



**THE 'IDEAL':**

**WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR SCHOOLS AND THEIR COMMUNITIES?**

**Carmen Mills & Trevor Gale**

**Central Queensland University**

**MIL01408**

**Paper presented at the**

**Australian Association for Research in Education (AARE)**

**Annual Conference, Perth, 2 - 6 December, 2001**

## **Correspondence:**

Carmen Mills

Faculty of Education and Creative Arts

Central Queensland University, Rockhampton, Queensland, 4702 AUSTRALIA.

Phone: (07) 4930 6873 Fax: (07) 4930 9604 Email: c.mills@cqu.edu.au

## **ABSTRACT**

This paper considers what the 'ideal' arrangements to promote 'success' in schooling for all students – especially so called 'disadvantaged' students – look like from a socially critical perspective. In particular, the paper considers the ideal for schools and their communities proposed by what has been termed 'recognitive justice' (Gale & Densmore, 2000): a model of social justice that incorporates a positive regard for social difference and the centrality of socially democratic processes. Three conditions of (i) self-identity and respect, (ii) self-development and self-expression, and (iii) self-determination are explored in the paper as a way of conceiving of the social justice literature at large. Specifically, the paper asks and seeks answers from this literature in relation to the following questions: How can schools foster self-respect in and facilitate positive self-identities for students? What part can and should schools play in promoting the development of their students' abilities and encouraging student expressions of their experiences? What might meaningful involvement in schooling, premised on self-determination, look like?

## **THE 'IDEAL':**

### **WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR SCHOOLS AND THEIR COMMUNITIES?**

## **INTRODUCTION**

To speak of an ideal is to lay claim to what ought or should be and to explain 'reality' as deviation. That is, ideals serve to provide direction towards some desired goal as well as judgment about how well a perceived reality approximates that desire. In more recent times, the postmodernist critique has provided its own 'reality check' on modernist ideals, challenging the notion that there is one best way to reach utopian ends. The emergence of postmodern theories has signalled a general shift in 'the structure of feeling' (Harvey, 1989, p. 39) from acquiescence to censure of the universal. But it is not as if there are no postmodern ideals. In these accounts, utopianism is more cogently understood as 'heterotopianisms'. While we are convinced by such critique, that there are diverse goals of value and pathways to reach them, we admit to some uneasiness about a 'postmodern pluralism' in which ideals have the potential to wash away into relativism, where one ideal is as good as the next and ways of achieving them are also equally regarded.

In this paper we take up these matters in the context of schooling, particularly as they relate to socially just ideals and practices. We begin by testing how effective schooling 'really' is in advancing the interests of all students; asking for whom schooling is effective and the ways in which it recognizes and deals with diverse interests. We then consider how things might be better, first in relation to what happens in classrooms and, second, with respect to what happens in school communities. In our view, these two interests – in who benefits (and who does not) by current social arrangements and what can be done about them – are the central tenets of a socially critical orientation. Given our disposition for recognitive justice (Gale & Densmore 2000), we also think the issues are about self-identity and respect, self-expression and development, and self-determination. We regard these as necessary conditions for socially just schooling; they form the 'tests' we apply, particularly in relation to how students are connected to schools and how decisions are made within their communities. We recognize that these matters are primarily concerned with the means rather than the ends of schooling although we do not entirely agree with the separation. Neither do we want to signal that a focus on recognitive justice is at the expense of distributive justice. 'Who gets what' remains an important issue. Here we address this from the perspective of 'how'.

Our analysis is confined to research and scholarship found in the academic literature. There is enough in the public data set concerning these issues to suggest that further empirical evidence may simply provide saturation. We think it may be better, then, to take stock of what is known as a beginning point for future empirical work. Hence, we begin with what we (now) know about schooling and its effectiveness in moving schooling beyond the goal of 'compensation' for the least advantaged and towards the reorganization of the cultural content of education as a whole (Connell, 1994). Having made the judgment that things could be better, we then canvass areas in need of revision and what that revision might entail. Specifically, we ask: what should be the (learning) experiences of students in schools?; and how and by whom should schools be managed?

## **HOW EFFECTIVE ARE SCHOOLS FOR STUDENTS AND THEIR LEARNING?**

For some time, the blame for the academic failure of many children from working class backgrounds, ethnic minorities and other marginalized groups has been placed at the feet of culturally 'disadvantaged' or 'deprived' children and their families (Knight, 1994). In this account, deviations from the cultural 'ideal' are viewed as deficiencies and imperfections, and 'deprived' children are seen to come from a group 'with no cultural integrity of its own' (Boykin, 1986, p. 60). Terms such as 'minority' and 'marginalized' also tend to suggest that all such groups are in essentially the same situation; that all of them are disenfranchised from the larger society in much the same way (Boykin, 1986). Informed by these assumptions, that 'disadvantaged' students are growing up in 'a web of social pathology and inadequate life experiences' (Boykin, 1986, p. 60), it has become the task of schooling to 'compensate' these children for their 'deficits' (Connell, 1994). While this model of deficiency and remediation still has many adherents, it does little except to find fault with students and their life experiences (Boykin, 1986).

What is missing from this account is recognition that education is driven by political interests that seek to legitimate particular ways of life (Giroux, 1990) by regulating the selection, organization and distribution of school knowledge (Singh, 2001). In this process it is the values, experiences and perspectives of privileged groups that parade as universal in schools. This cultural imperialism renders the perspectives of non-dominant groups invisible and blocks their opportunities to exercise their capacities in socially recognized ways (Young, 1990). The result is that:

... what meanings are considered the most important, what experiences are deemed the most legitimate, and what forms of writing and reading matter are largely determined by those groups who control the economic and cultural apparatuses of a given society. (Giroux, 1990, p. 85)

Bourdieu (1997) likens these social arrangements to that of a game. What might appear to some as 'simple games of chance offering at every moment the possibility of a miracle' (Bourdieu 1997, p. 46) are really highly structured processes that favour some students more than others. Below we suggest that there are at least four ways in which this game is played in schools to greater or lesser effect: game plans alternatively enacted by the dominant and the marginalized and which we refer to as (1) stacking the deck; (2) beating the odds (the aberration that legitimizes the game); (3) one rule for us, another rule for them; and (4) opting out.

### **Stacking the deck**

Both teachers and their students bring their cultural understandings into the classroom and school. In the best of circumstances, home, family, school, neighbourhood and society are complementary and reinforcing, 'guiding children's positive development into informed citizens and economically independent adults' (Edwards & Young, 1992, p. 72). This is often true for children from dominant groups (white, middle class, western, etc.) given that schools are staffed by teachers from similar backgrounds who reflect and authorize similar views: the ways of doing things, the ways of behaving, and the significant moments, traditions, and practices (Boykin, 1986). For instance, the particular ideologies and practices recognized as legitimate in schools inadvertently privilege middle class students over others (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). The children from families reflecting the attitudes, beliefs and knowledges of this dominant middle class culture find themselves empowered; their dispositions closely matching those encouraged and rewarded by the school.

