Putting social inclusion in its place: Three principles for pedagogic work
Keynote Address to the Pathways 10 Conference:
'Creating Space for People with Disabilities in Tertiary Education'
The Auditorium, Southbank Institute of Technology, Brisbane, 2 December 2010

Trevor Gale
National Centre for Student Equity in Higher Education[1]

Preamble
I want to begin by thanking Judy Hartley (Griffith University) and her colleagues for inviting me to speak to you today and for the honour of naming the theme of this conference after a throw away line in my keynote address to the First Year in Higher Education conference,[2] held mid last year in Townsville. In that address I argued for "the creation of space in higher education not just for new kinds of student bodies but also for their embodied knowledges and ways of knowing". The invitation to speak to you today gives me the chance to revisit and extend those observations in ways that I hope will be useful.

Introduction
In this paper I want to make the case for creating *spaces* in tertiary education for marginalised Australians. And I want to distinguish this from creating *places* for them. The reason for focusing on the first rather than the second is that I think we have been better at creating places than spaces for students from equity groups, although our track record in relation to their place in tertiary education is not very good either.

The recent *Review of Australian Higher Education* (Bradley et al. 2008) provided a timely reminder of the dismal performance of the nation and its higher education system in terms of the proportional representation of certain groups of Australians within the university student population. It would seem that a university place is not for everyone.[3] For example, for at least the last twenty years,

---

[1] The National Centre for Student Equity in Higher Education is an Australian Government funded research centre, hosted at the University of South Australia. Professor Trevor Gale is its founding director. GPO Box 2471 Adelaide SA 5001 AUSTRALIA. www.equity101.info

[2] Gale, T. (30 June 2009) *Towards a southern theory of higher education.* Keynote Address, 12th Pacific Rim First Year in Higher Education Conference "Preparing for tomorrow today: the first year experience as foundation". Rydges Southbank, Townsville, Australia.

[3] The Mayor of a City Council in one of Australia's most depressed socioeconomic areas (Vinson 2007), recently said these exact words to me: "a university place is not for everyone". Enrolment and graduation figures support his assertion. Currently, only 34% of 25 to 24 year old Australians hold a Bachelor degree (Australian Government 2009: 12) and the Bradley Review (Bradley et al. 2008) indicates that among those who participate in higher education, this is not evenly spread across the various Australian population groups. But the Mayor's comment was really aimed at pushing back on the idea that more people from his municipality should have the opportunity to go to university. It was also an assertion that there are things other than a university education that are equally worthwhile, pushing back on the patronising 'raising aspirations' agenda currently being promulgated by governments and universities. He is right to call into question the legitimacy of official knowledge (embodied in a university education) in society but fails to appreciate the power relations involved, which continue to marginalise constituents within his city.

people from low socioeconomic status (SES) backgrounds have only represented around 15 to 16 percent of undergraduate university students and yet they constitute 25 percent of the population as a whole. Indigenous Australians are also quite poorly represented in our universities. While 2.4 percent of all Australians are Indigenous, only 1.3 percent (DEEWR Selected Higher Education Statistics, 2008) of undergraduate university students are Indigenous. And people from regional and rural areas of Australia are similarly under-represented. In fact, in recent years their representation has been declining. 25.4 percent of Australians live in regional and rural areas but in 2008 only 18.6 percent of undergraduate university students came from these areas. In 2001 it was 20.2 percent (DEEWR 2008; Bradley et al. 2008: 28).

A similar story can be told about the upper end of Australia's Vocational Education and Training (VET) sector. Equity groups are traditionally over-represented in VET as a whole. The sector has a reputation for providing a 'second chance' at education for the disadvantaged in our society (Karmel & Woods 2008: 9), although certainly many people choose VET as their first preference and achieve very desirable outcomes (employment and further education). But the demographics of the upper end of VET, from Diploma or even Certificate IV and above, look very similar to our university student populations (Wheelehan 2009). Clearly, Australians do not benefit equally from VET.

