



Queensland University of Technology
Brisbane Australia

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted/accepted for publication in the following source:

[Doherty, Catherine A.](#) (2014) Forging the heteroglossic citizen : articulating local, national, regional and global horizons in the Australian Curriculum. *Discourse : Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 35(2), pp. 177-189.

This file was downloaded from: <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/55007/>

© Copyright 2012 Taylor and Francis

This is an Author's Accepted Manuscript of an article published in *Discourse : Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* [Volume 35, Issue 2, (2014)] [copyright Taylor & Francis], available online at: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/01596306.2012.745729>

Notice: *Changes introduced as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing and formatting may not be reflected in this document. For a definitive version of this work, please refer to the published source:*

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2012.745729>

Forging the heteroglossic citizen: articulating local, national, regional and global horizons in the Australian Curriculum.

Catherine Doherty

Centre for Learning Innovation, Faculty of Education, QUT, Victoria Park Road, KELVIN GROVE, 4059.

c.doherty@qut.edu.au

Abstract:

This paper offers a discourse analysis comparing selected articles in the national press over the consultative period for Phase 1 subjects in the new Australian Curriculum, with rationales prefacing official Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority documents, to trace how various versions of Australia, its 'nation-ness' and its future citizens have been taken up in the final product. *The analysis uses Lemke's analytic elaboration of Bakhtin's concept of heteroglossia and its derivative, intertextuality. It identifies a range of intertextual thematic formations around 'nation', 'history', 'citizen' and 'curriculum' circulating in the public debates, then traces their presence in official curriculum documents.* Rather than conclude that these themes are contradictory and incoherent, the conclusion asks how these multiple dialogic facets of Australian nation-ness potentially offer a better response to complex times than any coherent monologic orthodoxy might.

Key Words: curriculum, citizenship, nation, heteroglossia, intertextuality

Complex, entangled and uncertain times require more sophisticated responses to collective identity than nostalgic ‘narratives of nation-ness’ (Popkewitz, 2000, p. 8). National educational systems have been prompted to consider more conscious effort on two fronts: firstly to re-energise national identity as both reaction to and strategy for global challenges; and secondly, to develop new dispositions for globalising fields. The first is the centripetal project of re-nationalising the social imaginary, the second is the equal but opposite centrifugal project of de-nationalising the social imaginary. Historically, mass school curriculum has been intimately involved in the former and the formation of the modern nation-state (Anderson, 1991; Green, 1990). However, it is now increasingly enlisted in the second (Popkewitz, 2000; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010) to address ‘the issues of nation and global context, of political change, of new identity and cognitive demands this world has now generated’ (Yates & Grumet, 2011, p. 7).

In 2012 Australia commenced the first phase of its inaugural Australian Curriculum, prepared by a newly commissioned Commonwealth agency, the Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA). This national curriculum will eventually replace eight State curricula. Australia’s timing in developing a national curriculum might suggest it starts with a clean slate and could offer an innovative solution to producing both the national and the global citizen. This paper however will argue that there is no such thing as a fresh start in these matters, but rather the continuation of historical debates. Australia’s national identity has always been a work in progress (Elder, 2007; White, 1981), its fabrication achieved by sampling competing versions which have fuelled history wars and stoked political divides. In much the same way, the Australian Curriculum has taken shape through divisive public debates.

Numerous voices around issues of national identity and modes of citizenship have contributed to the finished product, which must manage this surplus of opinion in some palatable temporary settlement. As well as the history curriculum’s multiple treatments of Australia as a nation discussed below, and the studied avoidance of a national literature in the English curriculum, the curriculum stipulates three ‘cross-curriculum priorities’ - Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander

histories and cultures, Asia and Australia's engagement with Asia, and Sustainability – and the generic capability of intercultural understanding (ACARA, 2010). In sum, the Australian Curriculum has been constructed as a complex web of cross-hatched perspectives that pull the citizen in different directions in their assemblage, both re-nationalising and de-nationalising, centring and de-centring.

A decade ago, Seddon (2001) considered it unlikely that Australia would ever pursue a national curriculum, because curricular arrangements had become more fractured, increasingly invested in the expression of diverse identities and market positions. Other commentary on Australian curricular reform points to 'incoherence in the structuring of curriculum' (Yates & Collins, 2010, p. 90) or 'competing discourses' (Kennedy, 2008). These accounts of differences as problematic beg the question, how adequate or oppressive would be their implied antidote of some singular monologic orthodoxy? This paper will seek to move beyond a logic of 'either or' that spots 'tension' or 'contradictions' between seemingly incongruent frames in the same text, to understand what generative potentials might be gained when incongruent frames coexist and their meanings compete through the same official text.

