

# **Notions of Citizenship Revealed Through Multicultural Education Policies in Australia**

**by**

**Jayne Elizabeth Lysk**

[orcid.org/0000-0002-5985-7012](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5985-7012)

**Doctor of Education**

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment  
of the requirements  
for the award of the degree

Melbourne Graduate School of Education  
University of Melbourne  
December 2017

## **Abstract**

Before and after the Federation of Australia in 1901, successive national and state governments have sought to control both the demographic composition of the population and Australian national identity. Prior to the pre-Federation colonial period, the island continent now known as Australia was under the custodianship of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people for over 40,000 years. With the arrival of the British and the occupation of the land, great changes occurred. It is over this period that the notions of Australian citizenship have gradually been shaped and contested. Education is one of the major instruments for both communicating the values that inform citizenship, and passes on skills and knowledge and attitudes about citizenship.

This study considers the historical development of citizenship models and traditions, and examines interrelated settlement and educational policies, initially from a national perspective, to a specifically Victorian state education perspective to reveal contemporary conceptualisations of citizenship and determines the role of educational policies in providing an understanding of what it means to be a citizen in a multicultural society.

The study has two interrelated data sources. One data source is an historical account outlining the social and political construction of citizenship the implications for education from Federation in 1901 to 2009. The source employs policy sociology to analyse both the national and the Victorian state multicultural education policies. The second data source explores the impact of changing political ideology, changing government leadership, global influences on multicultural education policies, and the way in which citizenship is conceptualised and expressed through multicultural education policies. It is suggested that the current developments recall the historical process through which state control over the composition of the population and the conceptualisation of citizenship display significant links with an earlier era. Multicultural citizenship can be viewed as a fundamental shift from past racially exclusive settlement and citizenship policies and practices.

## Student Declaration

I, Jayne Elizabeth Lysk, declare that this thesis comprises only my original work towards the Doctor of Education except where indicated in the preface; due acknowledgement has been made in the text to all other material used, and; that the thesis is fewer than the maximum word limit in length, exclusive of tables, maps, bibliographies and appendices as approved by the Research Higher Degrees Committee.

Signed: .....

Date:

## Acknowledgements

I take this opportunity to thank a number of people who gave their support and guidance to me during this study. In particular, I thank four people for their continuous support. First, I cannot thank enough my partner in life, Dr Greg Dingle, whose patience, love, wisdom, advice, words and sense of perspective throughout was fundamental to its completion. Without you, there would be no thesis.

Second, my utmost gratitude goes to the inexhaustible and extremely knowledgeable Research Supervisor, Professor Joseph Lo Bianco. His support and guidance over the years were critical to its completion. Joe's enthusiasm for my initial idea for the study, and his positive attitude, patience, flexibility and research insights enabled this study to be completed. Third, thank you to Dr Barbara Kameniar thank you for your unwavering support. Finally, to Professor Steve Trumble, I am incredibly grateful for your support which enabled me to complete this thesis.

To our children, Flynn and Jacinta (jellybean), thank you for putting up with Mum and for reminding me of what is important in life. To my much missed and amazing parents Doreen Lysk and Ron Lysk, my heartfelt thanks for your support and the life experiences you provided. Thank you also to Anne Adams, Lol Bordas, Renata Alianai and Dr Kim Dang for your invaluable help.

Finally, thank you to the 'Pointys'—Suzanne Fegan, Dr Kath Lynch, Dr Greg Raymond and Dr Tom Verghese—for your insights and collegial support. Thank you also to Dr Jane Poynter, Dr Kath Lynch, Dr Barbara Kameniar and a random stranger "Jenn" for your proofreading and/or feedback.

Dr Jayne Lysk

# Table of Contents

by i

Jayne Elizabeth Lysk .....	i
Doctor of Education .....	i
Abstract.....	ii
Student Declaration .....	iii
Acknowledgements .....	iv
Table of Contents.....	5
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction.....</b>	<b>8</b>
Background to the Study.....	9
Research Questions.....	12
Defining Policy .....	12
The Data .....	14
Thesis Structure.....	18
Limitations of the Research.....	20
<b>Chapter 2: Citizenship – An Historical Context.....</b>	<b>21</b>
Antecedents of Citizenship: Latin Origins to Citizenships .....	22
Citizenship as Rights .....	24
Cosmopolitan Citizenship.....	29
Citizenship in Australia: From Federation to the 1960s .....	31
Citizenship: Pre and Post-WWII.....	41
The Immigration Policies of The 1940s.....	45
Citizenship for Diverse Societies .....	49

### **Chapter 3: Immigration and Citizenship Policy in the National and International Contexts – Influences and Policies ..... 54**

A Changing Nation (1960-1980): Immigration and Settlement Policies .....	54
Multicultural Theory .....	58
Multiculturalism for the Nation .....	66
Multicultural Education .....	69
A Changing Nation (1960-1980): Educational Responses to the Changing Population .....	74
The Whitlam Era and Education Reform.....	77
Language Policy in the 1980s .....	79
Moving Into the 1990s: Public Policies and Educational Policies.....	80
The 90s and Asian Engagement.....	84
Asian Studies .....	85
A New Agenda for Citizenship and Immigration Policy Moving Into The 2000s.....	89

### **Chapter 4: Educating for Citizenship - National and State Responses ..... 94**

Citizenship Education and Education for Active Citizenship .....	95
Section I.....	96
Education in Australia in the 20th Century .....	96
Section II.....	105
A Multicultural Education Policy.....	105
The Shifting Political Landscape.....	108
Victoria .....	110
Section III .....	116
Policy Text Analysis: Policy Texts for Multiculturalism in Victoria .....	116
The Source of Multicultural Policies for Victorian Schools.....	116
The Scope of Multicultural Policies for Victorian Schools .....	118
The Pattern of Multicultural Policies for Victorian Schools.....	121
Discussion of Results .....	122

<b>Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion .....</b>	<b>124</b>
Scope and Limitations .....	135
Implications for Future Research.....	135
Conclusion .....	136
<b>Reference List .....</b>	<b>138</b>

## Chapter I: Introduction

For the last two centuries, there has been a constant influx of new settlers to Australia. Initially these settlers were predominantly from the British Isles, but more recently from all corners of the world (Castles & Zappala, 1998). Prior to this time, the island continent had been inhabited for over 40,000 years by an Aboriginal population estimated to range between 300,000 to one million people, with diverse language and tribal groups (Short, 2003). It is against this backdrop that a concept of Australian citizenship has been gradually shaped and contested. The aim of this chapter is to introduce the background to the study, the research problem, the aims of the study, the research questions, the major contributions and limitations of the study and some key terms that are frequently used.

The study focuses on the notions of citizenship as revealed through educational policies for school-based education. As Gutmann and Ben-Porath (1987, p. 15) remind us, school-based education is our most deliberate form of human instruction. School in Australia is compulsory from the age of five or six until the age of sixteen. These are considered the most formative and influential years of learning. It is, therefore, a worthy and relevant place to study the values and assumptions that are transmitted intentionally and often unintentionally, through the policies and educational practices. To achieve this aim, the thesis provides a detailed depiction of the development of both public policies and educational policies that have emerged in response to changing population demographics brought about by sustained large-scale migration prior to and between 1989 and 2009. This period was selected for reasons that reflect the prevailing social, political, national, and international influences.

These two decades were important politically as they coincided with the expansion of the neo-liberal global economy, an economic expression of this political ideology that Australia governments enthusiastically embraced. It was also a time of a rapid population growth, both locally and internationally, due to processes of globalisation and mass immigration.<sup>1</sup> This population movement had an impact both politically and socially, resulting in demographic transitions, which produced a greater increase in cultural diversity. These shifts have in turn led to

---

<sup>1</sup> In this study, globalisation is a term that describes a phenomenon which includes: an increased mobility of people, and according to Rosewarne, has the hallmarks of 'freeing capital from the regulatory influence of the nation-state with the regulatory influence of the nation-state with world liberalisation, the removal of restrictions on the global circulation of money and investment, and the shoring up of this neo-liberal regime by international economic institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank and the World Trade Organisation' (Rosewarne, 2001, p. 29).



incremental and at times transformative, changes in notions of education in this country and in notions of citizenship.

It is during this period that a new nationwide agenda for a multicultural Australia was adopted as both a public policy and an educational initiative. The new agenda signalled a breaking away from long-held notions of integration and assimilation that had underpinned European settlement of Australia and the goal of social cohesion. Both new multicultural policies had been in place for a decade prior to the period on which this study is focused: 1989 to 2009. Therefore, the focus marks a time of policy review, with new responses and developments on the agenda. Moreover, the period also corresponds with other influences from the international arena such as the United Nations (UN) amendments to the *Rights of the Child*, which would bring into focus the notion of children as citizens. This is especially relevant because it is an expression of the Australian Government's commitment to these rights. A more detailed rationale will follow to fully explain why the author of this study has selected to report on, and analyse public policies by investigating the national context. Including a rationale for an examination of the policy assumptions underpinning multicultural education policies in the State of Victoria, which also reveal shifting notions of citizenship during this twenty-year time frame.

## **Background to the Study**

As a result of the creation of the colonies that would later combine to form the Australian nation, the politically engaged inhabitants sought to shape a distinctive national identity and to build a nation state. A central component of the evolution of Australian identity has been the notion of *citizenship and education* policy and practices have been major tools for communicating the values that inform citizenship. From the beginning of formalised, government-controlled education in 1872, the conception, purpose and practice of citizenship education has changed as a result of both internal and external events. An example of such internal influences was the legislative move in 1948 that saw a large portion of the population move from being 'subjects' of the crown, to become Australian 'citizens'. Added to this are external events such as the globalisation of the late 20th and early 21st centuries. In the face of intense globalisation when the power of nation states is challenged by trading blocs, multinational corporations and borderless markets, notions of national identity and citizenship have increasingly come under question. Moreover, it has been argued by some scholars that the authority of the nation state—and the associated concepts of citizenship and nationality—will gradually disappear (Bloemraad, *et al.*, 2008, p. 47). However, in Australia, this does not seem to be the case. National identity and citizenship have not faded away

as contentious issues for political debate, or legal and cultural practice, as is illustrated by a range of events in recent years.

The emphasis of the Howard Federal Government (1996-2007) on Australian ‘values’ and ‘identity’ just as the country was entering the new millennium was a keen reminder of the importance of nationality, the central idea in citizenship both in recent times and historically. The introduction of the *Northern Territory National Emergency Response Act 2007* raised questions around differentiated citizenship, rights and cultural identity. Additionally, the most recent debates over stripping citizenship from dual Australian nationals under the Abbott Government (2013-2014), as do the recent noises made when the two Green senators were ousted – albeit by their own declaration of failure to renounce their dual citizenship status indicate the ongoing significance of defining citizenship in Australia. The central place of citizenship in debates about Australian identity also extend to criteria for Federal Government funding for schools—introduced in the 2000s—such as singing the national anthem in schools, flying the Australian flag and learning about ‘Simpson’s donkey’ (Clark, 2006). The first iteration of the newly formatted citizenship ‘test’, that would have required applicants to cite their understanding of Australian culture—including knowledge of a prominent Australian cricketer—is another example of the nexus between citizenship and Australian identity. Equally this relationship was illustrated by the ‘MV Tampa’ controversy during the 2001 federal election campaign, which sparked public debate about who can be an Australian citizen and, who ‘will decide’ who will become an Australian citizen (Clarke, 2001). These examples and their significance will be discussed in more detail in later. What is apparent is that the Australian nation is still grappling with an ongoing contestation around the concept of citizenship and the role of citizenship education. Studying citizenship education therefore, is of critical importance to analysis of public policy more generally, and education policy in particular.

A key contention of the thesis is that both public and multicultural educational policies flow from how we define and understand concepts such as the nation, citizenship, and the purpose of education. As Bell and Stevenson (2006) note, the areas in which education is distinct from other forms of social provision take three forms. First, education plays a unique role in way in citizenship entitlement. That is, education has a wide reach; governments are obliged to provide it and students are required to attend. Second, that education has a hegemonic influence. This can be more clearly understood when Horst and Gitz-Johansen’s definition is applied such that hegemony:

...refers to the processes, whereby dominant groups and positions establish and maintain a specific social order in society or within certain sectors of society. The concept of hegemony elucidates how power and dominance are exercised by means of culture and ideology, i.e. by means of controlling discourse and hence the public's ways of thinking about and attitudes towards certain societal topics'. (2010, p. 137)

Finally, education has a unique capacity to shape the discourse relating to how individuals define themselves as citizens. Consequently, as Bell and Stevenson suggest 'Education policy therefore is both shaped by, and shapes, our sense of citizenship' (2006, p. 62).

All public policy is based on theories, descriptive or empirical arguments - assumptions of how the world is and how it works, or on normative arguments – assumptions of how it should work. Ever since the first multicultural education policy was conceived in the early 1980s, there has been a plethora of scholarly literature focused on multicultural education. The study focuses on public policies from the late 1980s onwards, as this represents the ideal period for examining contemporary conceptualisations and constructions of citizenship in Australia. Additionally, it concentrates specifically on multicultural education policies developed in the State of Victoria in response to the Federal Government's waning support for multiculturalism as a public policy. It has been well documented that the Victorian Government since the 1970s has taken the lead in promoting participation of newly arrived migrant groups in the field of education, which in turn has influenced Federal Government policy decisions. Further, until 1996, consecutive governments of Australia and Victoria had similar ideological agendas that informed citizenry and represented a shared vision. This shift provides a unique opportunity to compare and contrast the multicultural vision put forward by the Victorian State Government with the Australian national multicultural policies.

There is little scholarly agreement around practices of multicultural education, or expected outcomes, and very little written about how multicultural education or multicultural education policies reveal both concepts or notions of contemporary citizenship in Australia or how these concepts of citizenship are embedded in pedagogical documents in Victoria. What is missing in the pedagogy of citizenship and needs more work is a discussion of citizenship, to make clear the tensions between historical concepts of citizenship and the present conceptions.

## Research Questions

With major changes to immigration policies after WWII and the termination of the White Australia Policy, Australian demography shifted from a relatively homogenous population to a multicultural nation. This set in place challenges for the growth of the nation state, with initial changes to public policy to ensure assimilation of new arrivals and the original inhabitants, to more inclusive policies to ensure social cohesion. So, began a dynamic progression of policies that left important questions unanswered. Therefore, the research questions for this study are:

- 1) What are the assumptions about cultural diversity and notions of citizenship contained in past and present settlement policies?
- 2) What ideologies and values characterise Australian national multicultural policies between 1989 and 2009?
- 3) What do multicultural education policies in the State of Victoria reveal about understandings of multicultural education and notions of citizenship?

To help address these research questions, three sub-questions will be considered in Chapter 3: (1) How did Australian institutions seek to adapt immigration and educational policies in response to demographics and economic changes over time? (2) What were the international or internal discourses that influenced policies in the national arena? (3) How did national immigration and social policies influence the way in which education policies conceptualised education for a diverse society? This historical perspective provides a valuable vantage point from which to determine the role of educational policies to provide an understanding of citizenship in a multicultural society.

## Defining Policy

The following section discusses and defines what policies are, and the ways in which policies are understood and how the method of policy analysis will be applied as a tool to understand educational policies. It is important to establish how the term policy is understood as this study is one that explores the characteristics of Australian national multicultural educational policies. It highlights similarities and differences between the Victorian state multicultural education policy and the national domain. This understanding is crucial to understanding the impact of changing political ideology, changing government leadership and global influences on changes in policy.

The word *policy* derives from the Greek word 'polis': a 'city state'. A policy, therefore, is not a scientific document: rather, it is a political text (Lo Bianco & Wickert, 2001). There is a general

consensus among policy scholars that policies are a form of text that can be considered as an action plan, or a discourse or an outcome. Ball argues that policy is text and action, words and deeds; it is what is enacted as well as what is intended (1994, pp. 14-27). Citing other works (Byrne & Ozga, 2008; Ozga, *et al.*, 2009), Arnott and Ozga state that it is from policy texts that we find, 'definitions of problems, reference particular kinds of evidence and argument and produce 'knowledge' of particular kinds to guide the implementation of policy solutions (2010, p. 339). Further, Ozga suggests that policy texts can be seen as a resources for analysis, 'in terms of the messages they convey-or seek to convey' and that it is from the *source of the policy* we can establish, 'whose interest it serves: its relationship to global, national and local imperatives' (1999, pp. 94-95). The *scope of the policy* provides indications of what the policy 'assumed it is able to do; how it frames the issues; the policy relationships embedded in it'. Finally, the *pattern of the policy* can reveal what the policy 'builds on or alters in terms of relationships, what organizational and institutional changes or developments it requires' (Ozga, 1999, p. 95). In Chapter 4 specific policies are examined to illuminate conceptions of citizenship through the connections between the source, scope, and the patterns of these policies.

Building on the above definitions, policy texts include competing interests and values: they try to imagine a future that represents public interest, the public good. Moreover, there is usually a consistent approach to policy development and what is considered the public good. As Considine points out by, 'policy approximates a struggle for certainty through regularity. Governments do not start and stop a commitment to a policy area; rather they modify, prune and adjust' (1994, p. 7). It is with this in mind that selections of policy texts, in particular educational policy texts, have been included for analysis to complement and add depth to the historical mapping of policy development.

Educational policies have also traditionally represented national or state interests and are linked to the construction of the imagined national community (Anderson, B., 1991). Rizvi attests to this conception of policy authority, involving the institutional, territorial and centralised nature of the state and points out that it cannot be sustained without popular consent (2006, p. 199). Moreover, Rizvi also argues along similar lines to Anderson, that a social imaginary is required concerning the nature and scope of political authority. This then 'demands that people necessarily link their sense of subjectivity to the state and sustain an imaginary that regards national formations as inevitable, timeless and natural, territorially bounded and entirely legitimate' (Rizvi, 2006, p. 199). Therefore,

in the analysis of education policy in this thesis, there will be an exploration of the hegemonic processes sustained and exercised in the policy documents.

Public policies articulate a political purpose or a particular course of action over another and are designed to steer events, or actions or people's behaviour for a desired or imagined future. Rizvi and Lingard explain that policy:

...expresses patterns of decisions in the context of other decisions taken by political actors on behalf of state institutions from positions of authority ... a policy is designed to steer understanding and action without ever being sure of the practice it might produce. (2010, p. 4)

Considine furthers this notion of policy as action emphasising that a public policy, 'is an action which employs government authority to commit resources in support of a preferred value' (1994, p. 5). To thoroughly analyse policy for this study, it was therefore, necessary to explore the intent and purpose ascribed in the policy texts. Additionally, if we understand that public policies are an expression of what a government plans to do, then, when considering policies it is just as important to understand what has not been expressed or articulated in the policy (Dye, 1992). The consideration of what has not been included can be just as pertinent and informative as what has been explicitly decided and expressed or planned.

It is therefore, in the problematisation of constructions of citizenship that this study intends to provide insight to social change and transformation. Moreover, by examining dominant thinking and positioning in a new light we can try to understand how these dominant discourses impact on present understandings of citizenship. It is important to consider the construction of citizenship in official policy documents to understand what notions of this construct are being represented. This study takes the long view of citizenship to reveal ideas or notions of citizenship that are taken for granted and remain unchanged regardless of shifts and changes to social, political, and economic circumstances.

### **The Data**

As one of the aims of this study is to also examine the decentralisation of multicultural educational policies between the periods of 1989 and 2009, this will be done through specific Victorian educational policies: *Multicultural Policy for Victorian Schools* (1996); and, *Education for Global and Multicultural Citizenship: A Strategy for Victorian Government Schools* (2009–2013). The analysis of this policy data is intended to reveal notions of multicultural citizenship and education between

1989 and 2009. An integrated framework of questions was constructed that draws on and adapts frameworks previously employed by Lo Bianco (2001) and Ozga (1999) to explore the scope, source and patterns of policy. Key questions that these scholars pose should be answered and these include: Who was behind the policy? Who contributed to the policy? How were terms defined? What was the intent and purpose of the policy? How was this expressed? What ‘problem’ or issue was being addressed or how was the issue constructed, or how was the problem defined? What solutions were proposed? What were the goals or aims? Finally, in terms of the scope of the policy: Who was the policy aimed at? Where? And how? These questions will be applied to each policy to provide a consistent context for each document.

In seeking answers to the given questions, the author begins by evaluating relevant literature for conceptions of citizenship through history in an Anglophone world and since Federation in Australia. In seeking understanding of these conceptions, consideration is given as to how citizenship might be reimagined. The history of conceptions of citizenship is important because it cannot be reimagined without first understanding how citizenship came into being. In the following chapter, an exploration is presented of the historic data that maps the multifaceted history of immigration and settlement policies and the education policies that were linked to them. The subsequent chapters present the application of a policy analysis method in order to reveal the underlying intentions, understandings, and conceptualisations of multicultural education policies over the last two decades and what they reveal about notions of citizenship.

To address the research questions for this study, a qualitative methodological stance is adopted and within that methodological position, a *policy sociology* method is applied to the policy data. Additionally, the study draws upon *critical anthropology* which, as Hage suggests, hold the capacity for ‘taking us outside ourselves precisely to continuously remind us of the actual possibilities of being other to ourselves’ (2015, p. 15). In sum, the focus will be a consideration of what could be altered rather than on that which is resisted. This is reimagining where we are now, with the aim of being transformative rather than revolutionary.

This thesis is also concerned with providing a contextual understanding of how public policy has changed and shifted in relation to external and internal events and circumstances. This critical exploration through history is important. Rayner paraphrases Wilsford and reminds us that:

Time is not a frictionless medium through which the all-important processes pass, but a significant explanatory factor in its own right. It is the realm of contingency of what might have been if the particular historical sequence in question had been ordered

differently. Understanding policy change in this account means locating and explaining the relationships between the specific turning points that produce *this* outcome rather than any other (Wilsford, 1994). (Rayner, 2009, p. 84)

This study then, with the assistance of policy sociology method, examines the contextual and conceptual aspects of policy. Beginning with the genesis and socio-political context of public policy production, the focus shifts to probing how policy problems have been represented, the organisation of the discourses which continue it and the strategies by which policy, ‘masks the contradictions and incoherencies of the ideology that is inscribed in it’ (Codd, 2007, p. 181).

The origins of policy science can be traced back to the 1950s when it was established by, ‘mainly liberal democratic countries’ to inform and develop public policies for government (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, p. 1). Simons, Olssen, and Peters (2009) suggest that there were several factors that explain this including the development of the democratic state and its public policies, the effects of WWII and the expansion of communism, and a commitment to address social and economic issues. This branch of policy science depended on rationalist and empiricist modes of policy analysis, originating in positivist traditions, with the analysts contained within the public service. Over time, both the approaches to policy analysis and source of analysis have changed. For instance, the last fifty years has seen the number of independent or semi-independent institutions involved in policy research, influencing, and informing public policy increase and the broadening of policy research orientation.

As the field of policy studies has grown there are now a myriad of approaches, policy sociology being one. Policy sociology has roots in the critical tradition. According to Blackmore and Lander, it emerged in ‘the contest of the rise of the dominance of New Right policies in many Anglophone nation states during the 1980s on the one hand, the post-structuralist theory in the academy on the other’ (2011, p. 191). As this approach is grounded in critical sociology and focuses on the study of policies, it places policy in the broader context of social, cultural, economic, and political processes germane to the understanding the values and the ideological structures of policy. With multicultural education policies as the unit of analysis for this study, the enquiry gives critical consideration to past and present policies rather than to providing information for the production of new policies that could be described as policy analysis for policy, because that falls within the remit of the branch of policy study that is rooted in a rationalist approach (Ball, *et al.*, 2007; Gordon, *et al.*, 1977; Grace, 1995; Lingard, 2013).



The methods selected to guide the process adopted for the study are eclectic and informed by policy sociology and historical policy analysis. The concept of policy sociology as a tool for examining education policy was applied by Ozga in the 1980s describing the concept as being ‘rooted in the social science tradition, historically informed and drawing on qualitative and illuminative techniques’ (1999, p. 144). It is also from that same source that I maintain the need to, ‘understand education policy in a theoretically informed way’. Within that conceptual context, it is important to remember what Hulme and Hulme state, that:

Education policy is increasingly subject to supra-national influences as policy makers look to other education systems for ideas to enhance effectiveness and efficacy of local education policy and practice. (2011, p. 44)

It is widely accepted that critical policy studies of education are ‘historically informed’ (Ozga, 1987, 1999). It has also been argued that there should be more emphasis given to past policy phases and ‘links to wider issues of state, economy and wider society’ (Selwyn, 2013, p. 340). A common thread throughout is the assumption that knowledge is ‘a social construction’ and that ‘power differentials play a role in how knowledge is socially constructed’ (Brewer, 2014, p. 273; Fischer, 2003; Forester, 1993; Giddens, 1986). It is by representing a view of past policy developments that a social-historical approach to research, ‘can illuminate the cultural and ideological struggles in which schooling is located’ (Grace, 1995, p. 3). Furthermore, explanation of the historical developments and conceptualisations of policy is instrumental to understanding the present social world. This is supported by Kelly (2014) who also supports the importance of an historical approach to education policy research. Nevertheless, Donato and Lazerson warn that:

...educational policies are proposed and implemented in the context of historical moments. Invariably, the policies rest on assumptions about the past; they rest on the stories people believe about the past... (2000, p. 10)

It is from this perspective that I propose to be guided, therefore, to explain national policy decisions related to settlement and citizenship policies. In doing so, thoughtful consideration will be given to the political and social environment in which the selected educational policies developed. Second, as previously outlined, if we consider policies as a response to a problem either social or political or both, then in investigating ‘how’ and ‘why’ policies developed and changes and shifts in policies over time, we will be able to see how solutions are created in relation to historical context. Finally, as I am working within the field of critical policy sociology, I will adapt processes that Bourdieu termed, ‘denaturalisation’ and ‘defatalisation’ (Hage, 2015, p. 52). These

are used to offer insight into social change through policy development. Furthermore, the thesis will discuss whether these policy shifts are merely reproductions of dominant thinking, or whether they stand for new possibilities.

Through the exploration of past developments in citizenship and multicultural education policy texts, the fundamental aim of this research study is to reveal the contemporary conceptualisation of both multiculturalism and citizenship in Australia. The policy context will also take into consideration internal and external influences on policy. Therefore, by mapping the complex history of educational policies pertaining to settlement and notions of citizenship in Australia, I seek to contribute to current understandings of what it means to have a multicultural education policy for a multicultural citizenry.

### **Thesis Structure**

The chapters of this thesis are organised in the following way. Chapter 2 presents the major themes pertaining to notions of citizenship inherent in the literature: the origins of citizenship, threats to conceptualisations of citizenship, and the construction of citizenship. The origins of citizenship its conception and definition through Western thought offer important insights into citizenship in Australia, which is explored in the second part of the chapter. This section provides a context to the changes and developments to citizenship in Australia since Federation in 1901 and as a sovereign nation state, it is important to understand and to explore the antecedents of Australian specific citizenship.

Chapter 3 continues with the account of the development of citizenship in Australia in relation to internal and external events. The public and educational policy making in response to these events is examined in the context of national and state responses. To show how notions of citizenship have been communicated through public policy and shaped the purpose of education it has been important to give an account of the linear development of Australian Federal Government public policy pertaining to immigration, settlement, and citizenship during the period since 1960 until 2009. The chapter examines the context of public policy development over this period, including both internal and external events. Additionally, explanations for major shifts and changes to public policy will be put.

Chapter 4 of this thesis focuses specifically on the account of policy making at both federal and at state level and provides an analysis of the Victorian State Government policy response after the decentralisation of multicultural educational policies. The junctures in time have been specifically

selected because they coincide with societal changes outlined in the earlier chapter. This chapter includes an overview of policy documents that define the Victorian Government's response to multicultural education policies from 1996 to 2009, the period in which the state governments of Australia were solely responsible for multicultural education policies.

Chapter 5 of explores the impacts of the changing political ideology, economic climate, changing government leadership, global and local influence on the adaptations to both public policy and multicultural education policies, specifically pertaining to notions of citizenship. Many issues are argued, as follows. First, manifestations of citizenship have transformed over time as a result of changes in social, political, demographic, and economic circumstances. Second, in the Australian context as revealed through public policy, access to forms of citizenship has not been open to all, and notions of equality and how membership is conceived are still evolving. Third, education has remained both a way of forming and influencing notions of citizenship in futurity for the nation building project. The chapter therefore aims to offer an interpretation of the policy data in light of previous knowledge.

Subsequent writing includes a discussion of the ideologies and values that underpin and inform policy. If we agree with Kogan and Bowden that policies can be understood as 'operational statements of value', there are important factors to take into consideration (1975, p. 55). If, as argued by Ball that values do not 'flow free of their social context' this study will then contend with a series of questions (2012, p. 1). Who and what values are represented in the policy? Whose are not? It is also important to ask how these values relate to the dominant discourse. As Taylor and Henry suggest, 'the values enshrined in policy are those reflecting the dominant discourses - and political compromises - within nation states at any given time' (2007, p. 109). It is also necessary to understand both the discourse environment in which the policies are generated and that policy texts need to be understood against 'theoretical, historical and cultural frameworks'. Moreover, there are also other areas of influence that need to be included, as Rizvi explains, 'we can no longer merely attend to issues internal to the state, but need to ask how the interior of the state itself being reconstituted by forces outside its borders, becoming "relativized" (Waters, 1995) by the process of globalisation' (2006, p. 199). In other words, a policy sociology approach to this study has facilitated the examination of values, ideologies and assumptions in educational policy encompassing a rich exploration of multicultural educational policies that critically examine the internal socio-political context, with attention to historical and cultural antecedents, whilst attending to larger scale global influences.

### ***Limitations of the Research***

This study is limited to the exploration of the content of the two Victorian educational policies: (1) *Multicultural Policy for Victorian Schools* (MPVS, 1996); and, (2) *Education for Global and Multicultural Citizenship: A Strategy for Victorian Government Schools* (EGMC, 2009–2013). Therefore, the study does not follow a line of enquiry that focuses on the practices, effects, or interpretation of these policies by schools and teachers. Rather, it is a study of policy content, interrogating why multicultural educational policies were developed at a particular time, investigating contentious issues or problems that the policies addressed and how this was denoted in the policies. In order to better understand the nature of the shifts in policies, the historical framing of the policies was considered therefore bringing together historically informed policy analysis to enable, ‘the processes of educational change and to expose the possible relationships between the socio-educational present and the socio-educational past’ (Kincheloe, 1991, p. 234). It is through the lens of policy sociology in conjunction with document and policy analysis, that I, the researcher has provided a framework to support the illumination of ideologies and assumptions embedded within the specified policies.

## Chapter 2: Citizenship – An Historical Context

*‘Citizens are not born but made; citizenship is not fixed in stone but an evolving agenda for government and others to consider’.*

Education Academic, Simon Marginson (1997, p. 6).

This chapter provides an analysis of foundational texts and previous and current debates on citizenship. As this study’s focus is to illuminate notions of citizenship revealed through multicultural education policies, it is important to first establish the origins of citizenship. It is by tracing historic threads and transformations and revealing past conceptualisations that have been forged and practised that we can understand the current notions of citizenship revealed in public policies in Australia. It is also important to understand the trajectory of thinking and practices of citizenship that have shaped our present conceptions. As concepts of citizenship are built over time and have changed with shifts in society, we can see the evolution of ideas and ideals and an evolving agenda. Present day definitions of citizenship show a strong connection between nation building and citizenship and as citizenship has long been associated with empire, state or nation building, its context is highly important.

In the first section, the antecedents of citizenship models are discussed, especially those aspects perceived as valuable and influential in modern day conceptualisations of citizenship and particular attention is paid to challenges or opportunities in citizenship approaches in response to the changing nature of populations. The second section outlines the main themes and events that have impacted on citizenship practices in Australia and summarises the main contributors to the field. Specifically, it describes and analyses why change occurs in the social and political construction of citizenship and the implications for education in Australia from Federation in 1901 through until the 1960s. This section answers the first research question: How do past and present settlement policies reveal assumptions about cultural diversity and notions of citizenship? The exploration focuses on the relationship with history, past events in the understanding of present-day conceptualisations of Multicultural Educational policies.

As the period of historical development of citizenship in Australia stretches over more than one hundred years, I have selected two critical periods in which there were notable changes to

citizenship: 1901 to 1947 and 1948 to 1960. The data is drawn from historical accounts that track distinct responses publicly through legislation and privately through advocacy, with reactions to cultural diversity, ways of belonging and the vision for Australian citizenry. This section will provide the context for the creation of public policy for Australia's diverse society, the political and economic environment, ideology, and the explicit core values. The analyses will address three related theoretical and empirical questions: (1) How did Australian institutions seek to adapt immigration and educational policies in response to the changing demographics over time? (2) What were the international or internal discourses that influenced policies in the national arena? And, (3) How did national immigration and social policies influence the way in which education policies conceptualised education for the changing environment of social and political engagement?

### **Antecedents of Citizenship: Latin Origins to Citizenships**

It is important to have a broader appreciation of the origins and constructions of citizenship and it is also of equal importance to consider what it means to be a non-citizen. While it is evident that the concepts and constructions of citizenship shift in response to changing circumstances, it is equally true that some concepts and constructions of citizenship have persisted regardless of changing circumstances. Citizenship is for the most part acquired or transferred or bestowed, and there are two broad models delineating access to citizenship and social membership. One model of citizenship centres on citizenship acquisition and is based on notions of a shared history, or kinship. This is evident in the Latin phrase *ius sanguinis* that translates into English as, 'of the blood'. It reflects the idea that citizenship is transmitted from one generation to another through a 'blood line'. In contrast, the second model is more commonly associated with rights, duties, and membership: *ius soli*—also a Latin phrase—meaning 'of the soil', in which citizenship is acquired through the place of a person's birth. Both constructions of citizenship include a form of shared political life, with the emphasis on a form of civic responsibility. These conceptualisations are not binary opposites and there are also variants and features common to both. These are fundamentally important to the way in which modern nation states, countries or empires have conceived and theorised citizenship throughout history.

Literature illuminating past origins is particularly helpful for identifying how citizenship has been conceived, defined, and evolved. Theories and structures of citizenship in Western thinking date back to ancient Greece and Rome. Turner noted that citizenship 'may not be a universal concept, because it developed out of a particular conjuncture of cultural and structural conditions which

may be peculiar to the West' (1993, p. vii). The origins of citizenship in Australia can be traced back to the colonisation of the island continent by the British because their legal and political systems were adopted. Therefore, the following theoretical discussion emphasises notions of citizenship emerging from Western thought, with antecedents of citizenship first documented by classical Greeks (Heater, 2004b, p. 108).

Ancient Greek conceptions of citizenship embraced ideals of democracy and participation for elite members of society and exclusively for males. Athenian women and children were kept under the legal protection of the male head of the family or a male guardian, although some boys and young men had access to an education outside the home. Throughout history children have either been invisible, silenced or considered to have a form of passive citizenship, with their worth as citizens viewed in futurity. For the most part, children have invariably received limited attention and have held a similar position to other less dominant groups, including women, the mentally or physically impaired and slaves. That is, they have either been omitted from many theories and thinking and/or excluded from formal political processes pertaining to citizenship (Cockburn, 1998; Earls, 2011; Lister, 2007b; Mac Naughton, *et al.*, 2009).

For Ancient Romans, citizenship evolved as its polity grew from the Republic to empire and over time came to rely less on kinship. It included people from diverse cultures and represented a citizen's legal responsibilities and duties. Unlike the Ancient Greeks, the Roman conception of citizenship did not enshrine, 'equal participation in public life' (Castles & Davidson, 2000, p. 33). From the 3rd century AD, the Roman notion of citizenship evolved into a clearly multi-ethnic one that allowed for the expansion of borders, while the Greek notion of citizenship had included the desire for equal participation. The ancient Romans did however, hold a similar view in regard to women and children, positioning children under their parents' care, a situation known as *patria potestas* (Cockburn, 2013, p. 35).

In the differences between these two versions of citizenship, the critical impact of the polity can be seen. The Ancient Greeks focus of citizenship and citizenry was connected to a perceived hegemonic community or peoplehood. A community was bound together through kinship, through shared values, common laws, and religion. In contrast, the Ancient Roman version of the state was built on the expansion of an empire, therefore, constructions of citizenship had to provide protection for those who were part of expansion and it had to also be inclusive of new members of the empire. Athens was a relatively homogeneous city state; citizenship was restricted

to kinship (ethnos), while the expansion of Rome eventually led it to an acceptance of a non-ethnic basis to belonging to the empire.

The concept of citizenship from the perspective of both the Athenians and the Romans was based on fairly small populations compared to the 21st century. Rome was in antiquity a very large city and this had implications for the political community and the legitimacy of the state. The practice of taking a population census every five years provided a picture of the makeup of the Roman State for political purposes (Hin, 2008). As with changes in demographics, social, political, and economic transformation resulted in changes in notions of citizenship. The influence of the Roman census lives on today in many parts of the world, including Australia, where the data on people and their housing informs government planning.

After the period of classic antiquity, the classical European experience of citizenship was located mostly within religious and monarchical assumptions, apart from republican experiments in early Renaissance Italy.<sup>2</sup> England in the 13th century was a geographical and political entity ruled by its monarchy. From an English perspective, the state was considered a, ‘community of people who are subject to sovereign power’ (Skinner, 2009, p. 328). From this comes the understanding that people are considered subjects of a sovereign monarch rather than citizens of a state or nation with some form of established government (Skinner, 2009, p. 361)’. Subjects were answerable—or subject to—the laws of the state or institutions of authority, with ultimate power residing with the monarchy. Subjects had entitlements, but rights as we understand them in contemporary society were not conferred until the 13th century. A shift in power relations between the monarch and the subject in this period of history marked a further development in the conceptualisation of citizenship.

## Citizenship as Rights

The language of the *rights* pertaining to citizenship in common law societies can be traced back to the Magna Carta. The Magna Carta was developed through nation-building and land ownership claims in England and conferred freedoms in the form of *legal rights*, which limited the powers of the monarch. The signing of the Magna Carta in 1215 marked the first time when all people, including the monarch, became subject to the rule of law. With concepts of citizenship tracing back to antiquity, the norms and structural factors must be included in this understanding of rights. At this time in England, the majority of the population were peasants owned by lords, barons and

---

<sup>2</sup> For more about the classical European experience of citizenship, see Sintomer (2010, pp. 472-487)

Jayne Lysk. *Notions of Citizenship Revealed Through Multicultural Education Policies in Australia*



other land owners and so did not see themselves as ‘free’ or able to practice self-determination in regards to employment or life choices, consistent with anachronistic concepts. As Rubenstein notes, rights—including the right to participate—are a more, ‘democratic foundation to the concept of citizenship—the individual no longer has to be subject to the state; sovereignty lies with the people’ (2005, p. 517).

At the time of the Magna Carta there were no clear boundaries as to who was or was not considered to be a subject (Cohen, 2010). This delineation between subject and citizen can be attributed to two revolutions nearly five hundred years after the signing of the Magna Carta. Just as the Magna Carta changed the way in which liberties were afforded to subjects through individual protections, including property rights, it is clear from the time of Antiquity that there is a connection between citizenship and land or property ownership polity. One consequence of this was and is, that the right to participation is available to some and not all. Up until this point in history, we can see that notions of citizenship were formed and shaped by notions of hierarchy, power, membership, and control of land. The French and American revolutions in the 18th century again dramatically altered the dominant mode of thinking regarding citizenship and contrasted with the English construction of subject and sovereign with repercussions that resonate to the present day. These revolutions would bring new understandings of the way in which citizens are governed in democratic nations and forms of belonging structured within notions of citizenship. Moreover, they would change the relationship between the notion of power and control, and between nation state and citizenship.

The French Revolution (1789–1799), was fundamentally an attempt to make all citizens equal by overthrowing the aristocracy, while the American Revolution (1775–1783) centred on the winning of independence by overthrowing foreign rule. From these revolutions emerged the French Declaration of the *Rights of Man* and the American *Bill of Rights* and from both, modern forms of citizenship can be understood. These developments cement notions of political rights through participation, community and belonging in citizen discourse. Participation can be defined as individuals or communities having an influence or a voice over public policy. Although in ancient Greece to participate was part of public life (Heater, 2004b), participation was not open to all and it was not a given right. The French Declaration of the *Rights of Man* and the American *Bill of Rights*, gave the world a new political language, as well as two new styles of citizenship: the ‘civic republican’ style and the ‘liberal’ style.

Further key developments in the construction of citizenship in this period of history were concepts of citizenship generated by the people rather than dictated by the state. The French Revolution enabled a form of radical citizenship that swept away the subject status of living under an absolute monarchy, which was pivotal to the emergent notion that people could, 'define their own limits by reference to the modern state against which they stood' (Castles & Davidson, 2000, p. 37). Similarly, the liberal version of citizenship participation can be traced back to the American *Bill of Rights* (1760-1789). Participation came to include freedom of speech where, 'Congress shall make no law... abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances' (The First Amendment cited in Corwin, 1920, p. 48). Voting, however, as an act of participation, was solely restricted to land owners until 1856. By 1920, most of the population, excluding children, were given voting rights.

