Thinking beyond recognition: Multiculturalism, cultural intelligence, and the professional capacities of teachers

Megan Watkins & Greg Noble

Published online: 12 Feb 2016.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 31

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Thinking beyond recognition: Multiculturalism, cultural intelligence, and the professional capacities of teachers

Megan Watkins and Greg Noble

Multiculturalism as public policy has provided a set of programs which frame how individuals view and respond to the cultural diversity found in Australia's cities and towns. This is nowhere more evident than in Australian schools where, from the early 1970s, a range of programs have not only assisted students and their parents with a language background other than English (LBOTE)—such as through English as a Second Language (ESL) support and community liaison—but have sought to ensure all students develop a particular ethic in dealing with cultural difference through programs of inclusive curricula and anti-racism. There is much to commend in these programs and recognition of their ongoing benefits is important to combat the regular critiques of multiculturalism by opportunistic politicians and shock jocks keen to capitalize on community concerns around social cohesion, the plight of refugees, and border control. Yet, despite these benefits, we argue that multicultural education, as it is currently practiced in schools, doesn't quite address the challenges of the complex world in which we live, and needs to be rethought. All too often it is governed by regimes of cultural recognition premised on a view of culture as difference, shaped by assumptions about distinct, cohesive, and unchanging ethnic communities within the larger national community, which is also construed as cohesive and distinct (Noble 2009). This was the social imaginary upon which early multiculturalism was based but it is a poor fit for the more hybridized and dynamic identities of students and their wider communities in the globalized world of today. Reproducing this imaginary, we suggest, may contribute to, rather than address, the problems confronting students from ethnic minorities. Moreover, this multiculturalism has been premised on a moral discourse of tolerance and respect which, while sounding progressive, fosters an unreflexive civility that reproduces a politics of identity but detracts from a critical interrogation of the constitutive nature of cultural practices.

Now more than ever, as Australia is in the process of implementing a National Curriculum that promotes intercultural understanding as a capability to be fostered across the curriculum (Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority [ACARA] 2013), thought needs to be given to the skills and knowledges students need for living in the worlds they

inhabit. This focus in the Australian National Curriculum, as valuable as it is, skirts around the issue of unpacking what intercultural understanding might mean, theoretically and in educational practice. It insists that intercultural understanding "is an essential part of living with others in the diverse world of the twenty-first century" because it "involves students in learning about and engaging with diverse cultures in ways that recognize commonalities and differences, creates connections with others," requiring the development of the key "dispositions" of empathy, respect, and responsibility. It acknowledges that culture is complex and changing, and thus needs critical reflection by students, and outlines key skills in fashioning such an understanding (2013, 111, 118–120). We could engage in a critical deconstruction of ACARA's take on culture and cultural diversity, but that is not our focus here. While the emphasis in developing a framework for intercultural understanding is on *students'* capabilities, the issue that is missing in this discussion is whether teachers, as professionals engaged in the task of equipping students with these skills and knowledges, have these capacities themselves, and what kinds of regimes of recognition their teaching practices rest upon.

Cultural Studies as a "discipline"[1] possesses useful critical and theoretical resources to make important interventions in this regard. Its non-essentialist stance on questions of identity, its embrace of post-colonial notions of cultural hybridity, and its understandings around the dynamics of local and transnational space are pertinent to rethinking how multicultural education is approached in schools. Yet it is not enough for teachers to engage with these theoretical perspectives and to cast a critical eye on the limitations of current conceptions of multiculturalism and multicultural education. Indeed, Cultural Studies is itself often rebuked for failing to do little more than critique (Latour 2004) and wallowing in the complexities of social reality (Jacoby 2000; Ang 2011). We are not suggesting that teachers need to become Cultural Studies scholars, but rather they need to engage with these critical perspectives in order to move beyond them and towards a post-critical pedagogy and curriculum relevant to contemporary schooling systems.

As both intellectual workers and practitioners, teachers need to be thinking post-critically; that is, to not only adopt a capacity for critique but to then apply these understandings in productive ways with their students inside and outside the classroom and with their broader school communities. Ang (2011) terms this orientation to knowledge and its applied focus "cultural intelligence." By this term Ang (2011, 790) doesn't mean a broad brushstroke understanding of the many diverse nationally defined "cultures" that constitute contemporary societies, nor an "awareness" of diverse cultural values, but an orientation to knowledge which entails an intellectual and practical engagement with the complexity of the world and the constitutive role that culture plays in this complexity. Drawing on recent research in schools as part of the Rethinking Multiculturalism/Reassessing

Multicultural Education (RMRME) Project which involved teachers under-taking professional learning framed by these ideas and then designing and implementing action research projects to address issues of concern in their schools, this article examines the reduced politics of recognition that often inform teaching practices and explores the notion of cultural intelligence as it might apply to teacher professionalism. Focusing on two of these action research projects, it examines the benefits that accrue as teachers in one school adopt and apply this mode of thought in building partnerships with LBOTE parents. This is compared with another in which teachers adopt a professionalism that disavows their role as intellectuals, resulting in a pro-ject which simply reaffirms a notion of culture as difference and does little more than promote the ethos of unreflexive civility we argue is charac-teristic of existing multiculturalism.