Bourdieu argues that this is because schools draw unevenly on the social and cultural resources of society (Bourdieu, 1977a, 1977b; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990); specifically, on the cultural experiences in the homes of typically more affluent families, which facilitate their children's adjustment to school and, therefore, their academic achievement. These 'school ready' children have learnt skills that are useful in formal contexts of education and have the habitus (the ways of being and doing) that makes 'playing the game' of school easier (Comber & Hill, 2000). Such tools and dispositions allow them to 'quickly take up the institutional ethos, culture and pedagogic routines and to focus their attention on new academic learning' (Comber & Hill, 2000, p. 86). Perhaps the cruelest (card) trick of all is that schooling contributes to social inequality by giving success to those groups who possess existing cultural advantage, while appearing to reward individual intelligence and effort. However, those who 'succeed' in society typically fail to question the social system from which they have profited; not realizing that they are being rewarded for legitimizing – even embracing – the way the system operates (Boykin, 1986).

At the same time, the voices and experiences of marginalized groups tend to be excluded and students' inherited linguistic and cultural competencies (cultural capital) devalued (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). Unfamiliar with institutional routines and lacking the cultural capital valued by schooling, these students are likely to do poorly at school. This is because not all cultural capital is equal in status: some groups and their particular dispositions are 'socially dominant – carry[ing] with them social power and access to economic success' (Delpit, 1992, p. 297); whereas the cultural capital of others' homes and communities is significantly under-valued. Students in this second group experience a mismatch or clash of cultures, with the school imposing a set of values and beliefs incongruent with those learned at home (Boykin, 1986), and find that 'educational knowledge is uncommonsense

knowledge' (Bernstein, 1971, p. 58) that is removed from their everyday experiences and understandings. When this cultural divide between home and school is significant and little is done to recognize and ratify home practices (Lawson, 2000), students are prevented from seeing their own experiences of life and family as relevant to their learning at school. The exclusion of the knowledge and experience of the dominated or 'othered' often leads to their children entering school poorly prepared to meet the requirements of middle class schooling, frequently resulting in their alienation and failure (Bernstein, 1990).

It is through this 'hidden curriculum' of attitudes, values and authoritative relations that structural inequalities and existing patterns of social class are reproduced in schools (Knight, 1994). In such circumstances, the ideology of the prevailing group in society is taken for granted as natural (i.e. hegemonic) and serves to perpetuate the status quo (Boykin, 1986). It can be seen, then, that in spite of the best of intentions, educators can very easily become agents of hegemony (Boykin, 1986).

### **Beating the odds**

More often than not, irrelevant curricula is the norm for minority students, with schools rarely modifying their curriculum and teaching to meet individual needs. To illustrate this point, Schmuck and Schmuck (1992) give an example from their research about a teacher in an elementary school classroom who was well into the comprehension activities of a text about a boy living in an apartment building before she realized that most of her students did not know what an apartment building was and had missed the main point of the story. Nevertheless, studies undertaken by Ramsay, Sneddon, Grenfell and Ford (1983) in a sample of eight schools in Southern Auckland with a mix of working-class, under-class and largely Polynesian students, showed that schools could act as agents of transformation as well as reproduction. That is, depending on the curriculum on offer, schools and teachers can either:

... silence students by denying their voice, that is, by refusing to allow them to speak from their own histories, experiences, and social positions, or [they] can enable them to speak by being attentive to how different voices can be constituted within specific pedagogical relations so as to engage their histories and experiences in both an affirmative and critical way. (Giroux, 1990, p. 91)

Clearly, we should not imply that minority groups cannot do well in majority-culture settings. While the process of unequal educational opportunity and social and economic reproduction is deeply rooted and it cannot be denied that social class, race/ethnicity, and gender all impact on the educational outcomes of students, schooling is not a wholly deterministic process. Students do not pass through schools like pawns beholden to their parents' race and/or socioeconomic class (Yonezawa, 2000). It is not as simple as that. Rather,

... the process of inequity is shaped by the complex interaction between people's past histories, group and individual identities, self-efficacy and self-esteem, and their relationships with one another and the ever-changing structures and cultures in which they find themselves. (Yonezawa, 2000, p. 133)

In short, students are actively involved in determining their own futures; 'cooperating with or resisting teachers and the school system' (Knight, 1994). It should come as no surprise that children will be 'reluctant to give up the only way they know of interacting with the world and will resist having an alien set of styles imposed upon them' (Boykin, 1986, p. 78). Nevertheless, there is the possibility for teachers and students to 'play the game' in ways

that change the game itself (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992), by beginning from the standpoint of the least advantaged (Connell, 1993), for example. As Bourdieu explains:

... players can play to increase or conserve their capital, their number of tokens, in conformity with the tacit rules of the game and the prerequisites of the reproduction of the game and its stakes; but they can also get in it to transform, partially or completely, the immanent rules of the game. (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992, p. 99)

There are good reasons to play the game differently, even from the standpoint of the advantaged. As Connell notes, 'an education that privileges one child over another is giving the privileged child a corrupted education, even as it gives him or her a social or economic advantage' (1993, p. 15). That is, when a schooling system deals unjustly with some of its pupils, *'the quality of education for all the others is degraded'* (Connell, 1993, p. 15, emphasis original).

### **One rule for us, another rule for them**

While many argue that the curriculum should be an open space for exploring the world in which we live, the 'competitive academic curriculum' (Connell, 1994) functions to name and privilege particular histories and experiences (Giroux, 1990) and to marginalize or silence the voices of subordinate groups. When certain knowledge is selected and legitimated as *the* school curriculum, the dominant succeed in displacing other knowledges and experiences by ensuring that it is this 'real' knowledge that determines promotion in the education system (Connell, Ashenden, Kessler & Dowsett, 1982) and which is rewarded by society at large. Rather than school being an important place for gaining new understandings of culture in a democratic society, an elitist and narrow notion of what counts is supported by this assimilationist paradigm (Hattam, Shacklock & Smyth, 1998).

These hidden distinctions are readily apparent in relation to social class, for example. According to Brint (1998, p. 225), 'lower-class and minority students typically receive less instructional time, less demanding and lower-quality educational materials, and less imaginative teaching than other students'. Attributed with deficits associated with their disadvantage (Comber & Hill, 2000), these students are frequently held to much lower standards than others. Such differential treatment of social class populations has been confirmed by Anyon (1981) who found in his research that groups of predominantly working class students were taught by rote and were controlled rigidly, while teaching styles in middle class schools were less authoritarian and more child centred. For the latter group, teaching was stimulating and children were encouraged to think critically in schools largely populated by children from professional or managerial family backgrounds.

Clearly, those who are 'disadvantaged by virtue of their social circumstances can be expected to fall still further behind' (Brint, 1998, p. 225). Indeed, schools contribute to and compound this educational inequality by encouraging some students to lower their expectations to conform to the assessments educators have of them (Clark, 1961). Often these assessments lead to the streaming or tracking of students: the practice of grouping them according to their ability into classes and courses marked by a differentiated curriculum (Yonezawa, 2000). Consistently, it is children who belong to low socio-economic and minority groups that are most likely to end up in lower tracks regardless of whether they are tracked by the school or whether choices are left up to the parents and students themselves (Brint, 1998). Whereas, students from dominant middle-classes usually have more school-related knowledge and are frequently placed more highly than their low socio-economic peers. This is despite research that suggests tracking is educationally harmful to students placed in the lowest tracks (Oakes, Gamaron & Page, 1991) and of dubious value (often

harmful) when it comes to promoting equality of outcomes (Ladwig & Gore, 1998). In short, tracking has 'grave consequences for both opportunities to learn and educational outcomes' (Yonezawa, 2000, p. 109-10).