In contrast, the civic republican version of citizenship participation that arose from the French Revolution is expressed in the National Assembly of France's *Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen*. The declaration includes the edict that, 'men are born, always continue, free and equal' and that it is the duty of 'citizens to perform military service.' Although, there are similar to practices of participation in America, suffrage in France was also restricted. In essence, the French civic republican conception of citizenship places country before personal interest, a legacy of the ancient Greek contract of citizenship that included military duty and a country first ethos. In contrast, the American conception stressed individual rights where individual freedom is idealised (Turner, 1993).

The American Revolution also rejected monarchy in favour of political membership of a community as the central idea of its new polity. Citizenship consequently became, 'first an assertion of popular will and then a list of legal rights that are regarded as inherent in all people as equals' (Castles & Davidson, 2000, p. 36). However, notions of equality were contextual. For example, voting is seen today as essential to political participation; however, voting rights in America in the decades after their revolution were specifically connected to land ownership until 1856. Furthermore, most 'white' men only gained the right to vote in 1870, while 'white' women did not gain the vote until 1920 and African Americans in the 1960s. Therefore, citizenship in the United States of America from this time on bestowed forms of power and freedom to some individuals through the right to act. This was something previously unattainable to the majority of the population. It is clear that all models of citizenship up until this time discriminated in a variety of ways and typically by excluding membership based on age, gender, education, economic status, ethnicity, or religion.

Both American and French conceptions of citizenship drew on Roman republican models and the Greek idea of the public sphere—the ‘polis’—for the expanded role of public life. However, access to citizenship was neither guaranteed by kinship or birth rights. In France, nationality is still the only, ‘path to entitlement to the complete rights of citizen’, and the path to nationality or naturalisation is complex (Bertossi & Hajjat, p. 5). In America, access to citizenship has also had an equally complex and contentious history culminating in the now well-known 1964 *Civil Rights Act*, in which discriminatory naturalisation practices and other forms of discrimination were ended in favour of democratic cultural pluralism (Smith, R.M., 1988). Notions of citizenship have been difficult to neatly define when each state or territory is subject to internal and external influences, however, what has remained constant are the ideals that can be traced back to antiquity, with notions of equality evolving into more open forms of citizenship and with it access and participation in democratic nation states.

In both the civic republican and the liberal versions of citizenship, two factors remain salient and unchanged. Firstly, citizenship requires an acknowledgement of borders or boundaries. Secondly, citizenship is a means for territories or states to exercise their control or authority over their citizens. As Staeheli, Ehrkamp, Leitner, and Nagel Staeheli, *et al.* (2012, p. 4) argue:

... citizenship is a status in law that is framed through norms, constitutions, laws, and policies. More than a legal attribute, however, it is also experienced as people move through their daily lives and as opportunities afforded by citizenship are opened and forestalled for particular individuals at particular moments. (2012, p. 4)

Staeheli *et al.*’s observation supports the view that citizenship is mostly constructed for the people, rather than by the people. Nevertheless, citizenship can also be contested and challenged. Although citizenship has been conceived in different ways throughout history, basic elements have remained unchanged, including the influence of the Magna Carta where all people are subject to common law and there are rights associated with citizenship. Most models of citizenship include: participation, legal status, rights and belonging (Bellamy, 2008; Bloemraad, *et al.*, 2008; Castles & Davidson, 2000). Additionally, there is a general consensus among scholars that citizenship is a technique of membership in which diverse forms of inclusion and exclusion are inevitably part of any notion of citizenship. As Castles (2004b, p. 17) observes: it ‘denotes membership not in some putative global society but in a specific nation-state’.

According to Glenn the prevalence of the nation-state has only happened over the last two centuries he asserts:

Jayne Lysk. *Notions of Citizenship Revealed Through Multicultural Education Policies in Australia*

Prior to an operative notion of a nation, however, there were other and important efforts toward human closure in the development of the contemporary state. The most important were the strivings for a common language and a common religion; both were eventually to constitute important elements of any possible nation. Citizenship then could become the final cement between the individual and the nation-state. (2013, p. 86)

In the earlier sections, we have explored the origins of forms of citizenship that have predominantly been conceived around forms of governance and territorial bounded political communities including: city states; Empires; Republics; and Federations. Forms of citizenship have been constructed as the nature of the state has transformed throughout history to the most recent prevalence of the nation state throughout the world in the wake of WWII. As Habermas points out that with these newly formed nation states the nation 'carries connotations of a community shaped by common descent, culture and history, and often by a common language as well' (Habermas, 1996, p. 126). As citizenship is commonly associated with the nation state or nation building, this arrangement according to Bornman occurs when:

...members of disparate groups are drawn into the larger society through education and political participation. The state, on the other hand, expands its obligations to the larger society by offering an extended range of services and integrative networks, while subjects become active and participatory citizens of the nation-state. (2013, p. 433)

Therefore, the concept of citizenship is constructed around this relationship between the individual and the state and the context in which it is built. What is not automatically evident within the relationship between the nation state and citizens is how the nation state accommodates movement of citizens or future citizens who do not share language, ancestry, culture, or any form of allegiance. In regard to the accommodation of movement of citizens, an alternative form of citizenship that has been available during this period, and has re-emerged as an alternative concept to the recognised models of citizenship in the aftermath of the two world wars that links citizenship to the globe rather than the nation state: cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitan citizenship.

The following section will briefly consider this conception of citizenship as it has also influenced present day conceptions. After which is an exploration of how citizenship has been conceptualised in Australia, particularly in relation to building a nation state in which not all inhabitants do or will share a common language, ancestry, or culture.

## Cosmopolitan Citizenship

With the acceleration of globalisation in recent years, theories or models of cosmopolitanism citizenship, world citizenship and cosmopolitanism have been more widely discussed.<sup>3</sup> Glenn, in his book titled, *The Cosmopolitan State*, argues that regardless what laws and regulations a nation state puts in place, or how the diversity of the citizenry is officially recognised, all states are essentially 'cosmopolitan in character' (2013, p. 737). That is, irrespective of the political organisation of the nation state, the monocultural and monolingual nation is an idea, not a reality.

According to Professor of Politics and International Relations David Held (2003, p. 180), life chances are affected by national, international and transnational processes and, transnational movements, agencies and corporations have established the first stages of a global civil society.

Theories of cosmopolitan citizenship seek to address the problems of world polity and post-national membership, including issues of identity, cultural, political, and social rights. Theories of cosmopolitan citizenship challenge both the notion that nation states are homogenous in nature and that a citizen's political obligations should be solely aligned with a nation state. Cosmopolitan citizenship builds on the traditional and liberal concepts of citizenship, while creating a vision for types of membership that do not necessarily hold an allegiance to a particular nation or state, but which manifest locally, virtually, or regionally. Osler and Starkey (2005) define the cosmopolitan citizen as a citizen that recognises, 'others as essentially similar to themselves and arrive at a sense of citizenship based on a consciousness of humanity rather than on allegiance to a state' (p. 21).

The doctrine of cosmopolitanism can be usefully understood in terms of principles that under-pin it as suggested by Held (2010, pp. 69-74). The principles include: (1) The primacy of the human person whose rights and needs are to be recognised above all other claimants (e.g., states, other associations such as societies, religious organisations, clans, tribes, families)<sup>4</sup>; (2) The importance of human agency: 'the capacity of human beings to reason self-consciously, to be self-reflective and to be self-determining' (p. 70); (3) The importance of humans accepting personal responsibility for their decisions and actions and to be accountable for them; (4) A 'non-coercive political process in and through which people can negotiate and pursue their public interconnections, interdependencies, and life chances' (p. 71); (5) Inclusive representative democratic institutions as

---

<sup>3</sup> See Appiah (1997, pp. 617-639) and Nussbaum (1994, pp. 155-162).

<sup>4</sup> Echoing Kant, David Held explains 'Humankind belongs to a single 'moral realm' in which each person is regarded as equally worthy of respect and consideration' (2005, p. 191).

the mechanism through which people can negotiate; (6) Making decisions as much as possible based on closeness and localism; (7) Securing and maintaining human security and (8) The important process of 'economic and social development must be consistent with the stewardship of the world's core resources' (p. 74). These principles described by Held (2010) combine respect for the individual, the local or domestic with a respect for the global.

Critics of the cosmopolitan citizenship model argue that some aspects are problematic, especially in regards to the forms of governance required. Implicit in the concept is a diminished dependence of individuals on the nation state, therefore, a greater dependence on more universal laws and institutions (Carter, 2013, p. 2). These then require some form of global cooperation, which is seen as difficult and problematic. Critics of notions of cosmopolitan citizenship suggest that the governance issues render it undesirable and unworkable. However, it is understood as more than just a form of governance and there is a need investigate other characteristics, namely the individual or 'moral category'.

It is argued that there are good reasons to maintain the concept of cosmopolitan citizenship as a moral category and this is based on distinctions made between global citizenship and other traditional notions as Anker states:

Firstly, in the context of a nation-state citizenship is based on legal rights and duties instead of on moral norms only; and secondly solidarity is mainly focused on fellow citizens of one state instead of humanity at large'. (2010, p. 88)

Professor of Political Science Seyla Benhabib, further clarifies this by stating that cosmopolitanism is 'the concern for the world as if it were one's *polis*, is furthered by such multiple, overlapping allegiances which are sustained across communities of language, ethnicity, religion, and nationality' (2004, p. 174). Although this view is exclusively liberal, it highlights the mechanism of cosmopolitanism in an age of globalisation. This point emphasises the need to consider oneself as a cosmopolitan citizen and then to think of oneself as a citizen of the world. As Appiah notes:

There are two strands that intertwine in the notion of cosmopolitanism. One is the idea that we have obligations to others; obligations that stretch beyond those to whom we are related by the ties of kith and kind, or even the more formal ties of a shared citizenship. The other is that we take seriously the value not just of human life but of particular human lives, which means taking an interest in the practices and beliefs that lend them significance. (2009, p. 97)

One challenge facing cosmopolitanism is how peaceful coexistence and cooperation is maintained or established. Cosmopolitanism is underpinned by the need, for example to work toward shared laws or institutions which are premised on a shared value for both the human life and the nature world. However; as Hansen reminds us:

History bitterly shows that partiality can metamorphose into exclusion, sometimes because of unscrupulous demagogues who play on fear and anxiety, sometimes as an undirected consequence of external pressure or other evolving forces. But that same history offers counter instances in which a hitherto exclusive way of life was opened up to others and transformed while retaining its integrity. The reality of cosmopolitanism on the ground demonstrates that partiality and exclusion do not automatically accompany one another. (2010, p. 163)

A cosmopolitanism approach cannot guarantee that there will no clashes of views or violence arising from these clashes, but what it does propose is that there will be some inevitable transformation from these encounters. Notably, what also differs greatly when considering cosmopolitan approaches to citizenship is where the emphasis is on the individual elements and on what is enacted by nation states. Although membership or its forms are an integral part of citizenship, how membership is defined or accessed is contested and highly contextual and the approach taken by different nation states varies greatly. These conceptualisations of cosmopolitan citizenship and what it means to be a cosmopolitan citizen have become increasingly important as population mobility increases across the globe and particularly for Australia in an age of globalisation. Additionally, these concepts will be explored further in Chapter 4 in analyses of the Victorian State Government's policy for global citizenship.

### **Citizenship in Australia: From Federation to the 1960s**

The following section explores the concepts of citizenship that emerged over a sixty-year period in Australian history focusing on the events or circumstances that influenced them. It is important to note that the first inhabitants, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders viewed themselves as custodians of this island continent and adjoining islands. This is evident in the following words that state that sovereignty is a:

...a spiritual notion: the ancestral tie between the land, or 'mother nature', and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples who were born therefrom, remain attached thereto, and must one day return thither to be united with our ancestors. This link is the basis of the ownership of the soil, or better, of sovereignty. It has never

been ceded or extinguished, and co-exists with the sovereignty of the Crown. (Mutitjulu Community Aboriginal Corporation, 2017, p. i)

Mr. Bayona-Ba-Meya goes on to dismiss the materialistic concept of *terra Nullius*... and substitutes for this a spiritual notion: the ancestral tie between the land, or "mother nature", and the man who was born therefrom, remains attached thereto, and must one day return thither to be united with his ancestors. This link is the basis of the ownership of the soil, or better, of sovereignty. This amounts to a denial of the very concept of ***terra nullius*** in the sense of a land which is capable of being appropriated by someone who is not born therefrom. (Ammoun & Bayona-Ba-Meya, 1975, pp. 84-85)

These words first appeared in the Anglo centric public domain in relation to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders when cited by Justices Brennan and Toohey in the High Court of Australia in 1992 in the context of the Mabo decision as part of the Mabo v Queensland case. The original words were made by two judges involved in relation to the Western Sahara in the International Court of Justice. The quotation is that of Ammoun commenting on the presentation made by Bayona-Ba-Meya (representing Zaire) when he dismissed the concept of *terra nullius* and suggested that it be replaced by the concept that sovereignty is a *spiritual notion*.

As is evident in the varying contexts of the previous quotation, and what will become apparent in the following passages, exploration of citizenship in Australia was not shaped or influenced by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders' thought, but linked inextricably to concepts and antecedents of citizenship forged in the formation of political societies across the globe, and in the expansion of colonial powers.

The Australian experience of citizenship has been inextricably linked to the forging of the nation state and this chapter also considers the process of nation building. As Hill and Lian explain:

The process of nation building is seen as being engineered by intellectual minorities, though aimed at the whole social group. As such, nation building is a protracted process of political integration that always remains unfinished, even when the nation has gained its own independent state. The political consciousness required effectively to contain internal conflict does not result from a unilinear process of evolution but rather is a disjointed series of reverses and delays. (2013, p. 13)

As a settler nation that was also part of the British Empire, those new arrivals to Australia in 1901 were considered and considered themselves to be British subjects. The Latin term *Terra Nullius*



meaning unclaimed or unoccupied land, had been applied to the island continent of Australia from the time of Captain Cook and framed all subsequent laws, policies and planning for the nation state until 1992 (Simpson, 1993). The *Immigration Restriction Act of 1901* gave legislative expression to the government of the day's vision for those settlers and future settlers. This law, better known as the 'White Australia Policy', elaborated a policy that restricted non-white immigration, that is, people of non-European background or appearance. This racially discriminatory policy received bipartisan support and the policy was implemented in an effort to start building the desired future national Australian community (Jupp, 2002).

It was unsurprising that the Act received bipartisan support given that prior to Federation, colonies in Queensland, New South Wales and South Australia had already developed restrictive immigration policies regulating Chinese people and had openly practised racial exclusion and racism from around the time of the gold rushes beginning in the 1850s. The 'White Australia' vision can be traced back to the 'Chinese problem' in New South Wales and Victoria and later the Japanese immigrants in Queensland. Justification for exclusion of the Chinese included; 'their questionable moral character'; their 'different religious beliefs'; their perceived willingness to 'work for lower wages' than the average labourer; and their perceived 'different view' on politics (Huttenback, 1973, pp. 111-112). Historian Jeremy Martens asserts that similar accusations had been levelled at Indian immigrants entering South Africa in the late 1800s and the laws that had been enacted in South Africa, particularly the *Natal Immigration Restriction Act of 1897* offered a model for the White Australia Policy and the mandatory dictation tests administered to bar entry to Australia (2006, p. 324). Settler colonies at this time were following similar trajectories, a theme that will be expanded on later in this chapter.

The second Prime Minister of Australia, Alfred Deakin (1909–1910), evoked his vision for future Australian people stating, 'the unity of Australia is nothing if it does not imply a united race... unity of race is an absolute to the identity of Australia' (Hearn & Tregenza, 2014, p. 184). The intention of the White Australia Policy was to create a homogenous community of 'British character' where citizens spoke the same language, shared the same values and had similar lifestyles (MacCallum, 2006). Embedded in this thinking lay a number of factors, such as beliefs that associated people's ways of life were indicators of superiority or inferiority. McGregor describes the origins of the theory:

...by the late eighteenth century the Enlightenment idea of progress had crystallised into an assumption that societies followed a natural developmental sequence, from a

stage of savagery (characterised by hunting as the mode of subsistence) to one of barbarism (characterised by nomadic pastoralism) to civilisation (distinguished by agriculture and commerce). (1997, p. 3)

What can be concluded from this is that behind the very strong and racist exclusionary practices is that they not only targeted prospective arrivals, but also the original inhabitants of the land. There were three influencing factors: the first being that the Indigenous people of Australia were categorised as belonging to the ‘savage’ stage and the colonisers considered themselves as belonging to the ‘civilised’ stage, and so believed that they had more prospects for survival.<sup>5</sup> Second, beliefs of the late nineteenth century were largely influenced by Social Darwinian understandings of human evolution, which Professor of the History of Political Thought Gregory Claeys describes ‘as the application of the idea of evolution to a higher social type on the basis of social competition between ‘fit’ and ‘unfit’ groups and individuals, whose ‘fitness’ or ‘value’ to society can be defined in a number of ways’ (2000, p. 229). Underpinning this was the belief in the superiority of certain races, with British society and upper class European society at the apex of this hierarchy. A third factor noted at the time by educationist and historian, Myra Willard, was the fear held by ‘white Australians’ that people from Asia would descend in large numbers and that they would be, ‘dangerous to political life of the community, but also that their presence in Australia would be an external danger as well’. This notion of an ‘Asian invasion’ and associated fear, lasted well into the next century (1923, p. 195).

Notions of citizenship at this time were founded on and influenced by both biological and cultural racism. Moreover, there was a continuation of thinking that concepts of power, hierarchy and landownership were integral to participation and belonging in society. The settlers of Australia saw themselves as belonging to and representing Britain and so they were British subjects expanding the Empire. Even though Britain had had a relatively open door policy to immigrants from throughout its Empire, ‘white’ colonies in particular took a circumspect and exclusionary approach to expanding and controlling their populations (Holmes, 2016). The White Australia Policy was the embodiment of state-sanctioned discrimination; it was an exclusionary policy that was underpinned by specific understanding of ethnicity and race. These beliefs and attitudes about race legislatively endorsed racial exclusion, extending to migrants and other sectors of the population.

---

<sup>5</sup> For a more detailed account of the characterisations of societies and the Doomed race theory see (McGregor, 1997).

Jayne Lysk. *Notions of Citizenship Revealed Through Multicultural Education Policies in Australia*

Historian Ann Curthoys' (1999) study of race and ethnicity in Australia noted this feature of colonial racism and was clearly discernible in the treatment of Aboriginal Australians and non-Europeans in the colonies during the nineteenth century. This 'strong sense of British and European racial superiority was expressed and reinforced, and the conviction that coloured races were inferior to white was confirmed' (Curthoys, 1999, p. 280). As a result, it was a way of justifying the appropriation and settlement of land. Through the actions taken and the policies developed by the state, the territories, and the Federal Government, it is apparent that at this time there was no formal recognition, or respect, for either Australia's original inhabitants or for the character of the different communities already residing in the country. Moreover, access to Australia was restricted and controlled. In the building of the nation state of Australia, what was valued at that time was a hegemonic citizenry, with citizenship constructed upon clear boundaries of who was to be included or excluded.

This sense of racial superiority was also reflected in the Australian Constitution that came into existence in 1901. Contained within the Constitution were only two references to the original inhabitants; first, 'in reckoning the numbers of people of the Commonwealth, aboriginal natives shall not be counted' (as cited in Peterson & Sanders, 1998, p. 120). Counting people by way of a census was a practice that began in the colony of New South Wales with settlement, a practice that can be traced back to the Romans. The second reference indicated that it was the responsibility of the States rather than the Commonwealth Government to 'deal with Aboriginal people' (Peterson & Sanders, 1998, p. 23). As a result, forms of membership and participation in society were, 'a privilege of the settlers and extended only to Indigenous people under special circumstances' (Gray, 1998, p. 63). Interestingly, the *Commonwealth Elector Act* of 1902 granted women the right to vote in Federal elections, yet Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders would have to wait another 60 years for that right. As Marcia Langton stated in her talk, *The Nation of Australia*, 'Australian nationhood was founded on racism' (2002, p. 29).

However, it must be acknowledged that the newly formed Australian Federal Government was not alone in trying to control migration. Exclusionary immigration policies were standard practice in colonies or former colonies of the British Empire at this time including New Zealand, Canada and the United States of America (Rivett, 1962, p. 6). Debates regarding migration were simultaneously raging in America, Canada, and New Zealand just as they were in Australia. One of the common factors was gold mining, and Chinese prospectors and merchants who came in pursuit of wealth associated with the gold booms in these countries. Lake and Reynolds concluded that the Chinese

represented cheap labour and, therefore, 'unfair competition' to 'white men' (2008, p. 17). Additionally, as Lake and Reynolds argued 'industrial employment as well as gold was claimed as the exclusive preserve of white men' (2008, p. 17). As the movement of Chinese nationals during this period was seen as a threat to living standards, the government of the day put in place measures to limit the number of Chinese allowed to gain entry or settle. From this it is clear that notions of social cohesion and a desire for equality in the standard of living of 'white' Australians were dominant in notions of citizenship at this time.

Social cohesion is a contested and malleable term that has been discussed and debated by theorists such as Durkheim, Marx, neo-Marxists and sociologists such as Robert Merton and Talcott Parsons. Social scientists, Jane Jenson and Denis Saint-Martin, proposed that demands for social cohesion appear when, 'policy communities are engaged in discussing and redesigning citizenship regimes' (2003, p. 77). The term most recently has been associated with increasing migrant mobility, globalisation, cultural diversity and receiving migrant nations. Accordingly, social cohesion can be defined and conceived both as a political concept and as a social theory. Hulse and Stone expand on these two ways of conceptualising social cohesion. On one hand, social cohesion can be viewed as a political concept when it is applied to the policy context to 'indicate the aims of, and rationale for, certain public policy actions', and on the other hand, it can be conceived as a social theory to 'explain social, political and sometimes economic changes' (2007, p. 109).

Recent literature predominantly refers to social cohesion as a political concept. Vast asserts that the term social cohesion is most commonly associated with, 'social order and ensuring that immigrants and ethnic minorities integrate into the dominant receiving culture' (2010, p. 507). Cheong, Edwards, Gouldborne, and Solomos advance this argument explaining that in the dominant discourse, 'social cohesion is taken to mean a common national identity built via the development of common values, shared symbols, shared ceremonies and so on' (2007, p. 39). How social cohesion is conceived and defined can be influenced by a number of factors including the political ideology of the nation states, forms of citizenship and prevailing public social policies. The following discussion will explore how language related to constructs of social cohesion in the newly forming nation.

Language was a key tool used to control access to entry and settlement across Australia. This focus on language similarly reflected prevailing attitudes and policies on race, inclusion, and exclusion. As Stevenson reminds us:

Language loyalty becomes an overtly *ideological* issue, however, when particular statements are made about the relationship between the knowledge of a particular language and the right to belong to a particular social grouping or community. (2006, p. 6)

One of the language measures put in place to exclude immigrants was the implementation of a dictation test at Australian ports. The 1901 *Immigration Act* denied entry to any person or persons who could not pass a fifty-word dictation test. The test was given in a European language; however, the language selected was at the discretion of the immigration officers who administered the test. In 1905, it became standard practice that the European language test was amended and the dictation test of ‘any prescribed language’ was introduced. By 1909, the policy had become truly effective as no one of a non-European background was able to pass the test (Markus, 1994, pp. 25-26). As Walter and MacLeod assert:

Through this dictation test the government could prevent anyone considered unworthy of membership from entering the country, whilst not specifically singling out particular races for exclusion. The adoption of this procedure was intended to avoid offence to other members of the British Empire. (2002, p. 51 )

It is evident that the makeup of the citizenry of this colonised island nation was tightly controlled. Who would hold the wealth, the power and determine the life style of the inhabitants was not open for negotiation nor was it left to chance. Economic and social ties were firmly attached to Britain. Prior to WWI, Australians considered themselves to be a European nation and tied firmly to the United Kingdom and the British Empire. This was despite Australia’s geographic location in the Asia-Pacific region. The people were ‘British subjects’, and so at that time held no desire for a separate Australian nationality or citizenship (Warhurst, 1993, p. 103).

By the second decade of the twentieth century, developments signalled a subtle reorientation of citizenship policy in Australia with added emphasis on the Pacific region. To begin with, in 1917 a Pacific Branch was established within the Prime Minister’s Department. Baogeng He, Professor of Public Policy explains that the ‘Pacific’ was to become the favoured terminology, ‘largely because the United States was part of the Pacific and made Australia appear less vulnerable to Asia’ (2011, p. 267). Although Australia was geographically located in the Asia–Pacific region, when it came to initiating a foreign policy, the policies would customarily be in line with those of Britain. However, according to historian Neville Meaney (2001), it was the ‘British indifference’ to Australia’s Pacific concerns that drove Australia to form its own Pacific policy and also to forge economic and security

ties to the USA which eventually would grow stronger than the ties to Britain. Although the events of WWII would later see Australia take a more independent stance from Britain in foreign policy and notions of citizenship.

The period from 1901 to 1919 is one in which the Commonwealth of Australia was established and the Australian Constitution became known as the, 'birth certificate of the nation' (Commonwealth of Australia, 2015) . The constitution is the 'fundamental law of Australia binding everybody, including the Commonwealth Parliament and the Parliament of each State' (Commonwealth of Australia, 2010). Prior to Federation, Australia consisted of separately governed colonies, or states. At the time of the enactment of Federation, ultimate power still resided in Britain and the people referred to in the Constitution were considered to be British subjects. For in the drafting of the Constitution the inclusion of the term 'citizenship' was rejected and so as Rubenstein points out, 'citizenship in Australia is a statutory rather than a constitutional concept' (1995, pp. 505-506). In addition, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people were not recognised in the Constitution as subjects or conceptually as citizens. The first inhabitants, according to McCorquodale, Aboriginals were referred to in two sections of the Constitution and both can be seen in a pejorative light with sub-human qualities:

In section 51(xxvi) the Commonwealth was given legislative power other than for 'the aboriginal race in any State'; and in section 127 'aboriginal natives' were not to be counted in reckoning the numbers of the people of the Commonwealth, or of a State. At a number of places in the Constitution 'people' is used in a quantitative sense: to determine representation (s.24), allocation of expenditure debits (s.89(iiXb)). At other places 'person' is used for acquisition of property (s.51(xxxi), or appointment of deputies to the Governor-General (s.126). So that the fundamental machinery of governance comprehended both terms. Yet 'aboriginal natives' rather than 'the people of any race' or 'the people of the aboriginal race' was used in section 127. (1986, p. 9)

This was at a time when a new political environment was being bedded down and there was little change in state control and trade arrangements. Any new policy announcements were not so much representative of a new way of thinking, but more an affirmation of the mindset of the Colonial Empire. The *Commonwealth of Australia Act 1900* passed in the British Parliament paving the way for the independent Commonwealth of Australia, while maintaining influence over the Constitution, as Australia remained a constitutional monarchy (Commonwealth of Australia, 2016).

The first cabinet of the newly formed Commonwealth Parliament consisted of the six male Premiers of the self-governing British colonies and the first Prime Minister. Each of the six Australian colonies had their own constitution and retained power to make their own laws. The demographic make-up of the population in 1901, which included nearly four million people, was largely Anglo-Celtic. Although the Indigenous population was not included in the data, estimates of nearly 100,000 people have been made (Hugo, 2000). Immigration and associated laws were within the remit of the Commonwealth Government, while education resided under state control.<sup>6</sup> The devolution of power is a contested area and an area that will be returned to later in this thesis.

By investigating the key themes and significant events that occurred in relation to citizenship during the period of 1901 to 1919 focusing on international and domestic politics, the economic climate and the state of education is also important. As previously argued, models and understandings of citizenship are built over time and are highly dependent on contextual and historical experience. By 1905, Britain had also passed a comparable law to the *Commonwealth of Australia Act 1900*, the *Britain Aliens Act*. This period was one of industrialisation, the basis of economic wealth in Australia and so the Australian economy was not confined to activity on the gold fields. The manufacturing industry and in particular the iron and steel producing sectors in the larger cities, were growing. Education prior to Federation was predominantly held to be the domain of the church and private tuition was the norm for the wealthy. Elementary education had been made compulsory in the 1870s and each state had enacted its own legislation and in some states education was provided to train working men. According to Connell and Irving, education was part of a wider campaign for social control that included for children a ‘close connection between the Factory Acts prohibiting child labour and the establishment of compulsory education’, and for men, ‘the liberal idea of training working-men for citizenship was translated into rote-learning and physical drill, methods that imagined citizenship for the working class as a vocational serfdom’ (1980, pp. 205-206).

Laws, such as the 1880 *Public Instruction Act*, had a major influence in more than one state. By the beginning of WWI in 1914, states such as Victoria had compulsory education for all up to the age of 14 and the leaving age did not change until the 1940s. Separate technical colleges were established in the early 1900s to ensure that the Empire could keep abreast of the technical advances in Germany. Connell and Irving argue that the adoption of both the state advancement of technical

---

<sup>6</sup> For more information on the separation of powers for the States, the Commonwealth and Territories, see Australian Government (2015).

schools and of labour movements ‘reinforced the ideologies of imperialism and development through industrialisation—and strengthened their hold among the working class’ (1980, pp. 206-207). At the time of rapid economic expansion, education was seen as necessary for the growth of the nation, and there was a very strong push by the Federal Government to manage the growing population, and to sustain ‘British’ heritage and the superiority of European Australians over the non-European settlers.

In examining the influence of contextual and historical factors, the period between 1901 and 1919, that is from Federation to the end of WWI, is important, where Australian institutions sought to adapt immigration and educational policies in response to demographic and economic changes. The gold fields and industrialisation saw mobilisation of the workforce and the rise of populations in major cities. The gold rush attracted an influx of so called ‘cheap Asian labour’, and there were three major problems attached to non-European immigration: a perceived threat to security from an Asian invasion; cheap Asian labour seen as a threat to standards of living; and the threat posed to creating and maintaining a homogenous, national ‘British’ character. As a consequence, the newly-formed Commonwealth Government and their counterparts in the states reacted to these changes with laws linked to citizenship. The first response to these perceived threats was to continue pre-existing immigration controls within each state, but at a national level, to impose the *Immigration Restriction Act* that aimed at controlling the ethnic make-up of the entire population. The second response to the demographic and economic changes was the expansion of compulsory education by the states, principally to support a growing workforce, but also to ensure good citizens. Added to these influences on citizenship policy were both international and local discourses.

Political projects, nation building projects gained momentum around the globe and were built on shared common ancestry, language and values and the control of resources. The early decades of the 20th century saw a continuation of nationalism and nation building projects around the world and ideologies pertaining to nationalism in which racial superiority was prevalent. Although Meaney contests this, arguing that it was not until the 1960s that Australia had nationalistic imperatives and that, ‘the history of nationalism in Australia was not one of thwarted Australianness but rather of thwarted Britishness’ (2001, p. 89). Even so, the early decades of the 20th century saw an explicit desire for a homogenous society made up of British subjects.

Education had been central for Empire, loyalty, and national development in addition to ensuring a homogenous culture. As has been previously established, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders



were not recognised as subjects or citizens, nor were they considered a threat to the new nation. Their access to education, work and society was in the hands of the states and regulated through state laws. In contrast, settlers had access to education and women were able to be part of the workforce and obtain an education in most states, although they too, did not have voting rights.

## **Citizenship: Pre and Post-WWII**

This section will explore how WWII brought into sharp focus questions of citizenship, the role of the nation state and assumptions of racial and cultural superiority. It will demonstrate that this time was to be a turning point in the way in which citizenship was conceived and how nation states acted towards their citizens. Interestingly, in Australia it would not be until the 1940s that official forms of citizenship emerged. It has been argued that prior to this time that the government and people of Australia had not sought to become an independent nation state, nor to suspend or alter ties with Great Britain (Warhurst, 1993, p. 105). The majority of people residing in Australia regarded themselves as British subjects; the notion of Australian nationality was yet to be considered.

Australia's ties to Britain throughout WWI and through to the 1930s were very strong. This was true even though in the early part of the 1930s when Britain passed the *Statute of Westminster*. This statute subsequently opened up the possibility of Australia's release from subordination to the United Kingdom and therefore provided the means to become an independent nation state. That is, to separate itself from the British Empire's 'white dominions', a term which included New Zealand, Canada, Newfoundland, and South Africa referring to the majority population being from European descent (Wellings, 2002). It was not until WWII that the *Westminster Adoption Act* was passed to enable the Australian Government of the day to control its own foreign policy making decisions in regard to action required to defend its shores from Japanese invasion (Barratt, 2015).

It is significant that notions of citizenship were given renewed focus in the aftermath of WWI. Internationally, an organisation called the *League of Nations* was formed in January 1920 with the main intention to promote peace and international cooperation. Although the main aim of this organisation was to foster international cooperation, its establishment created space for new considerations of citizenship and the citizenship education that was subsequently formulated included concepts such as antiracism, cosmopolitanism, and internationalism that were being debated (Lake, 1998; McLeod & Wright, 2013). Nevertheless, these concepts did not see their way

into international law because WWII disrupted the process and the League of Nations was abolished. These ideas then resurfaced with the creation of the United Nations in 1945.

Until the formation of the *League of Nations* young adults and children held an interesting position in the debates pertaining to citizenship in both formal and informal representations. Throughout history there are many examples of children taking roles and responsibilities alongside and in the place of adults and it is clear that children have been part of the labour force or considered a potential part of it. This has been argued by Professor of Social Policy Ruth Lister when she points out that a number of welfare states view children as a potential labour force and as 'units of investment' (2007a, p. 54). From the League of Nations, we see instructional principles detailing children's rights as citizens, the *Declaration of the Rights of Children*. Marshall suggests that the, 'devastation of the war gave a new credence to the child in distress as the symbol of the problem of social life; equality of all children in front of disasters' (1999, p. 145). The declaration was a call to nation states to take responsibility for the children in the aftermath of war.

From this point on, there were three significant changes to the position of children as citizens: children became connected to international relations; the interests of children moved from solely in the private domain of the family to the public domain; and at the end of the 19th century, the arrival of mass public education saw acceptance of children as 'human beings' who required protection. However, this was not extended to, the right to self-determination (Coady, 2009, pp. 4-5). Eventually, it came to pass that understandings of citizenship encompassed children as individual entities in the public domain. The League of Nations was also very much in favour of people being citizens of one nation state, 'it is in the interest of the international community that all members should recognise that every person should have a nationality and should have one nationality only' (League of Nations, 1937, p. 93). Dual citizenship/dual nationality was seen as problematic and a threat to security. However, after WWI, considerations of nationality and nationalism were to be challenged with the political ideologies of Fascism and Nazism that were underpinned by doctrines of national supremacy. Additionally, citizenship and belonging was also challenged with the number of stateless and displaced people impacted by the war.

After WWII, notions of citizenship were defined around changing social structures, including the mass movement of displaced people across borders, particularly asylum seekers and refugees. Through the will of the survivors and the allied powers there was a determination, 'as never before to resurrect a lasting universal ethics from the ashes of unprecedented destruction' (Ishay, 2008, p. 16). This expanded view of community came to be understood as human rights and more

officially through the development of the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* by the United Nations who replaced the League of Nations in 1945. In 1959 with publication of the United Nations' *Declaration of the Rights of the Child* (United Nations General Assembly, 1959) there was another shift in the notion of children as citizens. This declaration placed many demands on nation states including that, 'children [should] be seen as members of society too, with a legitimate and valuable voice and perspectives' (Roche, 1999, p. 479); Principle 3 The child shall be entitled from his birth to a name and a nationality. The proclamation also included the right of children to have an education ('Principle 7') that is 'free and compulsory' at least to the 'elementary' stage (UNGA, 1959). The framing of the child as a citizen included both the legal aspects, and traditional notions, of a citizen with rights to participate. The declaration also changed the conception of children in need of protection and created a condition for children's rights to be protected.

It was apparent that after the Second World War conceptions of citizenship were being re-examined and reformed as a response to the changing environment. A particularly influential citizenship theorist at this time was T.H. Marshall (1950) whose work focused on membership, participation and citizenship rights categorised as; social citizenship, political citizenship and civil citizenship. Marshall believed that education was a necessary building block for future citizens. His theory reflected the dominant thinking of the time and his essential 'Britishness'. Although his theory appears to be developed for England, it has a universal appeal as it was underpinned by the ideal of equality. According to Turner, Marshall's theoretical notions of citizenship provided 'an important departure point for any debate about contemporary complexities of the relationship between citizenship entitlements and the economic structure of capitalist society' (Turner, 1994, p. 200). Commenting on Marshall's views on membership, Kymlicka and Norman stress that Marshall's understanding of citizenship was about, 'ensuring that everyone is treated as a full and equal member of society', and that the, 'fullest expression of citizenship requires a liberal democratic welfare state' in which 'every member of society feels like a full member of society, able to participate in and enjoy the common life of society' (Kymlicka & Norman, 1994, p. 354). Marshall's theory assumes the necessity of state institutions to provide education and welfare as a part of social rights and that citizenship is reliant on the equality of its members.

Australia, like Britain, formed a welfare state in the post-war period. In analysing the impact and what meant for citizenship, Shaver observes that the welfare state, 'came to represent ideals of social citizenship in which all members of society were assured a minimum standard of well-being and their recognition as of equal worth and dignity' (2002, p. 39). Establishing and maintaining a

welfare state underscores a belief and desire for citizens to have to have access to equality in all aspects of life that has been a constant since Federation.

Although Marshall's work is renowned for its analysis of the inequalities inherent in conceptualisations of citizenship and has formed the basis for a model of citizenship that includes social rights, his work has been criticised as being class focused, Anglo centric and evolutionist (Isin & Turner, 2007; Mann, M., 1987). It is important to look at the debates among theorists of how internal diversity or immigration and ethnic diversity challenged conceptualisations of citizenship. It is against the backdrop of theoretical debates of citizenship that we can then understand the evolution of multiculturalism citizenship as a theory, an ideology, a practice, and a policy.

While ideas of citizenship differ, they also share several features: a depiction of collective political life; and, an emphasis on either civic responsibility through membership of the same political community (*ius soli*) or through kinship (*ius sanguinis*). What is significant is that these ideas of citizenship pertain to *what it is* to be a citizen and not to more deeply rooted questions as to *how to be* a citizen or *what it means* to be a good citizen or even to the conception of citizenship as legal status (Kymlicka & Norman, 1994). In other words, citizenship is construed as entitlements and legal protections offered to members of society under the law. When exploring theories of citizenship these vexing questions will be considered in the next chapter, for they are essential to revealing assumptions pertaining to views of citizenship in multicultural frameworks. Kymlicka and Norman stress that citizenship as legal status denotes, 'full membership in a particular political community' (1994, p. 353). To give further clarity to the notion of membership, Feinberg emphasises that membership does not necessarily imply shared identity, but rather involves connections through a shared fate, that is, 'being entangled with others in such a way that one's future is tied to theirs' (2003, p. 209).

Recognition is often sought as a key component of citizenship for culturally diverse populations and it is through Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben's perspective that we can see the legal implications of citizenship; not just for entitlements and rights, or for belonging in a political community, but for the importance of citizenship as a form of recognition. Nevertheless, there are conditions under which recognition can be offered and taken away. In Nikos Papastergiadis' essay on agency and the migrant, he quotes Agamben observing that:

Throughout the history of philosophy there is a consistent argument that humans realise their potential through the process of gaining representation within the law. In modern times, he argues, the sovereign has greater power to decide the conditions

upon which the law can be suspended, and thereby to exclude people from the right of being a subject under law. (Papastergiadis, 2009, p. 154)

Agamben's argument is that recognition has always gone along with the possibility of exclusion and inclusion or suspension of recognition. This concept remains constant and Agamben is widely cited because people see that the dynamic that he points to remains, and that these notions of citizenship and non-citizenship are problematic. As will be seen in the next chapter, this proposition also encompasses debates regarding recognition and belonging and the position of dual citizens. This much-debated area, has wide implications for constructions of citizenship in Australia during the second half of the 20th century and into the 21st century.<sup>7</sup>

### **The Immigration Policies of The 1940s**

As a result of WWII, many people were displaced and the numbers of economic migrants increased. Many nation states rallied to accommodate refugees and migrants, which required changes to immigration and citizenship policies. Australia was not alone in amending or redefining legislation and policies pertaining to citizenship and nationality. The Australian *Nationality and Citizenship Act* of 1948 represented a legislative move from subjects of the crown, to citizens of the state. This Act had the characteristics of both *jus sanguinis* and *jus soli*, however, one of the main conditions to gain citizenship was to have a relative who was already an Australian citizen. From this it is clear that notions of citizenship were at that time bounded by both notions of fraternity and kinship, which can be traced back to ancient Greece and to citizenship as legal status, which can be traced back to Rome.