Teachers as intellectuals

The broader RMRME Project, which aimed to effect change around multi-cultural education in schools, was therefore very much reliant upon the professional capacities of the teachers involved. Yet, what these capacities entail and the professional basis of teaching are much broader issues that require consideration prior to an examination of what transpired in each of these schools. Whether or not teaching actually constitutes a profession is itself a matter of debate (Sachs 2001), with it variously referred to as "a semi-profession, a vocation or work that 'anyone can do'" (Servage 2009, 150). Such characterizations reflect a history of changing ideas about teaching (Connell 2009) and a degree of vocational ambivalence and dispute over the uses of "professional" rhetoric (Runté 1995).

Indeed, public debate around teaching surfaces in the Australian media on a regular basis and invariably raises issues about teacher quality (Thomas 2011), a matter integral to the framing of teaching as a profession. With concerns that entry requirements for university teacher training are far too low, the Australian Government is now set to lift these and to ensure teacher education programs meet agreed professional standards determined by the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL), a statutory body established by the Australian government to monitor the profession. To Connell (2009, 224), highly critical of such moves, government regulation of this type simply provides yet another example of neoliberal governance that promotes a managerial culture in which the teaching profession is reduced to a checklist of "auditable competences," fashioning teachers as technicians that require "skill rather than intelligence." There is little doubt that this managerial ethos has left its mark on teaching with a burgeoning literature documenting its impact both within Australia and other late capitalist econ-omies (Davies 2003; Press and Woodrow 2005; Nairn and Higgins 2007;

Watkins 2007; Hill and Kumar 2008). Yet it is not simply the deleterious effects of neoliberalism that have led to a professional culture that tends to privilege the craft-based aspect of teaching over any strong intellectual orientation. As Servage (2009, 152) explains in relation to the Canadian context, the professional identities of teachers tend to be "local and particular." Theoretical engagement around disciplinary content, pedagogy or broader educational issues is generally sacrificed for the more immediate concerns of the day-to-day teaching of students in classrooms. In such a "pragmatic" professional culture, teachers' work is framed as little more than relaying a bank of knowledge and skills and maintaining classroom behavior in the process. While these may be markers of competence, teachers' work involves far more. Whether cognizant of it or not, teachers also relay a set of values, systems of perception and recognition, and understandings about the world to their students. Yet as Connell (2009, 224) points out

> Interpreting the world for others, and doing it well, requires not just a skill set but also a knowledge of how interpretation is done, of the cultural field in which it is done, and of the possibilities of interpretation that surround one's own. This requirement helps to define teaching as intellectual labour and teachers as a group of intellectual workers.

The RMRME Project

It was such an approach that informed RMRME, an Australian Research Council (ARC) Linkage Project with the Multicultural Programs Unit (MPU) within the New South Wales (NSW) Department of Education and Communities (DEC) and the NSW Institute of Teachers. The Project had two main stages: first, the collection of data around understandings of multiculturalism and how multicultural education is practiced in schools; and second, a series of action research projects that were conducted in the fourteen project schools. The first stage involved a survey of all NSW DEC teachers with questions pertaining to teacher background, professional learning around multicultural education, current programs in schools, attitudes to diversity, schooling, and multiculturalism, and understandings of key concepts.[2] Separate focus groups were also conducted with teachers, parents, and students in each of the project schools to delve more deeply into the issues of multiculturalism and multicultural education raised in the survey. The second stage of the project, involving action research in the project schools, was preceded by training of the staff involved. School research teams, formed on a voluntary basis and comprising up to five teachers headed by a member of each school's executive, were given the brief of devising a program of action research within their school which addressed a specific need around multicultural education, but did so with the challenges posed by the professional learning around culture and multiculturalism in mind.

