

[Abstracts](#) | [Alphabetical index](#)

**Educational Governance, Social Inclusion and Social Exclusion in Australia:
AN OVERVIEW FOR THE Symposium at the 2000 AARE Conference, Sydney**

Presented by:

James G Ladwig, The University of Newcastle

Jennifer Gore, The University of Newcastle

Bob Lingard, The University of Queensland

Thomas Griffiths, The University of Newcastle

Kellie Morrison, The University of Newcastle

Sharon Cooper, The University of Newcastle

Educational Governance, Social Inclusion and Social Exclusion in Australia: Symposium at the 2000 AARE Conference, Sydney

'Educational Governance, Social Inclusion and Social Exclusion in Australia' (EGSIE-Australia) is the Australian leg of a large international comparative study examining the relationship between relatively recent restructuring of systems of schooling and the classic sociological question of who gets what from schooling. Conducted in three main stages, EGSIE-Australia included text analyses of selected policy documents, interviews with a national sample of teachers, principals and systems actors, and a series of youth studies, including a large scale survey of Youth. Funded by an ARCLG, from 1998 to 2000, this study has been conducted in partnership with scholars from nine European countries, funded by the European Union, in which parallel analyses have been developed. This symposium presents our first public reports of the study's findings in Australia and presents six papers developed within the study, cutting across each of the three main stages of analysis.

Research Background of the study

Recent forms of educational restructuring have been far reaching, both within any one nation as well as between countries. Ranging from broad scale system restructuring (at national and state levels), to within school management restructuring, to within classroom pedagogical restructuring, the current scope of educational reform is perhaps the most extensive of any previous cycle of educational reform. Casual observers of education would recognise that this is particularly true in Australia. Nearly every level and sector of education, in every state and territory in Australia has faced one form of restructuring or another in the past decade. What is most significant about these recent changes, however, is (1) that they have often been motivated by international concerns (most obviously a concern for economic international competitiveness) and (2) the nature of changes in national educational systems, at first glance, is remarkably similar throughout developed nations. In this light, an adequate analysis of the social consequences of educational restructuring requires an international perspective.

The main research question for this study has been, *'What is the relationship between new forms of governance in*

education and social inclusion/exclusion in different national contexts?' In one sense, this study addresses the classical educational question "Who is getting what kind of education with what kind of consequences?" (e.g. Archer, 1981; Karabel and Halsey, 1983). It is important to return to such classical concerns in the context of current restructuring changes in education. While the underlying questions of this study are squarely set within classic social analyses of education, the terms in which this study has been conceptualised mark its contemporary significance. Even as we may be able to argue that a great deal is known about these classical issues, contemporary societal developments make past answers virtually obsolete. Nations facing the so-called "impact of globalisation" currently face conditions that simply did not exist before. As a result, we argue, studies of classical social questions need to be reconceptualised and re-examined in their contemporary international light.

The notion of *educational governance* has developed from recent theorising and research about the nature of relationships between the State, educational policy and school systems in relation to post-structural notions of governmentality (Foucault, 1979; Popkewitz, 1991). *Educational governance* refers to the ways in which policy practices and administrative procedures reformulate socio-political issues into instrumental tasks. The terms *social inclusion and social exclusion* are taken directly from the language used in EU documentation. Although the common-sense meaning of these terms should be clear, the terms themselves are purposely broad and ambiguous, designed to allow empirical investigation into issues currently under debate in academic literature. This international study began its investigation of social inclusion and exclusion with two different conceptualisations. In the first instance, issues of social inclusion and exclusion were addressed in the categorical terms of conventional debate on educational equity (race, gender, class, ethnicity, etc.) These conventional terms are employed by most Western countries in development of educational policy and served as a starting point from which the study will investigate country to country differences and similarities. However, this conceptualisation of social difference has also been challenged by educational research which questions the descriptive validity of such categories and which emphasises the development of other "new" social movements (Wexler, 1995; Yeatman, 1993).

Hence, the second way in which social inclusion and exclusion was to be investigated was by conceiving issues of social differentiation in *dispositional* terms. This conceptualisation is intended to be responsive to criticisms of the more traditional categories of social difference as well as to incorporate the insights of post-modern and post-structural analyses of social identity and subjectivity (Singh, 1995; Ladwig, 1996). That is, building from cultural theories of social difference, like those of Bourdieu (1984, 1996), we sought to illuminate the degree to which alternative conceptions of social difference are evident in system-level analyses of education.

Guiding Questions of the study

Developed in collaboration with our European partners, EGSIE-Australia has applied three main analytical lenses to each stage of its analysis:

- First, we have sought to identify the national (or societal) *narratives relating to transitions in educational governance and social inclusion/ exclusion*, asking, for example: What are the stories of progress and its denials told in the policy texts and by the actors?, and What are the images, myths, sagas that are to place people together into a collective whole (an 'imagined community') in these narratives?
- Second we have used the notion of habitus as a framing category primarily as a way of thinking about the inter-relationship between the social and subjective that was the original object of our analysis. Here we asked, for example, In the texts and actor narratives, what are the conceptions of the individual (the citizen, the worker, the man, the woman, the consumer, the student, the 'self', etc.)? and What are the silences in these constructions of habitus? That is, who is not included in these constructions of habitus?
- Third, we approached the relationship between governance and social inclusion/exclusion with two related but distinct concerns. On the one hand, we were concerned with the systemic question of how policy enables or denies access to social, cultural and political resources. On the other hand, is the

power/knowledge relation. These relations were expressed, respectively, as: How do the constructions of narrative and habitus produce systems of governance and inclusion / exclusion? And, What is the relationship between systems of governance and systems of inclusion/ exclusion?