The change was not predicated on any desire to separate from Britain, but was rather a part of the evolution of the Commonwealth, and the adoption of a position similar to Canada (Mann, J., 2012). The Canadian Government had passed the *Citizenship Act* in 1947 and Britain enacted the *British Nationality Act* in 1948 to be consistent with the changing policy environment in the colonies. Nevertheless, it was a significant time for Australia, for it marked the beginning of the immigrant story and what that came to mean for the sense of citizenship in Australia.

Before the *Nationality and Citizenship Act* became law, most settlers in Australia were British subjects with a British nationality. The new legislation did not receive unified support and the Minister for Immigration, Arthur Calwell, had to assure the opposition that the Act did not break

---

<sup>7</sup> See for instance Castles, *et al.* (2013, pp. 115-121) and Faist (2012).

ties to the 'mother-country,' stating: 'under this bill nationality has been placed in the forefront...it is a bill relating first, to British nationality and, secondly, to Australian citizenship' (cited in Mann, J., 2012, p. 306). This was also true of most people of British ancestry residing in all British colonies. According to J. Mann, this identification 'as a British people' extended to both Canada and Australia until the 1960s. This identification was a clear delineation of who was to be included and who was to be excluded (2012, p. 294).

Not all those who came to Australia after WWII were self-selecting or economic migrants. The war resulted in vast numbers of displaced people in Europe. In 1951, with six other countries Menzies, the then Prime Minister and founder of the Liberal Party of Australia, agreed to the 1951 United Nations *Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees* that came into effect in 1954 (Maley, 2002, p. 37). However, as the former advisor to the Department of Immigration and Citizenship David Palmer contends, the agreement was made with very little public or cabinet debate. The delay in enforcement was due to the Department of Immigration's, 'desire to make absolutely certain that the Convention would have minimal impact on its policy freedom' (Palmer, 2009, p. 297). The implication being that government policies, such as the White Australia Policy, citizenship practices and settlement and work policies may be at odds with the requirement of the Convention. Australia was able to impose limitations including 'geographical limitations' (Palmer, 2009, p. 300). Moreover, the displaced persons from European camps were 'recruited essentially because they were a convenient source of labour' whereas, Asian refugees from the Pacific War who had been provided protection were repatriated at the war's end (York, 2003, p. 2). Therefore, the extent to which Australia responded to the humanitarian crisis was bound by the need for labour whilst upholding the principle of racial exclusion and discrimination against those thought to be unworthy of membership. Membership and access to Australian citizenship was still limited and a stark example of this was the treatment of Aboriginal Australians.

Aboriginal Australians who had not been granted citizenship were provided for under a 'protection' policy. The view that the indigenous population of Australia would eventually die out remained constant for over a century. The protection policy ostensibly was in place to help stop the declining numbers, but was seen as a paternalistic policy (Rowse, 1998). This was so even after the drawing up the Australian Constitution in 1901, in which scant regard was given to the Aboriginal people (Attwood & Markus, 1997). In addition, the *Nationality and Citizenship Act* also failed to grant full citizenship rights to Aboriginal Australians. Racist and discriminatory practices continued. Emigrants from the British Isles were desired and given preferential treatment. British

and European immigrants were eligible to vote on arrival and to apply for residency after two years, whereas, non-European immigrants had to wait until 1956 for the right to apply for residency and this was conditional on having lived in Australia for 15 years (Davies, A., 1997). Aboriginal Australians were given only limited self-management until 1967, at which time a decree by an amendment to the Constitution changed the Commonwealth Government's involvement in legislation concerning Aboriginal Australians (Armitage, 1995). Concepts of citizenship for a hegemonic community were still worth pursuing by policy makers and yet there was a prevailing belief that people could just conform or transform and adopt the dominant culture.

By the 1960s, there was a version of a protection policy in most states. Victoria established the *Aboriginal Protection Act* of 1869, in which all aspects of Aboriginal lives were regulated, however, Aboriginal Australians were not included in either the census or on any electoral role (Armitage, 1995). In most states and territories the original inhabitants did not hold any form of citizenship or subject status, as Beaumont attests, 'the Aboriginal population, in particular, deemed under social Darwinist theories to be doomed to extinction, were disbarred from receiving most rights accorded to other Australians' (2007, p. 172). Ahluwalia supports this argument adding that, 'settler colonies were forged out of the very idea of the elimination of the indigenous population... [and that] the diminished significance of the indigenous population is indicated by the importance of the question of when a settler becomes native' (2001, p. 65). If viewed through this lens, the *Citizenship Act* was one of many actions that characterise what it was to be an Australian citizen. Just how the Aboriginal populations viewed their sense of citizenship and belonging remains unclear in mainstream academic writing.

It is important to note here that the states and territories held full responsibility for Aboriginal affairs making it possible for individual Aboriginal people to attain citizenship rights through state legislation. An example of this is the Aboriginal artist Albert Namatijira, who was able to demonstrate to the Department of Territories that he 'could live independently, that is, as a full participant in the settler economy' (Wells & Christie, 2000, p. 117). If an Aboriginal person could demonstrate the ability to assimilate, potentially they could gain citizenship rights. Namatijira's story not only serves as an example of discriminatory practices in civil rights, later in life his actions as a citizen would expose deeper discriminatory and racist treatment of Aboriginal Australians entrenched in the legislation of the day, such as the forced removal of children.<sup>8</sup> Although this is an example of the beliefs of what was required to belong and to participate as an Australian citizen

---

<sup>8</sup> For more detailed analysis on the Stolen Generation see Wilson (1997).

at that time, this also extended to the treatments of new migrants as will be explored in the following section.

The post-war period was a time when there was an expansion of capitalist notions of what it meant to be an Australian. The period from 1948 to 1960 saw many changes in Australia, both to economic ideologies, labour movements and demographic shifts. There was a growth in multinational companies as well as welfare capitalism and technology, coupled with mass migration caused by WWII, and the re-alignment of borders in Europe. The growth in industrialisation saw a greater demand for unskilled labour and a substantial growth in the middle-classes. It was also a period in which women in urban centres moved from the workforce into roles in the home, such as child rearing and domestic duties. At the same time, the Australian Department of Interior reported on the need for considerable growth in the population due to the vast unprotected coastline and the relatively small population. Although the phrase, 'populate or perish' was coined in 1937, it made a reappearance in the late 1940s. However, this time the Australian Government found it had to look for an alternative source of immigrants to those from the British Isles. Even though, British emigrants were offered assisted passage and immigration numbers still needed to be boosted by offering places to eastern Europeans emigrants.

Through the formation of the United Nations (UN) in the 1940s and the UN *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* of 1948 we can see the germination of new thinking on the treatment of people including children. Even though debates about children's rights and citizenship are predominantly anchored in law, however, subfields include legal status, medical interventions, the relevance of age and status in regard to agency, age of voting rights and engagement in employment. These are all areas in which children had been treated differently to adult citizens in most societies.<sup>9</sup> With the notion of children's citizenship rights, participation and access to membership steadily widened over time. By 1989 the *United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child* expanded the position of children as citizens to incorporate areas where children had previously been denied a voice including: encouraging and supporting children to participate alongside adults in planning, developing and evaluating their world; the right to express their views on all matters affecting them and for their views to be taken seriously (Article 12) and the right to freedom of expression, including freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds through any media they chose (Article 13) (United Nations General Assembly, 1990).

---

<sup>9</sup> For a thorough coverage of the debates see Archard and Macleod (2002).

Jayne Lysk. *Notions of Citizenship Revealed Through Multicultural Education Policies in Australia*



In the 1940s, racial discrimination—publicly and privately—had been relatively uncontroversial. However, with the displacement of so many people during WWII and the horrific atrocities perpetrated on Jews, prior conceptualisations of race, racism and racial superiority were being questioned. Even though Australia was a signatory to various conventions of the United Nations these had little impact on internal policies of the Menzies Government. However, by the 1950s, changes were occurring including the *Migration Act* 1958, the Colombo Plan, and the removal of the dictation test. These changes along with forces at work both internationally and domestically would influence still greater changes in the 1960s and 1970s, including the beginnings of the ‘New Left’ movement.

By the mid-1960s, in the era of a rise in the ‘New Left’ and with anti-racism a part of everyday political discourse, settlement policies such as the assimilation settlement policy began to die away (Lopez, 2000). As has previously discussed, most models and forms of citizenship transformed throughout history from embodying forms of exclusion, to having facets of inclusion. Nonetheless, most nation states prior to WWII were relatively homogenous and global travel was limited. The next section explores how theories and conceptualisations of citizenship transformed with the changing nature of travel, immigration, the expanding global economy, and world-wide events.

## **Citizenship for Diverse Societies**

Citizenship education in Australia was based on historical suppositions of nation-building connected to forging an Australian national identity with a colonial culture and a strong connection to the ‘home’ country, Great Britain (Chesterman & Galligan, 1997). At the turn of the 20th century, conceptualisations of citizenship education in Australia had largely replicated practices and understandings inherited from Great Britain. The internal realities, including Aboriginals or any other ethnic group, had little or no influence on mainstream political culture.

The period from the 1950s to the 1970s saw an expansion in capitalism in many parts of the developed world. In Australia, this took the form of welfare capitalism. That is, the state had a raft of policies to guard against poverty and inequity for working families. This was also a time of growth in new-technologies and multinational companies where the United States of America emerged as, ‘the main source of international investment, as well as the defender of boundaries’ (Connell & Irving, 1980, p. 292). Prior to this period most working age men had been involved in the war effort and many women moved into the jobs previously reserved for men. As women moved back into child rearing roles, the need for a supply of unskilled labourers increased to feed

the expanding industrial workforce. Australian society underwent some subtle changes, including a change in public opinion regarding immigration and immigrants. Three factors can be attributed to this shift; firstly, the 1950s and 1960s saw a growth in the middle-classes and the number of educated professionals (Viviani, 1992, p. 2). Secondly, to reach immigration targets, people from northern and Western Europe were encouraged to migrate, as the once steady stream of British immigrants could no longer be relied upon as the economic fortunes in the UK improved through growing connections to the European Union (EU). Finally, with the introduction of the Colombo Plan in the 1950s, people had become more accustomed to other cultures and Asian faces had become a more familiar sight in the universities and business sectors (Albinski, 1977, p. 20). However, in regards to immigration policies and citizenship issues, elements of discrimination were still clearly evident.

In 1957, an official campaign by the Minister for the Territories, Sir Paul Hasluck, ran to educate the public on the vision for absorption. As Hasluck stated in the *Policy of Assimilation*:

The imagined construct of the modern Aboriginal family living the Australian way of life in the suburbs of the nation's cities and towns was central to the publications. This was an image that appealed to white audiences' own desire for a comfortable suburban life and to the popular altruism circulating in the post-war period. (Hasluck, 1961, p. 1)

By 1961, assimilation became a public policy; a policy intended to blend in the original inhabitants of Australia seamlessly into mainstream white society. Initially this policy specifically targeted the Aboriginal people of Australia, but later it came to include new settlers. The meaning and intent are made clear on the first page of *The Assimilation Policy 1961* as when Hasluck states:

The policy of assimilation means in the view of all Australian governments that all aborigines and part-aborigines are expected eventually to attain the same manner of living as other Australians and to live as members of a single Australian community enjoying the same rights and privileges, accepting the responsibilities, observing the same customs and influenced by the same beliefs, hopes and loyalties as other Australians. (Hasluck, 1961, p. 1)

The policy of cultural and social incorporation of Indigenous people at this time has been interpreted in two ways. On one side, it is argued that the policy played a role of governance, not genocide; whilst the opposite has also been canvassed. Either way, the enactment of the

Assimilation Policy was a culmination of previous policies, a way of addressing perceived social problems and an assertion of the changing notion of Australian citizenship.

With the passing of the *Migrant Act* (1958), changes were introduced, such as removal of the dictation test and provisions for the Colombo Plan were implemented. The Colombo Plan was, according to the then Minister for External Affairs Sir Percy Spender, a proposal to change social attitudes by inviting sponsored students from Asia and the Pacific to study at Australian universities. Interestingly, the motives put forward by Spender have been questioned. Auletta argues:

The establishment of the Colombo Plan had more to do with the containment of communism and the countering of criticism of racist policies in Australia, and the development of trade and future markets in the region, than any of its publicly avowed aims....The “changing of social attitudes” that Spender referred to may have been a product of other shifts in Australian society. It cannot be said that the Colombo Plan was established and developed with this end in mind. (2000, p. 57)

In a country that was geographically isolated and maintained a White Australia Policy, which affected relationships within the Asian region, the Colombo Plan paved the way for advancement of economic, political and cultural engagement which was essential to Australian security (Oakman, 2000).

By the 1960s, internal and international pressure mounted for Australia to abandon the racially discriminatory policy. For example, in Melbourne an immigration reform group rallied, published and distributed a pamphlet entitled ‘Control or Colour Bar?’ (Rivett, 1962). The main aim of the reformers was to restructure racist immigration policies. However, according to Senior Lecturer in Politics and Philosophy, Gwenda Tavan, the reform movement achieved more than this. She asserts that:

... by opposing the White Australia Policy, it helped popularise what many today have come to see as the central defining values of 'modern Australia': opposition to racial discrimination; a more pluralistic and inclusive definition of national identity; a more open and internationalist view of Australia's place in the world. (2001, p. 200)

The International pressure came from various Asian countries such as Malaysia and Japan. One of the most politically damaging and embarrassing cases happened in 1966 with the refusal of permanent residency to a well-qualified Filipino. The Aurolio Locsin case resulted in a ‘blanket condemnation of racial discrimination’ by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights

(Tavan, 2005, p. 153). The Colombo Plan, combined with the local or international disgruntlement with Australia's racist immigration policies, may have all contributed to the immigration reforms that would later eventuate.

This chapter provides an analysis of foundational texts and previous and current debates on citizenship. As this study's focus is to illuminate notions of citizenship revealed through multicultural education policies, it is important to first establish the origins of citizenship. It is by tracing historic threads and transformations and revealing past conceptualisations that have been forged and practised that we are able to understand the current notions of citizenship revealed in public policies in Australia. It is also important to understand the trajectory of thinking and practices of citizenship that have shaped our present conceptions. As concepts of citizenship are built over time and have changed with shifts in society, we can see the evolution of ideas and ideals and an evolving agenda. As citizenship has long been associated with empire, state or nation building, its context is highly important. Present day definitions of citizenship show a strong connection between nation building and the citizenship.

In this chapter, it has been clearly demonstrated that the antecedents of citizenship models and notions are present in modern day conceptualisations of citizenship in Australia. Through the exploration of citizenship practices and notions in Australia from Federation in 1901 through until the 1960s through legislation and advocacy, documenting reactions to cultural diversity, and highlighting ways of belonging and the vision proposed for Australian citizenry. During this period, it became evident that Australia was in the midst of a nation building project with public institutions adapting immigration and settlement policies to accommodate the nation building project whilst maintaining a cohesive society. With the changing demographics, educational policies remained geared toward growing and expanding the workforce, and citizenship education transitioned from imparting a British identity to that of an Australian identity coinciding with the move from British subject to Australian citizenship, nevertheless the English language maintaining strength and value. What was also significant in this period was that not all people had the same entitlements or the same rights or access to ways of belonging. During this period, the Aboriginal and Torres Straits Islander people experienced citizenship as something that would have to be earned by conforming to preconceived norms set by the population that derived from British descent, not dissimilar to the conditions set down for newly arrived migrants. Therefore, concepts of citizenships have developed but carry the old ideas within new notions of citizenship. These

notions are implicit and rarely critiqued, regardless of the many shifts and different stages documented in this chapter.

## Chapter 3: Immigration and Citizenship Policy in the National and International Contexts – Influences and Policies

*... the nation is a goal rather than an actuality. Put simply, nations are not creatures of 'God's hand', as post-Herder prophets of nationalism often claimed: instead they are synthetic—they have to be created in a complicated educational process.*

(Alter, 1989, p. 21)

This chapter will continue to expand our understanding of how and why public policies have formed and changed in response to immigration from 1960 onwards. It will also contextualise major shifts and developments in notions of citizenship, and focus on changes to education policy. Thus continuing to provide the background required to explicate what past and present settlement policies reveal about assumptions of cultural diversity and notions of citizenship in the investigation of the ideologies and values that characterise the newly evolving multicultural policies for the Australian nation. This will be achieved by describing change and investigating why change occurred – the discussion is illustrative rather than exhaustive. This chapter will explicate what has led to current understandings of multiculturalism as these have been communicated through public and educational policies. To guide the exploration and understandings of the shifts and changes throughout this period, the following questions are posed: (1) How did Australian institutions seek to adapt immigration and educational policies in response to demographics and economic changes over time? (2) What were the international or internal discourses that influenced policies in the national arena? (3) How did national immigration and social policies influence the way in which education policies were conceptualised for a diverse society?

### A Changing Nation (1960-1980): Immigration and Settlement Policies

Setting the context and background is important for a number of reasons. As Australia and Australian society has its own distinctive social, political and educational history, it is essential to see the present society in the light of past development. To understand the sequence of historical events in relation to organisations, institutions and individuals, I outlined a number of major socio-political events and significant internal incidents or events that contributed to changes and shifts in policies and legislation over time.

During the two decades from 1960 to 1980, Australian society underwent some dramatic changes, including rapid population growth with just over 10 million people at the beginning of the 1960s to

Jayne Lysk. *Notions of Citizenship Revealed Through Multicultural Education Policies in Australia*

just over 15 million by 1980 (ABS, 2016). As the population grew so did its diversity, and with this brought a change in public opinion in regard to immigration and immigrants. There are a number of factors can be attributed to this shift including: the growth in the middle-classes and an increasing numbers of educated professionals which started in the 1950s and continued throughout the 1960s with (Viviani, 1992, p. 2). Another factor was that migrants from northern and Western Europe were encouraged to migrate to reach immigration targets. These new migrants replaced the Britain immigrants whose numbers diminished as the economic fortunes in the UK improved through growing connections to the European Economic Community (EEC). There was also an expansion of capitalistic economics with a growth in multinational companies and industrialisation with international investment residing in America rather than in Britain. However, Australia had in place a closed-door policy that applied to trade as well as to migration. This policy included a protectionist tariff system overseen by the long serving Menzies' liberal government appropriated with the desire to insulate the economy from global competition. With Britain's turn toward the EEC, Australian was forced to reassess this policy and to look closer to home for business. This eventuated in expanding trade with Japan and the Pacific region, including the United States (Lopez, 2000).

Globally these two decades were a time of mass migration partly due to the Cold War (1947 -1991) and the Vietnamese War or as the Vietnamese describe it, the 'American War' (1955-1975), and the civil rights movements in the United States and the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa and Rhodesia [Zimbabwe] (Lopez, 2000). These movements had a ripple on effect in Australia and other countries, and so in combination, all of these factors impacted on notions of citizenship and participation. As Jakubowicz observes of this time:

Young Australians became increasingly aware of the issues of race in South Africa, a process that also forced them to reflect on the parallels between South Africa's treatment of its indigenous peoples and the experience of Aboriginal peoples under white Australian rule. (2010, p. 6)

This time also gave rise to the 'New Left', a movement that sprang from university students' dissatisfaction with old leftist ideologies and centre and rightist ideas and practices. The New Left focused on issues such as racism, feminism, war and nuclear power as well as ecological and environmental issues (Farrell, 1982). The New Left heralded in a growing awareness of issues around equity, equality and the interconnectedness of the planet and penetrated both public policies and education.

In regard to equality, race relations and citizenship entitlements, the Australian government also reacted to the call. Evidence of this was witnessed in a significant referendum in 1967 described by Pitty as an ‘attempt to create a constitutional basis that could facilitate efforts towards equalising substantial citizenship by giving the Federal Government authority to create special laws for Aboriginals when needed by them’ (2009, p. 33). This successful referendum has popularly been associated with indigenous people gaining equal citizenship rights and the abolition of targeted discriminatory laws. It has been argued by Attwood that one of the main reasons for this change was to redress the acute disadvantage experienced by Indigenous Australians and that the referendum was, ‘a call for a political program that has arguably never been implemented’ (2007, p. viii). The referendum has been viewed as a catalyst for change, a case for civil and citizenship rights, and importantly when considering notions of citizenship, from this time onwards that Aboriginal population numbers were also included in the census (Jayaraman, 2000, p. 143).

Throughout the last century, the indigenous people of Australia have attempted to influence decisions over public policy and legislation especially concerning belonging and entitlements. One such plea was by the Larrakia people’s call for a treaty.<sup>10</sup> Likewise, the establishment of an Aboriginal tent embassy in the nation’s capital Canberra is another case in point. This establishment of the tent embassy Foley *et al.* explained:

In protest to assimilation policies and the failure of the government of the day to recognise aboriginal land rights aboriginal activists established the aboriginal embassy making the standpoint that they were treated as ‘aliens in their own land. (2014, p. 1)

Another example was the formation of the Federal Council for the Advancement of Aborigines and Torres Strait Islanders, it took six years for the Australian Government to recognise the request from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders before the council was established in 1964. This marked a shift in relations and recognition as it differed from previous actions regarding Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, whose welfare had previously been left in state control. Areas such as this highlight how social inclusion and exclusion has become manifest and the forms of recognition that have been deemed appropriate in notions of citizenship in Australia.

During the 1960s and into the 1970s there were many changes to the way in which society was organised that impacted on how citizenship continued to be conceptualised and practised. One

---

<sup>10</sup> In 1972, the Larrakia people camped in front of Government House in Darwin at the time of a scheduled visit from Princess Margaret they wanted the Princess to pass on a treaty or petition with over 1000 signatures and inked thumbprints to her sister Queen Elizabeth as part of their land rights struggle. For more information see for example O’Brien (2014, pp. 357-376).



noteworthy change to society's organisation was a consequence of the Australian Government being a signatory nation to the *United Nations Refugee Convention*, cooperating with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). By signing this convention, Australia was committed to accepting migrants and refugees from around the world. Therefore, Australian settlement policies designed to aid new migrants merge in to the community moved from an assimilationist approach to an integrationist approach, although Australia's discriminatory immigration laws were still in place. Changes to settlement policies were not welcomed by all, with some parliamentarians fearing a public backlash to the loosening of immigration restrictions. It was clear that the government of the day was under pressure to do more on the migration front and to adjust citizenship laws accordingly. This process of defining their own citizenry had already begun in other dependent Commonwealth nations such as Canada and India.

There was much criticism against government discriminatory immigration policies in the early 1960s, both internally and externally. International pressure was mounting from sources such as a very dissatisfied United Nation Commission of Human Rights after a series of politically damaging incidents that highlighted that Australia was still actively enforcing racially discriminatory aspects of its immigration policies (Tavan, 2005, p. 153). The view that Australian policies were out of line with the need for citizens to be treated fairly regardless of ethnicity was very strongly supported in many nations across the globe (Castles, 1987). Public policies that reflected a very different way of managing cultural diversity began to emerge. In 1971 Canada was the first country in the world to adopt, in an official sense, its own version of multiculturalism. It did not take long for the Australian Government to follow. Under the leadership of Prime Minister Gough Whitlam, the Labor Government eliminated the last vestiges of the White Australia Policy and passed the 1973 *Australian Citizenship Bill*.

The newly-elected Labor Government did not have the same emotional attachment to Britain, and passed the *Australian Citizenship Act 1973*, allowing for a three-year naturalisation process for all, regardless of place of origin. All rules pertaining to race were removed from the immigration process. The national anthem also changed from 'God Save the Queen' to 'Advance Australia Fair'; and introduced national honours that steered Australia in a more nationalistic direction (Warhurst, 1993). The Labor Government's vision for Australia also included recognising and acting on disadvantage at many levels of society including migrant disadvantage.

The Australian Government's perspective to a culturally diverse society was rapidly changing. By the mid-1970s, the subsequent Fraser Liberal-Country Party (1975-1983) government together with

bipartisan support, made a strong statement on the future direction of the character and composition of the Australian population with a multicultural immigration policy. I have included this extended quote from Malcolm Fraser taken from an inaugural address at the Institute of Multicultural Affairs in 1981, because it not only outlined the reported achievements of multiculturalism but also emphasised the intentions behind the public policy:

I believe it is no coincidence that the strengthening commitment to Australian multiculturalism has accompanied the expansion of our foreign policy perspectives and ties with many new nations. It is in part because we have reconsidered our own society that we have been willing and able to make a distinctive international contribution to the struggle against racism, to the defence of human rights, and to the needs and aspirations of the Third World. These have earned us recognition and support amongst nations with whom we once believed we had little in common, and who viewed us with more than a touch of suspicion. If empathy and respect for each other's basic values and concerns are the heart of multiculturalism, their growing prominence has had a deep impact on our affairs abroad. (Fraser, M., 1981, p. 5)

To bolster the multicultural immigration policy two extremely influential and unique pieces of legislation were enacted to counter racial discrimination: *the Racial Discrimination Act 1975*, and the *Anti-Discrimination Act 1977* (Soutphommasane, 2015). Although laws in themselves cannot eradicate racism, they send a message as to what it is to be a 'good' citizen. This reveals a changing attitude towards how one was to enact citizenship in an ethnically diverse society.

## **Multicultural Theory**

It is necessary to explore the theories and debates around multiculturalism to explicate the assumptions about cultural diversity and notions of citizenship contained in a multicultural settlement policy. Therefore, the following section has been included in order to contextualise and deepen our understanding of what it means to have a multicultural public policy.

Multicultural theory has evolved since the 1950s, as an ideology, practice, policy and program that builds on a political framework of inclusion practised by liberal democratic nation states. These states are largely post-colonial or 'settler' societies, made up of majority and minority ethnic groups. According to a prominent American sociologist, C.W. Mills, multiculturalism is:

...basically a post-second World War phenomenon a result of the confluence of several major historical developments: the (partial) discrediting of racism and the concept of race itself by the Holocaust, global ant-colonial struggle and eventual success of decolonization, the civil rights movement of black Americans and

Jayne Lysk. *Notions of Citizenship Revealed Through Multicultural Education Policies in Australia*

Indigenous peoples in former white settler states, and mass labour migrations of the last few decades from 'south' to 'north.' (2007, p. 90)

British sociologist, Tariq Modood, reminds us that 'multiculturalism is not an abstract ideology but is grounded in specific set socio-political realities and is developed out of a broadly accepted framework of norms, policies, especially among Anglophone and some western European' (2013, p. 113). Anderson defined multiculturalism as, 'an officially endorsed set of principles designed to manage ethnic diversity' (1993, p. 93). Fleras described multiculturalism as, 'a set of normative ideas for balancing out minority rights with national interests and the public good' (2009, p. 5). It is clear then, that any understanding of multicultural theories must necessarily take into account the converging ideas of the time and the historical and cultural contexts that frame them. Any understanding of multiculturalism must encompass concepts of culture, identity, immigration, citizenship, nationalism and ethnicity.

Multicultural theories can tell us about the way in which political communities might respond to, or describe the religious, linguistic and cultural diversity of its citizens and future citizens. The breadth and depth of literature pertaining to multicultural theory are vast and is grounded in political philosophy, anthropology and sociology. Multicultural governance frameworks also provide a way of understanding the broad spectrum of multicultural theories, principles and related paradigms. Canadian sociologist Augie Fleras (2009) whose work is predominantly focused on multicultural governance, asserts that multicultural theory has six distinct levels of meaning. That is, multiculturalism be understood as: (1) an *empirical fact*; (2) a *counter hegemony*; (3) an *ideology*; (4) a *policy*; (5) a *program*; and (6) as a *practice*.

Multiculturalism as empirical fact, or 'demographic multiculturalism', is a definition of reality that recognises the patterns of immigration. Immigration has historically, and increasingly in the last 100 years had a worldwide impact on communities and societies; and we now live in a demographically diverse world. The extent of this diversity, how it is classified or acknowledged, can vary depending on whether the term multiculturalism is used as an adjective for purely descriptive purposes, or as a normative response. For instance, Australia is demographically multicultural, and there is an acknowledgement of the diversity of ethnic populations. As Jayasuriya points out, ethnic populations are referred to in numerical terms thereby diversity is acknowledged rather than valued. This suggests a, 'persistence of Anglo-conformist thinking', that emphasises culture practices and sees culture as bounded, therefore leaving the concept of culture unquestioned (Jayasuriya, 1977, p. 55).

Multiculturalism and multicultural theory are furthermore grounded in theories of recognition. Debates are revolving around issues of identity and identity politics. These debates need to be framed against wider debates about recognition: such as who is recognised as an individual, and how this is managed in a society with majority cultures with traditionally structured institutions. Recognition, predominantly viewed through the lens of identity, can also be viewed through the lens of status, access to society and participation. One of the most influential theorists on the politics of recognition—Charles Taylor—points to the psychological impact on identity in his essay, *The Politics of Recognition*:

...that our identity is partly shaped by recognition or its absence, often by the misrecognition of others, and so a person or group of people can suffer real damage, real distortion, if the people or society around them mirror back to them a confining or demeaning or contemptible picture of themselves. Nonrecognition or misrecognition can inflict harm, can be a form of oppression, imprisoning someone in a false, distorted, and reduced mode of being. (1994, p. 25)

In the context of multiculturalism, recognition according to Taylor is important not just for individuals but also in relation to recognition of group cultures and that this is a ‘vital human need’ (1994, p. 26).

Fraser considers recognition through the lens of justice and equality that questions if institutional structures favour some groups, disadvantage others, and can be systematically changed. They argue that to be misrecognized:

... is to be denied the status of a full partner in social interaction and prevented from participating as a peer in social life as a consequence of institutionalized patterns of cultural value that constitute one as comparatively unworthy of respect or esteem. (2000, pp. 113-114)

This debate is central to multiculturalism as well as to citizenship as it challenges group-differentiated rights in contrast to individual rights and asks which groups or individuals enjoy recognition. Prominent multicultural theorist James Tully also takes up this debate and, after assessing the disputes around recognition, highlights that recognition also involves struggles within power relations stating:

...if looked at schematically, a struggle for recognition is standardly both a challenge to prevailing rule or norm of intersubjective recognition and demand for another rule or norm of recognition by a group (or groups) of citizens against those who oppose

the proposed change and defend the status-quo or advance a change (or changes) of their own. (Tully, 2000, p. 470)

The literature reveals that similar themes and questions underpin multiculturalism and citizenship. As with notions of citizenship rights, the concept of multi-ethnic rights and membership is contested. Questions include: how people are to coexist when state expectations of assimilation and integration are removed and how diverse groups and individuals attain equitable cultural membership, recognition and inclusion. Multicultural theories attempt to address these questions of accommodation and recognition of cultural or minority groups within a dominant or majority culture. These theories propose how to best address disadvantage or inequalities that can result from a culturally diverse society, whilst for the most part, remaining within the bounds of liberalist theories. Conceptualisation of how multiculturalism can respond to ethnically diverse societies continue to be contested, and within liberal multicultural theories there are two main responses recur throughout the literature such as to view everyone as equal before the law, or to frame inclusion and equality by privileging difference (Fleras, 2009, p. 3).

Liberalism is a theory about individual rights. It is positioned against state regulated conformity. As a liberal concept, multiculturalism can embody the relationship between people with diverse ethnic backgrounds that includes mutual understanding and tolerance within a context of unity and diversity (Rizvi, 1985, p. 9). Multicultural theory is a 'collective' theory or a theory about individuals' rights to belong to ancestral identity groups. However, there is no overarching agreement in the way in which multiculturalism is seen as an extension of, or as an integral part within liberal theories. On one side of the argument, liberalists argue that multiculturalism risks cutting at the heart of liberalism, Weinstock sums up the arguments by stating:

...by granting groups power to organize their internal affairs as they see fit, power would in effect be vested in the most powerful elites within these groups to lord it over their members without the kinds of constitutional constraints and dispersals of power that are part and parcel of the organization of liberal states. (2007, p. 246)

This argument opposes any form of group privilege over individual rights and asserts that if privileges are granted to groups rather than individuals this will challenge the perceived equality of impact of the law and other forms of governance. This position is held by many theorists that support a form of 'weak' multiculturalism.

Parekh's (2002) work examines the way in which multiculturalism challenges the political structure in liberal nation states and questions what is needed to ensure a shift from the hegemonic tendencies found in institutionally sanctioned assimilationist models. He critiques three political models for managing cultural diversity; the proceduralist model, the civic assimilationist model and a third that Parekh terms the 'Millet Model.'<sup>11</sup> The 'proceduralist' political structure for a multicultural society has origins that date back to the political philosophy of Thomas Hobbes (Parekh, 2002, p. 199). However this has been restated with modifications by other scholars such as Nozick (1974), Kukathas (1992), and Oakeshott (1962) offering open recognition for claims of cultural diversity. The proceduralist model positions the state as having a minimal role in setting limits of conduct and regulation around moral and cultural differences, with citizens having the freedom to choose the life they want to lead. Nevertheless, it is viewed as problematic because, it is based on the assumption that however 'different their conceptions of the good life might be, all citizens can readily agree on what structure of public authority is most likely to achieve peace' (Parekh, 2002, p. 201). The second model, the Civic Assimilation Model, like the procedural model, respects claims of cultural diversity; however, these are limited to the private domain. In the public sphere, there is an expectation of a shared political culture. Although the Civic Assimilation Model appears to be conceptually different to the procedural model, Parekh suggests that both of these models:

... view diversity as a fact to be accommodated rather than as values to be cherished and leave it to the precarious mercy of the cultural and political market place, they also work to the disadvantage of minority cultures and do not create a climate conducive to cultural diversity. (2002, p. 206)

Both models are similar in that they privilege the status quo, as they do not offer the possibility of co-constructing the regulations and values of society

The Millet Model critiqued by Parekh (2002) requires loyalty to both the state and to the community, thereby making no accommodation for cultural diversity. Each community should self-regulate, and the state supports each separate cultural community. Whilst acknowledging there are some merits to this structure, Parekh stresses that there can be negative consequences of separate communities in that, 'it militates against the development of common social and political bonds without which no political community can act effectively and maintain its unity and

---

<sup>11</sup> This model is also referred to as the Ottoman Millet system by other scholars. See Kumar and Van Hillegersberg (2000, pp. 23-26).

cohesion' (2002, p. 205). This treatment by Parekh is useful in setting out the socio-political and legal framework for a multicultural citizenship analysis, but it is not the only scheme.

Another influential multicultural theorist and Professor of Philosophy, Will Kymlicka, finds some political responses to multiculturalism problematic. Kymlicka (1995) contends that cultural groups have to be differentiated and the support given should be varied in response to their circumstances. Kymlicka argues that unlike the 'majority culture', minority cultures are vulnerable to the decisions of the majority, and therefore, those cultural groups that have emigrated and resettled should have 'polyethnic rights' or group rights. In contrast, national minority groups such as the indigenous people of colonised nations should have self-governing rights. This way of distinguishing cultural or minority groups from the dominant group does not diminish from the main premise of Kymlicka's argument, that no minority group should be discriminated against and that minority groups should be able to maintain 'certain aspects of their culture' (1995, p. 11). The Kymlicka theorisations of multiculturalism include the support of specialised rights and the importance of these rights to the growth of an equal and socially just society.

Multiculturalism predominantly refers to the acceptance or tolerance of different cultures within a single socio-political and legal community. However, as seen above, there are contrasting debates over what it actually means to tolerate both in practice and in theory. For example, as Barbara Pasamonk points out, if we define tolerance as a virtue for peaceful co-existence, 'we are tolerant only when two conditions are fulfilled; first, we do not approve of some views or behaviours, and second, we are able to counteract our disapproval' (2004, p. 206). This then raises questions around the implications of tolerance for different groups within a society. For example, what range of tolerance is required for peaceful and respectful coexistence? Does to tolerate mean that there would have to be an unequal citizenship? According to Forst, toleration is a word that: 'signifies a peaceful way of social life in difference, while for others it stands for relations of domination and repression...because toleration is not an independent value' (2007, pp. 292, & 293).

In different ways, theorists, as the literature suggests, have been attempting to comprehend the dynamics of multiculturalism in unified political systems. The implication is that one group of society tolerates another. However, in a multicultural society Galeotti asserts that it, 'makes more sense to talk of majorities tolerating minorities than of the reverse' (2002). Modood (2013, p. 70) furthers this by questioning what the limits of this tolerance are and, 'how could discrepant minority practices be tolerated if they go against the established (and accepted) values of the

public sphere'. Intolerance can come in the form of racism; therefore, a critique of multiculturalism is crucial to any exercise in the deconstruction of racism. Here the term racism is influenced by the understanding posed by Francisco Bethencourt in his study *Racisms: From the Crusades to the Twentieth Century*:

The nouns racist and racism were created as recently as the 1890s and 1900s in order to designate those promoting racial theory along with a hierarchy of races. The division of humankind into groups of descent that supposedly shared the same physical and mental features was narrowed to fit specific political contexts. These groups were placed in a relation of superiority or inferiority. (2014, p. 6)

This notion was exemplified in the Darwinian notions noted previously in this thesis.

In relation to Australia, a prolific scholar in multicultural education, Mary Kalantzis begins by asking some important questions: 'What is Australian society like? What could it be like? Given Australia's history, the response to these questions, both in terms of analysis and possible intervention, implicates the issue of racism' (2013, p. 90). Notwithstanding, there is general agreement within the literature that tolerance, is a preferable option than its opposite, intolerance.

As we have seen, limitations and criticisms of multicultural theory are predominantly levelled at the underpinning conceptualisations of culture, identity and notions of the citizen within a political community. Puja Kapai states that, 'Multiculturalism based on liberal ideology has failed to include minorities through models of citizenship that enable the coexistence of cultural difference and belonging to the nation within a single individual' (2012, p. 284). The liberal democratic notions of citizenship were based predominantly on a dichotomy between the state and the individual, in which the individual is part of a hegemonic community. Multicultural models require an understanding of the political community as a trichotomy 'composed of individuals, cultural identity groups and the state' (Shachar, 1999, p. 89). The intersection of this way of organising the political community has been seen as problematic when the state predominantly supports, endorses and privileges 'particular cultural practices and traditions' such as language, educational values, cultural motifs and symbols (Levey, 2012a, p. 255). This therefore highlights the tensions that arise when concepts such as culture are left unscrutinised or taken for granted by society and or the state.

An understanding of how multiculturalism is prescribed depends on how the concept of culture is interpreted or understood. This understanding relates to whether more importance is assigned to cultural practices; or to the linking of cultural identity to national identity; or to culture as a concept

Jayne Lysk. *Notions of Citizenship Revealed Through Multicultural Education Policies in Australia*



that is contested and transformed. It has been suggested that there needs to be an alternative to multiculturalism. Hage for example suggests that:

...particularly in relation to the impasse in which the western governance of immigrants from Islamic backgrounds has found itself, I have argued that this encounter is generating 'ungovernable' spaces that cannot be easily understood or governed either by the logic of multiculturalism or the logic of assimilation. It invites us to think outside the existing governmental parameters of conceiving of intercultural relations. (2012, p. 294)

One alternative approach to multiculturalism that has been explored as an additional feature of multiculturalism, or as a standalone approach to conceptualising the way in which ethnically diverse societies should interact and how culture can be conceived, is interculturalism.

Interculturalism as a political idea has been superseding, or used in conjunction with, multiculturalism as an alternative way to respond to cultural diversity and to achieve a socially cohesive citizenry (Cantle, 2012, p. 38). In essence, interculturalism aims to go beyond passive coexistence, central to multiculturalism, to achieve a developing and sustainable way of living together—understanding, respect and dialogue between cultural groups. In examining concepts of interculturalism, compared with multiculturalism as a political idea, Meer and Modood have located four ways in which interculturalism has been conceived positively in contrast with multiculturalism which I will summarise here: (1) Something greater than coexistence, which encourages dialogue and re/negotiation of values; (2) Something less 'groupist' or more yielding; (3) More oriented to the 'whole of society', in terms of social cohesion and national citizenship; (4) Is more likely to lead to the problematisation of cultural practices (2012, p. 117). Meer and Modood conclude that as this stage interculturalism is unable to surpass multiculturalism as a political approach because as it is presently constructed it does not 'recognise that social life consists of individuals and groups, and that both need to be provided for in the formal and informal distribution of powers' (2012, p. 192).

It was concluded that multiculturalism and interculturalism could co-occur. In Chapter 4, approaches to intercultural education will be explored in contrast to multicultural education to acquire a more comprehensive understanding of the implications of these concepts on education for citizenship. In considering multicultural theory and its limitations and criticism, I will probe and consider how multiculturalism was put into practice in Australia as both a description of the population, and as an ideological vehicle to generate social change. Although Australia's

population is ethnically diverse, the term ‘multicultural’ cannot be separated from its philosophical underpinnings. The following will explore multiculturalism as constructed and conceived in the Australian context.