To its credit, the Australian Government has taken on the challenge of creating more university places for people from low SES backgrounds, to raise their level of participation in higher education to 20 percent by 2020. And it has also established financial partnerships with the States and Territories to target problems of low educational achievement associated with low SES schools and communities (reference agreement). However, it has been less vocal with respect to naming an equity agenda for the VET sector, particularly in relation to its top-heavy top end. And, as welcome as an emphasis is on breaking the nexus between low educational achievement and low socioeconomic status, the Government's conception of social inclusion in education seems to be consumed and possibly narrowed by this SES focus. Hence, while Indigenous Australians and people from regional and rural areas are acknowledged in the Government's statement on *Transforming Australia's Higher Education System* (2009), they are subsumed under an SES banner, with the expectation that efforts to increase university places taken up by people from low SES backgrounds will also benefit Indigenous and regional and rural Australians (Australian Government 2009: 14). At least they get a mention. Absent from the document is any reference to people with disabilities, who are still grossly under-represented in undergraduate university programs and also in the upper end of VET.

Clearly there is much work still to do to create places for Australians under-represented in tertiary education. On one level, it is work associated with the 4As of entry – Access, Achievement, Availability and Aspiration – identified by Don Anderson and his colleagues in the 1980s (Anderson et al. 1980; Anderson & Vervoon 1983). There is now good research on what institutions can do and the kinds of programs that best encourage and enable disadvantaged groups to participate in tertiary education (Gale et al. 2010). And a fund, the Higher Education Participation and Partnership Program (Commonwealth of Australia , 2010) – which is assessable at least by universities – has been created by the Australian Government to financially support these outreach programs. But the work of making our tertiary student cohorts more representative of the Australian population is also about the kind of places these institutions are. Uninviting places are difficult to fill (Sellar, Gale & Parker

2011). In part, increasing their appeal means providing support structures for all students, whatever their circumstances, to enable them to participate more fully in tertiary education. We know that certain students require particular kinds of support, often in greater amounts.[4] This support is vital in making room for people whose circumstances mean that they would otherwise be disadvantaged in and by our education systems. Increasing the appeal of tertiary institutions can also mean making them more 'experiential', through 'hands-on' activities, workplace learning opportunities, overseas exchange programs, and extra-curricula activities, not all of which are disability-friendly or indeed suited to the needs and interests of under-represented groups more generally.

But I am arguing for even more space than that. In fact, it is the distinction between place and space that provides the basis for a relational understanding of social inclusion, needed in our tertiary education institutions. In social geography, *spaces* are defined by their power relations, while *places* are spaces in which these power relations have been settled in favour of one way of viewing the world (reference). For example, in 1835, when the English explorer, John Batman, arrived on the banks of the Yarra River and announced "this will be the place for a village," which is now called Melbourne,[5] he was declaring the authority even superiority over that space of an English world view and specifically over the Wurundjeri people who lived there. He could have just as easily recited that old English proverb, 'a place for everything and everything in its place,' which is an acknowledgement of difference, even social inclusion, although it is not particularly socially just. Raewyn Connell (2007) has written about these ideas in terms of the power relations in the realm of knowledge. She argues that despite claims to universality, the social theories of the global north that dominate our social, political and economic systems fail to account for voices and knowledges from non-dominant peoples – the global south. While they are specific places, 'north' and 'south' are used by Connell as place markers for the centre and the periphery in knowledge relations, in a similar way as 'east' and 'west' are critiqued by Edward Said in his famous book, Orientalism (1978).

In advocating for the remediation of these social relations, Nancy Fraser (1997) draws attention to two different kinds of action required to make social spaces more just. As she explains:

> By affirmative remedies for injustice I mean remedies aimed at correcting inequitable outcomes of social arrangements *without disturbing the underlying framework that generates them*. By transformative remedies, in contrast, I mean remedies aimed at correcting inequitable outcomes precisely by *restructuring the underlying generative framework*. The crux of the contrast is end-state outcomes versus the processes that produce them. (Fraser 1997: 23; emphasis added)

In these terms, an affirmative approach to social justice informs the Australian Government's statement on *Transforming Australia's Higher Education System* (2009), despite its nomenclature. It

---

[4] For example: Study skills / learning support; Financial support; International student support, Disability services, Indigenous units, Equity practitioners; Counselling services, Career services, Ombud/complaint services, Accommodation services, Student association, Orientation

[5] An early proposal was to call it Batmania, in the same way that Tasmania is named after Tasman who 'discovered' it.

aims to correct the inequitable representation of people from low SES backgrounds in the nation's universities; to put them in their 'rightful' place rather than restructure those places. My intentions are more disturbing. I am interested in restructuring the very education with which all students engage, in ways that take account of not just different bodies but also and importantly the social, cultural and economic differences (and similarities) they embody.