A diverse range of schools were involved in the project, representing a mix of primary and secondary schools, with high and low numbers of LBOTE students, of high and low socio-economic status (SES), in a mix of urban and rural locations. Apart from our initial input during the training we took a backseat to examine the ways in which schools went about the process (supported by DEC consultants who had also received the professional training) of conducting and evaluating site-specific action research projects, the degree to which they engaged with issues around cultural diversity, and how they grappled with issues such as the tension between cultural maintenance and cultural flux.

From culture as difference to cultural complexity

The professional learning process focused closely on understandings of culture and related terms because culture has become a central feature of state policies, commercial activity, popular discourses, and professional practice (Breidenbach and Nyiri 2009). This is as true in education as anywhere. More than this, however, to engage with questions of culture is to get to the heart of social perceptions around cultural difference and social existence, and the need for an intellectual engagement with these issues in schools. We can illustrate this by examining some of the student focus group data which was collected prior to the action research projects. The students' responses around how they understand the term culture reveal much about current practices of multicultural education and what we have elsewhere called the multicultural schemas of perception (Watkins and Noble 2013). Students provided an array of responses when we asked them to explain what they understood by the term culture. Many from both primary and secondary schools (primary school students were mainly from years five and six and secondary students years nine and ten, though sometimes younger and older students were included) offered explanations such as a "set of beliefs" or "people's customs." Very often there was a focus on religion such as this by Jaylan from a low SES, low LBOTE secondary school: "It's like your belief system and the society and all that;" and Mohammed from a mid SES, high LBOTE primary school, who thought, "Culture can mean a background or a religion too."

Overwhelmingly, however, across the primary and secondary schools the idea of culture denoting difference or reference to *the Other* was foregrounded:

It means like different types of nationalities and all that.
    Miranda, low SES, low LBOTE secondary school

It means different countries and what they believe in, like their country.
    Madison, high SES, mid LBOTE primary school

What they believe in, kind of.
    Lucas, mid SES, low LBOTE secondary school

How they do stuff in their country, what food they would eat.
    Jillian, low SES, low LBOTE primary school

Well, I think culture is basically those sort of ideas that you get from your heritage, from your parents.
    Juzan, high SES, high LBOTE secondary school

It's like us Greeks like when we go to like … on Easter, we go to like church and we go at night.
    Phillip, mid SES, high LBOTE primary school

Well culture means from a different country, like their background is a different culture than our background.
    Elise low SES, low LBOTE primary school

Elise, however was quite confused when the interviewer responded that, "I was born in Australia, do I have a culture?" Her friend Vera came to her rescue: "Well, depends, as you said, you were born in Australia and if you have a culture, like say your parents were born in a different country and then they had a culture and then their parents had a culture so then you would have a culture because their parents have culture and so do your grandparents. So you would have a culture because they are from a different country or they were born in a different country."

Culture, therefore, is very much understood by these students as a thing that is inherited, a marker of difference that is distinct from the Anglo mainstream. If Australian culture was referred to it was generally in stereotypical terms as one boy from a low SES/LBOTE high school who was questioned about this remarked, "the meat pie, and stubbie, and kangaroos in our backyard sort of thing," but generally it was a notion of difference (i.e., the difference of ethnic others) that pervaded these students' understandings of culture. Multicultural Australia was still very much seen as a patchwork of discrete and different cultures. As Ang (2001) points out, multiculturalism has functioned more as a kind of "living-apart-together," a view that not only sets those who are perceived as different apart from the imagined culture of the host nation but similarly isolates the Anglo mainstream from engagement with those perceived as Other.

Even those students who comfortably navigated a heterogeneous mix of cultures in the course of their everyday lives had difficulty reconciling their understandings of culture with their lived experience. Juzan, for example, who had pointed out that "culture is basically those sort of ideas that you get from your heritage, from your parents" when questioned further added, "Well on the note of like going back to pretty much where your parents have come from, I've been to India and to Malaysia quite a few times and like I have a respect and fascination for both of the places. Like I enjoy going

there, I enjoy seeing my family; however, I still feel that where I truly belong is in Australia." This mismatch between Juzan's quite static view of culture and the actuality of his affective ties to Australia are significant as they indicate the conceptual resources he has acquired to date to make sense of not only his own experience of the world but that of his fellow students and cultural experience more broadly are clearly inadequate. They attest to a compartmentalized view of culture counterproductive for promoting the so-called twenty-first century global citizens envisaged in Australian education policy documents such as the Melbourne Declaration (Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs [MCEETYA] 2008). Rather than simply a multicultural education as it is currently realized, which seems to have manufactured this limited identitarian perspective on culture, students need to acquire the requisite abilities to reflect upon their own experience and that of others to engage productively with the cultural complexity in their midst. Such intercultural understanding is premised on capabilities aligned with what we might call a cosmopolitan educational ethos. By this we do not mean a cosmopolitanism of elites, but a perspective that moves beyond reductive notions of culture and identity to a reflexive mode of learning for engaging with new social formations based on an examination of the dynamics of cultural interactions and the global processes that are transforming identities and communities (Rizvi 2009, 265–266). Such cosmopolitan learning, however, requires cosmopolitan teaching, and while these students' perspectives on culture may have been very much fashioned by influences beyond the school, schools are important sites where these cultural norms have been reproduced through pedagogies of difference which, while intending to promote inclusivity, may have the opposite effect.