The three stages of analysis in EGSIE-Australia:

Our first tasks were conducted as four text analyses. Texts were selected for this portion of the study to 1) directly address the central question of the study, 2) offer insight into the 'clients,' organisation and curricula of Australian educational systems, and 3) provide at least one 'outsider' text - that is one that is not directly about schooling per se and not obviously related to the main study question (but which could offer unexpected insights). The text analyses selected for EGSIE-Australia included: 1) an analysis of the National Reports on Schooling in Australia, produced by MCEETYA, 2) an analysis of three state reports that were linked to decentralisation (the VIC *Schools of the Future* documents, the NSW *Scott Report*, and the QLD *Future Directions for SBM*), 3) an analysis of the Adey Report on teacher education, and 4) an analysis of the NSW Child Protection policies and legislation.

Our second analyses were based on interviews with two group of educators identified as a) 'system actors' (including activists, academics, and bureaucrats from the school level to the DG level, and b) practitioners (including principals and teachers). Roughly twenty interviews were conducted within each of these categories. Participants were selected specifically due to their direct knowledge of recent policy shifts, expertise in equity, or both. These participants were also selected to offer a broad perspective, cutting across the vast majority of Australia's educational systems, public and private in national, state, and local contexts.

Our third main focus was on Youth. Here our main source of data has been a relatively large scale survey. EGSIE-Australia conducted this survey of youth from March to May of 2000, constructed to parallel that of the international partners in the Youth survey (Finland, Portugal, Spain, and Sweden). This survey targeted students in the final two years of compulsory education. Data were collected in eight different school sites, from three States in Australia. Schools were selected to include students in rural and urban settings, from public and private schools, and to cover a wide range of socio-economic backgrounds. All the schools were co-educational. Approximately 640 students responded to our survey. The survey asked students their views on what it takes to succeed in school and later life, what factors contribute to life success, their views of themselves, their educational and occupational aspirations, their views on Australia's international relations, as well as information on the students' own backgrounds.

List of Papers/Participants:

1. James G Ladwig and Jennifer Gore, *The imposition of a schooled habitus*
2. Thomas Griffiths: *Much Obligated: Student responsibility for their own social exclusion*
3. Sharon Cooper: *Youth, work and education: the persistence of meritocracy and governance through misrecognition*
4. James G Ladwig and Sharon Cooper: *Mimicry, alchemy and fabricated optimism: on the production of the 'new' educational governance*
5. Kellie Morrison: *Teachers' understanding of educational inclusion and exclusion: A discursive analysis of limits and possibilities*
6. Bob Lingard: *The New Educational Magistrate: educational governance as a transnational policy field*

The imposition of a schooled habitus

By

Dr James G Ladwig, and

Professor Jennifer M Gore,

The University of Newcastle

A paper presented to the Annual AARE Conference, Sydney, Australia, 2000. This paper has been developed from a larger study entitled 'Educational Governance, Social Inclusion and Social Exclusion in Australia,' funded by the ARC. The Research Team who conducted that study included the authors and Dr Thomas Griffith, Ms Sharon Cooper, and Ms Kellie Morrison of the University of Newcastle, and Professor Bob Lingard of the University of Queensland. The views and opinions reported are solely the responsibility of the authors.

Dr James G Ladwig and Professor Jennifer M Gore,

The imposition of a schooled habitus

Abstract:

Drawing on policy text analyses, interviews with teachers, principals and other educators, and a survey of youth, this paper develops the argument that contemporary forms of educational governance in Australia are narrowing and circumscribing acceptable forms of 'habitus'. Despite a rhetorical embrace of diversity, it is demonstrated that a particular set of dispositions and ways of being a 'teacher', 'student', or 'citizen' are currently deemed acceptable. The (always) normalising effects of schooling have significant consequences for who is included and who is excluded with respect to social institutions and future possibilities. Implications of this argument for educational policy are examined in relation to analyses of schooling as a world-cultural institution, policy debates on the effects of economic rationalism in education and contemporary forms of school restructuring and reform.

Introduction

For the past three years, we have been engaged in a study of the relationship between forms of educational governance, on the one hand, and issues of social inclusion and social exclusion, on the other (EGSIE-Australia). This paper presents the results of the authors' first attempts to provide something of a summary, general analysis of the overall study. Here we argue that the data collected for EGSIE-Australia support an historical argument about the nature and extent to which school systems impose a particular set of culturally defined knowledges, skills and dispositions onto those within these systems. In our view, the overt forms of reformation of education governance do not, in themselves, point to a shift in the *modus operandi* of governing education that carries clear social consequences. Rather, we argue that if there is a new form of educational governance that relates to social inclusion and social exclusion, that newness lies in the degree to which what counts as educational capital has become self-defining.

That is, we suggest that the past few decades of educational reform in Australia have seen a qualitative three-fold cultural shift. Firstly, we would suggest that the range of cultural norms valued as cultural capital within education has been broadened. Secondly, the degree to which it is necessary to meet these norms explicitly has increased. And thirdly, we argue that with this increase in the necessary degree of explicit conforming, educational governance has sharpened the boundary between social inclusion and social exclusion. In total, these shifts point to a tightening of the cultural market of educational capitals. Educational systems imposing a particular habitus is not new. What is new is that what is now valued as a schooled habitus has become more clearly and explicitly defined, is more accountably measured, and is much broader than it once was in Australia.