Header here

It is the transformation of tertiary education, its restructuring to create spaces for marginalised groups, to which I want to now turn. This transformative work need not be confined to one area of an institution or system or to one set of processes within them, although – because of their centrality – some have more transformative potency than others. For this reason I will focus my attention on what Bourdieu and Passeron (1990) refer to as Pedagogic Work (PW). Basil Bernstein (1971) has identified pedagogy as one of three message systems of education. Bob Lingard and his colleagues (2003) argue that pedagogy is 'the central' message system. Given that PW is such a central activity of education institutions, it is a strategic place from which to create space for a social inclusion agenda.

However, I want to preface my comments about pedagogy with three introductory remarks. First, PW is more often implicated in the reproduction of inequalities, in closing down spaces rather than opening them up. In part, this is because:

> The man [sic] who deliberates on his culture is already cultivated and the questions of the man who thinks he is questioning the principles of his upbringing still have their roots in his upbringing. (Bourdieu & Passeron 1990: 37)

This should not leave us hamstrung; damned if we do and damned if we don't. In the roots of our upbringing there are socially inclusive dispositions from which we can draw and it is from these that I hope we can identify at least three principles for socially inclusive pedagogy. In this context, my comments in relation to particular equity groups will be illustrative. My intention is to advocate a general disposition on which to build a socially inclusive pedagogy rather than name pedagogies for particular equity groups or domains. And I am certainly no expert on disability, so I will need to defer to your expertise to flesh out what these ideas mean in that specific field.

My second preliminary comment is that my focus is on *secondary* PW, in the context of formal education. Primary PW occurs in the earliest phase of one's upbringing, as a primary cultivator of the habitus; that is, one's habits, disposition, or unthinking-ness in actions. This is not to say that there is no relationship between primary and secondary PW. On the contrary, "The success of all school education, and more generally of all secondary PW, depends fundamentally on the education previously accomplished in the earliest years of life" (1990: 43). That is to say, success in educational contexts has less to do with how well students learn in and from educational institutions and more to do with the extent to which those educational institutions recognize their *a priori* knowledge and skills.

My third remark is that pedagogy is not confined to the work of teachers and in classrooms. As Bernstein (2001: 366) reminds us, we live in a "Totally Pedagogised Society". Pedagogy is writ large. So even television talent quests provide lessons in "the management of disappointment, the cultivation of hope and the maintenance of belief in meritocracy" (Windle 2010: 251). PW, then, is more generally the work of all in an education institution. It can occur just as readily at the student information booth or at the IT help desk as within the walls of designated learning environments, including virtual ones.

As Bourdieu and Passeron (1990) define it, PW has three main characteristics:
- First, it is a *prolonged process*. It is not the stuff of "discontinuous and extraordinary actions" (1990: 31) but a *series* of pedagogic actions (PAs), irrespective of whether these actions are deliberate or unconscious in their intent (1990: 47).
- Second, PW produces a *durable outcome*. It transforms information into mental formation (1990: 19), into the habitus, which takes time! Those who 'receive' an education are able to generate practices that conform with the principles championed by a PA, across a number of fields and long after the PW has ceased (1990: 32).
- And third, PW requires Pedagogic Authority (PAu), which *legitimates* the pedagogic agent and the product of PW (1990: 19).

While all that may seem complex, I want to frame my comments about this PW – work that is everyone's in a tertiary education institution – in terms of the belief, design and practice that constitutes PA and which I think flow from a Bourdieuian understanding of PW and PA. I plan to particularly emphasise the principle in each of these constitutive elements for building a social inclusive pedagogy in tertiary education, which has the potential to open up spaces for currently marginalised groups.

Belief – in students' assets rather than their deficits
By *belief* I mean the ideas and theories (often expressed as principles) that name and frame good teaching, which are not always explicitly articulated by practitioners but are influential in their pedagogy nonetheless. It is these beliefs about teaching that inform pedagogic design and practice. There is considerable debate on these issues in the literature and in contexts of practice, most recently and comprehensively represented in what have become known in school systems as 'authentic' (Newman et al. 1996) and 'productive pedagogies' (Lingard et al. 1998).