But if students' comments are one indicator of the need for an educational practice which engages with the complexity of culture and reflects on the tendencies towards essentialism, perhaps more telling are the comments of teachers. To illustrate this, we draw on comments from teacher focus groups from the RMRME study. When teachers were asked what they understood by the term culture their responses included a range just as broad as the students:

Language, tradition, way of life, dress, upbringing … all those together is culture to me.
　Vidisi, mid to high SES, low LBOTE secondary school

Your underlying … well, that's your nationality we come from.
　Gina, mid SES, high LBOTE primary school

I think it's how we are brought up, I think, for me personally, I can only speak for myself with my culture, my Greek heritage, I know a lot about that, that's how I refer to as culture, what I've been brought up in, but the foods we eat, the music we listen to, the way—the movies, the way we talk, that's culture, yeah, family, the way we are with family … it's a hard word.
　Allesandro, low SES, low LBOTE secondary school

It's that sense of collective identity.
  Angus, high SES, high LBOTE secondary school

I think it is what you bring with you. I think it is your background, your inherit-
ance, and it is also how you accept it.
  Maggie, low to mid SES, low LBOTE primary school

We talk about it in regards to belonging, … say you do go out to the playground
and there are Sikh students playing together, they are belonging to their group, they
may be in a different country but they are belonging, they are together.
  Una, mid to high SES, low LBOTE secondary school

What we see captured here is quite different with understandings of culture
oscillating between communal and personal aspects, beliefs versus practices,
traditions and ways of life, rules versus identities, and linking these with other
things such as ethnicity, nation, place, and race. Not all of these are mistaken
perceptions—for many of these can be found in popular and academic dis-
course—but these incomplete conceptualizations reference a greater cultural
complexity and thus need reflection and analysis, especially if we are to
unpack the processes of recognition that inform teaching practices.

As in an earlier study (Watkins and Noble 2013), we found teachers who had
narrow conceptions of culture which essentialized their students' ethnicity or, if
more attuned to the cultural complexities of either their own students or the
broader Australian population, had difficulties translating these ideas in the
classroom. Others, however, felt constrained by the identity politics of multicul-
tural education, which to some degree had institutionalized cultural essentialism
through programs that were deemed to be "culturally sensitive." One teacher,
for example, commented that, "I think in addressing culture, because it is polit-
ical and the right thing to do, I think it had a reverse effect because we were
grouping them, so I think in trying to do the right thing and to be multicultural
and to address culture we've actually—it's had more of a reverse effect because
we did group them." The point here is not to ridicule teachers' and students'
poor conceptual understanding of a "hard word," but to ask, if culture has
become a key tool for thinking about the contemporary world, and if schools
are increasingly being asked to grapple with notions like intercultural under-
standing, then what kinds of capacities do teachers have to address these com-
plex issues in their teaching practices? What kinds of professional learning do
teachers need to undertake to reflect on and develop these capacities? And
how do teachers respond when presented with these challenges?

The professional learning for teachers, comprising part of the RMRME
Project, was initially conducted over two days. It explored and unpacked under-
standings of key ideas—like multiculturalism, culture, ethnicity, social cohesion,
and intercultural understanding—and examined the goals and dimensions of
multicultural education. Through a series of presentations, readings, group dis-
cussions, and activities, we asked teachers to reflect closely on the changing
nature of Australia's cultural diversity and our perceptions of ethnic communities

and the consequences of this for educational practice. This involved foregrounding some ideas drawn from cultural and social research in an attempt to give teachers conceptual resources that would help them consider the complexities of their school communities: concepts such as identity, complexity, essentialism, hybridity, globalization, and transnationalism. In other words, addressing reductive forms of cultural recognition means equipping teachers with the critical resources to think about wider relations of social complexity. The professional learning sessions also examined methodologies for action research to assist teachers in their school teams to design their own site-specific projects.