There is growing recognition of how the social world's complexity is managed by temporary, shifting settlements. Williams (1977, pp. 121-122) argued that:

We have certainly still to speak of the 'dominant' and the 'effective', and in these senses of the hegemonic. But we find that we have also to speak ... of the 'residual' and the 'emergent', which in any real process, and at any moment in the process, are significant both in themselves and in what they reveal of the characteristics of the 'dominant'.

Similarly, 'glocalisation' theory (Robertson, 1994) would argue that global and local orientations are mutually constitutive, not opposed. For Hall (1996), collective identities are produced in a discursive process of articulating and suturing cultural resources from the surplus

available. In this way, for Hall, any claim to collective identity needs its constitutive, relational Other with which to define boundaries and particularities. So the mutually exclusive are better understood to coexist as mutually dependent and mutually constitutive.

Featherstone's (1995) metaphor, 'range of foci', offers another way to think about how to manage cultural complexity – he highlights the growing capacity to adjust one's horizons and move across different scales depending on circumstances:

It is the capacity to shift the frame, and move between varying range of foci, the capacity to handle a range of symbolic material out of which various identities can be formed and reformed in different situations, which is relevant in the contemporary global situation. ... there has been an extension of cultural repertoires and an enhancement of the resourcefulness of various groups to create new symbolic modes of affiliation and belonging, as well as struggling to rework and reshape the meaning of existing signs ... (p.110)

In this way, a curriculum that simultaneously invokes local, minority, national, regional and global identities need not be construed as contradictory, but rather as offering resources and frames for extended cultural repertoires available for a variety of relational contingencies.

This paper explores a 'range of foci' in media debates and Australian Curriculum documents using Bakhtin's concept of 'heteroglossia' which makes evident multivocality within and between texts. **The analysis compares** selected newspaper articles published over the consultative period for Phase 1 subjects, with the rationales given in Phase 1 documents, to trace how various versions of Australia, its 'nation-ness' and its future citizens have been incorporated. This paper will thus explore how the opportunity of Australia's new curriculum has been used 'to appease, manage and accommodate competing interests' (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010, p. 6).

Analysing heteroglossia

Bakhtin's concept of heteroglossia captured how different characters speak with different voices, 'each possessed of their own discursive consciousness' (Allan, 2000, p.23), and the textual meaning created lies not just in what is said, but in relations of difference to other voices. This developed into the more sociolinguistic concept of 'social heteroglossia', being the environmental condition of multiple social languages, each 'ideologically saturated' (Bakhtin, 1994, p. 74) with 'specific points of view on the world, forms of conceptualizing the world in words, ... each characterized by its own objects, meanings and values' (p. 115). Bakhtin's treatment focuses on the plurality of world views within and across texts, and their interplay:

Any concrete discourse (utterance) finds the object at which it was directed already as it were overlain with qualifications, open to dispute, charged with value ... it is entangled, shot through with shared thoughts, points of view, alien value judgements and accents. ... and all this may crucially shape discourse, may leave a trace in all its semantic layers, may complicate its expression (Bakhtin in Morris, 1994, pp. 75-76).

By this reckoning a monologic orthodoxy is not possible, even if it were desirable.

Bakhtin further described what is now termed 'intertextuality' (Allen, 2000) whereby no text starts from a clean page, but emerges in dialogue with other previous or concurrent texts (intertexts) and their larger discourses 'out there' in society. Lemke (1995) elaborates on this dialogism and intertextual semantics:

As writers and readers, whether we explicitly refer to discourses other than our own or not, we make use of the existence and widespread currency of other discourses because

we must always take them into account, must always be at least implicitly in dialogue with them. (Lemke, 1995, p. 38)

Thus there are relations within texts (heteroglossia) that implicate relations between texts (intertextuality). The new national curriculum should thus be understood to be necessarily in dialogue with intertexts such as previous state curricula, other countries' curricula, media reports, political debates, international benchmarking reports, and submissions.