The Context: within / against studies of the 'globalisation' of educational policy and reform

On the face of it, the story told by the internal debates within the Australian field of educational policy would seem remarkably similar to those so often articulated by the now international field of educational intellectual critics. As in most parts of the industrialised Occidental world, the past few decades of Australian education have seen the rise of neo-liberal policies of choice, market logic, accountability, and measurable outcomes. In

the push to focus education in a manner that has to be for the ostensible economic good of the nation, the social has been lost. Past struggles to advance issues of educational equity and social justice have given way to a new breed of educational governors, and, so the story would go, a new form of educational governance. The simultaneous deregulation of budgets and personnel management (which occurred to varying degrees within Australia), have also been accompanied by a strong push for centralised control of outcomes. A momentary push for national curriculum, backed by a Labor federal government, gave way to an equally centralised but more narrowly defined national testing scheme for student outcomes in literacy and numeracy, backed by the current Coalition government. These concurrent and seemingly contradictory policy strategies (simultaneous decentralisation of management with centralisation of curriculum) have come to be recognised as an interwoven network of governance, sometimes labelled 'steering from behind.'

This grand narrative, this construction of a seemingly new hegemonic discourse of educational power, highlights a broad version of events. Not surprisingly, this is not the whole story. The success of the neo-liberal agenda has not come without moments of resistance, of oppositional interventions, of progressive counter-hegemonic struggle. In the details of nearly every major policy initiative that makes up this grand narrative, history has also recorded a series of other events that demonstrate a continued legacy of Australia's long standing commitment to educational equity, social justice and the existence of the very social life lost under the new regime. From internal debates in the obligatory consultation processes that transfer the bold announcement of policy 'green papers' to fully sanctioned 'white papers', innumerable battles have been fought. Similar enactments of power have been revealed in the development of some policy documents, commissioned by professional bodies, ad hoc coalitions of progressives, and the like, that stand as proposals for refocusing the power of the State back onto agendas of social justice and social progressivism. Even a national commitment to equity of outcomes has become a publicly documented goal for all systems of schooling .

For the United States and the UK, this discourse of neo-liberal dominion, as Foucault has said on other matters, 'holds up well, owing no doubt to how easy it is to uphold' . By placing the advent of the age of neo-liberal educational reign in the 1980s, after a decade or so of more socially just progressivism, the coincidence of this ostensibly new form of educational governance with the rise of Reagan and Thatcher would be lost on no political commentator. For Australia, placing the rise of neo-liberal educational governance in a similar time frame works well to position it as a response to the overtly economic 'demands' of globalisation and new free-flowing markets (albeit under a Labor government). In either case, the opposition of the economic and the 'social' presents itself authorlessly.

There seems no reason to retell this story. Throughout the Anglo-educational world, this story has been told often, and is by now very well known. But it is precisely because such a story has gone so unquestioned, and because both history and the present suggest otherwise, it seems to us that another analysis needs elaboration. If we were to ask whether or not this discourse documents the rise of a new form of governance, our answer, already implied in the question, would assuredly be a resounding affirmation. In Australia, what were once centralised systems are now decentralised. Increased reliance on technology, faceless bureaucratic mechanisms of advancement, and manipulation of public perceptions all mark the coming of a new, post-modern, age of Australian educational governance. By now, surely there is nothing new to be learned from questioning the existence of new forms of governance. But, it is precisely because such a story is so readily constructed, so common sense, that another very different orthogonal analysis is called for. The discourse of a new 'neo-liberal' form of education governance begs the question, how did it become plausible to speak of such reforms as if they are indeed a new form of governance?

On the one hand there has been a proliferation of globalisation studies that 1) examine the extent to which international policy and reform sharing has occurred, 2) describe the nature of the policies and reforms that seem to have enveloped the educational globe, and 3) criticise the largely anticipated socio-cultural impacts of those policies and reforms. The studies which follow this path of analysis largely rely on analytical categories taken from the now decades old debates between various incarnations of economic rationalised educators and their critiques. Social categories employed in these analyses are largely assumed and predictably pivot around the now classically triumphant race, gender and class. Policy and reform categories in these analyses tend to be drawn directly from their own rhetoric or their opposites, wherein we see analyses of neo-liberalism, market-driven reforms, and choice models of schooling, curriculum and pedagogy.

One the other hand, more theoretically driven scholars point to a need to develop analyses of these phenomenon based not on assumed and given categories, but from the theoretical lenses of social theorists. Specifically of interest for EGSIE has been the work of scholars who have come to rely on Foucault and Bourdieu in analyses of 'governance' (Popkewitz, Lindblad, and Strandberg, 1999.) One of the main stepping stones for this line of analysis is the logically accurate observation that explanations of market-driven reforms can not be built from the terms of those reforms themselves. Nor can a sounds explanation be constructed from the categories of the political critics of these reforms, such as can be readily found in critiques of a so-called neo-conservative restoration (e.g. Reid, 1998, Marginson, 1997a, 1997b). In both these instances, the analyses developed place explanatory weight on the very terms that need explanation in the first place. Thus their contribution is pushed toward the level of elaborative description (e.g. Whitty, Power and Halpin, 1998).

Unfortunately for these more theoretically driven critics of the now conventional studies of globalisation in education, pointing out the need to focus on other means to analyse changes in educational reform provides only the beginning of a new analysis. Thus EGSIE-Australia, as part of the international EGSIE project, began its analysis.