## **Multiculturalism for the Nation**

This section will explore the beginnings of multicultural policy in Australia, looking at the internal factors and the external events and circumstances that affected the development of a multicultural public policy to further understandings of the ideologies and values that characterise present day conceptions of multiculturalism in Australia.

Government response to the influx of refugees from mainly South-East Asia, escaping Vietnam or fleeing East Timor continued into the 1980s under a Liberal-Country Party Federal Government and then was passed on to Labor Government. The response came in many forms, including amendments to immigration policies and a different approach to settlement eventuating in most refugees being granted entry, family reunion enabled, and skilled migration being increased. The model of immigration throughout this period from 1980 to 2009 saw incremental changes from a settlement model to a ‘guest worker’ model of immigration (Collins, 2013, p. 160). Australian business and trade opened its doors to the international market and immigration was seen as beneficial for growing the economy (Klapdor, *et al.*, 2009). Until the end of the 1980s, Australian manufacturing was in decline and the Australian economy was moving into a recession with manufacturing collapsing, apprenticeship numbers decreasing and unemployment increasing.

Under the Fraser Liberal-Coalition Government, changes were made to assist or facilitate cultural diversity within Australia. For example, influenced by the *Galbally Report* the Fraser Government re-framed the way in which multiculturalism was to be understood. The *Galbally Report* reported on the Fraser Government’s inquiry into post-arrival programs and services for migrants, known as the ‘Galbally Inquiry’. Changes stemming from the report included replacing the term ‘race’ with the term ‘ethnic’ instead. This was a key factor in defining difference in the Australian population and building on Whitlam’s establishment of ethnic radio stations, the ethnic press, and a world first interpreting service (Stratton, 1999, p. 170). The Fraser Government also launched a multicultural television and radio service. The importance of the Special Broadcasting Service (SBS) was described by Ang, Hawkins, and Dabboussy as ‘one of the key institutional expressions of Australia’s official understanding of itself as a nation of many cultures, languages and communities,

rather [than] a single, homogeneous monoculture'. Signalling a new shift in the way citizens were conceptualised (2008, p. 9).

A decisive point in how future citizens were to be prepared was contained in the Australian multicultural education policy that emerged in 1977, which will be discussed in more detail in the next section. The policy came soon after the release of *Galbally Report*, which was highly influential with a number of recommendations in respect to multiculturalism that were largely accepted and implemented. The Prime Minister of the day, Malcolm Fraser, acknowledged the report's influence two decades after its release when he stated:

The report identified multiculturalism as a key concept in formulating government policies...The *Galbally Report* charted [sic] a bold new course. The Government moved rapidly across a broad front to implement the report in full...[it] developed a major orientation programme for new arrivals and introduced innovative English language instruction; promoted multicultural education in government and non-government schools; boosted the child migrant education programme. (Fraser, M., 1981, p. 4)

The *Galbally Report* influenced public policies very deeply and was a significant milestone in the advent of multiculturalism as a concept and policy. The report can be seen as the impetus in persuading the national government to become a stakeholder in multicultural policy, and in turn, generated momentum for wider public acceptance for the idea of multiculturalism. This adaptation set in place and generated the necessary conditions for introducing the practice of multiculturalism into education policy in Australia, which will be explored in more detail later in this chapter.

Under the Fraser Government, there was also a raft of reforms and changes to immigration policy. According to Jupp, the Fraser Government is best remembered for its 'humane approach to refugees' and for 'setting up institutions of multiculturalism' (2002, p. 43). Policy changes including: the end to assisted passages; a requirement for New Zealanders travelling to Australia to carry passports; liberalised immigration policies associated with family reunion and humane treatment of refugees. There was consistency across policies and there was a new understanding of the way citizenship was conceptualised and practised. According to a Ministerial Statement of May 6 1982, it was stated that acquiring Australian citizenship:

...should not require suppression of one's cultural heritage or identity....our vision of multicultural society shares with our concept of citizenship, strong emphasis on building cohesive and harmonious society which is all the more tolerant and outward looking because of the diversity of its origins. (Kalantzis & Cope, 1984, p. 83)

Therefore, the Fraser Government view on citizenship was ideologically in line with multicultural social policy. This expressed an understanding that multiculturalism is more than an empirical fact, and that being more tolerant is viewed as a virtue.

The Fraser Government lost power to the Hawke Labor Government (1983–1991) in the election of early 1983, and the new Labor government continued the process of removing discriminatory features contained within immigration and citizenship policies (Klapdor, *et al.*, 2009). In amending the *Citizenship Act* there were three changes of note. First, previous discriminatory features relating to English language were changed, so that for example, applicants aged over fifty were not required to have English language skills, and the level of English for all other applicants was required to be of a ‘basic’ level rather replacing the previous ‘adequate level’ requirement (Klapdor, *et al.*, 2009, p. 11). The second change according to Klapdor *et al.* was the, ‘definition of the status of British subject was repealed in order for the Act to reflect the national identity of all Australians’ and the third change was that new migrants were no longer required to renounce their citizenship from their country of origin to obtain Australian citizenship (2009, p. 11).

Further changes to citizenship were enacted in 1986, clarifying that the government of the day was abandoning the right to claim citizenship by being born in Australia. That is, the *jus soli* model of citizenship in which nationality was determined by birthplace. The change was a continuation of exclusionary practice to according to Rubenstein:

This is a transparent use of citizenship as a device of exclusion. It is not about including everyone born in Australia as a member of the community, but rather determining first and foremost whom we want and whom we do not want to be part of the Australian community. (2000, p. 588)

In the 1980s and moving through to the 1990s, successive Federal Government responded in a number of ways to the impacts of liberalising immigration policies. Firstly, there was an expansion of the AMEP cumulating in a 510-hour provision by 1991.<sup>12</sup> Secondly, there was a continuation of interpreting and translating services, and; thirdly, the public broadcaster of television and radio—the Special Broadcasting Service (SBS)—was established. The principal function of SBS was to provide, ‘multilingual and multicultural radio, television and digital media services that inform, educate and entertain all Australians and, in doing so, reflect Australia’s multicultural society’ (SBS,

---

<sup>12</sup> This program is still in existence Under the AMEP, eligible immigrants and refugees are provided with 510 hours of English language training, career counselling and general settlement assistance. An additional 100 hours of tuition is available through the special preparatory program to older humanitarian entrants with special needs. See Nicholas (2015, pp. 19-34).

2016). Multiculturalism as a public policy, however, remained contentious for reasons that will be discussed later in this chapter.<sup>13</sup> Having a multicultural public policy eventuated in a multicultural education policy.

## Multicultural Education

Similar to the previous section, in order to contextualise the coming shifts in education policy, it is necessary to explore theory and debate around multiculturalism education. This is important to understand before revealing how notions of citizenship have been communicated, and have shaped the purpose of education in the account of the linear development of Australia. Modern multicultural education can be traced back to the 1970s and specifically in English speaking nations that include—but are not limited to—Australia, Canada, the UK and the USA.<sup>14</sup> For example, Canada was one of the first nation states to introduce a multicultural policy. Canada had three ‘forms of distinct diversity’ and also an education system that historically has accommodated Francophone and non-Francophone people throughout the education system curriculum (Joshee, *et al.*, 2016, pp. 35-50). The Canadian multicultural policy was influenced by policy of other nation states that were experiencing shifts and changes to their ethnic makeup (Ghosh & Abdi, 2004, p. 91). Multicultural public policies and multicultural education was introduced initially to eradicate racism. As Kalantzis states:

...the questions of so-called 'race' and 'race relations' as introduced through multiculturalism, although misshapen and problematic, have made their most widespread inroads into education, albeit often only obliquely through the concepts of culture and ethnicity. (2013, p. 90)

Multicultural education at that time was commonly understood as a method of eliminating racism by educating school children of the majority population about other cultures.

Much like general theories of multiculturalism, multicultural education has been viewed predominantly through three lenses: *conservative*, *liberal* and *critical*. Other approaches have been proposed as alternatives to multicultural education such as anti-racism education, whilst there have also been debates about ‘after multiculturalism’ or ‘post-multiculturalism’, both of which will only be touched on briefly in this section. As the theories of multiculturalism have been covered in

---

<sup>13</sup> For a more comprehensive coverage, see Ang, *et al.* (2008).

<sup>14</sup> For further detail, see Lo Bianco and Bal (2016) which also includes non-English speaking nation's perspectives on multicultural education.

the previous section, the next section will focus mainly on Australian conceptualisations of multicultural education. Although there are some similarities, there are also differences due to the demographic composition of the nation, its history, and Australia's socio-political context.

It is important to note that there is no consensus or single definition of multicultural education in theory, or practice, within the literature. Notwithstanding this, there have been many attempts to create a single overarching typology. Multicultural education has multifaceted and multidisciplinary origins, and so definitions, conceptualisations and purposes of multicultural education vary immensely. Throughout the literature, two main societal objectives for multicultural education are evident: (1) advancement for equal educational opportunity, and; (2) cultural pluralism. According to Nieto and Bode, multicultural education is 'a philosophy, a way of looking at the world, not simply a program or a class or a teacher' (2000, p. 313). Professor of Political Science Amy Gutmann, argues that multicultural education plays a role in civil equality in democratic societies, 'by expressing the democratic value of tolerating cultural differences', and by, 'recognising the role that cultural differences have played in shaping society and the world in which children live' (2004, p. 71). This is echoed by Bennett, who emphasises that multicultural education sustains, 'cultural pluralism within cultural diverse societies in an interdependent world' (2003, p. 4). These goals of multicultural education are generally shared and thus multicultural education has evolved with the intention of creating an educational environment that fosters and maximises learning for all students within culturally diverse and democratic societies.

Multicultural education for democratic societies comes in many forms and is not without critics. One form of multiculturalism education assumes that all cultural groups should be represented in all aspects of education. Perry notes that this form of multicultural education has three underlying beliefs: first, it may reduce the marginalisation of minority students in the larger society (2009, p. 437). Secondly, it may make education more relevant for minority students, thus increasing their academic motivation and achievement and thirdly, it enhances all students' ability to actively engage and participate in a diverse and pluralistic society. Therefore, this form of multicultural education is assumed to be a driver for equal opportunity, with the potential of increasing educational outcomes for children of minority ethnic background and has the potential to combat discrimination, prejudice and racism. Additionally, it is assumed that multicultural education is a driver of cultural pluralism and that cultural diversity is strength for a society and an enabler of societal transformation.

A recent contribution that expands our understanding of multicultural education is a volume titled, *Learning from Difference: Comparative Accounts of Multicultural Education*, edited by Joseph Lo Bianco and Aydin Bal (2016). It comprises nine comparative analytical case studies that discuss responses to educational challenges posed by ‘internal diversity’. Several of these settings—China, Thailand, Turkey—are not commonly assumed to have, or be associated with, education policies framed through the lens of multiculturalism. Two other nations—Brazil and South Africa—have tended to repudiate multicultural descriptors in favour of either class or race based analyses of difference, while the others—Australia, Canada, Denmark and the US—have to various degrees either pioneered multicultural approaches to schooling, or are liberal states where embracing cultural pluralism for education has been more or less encouraged. Lo Bianco concludes that what counts as multicultural education is ‘deeply affected’ by the historically specific ways in which the idea of pluralism is taken up by systems of education, and is today increasingly shaped by globalisation (2016, p. 226). As a result, multicultural education can be conceived, constructed and critiqued in numerous ways.

The main point of comparison and place of departure is to move the field forward by, ‘learning from difference’, seeing that there are different ways that pluralism is conceived and interpreted, an idea that ‘speaks to policy and practice grounded in local experiences of global patterns of development originating in economic and political upheavals’ (Lo Bianco, 2016, p. 227). Although it also provides a wealth of contrasting examples of multicultural education to learn from, it is clear that what counts as good pedagogy always has common elements. A learner is not studying about others and examining their fundamental differences from him or her, but is getting to know the self in relation to the other as varied by specific circumstances and purposes. These pedagogical approaches allow for identity and difference to be unique in the curriculum because learners are not absorbing just information, but are coming to know and reflect on themselves. Citizenship is today appreciated to be a much more diverse notion, from its original legal basis now expanding into active participatory ideas bolstered by a richer sense of identity and belonging. Australian citizenship has been a process of ‘learning from difference’ too, expanding out progressively, always through struggle and contestation, and bolstered increasingly by what teachers are trained to see as good practice (Lo Bianco & Bal, 2016).

Ensuring the opportunity for all to succeed in educational settings is at the heart of the second form of multicultural education as outlined by Perry (2009). Sleeter (2014, pp. 94-106) notes that this form requires adaptation of teaching and educational practices and as Perry paraphrases

includes making sure that, ‘teachers are culturally responsive and adequately trained to teach in culturally diverse settings’(2009, p. 438). These two forms of multicultural education for democratic societies outlined by Perry sit within three broader theoretical approaches to multicultural education such as conceptualising multicultural education as anti-racist. Another perspective encompasses multicultural education in the critical education paradigm and the last approach views multicultural education as critical race theory. These perspectives are not distinct and there is a blending of ideas.

Professor of Education, Anna Kirova, argues that although there is a ‘divided field’ between the three aforementioned theoretical perspectives of multicultural education—anti-racism, critical pedagogy and critical race theory—this can be explained by the ‘varied histories’ and that the main scholars are, ‘variably motivated and positioned... with diverse political agendas’ (2008, p. 107). In summing up, Kirova proposes that:

... one of the criticisms of multiculturalism and multicultural education is that culture is simplified and reified to fit multicultural discourses that support visions of personal, ethnic, or national cultural identity that are fixed, essentialized, stereotyped, and normalised. This in turn, solidifies the boundaries between cultures and by extension, between cultural groups. (2008, p. 133)

Some of the criticisms of multicultural education, as exemplified in Kirova’s comments, have been problematized in the ‘post-multicultural’ debates, and in recent years informed new understandings of the fluidity of culture, the diversity of difference, and a reconsideration of the power imbalance in cultural spaces can flourish. One method of ensuring this is linking intercultural education with, or making it part of, multicultural education.

Intercultural education is frequently associated with multicultural education and in some cases replacing or superseding education for multicultural purposes, where the term multiculturalism and desire for multiculturalism has lost favour. When the terms are used in conjunction, multiculturalism characteristically becomes a normative description of a classroom population, whereas interculturalism is understood as the, ‘actual interaction between people once impediments to relations have been removed’ (Aman, 2015, p. 522). That is, the interaction amongst the school population, in which assimilation to the dominant culture is not forced, and there is the prospect of exchange and interaction between diverse languages and knowledge systems. According to Portera, ‘intercultural education offers the opportunity to ‘show’ real cultural differences, to compare and exchange them, in a word, to *interact*: action in the activity;



compulsory principle in every educational relationship' (2008, p. 488). The emphasis of intercultural education then relies on education from rather than about other cultures. Intercultural education in theory is then seen as affording the potential for cultural change.

Professor of Geography, Katharyne Mitchell, suggests that there is a move from the 'multicultural self' to the creation of 'strategic cosmopolitans' who are:

...motivated not by ideals of national unity in diversity, but by understandings of global competitiveness, and the necessity to strategically adapt as an individual to rapidly shifting personal and national contexts. (2003, p. 388)

Another perspective on cosmopolitan learning has been put forward by Rizvi in which the emphasis is on the product that is, the cosmopolitan student, but the cosmopolitan learner fostering a cosmopolitan disposition in which learning is not about accumulating knowledge rather it is 'learning about, and ethically engaging with, new social formations (2009, p. 254). These approaches are more in-line with recent thinking around the global citizen and global citizenship education which was covered earlier in this chapter.

In the field of multicultural education and in the absence of singular definitions, there is a vast literature, and continuing debates. The broad definition and approach to multicultural education defined by Grant and Sleeter (2007) has been adopted by schools throughout Australia (Jupp, et al., 2007). This approach elaborated by Grant and Sleeter provides a comprehensive definition including five approaches establishing a process that is underpinned by shared values, school reform and continual change. Grant and Sleeter's (2007) approach is summarised by Jupp as follows:

- The *teaching the exceptional and culturally different approach* aims to equip students with skills, concepts and values needed to function within society. It enables the culturally different student to fit in with the society.
- The *single group studies approach* refers to the study of particular groups. This approach has an explicit political goal of trying to raise the social status of a target group such as Asians, Muslims, and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.
- The *human relations approach* focuses on attitudes students have about themselves and each other. These aim to promote acceptance of self-identity and that of others and move towards eliminating biases and prejudice.
- The *multicultural education approach* focuses on the reduction of discrimination and racism among oppressed groups and works towards equality of opportunity and social justice. This approach is concerned with broad social reform and the reconstruction of curriculum to reflect pluralism and equality.

- The *multicultural and reconstructionist* model builds on the previous one but focuses more directly on issues such as oppression, social structural inequality based on race, social class, disability and gender. (Jupp, *et al.*, 2007, p. 151)

With ever-increasing shifts and movements of the global population and growing recognition of the indigenous population, the Australian education system—like many other education systems in similar situations—has been forced to respond to a variety of new challenges in relation to the management of cultural differences. The empirical research on multicultural education shows it is well understood that governments of democratic societies are responding to culturally diverse student populations by engaging with forms of multicultural education in practice and or policy. However, it is equally clear that the assumptions that underpin the approaches to multicultural education and the multicultural policy responses are only partly understood. Therefore, the following chapter will explore and analyse specific multicultural education policies at both the federal and state levels and the context in which they were developed, to explicate conceptualisations of social membership and citizenship revealed through education.

### **A Changing Nation (1960-1980): Educational Responses to the Changing Population**

The following section in a similar vein to the exploration of public policy, examine and explore the impact on educational approaches and policies with fluctuating contextual factors coupled with the shifts in public policies in regard to cultural diversity. As with the changes to public policy, the 1960s to the 1980s witnessed the ideological position of educational administrators, policy makers and the government, challenged by rapidly changing population demographics and the introduction of new trading partners. This time signified a unique aspect of Australian immigration policy reform. After WWII, a report prepared by the Department of the Interior raised concerns regarding Australia's vast land and relatively small population. As a result the Department of Immigration was set up to oversee nation building and mass immigration (Tavan, 2005, p. 48). The overriding assumption was that immigrant or Aboriginal Torres Strait Islander minorities could and should disregard their cultures and languages and become fully absorbed into the dominant culture of the ever-expanding Australian society. Migrant children were also encouraged to come to Australia under approved schemes. The slogan, '*the child, the best immigrant*', was widely used, with the understanding that children were seen as, 'inexpensive to house and easy to assimilate' (National Archives of Australia, 2016).

As has been previously argued, Australian society had seen many changes and developments since WWII including a rise in standards of living and steadily shifting demographics. This has been attributed to the 'Long Boom', an era of economic growth that lasted for three decades (Lopez, 2000; Maddock, 1987).<sup>15</sup> During this period the population grew exponentially, with over six million people arriving either as migrants, or as humanitarian entrants (DIMA, 2001). Cultural pluralism received support for the first time since settlement and, as Jayasuriya argued:

...the host society permits, and even encourages members of migrant and ethnic groups to cultivate cultural differences and at the same time to have mutual respect, tolerance and understanding for each other, especially an acceptance of 'cultural differences', or what I would call, 'an equality of respect. (1985, p. 3)

In the mid to late 1970s, the concept of multiculturalism as a public policy was introduced. There was a vision that diverse linguistic and cultural groups could co-exist within a cohesive shared society.

Settlement policies took on an integration policy approach, with a less discriminatory agenda. The integration policy made adjustments so that migrants could retain their cultural identity and recognised the right of migrant groups to have their own voice (Tavan, 2005, p. 110). This policy did not require minority groups to demonstrate an affiliation with the dominant group or majority culture in order to participate. The integration policy also afforded rights to Indigenous Australians as well as to immigrant minorities in mainstream society. Although the White Australia policy was still in place, Menzies Government (1949–1966) immigration ministers worked to change the way that the department operated as well as to make incremental changes to some of the more discriminatory policies and entitlements including the 'mixed-race' category and family reunion.

Immigration policies and settlement policies, and education policies shifted to reflect the new developments and thinking about citizenship and the anticipated citizenry. Under the assimilation policy, education was designed for a population whose backgrounds were predominantly Anglo-Celtic. The needs or representation of the smaller populations of newly-arrived migrants, or of indigenous cultures was not a priority. As the population started to become more multi-ethnic, the introduction of integrationist policies within educational institutions played a vital role.

---

<sup>15</sup> According to Maddock (1987, pp. 79-105), this economic boom was also experienced in Western Europe, Japan, Canada and USA.

Adult migrants also received assistance from the government to promote the assimilation process. Under Commonwealth Government policy in the 1940s, the *Adult Migrant Education Program* (AMEP) provided English Language tuition for new arrivals. This program aimed to teach English for 'everyday life' and provided language support for 'twelve months or earlier if you finished the book' (Martin, 1998). The prescribed text provided English language guidance, as well as information considered important to assimilating into Australian society. Some immigrants even received English tuition before they arrived in Australia by participating in 'Shipboard classes' (Martin, 1998). By the 1950s, responsibility for these programs was assigned to the states and the premise for this initiative would be reconsidered. Nevertheless, an 'adequate knowledge of English' remained a basic requirement of citizenship (McNamara & Ryan, 2011, p. 169).

The requirement either to learn the English language or to have some basic skills in the English language has been an enduring element of citizenship in Australia. As Lo Bianco has argued, 'the AMEP is a major reason why immigration policy [in Australia] has been more successful than its counterparts in other countries where there is little assistance to newcomers to acquire national languages' (2011). The AMEP is still running in 2017, although the aims of the program have shifted from focusing on issues of settlement and nation building, to concerns around 'social and economic participation outputs' (Burns & Roberts, 2010, p. 412). Lo Bianco (2011) points out that more recently the philosophies that underpin language policy are 'connected to economic efficiency arguments through literacy, trade languages and international English [after language policy] was entrusted to education and training ministries'. This reveals the changing focus and requirements for citizenship participation in the future. English language skills are linked with work prospects and growing the national economy, rather than English language skills for the betterment of life and society.

The education reforms enacted by the Australian Government at this time reveal a deliberate response to rapidly changing demographics. The intervention of the Federal Government in the area of education is significant as education policy is constitutionally a responsibility of state governments. Some commentators argue that the Federal Government's desire to set the education agenda was because it fell under the terms of the 'national interest', and the Commonwealth was able to use the 'financial levers which result from the vertical fiscal imbalance between the Commonwealth and the states' (Criddle, *et al.*, 2004, p. 27). Additionally, as will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 4, the Australian Government in requiring active participation

in the political process through compulsory voting, has invested in policies that relate to citizenship education.

An example of this Federal Government intervention in education was the introduction of the *Child Migrant Education Program (CMEP)*. In the 1970s, the Australian Government set up the CMEP; it was created to assist the children of newly arrived migrants to improve their English language. Schools implemented the program by withdrawing the children from class for English language tuition. This differed from the previous practice where little or no English language support was provided. The Liberal–National Federal Government also provided support and training for teachers.

The Australian Government initiative replicated the Victorian example that allowed migrant children to withdraw from class and receive specialist English as a Second Language (ESL) lessons. In addition, the CMEP provided funding for in-service training to raise awareness amongst teachers and to provide resources and guidance for migrant related issues. Moreover, in 1978 the *Migrant Services and Programs*—the so-called ‘Galbally’ Report (1978)—a review of post-arrival programs and migrant services was delivered directly to the Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser. This was in contrast to the to the most obvious recipient, the Minister for Migration, demonstrating the importance of the findings and recommendations. In the wake of this report in the same year, the *Commonwealth Multicultural Education Program (CMEP)* was released with a program designed to improve social tensions associated with racism, prejudice and the use of stereotyping. These initiatives were mainly to be achieved by incorporating multicultural perspectives across the curriculum, building on English as a Second Language (ESL) programs, and ensuring that schools had Languages other than English (LOTE) and ensuring that there was access to Mother-tongue maintenance and the encouragement of Bilingual Education. The Federal Government’s multicultural education policies had limited and pragmatic objectives Jupp (1997, p. 31).

More detail regarding the MEP will be covered in the multicultural education section of this chapter.

## **The Whitlam Era and Education Reform**

In the early 1970s, the Whitlam Government acknowledged that there existed areas of stark inequality within Australian society including barriers to women’s access to education and the workforce, and newly arrived migrants’ lack of access to many areas of life both social and economic. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders were similarly disadvantaged. Marginson points

out that this was ‘a rare acknowledgement of the problem of difference; though the implications for citizenship, and education, were not developed’. He takes this argument further by asserting that, ‘citizen power was defined as the right of access to career and consumption, rather than an equal measure of economic resources and important social decisions’ (Marginson, 1997, p. 17).

Access to education was reformed under the Whitlam Government, which was heavily influenced by the recommendations of the *Karmel Report* 1973. This report was a Commonwealth initiative focused on school education across Australia, led to significant changes on two fronts. Burnett and McArdle suggest that it was significant in raising awareness of the detrimental effects of assimilationist policies that not only, ‘disadvantaged immigrants... but also were wasteful in preventing the immense pool of potential migrant talent from contributing to society’ (2011, p. 5). Additionally, Lingard contends that this ‘systemised Commonwealth involvement in schools within a Keynesian framework’<sup>16</sup>:

...set the frame for subsequent developments and also marked the high mark of modernist hope in Australian education policy; education was to be the engine for achieving a more socially just Australia and increasing government expenditure was seen necessary in moving towards that goal. (2000, pp. 26-54)

In other words, by responding to the recommendations of this report, the Whitlam Government was committing the Commonwealth to involvement in education that ensured funding for equal opportunities for all citizens.

The period between the release of the *Karmel Report* in 1973 and up until 1996, saw marked modifications to the way in which the Federal Government was involved in and how it envisioned, education. Education was to be conceived and delivered to cater for and respond to Australia’s ever increasing ethnically and culturally diverse population. The *Karmel Report* in 1973 had triggered a systematic involvement of the Federal Government in education (Lingard, 2000). This was predicated on the recognition of the value that migrants offered to society, and the disadvantage that previous assimilation policies had imposed upon them (Burnett & McArdle, 2011). One aspect of the report focused particularly on how Australia’s children would learn languages and interact in a culturally diverse society which informed the MEP. According to Lo Bianco and Wickert Lo Bianco and Wickert (2001, p. 15):

---

<sup>16</sup> The Keynesian Framework was a system of economic management that was employed by many developed nations that favoured government intervention in the capitalist markets. For example please see Quiggin (1999, pp. 240-259).

It is our view that during this period there emerged an unselfconscious pattern of policy-making; the state exhibited a strong belief that the mechanism of overt and deliberate policy enunciation was appropriate and productive of its role in education, training policy, social policy, immigration, Indigenous affairs and the general management of cultural relations. (2001, p. 15)

This revealed an important shift in how cultural diversity was perceived, and in the acceptance of a culturally diverse citizenry. This reassessment of the Commonwealth engagement with educational issues and policies would remain constant until the mid-1990s.

### **Language Policy in the 1980s**

The Multicultural Education Policy (MEP) continued into the early 1980s, however, there was a shift in the late 1980s when the Hawke Labor Government released the *National Policy on Languages* (NPL) 1987, thereby separating languages from the MEP. This language policy had been a long time in the making. The push for a national language policy had started with a Senate inquiry in the early 1980s under Malcolm Fraser, with a groundswell of interest including ethnic groups and indigenous, organisations for the deaf.<sup>17</sup>

In a study of the language in education policies released nationally, including the NALSAS, the National Advisory and Co-ordination Committee on Multicultural Education (NACCME) report—*Education in, and for, a Multicultural Society: Issues and Strategies for Policymaking*—would be the final national government document examining multicultural education. The emphasis of multicultural education shifted to understanding language diversity as an asset or a resource, and the educational discourse shifted from ‘pluralist multicultural education’ to ‘equitable multicultural education’, that is, it moved from the celebration of difference to intercultural understandings and enabling access and participation. However, offering Asian studies as a subject projects a different message entirely (Liddicoat, 2005).

This period brought a renewed interest in languages and literacy throughout the 1980s. In 1987, the Federal Government released the *National Language Policy* (NLP) and in 1991, the *Australia’s*

---

<sup>17</sup> Among the achievements of the inquiry were: (1). The enthusiasm and understanding it generated for language issues. It is significant that the people conducting the survey were parliamentarians not academics. (2). The wide range of language issues included in the brief of the inquiry, establishing the complementarity of English and other languages in the Australian context which underlies all future Australian language policy. (3). The guiding principles which resulted from the Senate committee’s report and which are still widely regarded as the basis for language policy in Australia: I. Competence in English for all. II. Maintenance and development of languages other than English, both community and aboriginal languages. III. Provision of services in languages other than English. IV. Opportunities for learning second languages. Three of these principles had already become policy of the Victorian Education Department in 1979 (Shears, 1980).

*Language: The Language and Literacy Policy (ALLP)*, in which literacy became distinct from language. This claimed to 'represent an exclusive national interest, as distinct from minority interest (Lo Bianco, 2004). Lo Bianco continued to argue that both the NLP and the ALLP, 'enshrined standard English as the national variety of the common Australian language' (2004, p. 6). Liddicoat analysed the NLP, the ALLP and the NALSAS focusing on how culture and cultural knowledge is conceptualised in these documents, and found that there was a 'lack of clear and consistent conceptualisation' (2005, p. 161). Liddicoat argued:

... there is an expectation that cultural knowledge will contribute to the development of dynamic intercultural practices, but this expectation is in conflict with the definition of cultural knowledge as decontextualized pieces of information about otherness of the people and society using the language to be learned. (2005, p. 161)

This exemplifies the tension between the aspiration of embracing intercultural understanding and the monocultural mindset that has prevailed and dominated since it landed with European colonisers over two centuries ago.

### ***Moving Into the 1990s: Public Policies and Educational Policies***

This section will cover both public policies and educational policies as they responded to changes and shifted in Australia from 1990 through until 2009, in an effort to explore ideologies and values that characterise Australian national multicultural policies and the implications for notions of citizenship.

In 1988, Australia commemorated its national bicentenary. This was a time of celebration for some, but it was a time of protest and unease for others who were dissatisfied with the slow progress of rights for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders. According to Attwood and Markus, two major issues had not yet been addressed:

First, Aboriginal people had suffered nearly two hundred years of dispossession, destruction and discrimination, and this had (and has) affected generation after generation of families and communities, resulting in considerable loss of capacity. This crisis could not be resolved in one generation, let alone two. Second, Aboriginal campaigners not only continued to demand recognition of Indigenous rights to land and capital but also acknowledgement of Aboriginal people's status as a sovereign group, which entailed a different relationship between Aborigines and the Australian nation-state. (2007, p. 73)



In the 1990s, there was yet another opportunity for the Australian Government to address the issues that continued to taint relations with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in relation to differentiated citizenship and matters concerning sovereignty. In 1992, the High Court decision in the ‘Mabo case’—that recognised for the first time the concept of native title—offered an opportunity to turn away from the racial and cultural intolerances of the past. Instead, as Povinelli argued in her analysis of the Mabo case, ‘the state constructed native title as a legitimate part of state multiculturalism only to plough it into the ground of a new, transcendental, monocultural nation’ (1998, p. 579).

In Australian Government deliberations over the Mabo case, the Prime Minister of day, Paul Keating, linked the multicultural project to justice for the indigenous peoples of Australia. Documented in a commemoration speech to launch the International Year for the World’s Indigenous People—which later came to be known as the ‘Redfern speech’—Keating argued that:

We non-Aboriginal Australians should perhaps remind ourselves that Australia once reached out for us. Didn't Australia provide opportunity and care for the dispossessed Irish? The poor of Britain? The refugees from war and famine and persecution in the countries of Europe and Asia? Isn't it reasonable to say that if we can build a prosperous and remarkably harmonious multicultural society in Australia, surely we can find just solutions to the problems which beset the first Australians—the people to whom the most injustice has been done... Mabo is an historic decision—we can make it an historic turning point, the basis of a new relationship between indigenous and non-Aboriginal Australians. (Keating, 2011)

The associating of the multicultural project to the indigenous peoples of Australia has remained problematic and persists as an area of contention because of the strong links the project has with the accommodation of new migrants.

The 1990s were characterised by problematic immigration issues and discontent around multiculturalism as a public policy. ‘Hansonism’, otherwise known as the ‘Hanson phenomenon’, dominated domestic politics with media debates raging around immigration, welfare and the ‘Indigenous problem’ (Crofts, 1998).<sup>18</sup> In this context, multicultural education policy was devolved to the control of state governments.

Nationalism, sovereignty, citizenship and demographic shifts brought about by the 1988 bicentennial were still up for debate in the early 1990s. Debates, particularly about sovereignty

---

<sup>18</sup> For further analysis of the Hanson phenomenon, see Crofts (2016, pp. 7-19) and (Jayasuriya, 2012).

Jayne Lysk. *Notions of Citizenship Revealed Through Multicultural Education Policies in Australia*

were also about to receive attention as a test of the Terra Nullius claim would make its way to the High Court of Australia in what became known as the Mabo case as previously mentioned. In 1993, there was a reform to the Citizenship Act. There were no major changes to the constitution, as these would have had to be passed by referendum, however, a preamble was included that clarified how citizenship was defined. What was significant at this time was the shift away from adherence to *ius soli*, and the wording in the preamble stating

Australian citizenship represents formal membership of the community of the Commonwealth of Australia; and  
Australian citizenship is a common bond, involving reciprocal rights and obligations, uniting all Australians, whilst respecting their diversity; and  
Persons granted Australian citizenship enjoy those rights and undertake to accept these obligations by pledging loyalty to Australia and its people, and by sharing their democratic beliefs, and by respecting their rights and liberties, and by upholding and obeying the laws of Australia. (Rubenstein, 2005, p. 508)

These changes reflected the principles on which multicultural public policy has been based. Parekh described this as a 'proceduralist' political structure for a multicultural society, in which citizens can have different culture practices, lifestyles and languages as long as there is recognition of the laws that govern the nation (2002, p. 199). Kalantzis describes this form of citizenship as being bound by a, 'core culture and national standard' (2000, p. 100). However, with this model different cultural groups have equal citizenship rights and responsibilities that, as Kymlicka explains, can be 'vulnerable to the decisions of the majority' (1995, p. 11). Significantly, on claiming Australian citizenship there was an expectation that other citizenship claims were to be given up, as multiple or dual citizenship was not officially sanctioned until an amendment to Section 17 of the *Citizenship Act* in 2002 (Kleist, 2009).

During the 1980s and 1990s, there were four areas of debate internationally and within Australia that influenced policies in the national arena. First, multiculturalism as a social and education policy was enacted by many liberal democratic nation states, responding to the transforming demographic shifts and with the ever-increasing mobility of people, information, goods and services and ideas across nation states. Additionally, notions of national identity and citizenship were the subject of much discussion and examination both nationally and internationally during this period. Changes in notions of citizenship and a focus on national identity and values surfaced for various reasons including but not exclusively related to the expansion of the EU in the late 1980s, causing many European nation states to re-examine ideas about national identity and citizenship. Also during this time, there was a renewed interest in citizenship education, as was

evidenced by governments in the UK the USA, who, like Australia, commissioned reports and committees who generated and developed new educational curriculum materials for civics and citizenship. Finally, there was a persistent presence of neoliberalism underpinning policy decisions.

Variations of multiculturalism as a practice, as ideology and as policy, were endorsed in many countries. These included Canada, the UK, the USA and Russia and were met with resistance in the 1990s when many countries—particularly in Europe—debated the merits of multiculturalism. In Australia, both of the major political parties were embroiled in debates over immigration and multiculturalism at various stages. However, immigration debates dominated the entire period, beginning with the Asian immigration debate in the 1980s that continued through to the 1990s becoming more intense with the ‘Hanson phenomenon’. This period led to a widening of the debate to include issues such as multiculturalism, welfare, indigenous rights and nationalism. Immigration remained in the spotlight, particularly in the early 2000s with increasing numbers of refugees and asylum seekers arriving by boat to the shores of Australia, with the intensity increasing not only in Australia but also around the globe.

The Howard Government acted swiftly to make amendments to both the *Migration Act*, and the *Customs Act*, with two responses that were triggered by separate events occurring within months of each other. The first was the arrival in Australia of hundreds of asylum-seekers and refugees—by boat—that in turn led to increased ‘border protection’ by Australian maritime authorities, and the legal ‘excision’ of some Australian territory from migration zones. The second event was the notorious ‘9/11’ terrorist attacks in the United States that pre-empted the ‘international war on terror’. In 2001, the passage through the Australian parliament of the ‘Border Protection Bill’ entrenched the practices of ‘border protection’ and ‘territorial gatekeeping’, phenomena that were consistent with the post 9/11 international climate in which Australia was not alone in such responses.

Other major changes were seen with the reduction in the number of family reunion visas, the introduction of a new points-based merit system, temporary visa entitlements changed, and the stagnation of humanitarian settlement for nearly a decade (Betts, 2003, pp. 169-192). In the new climate where neoliberalism was a major influence, by the early 2000s, many adult literacy and workplace programs continued to focus on economic outcomes, and so consideration of settlement and community within these programs became secondary or obsolete. However, skilled migration intake numbers were increased, as were those for international students (Betts,

2003, pp. 181-182). These changes to immigration policies accentuated the government's imperatives and the precedence given to growing the Australian economy.

## **The 90s and Asian Engagement**

In the early 1990s—an era of increasing globalisation—the Australian Labor Government, especially during Paul Keating's tenure as Treasurer and Prime Minister, argued for a greater engagement with Asia. This effort led by Keating, and was a continuation of the approach begun whilst Federal Treasurer. In previous decades, Australia began engaging in the Pacific region with the intention of safeguarding itself from the Asian region. Efforts such as the Colombo Plan had resulted in the general public becoming more accustomed to other cultures, and Asian faces had become a more familiar sight in the universities and business sectors (Albinski, 1977, p. 20). The Vietnamese War from 1955 to 1975 had far-reaching effects on the movement of people. Although, during the 1960s to the 1980s there had been restrictions on entry for Asians and other non-whites to Australia, these had begun to be loosened. As with others who gained access, there was an expectation that these new arrivals from Asia would 'assimilate'. New citizens were 'encouraged to cast aside their own culture and to accept the predominant Anglo-Australian culture' (Gardiner-Garden, 1993).

This vision for Australia included cutting symbolic ties with Britain, and steering Australia towards becoming a republic (Haynes, 2009). As part of this vision, was the establishment of the Asia Education Foundation (AEF), that was set up with the purpose of supporting teachers and providing schools with the resources to help build an 'Asia capability' (AEF, 2016). This move was pursuit of both cultural, and economic, agendas. In contrast, when John Howard came to power in 1996, although there was a continuation of engagement with Asia, the focus and premise shifted, as Jayasuriya explains:

...the Howard government's foreign diplomacy reinforced its domestic state project of citizenship building. In so doing, it needs to be emphasised that much of the international relations debate on engagement or disengagement of Howard on Asia misses the point that it is the way in which this engagement was conducted that distinguished Howard's citizenship building or statecraft organised around 'Australian values. (2008, p. 14)

In summary, the push to engage with Asia was initially associated with Australia's geographic location, with the forging of economic links and trade, national security concerns and the changing the multicultural approach that previously had a European focus in a different direction (Cahill, Jayne Lysk. *Notions of Citizenship Revealed Through Multicultural Education Policies in Australia*

2001, p. 49). Forms of engagement with Asia did not change significantly with changes in the government. However, developing stronger ties with the United States was of growing importance to the Howard Government (Beeson, 2001; Smith, G. & Lowe, 2005; Tow, 2005).<sup>19</sup> However, the push for a deeper engagement with Asia strongly permeated the education system and therefore generated a shift in notions of citizenship embedded in pedagogy.

## Asian Studies

The *National Asian Languages and Studies Strategy* (NALSAS) was released in 1994. According to Liddicoat the vision of the strategy was ‘a mono-faceted repertoire which sees educative value solely in terms of the economic return generated by resulting skills set’ (2009, p. 196). The NALSAS was also significant to our understanding of multicultural education through its impact on the selection of languages to be taught in schools; as well as the position of Asian studies, one that was inconsistent with the tenets of multiculturalism, as it incorporated a form of ‘othering’ and stereotyping.