Resisting engagement and unreflexive civility

It is one thing to ask teachers to reflect on the categories they use in thinking about the world generally and their culturally diverse communities specifically; it is quite another for them to then apply these understandings and to foster such an approach across a school and in classrooms. Teachers responded variously to the professional learning process, but the real test for us was the ways in which they used it to inform their action research. The projects at each of the 14 schools were intended to address issues the schools felt were important to them, but framed through an analytical process designed to question assumptions and provide new ways of thinking through these issues. Following the training, school research teams comprising at least one executive member, classroom and ESL teachers and, in one case, parents, were asked to reassess their current approaches to multicultural education and to address an issue of concern in their own school. Schools engaged with different dimensions of multicultural education with varying degrees of success. It was disappointing to find that, despite the training and ongoing support of DEC Multicultural Education consultants, there were a few schools who responded with action research projects that did little more than revamp their existing multicultural days or hold excursions to visit the exotic Other in more culturally diverse suburbs. These projects not only serve to demonstrate the stickiness of more essentialized notions of culture but more worryingly pose questions about the professional capacities of some teachers unwilling to devise more challenging initiatives that deviate from established practice. One of these schools was Addington High[3] located in a low SES, outer south-western suburb of Sydney with almost twice the national levels of unemployment. While for many years this was a largely white, working class area, it had recently attracted many new migrants looking for affordable housing. The school had a population of approximately 800 students, 24% of whom had a LBOTE. These students were predominantly Polynesian Islanders from Samoa and Tonga with increasing numbers from Fijian Indian backgrounds.

From almost the very beginning of the project, the action research team from Addington High resisted modifying its approach to multicultural education. As Marta, the deputy principal and head of the research team

commented, "our core business is teaching and learning." To Marta there was little need to consider the theoretical dimensions of issues around multiculturalism presented in the training and the professional reading she received as part of the larger project. She explained

> I don't know what the point of that reading was actually. And one of the other teachers brought up the thing that this is all academic writing, like we are all things that happen every single day that we have to micro manage … teachers need to be in the classroom teaching.

In fact, the three readings the teachers were given were not particularly academic. One was an historical overview of changes to multicultural education in Australia. Another was a case study examining the introduction of a whole-school initiative. A third reading was the ten-page executive summary of a UNESCO Report. None were particularly theoretical.[4] But the responses of some teachers indicated an unwillingness, or inability, to engage with the kinds of questions we posed about the nature of cultural diversity.

The project at Addington involved a number of activities. First, teachers and students designed a multicultural mosaic of their cultural heritages. It eventually became an attractive mural, well-designed and seen by many members of the school's community as an enjoyable and worthwhile task. Yet the mosaic contained the classic message of multiculturalism: that cultures could be reduced to emblematic symbols and icons that captured the essence of a people in its entirety, as a timeless and cohesive force. The school also held a multicultural day for year ten students (aged fifteen–sixteen years) to which they invited speakers to address issues related to multiculturalism and the plight of refugees, requiring students to produce a range of literary texts in response. Here again, the message came from an existing multicultural discourse, based primarily on the moral imperative for respect for the traditions of discrete and traditional cultures and benevolence towards Others. In evaluating their project, the school research team simply used an attitudinal survey of students focusing on the degree to which they enjoyed and found these activities worthwhile, which may not be a bad thing in itself but is hardly a way of measuring a qualitative shift in students' understanding of cultural complexity. Most importantly, the team did not address the task of developing ways that engaged with the complex questions of culture nor develop amongst students and teachers the skills and knowledges of culturally complex societies. There were a couple of other schools that pursued similar projects but, unlike Addington, approached the action research process more systematically and found such programs had limited effect on shifting students' often narrow perceptions of culture. Equipped with data collected from a range of research instruments, the teachers at these other schools then sought to revise their programs by recommencing the action research cycle with another intervention more likely to effect change. At Addington, however, the anti-intellectual

stance of the research team resulted in an unwillingness to shift, and so a settled complacency governed the way multicultural education was conducted at their school. To Marta, the research team leader, professional development around these issues was counter-productive, as she commented that, "I know universities are driving this whole multicultural thing but there is some[thing] else driving our school—academic results! Pulling us out of classrooms to do multiculturalism, that's robbing could be up to thirty–sixty, up to ninety kids … teachers need to be in the classroom teaching."