EGSIE as an analytical strategy

In the attempt to begin a newer understand of educational governance, we have sought to identify the national (or societal) *narratives relating to transitions in educational governance and social inclusion/ exclusion*, asking, for example: What are the stories of progress and its denials told in the policy texts and by the actors?, and What are the images, myths, sagas that are to place people together into a collective whole (an 'imagined community') in these narratives? Framing our analysis of the educational policy changes in this manner forced us to continually question the readily apparent oppositions between the forces of market-driven economic rationalisation and its critics. Here our concern was to discern the degree to which some underlying notions of progress and collectivity might be found within the stories of educational reform in Australia.

In the attempt to open up the question of which social groups are effected by the recent tidal waves of change in educational governance, we have used the notion of habitus as a framing category. The notion of habitus, largely adapted from Bourdieu, primarily became a way of thinking about the inter-relationship between the social and subjective that was the original object of our analysis. Here we asked, for example, In the texts and actor narratives, what are the conceptions of the individual (the citizen, the worker, the man the woman, the consumer, the student, the 'self', etc.)? and What are the silences in these constructions of habitus? That is, who is not included in these constructions of habitus?

Within Australia, this effort may seem similar to many other recent studies of the new educational self, that have largely influenced by Foucault (such as those conducted by Nicolas Rose (1999), Ian Hunter (1994), and the like), but our task was designed to go one step further. That is, we hope to move from this identification of habitus to broader societal level analysis of educational inequality than is typically found in studies of the self. We have framed this effort to build a broader understanding of new forms of habitus in terms of the relationship between governance and social inclusion/exclusion with two related but distinct concerns. On the one hand, we are concerned with the systemic question of how policy enables or denies access to social, cultural and political resources. On the other hand, is the power/knowledge relation. The power/knowledge relations we express, respectively, as: How do the constructions of narrative and habitus produce systems of governance and inclusion / exclusion? And, What is the relationship between systems of governance and systems of inclusion/ exclusion?

The analysis presented here is focused on the last of our research concerns, on the relationship between educational governance and social inclusion/ exclusion. (We should note that this paper builds on only our very first, tentative, attempt to meet this design.) To present this analysis we begin from what our data tells us about the current construction of educational habitus as it is identified in constructions of 'the subject.

On the Grand Parade of the New Schooled Subject

While surface constructions of the 'subject' are relatively common throughout the data, elaborate articulations of just what type of subjects are required by the 'new' system of educational governance are sparse. This scarcity is especially true of our interview data, in which any positive elaboration of just what type of subject it takes to be included or successful in schooling is virtually non-existent. (This is despite our prompts designed to gain explicit and implicit information on this issue.) Thus, five observations need to be made about the nature of the construction of the subject. First, for discourses focused mainly on articulating an economically focused, neo-liberal rationale for schooling, it is quite remarkable how little is specifically said about the nature of the subjects of those systems. In a sense, the subject of policy texts and overt governance accountability mechanisms was often presented as nothing more than a physical body that could be counted. Second, along side this 'empty vessel' image of the subject, economically centred discourse sometimes do articulate a generic image of the subject which can be characterised as the active, self-regulating, consuming and producing subject. Third, the most expansive articulations of the subject can be found in policy texts which are arguably of least direct import in the fields of educational policy and schooling, such as the Adey Report on Teacher Education, and the Child Protection policy documents, and national goal statements (see, e.g., Gore and Morrison, in press). Similarly expansive images can be found in national texts articulating a concern for citizenship. Fourth, in our interviews, when asked about what types of students succeed or don't succeed in schooling, with few exceptions, it is remarkable how respondents quickly and readily identify subjects according the equity or labour categories canonised in national and state level policies. Fifth and finally, from our youth data, it seems evident that the young people in our sample exhibit a high degree of 'buy-in' toward the active, self-regulated consumer/producer in as much as they demonstrate a high degree of faith in education as a meritocratic institution. We believe the significance of these observations becomes most evident when trying to understand the relationship between educational governance and issues of social inclusion/ exclusion (and leave detailed analysis of these observations to the other presentations made today).

Some notes on 'The economic subject', the Active Citizen and the 'empty vessel'

Almost unanimously, the educators interviewed for our study took the image of an economic subject moulded within the current market-drive policy rhetoric, as an object of critique. At the same time, however, alternative formulations of a subject reveal a shared understanding of the subject as individuated, active, and self-regulated. The most direct positive articulations of this subject are found in the narrative of the National Reports on Schooling. Included in each of these annual documents are the "Common and Agreed National Goals for Schooling in Australia." Here, in the goals outlined in both the 1989 Hobart Declaration and the 1999 Adelaide Declaration, the "student" is constructed in futuristic terms. The goals refer to those qualities which students will have or become, and do not incorporate any description of students as they are or might be at the present time (except for a reference to "groups with special learning requirements"). In our National Goals for Schooling, a student is expected to become:

self-confident; optimistic; respectful of learning, others and of our cultural heritage; flexible and adaptable as part of the workforce; appreciative of the creative arts; and, participative and active in Australian society as informed citizens. A student is expected to have: certain skills, talents and capacities developed to full potential; understanding; knowledge; positive attitudes for life-long education; high values; and high self-esteem .

This focus on the future is significant. With an emphasis on outcomes, the harkening of the future, and the lack of any reference to improvement or further development of these attributes infers that students are perceived almost as blank slates, that all are shapeable in similar ways. Further, the inference is that students are passive subjects of the system. This is particularly evident in the framing of the goals where actions the schooling system undertakes are defined as "becoming" and "having" thereby putting the onus on the system rather than on the student. The wording of the goals has the system "providing for . . .", "enabling . . .", "promoting . . .", "responding to . . ." and "developing in . . . students."