With the introduction of Asian studies, specific languages were deemed important for students to study, shifting the language curriculum away from the traditional languages of French and German. As the education system had been modelled on the British education system, French and German—and to some extent Latin—had dominated foreign language learning in schools. This represented an ideological change in the perception and understanding of the place of languages in education and society. Nevertheless, as Singh noted:

Contrary to the myth that White Australia politics ended in the early 1970s the history of language policies reveals its continuing presence. Australia's multicultural and Asian language policy have been the focus of Anglo-fundamentalist campaigns to mobilise the cultural power of White Australian politics and reinstate its regime of anti-Asian discrimination (positioning Australia advantageously within the world's multilingual knowledge economy). (1996, p. 149)

The push for Asian studies as part of the shift toward engagement with Asia has been seen as being inconsistent with existing multicultural policy. The creation of Asian Studies was seen as

---

<sup>19</sup> For a more detailed understanding of Australia's engagement with Asia under the Howard Government, it is worth noting that external events such as the Bali bombings, East Timor's independence, the Asian Tsunami all played important roles in shaping foreign policy and forms of engagement.

problematic on various level. Singh's (1996, p. 159) analysis of the initiative was problematized in the *Rudd Report* stating:

... there is no neutral position from which Australians can study Asian languages and cultures; this curriculum initiative is already saturated with Australia's economic interests and concerns about creating new employment opportunities. (1996, p. 159)

Singh also points out issues that reside in the curriculum with education institutions:

... speaking in two voices, one recalling the gratitude and joy associated with British imperialism, and the other asserting the importance of the repositioning of multicultural Australia within the Asia-Pacific region. (1996, p. 165)

In addition, there is the possibility of Asian culture or people being positioned as different, or as other, and the question of where those students who have migrated from parts of Asia are positioned within a curriculum that is designed to educate *all* Australian students about Asia. Ang and Ang in a discussion of Australian Multiculturalism's ambition to eradicate 'direct expressions of racism', found that:

... the attempt to eliminate such expressions by preaching tolerance paradoxically perpetuates the self-other divide which is the epistemological basis of the very possibility for racism in the first place. (1996, p. 40)

In relation to studying an Asian language and culture, there is a failure by policymakers to recognise as 'Australian' those students or teachers who are Asian. This finding is consistent with assertions made by Professor of Ethnic Studies, Ramon Grosfoguel (2012, p. 88) who has questioned the appropriateness of creating ethnic studies programs or departments in 'Western academia'. Grosfoguel (2012, p. 88) and asserts that:

... if these (ethnic studies programs or departments) are reduced merely to study the sociology of race, and anthropology of ethno/racial identities, the history 'of' (not 'from or "with"') blacks, the economics of insertion of indigenous labour, etc. ... does not constitute an innovation in the field of knowledge production.

In other words, if ethnic studies—or Asian Studies in Australia's case—privileges knowledge of culture that is understood as a set of fixed values, beliefs and practices and is viewed from a 'Eurocentric' position, there are issues of 'othering'. It is also a missed opportunity to contribute to the production of knowledge either through intercultural understandings, or by embracing

‘transmodernity’ as proposed by Grosfoguel (2012, p. 86). That is, to have ethnic studies that are open to the ‘epistemic diversity of the world’ by offering to ‘think “from” and “with” those “others” that are subalternized and inferiorized by Eurocentric modernity’ (Grosfoguel, 2012, pp. 86, & 88). These Government imperatives to study Asia can be viewed as failing to develop, or transform, prior policies of assimilation or past understandings of moral superiority in regard to Asia, and therefore, have the potential to render those students and teachers from Asia—or with an ‘Asian’ background—as ‘second class citizens (Dick, 1988, pp. 47-56).

The 1990s saw two very different political leaders take control of the national agenda and to revise and reconsider concepts of national identity contributing to shifts in notions of citizenship. Not only did Keating have a vision for Australia to be part of the Asia-Pacific region, the vision also included Australia acting in the region as a republic. According to Dyrenfurth, Keating’s plan for a republic was part of larger vision for rapid transformation of the nation in which ‘the republic was about national identity and Australia’s reasonable, symbolic desire for an Australian head of state, yet it was also a political opportunity to lambast the conservatism of the Liberal Party’ (2005a, p. 185). Whereas, Ahluwalia asserts that in pushing for a republic, it was:

... not simply an assertion of Australian nationalism but a crisis of citizenship, culturally and politically, which ha[d] arisen from a multicultural society that even its architects had not envisioned. (2001, p. 63)

Both these considerations need to be kept in mind when considering notions of citizenship in Australia, as they both expose the continual contestation of the construction of citizenship in a colonised nation in the process of decolonisation or transformation.

Keating’s vision for an Australian republic did not disappear completely from public discussion. In 1999, the Howard Government (1996-2007) held a referendum on the issue of Australia moving from a monarchy to a republic. Many voters had shown a strong preference in the opinion polls for the move, however, the proposal was rejected (Higley & McAllister, 2002, p. 853). It has been argued that the rejection of the republic question had several factors, including a protest vote against the elite, the Hanson phenomenon or ‘Hansonism’—which was discussed earlier in the chapter—and a protest by a segment of the population who favoured assimilation over multiculturalism. This view, according to Charnock is also coupled with:

...negative attitudes towards perceived special treatment of immigrants and Aborigines and one could (at least partly) interpret their protest vote as a reaction resulting from their view of multiculturalism. (2001, p. 17)

A more holistic response, including a list of ten reasons for the defeat, was offered by The Honourable Justice Michael Kirby in his article, *The Australian Referendum on a Republic: Ten Lessons* (Kirby, 2000, p. 535). With new forms of republican citizenship not open for consideration, conceptualisations of citizenship were about to change.

In the 1990s, new ways of economic governance permeated political thought in many parts of the world, particularly in the USA, UK, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. In Australia, economic rationalism had been applied to structural reforms of the late 1980s. The premise of economical rationalism has been summed up by Professor of Sociology, Michael Pusey, in his influential text, *Economic rationalism in Canberra: a nation-building state changes its mind*, as:

...the reproduction of society turns increasingly or even exclusively, on a strengthened mode of system integration in which the burden of coordination is passed from the inferior medium of coordination of state bureaucracy to the supposedly better one of the economy. (2003, p. 18)

By the 1990s, 'economic rationalism' merged with the prevailing neo-liberal ideologies that were applied as political, social and economic practices. Neoliberalism has been defined by Professor of Anthropology and Geography, David Harvey in the introduction to his book—*A brief history of neoliberalism*—as:

...practices that propose that human well-being can be best advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong property rights, free markets and free trade. The role of the state is to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such practices. (2007, p. 2)

Neoliberal ideas permeated many sectors of life including the education sector; in direct contrast to the earlier ideas in the 1980s, which represented a period when equity and social opportunity were the basic tenets that underpinned education. Neo-liberalism was paired with notions of accountability in schooling and global competitiveness. Individualism was to become valued over collaboration and citizens were to become less dependent on government and, therefore, more self-reliant.



Moving into the 2000s, neo-liberal ideology would continue to affect public policy, but so to would a number of external and internal events. These events would directly influence immigration policy direction, understandings of citizenship, and the future of multiculturalism as a public—and educational—policy. Pivotal events in 2001 would have a ripple effect on foreign policy and on engagement with Asia and the Pacific region. There would also be significant changes made to immigration policy and to notions of citizenship with major changes to citizenship processes put in place until 2007.

### **A New Agenda for Citizenship and Immigration Policy Moving Into The 2000s**

There were two major incidents, with both attracting a considerable amount of media and political attention. Both resulted in significant changes to the notions of citizenship in public and educational policies. The first incident, involving a Norwegian container ship—the *MV Tampa*—occurred in August 2001.<sup>20</sup> The Australian Government refused permission for the vessel, which was carrying 438 refugees, to enter Australian waters. As a consequence of this event, illegal immigration became a national concern, and a bipartisan approach was taken to reinforce Australian sovereign territory by enforcing a legal basis for action taken against foreign ships in order to ‘protect Australia’s borders’ (Katter, 2005). Further amendments were made to the *Migration Act 1958* and the *Customs Act 1901* (Boulus, *et al.*, 2013, p. 313). The second incident, the September 11 terrorist attacks on New York and Washington—otherwise known as ‘9/11’—became the catalyst for the collaboration between the United States and other nation states such as Australia, to form an ‘International Coalition against Terror’. Demographer and academic, Professor Hugo, argued there were three reasons that the ‘war on terror’ became inextricably linked with immigration issues:

- 1) The bulk of boat people in 1999-2001 were followers of Islamic faith and hailed from countries such as Afghanistan and Iraq that were implicated in the events of September 11.
- 2) Some members of the government inferred (without evidence) that there were possibilities that some terrorists could be seeking to infiltrate Australia through portraying themselves as asylum seekers (Sydney Morning Herald, September 14, 2001).
- 3) The attacks on New York and Washington increased feelings of insecurity in Australia, as elsewhere, so that the government's pre-existing hard line on boat people and maintaining

---

<sup>20</sup> For a more detailed account of this incident, see Marr and Wilkinson (2003).

the security and integrity of Australia's borders gained in attractiveness to the voting public. (2002, pp. 37-40)

Although 9/11 was not directly related to immigration or asylum-seeker issues, through the media and the political debates that followed, the issues became intertwined.

The impacts of these two incidents have been widely debated in academic circles and many implications have been posited. Betts (2003) points to the most contentious aspects of the changes to the post-MV *Tampa* immigration policy: the continuation of mandatory detention for refugees who had arrived by boat, a change to the *Migration Act* that had been previously adjusted by the Keating Government; the turning away of refugee-laden boats, and offshore refugee processing. J. Olaf Kleist, argued that the Australian Government's response to the MV *Tampa*'s rescue efforts, 'modified the conception of sovereignty in a far-reaching manner, causing a new perception of citizenship, memory and the situation of asylum-seekers' (2009, p. 82). In reaction to this event and on numerous occasions after the event, Prime Minister John Howard stated, 'we will decide who comes to this country and the circumstances in which they come' (Howard, J., 2001). In analysing what had occurred after the MV *Tampa* incident, Kleist argued that:

...the notion of sovereignty changed from being the foundation of the polity that needed protection against stateless asylum-seekers to being the reason for policies to exclude refugees... (2009, p. 85)

In the midst of this, the Australian Government was simultaneously active in encouraging skilled migration and recruiting international students. There was a reduction in the number of family reunion visas, a point-based merit system, temporary visa entitlements, and the humanitarian settlement numbers were unchanged from 1996-2004 (Markus, 2009). The growth of asylum seekers and refugees grew worldwide in this period. In 2002, the numbers were estimated at 12 million (Crisp, 2003). This was happening in contrast to the opening of the gates to 'nomadic professionals, executives and entrepreneurs' (Walsh, 2011). Additionally, according to Aulich and Wettenhall these incidents justified the Howard Government's rejection of multiculturalism and emphasis on social cohesion as a way to combat terrorism (2008, p. 228). In 2006, the Howard Government introduced a Citizenship Test, one of many changes to the way in which future citizens would be processed, with the *Australian Citizenship Act 2007* released the following year.

Citizenship tests are becoming more pervasive across Western nations as a tool used by governments for immigrant selection. In Australia, language requirements were tightened

requiring the applicant to have ‘appropriate’ English language skills, as opposed to the 1984 *Citizenship Amendment Act* that required ‘basic’ English language skills. The test replicated similar tests that had been established in both Britain and the Netherlands (Tate, 2009, pp. 113-115). This, it could be argued was a regressive move back to a more assimilationist approach. Likewise, since the end of the 20th century, more than six European countries have introduced language testing linked to citizenship (Horner, 2015).<sup>21</sup> Van Oers links these tests with the ability to co-exist explaining that similar tests in Western Europe indicate that, ‘policy makers and politicians have established a direct link between the acquisition of knowledge on one hand and integration on the other’ (2013, p. 1).

Tavan argues that the Australian test was a ‘consciously constructed form of collective memory making that sought to reinforce a homogenous and undifferentiated view of Australian society and history in the pursuit of specific ideological and political interests’ (2009, p. 126). Tate similarly contends that the citizenship test was a concerted move away from multiculturalism, although he also asserted that the Test had ‘roots in concerns about elements of the Islamic population within Australian borders’ (2009, p. 118). Therefore, when viewed from these perspectives, the introduction of the citizenship test can either be seen as a retrospective act, moving away from multiculturalism to a more familiar assimilationist agenda, or an integrationist model of settlement, a form of protectionism, or a combination of all of these.

An emphasis on ‘Australian values’ by then Prime Minister John Howard became an important part in shaping citizenship throughout his years of government. Significantly, multiculturalism, asylum seekers and refugees were portrayed as challenges to these values. Jayasuriya maintains that Australia’s, ‘middle power politics has determined the nature and shape of citizenship building’, and that Howard’s endorsement of Australian values affected both domestic and external policy (Jayasuriya, K., 2008, p. i). In particular, throughout the period from 2001 to 2007, a series of events both internationally and nationally predicated changes to multiculturalism as a public policy, and to notions of citizenship. Australians also engaged widely in debates regarding Australian values and identity. According to Collins ‘by the end of 2006 both the Howard Government and the Labor opposition had replaced multiculturalism with ‘integration’ as the key word expressing the essence of Australia’s settlement policy for new immigrants’ (Collins, 1993, p. 67). The Howard Government adhered to a neo-liberal ideology that then influenced social and educational policies. Moreover,

---

<sup>21</sup>Analysis of the current policy suggests that, ‘official users of English language tests are more interested in the cultural affinity of prospective immigrants than their field-specific English proficiency’ Davies, A. (1997, p. 71).

the advancement of social cohesion was sought through a citizenship that emphasised of homogenous values rather than multicultural social policies.

During its time in office, the Howard Government was active in discrediting multiculturalism and asylum seekers. Border security and asylum seekers were seen as challenges to core values of national identity in so much as border security became not just a defence of the territorial boundaries but also provided defence against challenges to the core values of the nation (Jayasuriya, L., 2008; Maddox, 2005). As Maddox argued, Howard's emphasis on 'family', 'values' and 'social stability' played a key role in rebranding far right social conservatism as 'mainstream', by eliciting bipartisan support for carefully selected wedge issues' (Maddox, 2005, p. 69). Jayasuriya sums this up by proclaiming:

... this wedge issue that crystallised is the introduction of a formal procedure that tests prospective citizens on their ability to identify and accept key cultural and civil values seen as crucial to furthering the bonds of the national community. (2008, p. 15)

All these measures were a way of eliciting popular support, in the effort to shape and direct the formation of the political community.

In sum, multiculturalism as a public policy was introduced during a period that saw a myriad of changes to economic policy, social policy and educational policy. As Australia entered the new millennium, new challenges to the concept of multiculturalism would include involvement in a 'war on terror'; the development of economic ideology along a new path; and an increase in the global movement of people at a rate not witnessed before. It would challenge government to respond to these changes, to constantly adjust and adapt policies to rapid advances in technology, changing demographics, expanding competitive markets and trade and threats from and to the natural environment, to the security of citizenry and nation states. This period culminated in a global economic catastrophe, the 2008 Global Financial Crisis (GFC). While Australia avoided going into recession, the repercussions of the GFC had significant implications for decision making at a federal level and the impact of the GFC are likely to resonate for some time. These significant themes and main events—including the economic climate, international and domestic politics and the shifts and adjustments in education that occurred during the period from 1980 to 2010—will now be considered.

This chapter explored and probed the meaning and evolution of citizenship from an Australian perspective and also provided a contextual background to the first research question by

highlighting some of the unique forces that have shaped national public policies that have been put in place to respond to cultural diversity over time. Through this long view, ideas of citizenship have been revealed that are taken for granted and remain unproblematised, have been embedded in education and public policies regardless of shifts and changes in policies and in society. What has been demonstrated is that the historical trajectory had a substantial bearing on the ideologies and values that characterise the Australian national multicultural policies during the last two decades. Additionally, it is through understanding the background that the most recent policies for multicultural education can be contextualised. As education is part of the effort to influence and shape how political communities are formed, the following chapter will explore education for citizenship, and the manner in which multicultural education policies reveal notions of citizenship.

## **Chapter 4: Educating for Citizenship - National and State Responses**

As the previous chapters revealed, by 2009 notions of citizenship reflected the dominant ideas of that time and were evident in Federal Government policy and the changes to *Citizenship Acts*. In regard to the selection of new citizens, there was a move towards reinforcing exclusivity, with citizenship tests firmly in place and selective immigration schemes that favoured the skilled, educated and wealthy over the desperate and the needy. Whereas, notions of citizenship as revealed through public education were strongly influenced by neo-liberal ideologies that permeated public policies as exemplified with the ‘Schools of the Future’ initiative discussed previously. Earlier chapters explored and presented historical developments and changes in notions of citizenship, predominantly through Western thought and then, narrowing the gaze to Australia from 1901 focusing on immigration, settlement and the purpose of education during the major periods of change. To understand further, how notions of citizenship in multicultural education policies, this chapter focuses on the specific period of multicultural education policies from 1980 to 2009.

Chapter 4 aims to establish a deeper understanding of education, as it carries much responsibility for the shaping of citizens. Historical development, enactment and concepts of contemporary theories of citizenship for diverse societies were all explored in previous chapters. This chapter shifts the discussion by exploring ways in which citizenship education is conceptualised and constructed and the policies that guide it. The focus on education is important in understanding how people belong and to some extent, what they become. These discussions enable the researcher to answer the third research question that investigates what Multicultural Education policy responses in the State of Victoria reveal about understandings of multicultural education and notions of citizenship.

The chapter is divided into three interrelated sections. The first section provides an account of the approaches to citizenship education that emerged to support constructions of citizenship in Australia by discussing various understandings of citizenship education and how educational systems engaged citizenship education. This will allow for a greater understanding of how notions of citizenship are revealed communicated through education. The second section explores the shifting political landscape and the manner in which it has influenced educational design, content and teaching pertaining to citizenship education. Additionally, it provides the context, the environment that surrounds the position of multicultural education in the State of Victoria. Finally,

in order to answer the question of how citizenship is expressed through specific multicultural education policies, I will provide an analysis of the Victorian multicultural education policies between 1996 and 2009. These two policy texts have been analysed to establish how multiculturalism is understood and promoted, and in order to explain how notions of citizenship are articulated.

### **Citizenship Education and Education for Active Citizenship**

All education includes represented characteristics of citizenship, and how it is conceived and enacted. This has implications for how citizenship education is constructed in the education system. Citizenship education covers areas of belonging, inclusion, participation and political knowledge and it is possible to teach it as a specific subject or across the curriculum. Practice and promotion of citizenship education as a distinct part of the curriculum is not universal, and its place in the curriculum is subject to change. Questions of how citizenship education should be conceived and articulated, or if it should be taught at all, is still currently debated (Jenkins, 2011; Voloder, 2011).

Concepts of citizenship are linked with citizenship education. Education in most nations is considered a legal obligation, with students obliged to attend or participate in some form of schooling (van der Ploeg & Guérin, 2016). Education reflects societal values, current thinking, knowledge, ideas and notions of citizenship and as these change, the focus and nature of implicit or explicit citizenship education also shifts. Therefore, to help understand how citizenship is expressed through multicultural education policies this section will initially review current conceptions of citizenship education advanced in the literature, before focusing on citizenship education for culturally diverse or multicultural societies.

Citizenship education in multicultural societies or societies in which there is a high degree of cultural diversity is challenging, and widely debated (Banks, 2008). One of the vexing questions pertains to recognition of different cultural groups and cultural values. Citizenship education literature suggests that like education for multicultural societies, citizenship education should also have a reforming or transforming element, and should contribute and respond to changes in society. Kymlicka (2002) suggests that citizenship education can play a pivotal role in maintaining social order in ethnically diverse societies, by fostering attitudes of respect and tolerance. He warns that without these qualities, 'democracies become difficult to govern, even unstable' (Kymlicka, 2002, p. 285). Castles emphasises the responsibility of educators to not only enable

students to participate as ‘active’ citizens, education has a role in forming student’s, ‘social and political identity’, in addition, it is beholden on educators to respond to the, ‘effects of growing cultural diversity’ (2004a, pp. 17-48). For Parekh the vision for citizenship education in multicultural societies should have three important aims: to create a common culture out of difference; to form cross-cultural conversations and, to encourage intercultural dialogue (2002). Each of these notions of citizenship education provides possibilities of responding to cultural diversity and influencing societal change within democratic societies.

## **Section I**

### ***Education in Australia in the 20th Century***

The previous section provided an historical overview of how citizen education was widely promoted and understood and this section will focus specifically on the beginnings of citizenship education in Australia and follow how education for citizenship evolved over the past century. This will provide an historical perspective as a valuable vantage point from which to determine the role of educational policies and to provide an understanding of citizenship in a multicultural society.

As with notions of citizenship, conception, purpose and practice of citizenship and civic education and the epistemological nature of citizenship education differ considerably throughout history and from state to state. Although education in Australia does not appear in the Constitution as a right, it is now recognised as a right, with the responsibility for educating young children under state control. The Commonwealth provides around 40 per cent of education funding and has some influence over educational policy and curriculum. The concept of compulsory voting introduced at the beginning of the 20th century by then Prime Minister of Australia Alfred Deakin, eventuated in the present day requirement of citizens from the age of 18 years to vote in state and federal elections. The Federal Government has intervened in education policy in regards to civics and citizenship. As Ailwood *et al.* reason, by making it a mandatory obligation for citizens to vote this influences ‘constructions of the policy problem of education for citizenship’ (2011, p. 644). This has been the case for the Australian Government since public education was formed, therefore education for citizenship has been a part of the curriculum for the best part of the last 100 years.

When considering how citizenship education was conceptualised over the last century, Fyfe contends that in Australia from the late 1800s through to the early 1950s citizenship education reflected an, ‘imperial and national agenda that drew upon the historical relationship between



Australia, the British Empire and its monarchy' (2007, p. 115). In other words, the teaching of citizenship and civics related more to past associations and distant traditions than it reflected the prevailing conditions or responded to changes in society. This method of instruction was more in line with teaching political literacy that aimed to influence or shape permissible ways of life put forward by Clayton (2006, p. 130).

Over the passage of time, conceptualisations of citizenship education have been influenced by, and have responded to, external forces rather than to internal realities and focused on expectations of social improvement. Davidson points out that the first textbook produced for a formal civics course, by Isabella Marshall and Alice Hoy *Civics for Australian Schools* (1917), although 'emblematic' was, 'historically incorrect in its representation of self-government in Australia' Davidson (1997, p. 79). Moreover, it was based on the premise that, 'Australia is an ethnically British community and all rights depend on someone belonging to that community' (1997, p. 82). It is evident from this that when citizenship education was first conceived in Australia it encompassed British history and loyalty to the 'mother country' and expected standards of civic behaviour modelled on traditions and practices shaped historically over time in another land. This understanding of citizenship education remained quite stable in form and substance until the 1950s.

It is generally agreed that between the 1950s until the 1980s citizenship education and the 'old civics' lost impetus in the educational agenda. One area of education that saw dramatic change in this period was the teaching of civics education. Fyfe comments that in the 1960s, educators were more interested in teaching 'contemporary' themes under the name of social studies that encompassed issues affecting Australia, such as military conflict in the region, communism and concerns related to the national interest (2007, p. 116). Kennedy (2003) also notes the lack of 'explicit' teaching of citizenship education from the 1960s onwards. Of interest, in reviewing the literature more broadly however, there is no explanation as to *why* there was a lack of apparent attention shown by education authorities in teaching citizenship in an explicit and systematic way at this time. What it does indicate is that concepts of citizenship education were now becoming more fluid and that a desire or educational need for a hegemonic community was not as strong.

Throughout Australia, education was transitioning away from the assimilation approach towards an approach that placed emphasis on a range of policies to address needs and to provide opportunities for the culturally and linguistically diverse population. Initially, there was support given for bilingual and community language programs such as ESL learning and the beginnings of

development of a national Multicultural Education Policy. This also included a bilingual indigenous language program in the Northern Territory that remained in place until 1998 (Nicholls, 2005). As has been widely agreed, participation as members of society an essential objective of citizenship education. The knowledge and understanding of the dominant language is also associated with participation and a way of enabling members to take up the full benefits of citizenship in a democratic society. Therefore, it is believed that to participate fully in a democratic society knowledge of the language of the state is necessary (Heater, 2004b). National languages are also believed to be linked to social and cultural cohesion and social cohesion is often promoted through citizenship education (Cheong, *et al.*, 2007).

Academic and political debates regarding social cohesion and place of education are sometimes related to debates about social solidarity and social capital. Although the term social solidarity on the surface appears to be interchangeable with social cohesion, theories regarding social capital particularly those expounded by proponent Robert Putnam are a prominent feature of social cohesion in academic and political discussion especially in the United States of America (Putnam, 1993). It must be noted that theories of social capital theory have an extensive history in America, dating back to de Tocqueville, who strongly advocated communitarian ideals of social harmony and legislating through common interests (1838). Nevertheless, it has been Putnam's notions of social capital which he defines as 'features of social organization, such as trust, norms, and networks, that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions' have been central to policy debates and formation in regard to social cohesion (Putnam, 1993, p. 167).

There are integrationist ideals are also central to theories of social capital, those being related to the notions of a community unified by shared values. These aspects of this theory have been questioned. Harris points out three main problems with notions of a community of unified by shared values that are including 'disregard for the structural positionings that prevent people coming together as equals, the privileging of consensus over disagreement and debate, and the tendency for 'shared values' to in practice reflect dominant Anglo-Celtic cultural traditions and assumptions (Harris, 2010, p. 578).

Harris' counterpoint to social capital theories are also worth considering when examining government involvement in the creation of a social cohesive society. According to Heyneman and Todoric-Bebic, education as a state institution contributes in three ways. It helps provide public knowledge about social contracts, what they mean, and why they are important. Second, education helps provide the behaviour expected under social contracts, in part through the socially

heterogeneous experiences students have in the schools themselves. Third, education helps provide an understanding of the expected consequences for breaking social contracts (2000, p. 146).

Concerns regarding cultural aspects were echoed in Canada when policy makers moved to adopt a social cohesion framework and some commentators perceived this as a threat to multicultural policies. Hulse and Stone, when paraphrasing the concerns of Jenson (1998), as well as Beauvais and Jenson (2002) state that this is because the cultural components of 'shared values and commitment to community draws attention from other ways of looking at the cleavages and differences, such as social justice, inequality and discrimination' (Hulse & Stone, 2007, p. 115). Research in this area shows that policy shifts toward what Lithman (2011) refers to as the 'integration-citizenship –social cohesion nexus' in economically advanced democratic societies have been attributed to:

...socially fragmentary effects of globalization, and the symptoms of community breakdown and social disorder that seems to accompany rising consumerism, individualization and the cultural and religious conflicts that arise in reaction to globalisation (Beck 2000; Green 1997; Touraine 2000). (Green, *et al.*, 2006, p. 24)

How social cohesion can be achieved has been the subject of a relatively recent report by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) focusing on the competing demands of the recent developments. According to the OECD a society that is socially cohesive should have the following five characteristics:

...it works towards the well-being of all its members, fights exclusion and marginalisation, creates a sense of belonging, promotes trust, and offers its members the opportunity of upward social mobility. (OECD, p. 210)

The report also, stresses that education and education policies are key to the social cohesion agenda (OECD, p. 210). Problematic issues previously identified include the capacity to restrict competing or dissenting views if they are perceived to differ from the dominant normative discourse of a nation's social and cultural order. The following section will explore questions around the aim of social cohesion for diverse citizenship and how this has been constructed in the educational policy.

With the Migrant Education Program (MEP) and multiculturalism as public policy, there was a reconsideration of how education would reflect contemporary society. This required both Federal

and State Governments to conceptualise educational policies that specifically attended to cultural diversity, therefore, moving away from the previous integrationist or assimilationist approaches. How this translated specifically into the changes in curricula or changes to the approaches to citizenship education is relatively unexplored.

On the other hand, the advent of the Australian Bicentenary in 1988 was a time of new nationalism: a time to look anew at state, nation and diversity in Australia (Alomes, 1988; Rubenstein, 1995).<sup>22</sup> The purpose and direction of citizenship education transitioned completely to the focus on Australia and Australians. In this period, citizenship education also aimed at the involvement of the young in the political process. A campaign for 'Education for Active Citizenship' came from the states, particularly where there was a Labor incumbent (Davidson, 1997, p. 135). This initiative was prompted by the findings of a Senate Standing Committee on Employment, Education and Training report (Senate Standing Committee on Employment, 1988) that there was a 'participation deficit' in politics amongst Australian youth (Edwards, 2010, p. 1).

Citizenship education is commonly used as a vehicle for providing students with an understanding of the political system - political literacy - or as a form of political inculcation. In other words, it is the way in which students come to a shared understanding of political processes. To become politically literate, students have to acquire specific forms of political knowledge, with the most common intention of educators to connect student learning to, 'opportunities for participation in the wider society' (Fyfe, 2007, p. 10). Political theorist Matthew Clayton explains the two most prominent models of political literacy; the first model is specifically aimed at cultivating in individuals the, 'knowledge of the nature and history of the political institutions and laws that govern their lives' (2006, p. 129). In other words, citizenship education under this model of political literacy is taught to ensure that students have a grounded and unbiased knowledge of politics, and that they gain an understanding of the principles and justifications behind the formation of institutions and laws. In contrast, the second model of political literacy aims to influence or shape an individual's 'political motivation.' The second model of political literacy emphasises specific political beliefs and teaches participation in political life 'in permissible ways' (Clayton, 2006, p. 140). The latter model is regarded as problematic in democratic societies. If citizenship education was framed in this way, it would be more likely to play an important role in the promulgation and the perpetuation of the political institutions and laws of a particular political bias or persuasion, rather than informing political rights and critical evaluation of forms of power. This raises the

---

<sup>22</sup> The Australian Bicentenary was a celebration of the 200th anniversary of the arrival in Sydney of the British 'First Fleet.'

Jayne Lysk. *Notions of Citizenship Revealed Through Multicultural Education Policies in Australia*

question as to whether in practice citizenship education neatly fits into one or the other model or whether there are practices that borrow from both.

Political participation is a common aim within citizenship education, with many academics in agreement that for a state to be democratic and just, the purpose of citizenship education must be to ensure that students are knowledgeable about democratic principles (Banks, 2006; Fyfe, 2007; Heater, 2004a; Kymlicka, 1995; Lauder, *et al.*, 2006). To some scholars, citizenship education should be about enabling students to participate in the political process, but not limited to the political process; participation can also encompass the fostering of a democratic attitude (Biesta & Lawy, 2006). It is argued that citizenship education should enable students to contribute in a 'substantive' way (Lo Bianco & Gvozdenko, 2006, p. 211). For this to occur it is argued that students would need to have more than factual or procedural knowledge of democratic principles and institutions to able students apply a critical lens to their society.

In democratic societies particularly, citizenship education is seen as important and a sound way to help students appreciate and understand the systems and operations that underpin democracy. Kymlicka suggests that for students to participate in the advancement of democracy it also involves, 'acquiring a range of dispositions, virtues, and loyalties that are intimately bound up with the practice of democratic citizenship' (2001, p. 293). Westheimer and Kahne assert that for students to be educated for democracy, they must be taught to be 'personally responsible citizens, participatory citizens, and justice oriented citizens' (2004, p. 237). It must be acknowledged that participation does not necessarily only belong to the political domain, nor does it have to be officially taught through educational institutions. Citizenship education can come from participation in the community, and can also include creating ties to society through family, friends and informal social activities (Harris, *et al.*, 2008). That is, citizenship education involves engaging in social practices and social tasks, however, these latter activities do not dominate current educational practices that tend to focus of engagement and participation as tied to forms of political literacy.

We can identify a clear instance of this in the early 1990s under Prime Ministership Paul Keating who initiated a bipartisan supported push to encourage more political participation. This has implications for citizenship education. Kennedy suggests that this renewed interest in citizenship education stemmed from Keating's 'big picture' for the nation, which included a vision for greater engagement with the Asia pacific region, Indigenous reconciliation and, for the desire for Australia to become a republic (2003, p. 54). As discussed in Chapter 3, this new nationalism was reflected

in reforms to the *Citizenship Act*; evidenced by changes to citizenship legislation that made it harder for immigrants to obtain citizenship (Davidson, 2001, p. 159). Moreover, a report—*Australians All-Enhancing Australian Citizenship*—was published in 1994 and was part of a concerted process to define citizenship in Australia (Australian Joint Standing Committee on Migration, 1994). It was also around this time a Senate committee was established to investigate *Nation Citizenship Indicators* and the Civic Expert Group was established to provide recommendations on citizenship education for the public education sector.

The recommendations for this new initiative for citizenship education came from research conducted by the Civics Expert Group established in 1993 by the Keating Government. The group was charged with the task of providing the Commonwealth with a ‘strategic plan for a non-partisan program of public education and information on the Australian system of government, the Australian Constitution, Australian citizenship and other civics education’ (Civics Expert Group, 2002, p. 5). This education initiative, which was formed and funded nationally holds much significance for it not only promoted citizenship education as important for the national interest, it also encompassed visions for social and political literacy through provision of a clear picture as to how Australian’s national approach to democracy and politics was to be conceived.

During the 1990s, comparable government initiatives for citizenship education occurred in the United Kingdom, France, Germany and the United States all bringing changes to educational philosophies and practices (Torney-Purta, et al., 1999). Key changes included a greater emphasis on individualism and individual success, an awareness of global competitiveness, and an increase on pressures on schools to be accountable. Additionally, there were demands for greater market choice in the education sector, as citizens must be self-reliant and less dependent on the state in accordance with the neoliberal philosophy that permeated most developing countries (Walsh, 2014, p. 281). According to Macintyre and Simpson, as a result of the adoption of these neoliberal policies what emerged was ‘a disquiet that traditional community values and cohesion were breaking down’ and tension became increasingly apparent, ‘between education for individual success and economic efficiency on one hand, and personal and community wellbeing on the other’ (2009, p. 123). These conditions surrounded the re-emergence of a nationally sanctioned civic and citizenship education refined to suit the dominant neo-liberal agenda permeating the education sector.

Analysis and reviews of the *Discovering Democracy* resource reveal a number of ways of interpreting the underlining messages. It has been asserted that there was an emphasis on

community harmony and social cohesion and that civics curriculum should facilitate this by stressing commonalities among Australians (Howard, C. & Patten, 2006, p. xxiii). Davidson (2000) makes the point that the *Discovering Democracy* program does not adequately address the issues of 'living together in harmony' issues and that there is too much of a focus on history, and national identity. Conversely, an independent evaluation of the program conducted in the late 1999 and another in 2003 (Erebus Consulting Groups), concluded that it was of 'high educational quality and interest groups concurred that Indigenous, multicultural, gender, regional and international perspectives were all appropriately included, a result not easily achieved' (Macintyre & Simpson, 2009, p. 127). Whilst, multiculturalism as a public policy seemed to have simultaneously lost favour with the Federal Government of the day, there does seem to be enough evidence to conclude that the *Discovering Democracy* program supported multiculturalism. What perhaps became more prominent were concepts of social cohesion and Australian values.

There is a strong link between education and the promotion of nationalism, patriotism and national identity in the public school system. National education systems have been places to promote citizenship and national identity based on tautological and linear assumptions (O'Connor citing Beck, 2000). More specifically, citizenship and civic education can embody notions of a shared national identity, and this then has been seen as a means of promoting a sense of national identity (Dyrenfurth, 2005b; Kymlicka, 1995; Lauder, *et al.*, 2006). What is under challenge and constant debate in the literature is how national identity is constructed and if this is part of the remit of citizenship education, how is this transmitted and conceived especially in nations with diverse citizenry and in an age of ever increasing mobile citizenry.

Further to the understanding of citizenship education as a means to reinforcing or teaching students perceptions and considerations regarding nation identity. This has been challenged on a number of levels and has been critiqued by theorist as problematic. Firstly, because national identity 'open to influence by individual political leader's perceptions and their ideologies' and the conception of the national character or type is, 'imbued with specific qualities and beliefs' (Rubenstein 1995). Secondly, if a shared national identity is grounded in a common understanding of a shared past, that is, national identity is formed through a shared history, it raises questions regarding how history might to be interpreted. As Kymlicka (1995) points out this is an, 'emotional-affective sense of identity, based on a veneration of shared symbols or historical myths'. National identity is fluid and open to interpretation and politic ideology, and it is because of this that Lo Bianco and Gvozdenko (2006, p. 210) warn that if identity is to be a part of citizenship education it

must include changing views on, 'identity and new understandings of what citizenship means...and encompass difference'. Therefore, this begs the question can citizenship education in democratic societies with diverse populations reflect the contemporary rather than relying on past imaginaries to consider notions of national identity.

The reframing of citizenship education was further emphasised in 2005, when the Commonwealth Government released the *National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools*. This initiative was significant for it was the first time that values education had an explicit framework apart and separate from the civic and citizenship agenda. While Cranston *et al.* point out that these values are both consistent with notions of democratic equality, and could be viewed as 'typically Australian (yet none are exclusively Australian),' the issue is that the that the government is attempting 'to overlay or impose its own ideological understanding of these values onto schools'(2010, p. 14).

Dyrenfurth posits that the Howard government's values education contributed to both 'to his [Prime Minister John Howard] decade-long electoral success' but also impacted 'upon the collective desire to address inequality' (2007, p. 211). Haigh, Murcia, and Norris in examining the civics and citizenship for young Australians reports that although it appears the government's policy initiative recognise the importance of educating young citizens in terms of the rights and values that underpin democracy and citizenship:

The same policy network however appears reticent to introduce students to the ideas that inform our understanding of rights, values and the processes of government. By not paying the same attention to the ideas that inform political practice, young citizens, who are learning about the relationship between government, society and citizenship are not exposed to the tensions and complexities that shape society. More importantly, the policies do not encourage students to work through these complexities so as they can take a considered position on the issues that government, and therefore, political parties, need to address in society. (Haigh, *et al.*, 2014, p. 601)

Therefore, it was clear at this time that government was both supporting and recognising the importance of civics and citizenship education. However, it would appear that critical exploration of all aspects of this subject was not given equal importance or support.



## Section II

### ***A Multicultural Education Policy***

The first-ever multicultural education policy in Australia, the MEP, was released in 1978 under the Fraser Liberal-Country Party Government. The subsequent policy was released under the Hawke Labor Government *Education in, and for, a Multicultural Society: Issues and Strategies for Policymaking* in 1987.

In 1978, MEP was introduced with a funding commitment of \$5 million for a period of three years. The initial policy was, according to Cahill, framed around ‘pluralistic multiculturalism’, whereas this last national program for multicultural education was framed around ‘equitable multiculturalism’ (2001, p. 47). Expanding on this, Cahill extrapolates that the education priorities of the latest MEP had three key elements, ‘equity, understanding, and identity’ that is, opening up equality of access and participation for ethnic minorities, developing cross-cultural understanding and knowledge, and expanding what it meant to be an Australian (2001, p. 47). This redefined the focus of multicultural education away from the previous pluralist model, which was associated with the celebration of diversity or acceptance of difference to finding value in cultures. Notably, Lo Bianco points out:

Diversity is frequently cited as a concept worthy of recognition in policy, able to be celebrated and worthy of celebration. Yet diversity as a historically loaded term is associated in the minds of many social groups and individuals as eroding social cohesion. (Lo Bianco, 2016, p. 222).

Kalantzis and Cope made similar findings, adding that the MEP was also ‘in everybody’s self-interest’ (1999, p. 252). Schools were seen as a key agent for encouraging:

A multicultural attitude in Australian society by fostering the retention of cultural heritage of difference ethnic groups and promoting intercultural understanding’ (Canberra Multicultural Task Force, 1978, pp. 11-12).

The policy acknowledged ‘that other cultures did have something to share and that there could be something to learn from them’ (Cahill & Gundert, 1996, p. 16). The program included English as a Second Language (ESL), Languages Other than English (LOTE), Mother-tongue maintenance, bilingual Education, and strategies to combat prejudice, racism and stereotyping.<sup>23</sup> Although these

---

<sup>23</sup> For more on the history of bilingual education see Clyne - the clauses of the *Education Act* prohibiting bilingual education dating back to WWI persisted in some states when they were contradicted in practice. Victoria did not abolish the legislation until 1986, despite more than ten years of lobbying. (Clyne, 1997, p. 64)

programs were seen as 'something that was in addition to the real role of teaching' (Davies, I. & Issitt, 2005).

The MEP seen as something on the periphery of 'real education' is further evidenced in 1983, when the Hawke Federal Government initiated research to investigate its various manifestations and effects. The review concluded that a mere 14 per cent of all Australian schools had, to that time, received at least one grant and an estimated 7 to 10 per cent of the nation's school children participated in the programs (Cahill, 1984). Furthermore, very few schools with low numbers of children from Non-English Speaking Backgrounds (NESB) applied for grants. Underlying this pattern was a perception that the term 'multicultural' was synonymous with 'immigrant' or 'non-English' and there was a failure to explore the 'dimensions of the different ethnic heritages of British and Irish peoples within the multicultural framework' (Cahill & Gundert, 1996, p. 17).

The interpretations and application of the policy multicultural educational policies at this time were left open to educators and schools. They were aimed at NESB children and had a tendency to celebrate the ethnicity of those who were not part of the Anglo-Celtic mainstream. In addition, they, 'harboured a residual integrationism in that all are seen to be entitled to the socio-linguistically powerful forms of the dominant culture'. As Kalantzis and Cope noted in colourful terms, school multicultural days reflected a 'spaghetti and polka' approach where culture was fetishized as 'exotic food, folk dance and colourful national costume' (1981). The Commonwealth Government policy of multiculturalism was inadvertently promoting a form of essential difference. There was very little, if any intercultural understanding being promoted, and any increased appreciation of the knowledge that other cultures had to offer, was not apparent.