To understand how meanings build across texts, not just within them, Lemke (1995) coined the term 'intertextual thematic formations' (ITFs) (p. 49). Crucially ITFs carry not just topical content representing the world or ideas ('ideational' meanings), but also an attitudinal stance and evaluation of the content/idea ('orientational' meanings), by which 'each of these discourses creates its own defined "ideological-axiological" world' (p.47, quoting Bakhtin). ITFs then relate to each other in terms and degrees of alliance or opposition. **The concept of ITF resonates with Foucault's (1972) concept of discourse. However, at the risk of simplification, Foucault sought to understand the unity, coherence and regularity of discursive formations generating texts, identities and practices. In contrast, Bakhtin and Lemke's operationalisation thereof orient to how diversity is sustained through multivocality, incoherence and textual politics, and to the meanings produced in the competitive friction between voices. Where Foucault is interested in the historical emergence, dominance and disappearance of discursive formations over time, Bakhtin and Lemke are interested in the coexistence of alternatives, and their mutually constitutive dialogue.**

There are a number of politically-charged ITFs about Australia's nation-ness, curriculum, and their relationship to each other. Australia's 'history wars' (Macintyre & Clark, 2004) in recent decades have produced and disputed new readings of the nation's iconic narratives. These sparked a second 'history war' in state curricula (Kennedy, 2008; Parkes, 2007). Australia also

hosts historical and political differences regarding the status of the Indigenous population and cultural diversity in the population. The national curriculum effectively becomes an intersection and temporary settlement of these political positions through the sampling of their signature ITFs.

Furthermore, there are groups circulating opposed ITFs concerning curriculum itself, for example, the place of traditional disciplinarity versus integration of knowledge; instrumentalism versus humanism; procedural skills versus instructional knowledge. Labaree (1997) outlines longstanding competing discourses in US curricular debates around education as a public good, a private positional good, or for human capital. These could be understood as ITFs re educating the citizen, the individual, or the worker, and curricular reform as their ongoing dialogue. It is noteworthy that at this stage ACARA has deferred any debate around assessment, which would activate another arena of strongly defended ideologies. Then there are other ITFs around whether the curriculum should be differentiated, localized, or a uniform experience that builds collective foundations. While **school curricula have** typically been implicated in nation-building by means of ‘compulsory patriotism’ (Apple, 2004, p. 168), there is the emergent ITF promoting citizenship beyond the nation, and its trope of ‘the global citizen’. This ITF is itself a dialogue between three internal voices – one foregrounding global economic competitiveness, one promoting cosmopolitan ethics and intercultural awareness, and a third more specifically interested in environmentalism (see Doherty & Li, 2011). The different communities behind all of these ITFs would seek to orient the curriculum and its selection, sequencing and pacing differently (Bernstein, 2000).

Research design

For Lemke (1995), ‘heteroglossic relations are, above all, social and political relations’ (p.39). He offers a set of questions to explicate such ‘textual politics in texts: ‘Who speaks these ITFs, when, to whom, for what purposes, in whose interests and with what effects ... ?’ (p.57).

These questions apply to the ITF as the unit of analysis across an intertextual chain. This project collated 139 articles commenting on the national curriculum in the two calendar years (2009, 2010) leading up to and following the release of the draft documents for Phase 1 subjects, published in Australia's only national newspaper, *The Australian*, and its companion website. *The Australian* maintains a conservative editorial stance, frequently critical of the Labor Federal Government, and has championed both neoconservative and neoliberal agendas in educational policy (McKnight, 2001). It was considered a fertile site to capture explicit debate around the national curriculum, and evidence of alternative ITFs 'out there'. For this paper, four articles considered representative of public debates around 'Australia', 'history' or 'nation' are analysed to identify heteroglossic voices and illustrate ITFs working across the corpus more generally. Traces of these ITFs are then identified in official documents framing the Phase 1 Australian Curriculum subjects (English, Mathematics, Science and History). Lemke's analytic process has been adapted to the following:

- What voices are evident?
- What intertexts are mentioned or implied?
- What ideational and orientational meanings does each ITF promote?
- What other ITFs emerge in this text's dialogue through alignment/opposition?
- How do the intertexts promote one ITF over others?
- How does the ITF promoted seek to orient the curriculum?

Heteroglossic debates

The heteroglossic voicing in these four newspaper articles exemplifies a range of ITFs circulating in the public media, and the multiple stakeholders in curricular reform. While highlighting different voices at play in each text, this analysis does not deny the additional role of journalists and editors in selecting and framing these voices.