Within the *National Reports*, to be sure, there is something of a running debate or seeming contradiction with reference to how students are understood. That is, at times there are explicit declarations of what students should be as good economic subjects, but at other times the focus is on making students good citizens (Ladwig and Cooper, 2000, provides much more detail on this divide). While this divide is illustrative of the differences between more economically focused policy initiatives and those more concerned with social matters, what the debate hides, in a way, are the basic conceptions of the subject shared by both sides of this

debate. That is, in terms of the construction of the both economic subject and the citizen within the three National Reports we have analysed, the descriptions of specific assumed attributes for self-regulating citizens of the future are clear. Underneath this seeming debate is a shared notion of a subject that is a) an individual, b) active, c) self-regulating, and d) to be made, a current work in progress.

The persistence of categories and the presently absent subject

We suggested, above, that educational actors rarely elaborated or implied a vision of the subject in our interview data. In a sense this is not an entirely forthcoming claim. The educational actors we interviewed did articulate very general images of the subject; but, these images were remarkably unspecified. On the one hand, when discussing students who were potentially excluded from schooling, the imagined subjects were either countable bodies, defined by institutionally specific behaviours, or subjects defined by already sanctioned State categories of disadvantage. Neither of these images actually says anything about the nature of the dispositions of the socially included or excluded. While State categories of disadvantage may have once implied specified understandings of the subject, in our data they were presented very much as the hollow boundaries of what Connell once termed categorical understanding of power. On the other hand, both in relation to explaining who is included and who is not, and in relation to alternative programs designed to include the excluded, the imagined subjects were defined in terms of the self-regulated subject present in both economically focused and more socially focused policies.

Examples of institutionally specific behaviours included such observations as the 'transient population' of students which, for a range of reasons, has been enrolled for short periods of time in many schools and continue to move around within the system. These students were described by an assistant-principal in a primary school:

Last year I think there were, there were 90 kids that transferred in or out during the year. So it's a pretty big proportion of our school ... There's the adjustment, often they're children who have been to more than one school before, you know. It's one of many moves. (T7, p.17: 795-804).

Similarly, teacher 11 identified students 'on the move' as experiencing severe disadvantage and exclusion, linked to their transient status:

There's no doubt that some of the kids have ended up in jail, some of them have ended up dead. I mean, you know, the kids who were both the murders and the murdered in the Snow Town ... and all this stuff. It is all in and around that area, and over the road from the school, you know. But those young people had all been through multiple schools, as well, so issues like, I guess, transience, I mean you asked about categories, there were always kids who were just on the move. You know, nomadic is not glamorous. I think sometimes it is glamorised in the theory, that you know, that nomadic is the new post-modern existence ... I said to someone the other week when I was talking, that you know, piecing together is bloody different if you're MacKenzie Wark [a columnist for 'The Australian' newspaper] than if you are living in Northam (T11, p.13: 625-635).

Other categories and terms were used by teacher actors to describe students 'at risk' of exclusion and marginalisation, usually linked to failure and behavioural problems within school, and / or consistent non-attendance at school. Thus teacher 3 referred to "school refusers" (p.1: 32) as requiring special alternative programs, while teacher 4 refers to "social outcasts" (p.16: 694) and the "switched off group" (p.16: 696), in terms of those excluded in part by the mainstream curriculum and with few options other than to remain in school. In similar terms, teacher 2 notes that academic failure is a common characteristic of students not regularly attending school:

The greatest thing that all have in common is that they're students who have experienced failure on a regular basis ... If I was trying to hypothesise, I'd suggest that the pattern of failure, which probably goes back to primary school, is repeated through high school. That that influences self-esteem, and as a consequence, there is an attendance drop-off that

occurs there as well (T2, p.6: 283-287).

Here there really is no specification of a subject. Here the subjects are countable (the notion of transience being relative to the ability to being counted as present), and inclusion is defined as what breeds inclusion.

As noted by Griffiths, Morrison and Ladwig, and Morrison, Griffiths and Ladwig (1999), reliance on now conventional definitions of disadvantage was common when it came to explaining social inclusion and exclusion. That is, blanket references to Aboriginality, low socio-economic status, and sex ('boys' and 'girls' as the proxies for gender), were all readily employed as self-evident terms with presumed explanatory power. For example, the dominant discourse of systems actors in relation to the factors behind the social inclusion / exclusion of students from learning, was one of socioeconomic status and / or social class. This was often linked to the general silencing of this as a concept of social and educational disadvantage in government policy. The discourse was of socioeconomic status (SES) remaining the best indicator of likely success and failure in schools. This is apparent in the discussion of the following actors:

To me in the end it all comes back to class. What I've shown in there using a lot of Bob Gregory and Richard Teese's [two scholars who focus on class analyses] work, that's hardened over the last few years. There's no doubt that inter-generation poverty and inter-generational disadvantage has hardened. It's become more extreme, and it's become more obvious in some ways, probably more than in Australia in the past ... The kids from poor homes have always had a rough deal haven't they, and the kids from black families and so on have always had a rough deal. It may be hardening around who is in and who isn't, but it's always been there and been quite bad in my view ... Well, I think that the real struggle in schools at the moment is whether schools are there to entrench inequality or to overcome inequality (S4, p.7: 297-310).