The MEP extended integrationist policies with additional supports and extending language education. This points to the MEP being built on three main assumptions. First, the policy is targeted at new migrants and therefore, renders others as a homogenous group. The second assumption relates to the first, that the aim of equal access to participate as citizens as a core value limits the reach of the policy to new migrants. It, therefore, assumes that indigenous Australians and established citizens with ethnic origins do not require access program elements such as community languages or cross-cultural understandings. This is also evident in the belief that not having a full grasp of the dominant language renders citizens deficient in some way and not able to participate fully in society. The third assumption is that issues of racism and prejudice stemmed from the increased intake of new migrants. This points to a policy response that was shaped by the

perception that new migrants were the problem and not the way the society operated or was imagined.

The momentum for multiculturalism as a policy shifted again in late 1987, when the Hawke Government ceased funding the MEP. The aforementioned report of the National Advisory and Co-ordination Committee on Multicultural Education (NACCME)—*Education in, and for, a Multicultural Society*—clarified the concept of multicultural education. The NACCME report argued for a more equitable multiculturalism, and included the NLP. It argued that if the policy was carefully managed, ‘Australia’s diverse language resource, including Aboriginal languages, would produce complementary benefits: enrichment, economic opportunities, external relations and equality’ (cited in Kalantzis & Cope, 1999, p. 252). This highlighted the twofold imperatives of the policy: economic and social benefits. However, a year later, multiculturalism as an educational policy and as a concept would come under public criticism again, and a bipartisan agreement on multiculturalism as a national policy would be put to the test.

The ideological shifts and changes over the period from 1990 to 2009 impacted on the purpose and structure of education. Hilferty argues that was a period in which government looked toward education systems, ‘to solve both economic and social problems – to improve economic productivity and foster social cohesion’ (2008, p. 57). These changes echoed parallel movements in much of the Western world, where national identity and citizenship were promoted. As previously discussed, the citizenship education initiative continued under the Liberal-Coalition party (1996-2007). A nationally funded curriculum resource package titled, *Discovering Democracy* was released in 1997 and was distributed free to all government and non-government schools. The emphasis of citizenship education, which previously focused on the historical development of democracy of Australia, in 1995 shifted to, ‘developing active citizenship skills to participate in current civics issue’, however; under the newly elected Liberal and National government this new focus was ‘lessened in order that a greater emphasis be placed on knowledge of the historical development of Australian democracy (Kemp, 1997 cited in Macintyre & Simpson, 2009, p. 125)’. This change appeared to represent a trend away from multiculturalism and a move toward a desire for students to have a shared understanding of Australian history and values.

Professor of Political Science, Carol Johnson’s (2007) article—*John Howard’s ‘values’ and Australian identity*—not only argues that the then Prime Minister John Howard had a specific agenda which involved constructing the Australian identity as an Anglo-Celtic one with specific Australian values, but that these values had an marginalising effect:

Jayne Lysk. *Notions of Citizenship Revealed Through Multicultural Education Policies in Australia*

Howard's conception of Australia's identity and values also potentially marginalises those Anglo-Celts who support a formal government apology to the Stolen Generations, a Republic, more extensive Freedom of Expression; Rights agendas or those who disagree with the 'values' of the War in Iraq. (Johnson, 2007, p. 205)

Howard's Australian values are arguably underpinned by particularly limited view of egalitarianism, antithetically couched in terms such as 'mateship' and a 'fair-go.'

Howard and Patten suggest that in the wake of the 2002 Bali bombings, the Education Minister, David Kemp, enlisted civics education programs to help with the, 'achievement of national security objectives' (2006, p. 467). There was also a further push for social cohesion with the introduction of 'values education' in the mid-2000s. They also point out that the values considered important show 'scant acknowledgement of the existence of fundamental value conflicts, such as those between neo-liberalism and social democracy, as well as other political and cultural differences that persist in Australian society' (Howard, C. & Patten, 2006, p. 467). This understanding of the way in which values have been promulgated highlights the ideological position of the Federal Liberal-National coalition government of the time. Tsolidis reminds us of the then government's understanding of multiculturalism, 'the view that immigrants and their children needed to adopt dominant Australian values' and this marked a shift from previous paradigms (Tsolidis, 2011, p. 22).

The governments of Australia and Victoria had been in accordance and their ideological agendas, which informed citizenry, represented a shared vision. Nelson, Carlson, and Palonsky argue that such ideology plays a 'vital role' in the process of shaping society in both an individual, and collective, sense (1996, p. 4). They also emphasise that education, especially at primary and secondary school-levels, perform a key role in this society-shaping process (Nelson, *et al.*, 1996). In sum, this proposition was exactly what had been in place in both national and state understandings in relation to multicultural education up until 1996. Both the Victorian State Government, and the Federal Government, shared a similar vision for the nation's identity and that of their citizens. In the next section, the shifting ideology and policy approaches taken to multicultural education in relation to the initiatives in citizenship education will be discussed.

### ***The Shifting Political Landscape***

Prior to the Federal election in 1996, multiculturalism as a public policy had received bipartisan support for over twenty years. However, by 1996, the political landscape was changing and the ideological position of those in power at a national level was moving towards direct challenge to

their established multicultural policies and citizenship education policies. As a public policy, multiculturalism has always had critics. In 1984, Professor Geoffrey Blainey sparked the 'Asian immigration debate' by publically criticising the government's immigration policies. In 1988, the then Leader of the federal Opposition, John Howard, reignited the 'Asian immigration debate' with very strong criticisms of multiculturalism. In 1996, the leader of the newly-formed One Nation Party, Pauline Hanson yet again questioned Federal immigration and multicultural policies. The effect of Pauline Hanson, came to be known as the 'Hanson phenomenon', and had two main driving forces. One of these forces was the media; the second was that One Nation's mobilisation lay in opposition to 'new class' values particularly around race rather than concerns about economic insecurity (Goot & Watson, 2001, pp. 159-191). Hanson publicly attacked welfare recipients and Indigenous Australians.

The common thread linking Hanson, Blainey and Howard is their criticism of immigration, specifically 'Asian immigration'. Federal immigration policies directly relate to accommodation of diversity and conceptions of citizenship. As Ang and Stratton point out:

In contemporary multicultural Australia, where "cultural diversity" is supposedly accepted and even cherished, "race"—as operationalised in the term "Asian"—has become a marker of the limits of tolerable diversity, of what, from the point of view of the new racists, goes beyond the acceptable boundaries of Australian national culture and identity. It is through the rhetoric of "race" that the political right has consistently challenged multiculturalism. The term "Asian" stands here for unassimilable, unabsorbable difference, too different to be integrated into the "Australian way of life". But because the discourses of multiculturalism does not have a way of talking about "race" it cannot deal with the elements of diversity which, for Hanson, Blainey and Howard in his earlier incarnation, are "too much" and therefore, a threat to the "Australian community". (1998, p. 36)

This period marked a significant shift around both the discourse and practices that had been in place to ensure non-discriminatory immigration policies since the termination of the White Australia Policy in the 1970s. It also marked a shift in Federal Government support for multiculturalism as a public policy, and as a way of accommodating diverse citizenry.

Education policies considered important for the 'national interest' were also set to change under the Liberal-National government led by Prime Minister John Howard. Education was deemed to be an essential element of policies geared to the 'national interest' as defined, either broadly in social and opportunity terms or more narrowly in economic terms (Lingard, 2000, p. 29). The period

marked the beginning of fluctuating notions of citizenship, as revealed by shifts to government public and education policy and conditional involvement at the Commonwealth level. The following section examines these changes, focusing on the devolution of multicultural education to the domain of the states. It focuses on the Victorian State Government's multicultural policies to investigate the ideologies and values that characterise them and takes into account they were produced in the context of the latest national public policy settings.

## **Victoria**

Records since the gold rushes of 19th century Victoria show that the immigrant population continued to expand, with the 2011 Census figures showing that 46.8 per cent of Victorians were either born overseas, or have at least one parent born overseas (Victorian Multicultural Commission, 2016). Even with a strong immigrant presence, Victoria upheld values of the rest of the nation, and implemented assimilationist and integrationist settlement policies until the 1970s. In 1974, the Office of Victorian Multicultural Affairs and Citizenship, and the Ethnic Communities Council of Victoria, were both established. Additionally, the Commonwealth put in place the National Equity Program for Schools (NEPS), a source of funding for ESL students and newly-arrived immigrants. These organisations and others have played an important role in representing and advocating for multiculturalism and encouraging participation and social equality.

From the early 1980s, organisations emerged to provide and support the multicultural agenda. According to Clyne and Markus, the Victorian Government had been, 'at the forefront in development of multicultural policies' (2001, p. 84). One such development was the establishment in 1983 of the Victorian Multicultural Commission (VMC), which was later given a legislative framework by the Kennett Liberal-National government (1992–1999) via the *Victorian Multicultural Commission Act* (1993). The VMC acted as a voice for culturally and linguistically diverse (CALD) communities, and is today involved with advising government. The *Victorian Multicultural Commission Act* (1993) had six main objectives:

- (a) to promote full participation by Victoria's ethnic groups in the social, economic, cultural and political life of the Victorian community; and (b) to promote access by Victoria's ethnic groups to services made available by government and other bodies; and (c) to encourage all of Victoria's ethnic groups to retain and express their social identity and cultural inheritance; and (d) to promote co-operation between bodies concerned with ethnic affairs; and (e) to promote unity among Victoria's ethnic

groups; and (f) to promote a better understanding of Victoria's ethnic groups within the Victorian community. (*Victorian Multicultural Commission Act, 1993*)

In the early 1980s, the Victorian Ministry of Education had included multiculturalism in its educational guidelines and had been an advocate of multicultural education. Moreover, the Victorian *Ministerial Paper No. 4* written by Fordham noted that multiculturalism, as a policy was 'non-negotiable'. This was a directive within the policy framework requiring Victorian school councils to develop their own curricula (1983, p. 6). Previous forms of multicultural education existed in Victoria since the 1970s, with many initiatives developed during the inaugural Migrant Education Action conference of 1974 (DEECD, 2011). The Ministry of Education published Victoria's first multicultural educational policy in 1986. The policy—*Education In and For a Multicultural Society*—paraphrased the Hawke federal government policy. The document was not directional, but rather its main objective was to explain and apply the federal government's policies for multicultural education (Department of Education [DOE], 1997; Lew, 2016).

The new state policy maintained a number of themes and elements that were evident in previous Federal and state policies. Multicultural education policies, as Jupp explains, had limited and pragmatic objectives that included:

...ensuring the easy transition of immigrants into Australian society; limiting and reducing prejudice; developing access and equality in the provision of public services; encouraging non-English speaking Australians to maintain their languages and cultures; and advocating tolerance of new religions, cultural groups and languages within the context of acceptance of Australian laws and traditions. All this is designed to alleviate social and personal stress and to avoid the creation of disadvantage or alienated groups based on ethnic variety. (1997, p. 31)

The new Victorian policy maintained: multi-cultural perspectives across the curriculum; languages other than English; English as a second language; parental involvement; access and equity; and cultural retention (Arber, 2005, p. 638). Arber also noted that, 'what is noticeable is that these documents, like those issued by the federal government, refer to concepts of race and ethnicity in terms of multiculturalism' (2005, p. 638). This alignment between the policies, and the similar conception of multiculturalism, is not unusual although legally, education in Australia is a state responsibility (Criddle, et al., 2004, p. 27).

The *Galbally* report (1978) was, according to Rizvi, the impetus for the Multicultural education policy in the late 1970s, and recognised that ethnic relations in Australia were 'at a critical stage',

and feared 'heightened tensions' (1985, p. 20). Similarly, the *Multicultural Policy for Victorian Schools* (MPVS) was initiated and released in a context that was comparable to the social unease caused by the 'Hanson phenomenon.' Hanson rallied her supporters to join her in rejecting multiculturalism because she considered it a threat to Australians national unity. Before the release of the *Education for Global and Multicultural Citizenship* (EGMC) policy, it is apparent that social unease around ethnic diversity also required a solution. This included crises around asylum seekers, the Cronulla riots, and Islamic terrorism. Policy concerns regarding were manifest in several areas.

In 1996, the Howard Government was elected, after thirteen years of Labor government. In the State of Victoria, the Kennett Liberal-National coalition had been in office since 1992, after defeating the previous state Labor Government that had been in office from 1982 to 1992. As discussed in Chapter 3, this was to be a time of substantial change in the education arena, influenced by an underpinning neoliberal ideology championed by both state and Commonwealth Government. Public education was in a state of transformation, while socially there was much debate about immigration, the place of multiculturalism, and the impacts of globalisation.

As has been established, at the state level beginning in the 1980s, Victoria's multicultural policies were closely aligned with Federal Government policies, and indeed, had taken their direction from them. This section will next discuss the two decades in which the Victorian State Government released two significant multicultural education policies: *Multicultural Policy for Victorian Schools* (MPVS) in 1997 and, *Education for Global and Multicultural Citizenship: A Strategy for Victoria Government Schools 2009-2013* (EGMC), in 2009. The section will also discuss how multicultural citizenship is understood, conceptualised and accommodated at a state level in Victoria.

The influence on multicultural educational policies of the Federal Government changed in 1996. It is at this point where the Federal Government's ideological position in regard to multiculturalism becomes markedly different from the ideological position of the Victorian State Government, and in particular the views of its then leader, Premier Jeff Kennett. The most important change was that multicultural education policy was no longer considered a part of the national education agenda. Prior to the change of Federal Government in 1996, the Victorian State Government had initiated the Multicultural Victoria Inquiry (MVI). The MVI's findings made by the Victorian Ethnic Affairs Commission, were released in November 1995 noting a need to develop a 'specific multicultural education policy for schools, to provide intercultural education in primary and secondary school, and to develop strategies to combat prejudice, racial tension or misunderstanding in schools' (Victorian Ethnic Affairs Commission, 1995, p. 7). The report



highlighted some significant social problems: prejudice and racial tension. From this report emerged the first wholly state-initiated *Multicultural Policy for Victorian Schools* (MPVS) in 1997.

With the election of the Liberal-National coalition to state government in Victoria in 1992, the 'Schools of the Future' policy radically altered previous education policy in the state. Under the Kennett government, Victoria's well-resourced schools became some of the worst resourced in Australia, with over two hundred school closures, larger schools being formed as a consequence, and, a market-based approach to schools where resources were no longer equally distributed (Marginson, 1993, p. 47). Within two years, more than \$300 million was slashed from the state budget and more than 7,000 teachers were removed from the state system. Specialist programs such as, 'music, art, language, physical education and pastoral care were cut'. There was also substantial shifts in the 'distribution of integration and LOTE teachers from the western and northern regions to wealthier areas in the southern and eastern suburbs (McRae, 1994, p. 217). Many of the schools that were closed were in areas with a high proportion of newly arrived migrants. In November of 1992, the Victorian Government announced that over 4,000 teaching positions would be cut, and as a result, many ESL teachers either retired or moved into non-ESL classes (Cahill & Gundert, 1996, p. 18). These economically driven policies appear at odds with the social justice agenda put forward in the MPVS.

The *Schools of the Future* policy changed the way schools were organised such that they were modelled on private enterprise. Principals had more managerial responsibilities, with the government having tighter control over education policy. Moreover, Marginson noted that, 'individual schools, rather than the state school system as a whole, are now responsible for educational outcomes.' These outcomes were tied to the level of resourcing, and what appeared to be neglected—or not factored in—was a school's, 'academic record is not only a function of the educational process, but is also affected by the background of its students' (Marginson, 1993, p. 53). These changes appeared to disadvantage the most disadvantaged students, and the implications for schools with high levels of NESB students appeared bleak.

The 'Schools of the Future' policy had been in place for almost four years when the MPVS was released, and by this time, Victorian public schools had undergone massive restructuring and change. The influence of parents and community participation was now limited and there was a top-down approach to the curriculum. Costar and Economou argued that the approach employed by the government enabled reduced school funding whilst, 'taking tighter control over the curriculum and content' (1999, p. vii). The MPVS policy reflected this approach, because the

majority of respondents represented government departments, or Victorian universities. The curriculum was moved to state control and it was expected that the *Curriculum and Standards Frameworks* would include 'multicultural perspectives' in each 'key learning area' by 2000 (DOE, 1997, p. 9). Schools were required to devise and implement their own policies and respond to the recommendations. The government charged the Ministerial Advisory Council on Languages other than English and English as a Second Language (MACLOTE and ESL) with the responsibility of 'monitoring and implementation of the policy' (DOE, 1997, p. 9). However, ultimately the way the policy was interpreted depended on individual schools.

The MPVS policy can be seen as response to, and influenced by, numerous factors: the release of the results of the *Victorian Multicultural Inquiry*, stressed the need for an educational policy to address social problems including prejudice and racial tension; there was a populist backlash against multiculturalism, encouraged by Pauline Hanson's One Nation party; and importantly, the Hansonite backlash was not in any way assuaged by Prime Minister John Howard with his apparent indifference to multiculturalism. Rizvi reminds us that after the Federal commitment to the MEP ended in 1986, state education departments were asked to 'take up the challenge of ensuring the further promotion of multiculturalism by "mainstreaming" reform initiatives begun under the MEP' (1992, p. 134). Therefore, the impetus behind the Kennett Government initiative for a multicultural educational policy was multifaceted.

Policies rarely change completely. Considine (1994) contends that governments tend to re-affirm or adjust policies rather than stopping or starting anew. Even though the MPVS was a new policy and was 'recommended to all schools, teachers and administrators, school communities, and to the wider community' it was informed by over thirty years of research and reporting in the area of multicultural education (DOE, 1997, p. 4). The MPVS maintained the ideological position presented in previous policies because it advocated similar goals and values to those of previous policies: cultural pluralism, equality, and tolerance. Additionally, as has been previously pointed out, the MPVS included the strand's multi-cultural perspectives across the curriculum: languages other than English; English as a second language; parental involvement; access and equity; and cultural retention, that had previously been embedded in the MEP (Arber, 2005, p. 638).

The Victorian multicultural education policy encompassed a vision for a culturally plural, tolerant and egalitarian society. The changes to the new initiative tended to reside in the implementation rather than in a value shift. Victorian Premier Jeff Kennett was a major player in the policy creation, a person who had previously overseen a critical overhaul of educational policy, and a politician with

a personal and professional commitment to multiculturalism. All these factors appear to have influenced the creation and the timing of the release of the MPVS.

The second major multicultural education policy initiative from the Victorian State Government came later than previously anticipated. The lead up to the release of the EGMC was also in a climate of political change. Steve Bracks' Labor government came to power in 1999 and remained so until 2007. Like his predecessor Premier Jeff Kennett, Bracks was a Minister for Multicultural Affairs and was a very strong supporter of multiculturalism and Aboriginal reconciliation. John Brumby—who went on to become Victorian Premier from 2007 to 2010—took over the Multicultural Affairs portfolio. During Bracks' time in government, his support for multiculturalism was evident in the forms of legislation that were passed. In the first term, the *Racial and Religious Tolerance Act* (2001), and in the second term, the *Multicultural Victoria Act* (2004). According to Jakubowicz, the *Multicultural Victoria Act* 'established overarching principles of multiculturalism for the state, and set up reporting requirements for government departments in relation to multiculturalism' (2016).

As established previously, the focus of the MPVS was very much focused on developing students' abilities to take their place within the school community and the broader society, with the focus on the betterment of that society. In contrast, the EGMC was broader in its approach with a wider scope for developing students or citizens, not just for broader society, but also for a globalised world including the future work place. Conversely, as the full title of the most recent policy—*Education for Global and Multicultural Citizenship: A Strategy for Victoria Government Schools 2009-2013* (EGMC)—states, even though it appears to incorporate these broader intentions and aims, there is a narrowing in the reach of the policy from the earlier policy focus of 'Victorian Government Schools' solely to government schools. In addition, there is a shortening of the policy projection period. The MPVS had a ten-year timeframe, whereas the EGMC was set over a four-year period.

The MPVS advocated cultural pluralism, equality, and tolerance as 'essential to the economic and social health of the State', with statements stressing the goal of, 'equality of access and opportunity as essential to the economic and social health of the State' (DOE, 1997, p. 8). This strongly suggests that the role of education is to foster unimpeded participation in society. The EGMC, however, promotes loftier aims for the role of education that are broader than being solely for the benefit of the state. According to Jakubowicz, the EGMC:

...recognised the rapidly changing international environment, and the impact of globalisation on Victorian society. A changing complex multicultural and global context demanded curricular and pedagogical initiatives that would better equip and

prepare all students for their active participation and inclusion in this context. The policy aimed to create the conditions in which students would have greater power over their lives. (2016)

In Victoria, advocacy for multiculturalism continued to have an integral part in policy planning in throughout 1999 to 2009. In contrast to the ‘retreat’ from multiculturalism at a national level, the Victorian Government remained committed to multiculturalism as a public policy and as an education policy. This juxtaposition between state and national ideologies about multiculturalism reveals the contested notion of what is to be a citizen, and the fluid development of educational responses to an ethnically diverse population.

### **Section III**

#### ***Policy Text Analysis: Policy Texts for Multiculturalism in Victoria***

In this section, I present an analysis of the two Victorian Multicultural education policy texts to uncover the foundations of the policies. As has been established, embedded in citizenship is a notion of participation and belonging and multicultural education policies are designed to enable citizens to enact these notions. This analysis will establish how multiculturalism was, and is currently, understood and promoted in each policy, thereby revealing how citizenship is articulated in each policy. This research applies a policy sociological approach to illuminate conceptions of citizenship, through connections between: (1) *The source of the policy*: whose interests it serves; its relationship to global, national and local imperatives; (2) *The scope of the policy*: what it is assumed it is able to do; how it frames the issues; and the policy relationships embedded in it; (3) *The pattern of the policy*: what it builds on or alters in terms of relationships, what organisational and institutional changes or developments it requires (Ozga, 1999, p. 94). Considering the connections between the *source, scope and patterns*, and how they relate, will help to promote a greater understanding of how multiculturalism is conceptualised for educational purposes and the ideas of citizenship contained.

#### ***The Source of Multicultural Policies for Victorian Schools***

As articulated in the previous section, the MPVS was the first multicultural education policy issued by the Victorian State Government. It was a consultative document although MACLOTE and ESL were the main contributors, with respondents representing language schools, universities, and government institutions. The policy was recommended to, ‘all schools, teachers and

Jayne Lysk. *Notions of Citizenship Revealed Through Multicultural Education Policies in Australia*

administrators, school communities and to the wider community' (DOE, 1997, p. 4). The EGMC, released in 2009, was developed by the state education authorities, DEECD and MCEETYA (The Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs), and although it was claimed that the 'strategy has been developed with stakeholders', these stakeholders are not named or given attribution (DOE, 1997, p. 3). Neither policy documented consultations with students. The EGMC is also intended for all Victorians. Both policy documents are introduced by state ministers: the MPVS includes an introduction written by the two state ministers, the Education Minister and the Minister for Tertiary Education and Training, whereas the EGMC is introduced by the Education Minister, Bronwyn Pike.

Similar to the MPVS, the EGMC is targeted at *all* Victorians, specifically indicating that the policy is not solely for:

... those of language backgrounds other than English... Nor is it primarily one primarily aimed at addressing issues related to Aboriginal and Torres Strait islander students, ethnic minority groups or recent arrivals from language backgrounds other than English is as much concerned with long-established settlers and the generations that have followed them. (DEECD, 2009, p. 8)

Significantly, what is implied in the EGMC is that previous policies have been serving the interests of these aforementioned groups, or have been perceived as doing so, and that the current policy aims to address it.

Public policies are necessarily situated in relation to international policies, national policies and local imperatives. Both the MPVS and the EGMC concentrated the focus on the foremost national and local policy links, then, on external or global relationships. Both acknowledge the influence and impact of globalisation on education, with the MPVS stating the need for students to be aware of the 'global village', emphasising 'interdependence' as the main reason. In contrast, the EGMC places 'the global' in a highly prominent position and stresses the importance of students need to 'interact' across cultures, 'at school, in work and in life' (DEECD, 2009, p. 1). Neither policy makes explicit links to external policies apart from a very brief description on the 'phenomenon of multiculturalism' in the MPVS, in which multiculturalism is described as sweeping, 'many settler nations, predominantly the English speaking ones since the 1970s'. Nevertheless, external convergences of knowledge and similar practices and conceptual understandings of external multicultural education policies are apparent.

Both documents convey relationships and links with national and state policies. For example, the MPVS specifically states that the policy ‘encompasses’ the National Asian Languages and Studies in Australian Schools (NALSAS) Strategy (DOE, 1997, p. 9). On the local front, the MPVS states that the Ministerial Advisory Council on Languages other than English and English as a Second Language (MACLOTE and ESL) oversaw the development of policy. The policy makes strong links to language, although acknowledges that multiculturalism is more than just the ‘provision of language programs’ (DOE, 1997, p. 9). The EGMC also explicitly lists the state (i.e. Victorian) and national policies that link with the EGMC. Significantly, the EGMC also provided the legislative context and policy context (DEECD, 2009, pp. 6-7). Apart from the three specifically mentioned national policies: Civics and Citizenship Education; Values Education; and Studies of Asia and Australia, the EGMC communicates the strong connections with the Victorian policies, and resources emphasising the overarching commitment to multicultural public policy and the role of students as citizens:

The Victorian Government’s *All of Us: Victoria’s Multicultural Policy*, is due for release in 2009. *All of Us* reaffirms the Victorian Government’s commitment to multiculturalism and the important role education plays in providing opportunities for all students to become global and multicultural citizens. (DEECD, 2009, p. 7)

Another noted difference in the two policies is the relationships to other policies that reflect the development of new commitments and policies over time by the State Government. The MPVS mainly links with the Victorian curriculum and the individual school policies such as discipline and dress code policies. In contrast, by the time the latest multicultural education policy was released, there had been many new initiatives and policy shifts. Therefore, the EGMC constructed policy relationships from a variety of influences: *Blueprint for Education and Early Childhood Development* (DEECD, 2008); *The Racial and Religious Tolerance Act 2001*; *The Multicultural Victoria Act 2004*; *The Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006*; *The Education and Training Reform Act 2006*; *Victorian Essential Learning Standard (VELS)*; and, *All of Us* (2009). This highlights the complexity and extent of the policy scope and also implies that schools, teachers and learners have a broader range of resources from which to draw inspiration and resources.

### ***The Scope of Multicultural Policies for Victorian Schools***

The MPVS, in both the introduction and the brief contextual and historical background of settlement policies and educational responses, highlights the ways in which the Victorian

Government has addressed multiculturalism. It points out the influence of the *Multicultural Victoria Inquiry*, and education and language initiatives. It also highlights a connection between education and attempts to address racism and prejudice (DOE, 1997, pp. 4-6).

The EGMC is markedly different to the first Victorian multicultural education policy that firmly stated that the policy is aspirational and committed to the notions of 'equality, equity, choice and access' for society (DEECD, 2009, p. 4). The EGMC policy is also aimed directly at Victorian school children, and this is evident from its introduction:

... the Government's vision and strategy for equipping Victorian Government school students with the knowledge, skills and attitudes required for active global and multicultural citizenship... students who possess the skills, knowledge and attitudes of a global and multicultural citizen will have a competitive edge and contribute to our national advantage. (DEECD, 2009, p. 1)

Both the EGMC and the MPVS policies aim to foster social cohesion, with the EGMC linking this aim with social and economic needs of the nation. They suggesting that 'when appropriately delivered, education for global and multicultural citizenship builds the human and social capital that an inclusive nation needs for social cohesion as well as for economic success' (DEECD, 2009, p. 5). To achieve this aim, both policies remain committed to countering racism and prejudice as first established in the MEP. Although the ultimate goal of mitigating racism and prejudice is social cohesion, each policy highlights different areas of importance. The MPVS aimed to build on equality, equity, choice and access stating:

The role of education in the implementation of a multicultural policy is to ensure that racism and prejudice do not develop to hinder individuals' participation, and that all students are assisted to develop the understandings and skills that will enable them to achieve their full potential, and to participate effectively and successfully in a multicultural society. (DOE, 1997, p. 8)

In contrast, the EGMC promotes active participation and awareness of 'interconnectedness' with people, place and the economy stating that:

It will support schools to build inclusive school cultures, challenge ignorance and prejudice, and enable all Victorian students to become informed, thoughtful global and multicultural citizens. (DEECD, 2009, p. 1)

Subtle differences are apparent in the framing of the issue. For example, the MPVS is constructed for students to be educated for the betterment of society, as is the EGMC, although the reach is further for the EGMC. This is communicated in the statement that students will have, 'knowledge and skills required for the present and the future, for local, national and global' (DOE, 1997, p. 1). In this most recent policy, the students are seen in relation to the broader society, the nation and as part of the global community. This is in contrast to the MPVS in which the students were seen in relation to the local communities and the benefits are for, 'enriching social value, and equality of access and opportunity as essential to the economic and social health of the State' (DOE, 1997, p. 8).

Representations of the political purpose of the policy are provided in both policies. The MPVS stated that the policy was 'a considered response to the reality of a linguistically and culturally diverse society and its aim is to see intercultural awareness and skills become natural outcomes of schooling' (DOE, 1997, p. 8). This statement builds on previous multicultural education policies and are a reminder that approaches to education had relied heavily on assimilation or integrationist approaches to schooling and that there was a need to readdress this situation, and engender 'cultural inclusiveness'. The idea being that students are equipped with 'awareness' and 'skills' in the education system, by continuing and 'enhancing' the LOTE program, the ESL program, and intercultural education.

Although intercultural education is also mentioned in the MEP in the form of intercultural awareness—in which intercultural understanding, tolerance and respect for cultural patterns other than one's own is promoted—it stressed a need for educational programs to encourage 'intercultural understanding and tolerance' (Zubrzycki, 1982, p. 18). The MPVS stresses the need for students to have 'skills and understandings to interact comfortably and competently in intercultural settings' with the onus on teachers to be trained in this area. To achieve this MPVS introduces a two-pronged approach:

That negotiations be undertaken with tertiary institutions to ensure that preservice teacher training includes compulsory units designed to develop intercultural knowledge and awareness, and culturally-inclusive teaching skills, and that those units are well integrated in the overall course

That credit-bearing units and courses designed to broaden intercultural knowledge and awareness, and culturally-inclusive teaching skills be offered by tertiary institutions at post-initial level. (DOE, 1997, p. 9)



The EGMC introduces the term intercultural literacy defined as:

An interculturally literate person possesses the skills, knowledge, understanding and attitudes required to form relationships and collaborate with others across cultures. They value, respect and explore cultural difference, critically reflect upon varied cultural traditions (including their own) and participate fully in cross-cultural interactions. They are able to communicate effectively in contexts both familiar and unfamiliar. (DEECD, 2009, p. 5)

An understanding of the benefits and objectives of interculturalism are more fully developed and articulated throughout the policy beyond the aforementioned definition, skills are also outlined and an importance attached to the concept and purpose of interculturalism.

### ***The Pattern of Multicultural Policies for Victorian Schools***

Both the EGMC and the MPVS policies build upon previous multicultural educational policies and relationships with other institutions and departments and reflect changes made over time. For instance, the MPVS relied heavily on the MACLOTE and ESL to implement and develop policy signifying the relationship between the policy and the learning of English as well as the push for students to learn languages other than English. The policy is positioned to meet the needs of the community and is based on the assumption that the views of the community are important for implementation and the approach (DOE, 1997, p. 11). In contrast, the EGMC relies on the DEECD to develop and implement policy, which indicates a shift to a whole education approach and the centralising of resources. The school community is still considered important in the EGMC, however it differs from the MPVS in that school leaders are directed to ‘capitalise upon the cultural and linguistic capabilities of all members of the school community, including staff and New Arrival, ESL, refugee, international and exchange students’ (DEECD, 2009, p. 8). Additionally, this is evident in the discussion of *Strategic Directions* in which the description of how schools will build relationships with the community and parents suggests that ‘schools will be supported to develop local and global linkages’ (DEECD, 2009, p. 10). While, there is a case study as an example of what this might look like in practice, there is no concrete detail of how this strategy is to be achieved, funded and staffed.

Within the remit of the MPVS are recommendations for teacher training courses to, ‘include compulsory units: intercultural knowledge and awareness’ (DOE, 1997, p. 9). Further, by ‘2006 all students P-12 will have multicultural perspectives delivered across all eight key learning areas... and

incorporated into all aspects of school life' (DOE, 1997, p. 9). In contrast, the EGMC recommends professional development for teaching staff to come from the Victorian Institute of Education Leadership, and that School Principals should, 'build inclusive school cultures' (DEECD, 2009, p. 5). Moreover, the policy clarifies that:

The workforce will be supported in undertaking professional learning that supports education for global and multicultural citizenship. This includes the development of skills, knowledge and attitudes across a range of areas, including intercultural literacy, curriculum, pedagogy and leadership skills. Educators will be given opportunities to share exemplary practice and learn from and with their peers. (DEECD, 2009, p. 10)

### ***Discussion of Results***

The following discussion will engage with the notions of citizenships previously explored in chapters 2 and 3 and how these relate to and have been uncovered in the analysis of the two foundational Victorian Multicultural education policy texts. The connections between the *source, scope and patterns* helped establish a deeper understanding of how multiculturalism is conceptualised for educational purposes and the ideas of citizenship contained throughout.

As has been established, participation is an essential part of citizenship. Both policies suggest ways in which students can participate in society. The MPVS suggests that the role of education is to 'ensure that racism and prejudice do not develop to hinder individuals' participation' and the EGMC likewise aims 'to build inclusive school cultures, challenge ignorance and prejudice'. Although, these statements are part of a broader picture of multicultural education in the MPVS, and multicultural citizenship in the EGMC there is no clear indication of how this is to be achieved or how it will manifest. This coupled with an environment in which there is a push for studies of Asia and Asian languages; a 'provision for languages 'other than English' or 'in addition to English', however; there is a requirement for the study of the English language. Revealing tensions in the way participation is envisaged through intercultural understanding within a monolingual environment.

Additionally, even though, implicit in this is a commitment is an aspiration for people to be able to participate as equal citizens what has become apparent in the analysis of policy documents that the concept of the child or the students as a citizen is not equal to an adult citizen. There is no suggestion that students will participate as citizens through being given a way or a voice to participate through political rights or voting rights. Within this is also imbedded the notion that the citizen recognises state or territorial governance. As both policies have been delivered by government authorities with the expectation that they will be enacted. It is through this that we

see the hierarchies of citizenship and a notion of limited and controlled participation for children has not changed since antiquity and remains unchallenged in these policies.

Old notions of citizenship that require or foster allegiance to the nation state are seen in the statements in both policy documents that are aspiring for a notion of cosmopolitan citizenship or to forge a cosmopolitan character. The MPVS aims for students to be aware of the 'global village', emphasising 'interdependence', but this also situated the student as remaining within specific borders or boundaries. Likewise, The EGMC calls for students who possess the skills, knowledge and attitudes of a global and multicultural citizen will have a competitive edge and contribute to our national advantage....when appropriately delivered, education for global and multicultural citizenship builds the human and social capital that an inclusive nation needs for social cohesion as well as for economic success'. Again, the students are located within acknowledged borders and boundaries with allegiance expressed through economic return to the nation.

This chapter has explored and examined Federal government policy and Victorian multicultural education policies 1980 to 2009 to deepen our understanding how notions of citizenship are revealed not just as description but embedded in pedagogical education policies. Throughout the three interrelated sections it answered the question of how citizenship is expressed through specific multicultural education policies, with the final section providing an analysis of the Victorian multicultural education policies. The analysis of two policy texts established how multiculturalism is understood and promoted and presented on how notions of citizenship have been articulated. It observed how these concepts of citizenship purported to be for specific policy documents, nevertheless when these documents were scrutinized old notions of citizenship were not only present they remained unchallenged.

## Chapter 5: Discussion and Conclusion

Chapter 5 provides a synthesis of the conclusions reached in preceding chapters exploring the ideologies and values that characterise Australian national multicultural education policies between 1989 and 2009, and how they reveal notions of citizenship. The chapter includes an outline of the major findings informed by a policy sociology method that enabled the researcher to capture how and why public educational policies evolved in response to immigration and internal events. There is also a reprise of the scope and limitations of this study and the provision of implications for future research.

The overarching purpose of the study was to examine the values and the assumptions underpinning the developing notions of citizenship in education policies for school-based education. This required examining the evolution of Victorian State Multicultural policies from 1989 to 2009, taking into account the context of formal multicultural and citizenship policy and thinking at the Commonwealth level. To address these aims, literature was reviewed pertaining to how notions of citizenship for diverse societies evolved. This involved tracing historical threads and antecedents of understanding and practices of citizenship. Following the review, a policy sociology method was applied to, 'capture the existence of social relations, structure and forces' in policies for immigration, settlement and citizenship in Australia since Federation in 1901 (Hage, G., 2015, p. 3). By examining the development of discussions in the previous chapters, it has been possible to provide a detailed depiction of the development of both public policies and educational policies produced in response to changing population demographics that were brought about by sustained large-scale migration prior to, and between, 1989 and 2009. These developments reflect the internal socio-political context, and historical and cultural antecedents, whilst attending to bigger picture global influences.

In this chapter, it will be argued that for the purposes of nation building, constructions of citizenship in education have been underpinned by pragmatic solutions in dealing with difference for the overarching goal of social cohesion. As pointed out in Chapter 2, and highlighted again here, nation building is characterised as occurring when, 'members of disparate groups are drawn into the larger society through education and political participation' (Bornman, 2013, p. 433). The relationship between nation building and settlement policies has been significant for this study as a strong connection between nation building and notions of citizenship strengthens through political participation and education. In Chapter 3, findings emerged revealing that Australia's nation building project was linked to the creation of a common culture, a common language with

the education system positioned at different points in time to instil nationalism and national identity.

Within this narrative of the nation, which has been underway for over a century, diversity—particularly cultural diversity—has been a negotiated feature of Australia’s nation building project and the social cohesion underpinning it. Social cohesion has consistently been linked to the national economy and social needs. It depends on notions of citizenship constructed to encompass three strands of the population: the original inhabitants, those who took possession of the land from the original inhabitants and, those who came after. These findings build on the observations of Jenson and Saint-Martin who stated that the need for social cohesion, ‘appear(s) when policy communities are engaged in discussing and redesigning citizenship regimes’ (2003, p. 77). The exclusionary White Australia Policy, and the *Nationality and Citizenship Act 1948*, exemplify an understanding of social order for the different strands of the population where full citizenship was granted to all residing British subjects while Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders were provided with a ‘protection’ policy rather than citizenship status or rights. These elements illustrate that in this period of Australia’s history in ‘re-designing the regime’, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders were absent from the discussion, both literally and figuratively.

Moreover, this study has established that prior to the 1960s, and since Federation, successive settlement policies clearly articulated a form of social cohesion that encompassed an aspiration for equality in the standard of living for all citizens. This initially manifested in a desire for a culturally hegemonic society based on shared values, shared language and a shared objective to live and work for economic benefit in a democratic society. These understandings of social cohesion emphasise that social order is achieved through shared values (Cheong, *et al.*, 2007; Vasta, 2010). It also reflected a form of citizenship that had been passed down from the ancient Greeks, linking kinship to democracy, desiring homogeneity over diversity, and equal participation over the expansion of borders. This form of citizenship, coupled with theories of race and racial superiority, notions of class and society and a pursuit of capitalist endeavours represented the dominant ideologies and values of the day.

As has been noted throughout the study, notions of citizenship can be revealed through practices of inclusion and exclusion, membership and belonging. In Australia, these practices have continued to be stable in relation to the desire for social cohesion, and have had flexibility in relation to the toleration of diverse cultural practices insofar as they are not perceived as a threat to social cohesion. As discussed in Chapter 2, with the enactment of the *Nationality and Citizenship Act 1948*,

there was a significant move to officially recognise and sanction Australian citizens. Although this marked a shift from British subject hood to Australian citizenship, the overall rationale was more pragmatic and procedural in intent than a shift in ideological understandings. What became apparent in this evolution from subject to citizen, was a more transparent understanding of political ideologies that determined who was included, or excluded from Australian citizenship. As previously outlined, citizenship was not bestowed on all inhabitants; immediate access to citizenship was not granted to all, as was documented in the case of the original inhabitants. For these people of the existing population, citizenship was something that would have to be earned by conforming to preconceived norms set by the population that derived from British descent. This aspect reinforces Agamben's view that citizenship not only has legal implications; or is solely about entitlements and rights, or for belonging in a political community, but significantly notions of citizenship hold importance as a form of recognition. The Aboriginal and Torres Straits Islander people were not recognised as citizens, only as potential citizens under specific circumstances.