Some parents' linguistic and cultural differences can make it difficult for them to help their children who are positioned by schooling in these ways, partly because of their lack of access to knowledgeable networks. Their families' social networks are comprised of 'people like them': individuals of similar race and socioeconomic status who provide parents with limited assistance to help their children actively navigate the structures of schooling (Lamphere, 1993). These low income and minority students and their parents come from social locations that afford them little knowledge of the kind valued by schooling and low self-efficacy in academic contexts. Consequently, they rarely contest the placements school officials dole out and, instead, often interact in ways that reinforce beliefs that their children indeed belong in low-track classes, questioning their abilities to compete in regular or advanced classes (Yonezawa, 2000). Whereas, their more well-to-do counterparts tend to have much more pro-active involvement in the school system (Curtis, Livingstone & Smaller, 1992; Gamaron, 1992; Lareau, 1987; Useem, 1992) and use their highly educated and wealthy social locations to manipulate placement of their child into higher tracks (Yonezawa, 2000).

As some of the most strategically placed people to effect change in the lives of children, teachers have a central role to play in attempting to redress these educational injustices. The academic literature suggests that holding high expectations of students and engaging in 'visible' pedagogical practices with high intellectual 'demandingness' (Newmann 1996; Lingard, Mills & Hayes, 2000) may be some of the keys to making a difference for disadvantaged students. By setting high standards for students, letting them know that they are expected to meet them, and providing intellectually challenging lessons corresponding to these expectations, teachers can have a considerable impact on achievement (Sammons, Hillman & Mortimore, 1995). Yet the research also suggests that students from disadvantaged and traditionally underachieving backgrounds are those most likely not to be the recipients of schoolwork that requires rigorous intellectual inquiry, even though such inquiry improves learning outcomes. Lingard, Mills and Hayes (2000), for example, found intellectual demandingness to be lacking in many of the 800 classrooms they observed in 24 case study schools throughout Queensland, Australia.

Reflecting on similar issues, Delpit (1997) argues that the unequal distribution of knowledge and skills to working class and minority students reflects their exclusion from the codes or rules of the culture of power operating in schools. Unlike middle-class students who have a second site of acquisition – the family and its community – children of disadvantaged classes and groups find themselves doubly disadvantaged with their cultural capital diminished by the school (Bernstein, 1990). Drawing on Bernstein's (1975) earlier work on visible and invisible pedagogies, Delpit (1997) argues that teachers can make a difference for these students by using visible pedagogic models: making explicit the rules of that culture through examples, illustrations and narratives that facilitate the acquisition of school knowledge and, therefore, make the exercise of power easier. Bernstein (1990) suggests that the use of such pedagogies weakens the relationship between social class and educational achievement, while ensuring that the school provides all students with 'the discourse patterns, interactional styles, and spoken and written language codes that will allow them success in the larger society' (Delpit, 1997, p. 585).

### **Opting out**

Teachers in disadvantaged communities have an important part to play as students' 'key mediators of wider social values, goods and practices' (Comber & Hill, 2000, p. 86-7). Young

(1990) similarly contends that it is the role of teachers to redress the oppressive institutional constraints that render the perspectives of students from non-dominant groups as invisible and inhibit and even prevent them from exercising their capabilities and expressing their experiences and ideas. The challenge for teachers is to teach the academic skills and competencies required to enable their students to succeed in mainstream society, whilst also ensuring that this content is appropriate to the local community. Yet, despite repeated calls for teachers to be aware of and build upon the literacies their students bring to classrooms (Heath, 1983; Cairney & Ruge, 1998), schools continue to give priority to the stories of the lives enjoyed by 'well-off, highly educated and socially conforming groups' (Hattam, Shacklock & Smyth, 1998, p. 102). That is, schools 'connect best with, and work best for, students of middle class, Anglo, male backgrounds' (Ladwig & Gore, 1998, p. 19), with the values, experiences and perspectives of these privileged groups parading as universal.

Responding to their alienation, students often reject the legitimacy of schools as institutions of dominant groups (Brint, 1998). Excluded rather than respected for their difference, many develop an identity of themselves as outcasts, displaying a pattern of low commitment to schooling and behaviour that is not at all irrational in an environment that is viewed as 'uncaring, culturally incompetent, antagonistic, and oppressive' (Franklin, 2000, p. 12). Given the discontinuities between home and school, it is hardly surprising that so many of these students choose to leave, perceiving schooling as irrelevant to their needs and interests (Lamb, Dwyer & Wyn, 2000) and feeling as though they are not valued. Unlike the experience of white middle-class children – with values and beliefs congruent with their teachers – the cultural mismatch experienced by poor or minority students, who encounter institutional contexts hostile to their well being, impacts on their motivation, beliefs and values (Boykin, 1986). The reluctance of these students to give up their values and beliefs and their resistance to having an alien set of styles imposed upon them, affects their will to learn, impacts adversely on their interest, persistence, and attention to activities promoted by schooling (Boykin, 1986). Children may respond in this oppressive setting by:

... (a) decid[ing] that what they *should* do is not what the teacher thinks should be done; (b) act[ing] in such a way that they *will not* do what the teacher wants, and (c) display[ing] what they *can* do in ways that are not in accordance with what the teacher prescribes. (Boykin, 1986, p. 79, emphasis original)

In the research of Fordham and Ogbu (1986) on African-American students and peer group influence, they found that the perception of schooling as a subtractive process – that is, as 'one-way acculturation into the cultural frame of reference of the dominant group members of their society' (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986, p. 201) – caused students to resist and oppose achieving success in their academic pursuits. These students viewed success as 'white people's prerogative' and striving for success in school as 'acting white' at the expense of their own cultural and identity integrity (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986). The resulting social pressures against striving for academic success mean that many students who are academically able perform well below their potential. These students are choosing, either consciously or unconsciously, to maintain their view of their own identity in what they perceive as a choice between allegiance to 'them' or 'us' (Delpit, 1992).

## **WHAT SHOULD BE THE (LEARNING) EXPERIENCES OF STUDENTS IN SCHOOLS?**

Unlike Fordham and Ogbu (1986), who believe that schools should develop programs and offer counselling to help students learn to divorce academic pursuit from the idea of 'acting white,' others suggest that schools need to create environments that value and appreciate cultural differences and recognize education as a process that takes place both within formal

institutions as well as within families and communities (Cox, 2000). These advocates argue that mechanisms need to be established for the effective recognition and representation of the distinct voices and perspectives of all groups but particularly the oppressed and disadvantaged (Ladwig & Gore, 1998). Similarly, success at school 'needs to be redefined to incorporate the lives and experiences of currently marginalised and materially excluded groups' (Hattam, Shacklock & Smyth, 1998, p. 102).

It would seem, then, that at least four ideals should govern the experience of students in classrooms. First, schooling should value and add to students' existing cultural repertoires. Second, it should value and give voice to who students are, as they identify themselves. Third, schooling should value and promote all students' participation in decision-making. And fourth, it should consult and involve parents and the community in its educative processes. We consider each of these positive classroom experiences in turn.