Text 1: “History is key to understanding” The Australian, 21 May 2010.

AUSTRALIA risks being a nation at odds with its region if we do not grasp the nettle and equip our children for the Asian century. That is the message from one of the nation’s leading experts on Asian studies, Basham professor of history at ANU, Anthony Milner. ... Professor Milner added: “Given where Australia is situated in the world, and given the way in which we are relating economically to this part of the world, and given our security relationships, it’s perfectly obvious we have to be a pretty Asia literate community. And I think people all around the world expect that of Australia. You would not want to be a country at odds with its region.” Professor Milner said that while the situation with Asian languages was serious, his focus was on the study of history. “The new curriculum they are putting together is not, by any means, telling the Australian story in the Asian context,” he said. “This is partly a problem of expertise. I’m not suggesting we should be teaching every student the sophisticated history of the Asian region, but we should at least be teaching Australia in that regional context. If we really tell the Australian story in its Asian context, we will help people to see why they need to do an Asian language. It will also create a more open minded community, open minded to the issues we face as a nation.”

The article carries Professor Milner’s voice and his promotion of ‘the Australian story’ as part of Asia, therefore its treatment in the history curriculum. The set of ideas promoting Australia as part of Asia is an ITF promoted most forcibly in the 1990s by a Labor Prime Minister, Paul Keating, which informed major investment in the teaching of Asian languages (Henderson, 2008). This ITF typically references Australia’s geographic ‘region’, ‘context’, ‘neighbours’, ‘community’. Milner’s addition of economic and security considerations is itself

heteroglossic – extending the argument on contradictory premises for nurturing relations. Other voices are alluded to. Milner aligns with ‘people all around the world’ who expect Australia to be Asia-literate, and partially with those who more specifically promote Asian languages, while he opposes the voice of ‘they’ who are ‘putting together’ the curriculum. The article dialogues explicitly with the intertext of ‘the new curriculum’ as anticipated, and more implicitly with texts advocating Asian language learning as sufficient. By elaborating how the curriculum might ‘equip our children for the Asian century’ through regional history, not just language learning, the article adds weight to the Australia-as-part-of-Asia ITF, and its orientation to a future more centred on geographic region, than the implied alternative of European heritage.

Text 2: “Keep out the lobby groups: teachers,” by Justine Ferrari, The Australian, May 18, 2010.

HISTORY teachers are concerned the national curriculum panders to lobby groups demanding their pet topics be included, creating a course that will force teachers to race through content and leave no time for in-depth study. The interim response by the History Teachers’ Association of Australia says the Australian Curriculum Assessment and Reporting Authority needs to cull content from the history curriculum for students in Years K to 10 and withstand pressure from “numerous lobby groups” demanding their topics stay, are enhanced or are added to the final document. ...The submission cites comments attributed to Stuart Macintyre, the lead writer on the history curriculum, at a recent teachers’ forum about “the impact of ‘capricious’ decision-making on curriculum development”. “This echoes HTAA’s well-founded concerns about what has been a relatively unsophisticated process up to this point,” it says. “As a consequence, there is now considerable anxiety about ACARA’s capacity...” *The Australian*

understands similar concerns have been raised by members of the expert advisory group, who have complained that changes to the curriculum are made without reference to them or even the ACARA board.

The voice foregrounded in the second article is that of the History Teachers' Association of Australia, aligned with the purported voice of Professor Macintyre, and faceless 'members of the expert advisory group', while in opposition to the voices of 'numerous lobby groups' and in turn ACARA for being susceptible to their pressure. The HTAA argues against the ad hoc politicisation of the consultation process on pedagogical/curricular grounds, but resorts to similar tactics to be heard. The HTAA's argument projects a disciplinary ITF that promotes history curriculum as learning processes of critical historical enquiry. This historiographic ITF opposes versions of history as instruction in factual 'content' or celebratory narrative. This debate references perhaps a broader curricular debate between 'instruction' and 'education' ITFs (Connell, 1993, pp. 6-7). The article invokes not just the HTAA submission, but other texts being the more elusive 'similar concerns' and 'complaints', the draft curriculum, and the lobby groups' 'demands' though these are not exemplified, because fittingly it is the process that the HTAA are disputing. The HTAA's disciplinary ITF would orient the curriculum to critical enquiry in opposition to more conservative ITFs that promote the history curriculum as a vehicle for instilling nation-building narratives.