Interest in pedagogy has started to gain traction in HE as well. There are now at least three different sets of principles for teaching and learning (Chickering & Gamson, 1999; Kift & Nelson, 2005; David et al., 2009), which have gained currency in this learning environment, albeit in different HE systems. Not all principle-sets are the same and they do not agree on the ideal number, but there are three that seem to be consistent across each set. Specifically: (a) there is a diversity of learners and ways of learning, which need to be taken into account when designing pedagogy; (b) learners learn best when learning activities require them to be actively engaged; and (c) assessment should have a pedagogical intent, making a contribution to students' learning and not just serving an institutional purpose of allocating grades.

These are beliefs about pedagogy that many would share, although they are not particularly orientated towards achieving social inclusion. To have a more transformative effect on tertiary education, they need to be prefaced by the belief that all students bring things of value to the learning environment. This is the first principle on which to build a socially inclusive pedagogy.

At the moment, our tertiary institutions tend to define students from under-represented groups in terms of their deficits rather than their assets. Students with physical disabilities are very familiar with this deficit representation of who they are and, therefore, what they can or are allowed to do. Whereas, the most common claim about students from disadvantaged backgrounds is that they are not sufficiently prepared academically for university. To enrol them in a HE would require a lowering of entry standards measured in terms of eligible ATAR (Australian Tertiary Admission Rank) or entry scores. This is such a widely and deeply held view that it is hard to dislodge even when faced with evidence to the contrary. Richard Teese's research, for example, clearly demonstrates that students with low ATAR scores are highly correlated with low SES, and vice versa. In other words, the ATAR (or ENTER, TER, OP or UAI) is more indicative of socioeconomic status than it is of a student's academic potential (Teese and Polesel 2003). The fallacy of claims about low SES students' low academic ability is also born out in the research on these students' university performance. The evidence from any number of small and large-scale research projects across the country and across different university types, is that university students from low SES backgrounds perform at or about the same as their peers (Dobson and Skuja 2005; Tranter, Murdoch & Saville 2007; Dobozy 2008; Win and Miller 2005).

Unsettling deficit views, as a 'pedagogical intent' (Hickey-Moody et al. 2010: 232), requires strategies based on positive understandings of historically marginalised students and their communities. Instead of lamenting their students' deficits, tertiary education institutions and educators need to refocus on their students' assets, especially their particular knowledges and skills. Luis Moll and his colleagues (1992) refer to these assets as 'funds of knowledge', which are "historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual functioning and well-being" (Moll et al. 1992: 133). Indigenous knowledges are of this order and are starting to gain legitimacy in the HE sector, although there is still some way to go in that respect. More generally, "valorized diversity raises questions about what counts as knowledge and these questions in turn influence what is taught in universities and colleges throughout the world" (Ramirez 2006: 444).

The benefits for all students of recognising and valuing such knowledges are well illustrated in research from the USA on the effects of the racial and ethnic diversification of university student populations. In "a multidisciplinary analysis of the research literature", Jeffery Milem (2003: 129) has found that heterogeneous university student populations exhibit higher levels of academic achievement[6] than homogenous university student populations and that the greatest gains are by "majority students who have previously lacked significant direct exposure to minorities" (Milem 2003: 131-132). But it is not the sheer presence of different students that generates this effect. In

---

[6] The educational benefits for *all* university students in more diverse cohorts include: "greater relative gains in critical and active thinking … greater intellectual engagement and academic motivation … [and] greater relative gains in intellectual and social self-concept" (Milem, 2003, p. 142).

fact, institutions and their staff who fail to engage with the diversity of their students also fail to see this academic improvement (Association of American Universities 1997). In short, creating space for and valuing "diversity in colleges and universities is not only a matter of social justice but also a matter of promoting educational excellence" (Milem 2003: 126).

Design – of ??? 'two-ways' ???
A second element of PW involves the *design* of PA or rather the design of the planned course of PA: the processes by which intent and content are to be communicated. "Secondary PW is that much more productive when … it creates more fully the social conditions for communication by methodically organizing [teaching-learning] exercises" (Bourdieu & Passeron 1990: 45). At one level, we could regard design as the grammar of pedagogy, determining its schematic structure: its ordering and timing of PA, its inclusion of some exercises and the exclusion of others, and the arrangement of environments and conditions within which the PA takes place. Again, all of this is not confined to classrooms and to the work of designated teachers. There is a certain grammar involved in enrolment procedures, in parking restrictions, in borrowing library books, and so on. From such arrangements, students learn their place in the world of tertiary education and, indeed, the place of the institution and their tertiary qualification. For example, I recently heard of a graduation ceremony at an international language college scheduled for the day *before* the students' final examination.