Cultural intelligence and rethinking multiculturalism

Another school which engaged with the challenges posed by the project was Wellington Heights where a quite different professional ethos prevailed. Wellington Heights is a primary school in a middle range SES area with 95% of students from a LBOTE, 52% of whom were born overseas, predominantly in India. The main languages spoken are Tamil, Hindi, and Gujarati. The focus of the project at Wellington Heights was a community learning program. The school felt there was a lack of understanding among parents about the NSW primary curriculum and in particular math. Many parents, particularly those from Indian backgrounds, had high aspirations for their children and sent them after school and on weekends to academic coaching feeling there were inadequacies in the way math was taught. Despite holding information sessions for parents, teachers felt there was still a lack of understanding about the math curriculum. The research team engaged with the RMRME course readings and, as was encouraged as part of the action research process, conducted a literature review searching out programs that might have been successful elsewhere and information about the Indian educational system, which Ryan, the school Assistant Principal and Research Team Leader said

> was vital because it made us reflect and the more that we read the more we reflected on … this idea of putting people into boxes … we talked about the essentialism and breaking things down, I think we realized these are parents first and foremost … each one of those parents sitting there wanted the best for their child. As a school, we make assumptions about why parents were putting their kids in tutoring and why they were making them do extra study, but ultimately it was because they wanted to give their child the best chance they could have at an education.

He went on to explain that,

> So we sort of started exploring and that was the way that our project was really about, it was about us getting the parents to, to train the parents up. But through the process we began to realize that in a way that was almost similar to what we were doing … we were again telling parents and we were expecting them to change to meet what we expected. We began to realize that perhaps it needed to be a halfway, we had to meet them halfway. And what really became apparent that it was

more about changing values, well not changing values but understanding how values are really strong and you can't tell people to change something, if it is not necessarily part of their values, and that by building a relationship we began to understand where their values were. The parents began to understand our values as a school and it is a system, and it was much easier then to build that mutual understanding and I think that was, personally, the key.

The project came to involve six two-hour workshops with parents, discussing how they learnt math, how the teachers had learnt math, and how things had changed with the current approaches to learning math experienced by the students. Rather than simply offer information evenings, teachers and parents worked through the syllabus together and then participated in a series of different math problem-solving activities with "homework" that they undertook with their children. Parents came to understand the curriculum much better; they were able to assist their children with their homework and school relations with parents improved dramatically. After these workshops the parent participants then became the teachers and invited another set of parents to participate in the program and they ran the workshop themselves.

In this process, teacher-parent relations became systematically dialogic, but it also meant that teachers themselves reflected both on their own experiences as learners, as socially situated activities, and on their assumptions about the parents. When asked if her view of culture had now changed after being involved in the project, Penny, another research team member, remarked:

> I think I just feel a lot more relaxed about the whole thing. I just don't feel that it is as big deal to tell you the truth. I don't know if that's the right thing but it just doesn't come into the foreground for me at all. When I look at parents now I think I just see parents, you know I don't really see Indian parents, and the baggage that might have come with them beforehand. I just see—there is a parent that I am going to communicate with to the best of my ability about their child, and about that building of relationships.

Through conversation and the building of relationships these teachers and parents worked together to build an effective learning community in their school, moving away from prefabricated regimes of recognition to practices of negotiation. Ethnicity was not foregrounded in this exchange, simply a willingness to work together which brought with it a self-reflexivity about each party's own situatedness, which in the end led to common ground around ensuring the best for the students at their school.

From multicultural education to reflexive civility

While teachers at schools such as Wellington Heights demonstrated that some teachers enthusiastically embraced the challenge to critically reflect and change their entrenched ways, the resistance at Addington was indicative of a wider anti-intellectual undercurrent prevalent within the professional

discourse of teaching at many schools. This was acknowledged by a number of teachers across the schools who were disappointed by the lack of intellectual engagement within teaching and the ways in which everyday concerns dominated their working lives. Harry, a teacher of ten years' experience in one of the other primary schools who was involved in the project, remarked, "my brain hasn't' been clicked on for a long time because here you are doing the nitty gritty." Unlike Marta from Addington, Harry could see the value of theory informing his practice but felt that professional reading of this nature was simply not encouraged. Alice, a head teacher of English in one of the other project high schools, explained that

> some people are more intellectually engaged in the theory behind educational practices and ideas, so they will read. Other people just want to get in and do the practical. If it has no relevance to what I am actually doing in the classroom immediate, that I can see it, that I can apply straight away, then they are a little bit resistant.