Text 3: "Tony Abbott fears political correctness run riot in school curriculum,"

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/breaking-news/tony-abbott-fears-political-correctness-run-riot-in-school-curriculum/story-fn3dxiwe-1225835234157>, retrieved February 28, 2010.

Sorry Day and Anzac Day should not be treated similarly in the national school curriculum, Tony Abbott says. A draft curriculum for English, Maths, Science and History will be released for public consultation tomorrow. Newspaper reports have suggested there will be a strong focus on indigenous issues, with Sorry Day being taught as a community commemoration in the same way as Anzac Day is. The Opposition Leader said he didn't like the idea. "You always worry that there will be political correctness run riot in these things and I hope those reports are wrong," he said on Channel 10. "If that is what we do see, I think a lot of people will be very disappointed."

This text gives voice foremost to Tony Abbott, as Leader of the Opposition, on the eve of the release of the draft curriculum. Mr Abbott offers a critique of the curriculum before its release, on the grounds of what unnamed, perhaps self-referential 'newspaper reports' anticipate. Thus this article gives prominence to the Opposition's ITF on matters historical in dialogue with a hypothetical curriculum as opposed to its actual substance. The tag phrase 'political correctness run riot' serves as a caricature of the opposing ITF which dignifies Indigenous Australia's challenge of the 'settlement' narrative of Australia's history. This oppositional ITF is often also caricatured as the 'black armband' view of Australian history (Macintyre & Clark, 2004). By aligning himself with 'a lot of people' who 'will be very disappointed', Abbott conjures a silent majority behind his ITF to give it weight. This conservative ITF would privilege a Eurocentric orientation in the curriculum with an unapologetic account of colonisation.

Text 4 is from an article reporting the then Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Education, Employment and Workplace Relations, Julia Gillard's launch of the curriculum the next day. The journalist quotes her uptake of two caricature labels to invoke oppositional ITFs:

Text 4: "Gillard takes schools back to basics under national curriculum" by S. Maiden & J. Kelly, The Australian, March 1, 2010.

Launching the “big new reform that matters to Australian families” today, Ms Gillard also dismissed suggestions the new curriculum is too politically correct, arguing it is neither a “black armband or white blindfold” version of history. ...The teaching of Australian history became politicised when former Prime Minister John Howard seized on the phrase, coined by eminent historian Geoffrey Blainey, of the “black armband” view of history to challenge the view that Australia was invaded. But Ms Gillard today rejected suggestions the new curriculum would be politically correct. “It is neither black armband nor white blindfold version of history,” she said.

Gillard’s voice takes up the catchphrases of opposing ITFs thus laminating heteroglossic layers. The newspaper report then invokes the oppositional ITF’s ‘suggestions the new curriculum is too politically correct’. The newspaper may not say who ‘suggested’ so, but by these textual means they have brought into play the intertextual chain that sustains this counter-ITF as explicit intertext and made her construct the new curriculum in dialogue with it. By invoking ‘Australian families’, Gillard positions the national curriculum in a more neutral space to avoid alignment with either of the polarised ITFs. Her comments are pitted against the views of a previous Prime Minister and an ‘eminent’ historian. This small text highlights the discursive work of anticipation in public debate – hypothetical fears are raised and named, then dignified in public media which by circulating and amplifying such critiques, seeks to impact on the shaping of the actual document. This priming constitutes a pre-emptive strike in textual politics. The text also highlights the work of caricature in representing and belittling counter-ITFs, badging them with summary slogans such as ‘too politically correct’ that are typically dismissive, derogatory and overgeneralised. Such shorthand tactics are used by all camps in this inherently political process.

This sample of public media texts gives some sense of the heteroglossic debate and multiple ideological stakes in the Australian Curriculum, and of the ITFs ‘out there’ jockeying for representation. There are ITFs concerned with promoting particular versions of Australian

history and identity and ITFs concerned with curricular/pedagogic dimensions, all competing for consideration. ITFs typically dialogue in relations of opposition – that is, they need some constitutive Other (Hall, 1996) to realise their message.

The heteroglossic curriculum

This section turns to selections from official ACARA documents that made explicit reference to Australia's 'nation-ness'. The analysis highlights traces of competing ITFs at work.