Pedagogic design is informed by particular beliefs. A belief that all students bring things of value to the learning environment, calls for a pedagogic design that includes and draws on these funds of knowledge. The ways in which these are included are also important. Students from marginalised groups enter tertiary education not only with different knowledges to offer but also different ways of knowing. It is almost self-evident that PA can be designed or *composed* in a number of ways, but not all of these are legitimated or even recognised. Yet, as Lew Zipin comments, 'cultures of people in given historic times and social spaces … comprise not just knowledge contents – accumulated artefacts, skills and lore – but also inter-subjective ways of knowing and transacting knowledge – what [he] call[s] "funds of pedagogy"' (Zipin 2009: 324) and which deserve PAu.

This raises design questions around 'epistemological equity' (Sefa Dei 2010: 98). PA can be designed in ways that *privilege* some knowledges and ways of knowing over others, even when these are included. Drawing on Connell's southern theory critique, Anna Hickey-Moody and her colleagues suggest that in much current PA, "a form of theoretical and methodological Empire operates, whereby the particular theoretical perspectives and knowledges of the powerful global elite masquerade as *the only* theoretical perspectives and knowledges of any consequence" (Hickey-Moody et al. 2010: 231-232; emphasis original). Epistemological equity, then, is also concerned with *recognition*. As Sefa Dei explains, "the question of how to create spaces where multiple knowledges can co-exist in the Western academy is central, especially so since Eurocentric knowledge subsumes and appropriates other knowledges without crediting sources" (Sefa Dei 2010: 98).

These three design concerns – with composition, privilege, and recognition – are addressed to some extent by strategically employing what Lisa Delpit (1993: 163-165) has referred to as a 'two-ways' or 'both-ways' approach to designing pedagogy. "The point must not be to eliminate students' home languages [and knowledges], but rather to add other voices and discourses to their repertoires"

(Delpit 1993: 163). This is the second principle on which to build a socially inclusive pedagogy: to value difference while also providing access to and enabling critical engagement with dominance. It is a counter-hegemonic (Connell 1993) approach to pedagogic design, to do both rather than to replace one form of dominance with another. Drawing on Delpit (1995), designing pedagogy that accounts for both dominance and difference involves:

- Acknowledging and validating students' ways of expressing their knowledge of the world, and adding to this other ways of knowing and expressing this knowledge;

- Acknowledging that official knowledge can require students to choose between an allegiance to 'them' or 'us', and finding ways in which to saturate dominant forms of knowledge with new meaning so that there is space for students to retain a sense of themselves; and

- Openly acknowledging that education systems produce inequitable outcomes, based not on merit but on sponsorship (Turner 1971; Gale 1999), and then providing students with the resources to work the system.

Practice – working 'with' students
A third element of PW concerns PA in practice. It is that element of PA that seeks to engage students' senses in making sense of the world; it is work focused on "what actual bodies do in classrooms" (Probyn 2004: 22). Pedagogic practice typically "take[s] the form of bodily movements" (Bourdieu 1990: 92) that contribute to students' mental formation, whether this is intended or not. It includes but is not limited to: where to stand, whether to stand, for how long, what to say, what to write, who to ask, who to listen to, when to finish, when to start, when to try again. Of course, these pedagogic practices are exercised in relation to the practices of students and in fact are directed at monitoring and shaping student practice (Shilling 1993: 21-22; Gale & Densmore 2000: 98-99). The interest here is on the practical logic of PW although a more general understanding of practice is also useful in this regard.