One of her colleagues pointed out, "They see it as more work," with Alice summing up, "That's right, it gets back to the professional culture of teachers." The idea of the professionalism of teachers was invoked elsewhere to suggest how hard working teachers are: we don't dispute this, but what we are suggesting here is that this professional ethos also often rests on a craft-based view which discourages an intellectual orientation to teacher expertise. This professional culture frames teachers' work as a relatively unchanging set of knowledge and skills, while maintaining classroom behavior in the process, but which also rests on an uncritical understanding of the nature of the cultural diversity of contemporary schooling. As Timperley and Robinson (2000) argue, the implementation of effective multicultural educational programs is thwarted by a "professional ethos" of autonomy in many schools which tends towards the discouragement of a critically reflective evaluation of practice, misconstruing critique as criticism, and rests on compartmentalized thinking and an acquired resistance to thinking systemically, beyond the immediate demands of the classroom.

A rejuvenated multicultural educational program, then, must approach these elements as a fundamentally *intellectual* task, not simply an ethical one of tolerance of cultural difference. It should not just aim to celebrate forms of ancestral identification as the basis of systems of ethnic recognition, nor simply to take into account the diverse backgrounds of students, but to foster the kinds of critical skills and knowledges that are necessary for students and their teachers to unpack the complexity of culture in the complex societies of the twenty-first century. Yet it must also approach this task in an *engaged* manner, in which a willingness to enter into dialogue with a wide range of culturally-defined communities which are in themselves neither discrete not coherent fosters the capacity to live in a dynamic, changing world. Following Ang (2011), we see this as a demonstration of cultural intelligence,

characterized not simply as an understanding of diverse cultures, nor even an individual's ability to adapt to new environments (Earley, Ang, and Tan 2006), nor the kind of cultural sensitivity emphasized by many popular proponents within business and education and which is quantifiable and commodifiable (Peterson 2004; Livermore 2011), but rather an orientation to knowledge which entails a practical engagement with the complexity of the world and the constitutive role that culture plays in this complexity.

Multicultural education needs to be infused with what Kalantzis (2011) calls a "reflexive civility," which refers to a way of imagining and engaging in a shared, civic life which moves beyond the moral imperative that we recognize and respect cultural groups to develop the critical capacities for participating in a culturally complex, civic life; the capacities to reflect upon and to analyze the dynamism of human cultures (Watkins and Noble 2013). This task begins not in the classroom, but in the professional development of teachers. Schools typically focus on students as the target of educational reform, but this can only happen if teachers develop the critical resources for grappling with cultural complexity. We cannot teach young people the skills to understand and live in a culturally complex world unless the training of teachers equips them with the capacities to nurture these skills. We suggest that teachers' professional learning needs to begin with the promotion of teachers as intellectual workers, not simply practitioners, whose training in analytical techniques needs to be constantly renewed and applied to their own practice. This entails critical reflection upon: the forms of self-identification that all of us participate in, drawing upon a range of cultural resources; the categories through which teachers perceive and talk about their students (Watkins and Noble 2013); and a critical reflection upon the cultural dynamics of the contemporary world, shaped by migration, transnationalism, intermarriage, generational change, and cultural hybridization. It also entails the growing of programs in schools that turn these intellectual insights, through practices of serious action research, into mechanisms of cultural exchange with students, their parents, and their communities. Such programs would promote an understanding of civic relations as predicated not on a simplistic understanding of ethnic communities, but on an analysis of the ways that diverse cultural resources are deployed as part of a heterogeneous and fluid mix of elements that constitute who we are (Brubaker 2002). The inability to grapple with the complexity and dynamism of culture has been a flaw of much multicultural education. Both students and teachers need to develop these capacities if multicultural education is to have a role in moving beyond a politics of recognition and towards an ethics of acknowledgement (Noble 2009) which might provide a better foundation for a truly cosmopolitan society.

Notes

1. There is much debate about this, of course. We will call it a discipline in so far as it has been institutionalized as a distinct field, but many have claimed it more as an undisciplined

field of inquiry, an inter-discipline, or an anti-discipline (Turner 2012). These debates are important, but don't change the fundamental argument here that Cultural Studies, as an emerging, critical approach to knowledge, offers an important foundation for thinking about intellectual functions of schooling in a globalized world. It is important to acknowledge here the complex relation between Cultural Studies and older disciplines, such as sociology and anthropology, which have also gone through a similar intellectual transformation and have similar contributions to make to the analysis of school knowledge.

2. The survey had a response rate of 10% (n 5,128), and this data is currently undergoing analysis.
3. The names used to refer to the two schools in this article are both pseudonyms as are the names for each of the teachers and students.
4. These readings were Timperley and Robinson (2000), UNESCO (2009), and Inglis (2009).