Text 5: Rationale from History, Australian Curriculum (ACARA, 2011)

History is a disciplined process of inquiry into the past that develops students' curiosity and imagination. Awareness of history is an essential characteristic of any society, and historical knowledge is fundamental to understanding ourselves and others. ... History, as a discipline, has its own methods and procedures which make it different from other ways of understanding human experience. The study of history is based on evidence derived from remains of the past. It is interpretative by nature, promotes debate and encourages thinking about human values, including present and future challenges. The process of historical inquiry develops transferable skills, such as the ability to ask relevant questions; critically analyse and interpret sources; consider context; respect and explain different perspectives; develop and substantiate interpretations, and communicate effectively

The curriculum generally takes a world history approach within which the history of Australia is taught. It does this in order to equip students for the world (local, regional and global) in which they live. An understanding of world history enhances students' appreciation of Australian history. It enables them to develop an understanding of the past and present experiences of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, their

identity and the continuing value of their culture. It also helps students to appreciate Australia's distinctive path of social, economic and political development, its position in the Asia-Pacific region, and its global interrelationships. This knowledge and understanding is essential for informed and active participation in Australia's diverse society.

This text foregrounds the disciplinary ITF framing the subject of History as a 'disciplined process of inquiry', 'interpretative by nature' with 'methods and procedures' and critical analysis. However, embedded in this rationale, the second sentence shifts from historical inquiry to 'historical knowledge' as 'fundamental', offering a trace of the opposing ITF casting history curriculum as instructional input (see Text 2 commentary above). In contrast to the first paragraph's sense of inquiry and debate, the second paragraph shifts to 'the' singular, 'distinctive' history of Australia which is 'taught'. Meanwhile, the students' world is presented within a telescopic range of foci – 'local, regional and global' - with recognition of Indigenous identities, the Australia-as-part-of-Asia ITF, and a globalisation ITF, then settling on the multicultural ITF of 'Australia's diverse society'. The curriculum itself is asked to serve many larger purposes beyond introducing the discipline of History, as reflected in the different curricular ITFs of building 'fundamental knowledge', developing 'transferable skills', to 'equip students for the world', and for 'informed and active participation'. By highlighting the multiple ITFs referenced, my purpose is to demonstrate firstly the co-presence of competing ITFs, the delicate textual politics and balancing act underway, and the temporary settlement (asserting the disciplinary ITF while accommodating others) achieved at this time and tide. A different government may negotiate a differently balanced settlement. The complexity of the ITF salad thus arranged creates both possibilities and dilemmas for the teacher who are left to adjudicate and resource this heteroglossic surplus.

Text 6: Selection from “Rationale” from The shape of the Australian Curriculum, Version 2.0 (ACARA, 2010)

9. Education plays a critical role in shaping the lives of the nation’s future citizens. To play this role effectively, the intellectual, personal, social and educational needs of young Australians must be addressed at a time when ideas about the goals of education are changing and will continue to evolve. ...

11. Education must not only respond to these remarkable changes but also, as far as possible, anticipate the conditions in which young Australians will need to function as individuals, citizens and workers when they complete their schooling. These future conditions are distant and difficult to predict. ... Young people will need a wide and adaptive set of knowledge, understanding and skills to meet the changing expectations of society and to contribute to the creation of a more productive, sustainable and just society. ...

13. The commitment to develop a national curriculum reflects a willingness to work together, across geographical and school-sector boundaries, to provide a world-class education for all young Australians. Working nationally makes it possible to harness collective expertise and effort in the pursuit of this common goal. It also offers the potential of economies of scale and a substantial reduction in the duplication of time, effort and resources.

14. The Australian Curriculum also means that all young Australians can learn about the histories and cultures of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, of their contribution to Australia, and of the consequences of colonial settlement for Indigenous communities, past and present. For Aboriginal people and Torres Strait Islanders, the Australian Curriculum promotes the importance of pursuing excellence within education settings which respect and promote their cultural identity.