Practice is best described as a kind of bodily know-how or a bodily logic, which is distinguishable from the logic of theory. As Pierre Bourdieu explains, "practice has a logic which is not that of logic" (Bourdieu 1998: 82) or rather "not that of the logician" (Bourdieu 1990: 86) who employs "a mode of thought that works by making explicit the work of thought" (Bourdieu 1990: 91), which is then applied to the empirical world, as interpretation and/or proposition. It is not that practice defies logic – although to some extent that is true – but rather it has a logic of its own. It is a logic of the moment. It is "caught up in 'the matter in hand', totally present in the present and in potentialities" (Bourdieu 1990: 92). In fact, it is this anticipation – understanding (the codes particular to) the field so completely as to know what is best to do now, in relation to what will happen in the future – that defines good practice[7] or what Bourdieu refers to as a 'feel for the game'. "The 'feel' (sens) for the game is the sense of the imminent future of the game, the sense of the direction (sens) of the history of the game that gives the game its sense" (Bourdieu 1990: 82).

---

[7] 'Best' practice is an absurdity. It is a denial of different codes in different fields, which require familiarity in order to acquire a feel for the game in that field. This is not to deny that good practice is transferrable from one field or subfield to another. The extent to which this is possible will depend on the similarity of codes in those fields and their relative autonomy.

The game and its players provide a useful analogy for understanding practice, particularly its logic which "can only be grasped in action, in the temporal movement that distinguishes it" (Bourdieu 1990: 92). The example that Bourdieu provides is of:

> A player who is involved and caught up in the game [who] adjusts not to what he sees but to what he fore-sees, sees in advance in the directly perceived present; he passes the ball not to the spot where his team-mate is but to the spot he will reach – before his opponent – a moment later, anticipating the anticipations of the other and, as when, 'selling the dummy', seeking to confound them. He decides in terms of objective probabilities, that is, in response to an overall, instantaneous assessment of the whole set of his opponents and the whole set of his team-mates, seen not as they are but in their impending positions. And he does so 'on the spot', 'in the twinkling of an eye', 'in the heat of the moment' … He is launched into the impending future, present in the imminent moment" (Bourdieu 1990: 81-82).

Deborah Youdell (2010) has also provided a useful example of what this practice looks like in the context of PW. In the following excerpt she shows how pedagogic practice can create space for 'difficult' primary school students who are "becoming-student, becoming-learner, becoming-boy" (Youdell 2010: 322), in ways that enable and encourage them to understand these in positive terms. In Youdell's analysis of events:

> The boys move from Google Earth images of the nature reserve to Google Earth images of their own neighbourhoods, from discussion about geological features to ribbing and banter about the low-class areas other boys live in. From nature reserves and mammals to Sid and Nancy and car racing.
>
> The student-subject and the learner-subject here, then, is not predicated on an abiding and fixed identity, rather *it is the very fluidity of identifications that is the moving ground on which recognition takes place*. The expectation of conformity, singularity, consistency is set aside. Miss Groves does not delineate a universal acceptable and unacceptable student – she offers recognition across the boys' subjectivating practices: 'cool boy', 'angry boy', 'good student', 'reluctant student' are all valid and viable.
>
> These boys are subjectivated student and learner in the present, they are becoming student and learner in each moment, without requiring prior or abiding constitutions or requiring these constitutions to persist into the next moment. It is in the letting go of insisting that the boys act the student consistently that Miss Groves opens up space for them to be students. (Youdell 2010: 320-321; emphasis added)

Like Bourdieu's player, Miss Grove has a feel for the game. She is able to anticipate how her students would react if she were to insist on them conforming singularly and consistently with the legitimated student identity. She lets go. It is a tactical move, executed on the run, in response to the moves of her students. It involves recognition of the power relations in social spaces such as classrooms and of her students' previous experiences of being put in their place, albeit with some difficulty.

This, then, is the third principle on which to build a socially inclusive pedagogy, to 'work with' rather than 'act on' students and their communities.[8] It too is a principle that has applicability beyond the confines of classrooms.

Conclusion

To conclude, Australian universities and the upper end of VET are not places for everyone, although if the Australian Government has its way, they increasingly will be. Even so, not everyone who participates in tertiary education is well placed. There are some groups of Australians who continue to be under-represented in prestigious courses, levels, institutions and sectors. There is still some distance to go in reconfiguring these places to make them more socially inclusive. Yet, as important as this work is, the bigger question for social inclusion is what kind of places these will be. Creating places for students from diverse backgrounds is one thing. Creating space for diverse knowledges and ways of knowing is another. I think that the most strategic place to begin this creative work is with the PW of tertiary education, because of its positioning as a central message system in education. I also think this is not just work for tertiary education classrooms and designated teachers. Pedagogy is an activity engaged by all who work in education institutions, irrespective of whether this is consciously understood or not.