### **Schooling should value and add to students' existing cultural repertoires**

One way to contest the disempowering effects of the hegemonic curriculum is for schools to embrace the notion of multiple knowledges that are equally valid and embark on a strategy of *inverting* hegemony (Connell, 1993). Connell's intent is to reconstruct the mainstream hegemonic curriculum by incorporating content and pedagogy in ways that build on the interests and perspectives of the least advantaged in a program of common learning in schools. This approach would utilize the funds normally allocated to compensatory programs to reorganize the cultural content of education as a whole (Connell, 1994). Curricula and pedagogies that take seriously this notion of student voice, build on and add to the diverse experiences and knowledges that students bring to the classroom (Giroux, 1990). Instead of being a site of 'disjunction and dislocation' (Comber & Hill, 2000, p. 88), there should be transparent links between the classroom and the world beyond, with schools becoming an extension of home language and literacy practices by confirming 'the language forms, modes of reasoning, dispositions, and histories that give students an active voice in defining the world' (Giroux, 1990, p. 94). The use of texts that validate the experiences that students bring to the classroom is central to affirming the voices of these students. While this literature provides a connection to the voices of students in the class who generally cannot locate their own histories in the traditional literature, such texts also provide a means for students of dominant groups to understand the living experiences and struggles of the repressed (Giroux, 1990).

By relating school curricula to children's worlds, not only is the classroom made more inclusive by authorizing locally produced knowledge, but students can see their everyday lives and experiences as relevant to their learning and success at school. Clearly, it is the role of teachers and schools to encourage and assist students to draw on their cultural experiences in order to succeed academically (Gale & Densmore, 2000). The research of the Queensland School Reform Longitudinal Study (QSRLS) echoes these sentiments, encouraging the connection of classroom work to the diverse social, cultural and language backgrounds of students as one element of 'productive pedagogies'. It is work that builds on Newmann's (1996) conception of 'authentic pedagogy' – classroom practices that promote learning and achievements for all students, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds – and considers which pedagogies might make a difference for different groups of students (Lingard, Mills & Hayes, 2000).

In this account, attention would be paid to the vast range of knowledges that students bring to school as a consequence of their backgrounds (Collins, Kenway & McLeod, 2000) and the diversity of their community languages and literacies acknowledged and valued (Cairney & Ruge, 1998). Heath (1983) recommends interaction with parents and involvement with community paraprofessionals as a place for teachers to begin to learn about the community

and their practices. This enables teachers to re-evaluate their school curricula and learning environments and modify these to acknowledge and respond to the needs and interests of the cultural and linguistic diversity of the communities they serve. As Edwards and Young (1992, p. 74) suggest, 'until schools acknowledge the range in dispositions, backgrounds, experiences, and strengths among families, efforts to establish sound home/school communication and partnerships will continue to falter'. These partnerships between home, school and community are essential for ensuring the relevance of what is learned within the classroom to the world beyond.

Yet rather than teachers simply modifying their approach to fit the qualities or skills possessed by disadvantaged children, it is also important that a socially just curriculum equips students with 'the best of what contemporary society has to offer' (Comber & Hill, 2000, p. 80); complex repertoires of practices that make up the cultural capital valued by dominant groups. In this way, learning can open up ways of transforming the situation of the marginalized by equipping them with understandings that can empower them to act individually and together to improve their circumstances (Australian Schools Commission, 1995) and to lead successful, complete lives in today's society. The point is not to eliminate the cultural capital that students bring with them to school or use it to limit their potential, but rather to add other cultural capital to their repertoires (Delpit, 1992). This is epitomised in a play produced in 1974 by black and white students on language and cultural differences. In this excerpt, an adolescent black girl interacts with her teacher:

My way of communicating may be different from yours but it fills my adaptive and emotional needs as I perform it. Why should my 'at home' way of talking be 'wrong' and your standard version be 'right'? ... Show me ... that by adding a fluency in standard dialect, you are adding something to my language and not taking something away from me. Help me retain my identity and self-respect while learning to talk 'your' way. (Heath, 1983, p. 271)

### **Schooling should value and give voice to who students are, as they identify themselves**

While effective schooling promotes the valuing of voices and experiences that students bring to the classroom, it also calls for appreciation and respect for individual students, evidenced in teacher-student relationships and characterized by active trust and mutual respect. Such relationships are made possible when there is positive regard for social difference and when social groups are recognized for who they are, as they identify themselves (Gale, 2000). This recognition of difference or 'democratic cultural pluralism' (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985; Cunningham, 1987; Nickel, 1987) is linked to improving the academic outcomes of underachieving students from disadvantaged backgrounds (Lingard, Mills & Hayes, 2000). At the classroom level, it requires teachers to create opportunities to get to know their students, and for students to get to know themselves and to get to know and get along with 'the other' on the basis of who they are (Gale & Densmore, 2000).

The positive relationships and strong teacher-student rapport that ideally ensue from such practices have been found to have a positive influence on educational outcomes (Sammons, Hillman & Mortimore, 1995). Sammons et al. (1995) also found positive effects when teachers showed interest in and communicated enthusiasm to children as individuals. Teacher-student relationships can also be enhanced outside the classroom. Sammons, et al. (1995) tell of studies of secondary schools in the UK which show that shared teacher and student out-of-school activities have led to improved educational outcomes, as well as interpersonal openness and mutual understanding in their relationships (Schmuck & Schmuck, 1992).

## **Schooling should value and promote all students' participation in decision-making**

Knight (2000) has also found a sense of competence, a feeling of belonging and a sense of ownership central to student achievement. Having an active role in the life of the school is a key part of this. While Knight (2000) concedes that no teacher can walk into a classroom and instantly transform it into a democracy, every teacher can take a meaningful step toward making the class more democratic by bringing students into decision-making processes and moving in the direction of negotiable authority. Indeed, Connell (1994) suggests that to teach well in disadvantaged schools requires a shift towards more negotiated curriculum and more participatory classroom practices. Although the democratic social skills developed will be of benefit to students in the world beyond schooling, studies in the UK have also shown enhanced behavioural and academic outcomes as a result of giving students positions of responsibility in the school system (Sammons, Hillman & Mortimore, 1995). While conveying trust in students' abilities and, therefore, improving the teacher-student relationship, such practices give students greater control over what happens to them at school.

Despite these findings, teachers and schools more often than not underestimate the potential of students to participate in discussions about what happens in their schools. Consultation with students over issues can be tokenistic or students are left out of the dialogue completely (Edwards, 1999). Students are not ignorant of this. The contradictions, for example, 'of requiring students to sit, by compulsion not choice, in classrooms in which they have little input or control, while we attempt to teach them to think for themselves and to participate in decision-making are clearly evident' (Ladwig & Gore, 1998, p. 18). Student councils are often promoted as forums in which to pursue such agendas; as places that give students opportunities to experience representative democracy firsthand. However, Schmuck and Schmuck's (1992) research in schools in small districts in America did not find one school in which the student council had a discernible effect on aspects of school life other than entertainment and social events. Elected student leaders felt that they had very little influence over school operations and administrators admitted that the student council was ineffective. While a few schools provided leadership training to students, in most small districts student councils were slammed as 'perfunctory and pallid sham[s] of representative democracy' (Schmuck & Schmuck, 1992, p. 28). One possible explanation for this might be that when students do have a voice in such forums, this is seen as only reflecting the dominant voices within the school. That is, the student voices invited and listened to are those that reflect the views of the powerful groups in the school; students who often possess the social and cultural capital already valued by the school (Edwards, 1999).

## **Schooling should consult and involve parents and the community in its educative processes**

Involving parents and the wider community in schooling presents its own challenges. In disadvantaged schools in particular, forging strong relationships between the school and its surrounding communities can be extremely difficult (Connell, 1993). There are several reasons for this and it would be wrong to assume that 'working-class parents can simply be inculcated into what is essentially a bourgeois school culture in the relatively easy way in which middle-class parents are able to' (Lucey & Walkerdine, 2000, p. 46). Nevertheless, teachers take parental performance in schooling very seriously. They actively solicit parent participation and they see their requests of parents – such as reading to children and helping them at home with school work – as reasonable and assume that all parents, regardless of social and economic position, can help their children (Lareau, 1987). In fact, in the schools studied in Lareau's (1987) research, teachers' methods of presenting, teaching, and assessing subject matter were based on a structure that presumed parents would help children at home.