I mean firstly I think the whole area of marginalisation, we could take for example, the whole area of income, families with low incomes, or unemployed, just say that whole area of low income, whether it manifests itself in terms of being unemployed, or a sole parent or whatever. The access of those kids into the educational system, I am talking about the access, and their participation is less obviously, like technology, they've got to be able to afford it, that's one. The second one is the move away from voluntary fees to making it almost subtly non-voluntary, is again further diminishing their chances (S11, p.9: 437-443).

An officer with a professional educational association similarly stressed the ongoing importance of socioeconomic factors on individual performance:

Well, if you look at the results of students in, probably the HSC, but certainly the SACE [South Australian Certificate of Education] in South Australia, still the greatest determinant of University entry is your postcode. It's still the best predictor of university entrance. So regardless of whether you go to a government school or a non-government school. So very clearly, socioeconomic status is a prime factor (S9, p.11: 497-500).

Thus, while the material limits defined by class are recognised, these presentations are made as if no cultural understandings of class were required.

Interestingly, it was in discussions of programs that have been specifically designed to keep potential excluded students included where any specification of a subject was implied. But here the implied subject is the economically productive subject of the neo-liberal discourse of educational governance. This active subject of neo-liberal economic policies, ironically, was presented as the alternative for those excluded from schooling, was evident a) in many system actors' discussion of the virtues and vices of vocational education programs intended to serve the good of inclusion, and b) in more pedagogically specific proposals designed to incorporate the disenfranchised through mechanisms of choice and self-directed action. For example, many schools in Australia have turned toward overtly self-regulated pedagogical programs as a means of incorporation. The strongest indication of this is the emphasis articulated by teacher actors, on students' self-reliance in their learning, and preparation for post-school life. This shift in the expectations of students, to become a part of the required attributes for educational success and social inclusion, is described by a head

teacher:

Over the years, we have sort of gone from, almost like 'Sit-up and shut-up, and do what you're told', ... the kids sort of responded. That's the way I was brought up. That was probably the way we all began teaching because that was the method we knew. Today, it is a little bit more about how kids learn and giving them options and working in groups and being more self-directed in learning and taking charge themselves, but for some people that's really scary, to let kids control what they are doing (T4, p.13: 642-647).

For educational researchers who recall the debates of the late 1960s and early 1970s, the ironic return of the strategy of class reversal will not be lost. As was the case decades ago, students' empowerment and self-directed learning are once again seen as a means for incorporating those who are ostensibly not self-directed. (Recall Sharpe & Green, 1975; and the Bernsteinian analyses of the 'new-middle class,' Bernstein, 1975)

Educational governance and social inclusion/ exclusion in late 20th century Australia

On the face of it, the story told by the internal debates within the Australian field of educational policy would seem remarkably similar to those so often articulated by the now international field of educational intellectual critics. As in most parts of the industrialised Occidental world, the past few decades of Australian education have seen the rise of neo-liberal policies of choice, market logic, accountability, and measurable outcomes. But that story and its events have been constructed along side its Other, an Australian commitment to the social and to social justice focused on categories of disadvantage and the distribution of systemic inputs. For all the flurry and public criticism of this importation of a productive consumer, both the economic, market-driven adjustment of the State and its more progressive counter-part offer an enlightened future in which the subject is active, self-determined and powerful.

If there is something new in these new forms of educational governance, it lies not in some rupture in the history of ever expansive systems of State governance; but in the degree to which that system now defines itself in its own likeness. As retention rates of secondary students reach saturation points, and holders of diplomas of completion become the norm, a dime a dozen as it were, processes of credentialing ensure the devaluation of both that credential and its holder. Herein the included subjects are more defined not by what they bring into the system, but by the degree to which they can powerfully enact what that system defines *sui generis*, in its own likeness. The Weberian recognition of de-coupled systems of the State ought not be lost from vision.

"I don't think there's much accountability at systems levels. We have all of the bureaucratic responses that you would expect. I have a purchase agreement with the government; I set out the outcomes we're going to achieve; I set out performance indicators; we meet performance indicators; I'm audited; all of that sort of thing. But I don't think there is much accountability from systems, for what really counts, which is the education outcomes of kids" (S7, pp.2: 45-49).

Even as accountability is a benchmark of system governance, the cleverness of the self-governed and self-commodified powerful subject ensures that this accountability applies not to themselves, but is applied universally to any who seek to navigate that system.

Questions raised by this interpretation: On the relationship between the educated Subject, Habitus, and social inclusion/ exclusion

We have argued that both the official reforms so readily identified with economic globalisation and the triumph of the market place, and their resistors, share common assumptions about the human subject. Each foray into the field of educational policy we have analysed, relies and buttresses the other, thereby an expansion of the imposition of that image of the subject is evident. In many ways, the public debates of

educational policy shroud these shared assumptions leaving them hidden, covered further by an equally shared understanding of and commitment to progress.

If we are at all correct in our characterisation of a broadly shared understanding of what constitutes the schooled subject in current times, it becomes crucial to recognise that this subject is not alone. The dispositions that are elaborated within the mechanisms of educational governance have a particular and partial social ancestry. Here the link to a notion of habitus beckons. For as this image of a school subject is activated by educational systems, in its rationale, measurement and pedagogical production of new citizens, the question of how these new forms of governance became plausible in the first place comes centre stage.