From my perspective, there are three principles on which to build a socially inclusive pedagogy:
- A belief that all students bring things of value to the learning environment;
- A design that values difference while also providing access to and enabling engagement with dominance; and
- A practice that 'works with' rather than 'acts on' students and their communities.

Such pedagogy has great potential to open up spaces for currently marginalised groups.

REFERENCES

Anderson, D.S., Boven, R., Fensham, P.J., & Powell, J.P. (1980). *Students in Australian higher education: a study of their social composition since the abolition of fees*. Canberra: AGPS.

Anderson, D. S., & Vervoorn, A. E. (1983). *Access to Privilege: Patterns of Participation in Australian Post-Secondary Education*. Canberra: ANU Press.

Association of American Universities (1997). On the importance of diversity in university admissions. *New York Times*, 24 April, 27.

Australian Government (2009). *Transforming Australia's Higher Education System*. Canberra: DEEWR. Retrieved 9 February 2010, from http://www.deewr.gov.au/HigherEducation/Documents/PDF/Additional%20Report%20-%20Transforming%20Aus%20Higher%20ED_webaw.pdf

Ball, E. L., & Lai, A. (2006). Place-Based Pedagogy for the Arts and Humanities. *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition, and Culture, 6*(2), 261-287.

---

[8] I am cognisant of Bourdieu's caution to "avoid asking of [practice] more logic than it can give" (Bourdieu 1990: 86), but I think asking this much is about right (and is right). It also reflects the code or rules of the game, particularly the team games to which Bourdieu refers, to collaborate or play with your team-mates towards a shared goal and in such a way as to put them in an advantageous position.

Bernstein, B. (1971). On the classification and framing of educational knowledge. In M. F. Young (ed.), *Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education*. London: Collier-Macmillan, 47–69.

Bernstein, B. (2001). From pedagogies to knowledge. In A. Marais *et al.* (Eds.), *Towards a sociology of pedagogy: the contribution of Basil Bernstein to research* (pp. 363–368). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Bradley, D., Noonan, P., Nugent, H., & Scales, B. (2008). *Review of Australian Higher Education: Final Report*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia, http://www.deewr.gov.au/HigherEducation/Review/Documents/PDF/Higher%20Education%20Review_one%20document_02.pdf

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J.-C. (1990). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture, Second Edition* (R. Nice, Trans.). London: Sage.

Bowers, C. A. (2008). Why a critical pedagogy of place is an oxymoron. *Environmental Education Research, 14*(3), 325-335.

Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1999). Development and Adaptations of the Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning*, (80), 75-81.

Connell, R. W. (1993). *Schools and Social Justice*. Toronto: Our Schools/Our Selves Education Foundation

Connell, R. W. (2007). *Southern Theory: the global dynamics of knowledge in social science*. Crows Nest, N.S.W: Allen & Unwin.

Commonwealth of Australia (2010). *Higher Education Support Act 2003: Other Grants Guidelines (Education) 2010*. Canberra: Commonwealth of Australia. Retrieved 25 November 2010, from http://www.deewr.gov.au/HigherEducation/Programs/Equity/Documents/HEPPPGuidelines_2010.pdf

Dall'Alba, G., & Barnacle, R. (2005). Embodied Knowing in Online Environments. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 37*(5), 719-744.

Dall'Alba, G., & Barnacle, R. (2007). An ontological turn for higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 32*(6), 679-691.

David, M., Brennan, J., Broadfoot, P., Brown, A., Cox, R., Davis, P., et al. (2009). *Effective learning and teaching in UK higher education: A Commentary by the Teaching and Learning Research Programme*: Teaching and Learning Research Programme. Retrieved 23 February 2010 from, http://www.tlrp.org/pub/documents/UKHEfinal.pdf

de Certeau, M. (1984). *The Practice of Everyday Life* (S. Rendall, Trans.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom*. New York: The New Press.

Department of Employment Education and Workplace Relations. 2009. *Selected Higher Education Statistics, 2008, Students Full Year*. Retrieved 16 November 2010, from http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/higher_education/publications_resources/profiles/Students/2008_full_year.htm

Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the "Postsocialist" Condition*. New York: Routledge.