While parents from more advantaged families in Lareau's (1987) research frequently contacted teachers to discuss their child's academic progress, other parents were reluctant to contact the school. Some interpret this parental involvement as a reflection of the lower value that working-class families attribute to education compared with middle-class families (Deutsch, 1967). However, while there are variations within as well as between social classes, many working-class parents feel that they lack the culturally valuable educational skills and material resources to participate effectively in the educational process (Lareau, 2000). Although they may be willing to help with their children's education, their unfamiliarity with the tasks being asked of them means that they may have few ideas about how to provide this help and are, therefore, reluctant to comply with school requests. Further, the limited time and disposable income of lower and working-class parents make it difficult to supplement and intervene in their children's schooling. Middle-class parents, on the other hand, often have educational skills and occupational prestige matching or surpassing that of teachers and have the necessary economic resources and the time required – for managing child care and transportation, hiring tutors and meeting with teachers – to become intensively involved in their children's schooling (Lareau, 1987).

Moreover, in much the same way that parents depend on doctors to heal their children, many working-class communities turn over responsibility for their child's education to 'professionals' (Borg, 1994). These parents see education as a discrete process that takes place on the school grounds under the direction of a teacher and their own job as getting their son or daughter to school (Lareau, 1987). Whereas, middle-class parents in Lareau's (1987) study saw education as 'a shared enterprise and scrutinized, monitored, and supplemented the school experience of their children' (p. 81) by reading to them, initiating contact with teachers and attending school events. These parents, with similar or superior educational skills and occupational prestige levels to teachers, conceived of schooling as a partnership between equals and saw it as their responsibility to reinforce, monitor, and supervise the educational experience of their children (Lareau, 1987). In short, working-class and middle-class parents have different conceptions of the division of labour with respect to schooling their children.

Others trace unequal levels of parental involvement in schooling back to educational institutions, which are accused of making middle-class families feel more welcome than working-class and lower-class families (Lightfoot, 1978; Ogbu, 1974). This latter group of parents are also more likely to have had negative experiences as students themselves, and already experience feelings of insecurity and intimidation in school settings (Cairney & Munsie, 1995). This makes community participation in disadvantaged schools via conventional channels difficult (Connell, 1993). Those who are unwilling or unable to become involved face marginalization and risk being labelled as 'ignorant but also neglectful of their duty to their child and to the nation' (Hughes & Mac Naughton, 2000, p. 244). Moreover, the lack of participation on the part of subordinate groups leaves the door wide open for dominant groups – who are equipped with the cultural capital legitimated by educational institutions – to mobilise class advantage and lobby for their own agenda (Grimes, 1995; Henry, 1996).

To add to these difficulties of involving parents from disadvantaged communities in schooling, parents and teachers share a long history of tension and mistrust. They have even been described in the literature as 'natural enemies' (Waller, 1932), facing enduring problems of negotiating 'boundaries' between their 'territories' (Lightfoot, 1978). Teachers have had negative attitudes about parents and parent participation, and have claimed that parents are apathetic and come to school only to criticise (Briggs & Potter, 1990). This can result in the significant adults and institutions in children's lives pulling in opposite directions (Edwards & Young, 1992). Hence, attempts to develop participation programs to bring the school and community closer together are often ineffective and frustrating to both parents

and teachers (Cairney & Munsie, 1995). Parents and educators do not necessarily work well together and they do not equally share decision-making. Instead, parents have traditionally adopted the role of supporters or representatives, rather than full and equal partners (Borg & Mayo, 2001).

In these ways, parents (particularly those with backgrounds different from teachers) are often positioned in a binary relationship with teachers, as 'others'. Parental knowledge of the child is seen as anecdotal, subjective, ad hoc, individualized and applicable only to specific children. On the other hand, teachers' professional knowledge is seen as developmental, scientific, objective, norm-referenced and applicable to all children. Hence, parental knowledge is seen as inadequate (parents are seen as ignorant about what and how to teach their children), supplementary (parental knowledge of the child is seen as a supplement to rather than a necessary component of teachers' knowledge and can therefore be ignored without their professional standards being compromised) or unimportant. In fact, staff have little incentive to collaborate with parents, given that their claim to be professionals is undermined by giving credence to parental knowledge of the child. This prevents the creation of equitable parent-staff relationships (Hughes & Mac Naughton, 2000).

Clearly, schools should think differently about what they expect from families and communities (Edwards & Young, 1992). Parents must be viewed as partners, and the vital role that they play in education recognized. Rather than seeking to determine what parents can do for teachers – such as filling a variety of unpaid teacher aide or custodial roles – teachers need to implement initiatives that recognize the complementary roles of parents and teachers and bring schools and communities closer together (Cairney & Munsie, 1995). Schools also need to engage with community concerns (Taylor & Henry, 2000) and reach out to parents in new ways, as parents without money or status are often wary or uncertain about approaching teachers and administrators (Schmuck & Schmuck, 1992). They must help parents connect to resources, create environments where parents feel welcome, and organize various avenues for participation (Edwards & Young, 1992). In this way, positive relationships with school communities can be established and maintained and community representatives can be drawn into the process of educational decision-making and allowed a voice.

## **HOW AND BY WHOM SHOULD SCHOOLS BE MANAGED?**

Although schools were once 'fortress-like' institutions with the purposes of education departments carried out 'by principals and teachers with little negotiation with, and input from, school communities, including parents' (Lingard, Hayes & Mills, in press), there were efforts in the latter part of the twentieth century to devolve decision-making to schools and to experiment with more open and participatory relationships with parents and school communities. Devolution, as it was first implemented in Australian schools in the early 1970s, was strongly influenced by the Karmel Report (Interim Committee for the Australian Schools Commission, 1973). The report changed the way Australians thought about education and its governance and challenged 'the long-standing centralist bureaucratic tradition in Australian education, replacing it with a new democratic rhetoric which highlighted the principles of equality and participation' (Rizvi, 1994, p. 1).

Karmel's socially democratic agenda stressed the importance of bottom-up reforms and devolution of decision-making (Rizvi, 1994). The need for 'more teacher and school level professional autonomy, combined with greater input from parents and community' (Lingard, Hayes & Mills, in press) was championed as giving schools and communities increased power to manage their own affairs and improving educational outcomes for all students, particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds. The report itself argued that 'responsibility should be devolved as far as possible upon the people involved in the actual

task of schooling, in consultation with the parents of the pupils whom they teach and, at senior levels, with the students themselves' (Interim Committee for the Australian Schools Commission, 1973, p. 10).

The ideal of devolution (with some modifications) has now been widely accepted in Australian education and the need to respond to local concerns through shared decision-making is increasingly recognized. In Queensland, for example, there appear concerted efforts to ensure that 'wherever possible, decisions should be made by those who have access to the best local information, who are responsible for implementing policies, and who have to bear the consequences of the decisions' (Department of Education, 1990, p. 41). This socially democratic form of devolution provides opportunities for people to participate in decision-making and, in so doing, have a say in the way their lives are governed. It also suggests a closer association between school and community. However, not all forms of devolution share this same outlook. Some Australian governments prefer a liberal democratic form that champions the interests of the individual ahead of the community. Located within the broader ideology of market individualism, devolution in this sense is critical of the bureaucratisation of education and promotes the rights of individuals as 'consumers' to choose their child's school, as a way of giving them a greater say in educational decision-making. Utilized in this sense, the vocabulary of participation serves a set of contradictory political purposes and extends the operations of the market into the education arena (Rizvi, 1994).