As something of a speculative theoretical observation, in historical terms, we would suggest the nature of the shared conceptions of the schooled subject and its social counterpart in habitus are remarkably similar to that once identified as specific to 'the new middle class.' Educational readers will recognise this phrase and perhaps associate it with the 1960s and early 1970s analyses of Basil Bernstein. Bernstein, as we recall, noted that what he identified as 'progressive' pedagogies were then made up of a constellation of elaborated codes, weakly classified and openly framed curricula, delivered through largely hidden pedagogical practices. This is, of course, a simplification (see Bernstein, 1975, where it is clear he considered multiple combinations of these messages systems at length). Never the less, Bernstein's observation was a descriptively simple one, albeit a contentious one in a community of educators on the lookout for ostensibly deficit theorising. Working class children, according to Bernstein, were not coming from socialisation processes where such a constellation of practices was, by and large, part of the lived cultural repertoire of everyday life.

What many educational readers may not recall is that this notion of 'the middle class' was not Bernstein's own. By the early 1960s, British sociologist John Goldthorpe, working in the wake of a developing cultural Western Marxism, had articulated the concept of a new middle-class well prior to Bernstein (e.g., Goldthorpe and Lockwood, 1963). And it is in Goldthorpe's analyses that we find some possible stark implications for our study.

At the time Goldthorpe and his colleagues articulated the notion of a new middle class, Marxist social analysts were struggling to understand what then seemed to be a loss of solidarity amongst what had been traditional working-class politics in Britain. Common, public explanations of the time relied on the idea that as working class struggles delivered on an increase in basic work and life conditions, formerly loyal working class people had begun a process of 'embourgeoisement.' Goldthorpe's questioned this interpretation and set out an analysis of what he termed 'normative convergence.' The new middle-class, in this analysis, was theorised as possible converging with a part of the old working-class (the 'new working-class'), around three main analytical axial points. That is, according to Goldthorpe, the new middle-class had developed a norm reference based on: 1) individualism, 2) a commitment to instrumental collectivism, and 3) 'family centredness' - which in Goldthorpe's terms involved a commitment to 'commodity consumption' (Goldthorpe and Lockwood, 1963).

Following Bernstein and Goldthorpe's lead, it seems recent public debates on educational policy have obscured what may well be a triumph of the new middle class. Given our observations of the currently unquestioned image of a schooled habitus that is based on active individuals, who are to learn to work together for instrumental purposes, such a claim is not a huge leap. While such a claim would require much more verification than is possible based on our data, we can point to a variety of well known trends that support such a notion.

First, at the classroom level, consider current pushes to advance so-called constructivist pedagogies, or discipline-management schemes that rely on inculcating self-governance and instrumental reasoning. Glasser inspired programs of 'Control Theory / Reality Therapy,' and 'Responsible Thinking Classrooms,' all bear the markings of the instrumental individualism Goldthorpe identified decades ago. These pedagogical schemes are by no means limited to schools in affluent communities (at least not in NSW and QLD), but are in fact often found in some of the least affluent suburbs. At the level of school management, after a decade of team building and Total Quality Management, it is clear that the instrumental use of collectivism is alive and well in our school systems. And at the system level, it is quite clear that a commitment of commodity consumption guides schooling itself for many of our parents and students, and policy makers. Evidence from our interviews and text analyses certainly provides some grounding for these observations.

To be sure, there are as many questions as possible answers raised by this juxtaposition between current educational governance practices and Goldthorpe's descriptive of the new-middle class. For example, Does this expansion of the school habitus represent a generational development, wherein what used to be the terms of political debate on university campuses has now migrated to public policy (which would imply a very specific social genesis)? If we follow the work of Phil Wexler (1987), in his analysis of the new sociology of education, such an idea seems plausible at least within the Academy. At the level of party politics, such an observation has already been made part of common parlance in Australia. Could it be that educational policy debates are now, more than ever, hiding the degree to which an 'elite', the children of the old 'new middle-class,' are creating systems in their own likeness? A contentious claim, perhaps; but not implausible.

More importantly for our studies however is the question, Are the conventional categories of social difference still salient and accurate as predictors of social and educational inclusion? Taking economic class as but one example, we can see the picture is both clear and unclear. If analyses of the new work order (e.g. Gee, Hull and Lanksheak, 1996) are at all accurate, it seems clear that the modes of production on which cultural Marxist analyses of curriculum have been based no longer exist, at least not to same degree as they once did. There also has been a substantial amount of evidence that forms of pedagogy similar to the new-middle class curriculum Bernstein analysed actually can benefit students from lower socio-economic backgrounds (e.g. see Newmann and Associates, 1996; Ladwig, 1998). Further still, within Australia, Gary Marks has demonstrated that over the past three decades at least, the importance of educational attainment itself has outstripped parents' occupational status as a determinant of subsequent socio-economic-status attainment (Marks, 1992). So it is that we can say that the terms of cultural Marxist and Bernsteinian analyses of curriculum truly require re-analysis in these new times.

At the same time, however, it also seems that the more strictly materialist, 'crude,' understandings of social and educational exclusion remain vital. Current analyses of gender continue to point to the need to recognise differences within sex-groups along economic lines. Analyses of indigenous education continue to highlight the fundamental problems of dramatic economic disadvantage. And Australian analyses of poverty continue to make it clear that at least some communities face exclusion largely due to a basic lack of material resources.

And yet, oddly, again at the same time, initial analyses of our own youth data shows remarkable similarities between students whose parents have different levels of prior education and different occupational groups, in terms of the degree to which students hold faith in a meritocratic image of education.