Gale, T. (1999). Fair contest or elite sponsorship? Entry settlements in Australian higher education. *Higher Education Policy*, 12(1), pp. 69-91.

Gale, T., & Densmore, K. (2000). *Just Schooling: Explorations in the Cultural Politics of Teaching*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Green, B., McConaghy, C., McCulla, N., Boylan, C., Maxwell, T. W., Letts, W., Novak, M., Wallace, A. (2006). *Spaces and Places. The NSW Rural Teacher Education Project.* Report of the ARC Linkage Project. Charles Sturt University, University of New England, NSW Department of Education, Bathurst. (Restricted Circulation) http://www.csu.edu.au/research/ripple/docs/tepl/spaces_places.pdf

Gruenewald, D. A. (2008). The best of both worlds: a critical pedagogy of place. *Environmental Education Research, 14*(3), 308-324.

Hayes, D., Mills, M., Christie, P., & Lingard, B. (2006). *Teachers & Schooling Making a Difference*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Hickey-Moody, A., Savage, G. C., & Windle, J. (2010). Pedagogy writ large: public, popular and cultural pedagogies in motion. *Critical Studies in Education, 51*(3), 227-236.

Karmel, T. & Woods, D. (2008). *Second-chance vocational education and training*. Adelaide: NCVER. Retrieved 17 November 2010, from http://www.ncver.edu.au/publications/1831.html

Lingard, B. et al. (1998). *Queensland School Reform Longitudinal Study (QSRLS)*. Brisbane. Education Queensland.

Lingard, B., Hayes, D., Mills, M., & Christie, P. (2003). *Leading Learning Making Hope Practical in Schools*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

McConaghy, C. (2006). Schooling Out of Place. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 27*(3), 325-339.

McConaghy, C. (2006). Transience and Teaching: Place and the New Psychoanalytic Sociologies of Teaching. *Education in Rural Australia, 16*(2), 47-57.

Milem, J. F. (2003). The Educational Benefits of Diversity: Evidence from Multiple Sectors. In M. J. Chang, D. Witt, J. Jones & K. Hakuta (Eds.), *Compelling Interest: Examining the Evidence on Racial Dynamics in Colleges and Universities* (pp. 126-169). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of Knowledge for Teaching: Using a Qualitative Approach to Connect Homes and Classrooms. *Theory Into Practice, 31*(2), 132-141.

Mulcahy, D. (2006). The salience of space for pedagogy and identity in teacher education: problem-based learning as a case in point. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society, 14*(1), 55-69.

NCVER (2010). *Australian vocational education and training statistics: Students and courses 2009*. Adelaide: NCVER.

Newman, F. & Associates (1996). *Authentic Achievement: restructuring schools for intellectual quality*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Sefa Dei, G. J. (2008). Indigenous Knowledge Studies and the Next Generation: Pedagogical Possibilites for Anti-colonial Education. *Australian Journal of Indigenous Education, 37*(Supplementary), 5-13.

Sefa Dei, G. (2010). *Teaching Africa: Towards a Transgressive Pedagogy*. Dordrecht : Springer.

Somerville, M. (2006). An enabling place pedagogy for new teachers, Proceedings of the Annual AARE Conference, University of South Australia, Adelaide. http://www.aare.edu.au/06pap/som06819.pdf

Stevenson, R. (2008). A critical pedagogy of place and the critical place(s) of pedagogy. *Environmental Education Research, 14*(3), 353-360.

Vinson, T. (2007). *Dropping Off the Edge: The Distribution of Disadvantage in Australia*. Richmond, Vic & Curtin, ACT.

Windle, J. (2010). 'Anyone can make it, but there can only be one winner': modelling neoliberal learning and work on reality television. *Critical Studies in Education, 51*(3), 251-263.

Wheelahan, L. (2009). Do educational pathways contribute to equity in tertiary education in Australia? *Critical Studies in Education, 50*(3), 261-275.

Youdell, D. (2010). Pedagogies of becoming in an end-of-the-line 'special' school. *Critical Studies in Education, 51*(3), 313-324.

Zipin, L. (2009). Dark funds of knowledge, deep funds of pedagogy: exploring boundaries between lifeworlds and schools. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 30*(3), 317-331.