Critics point to the inevitable increase in social and economic inequalities to highlight the disastrous social consequences that this market view entails (Rizvi, 1994). It is a view of devolution that 'obscures the fact that people's capacities to make choices are affected by a large range of material, social and political conditions' (Rizvi, 1994, p. 4), which variably enable and prevent the exercise of choice. Clearly, not all parents are in a position to choose the school to which they want to send their children. Moreover, the market assumption is that 'choice is simply a matter of individual preference, unaffected by cultural learning and social conditions, and that collective decision-making consists of the aggregation of individual preferences' (Rizvi, 1994, p. 4). The notion of choice implicit in this market view of devolution is, therefore, a limited one, resting on a number of flawed assumptions (Rizvi, 1994).

Despite this market orientation, and perhaps because of it, many teachers and parents are committed to a social democratic version of devolution, believing that education can and should be a collective social activity, inextricably tied to the community rather than linked instrumentally to the 'outside' world, as corporate managerialists and free marketeers suggest (Rizvi, 1994). Drawing on a socially democratic view of devolution, we argue for at least two ideals. First, that schooling should democratize its leadership structures to include teachers and, second, that it should democratize its participation structures to include parents and communities.

### **Schooling should democratize its leadership structures to include teachers**

Educational institutions have long existed as closed systems with top-down structures, 'characterized by rigidity, extensive rules and regulations, and excessively tight norms that restrict creativity' (Whitaker & Moses, 1990, p. 128). While strong and visionary leadership in an organization is important, there is no evidence to suggest that the principal is necessarily the best and/or should be the only source of this leadership. Instead, the effective schools literature suggests that effective principals provide or cause others to provide strong leadership (Schlechty, 1990). The traditional, entrenched orthodoxy of principals as primary decision-makers needs to be challenged and the leadership role extended to many individuals and groups in a participatory style of management (Wheeler & Agruso, 1996).

However, it would be a mistake to assume that empowering teachers in this way means taking power away from principals and other administrators. The role of the principal is instead reconceptualised as leading, rather than managing and controlling, and developing leadership among those he or she leads. The sharing of leadership and the involvement more generally of teachers in decision-making is often seen to help teachers to become more efficacious and contribute more productively to schools (Rosenholtz, 1990). In such situations, the principal is less concerned with whether a teacher implements the principal's decision in the 'right way' than with whether the teacher makes the right decision – which is not always the decision that the principal would have made – and then implements it (Schlechty, 1990).

However, the empowerment of teachers may not come easily or quickly. Teachers have been conditioned to accept dependent roles and the culture of schools reinforces this trend (Whitaker & Moses, 1990). Furthermore, many teachers are skeptical about the motives and sincerity of administrators when it comes to empowerment. Indeed, Whitaker and Moses (1990) suggest that willingness to enfranchise teachers is lacking. While many principals tend to embrace and endorse the idea of participation, their behaviour – their controlling values and tendencies – suggests otherwise (Wood, 1984). Some teachers suspect that it may be the case that collegial energies may be harnessed less for the purpose of giving them a say than to 'squeeze out dissenting voices and secure commitment and compliance to changes imposed by others' (Hargreaves, 1992, p. 217).

As the front-line workers in schools, teachers are often expected to implement policies, but not to make them. Hence, they can often regard themselves as the 'objects of policy interventions rather than as the authors of social change' (Connell, 1994, p. 133). But rather than their input being included as a token gesture, teachers should be centrally involved in the design of reform strategies (Whitaker & Moses, 1990). For this to happen, teachers need to become full partners in their own profession (Whitaker & Moses, 1990). Participation in collaborative decisions affecting their profession, their classrooms, and their students not only challenges top-down structures but teachers' ownership and endorsement of decisions fosters feelings of empowerment. As a general rule, then, involving in decision-making those who will be responsible for implementation also appears to impact on their motivation to act upon and commitment to the outcomes of the decision-making process (Whitaker & Moses, 1990).

This is the premise of the most recent school reform movement in Queensland, the New Basics Project (Education Queensland, 2000), which 'seeks to foreground teachers' knowledges, teachers' professional development and the creation of school learning communities as a way to align the three message systems of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment (Bernstein, 1971) at the school site' (Lingard, Hayes & Mills, in press). It is a reaction to much previous educational reform – done to, rather than with teachers – which considers the importance of bringing teachers back into educational restructuring as central to improving student outcomes (Lingard, Hayes & Mills, in press). This empowerment of the teaching profession also enhances collaboration among educators (Whitaker & Moses, 1990), who supposedly learn most from colleagues in their own school (Hargreaves, 1992). And it is important for improving the outcomes of disadvantaged students as it involves teachers working together to improve their instructional programs, engaging in talk about teaching practices, observing one another teach, planning and preparing resources together and learning from one another about the practice of teaching (McNally, 1991).

## **Schooling should democratize its participation structures to include parents and communities**

Schools play a crucial role in the formation of democracy. However, for this to occur 'it seems clear that the operation of the school both within *and* outside it must model democratic principles' (Hattam, Smyth & Lawson, 1998, p. 13, emphasis added). The point here is that 'democratization *in* the school is not necessarily the same as democratization *of* the school' (Connell, 1993, p. 71, emphasis original). Given that the 'notion of "democracy" implies collective decision-making on major issues in which all citizens have, in principle, an equal voice' (Connell, 1993, p. 45), *all* those involved in schooling need to be involved in determining schooling's purposes. Clearly, 'you cannot have a democracy in which some citizens only *receive* decisions made by others' (Connell, 1993, p. 46, emphasis original).

Providing all members of the school community with access to forms of self-determining power certainly requires an investment of time, energy and emotion. Nevertheless, within a context of participative democracy, Wheeler and Agruso (1996) see the development of collaborative relationships among teachers, students, parents and the schools' communities as crucial in ensuring success in schooling for disadvantaged students. In part, this is because when decisions are more relevant to those they affect, schools are able to provide a more appropriate education for all students. As well, such 'devolution of power has the potential to reduce alienation from schools, increase job satisfaction of employees, promote direct participation of all relevant groups, and raise community understanding' (Lingard, Hayes & Mills, in press). This is apart from the fact that 'the rule of some people over others, their power to make decisions that affect the actions and conditions of action of others' (Young, 1990, p. 112) is hardly socially just and that delegation of authority to some who are charged with making decisions in an impartial manner can legitimate undemocratic, authoritarian structures of decision-making.

Giddens (1994) refers to the alternative as characterized by 'generative politics'. In the context of schooling, this 'allow[s] individuals and groups to *make things happen*, rather than have things happen to them' (Giddens, 1994, p. 15, emphasis added) and opens up the processes of schooling to groups that traditionally have been excluded by seriously engaging their views in decision-making. In short, generative politics calls for partnerships in which the ideals and interests of all members are valued and their respective concerns, conditions and objectives are compared and contrasted. Rather than being a power struggle between conflicting ideas, this is an open and public forum in which 'different groups can "sit down together", however difficult that may appear at times and however different their voices may sound' (Gale, 2000, p. 266) and negotiate their way forward.