This understanding of citizenship, which has resulted in the denial, or suspension of recognition is consistent with the governments' continuation of its nation building agenda, and the belief that social cohesion underpinning the project can only be achieved with the continuation of a hegemonic community. As discussed in Chapter 3, these exclusionary practices based on race, remained stable up until external events and changing circumstances required the recruitment and call for migrants to bolster the workforce, and to expand the population. The degree to which Australia both responded to the events of WWII, and the humanitarian crisis that ensued, coupled with the need to renew and to expand the labour force, was overshadowed by the fear of difference and therefore a continuation of an adherence to the principle of racial exclusion. At this time in Australia's history, notions of citizenship continued to encompass a paradigm of the racial superiority that bolstered discriminatory immigration policies and practices that remained in place despite the changing political, social and economic circumstances. This longstanding view of diversity of cultural practices and thoughts as a threat to social cohesion remained relatively stable for many decades.

As reported in Chapter 3, attitudes toward race and culture did start to become more flexible toward the end of the 1960s. This was evident in the gradual dismantling of the White Australia Policy, and the change of two clauses in the Australian Constitution as a result of the 1967 Referendum, when 90 per cent of the population voted for the amendments for equal citizenship rights for indigenous Australians, a form of recognition that had previously been withheld. Building

on these shifts, by the 1970s Australia had signed the *United Nations Refugee Convention* and the *United Nations Convention on Human Rights*, and continued a steady intake of migrants and refugees from all around the world. It is against the backdrop of these events that emerged a concept of multiculturalism, as an ideology, as a practice, and as a public policy that would change notions of citizenship.

The support of multiculturalism as a political ideology of national importance manifested in a number of ways as it marked a paradigm shift in the way in which minority cultures were recognised and how institutions changed from being previously been arranged around the majority culture. As has been argued over previous chapters, at a national level the support for multiculturalism has waxed and waned depending on the government of the day. As this study finds, overall the commitment to multiculturalism has been significant, as have been the corresponding changes to fundamental beliefs embedded in notions of citizenship, particularly in relation to recognition. However, it is still a matter of contestation as to what degree the multicultural public policy influenced or transformed the ways in which Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders were or are recognised as will be discussed shortly. Moreover, multicultural ideologies have continually been buttressed against the overarching need for social cohesion in which the level or degree of diversity from the dominant group tolerated has been highly dependent on the government of the day and the social and economic circumstances.

Multiculturalism, as a theory extends a political framework of inclusion, and is evolving and like notions of citizenship varies in the way it is practised and interpreted. Multiculturalism is, and has been practised by many liberal democratic nation states to support culturally diverse societies. Dominant models include those that privilege difference and those that regard everyone as equal before the law. Regardless of the model, questions of recognition, access to society and tolerance are at the heart of multiculturalism. This study found that the aforementioned changes resulted in a multi-ethnic citizenry, with a model of multiculturalism in which everyone is considered equal before the law becoming the dominant political ideology. Within this model, notions of citizenship were constructed in which membership does not necessarily imply shared identity, but rather involves connections through a shared fate (Feinberg, 2003, p. 209). Additionally, multicultural models require an understanding of the political community as a trichotomy (Shachar, 1999, p. 89). However, this way of organising the political community has been seen as problematic when the state predominantly supports and endorses 'particular cultural practices and traditions' including privileging specific languages, educational values, cultural motifs and symbols (Levey, 2012b, p.

255). This study found that multiculturalism became problematic at a National level when by the late 1990s a newly elected LNP Government attempted to reclaim the notion that Australian society and forms of citizenship should be based on homogenous values, therefore, multiculturalism was swiftly deemphasised.

The de-emphasis of multiculturalism and shifting notions of citizenship were made apparent with a raft of policies that emphasised Australian values at a national level; exemplified by *the National Framework for Values Education* and the shift in government legislation including; the *Migrant and Customs Act*, and the *Border Protection Bill*. Additionally, the 1990s' Prime Minister John Howard's message echoed similar remarks inscribed a century earlier stating: 'we will decide who comes to this country and the circumstances in which they come' (Howard, J., 2001). This builds on research by Jayasuriya (2008) who finds that notions of citizenship at this time 'were being tethered' to citizens who were perceived as having similar cultural and political values. Moreover, in Chapters Two and Chapter 3, it was argued that up until the 1960s, Australian citizens, through education and cultural practices, maintained a linguistic homogeneity. Participation in Australian society has been inextricably linked to understanding and knowledge of the dominant English language.

As set out in Chapter 2—from antiquity right until after the French and American revolutions—citizenship enabled participation in public life but was limited mainly to the elite, male members of society. Following these revolutions, participation came to be understood as individuals or communities having influence, or a voice over public policy. In focusing on notions of citizenship, the study has explained that there is an interplay and relationship with language in participation in public life. Although I argue that the teaching of the English language is linked to ideologies that have been associated with maintaining homogeneity, this study has confirmed that language has also been employed as a way of enabling participation and as a way of belonging with equal access to society. Significantly, language and language policies can be attributed to equal access and participation, although more work is needed to understand this phenomenon as this is outside the scope of this thesis.

The requirement either to learn, or to have some basic skills in the English language, has been an enduring and stable element within notions of citizenship. English language acquisition has been, and continues to be perceived as essential to process of nation building, and the social cohesion required to sustain it. This conclusion—that in building a nation state, language, especially a single language, has always played an important role (Glenn, 2013; Heller, 2013; Hobsbawm, 1990; Isin, 2008 ; Wright, 2006)—reflects wide agreement amongst scholars that language has had a dual



role as a barrier or an enabler to the acquiring of citizenship. These roles are most readily revealed on the examination of the evolution of the citizenship tests applied to migrant selection by consecutive Australian governments since Federation and the provision of language support made available by both state and federal governments.

Consistent with the findings presented in Chapter 3, citizenship tests and the requirements for language skills and abilities shifted. This shift from prospective citizens having ‘basic language skills’ since the early 1980s, to the need to have ‘appropriate language skills’ in place in the last decade also reflected educational policy shifts in English language skills in education policies at a state level as discussed shortly. This move sits in contrast to continuing government policies and programs such as the AMEP and multicultural education policies have acted as enablers for citizenship with the provision of language support for newly arrived members of the community. As discussed in Chapter 3, Australia has a sound education system for ensuring that newly arrived migrants acquire the national language (Lo Bianco, 2011). Understanding these changes in the light of the historical practices of immigration control, other researchers have suggested that this period represented a move back to more integrationist or assimilationist approaches (Collins, 2012; Horner, 2015; Jayasuriya, L., 2008; Tavan, 2009).

Significantly, at the same time multiculturalism was being dismissed at a national level, the Victorian State Government affirmed and continued to support multiculturalism and multiculturalism as an educational policy. The language policies that initially flowed from the support of multiculturalism, as has been noted, particularly targeted new settlers to Australia but also applied to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders who sought to participate, to belong and to have equal access to the dominant society. This study reveals that initiatives pertaining to language are very much a part of both consecutive multicultural education policies in Victoria and similarly, a higher standard of attainment expected from the students.

In the State of Victoria, in addition to building on English as a Second Language (ESL) programs, the government remained committed to ensuring that schools had Languages Other than English (LOTE), and safeguarded access to mother-tongue maintenance and the encouragement of bilingual education. Notwithstanding the period in which there was a heavy national push for Asian languages—although excluding the support for the English language—support for LOTE remained within the remit of the states. The MPVS asserts that one of the goals of a multicultural policy is to ensure that citizens have a ‘respect for democratic process and institutions, the rule of law and acknowledgment that English is the nation’s common language’ (DOE, 1997, p. 8). This

demonstrates the enduring assumption that all Australians should have access to the English language, or should have some knowledge or understanding of the language. As has been argued, this aim has been readily pursued and has been consistent across a range of policies. Significantly, the EGMC statement: 'More than ever before, intercultural skills, high-level English skills, proficiency in at least one language other than English and information communication technology skills are of critical importance for our students' (DEECD, 2009, p. 1). This is consistent with other government policies including immigration controls that called for a higher level of English language attainment than ever before. There is also a continuing commitment to language learning.

Education and educational policies have had a prominent role in affirming the relationship between language and citizenship. As has been reported, prior to the foundation of multiculturalism as public policy, Australian federal and state governments pursued educational policies that strongly encouraged and valued homogeneity, including the AMEP established in the 1940s and the CMEP in the 1970s. This study has confirmed that language has also been employed as a means of safeguarding homogeneity through settlement policies of assimilation and integration (Lo Bianco, 2003). As reported in Chapter 3, there was a considerable shift in the both social and educational policies, when the Commonwealth Government played a role in readdressing disadvantage created by previous public policies such as the assimilation policy and the growing disadvantage of students from migrant or refugee backgrounds. The latest multicultural education policy released by the State of Victoria remains resolute in continuing both LOTE programs, and ESL programs. As this study has revealed, there has been a heavy push for Asian languages, but the priority rests heavily on trade utilitarianism, with much specific language learning reduced solely to English with other languages on the periphery. As previously noted, the language policies that flowed from the support of multiculturalism particularly targeted new settlers to Australia. However the policies also applied to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders who sought to participate, belong and to have equal access to the dominant society. It is outside the scope of this thesis, but it is apparent that more work is needed to understand the significance of language as equating to equal access and participation.

The study finds that there are voices that are either silenced or silent in aspects of citizenship development and practices and this is particularly obvious with two different groups within society: children and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders. Children and adolescents hold an interesting place in notions of citizenship and in the form of membership that they can access. They are compelled to learn about it but how they practise or influence citizenship is limited. The student

voice in education either has not been considered or not considered important and neither the MPVS nor the EGMC documents recorded consultations with students. Notions of citizenship construe children and adolescents in futurity, as potential citizens and in a future workforce. This finding is consistent with the observation that children are amongst others including women, the mentally or physically impaired, and slaves who have been consistently excluded from forms of participation throughout history (Cockburn, 1998; Earls, 2011; Lister, 2007b; Mac Naughton, *et al.*, 2009). Although unlike many in this group, children's potential is included in a vision for the future as is apparent in the introduction to the EGMC stating that 'students who possess the skills, knowledge and attitudes of a global and multicultural citizen will have a competitive edge and contribute to our national advantage' (DEECD, 2009, p. 1). This suggests that the view of the future citizen is constructed and the exploration for the possibilities of transforming notions of citizenship is not open to transformation.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders hold an ambiguous place in notions of citizenship and in the form of membership they can access, the ways in which they can participate and the form of belonging and recognition that was achieved or granted throughout the history of settlement. Recognition, belonging, membership or participation have not been constant in the notions of citizenship in regard to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, which builds on findings of Attwood and Marcus (1997, 1998, 1999); Foley, Schaap and Howell (2014); Gray (1998); Peterson and Sanderson (1998); and Rowse (1998) amongst others. Their research has reached similar conclusions as those argued in the former discussion and throughout Chapters Two, Three and Four, that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders have been systematically excluded from both substantive and normative forms of citizenship. This reinforces the view that when culture is used as the basis for recognition it is significant, and illuminates the practice of non-recognition and misrecognition identified as damaging by Taylor (1994, p. 25). Moreover, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples' voices have been excluded from discussions pertaining to notions of citizenship as strongly evidenced by the Tent Embassy, and the call for a Treaty by the Larrakia people has yet to be brought to fruition. As exemplified by the political act of establishing an Aboriginal Tent Embassy in Canberra, this signifies that notions of citizenship are inadequate, exclusive, and fail to encompass the form of recognition required and demanded by the first inhabitants. It indicates that the issue is problematic as it challenges both policymakers' epistemological beliefs and the legal basis upon which substantive citizenship is based on.

One finding that emerges from this study is that no stable mechanism embedded in governance to address multi-ethnic citizenship, and that change has consistently been incremental, and this is relevant in the light of Wilsford's (1994) understanding of the importance of the relationship between time and 'turning points' particularly in the movements in the 1950s through to the 1970s. Through that time, debates, theories and manifestations of citizenship adapted and reacted to the changing nature of travel, immigration, the expanding global economy and world-wide events. Multiculturalism as a political ideology has been contested in many ways and as was stated in Chapter 4, it is tested in periods when related issues of immigration welfare, Indigenous rights and nationalism are publically debated. As this study has exposed, Australian economic policies were highly influenced by economic policies and systems circulating among 'advanced' economies. As previously stated, the Keynesian framework influenced government policy in the early 1970s as well as before and throughout the globalisation of the 1980s, with the steady rise of international trade, global markets and the neo-liberal reforms that were put into place. These factors including: increasing debates about immigration, the Gulf War, the Hanson' phenomenon and other such internal and external events saw the 1990s as a period of transformation. These transformations were evident within the public education system and in the way that multiculturalism as a public and educational policy was changing and that notions of citizenship were evolving in response.

This study finds the State Government policies of Victoria investigated the possibility of transforming notions of citizenship in addition to extending the pragmatic ethos to governance enacted by consecutive Federal Governments. The EGMC policy represents a new category of citizenship, the global citizen—that reflects an, 'awareness of our interconnectedness with people and environments around the globe and contribution to global society and economy' (DEECD, 2009, p. 4). This conception is problematic as it constructs citizens as uncritical contributors to both the nation state and to an unquestioned continuation of dominant political ideologies in relation to globalisation and the economy. This stance represents a transformational view of citizens and citizenship that is more in line with cosmopolitan theory in which citizens are part of a world polity, with a commitment to a 'consciousness of humanity' (Held, 2010, p. 69).

In the State of Victoria, findings from the *Multicultural Victorian Inquiry* reported on problems related to prejudice and racial tension in schools and the MPVS was developed to combat these issues. The policy had a social justice agenda that did not appear consistent with the other major education 'Schools of the Future' policy released by the Victorian State Government a few years earlier. This new organisational model for schooling linked resourcing to educational outcomes,

thereby limiting the resourcing available to schools in disadvantaged areas or with a large population of pupils from NESB. The MPVS was conceived and released at a time when at the National level there was an obvious withdrawal from multiculturalism as a public policy. Although the policy did not represent a major shift in values from the previous National education policy, the main difference resided in the implementation and the stakeholder engagement. This is consistent with the view MEP put forward by Rizvi 'like so many other liberal reforms in education, has failed to penetrate the solid defences of the status quo' (Rizvi, 1985).

Significantly, the findings indicate that multiculturalism as an ideology as revealed through public policy and educational policies are consistent, although this ideology does not appear to encompass a framework to reimage society, through co-construction and re-consideration of the underpinning values (Hage, G., 2015). The majority culture is central to all aspects of multiculturalism. This was again confirmed in most recent times, as outlined in Chapter 4 of this thesis, when asylum seekers, displaced people, and refugees increased in numbers and a 'War on Terror' was being raged. These mainly external events ushered in a renewed nationalistic fervour evidenced by the introduction of 'values education' in the national interest, significant changes to immigration policy, concepts of citizenship, and citizenship and multicultural education that involved more reverting to known practices rather than to re-imagining possibilities. These aforementioned key events during the period of 2000 and 2007 not only influenced notions of citizenship, immigration policy, and education policy; they also had a profound effect on the imagined global community. It was not solely one event, but the cumulative effect of these events, the media coverage, political debates. International responses all seemed to intersect with the changes to public policies, educational policies and notions of citizenship. In examining what it is to be a citizen in a multicultural society, the MPVS adopts the term multicultural to both describe the Australian population and to present this as a concept for education. The EGMC adopts the same approach, however; it is given that multicultural citizenship 'denotes active participation in our multicultural society and respect for our similarities and differences' (DEECD, 2009, p. 4).

Intercultural skills and approaches have been integral to all multicultural education policies; however, how they have been defined and represented has differed. The MPVS supported the need for teachers to be trained in intercultural awareness and knowledge to provide intercultural education for their students. The EGMC advocates that everyone requires intercultural skills and literacies to 'live and work as part of a diverse and globalised population' (DEECD, 2009, p. 3). In this policy, an intercultural literate person is defined as processing:

...skills, knowledge, understanding and attitudes required to form relationships and collaborate with others across cultures. They value, respect and explore cultural difference, critically reflect upon varied cultural traditions (including their own) and participate fully in cross-cultural interactions. They are able to communicate effectively in contexts both familiar and unfamiliar. (DEECD, 2009, p. 5)

The question remains as to whether educational institutions will fully grasp an intercultural approach without also changing traditional pedagogical approaches to the way in which knowledge is organised and conveyed.

The analysis reveals that both policy documents – the MPVS and the EGMC – spread over a period of fifteen years are still grappling with similar ideas, concepts and categories in relation to multiculturalism including: interculturalism; racism and prejudice; cultural tolerance; equality of opportunity and access; impact of globalisation and social cohesion. How multiculturalism is constructed in each policy has evolved in relation to educational purposes; the MPVS remit provided institutional guidance and brought change to the dominant discourse and practices afforded to cultural diverse students; the policy aimed to change institutionalised norms. This is evidenced in that defining of multicultural education stating that it ‘is not simply about the provision of language programs... Multicultural education is not a part of the curriculum, in the way that mathematics or Studies of Society and Environment are. It is a holistic approach to schooling that needs to permeate all parts of the curriculum and influence all school practices’ (Department of Education [DOE], 1997, p. 9).

History of social literacy can be located in its use within the context of multicultural education in Australia in the 1980s (Kalantzis & Cope, 1983 cited in Clayton, 2006). Australians over the past generation have not only become increasingly accepting of cultural differences, but value their importance. According to Jakubowicz and Union this embracing of cultural diversity ‘especially in its policy frame of ‘multiculturalism,’ carries three key implications – heritage culture preservation and survival, inter-cultural engagement and synergies, and capacity to operate as global citizens’ (2009, p. 1). However, it is only seen as transformative when paired with intercultural learning. Most models of citizenship education are not transformative and are predominantly based on the normative view of the nation states’ cultural and social order.

As discussed in Chapters Three and Four, the perspective of the longstanding way in which culture would be accommodated in the education system, and how education for citizenship would be advanced, can be shown through two main models of citizenship advancement. One focuses on

purely procedural and factual knowledge of political institutions and political literacy, and the other involves a critical engagement with the formation and practices of political institutions and laws. Citizenship education aimed at actively engaging the young in the political process and was very much under the control of the various state education departments prior to the introduction of multicultural educational policies. In the 1990s, the National Government sponsored a report into citizenship education, following which it was considered to be in the national interest for the Federal Government to intervene, with funding and educational resources that could implicitly promote a vision for democracy and politics in Australia. A second significant intervention occurred in 2005, with the *National Framework for Values Education in Australian Schools*. This was seen as a reaction to external events, rather than to internal events. Between 1989 and 2009, citizenship education had been focused on factual and procedural knowledge. This focus changed to an engagement with Australian history and to Australian values embedded in a framework for social cohesion.

## **Scope and Limitations**

The mentioned policy sociology was applied to the notions of citizenship during the period between 1989 and 2009. Chapters Two and Three reviewed the chronology of the developments in citizenship in Australia since Federation in 1901 by exploring public policy pertaining to immigration, settlement and citizenship until 2009. In order to understand how notions of citizenship are articulated at a state level, Chapter 4 presented an analysis of multicultural education policies released by the Victorian Governments during the period from 1996 to 2009. There were a number of limitations placed on this study as the data was exclusively from secondary sources, no persons were interviewed nor oral histories taken nor were related sources accessed, such as memos, papers written by principal policy makers to extend or enhance the interpretation of the policy documents. Nevertheless, the study builds on and adds to education policy literature that attends to understanding of the broader context of social, cultural, economic and political processes applicable to the development and implementation of policy and the evolution of thought pertaining to citizenship.

## **Implications for Future Research**

Future research focusing of conceptualisations of citizenship as revealed through multicultural policies could be extended to include the other Australian states and territories or to comparable nation states such as Canada or New Zealand that have similar histories and policy trajectories.

Likewise, as the findings that emerge from this study demonstrate, there is no stable mechanism embedded in governance at a Federal level to transfer notions of citizenship. The one exception may be the newly written and implemented National Curriculum, which could be a source for future research on contemporary conceptualisations of citizenship from a Federal level.

## Conclusion

This study has systematically explored Australia's historical context of immigration and citizenship policies from 1901 with the purpose of illuminating current multicultural education policies and modern manifestations of citizenship during the period from 1989 to 2009. This study was specifically interested in the notions of citizenship in the Australian context as revealed through public policy. To this end, the study tracked back through time to 1901, with two intentions. The study began to initially explore federated Australia's first vision for citizenry and citizenship practices, and the legislation that emerged. The next phase was to follow the impacts on concepts of citizenship made by changes in political ideology, economic climate, changing government leadership, global and local influence on adaptations and changes in both public policy and in the state of education throughout that period.

Historically, notions of citizenship in Australia have stemmed from an Anglo-European concept of citizenship formed in antiquity. This 'Western' thinking produced two models of citizenship that formed the basis of understanding, *ius sanguinis* and *ius soli*. With changes in social, political, demographic and economic circumstances, these models have transformed or evolved over time. Forms of citizenship were reimagined, but never significantly during different historical eras. Origins of adaptations of citizenship can be traced to both the French and the American revolutions, a time that saw the manifestation of political rights through participation, community and belonging. Although access to forms of citizenship and notions of equality has not been open to all, conceptions of membership are still evolving. Furthermore, the idea that only the nation state can confer or bestow citizenship and that a citizen can have multiple memberships or can participate as a global citizen is also still fluid.

In this study, I examined the notions of citizenship in the Australian context as revealed through public policy, in which the policy documents have served as texts. This research has taken into account that Australia's particular history, origins of citizenship were primarily conceptual rather than legal, access was controlled, restrictive and founded on racism and fear. It has been clear from the outset that the purpose of citizenship is contained within a meta-discourse of nation building



and that this nation building is dependent on social cohesion. Language has been a stable tool, applied in a variety of ways from controlling entry to supporting and enabling participation for new migrants, and promoting the attainment of the overarching goal of social cohesion. The attainment of linguistic abilities in languages other than English also have a newly valued economic benefit, and this can also be said in relation to cultural skills and competencies, however, cultural recognition has been more flexible and complex. There is an unresolved tension about how to promote a sense of social cohesion in a society with a culturally diverse citizenry. The diversity includes three main strands of the population, comprising those who of British descent, migrants from all corners of the world and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders.

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders have been viewed as a ‘residual problem’ and were silenced in discussions of citizenship. Both the Northern Territory Intervention and the Tent Embassy are stark reminders of the continual tension in how Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders fit in current notions of citizenship. They are a reminder that these notions are neither adequate nor sufficiently transformative to stop the alienation of the original inhabitants whilst living in their own land.

As the education system is an instrument of nation building, the quest for social cohesion is employed in multicultural education policies. It is from these policies that we see the child positioned as the property of the nation and the citizen of futurity. The child is thus a future citizen participating at a national and global level, yet is without a voice in shaping or diverging from the prevailing notions of citizenship.

We need to think more carefully about the notion of citizenship and view it as a work in progress. We need to consider whether citizenship adequately takes into account the stories of the first inhabitants, the immigrant story and the position of the dominant group. Notions of citizenship are still evolving and given the diversity of Australian society, they have the potential to be transformational. It is therefore hoped that the notions advanced in this thesis will facilitate the way reimage citizenship for the future.

## Reference List

- ABS. (2016). Population size and growth. Edited by Australian Bureau of Statistics Canberra, ACT, Australia: Australian Government. Retrieved: March 25 2016, from:  
<http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/by%20Subject/1301.0~2012~Main%20Features~Population%20size%20and%20growth~47>.
- AEF. (2016). About AEF. Melbourne, Vic, Australia: The University of Melbourne. [Asia Education Foundation portal], Retrieved: November 30 2016, from:  
<http://www.asiaeducation.edu.au/about-aef>.
- Ahluwalia, P. (2001). When does a settler become a native? Citizenship and identity in a settler society. *Pretexts: Literary and Cultural Studies*, 10(1), 63-73.
- Ailwood, J., Brownlee, J., Johansson, E., Cobb-Moore, C., Walker, S., & Boulton-Lewis, G. (2011). Educational policy for citizenship in the early years in Australia. *Journal of Education Policy*, 26(5), 641-653.
- Albinski, H.S. (1977). *Australian external policy under Labor: Content, process and the national debate*. University of British Columbia press. Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia Press.
- Alomes, S. (1988). *A nation at last? The changing character of Australian nationalism: 1880-1988*. Sydney, NSW, Australia: Angus & Robertson.
- Alter, J.S. (1989). *Pahalwani: Identity, ideology, and the body of the Indian wrestler*. PhD. Dissertation. Anthropology. University of California. Berkeley, CA.
- Aman, R. (2015). In the name of interculturality: On colonial legacies in intercultural education. *British Educational Research Journal*, 41(3), 520-534. doi: 10.1002/berj.3153.
- Ammoun, F., & Bayona-Ba-Meya, N. (1975). Separate opinion of Vice-President Ammoun [translation]. *International Court of Justice in its advisory opinion on Western Sahara*. The Hague, The Netherlands: United Nations. Retrieved 14 September 2015, from:  
<http://www.icj-cij.org/files/case-related/52/052-19690220-JUD-01-06-EN.pdf>.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origins and spread of nationalism*. Revised ed. London: Verso.
- Anderson, K. (1993). Aboriginal Redfern: Constructions of race and place. P. Jackson & Penrose, J. (Eds.), *Constructions of race and place*. London: University College London Press, pp. 81-100.
- Ang, I. (1996). The curse of the smile. *Feminist Review*, 52(1), 36-49.
- Ang, I., Hawkins, G., & Dabboussy, L. (2008). *The SBS story: The challenge of diversity*. Sydney, NSW, Australia: University of New South Wales Press.
- Ang, I., & Stratton, J. (1998). Multiculturalism in crisis: The new politics of race and national identity in Australia. *TOPIA: Canadian Journal of Cultural Studies*, 1(2), 22-41.
- Appiah, K.A. (1997). Cosmopolitan patriots. *Critical Inquiry*, 617-639.

- . (2009). Cosmopolitan ethics. L.V. Prott (Ed.), *Witnesses to history: A compendium of documents and writings on the return of cultural objects*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing, pp. 95-109.
- Arber, R.E. (2005). Speaking of race and ethnic identities: Exploring multicultural curricula. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 37(6), 633-652.
- Archard, D., & Macleod, C.M. (Eds.). (2002). *The moral and political status of children*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press on Demand.
- Armitage, A. (1995). *Comparing the policy of assimilation: Australia, Canada and New Zealand*. Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press.
- Arnott, M., & Ozga, J. (2010). Education and nationalism: The discourse of education policy in Scotland. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 31(3), 335-350. doi: 10.1080/01596301003786951.
- Attwood, B. (2007). *The 1967 referendum: Race, power and the Australian Constitution*. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Aboriginal Studies Press.
- Attwood, B., & Markus, A. (1997). *The 1967 referendum, or when Aborigines didn't get the vote*. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies.
- . (1998). (the) 1967 (referendum) and all that: Narrative and myth, aborigines and Australia. *Australian Historical Studies*, 29(111), 267.
- . (1999). *The struggle for Aboriginal rights*. Sydney, NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Auletta, A. (2000). A retrospective view of the Colombo Plan: Government policy, departmental administration and overseas students. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 22(1), 47-58.
- Aulich, C., & Wettenhall, R.L. (2008). *Howard's fourth government: Australian Commonwealth Administration, 2004-2007*. Vol. 9. Sydney, NSW, Australia: University of New South Wales Press.
- Australian Government. (2015). How government works. *About Government*. Canberra, ACT, Australia. [Australian Government information portal], Retrieved: 14 July 2016, from: <http://www.australia.gov.au/about-government/how-government-works/federation>.
- Australian Joint Standing Committee on Migration. (1994). *Australian all: Enhancing Australian citizenship*. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Australian Government Publishing.
- Ball, S.J. (1994). *Education reform: A critical and post-structural approach*. London: McGraw-Hill Education.
- . (2012). *Global education inc: New policy networks and the neo-liberal imaginary*. London: Routledge.
- Ball, S.J., Goodson, I.F., & Maguire, M. (Eds.). (2007). *Education, globalisation and new times: 21 years of the journal of education policy*. New York: Routledge.
- Banks, J.A. (2006). Improving race relations in schools: From theory and research to practice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 62(3), 607-614.
- . (2008). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational Researcher*, 37(3), 129-139.
- Barratt, D. (2015). Formation of the British Commonwealth of Nations. *Salem Press Encyclopedia*.

- Beaumont, J. (2007). Australian citizenship and the two world wars. *Australian Journal of Politics & History*, 53(2), 171-182. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8497.2007.00452.x.
- Beauvais, C., & Jenson, J. (2002). *Social cohesion: Updating the state of the research*. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Beck, U. (2000). The cosmopolitan perspective on the sociology of the second age of modernity. *British Journal of Sociology*, 51(1), 79-106.
- Beeson, M. (2001). Australia and Asia: The years of living aimlessly. D. Singh & Smith, A. (Eds.), *Southeast Asian affairs 2001*. Singapore: Institute of South East Asian Studies, pp. 44-55.
- Bell, L., & Stevenson, H. (2006). *Education policy: Process, themes and impact*. London: Routledge.
- Bellamy, R. (2008). Evaluating Union citizenship: Belonging, rights and participation within the EU. *Citizenship Studies*, 12(6), 597-611.
- Benhabib, S. (2004). *The rights of others: Aliens, residents, and citizens*. The John Robert Seeley lectures: 5. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bennett, C.I. (2003). *Comprehensive multicultural education: Theory and practice*. 5th ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bertossi, C., & Hajjat, A. (2013). *Country report: France*. EUDO Citizenship Observatory. Amsterdam University Press, Amsterdam. Retrieved: 4 July 2015, from: <http://eudo-citizenship.eu/docs/CountryReports/France.pdf>.
- Bethencourt, F. (2014). *Racisms: From the crusades to the twentieth century*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Betts, K. (2003). Immigration policy under the Howard government. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 38(2), 169-192.
- Biesta, G., & Lawy, R. (2006). From teaching citizenship to learning democracy: Overcoming individualism in research, policy and practice. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 36(1), 63-79.
- Blackmore, J., & Lander, H. (2011). Researching policy. B. Somekh & Lewin, C. (Eds.), *Theory and methods in social research*. London: Sage, pp. 190-198.
- Bloemraad, I., Korteweg, A., & Yurdakul, G. (2008). Citizenship and immigration: Multiculturalism, assimilation, and challenges to the nation-state. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 34(1), 153-179.
- Bornman, E. (2013). Citizenship, nation building and diversity: What is the role of the media in all of this? *South African Journal for Communication Theory and Research*, 39(4), 432-448.
- Boulus, P., Dowding, K., & Pietsch, J. (2013). Policy agendas and immigration in Australia 1996-2012. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 48(3), 299.
- Brewer, C.A. (2014). Historicizing in critical policy analysis: The production of cultural histories and microhistories. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 27(3), 273-288.
- Burnett, B., & McArdle, F. (2011). Multiculturalism, education for sustainable development (ESD) and the shifting discursive landscape of social inclusion. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 32(1), 43-56.
- Burns, A., & Roberts, C. (2010). Migration and adult language learning: Global flows and local transpositions. *TESOL Quarterly*, 44(3), 409-419.
- Byrne, D., & Ozga, J. (2008). BERA review 2006: Education research and policy. *Research Papers in Education*, 23(4), 377-405.

- Cahill, D. (1984). *Review of the Commonwealth Multicultural education program: Listing of funding projects 1980-1984*. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Commonwealth Schools Commission.
- . (2001). The rise and fall of multicultural education in the Australian schooling system. C.A. Grant & Lei, J.L. (Eds.), *Global constructions of Multicultural education: Theories and realities*. London: Routledge, pp. 27-60.
- Cahill, D., & Gundert, A. (1996). *Immigration and schooling in the 1990s*. A. Gundert (Ed.). Canberra, ACT, Australia: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Canberra Multicultural Task Force. (1978). *The galbally report in the A.C.T. And the prospects for multiculturalism: Review of post-arrival programs and services to migrants*. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Canberra Multicultural Task Force.
- Cantle, T. (2012). Interculturalism: For the era of globalisation, cohesion and diversity. *Political Insight*, 3(3), 38-41.
- Carter, A. (2013). *The political theory of global citizenship*. New York: Routledge.
- Castles, S. (1987). A new agenda in multiculturalism? *Occasional paper series no. 12*. Wollongong, NSW, Australia: Centre for Multicultural Studies, pp. 1-16.
- . (2004a). The factors that make and unmake migration policies. *International Migration Review*, 38(3), 852-884.
- . (2004b). Migration, citizenship, and education. J.A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives*. Chichester, UK: Jossey-Bass, pp. 17-48.
- Castles, S., & Davidson, A. (2000). *Citizenship and migration: Globalization and the politics of belonging*. Basingstoke, UK: Macmillan.
- Castles, S., Hugo, G., & Vasta, E. (2013). Rethinking migration and diversity in Australia: Introduction. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 34(2), 115-121. doi: 10.1080/07256868.2013.781915.
- Castles, S., & Zappala, G. (1998). Citizenship and immigration in Australia. *Georgetown Immigration Law Journal*, 13(2), 273-316.
- Charnock, D. (2001). National identity, partisanship and populist protest as factors in the 1999 Australian republic referendum. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 36(2), 271-291.
- Cheong, P.H., Edwards, R., Gouldborne, H., & Solomos, J. (2007). Immigration, social cohesion and social capital: A critical review. *Critical Social Policy*, 27(1), 24-49.
- Chesterman, J., & Galligan, B. (1997). *Citizens without rights: Aborigines and Australian citizenship*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Civics Expert Group. (2002). *Whereas the people: Civics and citizenship education: Report of the civics expert group*. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Claeys, G. (2000). The "Survival of the Fittest" and the origins of social Darwinism. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 61(2), 223-240.
- Clark, A. (2006). Flying the flag for mainstream Australia. *Griffith Review*(Getting Smart: The Battle for Ideas in Education), 107-110.
- Clarke, S. (2001). Liberals accused of trying to rewrite history. *Lateline*. Sydney, Australia: Australian Broadcasting Corporation. [Australian Television News Programme], Retrieved: 7 August 2014, from: <http://www.abc.net.au/lateline/content/2001/s422692.htm>.
- Clayton, M. (2006). *Justice and legitimacy in upbringing*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- Clyne, M. (1997). Language policy in Australia—achievements, disappointments, prospects. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 18(1), 63-71.
- Clyne, M., & Markus, A. (2001). Attitudes towards immigration and multiculturalism. A. Markus (Ed.), *Building a new community: Immigration and the Victorian community*. Crows Nest, NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin, pp. 79-88.
- Coady, M. (2009). Beings and becomings: Historical and philosophical considerations of the child as citizen. G. Mac Naughton, Hughes, P. & Smith, K. (Eds.), *Young children as active citizens: Principles, policies and pedagogies*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars, pp. 2-14.
- Cockburn, T. (1998). Children and citizenship in Britain A case for a socially interdependent model of citizenship. *Childhood*, 5(1), 99-117.
- . (2013). *Rethinking children's citizenship*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Codd, J.A. (2007). The construction and deconstruction of educational policy documents. S.J. Ball, Goodson, I.F. & Maguire, M. (Eds.), *Education, globalisation and new times: 21 years of the journal of education policy*. New York: Routledge, pp. 167-182.
- Cohen, E.F. (2010). Jus tempus in the magna carta: The sovereignty of time in modern politics and citizenship. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 43(03), 463-466.
- Collins, J. (1993). The landmark of cronulla. J. Jupp & Kabala, M. (Eds.), *The politics of Australian immigration*. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Bureau of Immigration Research, pp. 61-69.
- . (2012). Integration and inclusion of immigrants in Australia. J. Frideres & Biles, J. (Eds.), *International perspectives: Integration and inclusion*. Montreal, CA: Queen's University Press, pp. 17-37.
- . (2013). Rethinking Australian immigration and immigrant settlement policy. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 34(2), 160-177.
- Commonwealth of Australia. (2010). Australia's Constitution. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Parliamentary Education Office. from: [http://www.aph.gov.au/~media/05%20About%20Parliament/52%20Sen/523%20PPP/2012\\_Australian\\_Constitution.pdf](http://www.aph.gov.au/~media/05%20About%20Parliament/52%20Sen/523%20PPP/2012_Australian_Constitution.pdf)
- . (2015). Fact sheet: Australian Constitution. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Parliamentary Education Office. from: <http://www.peo.gov.au/learning/fact-sheets/australian-constitution.html>.
- . (2016). Federation. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Australian Government. from: <http://www.australia.gov.au/about-government/how-government-works/federation>.
- Connell, R.W., & Irving, T.H. (1980). *Class structure in Australian history: Documents, narrative and argument*. Melbourne, Vic, Australia: Longman Cheshire.
- Considine, M. (1994). *Public policy: A critical approach*. South Melbourne, Vic, Australia: Macmillan Education Australia.
- Corwin, E.S. (1920). Freedom of speech and press under the First Amendment: A resume. *Yale Law Journal*, 30(1), 48-55.
- Costar, B., & Economou, N. (1999). The electoral contest and coalition dominance 1992-98. *The Kennett revolution: Victorian politics in the 1990s*. Sydney, NSW, Australia: University of New South Wales Press, pp. 122-131.
- Cranston, N., Kimber, M., Mulford, B., Reid, A., & Keating, J. (2010). Politics and school education in Australia: A case of shifting purposes. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 48(2), 182-195.



- Criddle, E., Vidovich, L., & O'Neill, M. (2004). Discovering democracy: An analysis of curriculum policy for citizenship education. *Westminster Studies in Education*, 27(1), 27-42.
- Crisp, J. (2003). Refugees and the global politics of asylum. *The Political Quarterly*, 74(s1), 75-87.
- Crofts, S. (2016). Hansonism, right-wing populism and the media. *Queensland Review*, 5(2), 7-19. doi: 10.1017/S132181660000101X.
- Curthoys, A. (1999). Expulsion, exodus and exile in white Australian historical mythology. *Journal of Australian Studies*, 23(61), 1-19.
- Davidson, A. (1997). *From subject to citizen: Australian citizenship in the twentieth century*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- . (2000). Democracy and citizenship. W. Hudson & Kane, J. (Eds.), *Rethinking Australian citizenship*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 45-55.
- . (2001). The state, democracy and citizenship in Australia. R. Axtmann (Ed.), *Balancing democracy*. London: Continuum, pp. 158-175.
- Davies, A. (1997). Australian immigrant gatekeeping through English language tests: How important is proficiency? A. Huhta, Kohonen, V., Kurki-Suoni, L. & Luoma, S. (Eds.), *Current developments and alternatives in language assessment*. Jyväskylä, Finland: University of Jyväskylä and University of Tampere, pp. 71-84.
- Davies, I., & Issitt, J. (2005). Reflections on citizenship education in Australia, Canada and England. *Comparative Education*, 41(4), 389-410.
- DEECD. (2009). *Education for global and multicultural citizenship: A strategy for Victorian government schools 2009-2013*. Department of Education and Early Childhood Development, Melbourne, Vic, Australia: Student Learning Programs Division: Office of Government School Education, Department of Education and Early Childhood Development. Retrieved: 22 March 2015, from: <http://www.education.vic.gov.au/Documents/school/teachers/health/multicultedstrat.pdf>.
- . (2011). *Lessons learned: A history of migrant education in Victorian government schools - 1960-2006*. Department of Education and Early Childhood Development. Student Learning Division, Office for Government School Education, Department of Education and Early Childhood Development. Retrieved 16 August 2014, from: <http://www.education.vic.gov.au/Documents/school/teachers/teachingresources/diversity/eal/lessonslearned.pdf>.
- Department of Education. (1997). *Multicultural policy for Victorian schools*. Melbourne, Vic, Australia: Community Information Service, Department of Education.
- Dick, H.W. (1988). The immigration debate: A challenge for Asian studies. *Asian Studies Association of Australia Review*, 12(2), 47-56.
- DIMA. (2001). *Immigration: Federation to century's end, 1901-2000*. Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs, Canberra, ACT, Australia: Department of Immigration and Multicultural Affairs.
- Donato, R., & Lazerson, M. (2000). New directions in American educational history: Problems and prospects. *Educational Researcher*, 29(8), 4-15.
- Dye, T.R. (1992). *Understanding public policy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Dyrenfurth, N. (2005a). Battlers, refugees and the republic: John Howard's language of citizenship. *Journal of Australian Studies*, 28(84), 183-196.
- Jayne Lysk. *Notions of Citizenship Revealed Through Multicultural Education Policies in Australia*

- . (2005b). The language of Australian citizenship. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 40(1), 87-109.
- . (2007). John Howard's hegemony of values: The politics of 'mateship' in the Howard decade. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 42(2), 211-230.
- Earls, F.J. (2011). *The child as citizen*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Edwards, K. (2010). *Beyond the blame game: Examining 'the discourse' of youth participation in Australia*. Paper presented at Future of Sociology, Australian Sociological Association 2009 Annual Conference, 1-4 December. S. Lockie, Bissell, D., Greig, A., Hynes, M., Marsh, D., Saha, L., Sikora, J. & Woodman, D. (Eds.), Canberra, ACT, Australia: The Australian Sociological Association.
- Faist, T. (Ed.). (2012). *Dual citizenship in Europe: From nationhood to societal integration*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate.
- Farrell, F. (1982). Labour history in Australia. *International Labor and Working-Class History*, 21(Spring), 1-17.
- Feinberg, W. (2003). Religious education in liberal democratic societies: The question of accountability and autonomy. K. McDonough & Feinberg, W. (Eds.), *Education and citizenship in liberal-democratic societies: Teaching for cosmopolitan values and collective identities*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, pp. 385-413.
- Fischer, F. (2003). *Reframing public policy: Discursive politics and deliberative practices*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Fleras, A. (2009). *The politics of multiculturalism: Multicultural governance in comparative perspective*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foley, G., Schaap, A., & Howell, E. (Eds.). (2014). *The Aboriginal tent embassy: Sovereignty, black power, land rights and the state*. (1st ed.). London: Routledge.
- Fordham, R. (1983). *School councils. Ministerial Paper No. 4*. Victorian Minister of Education, Melbourne, Vic, Australia: Education Department of Victoria.
- Forester, J. (1993). *Critical theory, public policy, and planning practice: Toward a critical pragmatism*. SUNY series in political theory: Contemporary issues. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Forst, R. (2007). A critical theory of multicultural toleration. A.S. Laden & Owen, D. (Eds.), *Multiculturalism and political theory*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 292-311.
- Fraser, M. (1981). *Multiculturalism: Australia's unique achievement*. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Commonwealth Government Printer. [Inaugural Address on Multiculturalism to the Institute of Multicultural Affairs].
- Fraser, N. (2000). Rethinking recognition. *New Left Review*, 3(3), 107-120.
- Fyfe, I. (2007). Hidden in the curriculum: Political literacy and education for citizenship in Australia. *Melbourne Journal of Politics*, 32(1), 110-134.
- Galbally, F. (1978). *Review of post arrival programs and services for migrants: Migrant services and programs*. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Galeotti, A.E. (2002). *Toleration as recognition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.