One way to understand these divergent observations might well be by turning back to an analysis of just what the schooled habitus is, and where it holds currency in the larger flows of power in our now global societies. Zygmund Bauman draws our attention to an important distinction when he imagines a world, a planet, divided in new terms:

Segregated and separated on earth, the locals meet the globals through the regular televised broadcasts of heaven. The echoes of the encounter reverberate globally, stifling all local sounds yet reflected by local walls, whose prison-like impenetrable solidity is thereby revealed and reinforced (Bauman, 1998: 54).

If our ideas on the self-defining characteristic of the 'new' educational governance are at all accurate, it seems clear that the sources of social exclusion do not lie solely in the specificities of the local and particular cultures of those excluded. Rather, in traditional relational thinking, it is clear that the constitution of the schooled habitus is a key defining element in determining where the boundary between inclusion and exclusion lies.

Where does that leave us on the question of categories?

Ultimately this analysis is still only a beginning, but some specific points and strategies for future analysis do flow from this line of thinking. On the surface of it we must point out that we are not suggesting there is some collective unconscious amongst a clearly defined set of individuals that can be readily named 'the new-new middle class.' It is quite clear that if Goldthorpe's insights do hold descriptive validity in the current Australian context its social origins were no limited to 'the middle-class,' since even Goldthorpe and his colleagues were describing a convergence of social groups. It is also clear that the readily apparent rise of

discourses built on individualism and the equally ubiquitous adherence to commodity consumption pose a fundamental theoretical tension for any social analysis of education. In theoretical terms, we must recognise the paradox of trying to develop a social sense of an educational world whose main sense of the social is built from categories that are widely recognised as limited and limiting. In a sense, the overwhelming growth of individualism offers Australia the same senses of ambiguity long noted by 'left' analyses of the United States. How can a social collective exist at the same time the rejection of the social is the basis of that collectivity?

So it is that in the attempt to map the current boundaries between social inclusion and social exclusion in Australian education, we have turned to describing what lies 'at the Centre,' rather than building our theory 'from the margins.' This analytical move is consistent with an understanding of schooling as a world-cultural institution (Ladwig, 2000), and guides our future work. For example, one strategy this analyses brings to light is the potential of building an understanding of educational inclusion/exclusion from educational sites where it seems the transition from exclusion to inclusion are being made. That is, as Morrison (2000) has argued, a more developed descriptive sense of this boundary may well be operative in the discourse of educators who have already successfully developed programs that allow young people to navigate across this new frontier. One strategy for future analysis lies in this observation and in further studies for Australia. Another strategy underway involves using the statistical data from our youth survey in an analysis of the relationships among the dispositional items on the survey, indicators of school success, and already given social categories.

References

- Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization: The human consequences*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bernstein, B. (1975). *Class, Codes and Control* Vol.3., *Towards a Theory of Educational Transmissions*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and Power*. Stanford, CA.: Stanford University Press.
- Foucault, Michel. (1980). *The History of Sexuality. Vol I: An Introduction*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Gee, J., Hull, G. and C. Lankshear. (1996) *The New Work Order: behind the language of the new capitalism*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Goldthorpe, J. H. and D. Lockwood. (1963) Affluence and the British Class Structure, *The Sociological Review*, XI(2), 134-36, and 148-156.
- Gore, J. M. and K. Morrison. (in press). The Perpetuation of a (Semi-) Profession: Challenges in the Governance of Teacher Education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*.
- Griffiths, T., Morrison, K., and J. Ladwig. (1999). EGSIE Australia Interview Report: Systems Actors. Newcastle: University of Newcastle.
- Hunter, I. (1994) *Rethinking the School*, Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Ladwig, J. G. (1998) Authentic School Reform, *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 19(1), 113-119.
- Ladwig, J. G., and S. Cooper. (2000). *Mimicry, alchemy and fabricated optimism: on the production of the 'new' educational governance*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Sydney, Australia, December, 2000.
- Marginson, S. (1997a). *Markets in Education*. Edited by Fazal Rizvi and Bob Lingard, *Studies in Education*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

- Marginson, S. (1997b). *Educating Australia: Government, Economy and Citizen Since 1960*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marks, G. (1992). Ascription versus Achievement in Australia: Changes over Time, 1965-1990. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 28(3), 330-350.
- MCEETYA, Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs. (1996). *National Report on Schooling In Australia 1996*. Melbourne: Curriculum Corporation.
- MCEETYA, Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs. (1999). *The Adelaide Declaration on National Goals for Schooling in the Twenty-first Century*, [Online]. Available: <http://www.deetya.gov.au/schools/adelaide/text.htm> [10/03/00].
- Morrison, K. (2000). *Teachers' understanding of educational inclusion and exclusion: A discursive analysis*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Australian Association for Research in Education, Sydney, Australia, December, 2000.
- Morrison, K., Griffiths, T. and J. Ladwig. (1999). *EGSIE Australia Interview Report: Teacher Actors*. Newcastle: University of Newcastle.
- Newmann, F. and Associates. (1996) *Authentic Achievement*. San Francisco: Josey Bass.
- Popkewitz, T. P., Lindblad, S. and J. Strandberg. (1999) Review of research on educational governance and social integration and exclusion. *Uppsala Reports on Education*, 35, Uppsala: Department of Education, Uppsala University
- Reid, A., Ed. (1998). *Going Public: Education policy and public education in Australia*. Deakin West, ACT, Australia: Australian Curriculum Studies Association.
- Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of Freedom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sharp, R. and A. Green. (1975). *Education and Social Control*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Wexler, P. (1987) *Social analysis of Education*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Whitty, G., Power, S., and D. Halpin. (1998). *Devolution and choice in education: The school, the State and the market*. Melbourne: Australian Council for Education Research.