A governance structure supporting decision-making practices in concert with the entire school community also assumes more flexible leadership that enables participants to 'exercise the power of their human agency in self-determining ways' (Millwater, Yarrow & Short, 2000, p. 5). The shift and subsequent change in roles and responsibilities affords all members of the school community with opportunity for increased involvement that leads to a sense of ownership of school reform and control over the school agenda. These opportunities to be involved in collaborative decisions that affect schooling and, therefore, the lives of their children, empower families and help all members of a school's community to feel that they are valued.

## **CONCLUSION**

In casting a critical eye over the effective schooling literature, we do not mean to suggest that schooling practices short of our ideals are necessarily inappropriate. We are still

concerned to detail what we regard as socially just forms of schooling – and therein lies measures of what we regard as appropriate ends – but we also want to engage with matters related to how well these ends are pursued. Hence, while there might be agreement that schools should ideally equip students with the intellectual, cultural and social capital necessary to pursue a wide range of post school opportunities, whether these capabilities and opportunities are distributed differentially or equitably is a key question (Collins, Kenway & McLeod, 2000). Certainly, the research shows that equity is not as marketable as academic excellence or exclusiveness in schools, and that promoting equity could even put a school's survival at risk (Blackmore, Hodgens, Laskey & Thorpe, 1998). Nevertheless, if we are to take the conditions of recognitive justice seriously it remains important for all schools to move beyond the goal of 'compensation' and towards the reorganization of the cultural content of schooling if they are to improve the educational outcomes of disadvantaged students (Connell, 1994).

We have argued that such reorganization necessarily entails modifying both teachers' pedagogies and school curricula, and adopting organizational styles that reconfigure teacher-student and school-community relations based on an appreciation and respect for individuals, as they identify themselves. As part of this agenda we have also argued for the devolution of decision-making in schools, in ways that promote open and participatory relationships among teachers, students, parents and school communities. That is, all those affected by school and classroom decisions need to be included in the decision-making process, particularly the voices of the least advantaged. Moving away from the principal as the traditional primary decision-maker to a participatory style of management is courageous work, as we have noted. So, too, for teachers who attempt to move away from their traditional position as the gatekeeper of legitimate knowledge. However, to maintain the status quo, to do nothing apart from tinker at the edges of schooling with compensatory programs that regard difference as deficient, is to continue the current reproduction of educational disadvantage across generations (Lingard, 1998). Is this what we mean by effective schooling?

## REFERENCES

Anyon, J. (1981). Elementary schooling and distinctions of social class. *Interchange*, 12(2&3), 118-132.

Australian Schools Commission. (1995). *Quality and equality*. Canberra: Commonwealth Schools

Commission.

Bernstein, B. (1971). On the classification and framing of educational knowledge. In M. F. D. Young (Ed.),

*Knowledge and control* (pp. 47-69). London: Collier-Macmillan.

Bernstein, B. (1975). *Towards a theory of educational transmissions*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bernstein, B. (1990). *The structuring of pedagogic discourse*. London: Routledge.

Blackmore, J., Hodgins, J., Laskey, L., & Thorpe, S. (1998). *'Media/ting change' self managing schools, the*

*media and educational reform*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Adelaide.

Borg, C. (1994). Sehem il-genituri fl-edukazzjoni taz-zghar (Parents' participation in early childhood

education). In R. G. Sultana (Ed.), *Genituri u ghalliema ghal edukazzjoni ahjar. Gwida ghal shubija gdida (Parents and teachers for a better education. Guide for a new partnership)*. Msida: Mireva.

Borg, C., & Mayo, P. (2001). From 'adjuncts' to 'subjects': Parental involvement in a working-class

community. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 22(2), 245-266.

Bourdieu, P. (1977a). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In J. Karabel & A. H. Halsey (Eds.),

*Power and ideology in education* (pp. 487-511). New York: Oxford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1977b). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1997). The forms of capital. In A. Halsey & H. Lauder & P. Brown & A. S. Wells (Eds.),

*Education: Culture, economy and society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (2nd ed.). London:

Sage.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). The purpose of reflexive sociology (the Chicago workshop). In P.

Bourdieu & L. Wacquant (Eds.), *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Boykin, A. W. (1986). The triple quandary and the schooling of Afro-American children. In U. Neisser (Ed.),

*The school achievement of minority children: New perspectives* (pp. 57-92). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Briggs, F., & Potter, G. (1990). *Teaching children in the first three years of school*. Melbourne: Longman

Cheshire.

Brint, S. (1998). *Schools and societies*. Thousand Oaks, US: Pine Forge Press.

Cairney, T. H., & Munsie, L. (1995). Parent participation in literacy learning. *The Reading Teacher*, 48(5),

392-403.

Cairney, T. H., & Ruge, J. (1998). *Community literacy practices and schooling: Towards effective support for*

*students*. Canberra: Department of Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs.

Clark, B. R. (1961). The "cooling-out" function in higher education. In A. H. Halsey & J. Floud & C. A.

Anderson (Eds.), *Education, economy and society: A reader in the sociology of education* (pp. 513-523). New York: Free Press.

Collins, C., Kenway, J., & McLeod, J. (2000). Gender debates we still have to have. *Australian Educational*

*Researcher*, 27(3), 37-48.

Comber, B., & Hill, S. (2000). Socio-economic disadvantage, literacy and social justice: Learning from

longitudinal case study research. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 27(3), 79-97.

Connell, R., Ashenden, D., Kessler, S., & Dowsett, G. (1982). *Making the difference: Schools, families and*

*social division*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Connell, R. W. (1993). *Schools and social justice*. Leichhardt: Pluto.

Connell, R. W. (1994). Poverty and education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 64(2), 125-149.

Cox, T. (2000). Introduction. In T. Cox (Ed.), *Combating educational disadvantage: Meeting the needs of*

*vulnerable children* (pp. 1-14). London: Falmer Press.

Cunningham, F. (1987). *Democratic theory and socialism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Curtis, B., Livingstone, D. W., & Smaller, H. (1992). *Stacking the deck: The streaming of working-class kids*

*in Ontario schools*. Toronto: Our Selves Education Foundation.

Delpit, L. (1992). Acquisition of literate discourse: Bowing before the master? *Theory into practice*, 31(4),

296-302.

Delpit, L. (1997). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. In A. H.

Halsey & H. Lauder & P. Brown & A. S. Wells (Eds.), *Education: Culture, economy and society* (pp. 582-594). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Department of Education. (1990). *Focus on schools: The future organisation of educational services for*

*students*. Brisbane: Department of Education, Queensland.

Deutsch, M. (1967). The disadvantaged child and the learning process. In M. Deutsch (Ed.), *The*

*disadvantaged child* (pp. 39-58). New York: Basic Books.

Education Queensland. (2000). *The new basics: Theory into practice*. Brisbane: Education Queensland.

Edwards, J. (1999). *Students-as-researchers*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Australian

Association for Research in Education and New Zealand Association of Research in Education, Melbourne.

Edwards, P. A., & Young, L. S. J. (1992). Beyond parents: Family, community, and school involvement. *Phi*

*Delta Kappan*, 74(1), 72-80.

Fordham, S., & Ogbu, J. U. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the "Burden of acting

White". *Urban Review*, 18(3), 176-206.

