gender, religion, class, age, and place of residency. Because of this, developing a snapshot of Chinese culture is unlikely to assist us as educators. Stylized renditions of particular cultures rely on static and homogenous understandings of particular communities. As educators we need to develop cultural awareness, sensitivity, and agility as primary pedagogies as well as end points for our teaching. We also need to recognise that what is "ours" is also diasporic. In Australia we are fortunate to experience cultural diversity in dynamic ways. We have a history of immigration and progressive policy responses to this, particularly with regard to education. This provides an explicit stepping-off point for students to recognize the positive nature and potential of diasporic cultures.

Our classrooms need to be democratic spaces (Giroux & McLaren, 1994) in which students can share, exchange, and experiment with cultures without fear of retribution, being misunderstood, or exposing themselves to ridicule. There needs to be trust and reciprocity between students so that this can occur. Often I have experienced classrooms where a wealth of knowledge and experience remains private because students lack the confidence or opportunity to share. Creating pedagogies that build on and extend cultural diversity present in the classroom should not be understood as an act of benevolence but instead as a means of sharing knowledge that will benefit all students, especially those who lack transcultural experience.

An important element in making classrooms democratic spaces where students can share and experiment with cultures in this way is providing a common medium of exchange. English language occupies such a function in Australia. We need to ensure that all students have adequate support developing the "must haves" of any curriculum. Apart from obvious support such as ESL tuition, we need to make culturally assumed knowledge transparent. Looking behind what is assumed is a way of providing meaning and also a way of opening up for debate whether or not such understandings should remain assumed.

Understanding the world is a smaller place brings with it new possibilities, but also new responsibilities. As educators we have to nudge ourselves out of cultural complacency. Students need to know what we teach and we should teach what they need to know. In countries like Australia, there can exist a tendency to assume without reflection that English and other aspects of Western culture are all students need in order to become successful global citizens. The argument I am making here is that cultural fluidity is the currency of globalization. Students need to know how to function between cultures not just within one, albeit one associated with dominance. In Australia, educators are surrounded by cultural resources that allow this shift in consciousness to occur successfully.

Conclusion

Australia takes pride in its multiculturalism. As a formal policy it is associated with social reform movements that began in the 1970s and were consolidated into a range of policies in the 1980s. Although the policy has had bipartisan government support, there have been marked differences of emphasis over time. Nonetheless, a major plank of Australian multiculturalism has been schooling and the belief that citizens can be educated for cultural difference and that this will sustain social cohesion through respect and opportunity. In summary, multicultural education has had a number of key characteristics. The importance of English has been a key element. The opportunity to learn to speak, read, and write English has been linked to success and active citizenship. This right has been reiterated in various national language policies (Lo Bianco, 1987). Various modes of acquiring English have received government support over the years and there have been responsive to shifts in emphasis within language teaching, funding priorities, and government priorities related to the promotion of languages other than English. In this context, bilingual approaches to teaching, particularly young students, have waxed and waned. There have been some remarkably successful examples of such programmes in Australia and these have been linked the successful acquisition of both languages (Clyne, 1991). Similarly, the teaching of community, foreign, or so-called trade languages has shifted in emphasis as well. Multicultural education has nonetheless promoted the teaching of languages other than English for reasons of cultural maintenance and in order to induct monolingual English speakers into other cultures. Language issues often have dominated multicultural funding priorities. However, there have been a range of innovative interventions associated with culture more broadly. Multicultural perspectives across the curriculum received support through some curriculum development initiatives and were intended to encourage teachers to teach in ways that were inclusive of a wide range of cultural perspectives. This led to strategies such as the incorporation of so-called migrant history or literature into mainstream subjects. Another element that characterized multicultural education was communication between parents and schools. These priorities were reinterpreted in various ways to include antiracist strategies or curriculum and professional development that targeted specific groups of students, including refugees or ethnic minority girls (Tsolidis, 1986).

Australian multiculturalism continues to remain a priority. However, it is now situated in relation to ongoing debates about the so-called war on terror. Globalization has severely challenged the underpinning assumption of previous renditions of multiculturalism, whereby it was evaluated in relation to intranational social cohesion. Increasingly it is evaluated in relation to the possibility that it can engage meaningfully with cultural difference as this operates transnationally. This becomes the new challenge: to learn from and successfully reinterpret and extend the strategies that have characterised multicultural education.

References

Anzaldua, G. (1987). *Borderlands/La Frontera: The new mestiza*. San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Australian Government Department of Education, Science and Training (2005). *National framework for values education in Australian schools*, Canberra: Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts.

Bauman, Z. (1997). *Postmodernity and its discontents*. New York: New York University Press.

Brah, A. (1996). *Cartographies of diaspora; contesting identities*, London/New York: Routledge.