- Gardiner-Garden, J. (1993). *The multiculturalism and immigration debate 1973-1993*. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Department of the Parliamentary Library.
- Ghosh, R., & Abdi, A.A. (2004). *Education and the politics of difference: Canadian perspectives*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Canadian Scholars Press.
- Giddens, A. (1986). *Central problems in social theory: Action, structure and contradictions in social analysis*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Glenn, H.P. (2013). *The cosmopolitan state*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Goot, M., & Watson, I. (2001). One nation's electoral support: Economic insecurity versus attitudes to immigration. *Australian Journal of Politics & History*, 47(4), 512-515.
- Gordon, I., Lewis, J., & Young, K. (1977). Perspectives on policy analysis. *Public Administration Bulletin*, 25, 26-35.
- Grace, G. (1995). *School leadership: Beyond education management: An essay in policy scholarship*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Grant, C.A., & Sleeter, C.E. (2007). *Turning on learning: Five approaches for multicultural teaching plans for race, class, gender and disability*. 4th ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Gray, G. (1998). From nomadism to citizenship. N. Peterson & Sanders, W. (Eds.), *Citizenship and Indigenous Australians: Changing conceptions and possibilities*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 55-78.
- Green, A., Preston, J., & Janmaat, J.G. (2006). *Education, equality and social cohesion: A comparative analysis*. London: Palgrave.
- Grosfoguel, R. (2012). Decolonizing Western uni-versalisms: Decolonial pluri-versalism from Aimé Césaire to the Zapatistas. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, 1(3), 88-104.
- Gutmann, A. (2004). Unity and diversity in democratic Multicultural education: Creative and destructive tensions. J.A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives*. Chichester, UK: Jossey-Bass, pp. 71-96.
- Gutmann, A., & Ben-Porath, S. (1987). *Democratic education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1996). The European Nation state. Its achievements and its limitations. On the past and future of sovereignty and citizenship. *Ratio Juris*, 9(2), 125-137. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9337.1996.tb00231.x.
- Hage, G. (2012). Critical anthropological thought and the radical political imaginary today. *Critique of Anthropology*, 32(3), 285-308. doi: 10.1177/0308275X12449105.
- Hage, G. (2015). *Alter-politics: Critical anthropology and the radical imagination*. Melbourne, Vic, Australia: Melbourne University Press.
- Haigh, Y., Murcia, K., & Norris, L. (2014). Citizenship, civic education and politics: The education policy context for young Australian citizens. *Journal of Education Policy*, 29(5), 598-616. doi: 10.1080/02680939.2013.865080.
- Hansen, D.T. (2010). Chasing butterflies without a net: Interpreting cosmopolitanism. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 29(2), 151-166. doi: 10.1007/s11217-009-9166-y.
- Harris, A. (2010). Young people, everyday civic life and the limits of social cohesion. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 31(5), 573-589. doi: 10.1080/07256868.2010.513424.

- Harris, A., Wyn, J., & Younes, S. (2008). *Rethinking youth citizenship: Identity and connection*. Parkville, Vic, Australia: Australian Youth Research Centre.
- Harvey, D. (2007). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Hasluck, P. (1961). *The policy of assimilation: Native Welfare Conference*. Decisions of Commonwealth and state ministers at the Native Welfare Conference, Canberra, January 26th and 27th, 1961. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Commonwealth Government.
- Haynes, B. (2009). History teaching for patriotic citizenship in Australia. *Educational Philosophy & Theory*, 41(4), 424-440. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.2008.00430.x.
- He, B. (2011). The awkwardness of Australian engagement with Asia: The dilemmas of Australian idea of regionalism. *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 12(02), 267-285.
- Hearn, M., & Tregenza, I. (2014). The maximum of good citizenship': Citizenship and nation building in Alfred deakin's post-federation speeches. J. Uhr & Walter, R. (Eds.), *Studies in Australian political rhetoric*. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Australian National University, pp. 177-194.
- Heater, D.B. (2004a). *Citizenship: The civic ideal in world history, politics and education*. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press.
- . (2004b). *A history of education for citizenship*. London: Routledge-Falmer.
- Held, D. (2003). *The changing structure of international law: Sovereignty transformed?* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- . (2005). Globalization, corporate practice, and cosmopolitan social standards A. Kuper (Ed.), *Global responsibilities: Who must deliver on human rights?* New York: Routledge, pp. 185-204.
- . (2010). *Cosmopolitanism: Ideals and realities*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Heller, M. (2013). Language and dis-citizenship in Canada. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 12(3), 189-192.
- Heyneman, S.P., & Todorovic-Bebic, S. (2000). A renewed sense for the purposes of schooling: The challenges of education and social cohesion in Asia, Africa, Latin America, Europe and central Asia. *Prospects*, 30(2), 145-166.
- Higley, J., & McAllister, I. (2002). Elite division and voter confusion: Australia's republic referendum in 1999. *European Journal of Political Research*, 41(6), 845-861.
- Hilferty, F. (2008). Teacher professionalism and cultural diversity: Skills, knowledge and values for a changing Australia. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 35(3), 53-70.
- Hill, M., & Lian, K.F. (2013). *The politics of nation building and citizenship in Singapore*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Hin, S. (2008). Counting Romans. L. de Ligt & Northwood, S.J. (Eds.), *People, land and politics. Demographic developments and the transformation of Roman Italy, 300 BC-AD 14*. Brill: Leiden, The Netherlands, pp. 187-238.
- Hobsbawm, E.J. (1990). *Nations and nationalisms since 1780: Programme, myth, reality*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Holmes, C. (2016). *John Bull's island: Immigration and British society, 1871-1971*. Vol. 10. London: Routledge.

- Horner, K. (2015). Discourses on language and citizenship in Europe. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 9(5), 209-218.
- Horst, C., & Gitz-Johansen, T. (2010). Education of ethnic minority children in Denmark: Monocultural hegemony and counter positions. *Intercultural Education*, 21(2), 137-151.
- Howard, C., & Patten, S. (2006). Valuing civics: Political commitment and the new citizenship education in Australia. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue Canadienne de l'education*, 29(2), 454-475.
- Howard, J. (2001). John Howard's policy speech. *Address at the Federal Liberal Party Campaign Launch, Sydney*. Australian Politics. [Transcript of the Prime Minister John Howard 28 October 2001], Retrieved: April 1 2013, from: [http://australianpolitics.com/downloads/howard/2001/01-10-28\\_election-launch\\_howard.pdf](http://australianpolitics.com/downloads/howard/2001/01-10-28_election-launch_howard.pdf).
- Hugo, G. (2000). A century of population change in Australia. *Year book Australia 2001*. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Australian Bureau of Statistics, p. 1.4.
- . (2002). Australian immigration policy: The significance of the events of September 11. *International Migration Review*, 36(1), 37-40.
- Hulme, R., & Hulme, M. (2011). The policy context of citizenship education. J. Arthur & Cremin, H. (Eds.), *Debates in citizenship education*. New York: Routledge, pp. 43-55.
- Hulse, K., & Stone, W. (2007). Social cohesion, social capital and social exclusion: A cross cultural comparison. *Policy Studies*, 28(2), 109-128.
- Huttenback, R. (1973). The British Empire as a 'white man's country'. *Journal of British Studies*, 13(1), 108-137.
- Ishay, M.R. (2008). *The history of human rights: From ancient times to the globalization era*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Isin, E.F. (2008 ). Theorizing acts of citizenship. E.F. Isin & Nielsen, G.M. (Eds.), *Acts of citizenship*. London, UK: Zed Books, pp. 15-43.
- Isin, E.F., & Turner, B.S. (2007). Investigating citizenship: An agenda for citizenship studies. *Citizenship Studies*, 11(1), 5-17.
- Jakubowicz, A. (2010). Australia's migration policies: African dimensions. Sydney, NSW, Australia: Australian Human Rights Commission. [Background paper for African Australians: A review of human rights and social inclusion issues], Retrieved: 27 April 2015, from: [https://www.humanrights.gov.au/sites/default/files/content/africanaus/papers/africanaus\\_paper\\_jakubowicz.pdf](https://www.humanrights.gov.au/sites/default/files/content/africanaus/papers/africanaus_paper_jakubowicz.pdf).
- . (2016). *Commentary on: Embedding multiculturalism in Victorian public culture. Making Multicultural Australia*. Department of Education and Early Childhood, Melbourne, Vic, Australia. Retrieved: March 25 2015, from: <http://www.multiculturalaustralia.edu.au/library/media/Timeline-Commentary/id/158.Embedding-multiculturalism-in-Victorian-public-culture>.
- Jakubowicz, A., & Union, A.E. (2009). *Cultural diversity, cosmopolitan citizenship and education: Issues, options and implications for Australia*. Southbank, Vic, Australia: Australian Education Union.
- Jayaraman, R. (2000). Inclusion and exclusion: An analysis of the Australian immigration history and Ethnic relations. *Journal of Popular Culture*, 34(1), 135-155.

- Jayasuriya, K. (2008). *From British subjects to Australian values: Australia-Asia relations as citizenship building*. (Working Paper No.151). Asia Research Centre, Murdoch, Western Australia: M. University.
- Jayasuriya, L. (1977). *Rethinking Australian education in relation to social change: The need for an approach based on cultural pluralism*. Proceedings of Australia 2000: The Ethnic Impact: Proceedings of the First National Conference on Cultural Pluralism and Ethnic Groups in Australia, August 21-25, 1976. Armidale, NSW, Australia: University of New England p. 43.
- . (1985). Multiculturalism in Australia. *Ethnos (Ethnic Affairs Commission of NSW)* (40), 3-4.
- . (2008). Australian multiculturalism reframed. *AQ: Journal of Contemporary Analysis*, 80(3), 27-30.
- . (2012). *Transforming a 'White Australia': Issues of racism and immigration*. New Dehli: SSS Publications.
- Jenkins, L. (2011). Socially inclusive school environments: Identity development and active citizenship. F. Mansouri & Lobo, M. (Eds.), *Migration, citizenship, and intercultural relations: Looking through the Lens of social inclusion*. London: Ashgate, pp. 117-128.
- Jenson, J. (1998). *Mapping social cohesion: The state of Canadian research*. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Policy Research Networks.
- Jenson, J., & Saint-Martin, D. (2003). New routes to social cohesion? Citizenship and the social investment state. *Canadian Journal of Sociology/Cahiers Canadiens de sociologie*, 28(1), 77-99.
- Johnson, C. (2007). John Howard's 'values' and Australian identity. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 42(2), 195-209. doi: 10.1080/10361140701319986.
- Joshee, R., Peck, C., Thompson, L.A., Chareka, O., & Sears, A.M. (2016). Multicultural education, diversity, and citizenship in Canada. J. Lo Bianco & Bal, A. (Eds.), *Learning from difference: Comparative accounts of Multicultural education*, Multilingual education, (Vol. 16). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer, pp. 35-50.
- Jupp, J. (1997). Tacking into the wind: Immigration and multicultural policy in the 1990s. *Journal of Australian Studies*, 21(53), 29-39. doi: 10.1080/14443059709387314.
- . (2002). *From white Australia to Woomera: The story of Australian immigration*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Jupp, J., Nieuwenhuysen, J., & Dawson, E. (2007). *Social cohesion in Australia*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kalantzis, M. (2000). Multicultural citizenship. W. Hudson & Kane, J. (Eds.), *Rethinking Australian citizenship*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 99-110.
- . (2013). The cultural deconstruction of racism: Education and multiculturalism. *Sydney Studies in Society and Culture*, 4, 90-98.
- Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (1981). *Just spaghetti and polka?: An introduction to Australian Multicultural education*. Sydney, NSW, Australia: Catholic Education Office.
- . (1984). Multiculturalism and education policy. G. Bottomley & de Lepervanche, M. (Eds.), *Ethnicity, class and gender in Australia*. Sydney, NSW, Australia: Allan & Unwin, pp. 82-97.
- . (1999). Multicultural education: Transforming the mainstream. S. May (Ed.), *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking Multicultural and antiracist education*. London: Falmer Press, pp. 245-276.

- Kapai, P. (2012). Developing capacities for inclusive citizenship in Multicultural societies: The role of deliberative theory and citizenship education. *Public Organization Review*, 12(3), 277-298.
- Katter, D. (2005). Australia's international legal obligations: Maritime zones and Christmas Island. *Proceedings of the Seventeenth Conference of The Samuel Griffith Society*, 17(17), <https://www.samuelgriffith.org.au/papers/html/volume17/v17chap10.html>.
- Keating, P. (2011). Australian launch of the International Year of the World's Indigenous People. *Indigenous Law Bulletin*, 7(23), 20-22.
- Kelly, M.G. (2014). The mythology of schooling: The historiography of American and European education in comparative perspective. *Paedagogica Historica*, 50(6), 756-773.
- Kennedy, K.J. (2003). Preparing young Australians for an uncertain future: New thinking about citizenship education. *Teaching Education*, 14(1), 53-68.
- Kincheloe, J.L. (1991). Educational historiographical meta-analysis: Rethinking methodology in the 1990s. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 4(3), 231-245.
- Kirby, M. (2000). The Australian referendum on a republic: Ten lessons. *Australian Journal of Politics & History*, 46(4), 510-535.
- Kirova, A. (2008). Critical and emerging discourses in multicultural education literature: A review. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 40(1), 101-124.
- Klapdor, M., Coombs, M., & Bohm, C. (2009). *Australian citizenship: A chronology of major developments in policy and law*. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Kleist, J.O. (2009). Refugees between pasts and politics: Sovereignty and memory in the Tampa crisis. K. Neumann & Tavan, G. (Eds.), *Does history matter? Making and debating citizenship, immigration and refugee policy in Australia and New Zealand*. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Australian National University Press, pp. 81-103. doi: 10.1080/07256868.2012.746172.
- Kogan, M., & Bowden, K. (1975). *Educational policy-making: A study of interest groups and parliament*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Kukathas, C. (1992). Are there any cultural rights? *Political Theory*, 20(1), 105-139.
- Kumar, K., & Van Hillegersberg, J. (2000). ERP experiences and evolution. *Communications of the ACM*, 43(4), 23-26.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship. A liberal theory of minority rights*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- . (2001). *Politics in the vernacular: Nationalism, multiculturalism and citizenship*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- . (2002). *Contemporary political philosophy: An introduction*. 2nd ed. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, W., & Norman, W. (1994). Return of the citizen: A survey of recent work on citizenship theory. *Ethics*, 104(2), 352-381.
- Lake, M. (1998). Feminism and the gendered politics of antiracism, Australia 1927-1957: From maternal protectionism to leftist assimilationism. *Australian Historical Studies*, 29(110), 91-108.
- Lake, M., & Reynolds, H. (2008). *Drawing the global colour line: White men's countries and the question of racial equality*. Carlton, Vic, Australia: Melbourne University Press.

- Langton, M. (2002). The Nations of Australia *Balay: Culture, Law and Colonialism*, 4, 29-34.
- Lauder, H., Brown, P., Dillabough, J.-A., & Halsey, A.H. (Eds.). (2006). *Education, globalization, and social change*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- League of Nations. (1937). Convention on certain questions relating to the conflict of Nationality laws. Signed at the Hague, April 12th, 1930. *League of Nations treaty series no. 4137: Treaties and international engagements registered with the secretariat of the League of Nations - Germany, Austria, Belgium, Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Canada, etc.*, (Vol. 179: 1937-1938, Nos. 4130-4169). The Hague: Secretariat of the League of Nations, pp. 89-114. Retrieved 11 November 2015, from: <https://treaties.un.org/doc/Publication/UNTS/LON/Volume%20179/v179.pdf>.
- Levey, G.B. (2012a). Multiculturalism and Australian national identity. G.B. Levey (Ed.), *Political theory and Australian multiculturalism*. New York: Berghahn Books, pp. 254-276.
- . (2012b). *Political theory and Australian multiculturalism*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Lew, S. (2016). Chronologies of secondary school curriculum policy. *Melbourne Graduate School of Education Curriculum Policies Project*. Melbourne, Vic, Australia: Melbourne Graduate School of Education, University of Melbourne. Retrieved: September 12 2015, from: [http://web.education.unimelb.edu.au/curriculumpoliciesproject/chrono\\_vic.html](http://web.education.unimelb.edu.au/curriculumpoliciesproject/chrono_vic.html).
- Liddicoat, A.J. (2005). The conceptualisation of the cultural component of language teaching in Australian language-in-education policy. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 25(4), 297-317.
- . (2009). Evolving ideologies of the intercultural in Australian Multicultural and language education policy. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 30(3), 189-203.
- Lingard, B. (2000). Federalism in schooling since the Karmel report (1973), schools in Australia: From modernist hope to postmodernist performativity. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 27(2), 25-61.
- . (2013). *Politics, policies and pedagogies in education: The selected works of Bob Lingard*. Oxfordshire, England: Routledge.
- Lister, R. (2007a). Inclusive citizenship: Realizing the potential. *Citizenship studies*, 11(1), 49-61. doi: 10.1080/13621020601099856.
- . (2007b). Why citizenship: Where, when and how children? *Theoretical Inquiries in Law*, 8(2), 693-718.
- Lithman, Y. (2011). *The integration-citizenship-social cohesion nexus*. Bergen, Norway: The University of Bergen. [Eurosphere Working Paper no.36]. Retrieved April 1 2013, from: <http://eurospheres.org/publications/working-papers>.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2004). Multiculturalism and language policy in education: From clever to bland. *Migration Action*, 26(2), 8-13.
- . (2011). *Multicultural education in Australia: Evolution, compromise and contest*. Paper presented at International Alliance of Leading Education Institutions (IALEI) Annual Conference. University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia: Melbourne Graduate School of Education (MGSE), University of Melbourne.
- . (2016). Learning from difference. J. Lo Bianco & Bal, A. (Eds.), *Learning from difference: Comparative accounts of Multicultural education*, Multilingual education, (Vol. 16). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer, pp. 221-227.

- Lo Bianco, J., & Bal, A. (Eds.). (2016). *Learning from difference: Comparative accounts of Multicultural education*. Multilingual education (Vol. 16). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Lo Bianco, J., & Gvozdenko, I. (2006). Collaboration and innovation in the provision of languages other than English in Australian universities. *Melbourne Faculty of Education, University of Melbourne*, 2, 2008.
- Lo Bianco, J., & Wickert, R. (Eds.). (2001). *Australian policy activism in language and literacy*. Melbourne, Vic, Australia: Language Australia.
- Lopez, M. (2000). *The origins of multiculturalism in Australian politics 1945-1975*. Carlton South, Vic, Australia: Melbourne University Press.
- Mac Naughton, G., Hughes, P., & Smith, K. (2009). *Young children as active citizens: Principles, policies and pedagogies*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars.
- MacCallum, M. (2006). Girt by the sea: Australia, the refugees and politics of fear. *Quarterly Essays*, 4: *Classic quarterly essays on the Australian story* (5), 141-217.
- Macintyre, S., & Simpson, N. (2009). Consensus and division in Australian citizenship education. *Citizenship Studies*, 13(2), 121-134. doi: 10.1080/13621020902731132.
- Maddock, R. (1987). The long boom 1940–1970. R. Maddock & McLean, I.W. (Eds.), *The Australian economy in the long run*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 79-105.
- Maddox, M. (2005). *God under Howard: The rise of the religious right in Australia*. Sydney, NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Maley, W. (2002). Refugee policy: Towards a liberal framework. *Policy*, 18(3), 37-40.
- Mann, J. (2012). The evolution of Commonwealth citizenship, 1945–1948 in Canada, Britain and Australia. *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics*, 50(3), 293-313.
- Mann, M. (1987). Ruling class strategies and citizenship. *Sociology*, 21(3), 339-354.
- Marginson, S. (1993). *Education and public policy in Australia*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- . (1997). *Educating Australia: Government, economy and citizen since 1960*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Markus, A. (1994). *Australian race relations, 1788-1993*. Sydney, NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- . (2009). *Australia's immigration revolution [electronic resource]*. Sydney, NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Marr, D., & Wilkinson, M. (2003). *Dark victory*. Crows Nest, NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin.
- Marshall, D. (1999). The construction of children as an object of international relations: The Declaration of Children's Rights and the Child Welfare Committee of League of Nations, 1900-1924. *The International Journal of Children's Rights*, 7(2), 103-148.
- Marshall, I.D., & Hoy, A. (1917). *Australasian text book of civics with an introduction by Frank Tate*. Melbourne: Lothian.
- Marshall, T.H. (1950). *Citizenship and social class and other essays*. Vol. 11. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Martens, J. (2006). A transnational history of immigration restriction: Natal and New South Wales, 1896–97. *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 34(3), 323-344.

- Martin, S. (1998). *New life, new language: The history of the adult migrant English program*. Sydney, NSW, Australia: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarie University.
- McCorquodale, J. (1986). The legal classification of race in Australia. *Aboriginal History*, 10(1), 7-24.
- McGregor, R. (1997). *Imagined destinies: Aboriginal Australians and the doomed race theory, 1880-1939*. Melbourne, Vic, Australia: Melbourne University Press.
- McLeod, J., & Wright, K. (2013). Education for citizenship: Transnational expertise, curriculum reform and psychological knowledge in 1930s Australia. *History of Education Review*, 42(2), 170-184.
- McNamara, T., & Ryan, K. (2011). Fairness versus justice in language testing: The place of English literacy in the Australian citizenship test. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 8(2), 161-178. doi: 10.1080/15434303.2011.565438.
- McRae, D. (1994). *The first three years: The national languages and literacy institute of Australia limited*. Deakin, ACT, Australia: The National Languages and Literacy Institute of Australia.
- Meaney, N. (2001). Britishness and Australian identity. *Australian Historical Studies*, 32(116), 76.
- Meer, N., & Modood, T. (2012). How does interculturalism contrast with multiculturalism? *Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 33(2), 175-196.
- Mills, C.W. (2007). Multiculturalism as/and/or anti-racism. A.S. Laden & Owen, D. (Eds.), *Multiculturalism and political theory*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 89-114.
- Mitchell, K. (2003). Educating the national citizen in neoliberal times: From the Multicultural self to the strategic cosmopolitan. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 28(4), 387-403.
- Modood, T. (2013). *Multiculturalism: A civic idea*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Mutitjulu Community Aboriginal Corporation. (2017). The Uluru Statement of the Heart. *Final report of the referendum council*. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Commonwealth of Australia, p. i. Retrieved 2 June 2017, from: <https://www.referendumcouncil.org.au/final-report>.
- National Archives of Australia. (2016). *Child migration to Australia – fact sheet 124*. National Archives of Australia. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Australian Government. Retrieved 5 June 2016, from: <http://www.naa.gov.au/collection/fact-sheets/fs124.aspx>.
- Nelson, J.L., Carlson, K., & Palonsky, S.B. (1996). *Critical issues in education: A dialectic approach*. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Nicholas, H. (2015). Shaping Australian policy for Australian adult migrant English language learning. J. Simpson & Whiteside, A. (Eds.), *Adult language education and migration: Challenging agendas in policy and practice*. London: Routledge, pp. 19-34.
- Nicholls, C. (2005). Death by a thousand cuts: Indigenous language bilingual education programmes in the Northern Territory of Australia, 1972–1998. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 8(2-3), 160-177.
- Nieto, S., & Bode, P. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical content of Multicultural education*. 6th ed. Boston: Tufts University in Affiliation with The School of the Museum of Fine Arts.
- Nozick, R. (1974). *State, anarchy, and utopia*. New York: Basic Books.



- Nussbaum, M. (1994). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. G. Wallace Brown & Held, D. (Eds.), *The cosmopolitan reader*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, pp. 155-162.
- O'Brien, K. (2014). Boots, blankets, and bomb tests: The first Australian petitioning and resistance to colonisation. *Griffith Journal of Law & Human Dignity*, 2(2), 357-376.
- Oakeshott, M. (1962). *Rationalism in politics*. London: Methuen.
- Oakman, D. (2000). The seed of freedom: Regional security and the Colombo Plan. *Australian Journal of Politics & History*, 46(1), 67-85. doi: 10.1111/1467-8497.00086.
- OECD. (2012). *Perspectives on global development 2012*. Paris: OECD Publishing. doi: 10.1787/persp\_glob\_dev-2012-en.
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2005). *Changing citizenship: Democracy and inclusion in education*. New York: McGraw-Hill International.
- Ozga, J. (1987). Studying education policy through the lives of the policy-makers: An attempt to close the macro-micro gap. S. Walker & Barton, L. (Eds.), *Changing policies, changing teachers: New directions for schooling*. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press, pp. 138-150.
- . (1999). *Policy research in educational settings: Contested terrain*. New York: McGraw-Hill International.
- Ozga, J., Grek, S., & Lawn, M. (2009). The new production of governing knowledge: Education research in England. *Soziale Welt*, 60(4), 353-369.
- Palmer, D. (2009). The quest for 'wriggle room': Australia and the Refugees Convention, 1951-73. *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 63(2), 290-308. doi: 10.1080/10357710902895178.
- Papastergiadis, N. (2009). Wog zombie: The de-and re-humanisation of migrants, from mad dogs to cyborgs. *Cultural Studies Review*, 15(2), 147-178.
- Parekh, B.C. (2002). *Rethinking multiculturalism: Cultural diversity and political theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Pasamonk, B. (2004). The paradoxes of tolerance. *The Social Studies*, 95(5), 206-210. doi: 10.3200/TSSS.95.5.206-210.
- Perry, L.B. (2009). Conceptualizing education policy in democratic societies. *Educational Policy*, 23(3), 423-450. doi: 10.1177/0895904807310032.
- Peterson, N., & Sanders, W. (Eds.). (1998). *Citizenship and indigenous Australians: Changing conceptions and possibilities*. Reshaping Australian institutions. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Pitty, R. (2009). The unfinished business of Indigenous citizenship in Australia and New Zealand. K. Neumann & Tavan, G. (Eds.), *Does history matter? Making and debating citizenship, immigration and refugee policy in Australia and New Zealand*. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Australian National University Press, pp. 25-46. doi: 10.1080/07256868.2012.746172.
- Portera, A. (2008). Intercultural education in Europe: Epistemological and semantic aspects. *Intercultural Education*, 19(6), 481-491.
- Povinelli, E.A. (1998). The state of shame: Australian multiculturalism and the crisis of indigenous citizenship. *Critical Inquiry*, 24(2), 575-610.
- Pusey, M. (2003). *Economic rationalism in Canberra: A nation-building state changes its mind*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Putnam, R. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Quiggin, J. (1999). Globalisation, neoliberalism and inequality in Australia. *The Economic and Labour Relations Review*, 10(2), 240-259.
- Rayner, J. (2009). Understanding policy change as a historical problem. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, 11(1), 83-96.
- Rivett, K. (1962). *Immigration: Control or colour Bar?: The background to "White Australia" and a proposal for change*. Parkville, Vic, Australia: Melbourne University Press. doi: 10.1080/10314610108596160.
- Rizvi, F. (1985). *Multiculturalism as an educational policy. ESA 842, policy development and analysis*. ESA 842: Policy development and analysis. Waurin Ponds, Vic, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- . (1992). Educative leadership in a multicultural society. P.A. Duignan & Macpherson, R.J.S. (Eds.), *Educative leadership: A practical theory for new administrators and managers*. London: Falmer Press, pp. 134-169.
- . (2006). Imagination and the globalisation of educational policy research. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 4(2), 193-205.
- . (2009). Global mobility and the challenges of educational research and policy. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, 108(2), 268-289. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-7984.2009.01172.x.
- Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalising educational policy*. London: Routledge.
- Roche, J. (1999). Children: Rights, participation and citizenship. *Childhood*, 6(4), 475-493.
- Rosewarne, S. (2001). Globalisation: The new migration (assault on the human rights of asylum seekers and migrant workers). *Overland*, 164, 29-33.
- Rowse, T. (1998). Indigenous citizenship and self-determination: The problem of shared responsibilities. N. Peterson & Sanders, W. (Eds.), *Citizenship and Indigenous Australians: Changing conceptions and possibilities*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Press, pp. 79-100.
- Rubenstein, K. (1995). Citizenship in Australia: Unscrambling its meaning. *Melbourne University Law Review*, 20(2), 503-527.
- . (2000). Citizenship and the centenary: Inclusion and exclusion in 20th century Australia. *Melbourne University Law Review*, 24(3), 576-608.
- . (2005). 'From this time forward... I pledge my loyalty to Australia': Loyalty, citizenship and constitutional law in Australia. Paper presented at Symposia Series, API Network Press. [ANU College of Law Research Paper No. 08-09]. Canberra, ACT, Australia. Retrieved: 15 May 2013, from: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1130626>.
- SBS. (2016). SBS Charter. Sydney, Australia: Special Broadcasting Service. [Government television broadcaster mission statement], Retrieved: March 25 2016, from: <http://www.sbs.com.au/aboutus/corporate/index/id/25/h/SBS-Charter>.
- Selwyn, N. (2013). Researching the once-powerful in education: The value of retrospective elite interviewing in education policy research. *Journal of Education Policy*, 28(3), 339-352.
- Senate Standing Committee on Employment, Education and Training. (1988). *Education for active citizenship in Australian schools and youth organizations: A discussion paper*. Senate

- Standing Committee on Employment, Education and Training, Canberra, ACT, Australia: A.G.P. Service.
- Shachar, A. (1999). The paradox of multicultural vulnerability: Individual rights, identity groups, and the state. C. Joppke & Lukes, S. (Eds.), *Multicultural questions*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, pp. 87-111.
- Shaver, S. (2002). Australian welfare reform: From citizenship to supervision. *Social Policy & Administration*, 36(4), 331-345.
- Shears, L.W. (1980). *Report of the education department for the year ended 30 June 1979: Ordered by the legislative assembly to be printed*. Parliamentary paper (Victoria. Parliament). L.W. Shears & Department of Education, V. (Eds.). Melbourne: F.D. Atkinson, Government Printer. Retrieved 15 October 2014, from: <http://www.parliament.vic.gov.au/papers/govpub/VPARL1980-81No67.pdf>.
- Short, D. (2003). Reconciliation, assimilation, and the indigenous peoples of Australia. *International Political Science Review*, 24(4), 491-513.
- Simons, M., Olssen, M., & Peters, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Re-reading education policies*. Educational futures: Rethinking theory and practice, M. Peters (Ed.). Chicago, IL: Sense.
- Simpson, G. (1993). Mabo, international law, terra nullius and the stories of settlement: An unresolved jurisprudence. *Melbourne University Law Review*, 19(1), 195-210.
- Singh, M.G. (1996). Studying Asia for the national economic interest: An analysis of the Australian governments' strategy for schools. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 17(2), 153-178.
- Sintomer, Y. (2010). Random selection, republican self-government, and deliberative democracy. *Constellations*, 17(3), 472-487.
- Skinner, Q. (2009). A genealogy of the modern state. R. Johnston (Ed.), *Proceedings of the British Academy*, (Vol. 162). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, pp. 325-370.
- Sleeter, C.E. (2014). Multiculturalism and education for citizenship in a context of neoliberalism. *Intercultural Education*, 25(2), 85-94.
- Smith, G., & Lowe, D. (2005). Howard, downer and the liberals' realist tradition. *Australian Journal of Politics & History*, 51(3), 459-472.
- Smith, R.M. (1988). The "American Creed" and American identity: The limits of liberal citizenship in the United States. *The Western Political Quarterly*, 41(2), 225-251.
- Soutphommasane, T. (2015). The racial discrimination Act at 40. *Australian Law Journal*, 89(5), 303-305.
- Staeheli, L.A., Ehrkamp, P., Leitner, H., & Nagel, C.R. (2012). Dreaming the ordinary: Daily life and the complex geographies of citizenship. *Progress in Human Geography*, 36(5), 628-644.
- Stevenson, P. (2006). 'National' languages in transnational contexts: Language, migration and citizenship in Europe. C. Mar-Molinero & Stevenson, P. (Eds.), *Language ideologies, policies and practices*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 147-161.
- Stratton, J. (1999). Multiculturalism and the whitening machine, or how Australians become white. G. Hage & Couch, R. (Eds.), *The future of Australian multiculturalism: Reflections on the twentieth anniversary of Jean martin's the migrant presence*. Sydney, NSW, Australia: University of Sydney, pp. 163-188.

- Tate, J.W. (2009). John Howard's "Nation": Multiculturalism, citizenship, and identity. *Australian Journal of Politics & History*, 55(1), 97-120. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8497.2009.01507a.x.
- Tavan, G. (2001). Immigration: Control or colour Bar? The immigration reform movement, 1959–1966. *Australian Historical Studies*, 32(117), 181-200.
- . (2005). Long, slow death of White Australia. *The Sydney Papers*, 17(3/4), 135-139.
- . (2009). Testing times: The problem of 'history' in the Howard government's Australian citizenship test. K. Neumann & Tavan, G. (Eds.), *Does history matter? Making and debating citizenship, immigration and refugee policy in Australia and New Zealand*. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Australian National University Press, pp. 125-143.
- Taylor, C. (1994). The politics of recognition. K.A. Appiah, Habermas, J., Rockefeller, S.C., Walzer, M. & Wolf, S. (Eds.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 25-74.
- Taylor, S., & Henry, M. (2007). Globalization and educational policymaking: A case study. B. Lingard & Ozga, J. (Eds.), *The RoutledgeFalmer reader in education policy and politics*. London: Routledge, pp. 101-116.
- Torney-Purta, J., Schwille, J., & Amadeo, J.-A. (1999). *Civic education across countries: Twenty-four national case studies from the IEA civic education project*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.
- Tow, W.T. (2005). Sino–American relations and the 'Australian factor': Inflated expectations or discriminate engagement? *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, 59(4), 451-467.
- Tsolidis, G. (2011). Dressing the national imaginary: Making space for the veiled student in curriculum policy. *World yearbook of education 2011—curriculum in today's world: Configuring knowledge, identities, work and politics*. London: Routledge, pp. 17-30.
- Tully, J. (2000). Struggles over recognition and distribution. *Constellations: An International Journal of Critical & Democratic Theory*, 7(4), 469-482.
- Turner, B.S. (1994). Outline of a theory of citizenship. B.S. Turner & Hamilton, P. (Eds.), *Citizenship: Critical concepts*, (Vol. 1). London: Routledge, pp. 100-226.
- (Ed.). (1993). *Citizenship and social theory*. (Vol. 24). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- United Nations General Assembly. (1959). *United Nations' declaration of the rights of the child*. United Nations General Assembly. Geneva, Switzerland, from: <https://www.unicef.org/malaysia/1959-Declaration-of-the-Rights-of-the-Child.pdf>.
- . (1990). *Convention on the rights of the child*. United Nations General Assembly. Geneva, Switzerland: United Nations: Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner. Retrieved 14 June 2014, from: <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/ProfessionalInterest/crc.pdf>.
- van den Anker, C. (2010). Transnationalism and cosmopolitanism: Towards global citizenship? *Journal of International Political Theory*, 6(1), 73-94.
- van der Ploeg, P., & Guérin, L. (2016). Questioning participation and solidarity as goals of citizenship education. *Critical Review*, 28(2), 248-264. doi: 10.1080/08913811.2016.1191191.
- Van Oers, R. (2013). *Deserving citizenship: Citizenship tests in Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom*. Leiden, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Vasta, E. (2010). The controllability of difference: Social cohesion and the new politics of solidarity. *Ethnicities*, 10(4), 503-521.

- Victorian Ethnic Affairs Commission. (1995). *The Multicultural Victoria Inquiry Report*. Melbourne, Vic, Australia: Victorian Ethnic Affairs Commission.
- Victorian Multicultural Commission. (2016). 2011 census: A snapshot of our diversity. Melbourne, Vic, Australia: Victorian Multicultural Commission. Retrieved: December 2 2016, from: <http://www.multicultural.vic.gov.au/population-and-migration/victorias-diversity/2011-census-a-snapshot-of-our-diversity>.
- Victorian Multicultural Commission Act 1993*
- Viviani, N. (1992). *The abolition of the white Australia policy: The immigration reform movement revisited*. Nathan, Brisbane, Qld, Australia: Griffith University, School of Modern Asian Studies, Centre for the Study of Australian-Asian Relations.
- Voloder, L. (2011). Avenues for belonging: Civic and Ethnic dimensions of Multicultural citizenship in Australia. F. Mansouri & Lobo, M. (Eds.), *Migration, citizenship, and intercultural relations: Looking through the Lens of social inclusion*. London: Ashgate, pp. 103-116.
- Walsh, J. (2011). Quantifying citizens: Neoliberal restructuring and immigrant selection in Canada and Australia. *Citizenship Studies*, 15(6-7), 861-879.
- . (2014). The marketization of multiculturalism: Neoliberal restructuring and cultural difference in Australia. *Ethnic & Racial Studies*, 37(2), 280-301. doi: 10.1080/01419870.2012.720693.
- Walter, J., & MacLeod, M. (2002). *The citizens' bargain: A documentary history of Australian views since 1890*. Sydney, NSW, Australia: University of New South Wales Press.
- Warhurst, J. (1993). Nationalism and republicanism in Australia: The evolution of institutions, citizenship and symbols. *Politics*, 28(4), 100-120.
- Weinstock, D.M. (2007). Liberalism, multiculturalism, and the problem of internal minorities. A.S. Laden & Owen, D. (Eds.), *Multiculturalism and political theory*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp. 244-264.
- Wellings, B. (2002). Empire-nation: National and imperial discourses in England. *Nations and Nationalism*, 8(1), 95-109.
- Wells, J.T., & Christie, M.F. (2000). Namatjira and the burden of citizenship. *Australian Historical Studies*, 31(114), 110-130.
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 237-269.
- Willard, M. (1923). *History of the White Australia policy*. University of Melbourne publications: No. 1. Melbourne, Vic, Australia: Melbourne University Press.
- Wilsford, D. (1994). Path dependency, or why history makes it difficult but not impossible to reform health care systems in a big way. *Journal of Public Policy*, 14(3), 251-283. doi: 10.1017/S0143814X00007285.
- Wilson, R.D., Sir. (1997). *Bringing them home: Report of the national inquiry into the separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children from their families*. Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, Sydney, NSW, Australia.
- Wright, S. (2006). Language policy and language planning. C. Llamas, Mullany, L. & Stockwell, P. (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to sociolinguistics*. London, UK: Routledge, pp. 164-172.

York, B. (2003). *Australia and refugees, 1901-2002: An annotated chronology based on official sources*. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Information and Research Services, Department of the Parliamentary Library Canberra.

Zubrzycki, J. (1982). *Multiculturalism for all Australians: Our developing nationhood*. Canberra, ACT, Australia: Australian Council on Population and Ethnic Affairs.