This excerpt is taken from the second version of a discussion paper prepared by ACARA to explicate its design for consultation. In this statement, the dominant ITFs concern the national interest and the production of the future citizen, orienting to challenges of the future, rather than legacies of the past. The reference to ‘the intellectual, personal, social and educational needs of young Australians’ neatly indexes multiple voices to be accommodated. ‘Intellectual’ needs reference a traditional academic ITF regarding curriculum as introduction to the established disciplines of Western knowledge. The ‘personal’ needs reference more progressive curricular discourses around fostering the individual. The ‘social’ needs could be interpreted to reference either the human capital discourse of preparing the worker, or the more critical ITF around ‘active citizenship’. The ‘educational’ needs similarly could reference either developmental frames on generic cognitive competencies, or more liberal ideas of education as an end in itself. This multi-faceted construction of curricular aims is repeated in the idea that ‘young Australians will need to function as individuals, citizens and workers’. While Labaree (1997) described these three orientations as constant competitors in US curricular reforms, here they are presented as companions, and the curriculum compatible with all three. Similarly, the phrase ‘a more productive, sustainable and just society’ with its string of adjectives and innocuous ‘and’, has drawn together as a benign assemblage potentially antagonistic ITFs regarding moral priorities with which to steer the nation into the future. Paragraph 13 builds the case for curriculum as shared funds of knowledge to underpin collective solidarity, yet the last sentence shifts ITFs with an economic rationalist argument for cost-saving through up-scaling curriculum development. Where this paragraph overwrites or defers difference within the nation, Paragraph 14 reinstates it in a strong statement dignifying the colonisation-as-invasion ITF (the ‘black armband’ version of Australian history in Texts 3 and 4). The last sentence however combines this with an ITF of academic excellence implicitly in dialogue with an apologist ITF, thus setting ambitious goals for by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students.

The analyses above have unravelled some of the complex tapestry of ITF threads working across public debate into ACARA documents, such that advocates of any ITF will be able to recognize aspects of both their hopes and fears. Not all ITFs have been granted equal status. For example, while the futurist ITF dominates, there are residual traces of more traditional ITFs invoking academic standards and disciplinary fundamentals carrying vestiges of their attitudinal priorities. Similarly, while the nation is repeatedly invoked, there is also an emergent ITF around Australia as part of Asia, and a taken-for-granted reading of the world as globalised. The future citizen is constructed as one able to move across these scales, so no frame in itself becomes redundant, rather the innovation and challenge is in their suturing as coexisting subjectivities. While citizenship has been stretched to wider horizons, there is also a disaggregation of the nation within, with official recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait identities and histories in the curriculum and cultural diversity as a constitutive feature of Australia. These social aggregations and disaggregations would make a monologic version of Australia's 'nation-ness' either a nonsense or a violence. Maturing as a nation must involve being able to negotiate and dignify such complexity.

Curricular politics or potentials in heteroglossic curriculum?

This paper started with the new curricular imperative to produce global citizens as well as national citizens, and Australia's historic opportunity to address this in its inaugural national curriculum. Rather than construe these ambitions as contradictory, this challenge was conceptualized through the concepts of heteroglossia and intertextuality, such that a 'range of foci' (Featherstone, 1995) becomes a rich resource for meaning and identity. This frame suggests there is never a clean page, but rather ongoing dialogue between the ideational and attitudinal messages of coexisting ITFs. The analysis of selected newspaper articles identified numerous ITFs circulating in public discourse that would construct the nation, its history, its

citizens and the curriculum in different ways. Similar analysis of curricular documents demonstrated how a variety of such agendas are reflected in the curricular documents. The competition between ITFs can be understood as a relational matter of emergence, dominance, or residualisation, rather than presence/absence. This focus on textual politics also makes evident how curriculum is unfinalised and unfinalisable work in progress around which dialogues will and must continue. Any balance brokered in the textual politics of these documents is temporary and will need to constantly defend its relevance.

A heteroglossia, though unstable, is potentially a more generative and protean response to complex times than the search for one coherent ITF to enforce hegemonically. It will produce a more complex picture of who Australians were, are and might be. This argument however should not be used to celebrate mere expediency in glossing over ideological differences to deliver all things to all stakeholders. There is further work needed to interrogate the rather weak links made between local, national, regional and global framings, so the subjectivities invoked can be more thoughtfully 'sutured' together and 'articulated' (Hall, 1996b, p. 14) less haphazardly, and more mindfully. Similarly, glib rhetoric such as 'a more productive, sustainable and just society', though laudable, should be challenged on the grounds that it masks considerable dilemmas in combining these goals.