Browning, J., & Jakubowicz, A. (2003). *What can we say about racism in Australia today?* Trans/forming Cultures Research Centre, University of Technology Sydney. Retrieved on July 23 2007, from http://www.saynotoprejudice.com.au/reports.html

Castells, M. (1996). *The information age: Economy, society and culture. Vol. 1: The rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Castles, S. (1997). Multicultural citizenship: a response to the dilemma of globalisation and national identity? *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 18*(1), 5–22.

Castles, S., Cope, M., Kalantzis, M., & Morrissey, M. (1988). *Mistaken identity: Multiculturalism and the demise of nationalism in Australia*. Sydney: Pluto Press.

Clyne, M. (1991). *Community languages: the Australian experience*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Committee of Review of Post Arrival Programs and Services to Migrants (1978). *Report of the review of post arrival programs and services to migrants*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Committee on Multicultural Education (1979). *Education for a multicultural society*. Report to the Schools Commission. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Commonwealth Education Portfolio Group (1979). *Commonwealth education portfolio discussion paper on education in a multicultural Australia*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Commonwealth of Australia (2003). *Multicultural Australia: United in diversity. Updating the 1999 new agenda for multicultural Australia: Strategic directions for 2003–2006*. Canberra: Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts.

de Lepervanche, M., & Bottomley, G. (Eds.) (1988). *The cultural construction of race*. Sydney Studies in Society and Culture, Number 4. Annandale: NSW.

Giroux, H., & McLaren, P. (Eds.) (1994) *Between borders – pedagogy and the politics of cultural studies*. New York/London: Routledge.

Hage, G. (1998). *White nation: Fantasies of white supremacy in a multicultural society*. Sydney: Pluto Press/Comerford and Miller.

Hage, G. (2003). *Against paranoid nationalism: Searching for hope in a shrinking society*. Annandale: Pluto Press.

Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission (1991). *Report of the national inquiry into racist violence*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Huntington, S. (1993) The clash of civilizations? Foreign affairs. *Council for Foreign Relations*, Summer, 22–49.

Interim Committee for the Australian Schools Commission (1973). *Schools in Australia: Report of the interim committee for the Australian schools commission*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Jakubowicz, A. (1981). State and ethnicity: Multiculturalism as ideology. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, *17*(3), 4–13.

Jakubowicz, A. (2002). White noise: Australia's struggle with multiculturalism. In C. Levine-Rasky (Ed). *Working Through Whiteness: International Perspectives* (pp. 107–125). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Lo Bianco, J. (1987). *National policy on languages*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

MACMME (1984). *Ministerial advisory committee on multicultural and migrant education 1983/84 annual report*. Victoria: Ministry of Education.

Morely, D., & Chen, K. (Eds.) (1996). *Stuart hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies*. New York/London: Routledge.

NACCME (1987). Education in and for a multicultural society: Issues and strategies for policy making. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Office of the Minister of Ethnic Affairs (Undated). *Ministerial discussion paper racism in the 1980's* [sic] *a response*. Victoria: Government of Victoria.

Poynting, S. (2004). *Bin Laden in the suburbs: Criminalising the Arab other*. Sydney: Institute of Criminology.

Robertson, R. (1996). *Globalization: Social theory and global culture*. London: Sage.

Schools Commission (1975). *Report for the Triennium 1976–1978*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Secretariat to the Committee to Advise on Australia's Immigration Policies (1987). *Understanding immigration*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

Sheehan, P. (2005, December 12). Nasty reality surfs in as ugly tribes collide. *Sydney Morning Herald*. Retrieved on March 11, 2006, from http://www.smh.com.au/articles/2005/12/11/1134235944844.htm

Silkstone, D. (2005, December 14). When two tribes go to war: A culture clash. TheAge.com. Retrieved on February 20, 2006 from http://theage.com.au/news/national/when-two-tribes-go-to-war-a-cu.

Tsolidis, G. (1986) *Educating Voula: Report to the ministerial advisory committee on multicultural and migrant education*. Melbourne: Ministry of Education, Victoria.

Tsolidis, G. (2001). *Schooling, diaspora and gender: Being feminist and being different*. Philadelphia: Open University Press, Buckingham.

Tsolidis, G. (2006). *Youthful imagination: Schooling, subcultures and social justice*. New York: Peter Lang.

Vasta, E., & Castles, S. (Eds.) (1996). *The teeth are smiling: The persistence of racism in multicultural Australia*. St Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin.

Victorian Committee to Advise the Attorney-General on Racial Vilification (1992). *Racial vilification in Victoria: Report of the committee to advise the attorney-general on racial vilification*. Melbourne: Victorian Committee to Advise the Attorney-General on Racial Vilification.