Franklin, W. (2000). Students at promise and resilient: A historical look at risk. In M. G. Sanders (Ed.),

*Schooling students placed at risk: Research, policy, and practice in the education of poor and minority adolescents* (pp. 3-16). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gale, T. (2000). Rethinking social justice in schools: How will we recognize it when we see it? *International*

*Journal of Inclusive Education*, 4(3), 253-269.

Gale, T., & Densmore, K. (2000). *Just schooling: Explorations in the cultural politics of teaching*.

Buckingham: Open University Press.

Gamaron, A. (1992). Access to excellence: Assignment to honors English classes in the transition from

middle to high school. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 14(3), 185-204.

Giddens, A. (1994). *Beyond left and right: The future of radical politics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giroux, H. (1990). Reading texts, literacy, and textual authority. *Journal of Education*, 172(1), 85-103.

Grimes, J. (1995). *Cultural capital, ethnicity and early education*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of

Oxford, Oxford.

Hargreaves, A. (1992). Cultures of teaching: A focus for change. In A. Hargreaves & M. G. Fullan (Eds.),

*Understanding teacher development* (pp. 216-240). New York: Teachers College Press.

Harvey, D. (1989). *The condition of postmodernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Oxford,

UK: Basil Blackwell.

Hattam, R., Shacklock, G., & Smyth, J. (1998). Doing critical cultural studies - An antidote to being done to.

In J. Smyth & R. Hattam & M. Lawson (Eds.), *Schooling for a fair go* (pp. 97-114). Leichhardt, NSW: The Federation Press.

Hattam, R., Smyth, J., & Lawson, M. (1998). Schooling for a fair go: (Re)making the social fabric. In J. Smyth

& R. Hattam & M. Lawson (Eds.), *Schooling for a fair go* (pp. 1-14). Leichhardt, NSW: The Federation Press.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Henry, M. (1996). *Parent-school collaboration: Feminist organisational structures and school leadership*.

New York: SUNY Press.

Hughes, P., & Mac Naughton, G. (2000). Consensus, dissensus or community: The politics of parent

involvement in early childhood education. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 1(3), 241-258.

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.

Knight, J. (1994, May 13). Social justice and effective schooling. *Education Views*.

Knight, T. (2000). *Longitudinal development of educational theory: Democracy and the classroom*. Paper

presented at the annual conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Sydney.

Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*.

London: Verso.

Ladwig, J., & Gore, J. (1998). Nurturing democracy in schools. In J. Smyth & R. Hattam & M. Lawson (Eds.),

*Schooling for a fair go* (pp. 15-26). Leichhardt, NSW: The Federation Press.

Lamb, S., Dwyer, P., & Wyn, J. (2000). *Non-completion of school in Australia: The changing patterns of*

*participation and outcomes* (Longitudinal Surveys of Australian Youth Research Report Number 16). Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research.

Lamphere, L. (1993). *Structuring diversity: Ethnographic perspectives on the new immigration*. Chicago:

University of Chicago.

Lareau, A. (1987). Social class differences in family-school relationships: The importance of cultural capital.

*Sociology of Education*, 60(2), 73-85.

Lareau, A. (2000). *Home advantage: Social class and parental intervention in elementary education*. Blue

Ridge Summit, PA: Rowman & Littlefield.

Lawson, J. (2000). *Be it ever so humble: Home-school congruence and literacy for poor kids*. Paper

presented at the annual conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Sydney.

Lightfoot, S. L. (1978). *Worlds apart*. New York: Basic Books.

Lingard, B. (1998). The disadvantaged schools program: Caught between literacy and local management of

schools. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 2(1), 1-14.

Lingard, B., Hayes, D., & Mills, M. (in press). Developments in school-based management: The specific case

of Queensland, Australia. *Journal of Educational Administration*.

Lingard, B., Mills, M., & Hayes, D. (2000). Teachers, school reform and social justice: Challenging research

and practice. *Australian Educational Researcher*, 27(3), 99-116.

Lucey, H., & Walkerdine, V. (2000). Boys' underachievement: Social class and changing masculinities. In T.

Cox (Ed.), *Combating educational disadvantage: Meeting the needs of vulnerable children* (pp. 37-52). London: Falmer Press.

McNally, P. (1991). Collegiality and collaboration in early field experiences. *The Journal of Teaching*

*Practice*, 11(1), 31-42.

Millwater, J., Yarrow, A., & Short, J. (2000). *Restructuring and reculturing schools: Addressing the data*.

Paper presented at the annual conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Sydney.

Newmann, F., & Associates. (1996). *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality*.

San Francisco: Josey Bass.

Nickel, J. W. (1987). Equal opportunity in a pluralistic society. In E. Frankel Paul & F. D. Miller & J. Paul & J.

Ahrens (Eds.), *Equal opportunity* (pp. 104-119). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Oakes, J., Gamaron, A., & Page, R. (1991). Curriculum differentiation: Opportunities, outcomes, and

meanings. In P. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research in curriculum* (pp. 570-608). New York: Macmillan.

Ogbu, J. (1974). *The next generation*. New York: Academic Press.

Ramsay, P., Sneddon, D., Grenfell, J., & Ford, I. (1983). Successful and unsuccessful schools: A study in

Southern Auckland. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 19(2), 272-304.

Rizvi, F. (1994). Devolution in education: Three contrasting perspectives. In R. Martin & J. McCollow & L.

McFarlane & G. McMurdo & J. Graham & R. Hull (Eds.), *Devolution, decentralisation and recentralisation: The structure of Australian schooling* (pp. 1-5). Melbourne: Australian Education Union.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1990). Education reform strategies: Will they increase teacher commitment? In A.

Lieberman (Ed.), *Schools as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now* (pp. 79-102). New York: The Falmer Press.

Sammons, P., Hillman, J., & Mortimore, P. (1995). Key characteristics of effective schools: A review of

school effectiveness research. In J. White & M. Barber (Eds.), *Perspectives on school effectiveness and school improvement* (pp. 77-124). London: Bedford Way Press.

Schlechty, P. C. (1990). Schools for the twenty-first century: The conditions for invention. In A. Lieberman

(Ed.), *Schools as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now* (pp. 233-255). New York: The Falmer Press.

Schmuck, R. A., & Schmuck, P. A. (1992). *Small districts, big problems: Making school everybody's house*.

Newbury Park: Corwin Press.

Singh, P. (2001). Speaking about cultural difference and school disadvantage. An interview study of

'Samoan' paraprofessionals in designated disadvantaged secondary schools in Australia. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 22(3), 317-337.

Taylor, S., & Henry, M. (2000). Challenges for equity policy in changing contexts. *Australian Educational*

*Researcher*, 27(3), 1-15.

Useem, E. L. (1992). Middle schools and math groups: Parents' involvement in children's placement.

*Sociology of Education*, 65(4), 263-279.

Waller, W. (1932). *The sociology of teaching*. New York: Wiley.

Wheeler, N., & Agruso, R. (1996). *Implementing school centered decision making*. Paper presented at the

Summit on Education, Nashville, Tennessee.

Whitaker, K. S., & Moses, M. C. (1990). Teacher empowerment: A key to restructuring. *The Clearing House*,

64(2), 127-130.

Wood, C. J. (1984). Participatory decision-making: Why it doesn't seem to work. *Educational Forum*, 49, 55-

64.

Yonezawa, S. S. (2000). Unpacking the black box of tracking decisions: Critical tales of families navigating

the course placement process. In M. G. Sanders (Ed.), *Schooling students placed at risk: Research, policy, and practice in the education of poor and minority adolescents* (pp. 109-137). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.