The cross-hatched web of citizenships, identities and range of foci invoked in these curricular documents is an ambitious design. To dignify the design in practice, teachers are challenged to do justice to multiple citizenships and to the complexity of managing the whole range of foci as resources to think with and act through. With multiple versions of the citizen legitimated, students will need to consider which frame applies when, where and why. Closer consideration of how these forms of citizenship might articulate in students' lifeworlds will help take such goals beyond motherhood statements to rich curricular design.

Acknowledgments

This research is part of a project with Professor Chin-Ju Mao of National Taiwan Normal University, funded by the Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia (ASSA) and The Department of Industry, Innovation, Science and Research (DIISR).

References

- Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) (2010) *The shape of the Australian Curriculum, Version 2.0*. Retrieved September 10, 2011 from http://www.acara.edu.au/verve/resources/Shape_of_the_Australian_Curriculum.pdf
- Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) (2011) "Rationale", *History, Australian Curriculum*. Retrieved September 10, 2011, from <http://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/History/Rationale>
- Allen, G. (2000). *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism* (Revised ed.). London: Verso.
- Apple, M. (2004). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Bakhtin, M. (1994). Social heteroglossia. In P. Morris (Ed.), *The Bakhtin reader: Selected writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, Voloshinov* (pp. 73-80). London: Arnold.
- Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity* (revised ed.). Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Connell, W. F. (1993). *Reshaping Australian education 1960 -1985*. Melbourne: ACER.
- Doherty, C., & Li, M. (2011). Producing the intercultural citizen: interculturality in the International Baccalaureate. In F. Dervin, A. Gajardo & A. Lavanchy (Eds.), *The politics of interculturality* (pp. 165-188). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.
- Elder, C. (2007). *Being Australian: narratives of national identity*. Crows Nest, NSW: Allen & Unwin.
- Featherstone, M. (1995). *Undoing culture: Globalization, postmodernism and identity*. London: Sage.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). London: Routledge.
- Green, A. (1990). *Education and state formation*. London: Macmillan.
- Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs 'identity'? In S. Hall & P. Du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 1-17). London: Sage.
- Henderson, D. (2008) Politics and policy-making for Asia literacy: The Rudd Report and a National Strategy in Australian education. *Asian Studies Review*, 32(2), 171-195.
- Kennedy, K. (2008). More civics, less democracy: competing discourses for citizenship education in Australia. In D. Grossman, Wing On Lee & K. Kennedy (Eds.), *Citizenship curriculum in Asia and the Pacific* (pp. 181-196). Hong Kong: Springer.
- Labaree, D. (1997). Public goods, Private goods: The American struggle over educational goals. *American Educational Research Journal*, 34(1), 39-81.
- Lemke, J. L. (1995). *Textual politics: Discourse and social dynamics*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Macintyre, S., & Clark, A. (2004). *The history wars* (2nd ed.). Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- McKnight, D. (2001). "A world hungry for a new philosophy": Rupert Murdoch and the rise of neo-liberalism. *Journalism Studies*, 4(3), 347-358.
- Morris, P. (Ed.). (1994). *The Bakhtin reader: Selected writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, Voloshinov*. London: Arnold.
- Parkes, R. (2007). Reading history curriculum as postcolonial text: towards a curricular response to the history wars in Australia and beyond. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 37(4), 383-400.

- Popkewitz, T. (2000). Globalization/regionalization, knowledge and the educational practices: some notes on comparative strategies for educational research. In T. Popkewitz (Ed.), *Educational knowledge: changing relationships between the state, civil society, and the educational community* (pp. 3-27). New York: State University of New York Press.
- Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing education policy*. London: Routledge.
- Robertson, R. (1994). Globalisation or glocalisation? *Journal of International Communication*, 1(1), 33-52.
- Seddon, T. (2001). National curriculum in Australia? A matter of politics, powerful knowledge and the regulation of learning. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 9(3), 307-331.
- White, R. (1981). *Inventing Australia: images and identity 1688-1980*. Sydney: George Allen & Unwin.
- Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yates, L., & Collins, C. (2010). The absence of knowledge in Australian curriculum reforms. *European Journal of Education*, 45(1), 89-102.
- Yates, L., & Grumet, M. (2011). Curriculum in today's world: configuring knowledge, identities, work and politics. In L. Yates & M. Grumet (Eds.), *World Yearbook of Education 2011: Configuring knowledge, identities, work and politics* (pp. 3-14). London: Routledge.