References

Ang, I. 2001. *On Not Speaking Chinese: Living between Asia and the West*. London, UK: Routledge.

Ang, I. 2011. "Navigating Complexity: From Cultural Critique to Cultural Intelligence." *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies* 25 (6):779–94. doi:10.1080/10304312.2011.617873

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA). 2013. "General Capabilities in the Australian Curriculum." Accessed February 2013. http://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/GeneralCapabilities/Pdf/Overview

Breidenbach, J., and P. Nyiri 2009. *Seeing Culture Everywhere: From Genocide to Consumer Habits*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

Brubaker, R. 2002. *Ethnicity Without Groups*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Connell, R. 2009. "Good Teachers on Dangerous Ground: Towards a New View of Teacher Quality and Professionalism." *Critical Studies in Education* 50 (3):213–29. doi:10.1080/17508480902998421

Davies, B. 2003. "Death to Critique and Dissent? The Policies and Practices of New Managerialism and of 'Evdience-Based Practice'." *Gender and Education* 15 (1):91–103. doi:10.1080/0954025032000042167

Earley, C., Ang, S., and Tan, J.-S. 2006. *CQ – Developing Cultural Intelligence at Work*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Business Books.

Hill, D., and Kumar, R. 2008. "Introduction: Neoliberal Capitalism and Education." In *Global Neoliberalism and Education and its Consequences*, edited by D. Hill and R. Kumar, 1–29. London, UK: Routledge.

Inglis, C. 2009. "Multicultural Education in Australia: Two generations of evolution." In *The Routledge International Companion to Multicultural Education*, edited by J. Banks, 109–20. New York, NY: Routledge.

Jacoby, R. 2000. *The Last Intellectuals: American Culture in the Age of Academe*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Kalantzis, M. 2011. *Rethinking Multiculturalism/Reassessing Multicultural Education International Symposium Report*. Penrith, NSW: University of Western Sydney.

Latour, B. 2004. "Why has Critique Run Out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern." *Critical Inquiry* 30 (2):225–48. doi:10.1086/421123

Livermore, D. 2011. *The Cultural Intelligence Difference*. New York, NY: AMACOM.

Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs. 2008. *Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians*. Canberra, Australia: MCEETYA.

Nairn, K., and Higgins, J. 2007. "New Zealand's Neoliberal Generation: Tracing Discourses of Economic (ir)Rationality." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 20 (3):261–81. doi:10.1080/09518390701281819

Noble, G. 2009. "Countless Acts of Recognition." *Social & Cultural Geography* 10 (8):875–91. doi:10.1080/14649360903305767

Peterson, B. 2004. *Cultural Intelligence*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.

Press, F., and Woodrow, C. 2005. "Commodification, Corporatisation and Children's Spaces." *Australian Journal of Education* 49 (3):278–91. doi:10.1177/000494410504900305

Rizvi, F. 2009. "Towards Cosmopolitan Learning." *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 30 (3):253–68. doi:10.1080/01596300903036863

Runté, R. 1995. "Is Teaching a Profession?" In *Thinking About Teaching: An Introduction*, edited by G. Taylor and R. Runté, 288–99. Toronto, ON: Harcourt Brace.

Sachs, J. 2001. "Teacher Professional Identity: Competing Discourses, Competing Outcomes." *Journal of Education Policy* 16 (2):149–61. doi:10.1080/02680930010025347

Servage, L. 2009. "Who is the 'Professional' in a Professional Learning Community? An Exploration of Teacher Professionalism in Collaborative Professional Development Settings." *Canadian Journal of Education* 32 (1):149–71.

Thomas, S. 2011. "Teachers and Public Engagement: An Argument for Rethinking Teacher Professionalism to Challenge Deficit Discourses in the Public Sphere." *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 32 (3):371–82. doi:10.1080/01596306.2011.573253

Timperley, H., and Robinson, V. 2000. "Workload and the Professional Culture of Teachers," *Educational Management & Administration* 28 (1):47–62. doi:10.1177/0263211x000281005

Turner, G. 2012. *What's Become of Cultural Studies?* London, UK: Sage.

UNESCO. 2009. *UNESCO World Report Executive Summary - Investing in Cultural Diversity and Intercultural Dialogue*, 1–10. Paris, France: UNESCO.

Watkins, M. 2007. "Thwarting Desire: Discursive Constraint and Pedagogic Practice," *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 20 (3):301–18. doi:10.1080/09518390701281900

Watkins, M., and Noble, G. 2013. *Disposed to Learn: Schooling, Ethnicity and the Scholarly Habitus*. London, UK: Bloomsbury.